



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 165

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JULY 17, 2019

No. 120

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
July 17, 2019.

I hereby appoint the Honorable HENRY CUELLAR 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.

ADVANCE TO IMPEACHMENT

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

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, and still I rise, a proud American. But I am especially proud, Mr. Speaker, of this House of Representatives because, yesterday, this House engaged in the first part of a bipartisan—bipartisan—effort.

It was bipartisan yesterday, but it is a bifurcated effort as well. Bifurcated because, yesterday, this House voted with a vote of 244 to condemn the

President. Yesterday's vote was to condemn, the first part of the bifurcated process. Today's vote is to determine whether or not we will punish the President.

The effort yesterday was wonderful. I supported it. But it does not punish the President. It does not fine him. He will remain in office.

Today, we will deal with the question of what his punishment should be. Today, between 4 and 5, somewhere in there, there will be Articles of Impeachment voted on. This will be the opportunity for us to go on record letting the world know where we stand.

If we vote to table, we are voting not to advance impeachment. If we vote to send it to the Committee on the Judiciary, we are voting not to advance impeachment.

I will not vote to table. I will not vote to send it to the Committee on the Judiciary. I will want to move forward so that we can move to vote to impeach.

This President has committed impeachable offenses. Yesterday, we condemned him for them. Today is our opportunity to punish him for them.

And for those who might say, "Well, if you do this, there may be some people who won't like you," well, there are times when you have to do that which is neither safe nor politic nor popular. You have to do it because it is right.

But I would also say this: If we voted yesterday to condemn him, those who are not going to like you are not going to like you any more today when you vote to impeach than they will if you vote not to impeach. They are still going to be where they were when you decided that you were not going to support what the President has been doing since he has been in office.

Finally this, Mr. Speaker. I love my country. It means something to me to be a part of the fiber and fabric of this country. And because I love it, I will not allow anyone to be above the law.

The President has been above the law some 91 days since the Mueller report was presented—some 91 days. I think that it is time for us to send the President a clear message that he is not above the law. I think it is time for us to impeach.

I also believe that this, and understand, what we are doing today with impeachment, does not impact the Mueller report. It does not impact what the Committee on the Judiciary is doing or any other committee investigating obstruction. Obstruction has nothing to do with what we will vote on today. This is about what the President has done.

You cannot incite people to harm other people with your words. You can't yell, "Fire," in a crowded theater.

The President has committed an impeachable offense, and we ought to take it up. He ought to be impeached.

I will vote to advance to impeachment, and I pray that this President will be impeached today.

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

IMMIGRATION CRISIS REQUIRES IMMIGRATION REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, our country is seeing unprecedented numbers of illegal aliens attempting to circumvent U.S. immigration and asylum laws at our southern border.

The Department of Homeland Security reported that 104,344 arrests occurred last month, making 4 straight months of arrests totaling over 100,000. That is the equivalent to the entire population of Watauga County in

□ 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.

H5915

North Carolina's Fifth District being detained at our southern border every 2 weeks.

Our Border Patrol officers, aid workers, and National Guard units have been overwhelmed performing the vital and often thankless work upholding the rule of law to keep our country safe. They deserve the support of this body, and so do those who have legitimate asylum petitions and humanitarian needs.

As we know, many in this recent migrant influx include women with children who want the life of opportunity that this country and our freedoms afford. Caring for children and families at our southern border need not be a partisan issue.

Last month, House Republicans delivered \$4.6 billion to help manage the humanitarian crisis and strengthen border security. While this funding is necessary to address the border crisis, more needs to be done to modify the law and streamline asylum regulations.

Rather than pivot to political pandering and policy extremes like open borders, we need to recognize the complex failures of our current system and address them head-on. That is why I am proud to cosponsor the Fix the Immigration Loopholes Act. This bill updates immigration law to efficiently process real asylum claims and safely return children to their countries of origin. It is past time that we debate it on the House floor.

I call on Speaker PELOSI to continue our progress addressing the border crisis by bringing up bipartisan legislation for comprehensive immigration reform. The immigration crisis our country is facing has strained our country's border security and customs enforcement protections to the breaking point. Letting this crisis continue is not an option.

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE "APOLLO 11" MOON LANDING

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

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as chairwoman of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, it is an honor to stand before you today to celebrate the 50th anniversary of *Apollo 11*.

On the morning of July 16, 1969, Neil Armstrong, Michael Collins, and Buzz Aldrin lifted off from NASA's Cape Kennedy. That day, millions watched in awe as NASA launched *Apollo 11*'s Saturn V rocket and began the long journey to accomplish the goals set by President Kennedy less than 10 years earlier to land a man on the Moon before the end of the decade.

As President Kennedy said in his speech at Rice University in September 1962: "We choose to go to the Moon in this decade and do the other things, not because they are easy, but because they are hard."

There is no better explanation that captures the American spirit. We

choose to take giant leaps. We choose to know the unknown. We choose to lead into the future.

On July 20, 1960, just 4 days after the launch, the world listened and watched as the first steps were taken on the Moon. Again, hundreds of millions of people across the world watched as history was made.

Five times more, NASA astronauts landed on the Moon and returned home safely. President Kennedy's promise that our great democracy could achieve these hard things became a reality.

As we watched those things in July 50 years ago, dreams began to form. Every person watching the success of the Apollo program, young and old, no matter their background, was filled with inspiration.

Some youngsters could say to themselves, "I will be an astronaut," or, "I will be a scientist." As they looked up to the Moon, they pictured themselves up there amongst those American heroes an unimaginable distance away.

This impact has its greatest effect on our young people. We must always remember that inspiration when we set out to accomplish our greatest goals, the youth inspiration. The world's rising generations are watching, always setting their eyes on the sky and the stars. Young girls and young boys from all backgrounds thrive off the visions that we have now and imagine themselves becoming a part of it when they can.

We must meet this great responsibility to the following generations by providing opportunities for them to do great things with the challenge we face today. As my predecessor, chairman of the then-Committee of Science and Astronautics, Congressman George P. Miller said after the *Apollo 11* crew splashed down safely in the Pacific Ocean:

Those of us who are privileged to live today will pass this on to our children and our grandchildren, and they will, in turn, brag about the fact that we were there. The flight of *Apollo 11* is perhaps the greatest secular achievement that the world has ever seen.

This achievement was made possible by the unified efforts of nearly a half million men and women, scientists and engineers, technicians and craftsmen, and the support of the American people and their government. The United States discovery and exploration enterprise is unmatched.

Just as we once set our sights to be the first to land on the Moon, let us bring that same sense of commitment to meeting other challenges facing our Nation.

FOR THE BENEFIT OF ALL

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

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, this week America celebrates the 50th anniversary of one of mankind's—

and America's—greatest achievements: walking on the surface of the Moon.

Although then only a child, I well remember the earth shake and the dishes in our kitchen cabinets rattle as the Saturn V engines were tested nearby. Even now, 50 years after the Moon landing, I get chills remembering when Apollo astronauts landed and later planted the American flag on the Moon's surface.

It was American ingenuity, boldness, technical prowess, and economic might that made this historic achievement possible.

I am proud to say the legacy of the *Apollo 11* Moon landing lives on in the Tennessee Valley of Alabama that I represent. Some history is in order:

The Tennessee Valley's Marshall Space Flight Center is the birthplace of America's space program. Americans generally, and Alabamians in particular, designed and engineered the Saturn V rocket that launched the historic *Apollo 11* and took American astronauts to the Moon.

I will never forget the flames and the roar as our Saturn V rocket was launched and carried the *Apollo 11* crew in vehicles to the Moon. I remember with tremendous pride Neil Armstrong's words as he set foot on the Moon: "That's one small step for man, one giant leap for mankind."

That giant leap meant to benefit all mankind is a prime example of American exceptionalism and helped cement America's status as the best, most powerful and most influential nation in world history.

When Neil Armstrong and Buzz Aldrin planted America's flag on the Moon surface on July 20, 1969, there was no doubt that America's space program had passed the Russians and become the preeminent leader in space exploration, a position America maintains today.

This week, America not only reflects on the miraculous achievements of the *Apollo 11* mission, but we also honor those who played a critical role in its ultimate success. The Tennessee Valley is immensely proud of our pivotal role in landing a man on the Moon and, equally importantly, returning them alive to Earth.

Reflecting our pride in America's achievement, there are two—that is, two—Saturn V rockets displayed at the United States Space and Rocket Center in Huntsville, Alabama.

□ 1015

These Saturn V displays help inspire the next generation to reach for the stars and achieve what now may be thought impossible.

While it is important to remember the historic achievements of the Apollo missions, it is also important to honor those who sacrificed their lives in the effort to achieve American greatness.

In that vein, Huntsville has named schools after Apollo Command Pilot Virgil "Gus" Grissom, Senior Pilot Ed White, and Pilot Roger Chaffee, each of

whom died in a capsule fire during an Apollo 1 ground test.

After the Moon landing and return of *Apollo 11* astronauts Buzz Aldrin, Neil Armstrong, and Michael Collins to Earth on July 24, 1969, Huntsville's streets were awash with revelers.

German rocket scientist Wernher von Braun said on the Huntsville courthouse steps that day: "My friends, there was dancing here in the streets of Huntsville when our first satellite orbited the Earth, and there was dancing again when the first Americans landed on the Moon. I'd like to ask you: Don't hang up your dancing slippers."

Von Braun's words remind us that mankind's greatest achievements are yet to come, that America will continue to accomplish the unimaginable in space for the benefit of all humanity.

As we reach for the stars, I have confidence that the Tennessee Valley, Marshall Space Flight Center, and Huntsville, where we say, "The sky is not the limit," will be instrumental in carrying American astronauts back to the Moon, to Mars, and beyond.

HONORING DEPUTY WILLIAM KIMBRO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CUNNINGHAM) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chair, I rise today to honor the valiant actions of Deputy William Kimbro of the Berkeley County Sheriff's Office.

On June 11, Deputy Kimbro pulled over a speeding vehicle to find that 12-day-old Riley had stopped breathing. She needed immediate help, so without hesitation, Deputy Kimbro administered lifesaving care to this newborn until the first responders could arrive on the scene.

Deputy Kimbro served our Nation in the Navy for 21 years before joining the Berkeley County Sheriff's Office in 2013. A school resource officer on summer break, patrolling the road is not Deputy Kimbro's primary duty, but he acted without hesitation. For his bravery and composure, he earned Berkeley County's Life-Saving Medal.

He is a husband and father of two children. Deputy Kimbro is an all-around hero, and we are lucky to have him looking after us in the Lowcountry. He, alongside all first responders, keep the Lowcountry and this Nation a safer and better place.

Deputy Kimbro should take a bow. We are extremely proud of him.

RECOGNIZING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF "APOLLO 11"

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, as a number of my colleagues have, to recognize

that this Saturday, July 20, is the 50th anniversary of the *Apollo 11* Moon landing.

Fifty years ago, Neil Armstrong became the first human to set foot on the surface of the Moon and declared the moment "one small step for man, one giant leap for mankind."

Along with Buzz Aldrin and Michael Collins, he launched from the Kennedy Space Center in Florida and embarked on a journey that would change the course of human history forever.

At the age of 8, I can remember watching the coverage of the landing from my family living room, where we had moved the dining room table to eat dinner and watch this historic occasion. I remember the landing that occurred at 4:18 p.m. Eastern Standard Time on July 20. Along with many other children of that time across the country, I was filled with a sense of awe and wonder.

This consequential moment was sparked years before in 1961 when President Kennedy stood before Congress and set forth an ambitious goal of putting a man on the Moon before the decade's end, long before, as he acknowledged, the materials had been yet invented to make that a reality.

His bold vision became a reality on July 20, 1969. This achievement would not have been possible without American innovation and work ethic, paired with the support of the public.

Now, we are tasked with safely sending the first woman and another man to the south pole of the Moon, where no human has traveled.

This mission, called Artemis, will send astronauts back to the Moon by 2024, allowing us to establish a permanent presence on the Moon by 2028.

None of this can be achieved without a strong public-private partnership between NASA and the commercial industry and the strong support of the American people.

NASA works with companies, both large and small, from across the 50 States to prepare for the Artemis mission, as well as many other projects NASA conducts in space.

In Pennsylvania's 15th Congressional District, there are several local businesses working with NASA. Just recently, NASA announced a contract for infrastructure support service from the H.F. Lenz Company in Johnstown to provide their engineering expertise.

In Bellefonte, Actuated Medical is working with NASA on additive manufacturing methods and custom medical devices.

Public-private partnerships like these will fuel the next generation of exploration.

Space is more than just a place of academic study, however. It is instrumental to our national security, discovers new technologies that have everyday applications, and encourages us to push the boundaries of what is possible.

Mr. Speaker, the legacy of the *Apollo 11* Moon landing is forever enshrined in

the hearts and the minds of Americans who witnessed the moment 50 years ago this week. We must reignite our curiosity for space exploration as we prepare to return to the Moon and seek further horizons in the decades to come.

RAISE THE MINIMUM WAGE

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

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge my colleagues to vote for the Raise the Minimum Wage Act.

In my district of Milwaukee, Wisconsin, Milwaukeeans are stuck at the Federal minimum wage of \$7.25 an hour set over a decade ago. These workers struggle to support themselves and their families with their meager wages. However hard they try, at \$7.25 an hour, they are working themselves into poverty, since \$15,000 a year is below the Federal poverty level.

What do these workers do? They are forced to juggle multiple jobs and contend with long and unpredictable hours. Meanwhile, congressional inaction on minimum wage workers' paychecks continues to erode this basic labor standard.

This inaction has contributed to out-of-control economic inequality and the decline of the middle class. Hardworking Americans working at the minimum wage are, indeed, working below the poverty level. Not only are they working below the poverty level, but they are supplying cheap labor to wealthy corporations that have benefited from our tax policy.

It also requires you, hardworking taxpayers, to subsidize those corporations. Why? Because these workers working 40 hours a week still qualify for public benefits like food stamps and Medicaid because those employers don't provide those benefits.

I personally know the hardships of surviving on less than a living wage. That is why I have fought throughout my entire career in public service to lift America's vulnerable workers, not just to help them make ends meet but to empower them and to help them reach their ambitions.

I am so proud that I protested for fair wages alongside fellow Milwaukeeans in 2014 as part of the national Fight for \$15 campaign. I was arrested for participating in the fight for \$15 an hour in that protest, and I am grateful for the courage demonstrated by the protesters nationwide who joined the Fight for \$15.

I thank you for the personal risks you have taken. We are voting on the Raise the Minimum Wage Act because of the momentum that you have created.

Raising the minimum wage will have countless benefits. To name a few, it will lift 40 million workers out of poverty, boost the economy, and spread the benefits of economic growth that President Trump has hoarded for the wealthy few.

Raising the national minimum wage is well overdue, and I urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on the Raise the Wage Act.

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

HONORING THE LEGACY OF THE
“APOLLO 11” MISSION

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

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, 50 years ago, on July 20, 1969, people across the country and around the world watched in eager anticipation as Neil Armstrong and Buzz Aldrin landed on the Moon.

This historic event ended the space race and brought American innovation, determination, and leadership to the forefront of the global stage.

This was American exceptionalism at its best. My brother, sister, and I never missed an Apollo liftoff. We all became very familiar with that countdown:

Ten, 9, 8—ignition sequence—6, 5—fire the retro-rockets—3, 2, 1. Liftoff. We have liftoff. The rocket has cleared the tower.

We watched in amazement as we sat in front of that little RCA black-and-white TV. It was like the whole room was shaking. We would sit and watch the TV set until we saw the rocket finally leave all the way out of sight.

Apollo 11 was a 36-story-high rocket. It started its 8-day, 953,000-mile journey to the Moon and back.

We all had toy rockets back in the day, and we would repeat that liftoff sequence over and over. My brother and I would climb our garage and launch our toy rockets.

In Cub Scouts, we built rockets. In Boy Scouts, we built rockets. In our high school physics classes, we built rockets. We had contests to see who could fly their rockets the highest and the farthest.

I have no idea how many young boys and girls were inspired to go into science because of the joy of watching rockets being launched to the Moon.

That Apollo jargon took over our daily lives. Our teachers would say things like, “Lunch is T minus 30 minutes.” Or at the end of a tough test, they would say, “Mission accomplished.”

As we celebrate this historic event, I think back to all the times I took my children to the Cosmosphere in Hutchinson, Kansas, which displays one of the Moon rocks brought back by the *Apollo 11* mission. This world-class museum and science center, number one of its kind, showcases American innovation in space and aeronautics and provides interactive opportunities to engage with historic events such as the Moon landing.

In fact, they currently have a traveling exhibit called “Apollo Redux,” which allows visitors to sit in an actual mission control console from the

Johnson Space Center where the Apollo missions were coordinated.

It amazes me to think of all the advancements that have been made possible as a result of these Apollo missions. Aerospace and manufacturing revolutions have dramatically changed the way we build and fly airplanes. Research conducted by NASA has helped us to better understand our solar system, as well as our universe.

In fact, Astronaut Nick Hague of Hoxie, Kansas, in my district, is currently conducting research on the International Space Station.

We are proud of Nick, who will keep doing a great job for America.

As a member of the House Science, Space, and Technology Committee, I am proud to join my colleagues here today in honoring the 50th anniversary of the *Apollo 11* landing and its legacy that we continue to build upon today.

END HUNGER NOW

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago, the House Agriculture Subcommittee on Nutrition, Oversight, and Department Operations hosted a hearing that discussed the devastating impacts of President Trump’s proposed cuts to broad-based categorical eligibility.

Today, I would like to share the stories of a few of my constituents who have benefited from the streamlined process that broad-based categorical eligibility provides hungry families in accessing food benefits.

In my hometown of Worcester, Massachusetts, a single mother who is a domestic violence survivor raising one child works as a certified nursing assistant and makes \$1,819 per month before taxes or payroll deductions.

While this may sound like enough to get by, her current income is barely over 130 percent of the Federal poverty level.

Even with an income this low, her family only receives a \$15 monthly SNAP benefit. But because of broad-based categorical eligibility, her child is also able to receive free school meals, and it helps her stay afloat as a working mom.

□ 1030

Then there is another Worcester-area family of four, former refugees, with two high school aged children. The mother and father, who both work in shipping and packaging, make \$15.35 an hour. While both parents work as many hours as they can, their income fluctuates depending on how many shifts they are assigned each week.

Many months they make under 130 percent of the Federal poverty level. But during other months, when they get extra shifts, it puts them slightly higher, over 130 percent. This month they received \$110 in SNAP; but if it

were up to the Trump administration, just one more shift could threaten the entire family’s access to SNAP and their children’s access to free school meals.

Mr. Speaker, broad-based categorical eligibility is not a black-and-white issue. President Trump shouldn’t be cutting off people’s benefits just as they are getting on their feet.

Last year, we worked hard to come up with a bipartisan farm bill and, despite some discussions on this issue, Congress agreed then, and in 2014, to allow States to maintain their flexibility in accommodating low-income households. In my home State of Massachusetts, where the cost of living is relatively high, compared to the rest of the country, that flexibility is crucial.

I would like to take a moment now to highlight a forward-thinking partnership to address hunger among college students in Gardner, Massachusetts. I find the work of organizations that address food insecurity to be especially important during times like these.

I have mentioned before that the average SNAP benefit is around \$1.40 per person per meal. You can’t even buy a cup of coffee for that, much less feed an entire family. For those experiencing hunger, food pantries often serve as the safety net when SNAP just isn’t enough.

In my district, for example, Worcester County Food Bank provides donated food to a network of 118 partner agencies, including food pantries, community meal programs, and shelters. Its mission is to engage, educate, and lead Worcester County in creating a hunger-free community. Last year, they served 81,000 neighbors.

Recently, I visited one of the food bank’s partners, the Mount Wachusett Community College’s Food for Thought Campus Pantry, one of the first college food pantries to partner with the Worcester County Food Bank in addressing food insecurity on local college campuses.

Research shows that community college students experience higher food insecurity than the rest of the population. A recent study found that two out of three community college students are food insecure.

The Food for Thought Campus Pantry was created in October of 2017 for students and by students in response to food insecurity among community college students, which is becoming an increasing threat to student success.

Since the Food for Thought Pantry opened its doors in October 2017, 210 students have registered for food assistance, and 7,238 pounds of food, and 15,807 total items were distributed.

Without organizations like the Worcester County Food Bank and Mount Wachusett’s Food for Thought Food Pantry, students and families would not have consistent access to the food that they need. These programs and organizations are an irreplaceable key to solving our Nation’s hunger crisis, but they can’t bear all of the

weight if the Trump administration has its way and cuts millions off of SNAP.

That is why I encourage my colleagues in the House and Senate to join me and fight every single attempt this administration makes to wage war on people who are hungry. Working together is the only way we are going to be able to end hunger now.

“APOLLO 11” COMMEMORATION

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

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Speaker, 50 years ago, America achieved the greatest technological accomplishment in human history.

Three men, Neil Armstrong, Michael Collins, and Buzz Aldrin, set off from Cape Canaveral on a voyage that President Kennedy called “the most hazardous, and dangerous, and greatest adventure on which man has ever embarked.”

Four days into their 8-day mission, Neil and Buzz climbed down the ladder of the lunar module and stood on the surface of the Moon; the very first human presence on a celestial body other than Earth; a feat that, to this day, no other country has equaled. And we did it five more times.

Armstrong, Collins, and Aldrin could not have accomplished this alone. *Apollo 11* was the culmination of the hard work of more than 400,000 Americans who, with limited experience, and comparatively primitive technology, committed themselves to accomplish this task and completing President Kennedy’s order of returning the astronauts safely home.

I am so proud to represent Johnson Space Center in Houston, Texas, and the historic Mission Control of that Apollo era.

On the wall of the House Science, Space, and Technology Committee here on Capitol Hill, where I serve as the senior Republican on the Space and Aeronautics Subcommittee, is written, from the Bible, Proverbs 29:18, which reads: “Where there is no vision, the people perish.”

The 50th anniversary of the first Moon landing should serve as a reminder of what we, as a Nation, can accomplish when we do have a clear mission.

Six hundred million people from around the world gathered around their grainy television sets to watch those first steps. What is amazing is that this took place only 40 years after Lindbergh first flew across the Atlantic; and only 65 years after two bicycle-making brothers from Dayton, Ohio, achieved powered flight in Kitty Hawk, North Carolina.

The Apollo program built upon these accomplishments and exponentially pushed our technology forward; and we are on the cusp of doing it again.

President Trump and Vice President PENCE have ensured that we are, again,

pushing outward, and launching America back into its dominant role as the global leader in space. We have our vision. This time, we head to the red planet by way of the Moon, and this time we stay.

NASA Administrator Bridenstine has focused NASA on achieving these goals with the Artemis program, Apollo’s sister, and I will continue to use my position in Congress to advocate for the support needed for NASA to accomplish this very worthwhile effort.

Mr. Speaker, as we commemorate the 50th anniversary of *Apollo 11* this week, I would like to thank all out there who helped us get to the Moon, and all those out there who will get us back to the Moon; and thank them for their tremendous contribution to our country.

I am anxiously looking forward to the next small steps and giant leaps in our space program.

“APOLLO 11” CELEBRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Oklahoma (Ms. KENDRA S. HORN) for 5 minutes.

Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, this week, we celebrate one of the most remarkable moments in human history: The launch of the *Apollo 11* lunar mission, and the first steps on the Moon by American astronauts Neil Armstrong and Buzz Aldrin. American leadership, ingenuity, and investment made this moment possible 50 years ago.

As the Space and Aeronautics Subcommittee chairwoman, I am honored to be joined by my colleagues today to recognize this achievement and talk about what it means, 50 years later. As we commemorate this historic accomplishment, it is clear that we stand on the shoulders of space pioneers, some of whom are still with us today.

Apollo 11 and Armstrong’s first steps on the lunar surface were the culmination of a focused, methodical buildup of the developments, demonstrations, and operational capabilities needed to achieve the Moon landing.

The value of the Apollo program is beyond measure. Its mission inspired and continues to draw countless Americans into science, technology, engineering and math. This program led to significant technological advances and products that changed the world as we know it and benefit our lives today.

Fundamentally, the success of Apollo contributed to our standing in the world. Apollo taught us the value of taking audacious, and yet intentional risks.

I would like to focus, as well, for a moment, on the mission that immediately preceded the Moon landing, *Apollo 10*. This mission, launched 2 months before, was launched to test all of the components and procedures just short of landing. Carrying the lunar module, it came as close as 50,000 feet from the lunar surface before returning safely to Earth.

Retired Air Force General Thomas P. Stafford, an Oklahoman, commanded this essential mission that enabled us to land on the Moon.

General Stafford was born in Weatherford, Oklahoma, and received a Bachelor of Science degree from the United States Naval Academy in 1952, graduating with honors. Commissioned as a second lieutenant in the Air Force, he completed advanced interceptor training and served tours of duty flying F-86Ds. He then graduated from the U.S. Air Force Test Pilot School as the outstanding graduate.

Throughout his career, Stafford flew more than 100 different types of aircraft as he pushed the boundaries of achievement in air and space. Stafford was selected as an astronaut in 1962 and, 3 years later, flew on *Gemini 6* as the first space rendezvous mission, followed by *Gemini 9*.

Later, General Stafford commanded the first international space flight mission, *Apollo-Soyuz*. This peaceful cooperation between two Cold War rivals was the first step in what has become a sustained relationship between the U.S., Russia, and our international partners with the International Space Station.

The last of the Apollo missions, its lasting impacts, reminds us that even in times of warfare and global distress, that space exploration is a unifying force of discovery, peace, cooperation, and diplomacy.

Beyond all his accomplishments, General Stafford has also become a friend and mentor. To General Stafford, and all of those who contributed to the success of Apollo, you inspired a generation and showed the world what is possible when our Nation comes together to focus on an ambitious goal and, in turn, change the world in both foreseeable and unforeseeable ways.

BUILDING ON THE APOLLO LEGACY

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

Mr. POSEY. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to be here today to speak about the 50th anniversary of *Apollo 11*.

I can remember sitting in class with the teacher discussing President John F. Kennedy’s speech about going to the Moon at Rice University in 1961, when he committed this country to putting a man on the Moon and bringing him safely back to Earth within the decade.

He said: Great nations do things, not because they are easy, because they are hard. And it certainly was hard.

I remember doing the math on my fingers and saying, you know, I am going to be old enough to be involved in that program. And my goal became to have my fingerprints on the rocket that took the first man to the Moon. To make a long story short, 5 years later I was an inspector working on the third stage of the Apollo rocket, one of the highlights of my life.

Americans were united in those days in their zeal for space; the Apollo Moon landing being the greatest technological advancement in the history of mankind. Some writers described those times as a Camelot era, where people respected their President, even if they didn't vote for them. Not until 9/11 had I seen Americans as united as they were around the Apollo program.

Space, of course, is important to our national security. It is important to our economic prosperity. It is important to our technological advancement.

I ask people how often they benefit from space, and the response usually averages, 6 percent say they benefit from space once a year; 4 percent say they benefit from space once a month; and only 2 percent say they benefit from space once a week. And we won't even go to once a day.

I guess those people have roosters in the backyard that give them their weather reports. They don't pay any attention to the images we have from the satellites. I guess they don't use cell phones, or use credit cards, or even make cash transactions, because those are all satellite-linked.

Ultimately, space is important to us for the ultimate survival of our species.

Neil deGrasse Tyson lectured our Science, Space, and Technology Committee several years ago on the benefits of space. And while he was here, he gave a lecture for staff and Members over at the Jefferson Building at the Library of Congress; very well-attended and well-taken.

During his presentation, he mentioned that space is the only thing Congress really spends money on to truly benefit the next generation, and I believe that. I believe those are trees that we plant without the expectation of being around to enjoy all the shade.

I want to thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle on the Science, Space, and Technology Committee for helping keep space a bipartisan issue. I hope we can build on the legacy of *Apollo 11* and that, some day, our children and their children can come together and enjoy positive achievements for their generation and generations to follow.

□ 1045

COMMEMORATING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE "APOLLO 11" MOON LANDING

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

Mr. McADAMS. Mr. Speaker, in the lead-up to the *Apollo 11* Moon landing's 50th anniversary, people across our country, including many from my State, Utah, have been sharing their memories of this historic event and its inspiration in their lives. Some of the lucky ones played a role in helping the space program reach this historic achievement.

Brigham Young University graduate Charlie Bunker remembers watching

from a common room of a boardinghouse in downtown Denver. Charlie's companion was an Amish gentleman who turned to him and asked if he thought the astronauts were really going to land on the Moon. Charlie said, yes, he was sure, because he worked at a place where they made the rockets that helped to get them there.

Charlie was a physicist who remembers, as a 19-year-old, President John F. Kennedy issue his challenge to America to go to the Moon. And after graduating from college and getting married, Charlie landed a job with the Hughes Corporation in Los Angeles for a starting salary of \$8,000 a year. He worked on Surveyor, a NASA-funded program that sent unmanned rockets to the Moon. That work led to being hired by Martin Marietta, a Denver-based aerospace company.

Charlie and his family were living temporarily in the boardinghouse on the historymaking night of the Moon landing. Charlie worked for Martin Marietta for nearly 40 years, including the last few years in Utah.

When the Deseret News asked readers to answer whether they remembered where they were on July 20, 1969, they received hundreds of responses. Several Utahns who were serving in the military wrote in, and one wrote: "I was returning from a night mission over the Ho Chi Min trail in Laos as a pilot of a B-57. I remember it was a clear night with a full Moon, and my navigator and I were listening to the radio broadcast on Armed Forces radio at 30,000 feet. Later, my wife and I had Neil Armstrong to dinner in Paris while I was Air Attache to France."

Another wrote: "I was at building No. 9 Manned Spacecraft Center, now called the Johnson Spacecraft Center, in Houston. NASA set up big TV screens and chairs for NASA employees and their friends. I remember the pride and accomplishment of the mission and celebrations from NASA engineers and contractors. I remember it like it was yesterday."

Apollo 11 and the Moon landing was a jewel in NASA's crown at the time. It set the foundation for many future American achievements in space.

Sixteen years later, Utah Senator Jake Garn became the first sitting Member of Congress to fly in space when he flew aboard the space shuttle *Discovery* as a payload specialist in 1985.

The closest I have gotten to the Moon—to date, anyway—is when, as the mayor of Salt Lake County, I placed the Clark Planetarium Moon rock into the Zions Bank vault for safekeeping. The planetarium was undergoing renovation, and we transferred our precious Moon rock under the watchful eye of law enforcement to its secure and temporary home.

Our planetarium is one of many across the country that benefits from Apollo's legacy and brings science education to life for students in Utah. Those students will soon hopefully be-

come the engineers, the mathematicians, and the explorers who will chart the next five decades of space research and space travel.

Here in Congress, I am proud to sit on the Science, Space, and Technology Committee, where we continue our forebearers' legacy of bipartisan investment in our Nation's space program. Apollo inspired a generation of scientists and Americans, and some day soon, my four children may become space travelers themselves when space tourism becomes a reality. They will stand on the shoulders of the thousands of dedicated men and women who dreamed the impossible dream and then made it a reality.

THE PUSH FOR SPACE IS ABSOLUTELY CRITICAL

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

Mr. WALTZ. Mr. Speaker, 50 years ago this week, a group of astronauts launched from Kennedy Space Center in Merritt Island, Florida, embarking on a journey of discovery into uncharted territory.

July 20, 1969, Neil Armstrong took one small step for man and one giant leap for mankind on the surface of the Moon. Armstrong and fellow astronaut Buzz Aldrin spent 2½ hours collecting samples and taking photographs. Critically and importantly, they left behind an American flag and some of the most famous footprints in history, sealing America's place as the leader of the space renaissance in the international space race.

Our journey to outer space was born out of a desire to discover, but that wasn't the only reason we went to the Moon. We also went to the Moon to compete with Russia, specifically regarding protecting our Nation's security. That competition still exists today, but it is even more serious now because of our economic and our military dependency on space and because, in addition to Russia, we now have China explicitly stating its intent to surpass America as the leader in space.

Russia and China have made it clear their intention is not just to explore space, but to prepare themselves for conflict. Russia and China both know that they will never be able to take us on tank to tank, carrier to carrier, plane to plane, so they have decided in their national security strategy to take us out in space if we ever have to come to blows.

This is why I fully support the creation of the space force. This is why space has now been declared a warfighting domain. And if we don't prepare ourselves, our very way of life will be at significant risk.

Our banking, our financial institutions, our global logistics, our telecommunications systems all depend on space. So the 21st century space race is on, and America must lead, and this is why the push for space resources and funding today is absolutely critical.

As a member of the House Armed Services Committee and the Science, Space, and Technology Committee, I see how national security and space intersect every day. And as a Floridian, space is something that is absolutely in my DNA.

It is from, of course, Florida's Kennedy Space Center that our astronauts launched to the Moon, and I know that Florida will be a key player when we go back to the Moon once more in 2024 and as NASA, the U.S. military, and American industry work together to maintain American leadership in space. In my district in northeast Florida, we are very fortunate to have companies that once again will assemble the lunar landers to help NASA get back to the Moon.

So looking back on this historic Moon landing 50 years later, I hope we will all remember what an incredible moment this was for our country. Our American values and American ingenuity have taken us to new worlds not just on Earth, but beyond. It is an honor to celebrate these accomplishments here today, and it is absolutely critical that we continue exploring and we continue innovating.

But it is also equally critical that we fully understand that our competitors seek to supplant our leadership role in space, and they are not in line with our values. We cannot and will not allow that to happen.

CELEBRATING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE LAUNCH OF THE "APOLLO 11"

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Mrs. FLETCHER) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. FLETCHER. Mr. Speaker, this week we celebrate the 50th anniversary of the launch of *Apollo 11*, the spacecraft that sent Americans to the Moon.

On September 12, 1962, before a crowd of 40,000 spectators at Rice University in Houston, President John F. Kennedy announced the ambitious goal of sending Americans to the Moon before the end of the decade.

On July 20, 1969, we got there. Neil Armstrong became the first human to set foot on the surface of the Moon, and 19 minutes later Buzz Aldrin became the second.

More than 600 million people around the world watched Armstrong take his first step live on television. The first words they heard on the Moon were "Houston, Tranquility Base here. The Eagle has landed," followed by the observation, "That's one small step for man, one giant leap for mankind."

As a native Houstonian and the Representative of Texas' Seventh Congressional District, these historic words are seared in my mind. The *Apollo 11* mission was more than just an amazing technological advancement, it brought Americans from all backgrounds and beliefs together toward a common goal and a common purpose. It made people a part of something bigger than them-

selves, perhaps bigger than they had ever imagined.

More than 400,000 Americans worked to make the *Apollo 11* mission a success, many of them based at the Johnson Space Center in Houston. From the support crew to the flight directors at mission control, to the space suit designers, to the human computers, engineers, and scientists who designed and built the hardware and software, to the custodial staff who worked in the building to make sure that they had a place to work, and to every small job in between, *Apollo 11* was the result of a historic collaboration across our country.

The resounding success of the Apollo program served to captivate the world's attention and cemented America's status as a leader in scientific discovery and technological innovation, and it taught us what we as Americans can do, what we can accomplish when we work together toward a common goal. What we learned from this mission is that, when we do that, even the sky is not the limit.

AMERICA MUST REMAIN THE LEADER IN SPACE

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

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 50th anniversary of the *Apollo 11* mission.

In his famous 1961 speech at Rice University in Houston, Texas, President John F. Kennedy challenged the Nation to put a man on the Moon by the end of the decade. President Kennedy spoke these now famous words: "We choose to go to the Moon in this decade and do other things, not because they are easy, but because they are hard."

President Kennedy understood the importance of American leadership in space. He added: "Whether it will become a force for good or ill depends on man, and only if the United States occupies a position of preeminence can we help decide whether this new ocean will be a sea of peace or a new, terrifying theater of war."

Military professionals will tell you that whoever occupies the high ground in a conflict has the upper hand. Folks, there is no higher ground than space. America must remain the leader in space. It is just that simple.

In 1969, the crew of *Apollo 11* fulfilled that very mission to put a man on the Moon. Today, we honor not only the astronauts Neil Armstrong, Buzz Aldrin, and Michael Collins, but all of the great NASA men and women who worked tirelessly to make the *Apollo 11* mission a success.

We have learned about the hidden figures of the Apollo program, those behind the scenes. Here are some more.

At the height of the Apollo program, according to one estimate, 1 in 50 Americans were working on some aspect of the program. This included some 400,000-plus full-time employees.

The astronauts knew their lives depended on these people, most of whom they never knew nor would they ever meet, that were performing difficult tasks on a very demanding schedule.

Over 530 million people around the globe watched the telecast of Armstrong's first steps from 250,000 miles away. Not only did *Apollo 11* show the world what America can achieve, but it displayed a beautifully unique ability of human space exploration, its capacity to stimulate, to inspire, and to cause people to reach deep inside to find the very best they had to offer.

□ 1100

American greatness is a compilation of these things. On that day, we spread our message of American greatness around the globe.

Fifty years ago, the politics of a volatile world order compelled us to the challenge of space competition. The world has changed, and in today's uncertainty, one thing remains certain: the importance of American preeminence in space.

Now, we turn our focus to a new challenge. We will send Americans back to the Moon's surface by 2024, only this time, to stay. It has been a long time since man walked on the Moon. In 2024, we will make history once again when the first woman walks on the Moon.

With our great NASA's lead, the private and public sectors are coming together to accomplish this great and very difficult task. Through their partnerships, American excellence is leveraged across the board. We are building sustainable, reusable systems that will not only take us to the Moon but leapfrog us to Mars.

Our great NASA is bringing Democrats and Republicans together in what I call American togetherness.

Thank God for NASA.

CELEBRATING HIDDEN FIGURES OF "APOLLO 11" MISSION

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

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, 50 years ago, the *Apollo 11* mission sent a crew of pioneering women on a journey of incredible significance. All were astronauts.

Symbolically, it was a representation that with enough hard work, dedication, and will, America could achieve the seemingly impossible.

The mission left lasting imprints, from the eternal footprints left on Tranquility Base to the values engraved into an entire generation.

The Moon landing inspired all who watched it to believe in the power of innovation, dedication, and most especially, unwavering courage. But today, I want to draw attention to some of the unseen heroes of the *Apollo 11* mission. I will refer to them as the "hidden figures."

Ms. Katherine Johnson, Ms. Dorothy Vaughan, and Ms. Mary Jackson have

only recently been recognized for the incredible work they put into the mission that defined generations, thanks to the film "Hidden Figures."

Only Ms. Johnson is still alive today to receive our overdue gratitude for these women.

Before we began carrying calculators in our pockets, Ms. Johnson, Ms. Vaughan, and Ms. Jackson did manual calculations of astronomical problems using only pen and paper.

The stakes were incredibly high. The working conditions were segregated and tense. Yet, these women produced work at a caliber high enough to send men to the surface of the Moon.

That is what I call some Black girl magic.

Ms. Johnson, Ms. Vaughan, and Ms. Jackson each defied intense discrimination and overwhelming adversity. Their lifetimes were metaphorical Apollo missions: astronomically successful despite all odds.

But they were hidden figures. We did not know them.

I am proud to recognize them today on the floor as women of distinction with unrivaled talent. I am proud to know that their contributions are finally being recognized.

On a very personal note, as a member of Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority, Inc., I am proud to call them my sisters.

Their legacy of Black female excellence and newfound recognition will undoubtedly inspire a generation of young people to pursue STEM careers, despite whatever odds may be against them.

Black girls can learn about the *Apollo 11* mission and know that there are heroes who look just like them. First-generation college students, low-income children, and children of color can discover how it is possible to defy the odds with STEM.

To help make this possible, my long-term friend and colleague from Florida (Mr. POSEY) and I worked together to pass H.R. 2726, the *Apollo 11* 50th Anniversary Commemorative Coin Act, which honors the *Apollo 11* crew, NASA scientists, engineers, astronauts, and Americans from every State who made the mission possible. The bill supports college scholarships for future scientists, engineers, and astronauts. Surcharges from the sale of the coins will help promote STEM education, space exploration, and scientific discovery.

I am grateful that throughout my lifetime, these hidden figures have finally been brought into the light and celebrated in the manner they have deserved since 1969. They are no longer hidden. Now, we all know them, celebrate them, and thank God for their brilliance and magnificent contributions.

HONORING ABE BROWN

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember the life of Mr. Abe Brown.

In 1984, Mr. Brown was the first African American to be elected Glynn County coroner. This was not only important to Brunswick, but he was the first African American coroner in the entire State of Georgia.

His service to the Brunswick community was exceptional. He made it a point to treat each case like it was his own family.

Before his remarkable 8 years of public service, Mr. Brown owned a funeral home in town and built friendships with nearly everyone residing in Brunswick. Citizens there remember him as loved by anyone who came in contact with him and as a man who had a special way of encouraging people to work together.

Mr. Brown passed away earlier this year at the age of 77. This past June, the Brunswick City Commission named a park in his honor.

I am proud that Brunswick could celebrate his work with this park, an honor that is truly well deserved.

RECOGNIZING SHAKEMA DEAL

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Ms. Shakema Deal for her dedication to her country, her community, and her own education.

A native of the First Congressional District of Georgia, Ms. Deal is currently serving in Afghanistan as part of the Georgia National Guard. However, while at home, she works as a police officer with the Savannah Police Department.

Through all of her hours spent keeping the Savannah area a safe place to live, as well as her time dedicated to serving the United States Armed Forces, Ms. Deal has been studying for the last 7 months to earn a degree in criminal justice administration from Columbia College.

In late June, her fellow soldiers and police colleagues took part in something truly unique: a graduation ceremony in Afghanistan.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Ms. Deal on her graduation. She is an inspiration to all of us, and I wish her the best of luck with her career.

REMEMBERING DR. RAYMOND ALLEN COOK

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember the life of Dr. Raymond Allen Cook, who passed away on June 29 at the age of 99.

Dr. Raymond Allen Cook dedicated his life to sharing his love for English language literature with not only countless university students in the State of Georgia but also students all over the world. He taught for over 30 years at multiple Georgia universities and even traveled the world to share his knowledge when he was appointed as a Fulbright lecturer in American literature at the University of Shiraz in Iran.

Highly accomplished in academic circles, he published numerous papers and even five books on some of the authors who developed the canon of our language's literature, including Walt Whitman, Geoffrey Chaucer, Jane Austen, and more.

Through all of this, he never forgot where he came from. In 1964, Dr. Cook returned to his and my alma mater, Young Harris College, to serve as its president.

I am thankful that both the State of Georgia and also my alma mater, Young Harris College, could partner with a scholar as distinguished as Dr. Cook for the last 30 years.

His family and friends will be in my thoughts and prayers during this most difficult time.

SALUTING CHIEF ANTHONY TANNER UPON HIS RETIREMENT

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Chief Anthony "Tony" Tanner, who has dedicated his entire professional career to protecting the city of Waycross from crime.

Chief Tanner began his career over 30 years ago with the Waycross Police Department in the First Congressional District of Georgia. A testament to both his hard work and commitment to the city of Waycross, he worked his way from patrol officer to chief of police, holding every single rank within the department during different points of his career.

Of the 12 men who have been chiefs of police in Waycross beginning in 1906, Chief Tanner has held the position longer than any of them.

His work in his community doesn't stop there, though. Outside of the police force, he continued dedicating time to the community through the Exchange Club, Red Cross blood drives, the Domestic Violence Task Force, and much more.

Chief Tanner retired from the Waycross Police Department on June 28, and his work in the First Congressional District of Georgia will be deeply missed.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Chief Tanner on his retirement.

RECOGNIZING STEARNS COUNTY FOR WATER CONSERVATION

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

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Stearns County Soil and Water Conservation District for receiving the Source Water Protection Award for 2019.

Each year, the Minnesota Department of Health and the Minnesota Rural Water Association recognize water suppliers that conserve resources. This year, the Stearns County facility demonstrated its ability to go above and beyond to help save energy for the community.

Over the course of the year, the Stearns County facility updated its wellhead protection activities and ensured its inventory met contamination standards. Because of practices like these, the constituents of Minnesota's Sixth Congressional District have access to safe drinking water.

Additionally, these efforts worked to conserve water, saving money for the county and bettering the environment.

The Stearns County Soil and Water Conservation District has worked closely with grant programs to raise money for its efforts. The citizens of Stearns County have better access to the services they need because the district has put conservation and health first.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the Stearns County Soil and Water Conservation District for this outstanding recognition. We are grateful for its work to help our district and the great State of Minnesota.

RECOGNIZING DAN STOLTZ

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Dan Stoltz for receiving the HERBIE Award.

This award from the St. Paul Area Chamber of Commerce recognizes individuals that exemplify the traits inspired by its namesake, Herb Brooks: humanitarian, enterprising, resilient, bold, inspirational, and ethical.

Herb Brooks remains a Minnesota legend. As coach of the United States Olympic men's hockey team in 1980, he led them to their gold medal victory with his focus, determination, strong work ethic, and inspirational leadership.

As CEO of Spire Federal Credit Union and in his everyday life, I can attest that Dan Stoltz channels the energy of our Minnesota legend, Herb Brooks.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Dan for this well-deserved award. Our community appreciates the generosity he provides every day.

CONGRATULATING THE SCHLICHTINGS, FARM FAMILY OF THE YEAR

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Schlichting family for being named the University of Minnesota 2019 Farm Family of the Year.

The Schlichting farm is a third-generation farm owned and operated by the Rick Schlichting family. His grandparents homesteaded in Rice, Minnesota, in the 1920s.

Since then, Rick has taken pride in the land his family has worked and cared for by restoring some of the land to what it was like when his grandparents first settled the property. In fact, close to 70 acres have been reverted to original prairie.

The Schlichtings are dedicated to stewardship. In 2016, they were honored with the Outstanding Conservationist Award by the Minnesota Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts.

I am honored to represent farm families like the Schlichtings. They have dedicated themselves to preserving the land while doing their part to feed the world.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Rick and his family for being named Farm Family of the Year.

REMEMBERING GABRIELE GRUNEWALD

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember the incredible life of Gabriele Grunewald, who passed away far too early.

Taken by a disease that has impacted the lives of nearly everyone we know,

Gabriele was known by the world as an Olympic runner, star track athlete for the University of Minnesota, and someone who fought cancer every step of the way.

She used her story and her struggle to share a message of hope. She did this by starting the Brave Like Gabe Foundation, which supports research on rare cancers.

A cure is vital, but private and public dollars are necessary to fund this work, which is why we have and should continue to fund the National Institutes of Health.

We did not have a cure in time for Gabriele or for all the other loved ones we have already lost, but if we continue to support medical research and innovation, a cure will be found, and we can save future generations from this awful disease.

THANKING BRENT HALES FOR HIS SERVICE AND LEADERSHIP

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank Brent D. Hales for the service and leadership he provided to the University of Minnesota's Extension program. I am also grateful for his participation on my Agricultural Advisory Committee.

Brent's service to agriculture in Minnesota has been amazing. His work to foster community development and innovation in agricultural production has served our State well.

We have been lucky to benefit from his expertise and commitment. While we will miss him, I want to congratulate Brent for his new role as Penn State's director of extension. As he transitions out of this service to the University of Minnesota on July 31, we wish him the best.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Brent, and congratulate him on his new opportunity.

□ 1115

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF "APOLLO 11"

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

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Speaker, it is no secret that it was 50 years ago this week that three brave Americans stepped foot on the Moon. When we look at our children's toys today, it is amazing that they contain more data processing power than the systems which actually operated the Apollo vehicles 50 years ago.

These three American astronauts—Neil Armstrong, Buzz Aldrin, and Michael Collins—could not really know whether they would return. They were willing to serve their country and proud for America to be leading the world in space.

But even if our space program got a strong jump-start, even because of the Cold War, this mission was also about the human spirit and the need to explore. The whole world was eager to hear news of the mission. No matter what may happen in the future, this

would be the first time human beings would step foot on a world other than our own home. Neil Armstrong's description of that mission was a leap, and it is as fitting today as it is instructional now.

I am excited, as many of my colleagues and many Americans are, about the President's call to accelerate our plans to land again on the Moon by 2024. I am very proud of the role that my home State of Alabama has played in the development of the most powerful rockets, the Saturn family. You can still see today, if you go down to Huntsville, Alabama, a real Saturn V rocket suspended horizontally at the U.S. Space & Rocket Center in Huntsville.

Likewise, I am proud of the Marshall Space Flight Center, including the Michoud Assembly Facility, as the designer and the builder of the Space Launch System. This will be the most powerful rocket in the world and is approximately 90 percent finished. The American taxpayers own it, and they will benefit from it as a national asset. It is the successful combined work of product companies and suppliers from virtually every State in the Nation.

The Saturn V rocket was able to execute the Apollo mission in one launch because of the rocket's third stage propelled lander and the reentry vehicle to the Moon's orbit.

Similarly, the SLS exploration upper stage, referred to as the EUS, will enable a payload delivery to the Moon's orbit, including the Orion capsule, of 45 metric tons, three to four times greater than any other launch vehicle currently in use or close to completion. It can have that EUS capability ready by 2024, but we can only have that ready if we move ahead this year with that goal.

Systems like the SLS and Orion inspire innovation, and maybe one day other rockets and capsules will surpass them. But to reach our goal by 2024, we need to stay focused and complete these nearly mature systems.

Some have said in recent years about our going to the Moon: We have been there. We have done that. With all due respect, I would disagree. But this new mission to the Moon, I would say: Go there, but don't stop there.

Sustainability offers many future benefits, but let's not get distracted for this first human return to the Moon. Let's reach the peak. Let's make that landing.

And as we ponder the future of the Moon, let's look up again and set a date, a real mission date, for setting foot on Mars.

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF "APOLLO 11"

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

Mr. BALDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 50th anniversary of spaceflight *Apollo 11* that

first landed humankind on the Moon. As we all know, aboard this mission were American heroes: Neil Armstrong, Buzz Aldrin, Jr., and Michael Collins.

When Neil Armstrong first set foot on the Moon on July 20, 1969, he secured a place in a long, proud line of Ohioans who have performed aviation firsts. Beginning with the Wright brothers and continuing today with the fine scientists at NASA's Glenn Research Center, generations of Ohioans have consistently led and driven innovation in our country. For centuries, Ohio has been on the forefront of new technologies and always pushed the boundaries of mankind in the name of exploration.

I would be remiss if I did not personally thank those brave astronauts who led the *Apollo 11* mission 50 years ago for putting their lives on the line in service to their country. When Commander Armstrong took his first steps onto the Moon, surely, he couldn't have known that a 7-year-old boy from his home State of Ohio was watching in amazement with his whole life ahead of him.

May our country always remember how profound the *Apollo 11* Moon landings were, and still are. May we always honor the crew members, backup crew, support crew, capsule communications, and flight directors who made this mission a success and may the United States of America forever remain not only the first, but the principal nation of space exploration.

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF "APOLLO 11"

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

Ms. HILL of California. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor the 50th anniversary of the *Apollo 11* series.

When I think of *Apollo 11*, I am reminded of a feeling that many of us have forgotten in this current time of divisiveness and anger. *Apollo 11* reminds me of an America that pulled together; a time when America prioritized impossible dreams, because impossible dreams were what built this country; a time when we understood that achieving those impossible dreams was a way to make every child feel prouder to be an American and every adversary feel that our Nation loomed larger than they could hope to surmount.

As Americans, we work hard, we get better, then we become the best.

At its core, space exploration and the Moon landing were rooted in the American Dream, and I believe that dream is still worth dreaming today.

Fifty years later, the *Apollo* series and the space exploration of that time remind us that we are part of something bigger than ourselves. I stand here today as the congresswoman of a district that is incredibly proud of our contributions to space technology, flight, and exploration. Really, our

contributions to bringing that dream to life.

My district is home to many of the Edwards Air Force Base workers who are critical to our country's defense and service. We often say that the Antelope Valley is actually the aerospace valley because of how much testing, research, and development takes place in our community.

The NASA Armstrong Flight Research Center at Edwards Air Force Base made countless contributions to the NASA human spaceflight program during the sixties, from the X-15 rocket plane hypersonic research program to the lunar landing research vehicle, both of which had a direct impact on the Apollo missions. In fact, the first flight of a lunar landing research vehicle was in 1964 at Edwards Air Force Base. These vehicles were later used at Ellington Air Force Base to train the Apollo flight crew, including Neil Armstrong.

For my constituents and so many others across the Nation, the celebration of the Apollo mission is the celebration of our history. It is the celebration of people like my grandfather, who worked on the thrusters for the lunar lander. From 1961 to 1970, he was involved with Apollo service module rocket development, qualification, and production.

In talking with my grandfather, I have seen how much of a catalyst this work is for our identity as Americans. The Moon shot gave so many of us something to believe in, and that belief paid off in its enduring impact to scientific discovery and commercial applications. We need to realize that triumph in this generation of Americans.

My work on the House Armed Services Committee has also shown me that the military and our defense capabilities simply don't work any longer without a mastery of space. Our adversaries are on their way to the Moon, and we have no choice but to be there, as well. That is a vital part of how we maintain our status as the global leader that we have always been. To keep our strongest position, we have to have a plan and a strategy for space.

In doing so, we will inspire a generation of STEM workers, many of them young women, people of color, and first-generation college students, to be part of something great, something that defines our identity as Americans. We will stimulate our economy, innovate products that stretch beyond use in space, and contribute to our comfort and well-being here in America.

On the 50th anniversary of *Apollo*, I am honored to champion a program that unlocked so much American greatness. I am even more honored to stand with the knowledge that greater things are yet to come. Together, we can do so much and go so far, further than we have ever gone before. Because we can. Because we have to. Because our security demands it. Because, without doing so, we will never know what is possible. And as humans, as Ameri-

cans, we will not let the impossible stop us.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately noon today.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 25 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

Reverend John P. Fitzgibbons, S.J., Regis University, Denver, Colorado, offered the following prayer:

Most Holy God, please unite and guide the leaders in this House to recognize, to speak for, and to safeguard the vulnerable and the marginalized in all corners of our Nation.

Help us to hear and to champion the rights of dreamers of all colors, all contexts, and all ages, especially the young, whose ardent desire is to know and to build a better society.

Help us to illuminate the path and to advocate for our country's learners and their teachers so that access to education and the power of knowledge will continue to produce servant leaders committed to democracy, equality, and justice.

Help us to unite our hearts and our minds, to share freely of our gifts, to reflect critical thought and responsible action on moral and ethical issues, and to be men and women for others that both You and our constituents expect and deserve.

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 Illinois (Mr. GARCÍA) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

WELCOMING REVEREND JOHN P. FITZGIBBONS, S.J.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CISNEROS. Madam Speaker, I am delighted to welcome to this Chamber Father John P. Fitzgibbons, who delivered today's opening prayer.

A native of Omaha, Nebraska, he entered the Wisconsin Province of the Society of Jesus in 1973, and he was ordained as a priest in 1985.

Like all good Jesuits, Father Fitzgibbons has dedicated his life to God and to education. He currently holds bachelor's degrees in philosophy and English, two master's degrees in theology, a master's in English, as well as a Ph.D. in English.

He had stints teaching at Creighton and Marquette Universities, and he served as the dean of the College of Professional Studies at the University of San Francisco. He would later return to Marquette University to serve as the associate provost for faculty development. In 2012, he was appointed the 24th president of my alma mater, Regis University.

Madam Speaker, I thank Father Fitzgibbons for his 26 years in education, his 34 years as a priest, and his 46 years of dedication to God. It has been a tremendous pleasure having him here today.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

CELEBRATING THE 30TH ANNIVERSARY OF GRANDMONT ROSEDALE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

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

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of the Grandmont Rosedale Development Corporation as they celebrate 30 years of service to the residents of northwest Detroit.

Grandmont Rosedale Development Corporation was formed in 1989, initially as a business association for the five neighborhoods it represents. However, its focus from business to neighborhood preservation. From then on, Grandmont Rosedale Development Corporation has been active in reducing neighborhood blight, promoting sustainable economic development, and increasing homeownership.

Beyond that, they run a number of community-based programs, including a neighborhood coworking space, farmers market, and vacant property task force to help improve the quality of life for all the residents in the city of Detroit.

Grandmont Rosedale Development Corporation's holistic approach to maintaining its neighborhoods is the true definition of community development. Its diverse staff and the count-

less volunteers put their heart and soul into the community, and that shines through in every project.

I am honored to serve this community, and I commend Grandmont Rosedale Development Corporation on the occasion of its 30th anniversary.

RECOGNIZING MURRAY-CALLOWAY COUNTY CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

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

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Murray-Calloway Chamber of Commerce for their designation as the 2019 National Chamber of the Year.

This national honor was awarded at the ACCE National Convention in Long Beach, California, on July 15. This is the second win for the Murray-Calloway County Chamber, the first being in 2012.

The National Chamber of the Year Award recognizes the area's business leaders whose community contributions are unparalleled. ACCE only invites a limited number of the chambers to apply, and the application process considers the chambers' structure, finances, member engagement, services, and programs upon honoring a chamber. The chamber's efforts have benefited not only the Murray-Calloway County area, but positively impacted communities throughout western Kentucky.

I would like to thank President Michelle Bundren and Board Chair LaCosta Beane-Hays, as well as the directors, staff, and chamber members for their unwavering dedication to the betterment of local industry.

I look forward to future accomplishments of the chamber and am proud to represent the thriving business leaders in Murray and Calloway County, Kentucky.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF MICHAEL GONZALEZ

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

Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I would like to honor the life and legacy of one of my constituents and a friend for over 50 years, Michael Gonzalez. He was a professional engineer, deeply involved in many Chicago community issues and affairs.

As one of the founding members of the Illinois Latino Legislative Caucus Foundation, Michael paved the way for younger Latinos to follow. In his role as vice chair, Michael was instrumental to the growth of the foundation for 17 years. His invaluable work for our community ensured that hundreds of talented Latino and Latina students received scholarships to college.

Michael's dedication and unwavering commitment to the foundation did not

go unnoticed. He was often referred to as "the heart and soul" of the foundation. Most notably, he never received a dollar for the thousands of hours he dedicated to the foundation.

Michael Gonzalez leaves a legacy of engagement that continues to shape the foundation. His passing is a true loss for the foundation and the community. His presence in the community will be missed by many.

I extend my condolences to family, neighbors, and friends.

MADE IN AMERICA SHOWCASE

(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. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the importance of American manufacturing and to highlight Pennsylvania's contributions.

This week, the White House hosted its annual Made in America showcase, displaying products from all 50 States. Businesses of all sizes were invited to participate in the event to highlight the strength, creativity, and ingenuity of American manufacturers. I am pleased that Pennsylvania's 15th District represented the Commonwealth for 2 years in a row.

In 2018, BWP Bats, a baseball bat company from Brookville, traveled to the White House to share their products with attendees. This year, Zippo lighters, which are manufactured in Bradford, Pennsylvania, McKean County, represented the Keystone State.

Businesses involved in manufacturing are vital to Pennsylvania's economy. Advanced manufacturing ranks among the Commonwealth's top five industries, and nearly 1 in 10 people across the Commonwealth work for a manufacturer.

A strong manufacturing sector helps America stay competitive, and supporting legislation that strengthens the industry bolsters our Nation's potential for a prosperous future by keeping good-paying, family-staying jobs right here at home.

HEALTHCARE IS PERSONAL

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

Ms. HILL of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to give voice to what so many individuals and families in my community and across the country are feeling: deep anger at the threat of losing access to their healthcare.

First, I have to condemn the developments in the Ninth Circuit case that state title X providers can no longer lawfully refer women for abortion services.

Healthcare is personal. The conversations that take place between a woman and her doctor cannot be policed by Congress. These rules are damaging to

providers and dangerous—possibly even deadly—to patients.

What is worse is that it is not just reproductive care. This administration is using stacked courts to dismantle the healthcare system that gives coverage to millions of Americans, including 60,000 individuals in my district, without even the vaguest plan to replace it.

My colleagues and I are working every day to lower the cost of prescription drugs and to ensure that we have a healthcare system that works for everyone, while this administration tries to rip coverage away. As Members of Congress, we owe it to our communities to fight back against these rollbacks at every step, and we will.

HOLLAND VIRTUAL TECH HIGH SCHOOL PROGRAM

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

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Holland Virtual Tech High School.

This program was brought to my attention by a gentleman named Louis, who talked about it and the positive impact it had on his family during one of my telephone townhalls recently. Since 2015, the program has served as an alternative credit recovery school on the campus of Holland High School in Holland, Michigan.

The fully accredited program offers a unique online learning environment designed for students who struggle in a traditional classroom setting or have fallen behind in their schoolwork due to unforeseen circumstances. Together, teachers, guidance counselors, and support staff at the school work with the students to develop an individualized graduation plan.

Through these efforts, nearly 400 students have graduated from the program. That represents countless lives positively impacted, even more doors opened, and endless opportunities created for these young men and women.

Upon completion of the program, students receive a Holland Public Schools diploma that meets all requirements of the Michigan Merit Curriculum. The program has played an integral part in increasing the overall Holland High School graduation rate by 5 percentage points over the last 2 years.

Students who graduate are equipped with the skills to successfully transition into their postsecondary lives, whether that be continued education, apprenticeships, or directly into the job market.

Mr. Speaker, I thank everyone who is involved with Holland Virtual Tech High School. Keep up the great work.

□ 1215

REMEMBERING THE PORT CHICAGO 50

(Mr. DESAULNIER asked and was given permission to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, on this day in 1944, at 10:18 p.m., a cargo vessel exploded at the Port Chicago Naval Magazine located in my district in California, resulting in the deadliest home-front disaster of World War II.

All of the men loading ammunition at the site that day were African American. When the surviving sailors, understandably, hesitated to return to those unsafe conditions of loading, 50 were discriminately convicted of mutiny.

Congress and the administration have repeatedly recognized the injustice these men suffered. Congress directed the creation of a memorial, the executive branch pardoned one of the 50, and the then-Secretary of the Navy said he strongly supported executive action in favor of the Port Chicago 50.

To commemorate this anniversary, the House of Representatives passed, just this week, our measure that directs the Secretary of the Navy to finally exonerate the Port Chicago 50.

On the 75th anniversary today of the explosion, let us remember the words of Thurgood Marshall when he traveled to San Francisco to defend these innocent men. The future first African American Supreme Court Justice said:

What is at stake here is more than the rights of the Port Chicago 50. It is the moral commitment stated in our Nation's creed.

HONORING H. ROSS PEROT

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, back home in Texas, 1,500 people gathered at the Highland Park United Methodist Church on the campus of SMU to honor the life and legacy of H. Ross Perot.

We lost Mr. Perot just a little over a week ago, at the age of 89. Mr. Perot had an outsized influence on our State and, indeed, our Nation.

Mr. Perot was remembered by his children in very touching tributes.

Mr. Perot's accomplishments were too numerous to go into in the space of a 1-minute talk, but I did want to acknowledge all of the work that he did on behalf of the United States prisoners of war and, certainly, his efforts to elucidate the cause and, yes, some treatment for what was then known as Gulf War Syndrome.

Mr. Perot was a driving force in that, and he should be remembered for all of the efforts that he put forward for our Nation's servicemembers.

FREE TRADE AMONG FREE PEOPLE

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, America's economic history is rooted in the

exploitation of labor. It is a lesson worth remembering, but its history is not one of yesteryears alone.

Our existing trade deals impose an economic model built on cheap labor, where profits matter more than people. This system undermines the rule of law with a global race to the bottom.

Trade is not just about goods. It is about people. It is about communities. It is about workers.

In the agriculture sector alone, one can argue that our continent has gone from slavery to serfdom. That is why, today, I am introducing the Independent Labor Secretariat for Fair Trade Deals Act.

We need a trade model that respects workers and holds employers and workers accountable, with strong mechanisms for labor enforcement.

My bill would establish an independent labor secretariat to monitor and enforce transnational labor issues, with a wages and standards working group with expert wage panels to study the impacts on wages, benefits, labor rights, working conditions, and inequality.

The bill also requires that any trade agreement eligible for expedited consideration include enforceable labor standards and protections.

Mr. Speaker, let us dignify the workers who sustain us.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 582, RAISE THE WAGE ACT

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 492 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 492

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 582) to provide for increases in the Federal minimum wage, 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 Education and Labor now printed in the bill, modified by the amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying 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 chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor; (2) the further amendment printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules, if offered by the Member designated in the report, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order, shall be considered as read, shall be separately debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question; and (3) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS), 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

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. 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 New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the Rules Committee met and reported out a rule, House Resolution 492, providing for consideration of H.R. 582, the Raise the Wage Act, under a structured rule.

The rule provides 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the Committee on Education and Labor. The rule makes in order one amendment, debatable for 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the Raise the Wage Act gradually increases the Federal minimum wage to \$15 an hour by 2025, thereby fulfilling a promise to the American people that with hard work comes, at a minimum, a livable wage. Not a wage with eroded purchasing power or a wage that keeps workers from providing for their families, but a minimum wage that empowers Americans and gives them a fighting chance at economic mobility.

It has been over a decade, the longest stretch since the establishment of the Federal minimum wage, since this body voted to increase the minimum wage. This is a great disservice to the American people, and I am thankful to Chairman SCOTT for making a gradual increase of the Federal minimum wage a top priority of his Committee on Education and Labor, of which I am a proud member.

In my home State of New York, we have one of the highest minimum wages in the country. I was proud to support gradually increasing the minimum wage to \$15 an hour while I served as majority leader in the New York State Assembly, and I look forward to doing the same here today to ensure all Americans working full-time can live safely and sustainably above the poverty line.

The benefits of increasing the minimum wage have far-reaching impacts throughout our society. The Raise the Wage Act could increase wages for over 30 million Americans, people who get up every day to work toward their own version of the American Dream.

It empowers women, narrowing the gender wage pay gap through pay increases for nearly 23 million women across America.

It would also lift the families of at least 1.3 million Americans, 600,000 of whom are children, out of poverty. Let's just think about that for a mo-

ment: 1.3 million Americans who are working hard to make ends meet but struggle below the poverty line because, for years, Congress let the real value of their hard-earned dollars erode.

This isn't a handout for them. This is a fair and overdue adjustment for employees who deserve to earn a livable wage.

Recently, a friend of mine, who is the administrator at Temple B'rith Kodesh in Rochester, New York, where I worked to put myself through college, sent me a copy of my pay stub from 1976.

At the time, I made the minimum wage, \$2.30 an hour. People might argue or debate whether or not I was worth \$2.30 an hour, but that was the minimum wage in 1976. Adjusted for inflation, that would be \$10.35 in 2019 dollars.

Had the minimum wage kept pace with inflation, a worker who puts in 2,000 hours annually would make \$20,700 today, but because the Federal minimum wage is still at \$7.25, or more than \$2 an hour lower than if the minimum wage had simply been adjusted for inflation since that time, the same full-time worker today earns \$14,500, a more than \$6,200 erosion of purchasing power since 1976.

Even if you adjust for inflation since 2009 and look again at a 2,000-hour work year annually, the difference is \$2,800.

When you are living paycheck to paycheck, as many minimum wage workers do, an additional \$6,200, or at least \$2,800 annually, can make a significant difference in your financial stability.

Gradually raising the minimum wage to \$15 an hour doesn't just benefit those earning minimum wage. It boosts the local economy in communities across this country.

A gradual increase to \$15 will accelerate economic growth by putting money in the pockets of workers who want—and now can afford—to spend money beyond their basic needs.

Whether it be at the community grocery stores or family-owned shops, by spending money back in their local economy, they contribute to a positive economic cycle.

From narrowing the gender pay gap and lifting families out of poverty to strengthening local economies, the Raise the Wage Act has clear benefits we should all get behind. I am proud to be a cosponsor of this significant piece of legislation and urge all my colleagues to join me in supporting its passage.

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. MORELLE for yielding the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, today we are considering H.R. 582, the Raise the Wage Act.

This legislation would raise the Federal minimum wage to \$15 an hour, a 107 percent increase over the current rate of \$7.25 an hour.

An increase of this magnitude could harm American businesses, could harm American consumers, and certainly will harm American workers.

The legislation does not consider the labor market, it disincentivizes job growth, and it has the potential to leave nearly 4 million workers unemployed.

Let us consider the data. The Congressional Budget Office recently released a report on the effects of mandating a Federal minimum wage in the United States.

The report explains how more than doubling the minimum wage would increase unemployment up to 4 million individuals. Four million workers would have to be laid off to increase wages for a little over 1 million people.

That means, for each person lifted out of poverty due to a wage increase, another three individuals will lose their jobs. Why?

I ask my colleagues: Is this a fair tradeoff? This bill creates false hope for low-wage earners who will be counting on a wage increase and keeping their job. But what if they don't keep their job? Then it is no wage at all.

In addition, those who are most likely to lose their jobs are likely to be minorities, women, and our young people.

Increasing the Federal minimum wage to \$15 an hour would have unintended secondary effects, particularly increasing the risk of inflation. As wages increase, the cost of doing business will rise as well. Businesses will be forced to pass on these increased costs by raising the price of their goods and services. As the costs are passed on to the consumer, who will be hurt the most?

It is those vulnerable populations at the lower wage scale that this bill supposedly helps: the Americans who live in poverty.

Congress cannot, in good conscience, pass this legislation, at least, without understanding the full effects.

In January, the American Enterprise Institute released a report detailing how the costs of goods have changed over the past 20 years, controlled for inflation. This study included everything from televisions to furniture to housing and more.

Unsurprisingly, the products with the most government involvement—let's use as examples healthcare and education—saw the most rapid increase in cost.

Is it the intent of the majority to increase prices of many consumer products and services beyond what would be natural economic inflation?

Congress must also consider how this legislation will impact different parts of the country in different ways.

Many urban areas have already raised their minimum wage to similar levels. By the end of this year, New York City and San Francisco will have minimum wages of \$15 an hour. Seattle's two-tiered minimum wage system goes even further by requiring small employers to pay \$15 an hour and large employers to pay \$16 an hour.

However, in many parts of the country, they simply cannot handle the burden of a \$15-an-hour minimum wage. Rural areas with small mom-and-pop businesses and significantly lower costs of living do not have the same needs or purchasing priorities as urban dwellers.

A Federal minimum wage should be a floor for all workers, not the floor for those working and living in the heart of the most expensive areas of the country.

Even the progressive think tank, The Third Way, lobbied for a regional minimum wage in place of an across-the-board increase.

If this legislation goes into effect as currently written, it should be renamed the “Rural Jobs Killer Act” because this one-size-fits-all policy would accomplish just that.

□ 1230

Another consequence of this legislation will be the pricing-out of individuals who seek to enter the workforce.

According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, nearly half of low-wage earners are under 25 years of age. Increasing the Federal minimum wage to \$15 an hour will make it harder for these individuals to compete, meaning that many will not be able to find work.

As a teenager growing up in Denton, Texas, I worked a lot of different jobs. I bailed hay, delivered pizzas, and mowed lawns to earn money for my education. Passing this legislation will eliminate such opportunities for the young people of today.

With this concern in mind, I offered an amendment to the Raise the Wage Act to protect opportunities for entry-level workers. My amendment would ensure that those individuals with less than a year of work experience have the opportunity to compete in the job market by allowing an entry-level wage for workers with less than 1 year’s experience.

The initial wage would be set at the current minimum of \$7.25 an hour for the first year. Following that year, the Secretary of Labor would be authorized to update the entry-level minimum wage using a market-based analysis. The Secretary would be tasked to update this wage every 5 years to keep up with the changing labor and business environment, instead of a heavyhanded government mandate.

Young Americans and new workers deserve a chance to gain experience without being priced out of the job market by more experienced job seekers.

The final downside of a significantly higher Federal minimum wage is the risk this action has on the rapid automation of many jobs throughout the economy. Automation in stores, vehicles, and assembly lines could make many of our everyday tasks more efficient and convenient. However, the new technologies will likely displace those who are not trained for other occupations.

There is a compelling commercial that one of our fast-food franchises has today that details the path of a young woman who gets her first job at one of these restaurants. Then, it sort of details her progress in every stage along the way. They say her name, and she gets the job. She gets promotions. She gets into school. She is the first in her family to walk across the stage at graduation.

But wouldn’t it be ironic if, instead of that young woman’s name, they would have a kiosk from the same fast-food franchise. The kiosk is actually advancing through the university, the artificial intelligence university. Eventually, the kiosk may sit in the Speaker’s chair one day.

Look, that is not the future we want. We want to empower our young people. We want to be able to give them work experience and allow them to work and grow.

It is a beautiful commercial. I think they have done a wonderful job telling that experience. But ironically, I think of that now when I go into that same restaurant. I am able to order a cup of coffee off the kiosk, and I never have to interact with an actual human at all.

Increasing the minimum wage by 107 percent across the country will expedite this process quicker than the pace of innovation ever would.

My fellow Texas Representative, freshman Representative RON WRIGHT, brought this concern to the attention of his colleagues at the House Education and Labor Committee. During consideration of this bill, Mr. WRIGHT offered an amendment that required the Government Accountability Office to study the impact of the minimum wage on the loss of jobs due to automation and would stop the minimum wage hike if this job loss rose to half a million jobs. That seems reasonable.

Unfortunately, our colleagues on the other side of the dais in the Education and Labor Committee rejected his concerns and his amendment.

With that said, I commend my Democratic colleagues for their efforts to support the disability community with the inclusion of H.R. 873, the Transformation to Competitive Employment Act.

Under the Fair Labor Standards Act, the Department of Labor is able to grant employers 14(c) certificates. These certificates give employers the legal right to pay disabled employees’ wages below minimum wage, officially called subminimum wages. This unfair policy enables individuals with disabilities to be exploited under the guise of integrating them into society.

However, a 2001 GAO report found that only 5 percent of disabled workers at workshops that used the 14(c) certificates found employment outside of these facilities. Little to no training took place, and there was minimal integration into our modern society. Some workers, unfortunately, were paid as little as 4 cents an hour.

This issue was brought to my attention by a constituent of mine, Blake

Pyron. Blake is a hardworking Texan. He owns his own business in Sanger, Texas.

Blake happens to have Down syndrome. He was the first person with Down syndrome in the State of Texas to start his own business, and he has been an advocate for those with disabilities for years. Blake is proof that being differently abled does not change the value of one’s life or one’s labor.

Congress should continue to allow real wage growth to take place through a thriving labor market. By avoiding burdensome Federal mandates, by reducing expenses, by reducing red tape, Americans will see gains in productivity and wages, allowing for more employment, not less.

We don’t have to look very far to see an example of this. Over the past 2 years, the United States has seen unprecedented low levels of unemployment and record-high rates of wage growth. Due to comprehensive tax reform passed by the last Congress in the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, American companies have been able to reinvest in their employees and projects like never before.

Due to the Trump administration’s effort to reform and rein in overbearing and obstructive Federal regulations, the economy is no longer being held back.

With 7 million unfilled jobs in the United States today, the best way to raise wages is to let the power of capitalism work and allow companies to compete for workers. I urge opposition to the rule.

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

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

I appreciate hearing from my distinguished friend and colleague on the Rules Committee, Mr. BURGESS. There is a lot to unpack from what he said. Let me make a few points before I yield to my colleagues on my side of the aisle.

First of all, as it relates to the economic numbers, the picture that Mr. BURGESS painted is heavily overstated. What it doesn’t take into consideration is the full picture here, which is the question of, if you are going to establish as a matter of public policy that there ought to be a minimum wage throughout this country, you do so recognizing that that minimum wage ought to continue to keep pace so that it doesn’t get eroded over time. I will come back to that in a minute.

I want to remind the gentleman that this change alone would lift 1.3 million people out of poverty—600,000 of whom are children who live in poverty—even though they might work 2,000 hours a year, what we consider full-time, full employment.

It is extraordinary. The savings alone to the government for people who are no longer in poverty and who might rise out of the need for public programs will be significant. Thirty million people would benefit from this. Thirty million Americans benefit from the legislation that Mr. SCOTT has advanced.

I also note that this economy has been growing for a decade now, what I call the Obama recovery, which has continued. I also have the view that Presidents probably get too much blame and certainly take too much credit, perhaps, for economic growth.

This has been a sustained recovery. During times when there are labor shortages is exactly the time that we would want to raise the minimum wage. To do it during a labor market in which there was an excess labor capacity would be the wrong time, it seems to me, from an economics point of view.

Nonetheless, the point here is that the value of this has been agreed to since 1938, when the minimum wage was first enacted under Franklin D. Roosevelt.

I note, too, that in Mr. BURGESS' district in Texas alone, 26 percent of workers would see a raise of \$3,900 a year, on average. That is just in that district. That is a significant change in the economic well-being of people in his district in Texas.

I certainly don't ever doubt the sincerity of my colleague, but what would the minimum wage be?

Perhaps my colleagues could argue we get full employment at \$2 an hour. Unfortunately, people would make \$4,000 a year. So if we are going to be truthful to and have fidelity to the notion that a floor needs to be established—and that is what this is; States and communities are free to raise beyond the Federal minimum wage—then the question is, what do we set it at?

I note that in 2007, when the question was last before the House and when we raised the minimum wage that was at \$5.85 per hour, and it is now at \$7.25, Mr. BURGESS voted "no," as did many of his colleagues.

Should the minimum wage still be \$5.85? I think the question is, what do we value as Americans? What is the appropriate public policy for establishing the floor for what an individual works in America?

We feel very strongly about it. We feel lifting 30 million Americans' economic prospects make this the appropriate thing to do, particularly in an economy that is growing and an economy that can certainly not only afford it, but we believe there is a moral imperative to do so.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. FRANKEL).

Ms. FRANKEL. Mr. Speaker, I stand in support of this very important legislation, the Raise the Wage Act.

Mr. Speaker, they are your mothers, your daughters, your sisters, your grandmothers. They are your childcare workers, your home health aides, your retail workers, your maids. They, too, have to pay rent, buy food for their families. By the time many retire, they live in poverty.

Women play an essential role in the economy of the United States of America yet make up two-thirds of min-

imum-wage workers. They are our mothers, our sisters, our grandmothers, our daughters. They deserve a raise, and they need a raise.

When women succeed, America succeeds.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes for the purpose of response.

The gentleman, Mr. MORELLE, was not here in 2007, the last time the minimum wage vote was taken.

The Speaker of the House was the same Speaker of the House that we have now. The minimum wage was raised. I don't know if the gentleman remembers what happened in the year and a half following that, but job losses in this country were staggering. I am not saying it was a one-to-one relationship, but it certainly set the stage. The economy may have already been softening, but it really did accelerate the job losses that occurred in the recession of 2008.

Now, the gentleman correctly points out that 1.3 million people would get a raise. That comes at the expense of 4 million people who would see their employment eliminated by raising the minimum wage. Is that really the direction we want to go?

His jurisdiction has raised the minimum wage. Any jurisdiction that I represent is free to raise the minimum wage to whatever level it wants. A city in my district may say that it is not going to negotiate with a contractor that pays less than \$15 an hour. That is fine. That is its job. That is its prerogative. It may do so, but it will find itself in competition with other jurisdictions that perhaps will not be so onerous.

Look, I was an employer not too terribly long ago, and I recognized, in the full-employment economy of the 1990s, that if I posted a job, the most entry-level job in my medical practice, for a minimum wage hire, I was wasting my money. No one was going to respond to that ad because no one worked for minimum wage in the late 1990s during the tech boom. Everyone had jobs that paid higher than the minimum wage.

That should be our aspirational goal, to have an economy that pays more than what a baseline economy would pay.

I sat on the Joint Economic Committee for the first several years of the Obama administration. It was a difficult time in this country. Christina Romer and Mr. Summers would tell us that the country's best days were behind us.

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself an additional 1 minute.

Now, we find ourselves emerging into a new area of our economy, a new area of economic freedom. Why don't we embrace that?

Look, if we really wanted to do something to help people at the lower end of the wage scale, we would be working seriously on border security. We

wouldn't have off-the-books labor competing with the lowest wage earners in this country. We would fix that problem as a United States Congress. That might have been a better effort than what we spent our day doing yesterday.

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

□ 1245

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

I will admit I think this is the first time I have heard that the great crisis of 2007–2008 was caused by or a contributing factor was the increase in the Federal minimum wage from \$5.85. That sort of ignores the problems in the housing industry, credit default swaps, and a whole host of things in the financial community, not to mention what happened in the automotive industry. So this is the first time I have heard that theory promoted by anyone, and I think it varies dramatically from what history will write about 2007 and 2008.

Nonetheless, I do want to just correct a few things that I thought I heard my distinguished friend say.

First of all, the 1.3 million people who will receive a raise, that is not what I said nor is it what CBO said. 1.3 million people will be out of poverty. It will be a raise for 27 million Americans. So that is the right number. It is not 1.3 million; it is almost 30 million Americans.

I just note that nowhere in the CBO does it talk about 4 million people being displaced. What it says is that there will be zero to 3.7, a two-thirds chance that will happen. The median loss will be 1.3 million. So nowhere is there 4 million.

But, again, the point here that I think we should take from this is, using the logic that has been posited by my friend and colleague, you could argue that, using that logic, there would be no minimum wage. Just let the States do whatever the States choose to do, localities do whatever localities choose to do. That is not the public policy decision we made in 1938, and we continue to have fidelity to this day and this time and place.

Now, there may be people who disagree with that who think there ought not be a Federal minimum wage at all. I guess that is certainly their right to do that and make that argument. But the most important thing here is that, if we are going to establish this—which we on this side of the aisle certainly believe in the Federal minimum wage—if you are going to allow it to continue to function without the erosion of inflation and the loss of purchasing power, making adjustments—which I think is one of the things that most advocates for this bill is that there may be other changes in time to wage rates, et cetera, under law—this will establish, for the first time in Federal law, a wage inflation adjuster each year so that we will stop, for the first time since we initiated the minimum wage,

the erosion of purchasing power, and we won't need to wait 10 years.

This is the longest period of time, as I mentioned in my opening comments, the longest period of time since the establishment of the Federal minimum wage, that we have waited to make those adjustments.

I would just note that, while I was not here and I was laboring in the State legislature in New York creating what I think was good economic policy, I noted that the Committee on Education Labor, during the intervening time while my friends were in the majority, not only did they not attempt to raise the minimum wage, they did not hold a single hearing on the erosion of the purchasing power of the minimum wage, which at the time was \$7.25 and remains, to this date, \$7.25.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, corporate America and Wall Street are awash in profits and cash, but American workers haven't had the benefit of a Federal minimum wage increase in over a decade, while the prices of everything have gone up—medicine, housing, food, cars. A recent study found there isn't a single congressional district in our Nation where a full-time minimum wage worker can afford a two-bedroom apartment.

While many States and cities have raised their own minimum wage requirements, millions of Americans are stuck at \$7.25 an hour.

What does this really mean? A person working full time for minimum wage takes home an annual salary of just a bit over \$15,000 a year. With inflation, these workers have effectively had their wages cut by an astonishing 17 percent.

That is why I rise today in support of the Raise the Wage Act, a bill that will gradually raise the minimum wage to \$15 by 2025, lift 27 million American workers out of poverty, give roughly 40 million Americans a raise—nearly a third of our workforce—and stimulate local economies as Americans have more money to spend.

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

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman from Ohio an additional 15 seconds.

Ms. KAPTUR. Such a raise would put \$3,200 in the pockets of more than 128,000 workers just in northern Ohio.

Mr. Speaker, the Raise the Wage Act will dramatically improve the lives of millions of hardworking people and families and communities across our country. Let's come together and really help the American people who are working and pass this much-needed legislation without delay.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds just to read from the Congressional Budget Office report.

The paragraph that says, "Effects of the \$15 option on employment and income," ends with the sentence "a reduction of 3.7 million workers." And

there is also the little item of an \$8.7 billion loss in family income.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BROOKS).

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, socialist Democrats support open borders. Open borders mean a literal tsunami of illegal alien labor that artificially inflates the labor supply and suppresses American wages. This is economics 101. If the supply goes up, everything else being constant, the price goes down.

The way to raise wages is simple: America must stop importing cheap foreign labor that takes American jobs from American workers and suppresses the wages of hardworking Americans who need that money for their families.

The question is: Do we care enough about American family incomes to secure our borders and stop the flood of illegal alien labor that suppresses American wages? Of course not. Instead, there are those who seek an imperial decree for a \$15-per-hour minimum wage.

Well, that all sounds fine and good. Socialist policies always have a cost, and according to the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, that cost is a loss of as many as 3.7 million jobs.

You heard right. The policies being advocated today really are advocating the firing of as many as 3.7 million American workers from their jobs. That is like firing the entire population of the State of Oklahoma.

Mr. Speaker, if the advocates of this legislation really cared about American workers, they would not fire them; rather, they would help secure our borders, save American jobs, save American incomes, and, as an added bonus, help prevent the deaths of over 30,000 Americans who die each year because of America's porous southern border.

But that is not what the advocates of this legislation prefer. Rather, out of a lust for political power, they prefer open borders and the firing of 3.7 million American workers.

Mr. Speaker, I say yes to border security; I say no to killing jobs; and I say no to this job-killing socialist legislation.

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

Mr. Speaker, I note that using that logic, people might have said the same thing about my grandparents who came over from Italy at the turn of the previous century, who came to work in this country as carpenters and bricklayers and pipefitters.

What we really need, if the gentleman is serious, is a path to citizenship to allow people, as we did a century ago, to come and fulfill and be a part of the American Dream.

The truth is it also avoids what is happening, which is we have a shortage of workers in the country. Every week I try to visit employers in my community and get a sense of the pulse of what the challenges are that they face

in continuing to seek economic growth and more opportunities. Repeatedly, I hear the same thing over and over again: We need good workers. Send us more workers. Do whatever you can.

This is the time while our economy continues to grow following the policies of the Obama administration, continuing today, economic growth is now at a 10-year sustained path, but we need workers. You see this all the time.

We can talk, and I am happy to talk about the impacts of automation and robotics and AI, but the truth is that, even among some of the biggest technology companies in the United States, there are thousands and thousands of openings for jobs. This is hardly a job killer. This is rewarding people who put in long hours, who look to climb that ladder of success in the American economy.

I just note, also, for my colleague, Mr. BROOKS, that 34 percent of the workers in his district in Alabama would receive an average raise of \$3,700 a year by implementation of this wage increase.

And I would also remind my colleagues, 65 percent of Americans, when asked, believe that increasing the minimum wage to \$15 an hour by 2024 is the right policy for Congress to take.

So this has the backing and support of the American public. It has a clear path to making sure that there isn't erosion of income in the United States by people at the lowest end of the economic scale. It is an opportunity for us to think about a path to citizenship, to end the challenges faced by so many employers who seek good, hardworking workers.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE), my good friend and a distinguished gentleman.

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

I rise in strong support of H.R. 582, the Raise the Wage Act. It has been more than a decade since working people got a raise in this country. Americans are working harder than ever, and labor productivity is overperforming expectations.

However, the profit of this increased productivity is not being felt in the checkbooks of working people. In fact, American workers have experienced a 20 percent pay cut in real income due to inflation and the government's failure to raise wages.

It is unconscionable that people working full time in the wealthiest nation in the history of the world are unable to afford basic essentials or live in poverty. That is why it is critical that we pass the Raise the Wage Act.

Here are the facts: The bill will increase wages for nearly 34 million American workers. About 28 percent of workers in my district in Rhode Island will get a raise of about \$2,100 a year. It will lift 3.1 million Americans out of poverty, including 600,000 children, and it will stimulate economic growth. And

we know that when workers earn more, they spend more money.

While the top 1 percent of Americans continue to amass Gilded Age amounts of wealth, working men and women have been left behind. It is time to reaffirm our commitment to hard-working Americans and pass this critical legislation. Americans deserve a raise, and that is what this bill does.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter signed by many LGBTQ organizations and human rights organizations in strong support of this legislation.

JULY 16, 2019.

DEAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS: We, the undersigned organizations, write to express our strong support for the Raise the Wage Act (H.R. 582). As lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer (LGBTQ) and allied organizations, we believe raising the minimum wage is a critical LGBTQ issue. Raising the federal minimum wage would benefit LGBTQ people by helping to reduce poverty and increase stability and economic security for LGBTQ people and their families.

Because of discrimination in employment, housing, education, and other areas, LGBTQ individuals are more likely to be jobless, homeless, and poor than the general population. Nearly 40 million workers, including LGBTQ people, would receive increased wages from the Act. In light of the disproportionate rates of poverty among LGBTQ people, passing this measure is a critical priority for our community.

The Raise the Wage Act would raise the federal minimum wage to \$8.55 this year and increase it gradually over the next six years until it reaches \$15 an hour in 2025. After 2025, the minimum wage would be adjusted annually to keep pace with growth in the typical worker's wages. In addition, the Act would phase out the outdated subminimum wage for tipped workers, which has been stagnant at \$2.13 since 1991. It would also sunset the ability for employers to pay a subminimum wage to workers with disabilities and phase out the subminimum wage for workers under the age of 20.

An increase in the federal minimum wage would help the LGBTQ community, especially its most marginalized members. Incomes would rise above poverty level for nearly 30,000 people in same-sex relationships. Raising the minimum wage to \$15 would decrease poverty by almost 50% among female same-sex couples and by 35% among male same-sex couples.

Transgender people would be particularly impacted by this bill. Almost one-third of transgender people live in poverty, which is more than twice the rate of the U.S. general population.

The bill would also have a profound impact on LGBTQ youth, who make up between 30% and 40% of homeless youth. 47% of these LGBTQ homeless youth are persons of color. Since 55% of homeless LGBTQ youth were forced out by their parents or ran away because of their sexual orientation or gender identity, more than 50% of LGBTQ homeless youth remain homeless for longer periods of time than non-LGBTQ homeless youth. Raising the wage and phasing out the subminimum wage for workers under age 20 will help reduce homelessness among LGBTQ youth by helping them afford housing and achieve economic security independent of their families.

Additionally, the Act will have enormous impacts on LGBTQ people of color and LGBTQ women. 37% of the LGBTQ community identify as people of color. Under the Act, 40% of Black workers and 34% of Latino/

a workers will benefit. Women account for nearly 56% of the workers benefiting from an increased minimum wage. Women also account for 2/3 of the country's tipped workers, who are more than twice as likely to live in poverty than the rest of the workforce. LGBTQ women are more likely than their non-LGBTQ counterparts to receive public assistance, be unemployed, and be near or under the poverty level.

Critics of the bill have argued against raising the federal minimum wage, proposing instead that minimum wages should be established by region. However, a minimum wage of \$15 by 2025 is not unrealistic in any part of the U.S. In addition, rural communities have a strong incentive to support the Act because they are experiencing a housing affordability crisis in part due to flat incomes for low- and moderate-income workers in those communities.

Additionally, the Act's plan to phase in the \$15 wage over six years allows for lower-wage states and regions to adjust to the new wage. Opponents of the bill also contend that small businesses do not benefit from raising the wage. However, 61% of American small business owners support raising the minimum wage.

For these reasons, we support the Raise the Wage Act and urge you to consider the enormous benefits the bill will bring to the LGBTQ community. LGBTQ workers need jobs that allow them to have security and take care of themselves and their families.

Sincerely,

9to5, A Better Balance, AIDS Action Baltimore, AIDS Alabama, AIDS Foundation of Chicago, AIDS Legal Referral Panel, AIDS United, Alaskans Together For Equality, Albany Damien Center, American Association of University Women (AAUW), Americans for Democratic Action (ADA), Athlete Ally, Black AIDS Institute, Cascade AIDS Project, Center for American Progress, Center for Black Equity, Center for Disability Rights, CenterLink: The Community of LGBT Centers, Coalition on Human Needs, DC Fights Back.

Equality California, Equality Federation, Equality Illinois, Equality North Carolina, Equality Utah, Fair Wisconsin, Family Equality, Family Values @ Work, Howard Brown Health, In Our Own Voice: National Black Women's Reproductive Justice Agenda, Interfaith Worker Justice, Lambda Legal, Latinos Salud, LGBTQ Allyship, Modem Military Association of America, MomsRising, Movement Advancement Project, National Asian Pacific American Women's Forum (NAPAWF), National Center for Lesbian Rights, National Center for Transgender Equality.

National Coalition for the Homeless, National Council on Independent Living (NCIL), National Employment Law Project, National Equality Action Team (NEAT) National LGBT Cancer Network, National LGBTQ Task Force Action Fund, National LGBTQ Workers Center, National Women's Law Center, National Working Positive Coalition, NETWORK Lobby for Catholic Social Justice, New York City Anti-Violence Project, Oasis Legal Services, Open Health Care Clinic, Oxfam America, PathWays PA, People For the American Way, PFLAG National, Positive Women's Network-USA, Poz Military Veterans USA INTL, Pride at Work.

PROMO, Reframe Health and Justice, Sexuality Information and Education Council of the United States (SIECUS), Shelter Resources, Inc., Shriver Center on Poverty Law, Silver State Equality-Nevada, Southerners On New Ground, The DC Center for the LGBT Community, The National LGBTQ Workers Center, The Well Project, Thrive Alabama, TRANScending Barriers, Transgender Law Center, Treatment Action

Group (TAG), UCHAPS, United States People Living with HIV Caucus, United We Dream, US People Living with HIV Caucus, Voices for Progress, Workplace Fairness.

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

I, first, just want to remark that—I think, the last 11 months are the last figures I saw—over the last 11 months wage growth in this country has increased more than at any time in recent memory.

Wage growth is a lagging indicator, but it is happening, and that is a good thing, and we should celebrate that. There would be no reason to put the brakes on that that I can see.

I think we should be encouraged that that is happening, and I don't think we should be doing things to the economy that would be detrimental and reverse that trend.

But let me just say at this point, if we defeat the previous question, Republicans will amend the rule to immediately bring up H.R. 748, the Middle Class Health Benefits Tax Repeal Act, or Cadillac Tax Repeal Act, and include the text of H.R. 1398, the Health Insurance Tax Relief Act, and H.R. 2207, the Protect Medical Innovation Act, or the medical device tax repeal.

Legislation in previous Congresses to repeal the Cadillac tax has gathered strong support and brought employers and labor unions together in their efforts to eliminate this tax.

Since the Cadillac tax is calculated only based on insurance premiums, it could unfairly target those already struggling with higher healthcare costs and affect middle-income workers, including teachers and nurses, due to the continuing rise of health insurance costs.

H.R. 748 would repeal this tax in its entirety.

I would also like to note my support for the repeal of the medical device tax and to delay the health insurance tax.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. WALORSKI), my good friend.

□ 1300

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to vote down the previous question.

If we defeat the previous question, Republicans will amend the rule to include the repeal of the medical device tax and the health insurance tax as part of H.R. 748, the Middle Class Health Benefits Tax Repeal Act of 2019.

H.R. 748 is an important piece of legislation that would permanently repeal ObamaCare's 40 percent tax on employer-provided health insurance, commonly referred to as the Cadillac tax. Ending the Cadillac tax will provide important relief to both employers and employees and ensure employers can remain leaders in utilizing new technologies to reduce healthcare costs and ensure better patient outcomes.

However, this bill doesn't include repealing other burdensome taxes, like the medical device tax and the health

insurance tax. We all know that Americans are facing rising costs and fewer healthcare options. Raising taxes on health coverage would only make matters worse for families, small businesses, and Medicare Advantage enrollees. That is why we should also include a bipartisan provision to provide seniors relief from the burdensome health insurance tax.

Hoosiers are proud to be leaders in medical innovation, with more than 300 medical device manufacturers in my State that support nearly 55,000 good-paying jobs. However, after ObamaCare's medical device tax took effect, the medical technology industry lost almost 29,000 jobs nationwide from 2012 to 2015, according to the Commerce Department's data.

Medical devices have changed the way we think about healthcare. New technologies diagnose illnesses earlier, lowering the impact of care on a person's daily life. All these notable gains will be wiped out if the medical device tax is reinstated. By defeating the previous question, we can repeal this job-killing tax as well.

It is critical that we repeal all three of these burdensome taxes before they go back into effect. Doing so will help lower premiums, improve access to care, and boost American manufacturing jobs.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote against the previous question.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. 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 (Mr. CUELLAR). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, although the gentleman from Indiana (Mrs. WALORSKI) did not actually talk about the minimum wage increase which is before us, I do note that about 40 percent of the workers in her district would be affected by this, with annual average raises of \$3,200 a year.

Before I just make a couple of other points, Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the following letters: The first letter is from the Service Employees International Union, SEIU, and the second is from the Communications Workers of America, both sharing overwhelming support for H.R. 582, the Raise the Wage Act.

SEIU,

Washington, DC, July 16, 2019.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the two million members of the Service Employees International Union ("SEIU"), I write to urge you to vote YES on H.R. 582, the Raise the Wage Act of 2019, and oppose any Republican Motion to Recommit. For years, working people and allies have taken to the streets to call for a \$15 an hour minimum wage and to have their voices heard in the workplace. By ensuring a path to \$15 in every part of our country, Congress will make sure

that everyone—no matter where they are from or what the color of their skin is—is closer to having what they need to get by. This is one of the most important changes we can make in this country. Airport workers, home care workers, child care providers, and all SEIU members are proud to stand with the Fight for \$15 and a Union and support this legislation.

It has been more than ten years since Congress raised the federal minimum wage—the longest stretch in history. While wealthy corporations have been handed tax cut after tax cut, working families have been forced to scrape by with less than they need. As a result, one in nine of our nation's full-time workers struggle to support themselves and their families on wages that leave them in poverty. There is currently no place in America where a full-time worker making the federal minimum wage can afford the basic essentials.

A \$15 federal minimum wage would be life-changing for tens of millions of working families, lifting an estimated 1.3 million Americans out of poverty, and helping to create an economy that works for everyone, not just the wealthy few. It is no surprise that poll after poll confirms widespread support among Americans for this proposal.

The overwhelming share of low-wage earners would unambiguously benefit from a \$15 minimum wage, but enactment of this bill is particularly critical for women who make up nearly two-thirds of the workforce earning the federal minimum wage or just above it, as well as Latinx and black workers. Currently, black workers are significantly over-represented in states where the minimum wage has stayed at \$7.25 an hour. Many of the same states with low minimum wages also have so-called "Right-to-Work" provisions that weaken collective bargaining and the voice of working people. These same jurisdictions are also places where voting rights are under attack, Medicaid has not been expanded, and pre-emption laws block many localities from raising the minimum wage. Underpaid people in these regions and across the country are depending on Congress to take immediate action to raise the wage.

People like Terrence Wise, a worker at a McDonald's in Kansas City, Missouri, have been on the front lines fighting for a \$15/hour minimum wage knowing it would be transformative for him and his family. In his own words: "Just like me, a lot of folks in fast-food work two or more jobs because pay is so low. What if every U.S. worker just had to work one job, and that was enough to make ends meet? I want to know that when I get my paycheck, it'll be enough to pay the rent, feed my kids and keep the lights on—and maybe even a little extra, like enough to take my girls out to ice cream. It's not a lot to ask of Congress, and it would change the lives of millions of workers like me. It would give us a fair shot at the American dream we all hear so much about."

We urge Congress to heed the call to action from workers like Terrence Wise, and raise the wage so that millions of working people can be paid enough to lead a decent life, provide for their family and build a better future. SEIU strongly urges you to vote for H.R. 582, and to vote NO on any Republican Motion to Recommit. We will add votes on this legislation and the Motion to Recommit to our legislative scorecard. If you have any questions, please reach out to Jaya Chatterjee.

Sincerely,

MARY KAY HENRY,
International President.

COMMUNICATIONS WORKERS OF AMERICA,

July 11, 2019.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the officers and 700,000 members of the Communications Workers of America (CWA), I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of H.R. 582, the Raise the Wage Act of 2019, and against any amendments that undermine the bill. At a time when wage stagnation and income inequality hold back our families and our economy, the Raise the Wage Act will begin to reverse that cycle and raise pay broadly across the bottom of the workforce.

It's been a decade since the federal minimum wage has increased. Meanwhile, the cost of living has continually increased for working Americans. For many Americans, working 40 hours or more a week is not enough to support themselves and their families. Airline employees, call center workers, retail store employees and bank workers are among those who work full time for some of the most highly profitable corporations, but still earn poverty level wages. It's time for an economy that works for working families and especially for the people who work full time but who earn poverty level wages.

If enacted, the legislation will raise the federal minimum wage to \$8.55 this year and increase it over the next five years until it reaches \$15 an hour in 2024. Raising the minimum wage to \$15 an hour will give roughly 40 million workers a pay increase, which is nearly 30% of the workforce. After 2024, the minimum wage will adjust each year to keep pace with growth of inflation. In addition, the legislation will phase out the subminimum wage for tipped workers, individuals with disabilities and workers younger than 20 years old.

All workers deserve to earn a living wage so they can live with dignity and respect. It is time Congress takes action to raise the wages of these low income workers and ensure the economy works for everyone, instead of those in the 1%. Therefore, I urge you to support H.R. 582, the Raise the Wage Act of 2019. CWA will include votes on this bill and any amendments that would undermine the bill in our Congressional Scorecard. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

SHANE LARSON,
Director of Legislative,
Political and Inter-
national Affairs,
Communications
Workers of America
(CWA).

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD letters from the American Association of University Women, the Patriotic Millionaires, the National Education Association, and the NAACP, all in support of H.R. 582.

AAUW,
July 15, 2019.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the more than 170,000 bipartisan members and supporters of the American Association of University Women (AAUW), I urge you to vote for the Raise the Wage Act (H.R. 582) when it comes to the House floor for a vote and oppose any harmful amendments and any possible motion to recommit. The Raise the Wage Act (H.R. 582) is critical legislation which would gradually increase the federal minimum wage from \$7.25 to \$15 per hour and then require that the minimum wage increase be based on changes in the median wage. It would also eliminate the tipped minimum wage and prohibit the use of subminimum wages for employees with disabilities.

Today, millions of women live in poverty because our federal minimum wage is inadequate for ensuring the economic well-being

of workers and their families. The federal minimum wage is currently only \$7.25 per hour and just \$2.13 per hour for tipped workers. Women comprise a majority of the low-wage workforce, and African American women and Latinas are significantly overrepresented in the low-wage workforce. Nearly two-thirds of minimum wage workers in the United States are women, as well as two-thirds of workers in tipped jobs. Some workers with disabilities are paid a subminimum wage through certificates issued by the Department of Labor. This is not even close to a living wage, which is necessary to lift workers out of poverty. A woman with two children working full-time at minimum wage earns a yearly salary of \$14,500, \$5,000 below the poverty line.

Congress must take action to increase the minimum wage by passing the Raise Wage Act of 2019 (H.R. 582). If enacted, this legislation would raise the federal minimum wage to \$8.55 this year and increase it over the next several years until it reaches \$15 an hour, phase out the outdated subminimum wage for tipped workers, and also sunset the ability of employers to pay workers with disabilities a subminimum wage.

Women's overrepresentation in low-wage jobs is a significant factor contributing to the gender pay gap. Currently, women working full-time, year-round are typically being paid only 80 cents for every dollar paid to men. The pay gaps have grown even wider for women of color. African American women and Latinas make, respectively, 61 and 53 cents on the dollar as compared to non-Hispanic, white men. Women make up nearly 58 percent of the workers who would benefit from a \$15 minimum wage, making this bill instrumental for helping to close the gender wage gap. According to recent estimates from the Economic Policy Institute, increasing the federal minimum wage to \$15 by 2024 would give more than 31 percent of all working women a raise, including 41 percent of African American working women, 38 percent of working Latinas, 29 percent of white working women, and 18 percent of Asian working women. Even the Congressional Budget Office's analysis of the impact of the bill shows that workers overall will be better off and have higher annual earnings on average.

Raising the minimum wage is one action that Congress should take to ensure the economic security of families across the country. I urge you to vote for the Raise the Wage Act (H.R. 582) when it comes to the House floor for a vote and oppose any harmful amendments and any possible motion to recommit. Cosponsorship and votes associated with this bill may be scored in the AAUW Action Fund Congressional Voting Record for the 116th Congress. Please do not hesitate to contact me or Anne Hedgepeth, Director of Federal Policy, if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

DEBORAH J. VAGINS,
Senior Vice President,
Public Policy and Research.

PATRIOTIC MILLIONAIRES,
July 15, 2019.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: I am writing on behalf of the Patriotic Millionaires organization to urge you to support the Raise the Wage Act (H.R. 582). Our members are deeply committed to raising the federal minimum wage to \$15 an hour, and we hope that you will take this opportunity to show your commitment to ensuring that all working Americans are able to afford their basic needs.

We understand that you may have some hesitations about supporting the bill, but I believe that this letter should adequately address those concerns.

While we understand that legislation is always changeable until it is voted on, for us this policy has a few "red lines" as follows: \$15 per hour by 2024

One Fair Wage (no sub-minimum for tipped workers or anyone else)

Indexing

"No" on the vote to recommit

Within that framework, we will gladly support whatever piece of legislation you all decide to advance.

Our members believe that current levels of economic inequality pose an existential threat to the nation, and that wealthy Americans have an inescapable responsibility to engage in the fight for an inclusive economy. That is why we were such an early adopter of the \$15 wage, first endorsing it in 2013. We will fight urgently and publicly for this critical policy until it becomes law. Once the House passes the bill, we will formally launch a robust public education and advocacy campaign that will continue through next year and into the 117th Congress.

As business leaders and investors, our members are well acquainted with building profitable business models and plan to spend quite a bit of our public education efforts on outreach to the business community, particularly owners of small and medium sized companies. A few thoughts to share with business owners in your district:

First, because every business in the country will be required to raise wages, no establishment will gain or lose a competitive advantage based on wages as the cost "input" will change at the same rate for each of them simultaneously.

From a macroeconomic point of view, 70% of the American economy is based on consumer demand. It is only logical that putting more money in the hands of more consumers will be a net positive to the economy. Picture a bar on a Saturday night filled with patrons. Should the owner of the bar be more concerned about how much money all of those potential customers have to spend, or the higher wage he is paying the single bartender who is serving them? It's simple math.

And to the small (but very vocal) group of business owners who insist their businesses will go under if they are required to pay a living wage, we have a simple message. If you cannot afford to pay someone a livable wage, you cannot afford to hire an employee.

You may have concerns that a higher minimum wage will lead to greater automation. To that, we say that automation is coming no matter what—in fact it is already here—and rather than speeding that inevitable process, a livable minimum wage will ensure that the jobs that cannot be automated pay enough. The fact is that companies will automate to the extent that they believe the capital outlay of automation will be offset by higher future profits. In that sense, as technology advances, automation is inevitable regardless of the minimum wage.

If you've been in a McDonald's recently, you've likely seen that truth in action. McDonald's pays many of its workers minimum wage, yet it has already heavily invested in automation technologies. Raising the minimum wage will not speed up automation, but will instead ensure that as the process unfolds, people who are working will be stable enough (because of the higher wages) to have the time and energy to do the extra education or training necessary for other positions.

There is real urgency to our efforts on this policy. June 16th marked the longest period in American history—since the minimum wage was first implemented in 1938—that the federal minimum wage has not been raised by Congress, just shy of a decade. Because the wage was not indexed, that means we've

spent nearly ten years where each passing day marks another decrease in the purchasing power of millions of working Americans, adding up to the wage being worth nearly 15% less than it was in 2009.

Every day that Congress does not act is another day where millions of paychecks decline in real value. Clearly it is time to act. Unfortunately in the political dynamic we are currently suffering under, bipartisan action is difficult to come by (despite the bipartisan popularity of this issue). The only way to force the Senate to act is for the House to act first, and to act decisively. Keep in mind, this issue polls incredibly well, with 83% of registered voters believing we need to raise the minimum wage, and 55% of registered voters, including 53% of independents and 37% of Republicans, supporting a \$15 federal minimum wage.

Senators MITCH MCCONNELL and ALEXANDER LAMAR clearly have no interest in passing a minimum wage bill. To force their hand, we need to change the perceived consequences of their inaction by pushing this issue into the public debate and keeping it there.

To be clear, the choice is not between this bill and some other more perfect bill, the choice is between this bill and no bill. While there is another minimum wage bill that has generated support, it will not reach the threshold of support required to pass. Nor should it. With all due respect to Third Way and other "centrist" think tanks, the so-called regional approach will not solve the problem.

First, there already is a regional approach to this issue in that states and localities are reasonably free to set wages higher than the federal wage if their economies and politics support it. The purpose of federal legislation is to set a floor for the entire country, to ensure that at a minimum everyone is ok. That floor for everyone should be \$15. A study by the Economic Policy Institute shows that by 2024, there will be no county in the country where a person can support themselves on less than \$15 an hour.

In terms of expecting different things from different localities, \$15 is already not enough in several areas of the country, but we are not demanding \$25 or \$30 an hour in these areas. To say that \$15 is "too much" in some places while not being equally as concerned that \$15 is "far from enough" in many others challenges the credibility of the argument.

Furthermore, the regional approach puts the \$15 figure for rural counties off to 2033. Frankly, a 14 year timeline is absurd on its face.

Lawmakers in the House have a simple choice to make—do something, or do nothing. Move the minimum wage to \$15 an hour, or keep it at \$7.25. The Raise the Wage Act has 203 voting cosponsors, and needs 218 votes to pass the House. This simple policy will help stabilize the economic lives of 40% of working people. And it is supported by a bipartisan majority of Americans. This is a no-brainer.

We recognize that you might disagree with our assessment, that there might be other approaches you think are more appropriate. But as I stated before, the choice before you is this bill or no bill. You might not believe that \$15 an hour for the entire country is the best option, but surely you must see that it's better than \$7.25 an hour. We've reached a critical point where inaction is simply no longer an option.

The Patriotic Millionaires believe that a fair minimum wage is a fundamental building block of an economy that works for all Americans, not just the ultra-wealthy. We also believe that every member of Congress who stands with working Americans will ultimately recognize the importance of this

bill, and will vote to support it. We hope that you will be one of them.

Thank you so much.

MORRIS PEARL,
Chair.

NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION,
July 11, 2019.

*U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.*

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of our 3 million members and the 50 million students they serve, I urge you to VOTE YES on H.R. 582, the Raise the Wage Act. Votes on this issue may be included in NEA's Report Card for the 116th Congress.

This legislation will benefit working people across our nation, including NEA's education support professionals—the school bus drivers, cafeteria workers, custodians, and other members of school communities who are the first ones to arrive in the morning, and the last to go home at night. Their work is tremendously valuable, and the support they provide students often goes well beyond their job titles. Yet, they struggle to make ends meet.

The Raise the Wage Act would:

- benefit all low-wage earners, not just teenagers or restaurant workers;
- benefit nearly one-third of manufacturing workers, one-fourth of health care workers, one-fifth of construction workers, and one-sixth of educators;
- reduce poverty and income inequality by raising the total annual income of the lowest-paid workers; and
- help to close racial earnings gaps.

As you know, the federal minimum wage has not increased since 2009. During that decade, many working families have lost ground, and lost hope. Several states have raised their minimum wages in the past 10 years, but it is time for the federal government to act. Doing so will improve the circumstances not only for the workers themselves, but for their family members and communities. Please VOTE YES and Raise the Wage.

Sincerely,

MARC EGAN,
*Director of Government Relations,
National Education Association.*

NAACP WASHINGTON BUREAU,
July 8, 2019.

Re: NAACP strong support for H.R. 582, the Raise the Wage Act

*U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.*

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the NAACP, our nation's oldest, largest and most widely-recognized grassroots-based civil rights organization, urge you to vote for and support through passage H.R. 582, the Raise the Wage Act. People of color, women, families and too many others have been left behind by our economy and our policies far too often, for far too long. Adopting the Raise the Wage Act would mark a crucial step toward ensuring we can all work towards greater equity, dignity, and a living wage.

The Raise the Wage Act will make significant contributions in the economic security of millions of American women, men, and families by raising the federal minimum wage from \$7.25 to \$15 an hour by 2024, then indexing it so that it continues to rise along with wages overall. H.R. 582 will also end unfair current exclusions for tipped workers, people with disabilities, and youth so that they too, can benefit from a decent minimum wage.

The NAACP has a long and strong history of supporting federal laws that improved the lives of hard working Americans, and ensur-

ing that all people are covered. From the Fair Labor Standards Act to the very first federal minimum wage bill in 1938, we were active supporters of a fair day's wage for a hard day's labor. We continue to advocate for an increase in the buying power of the minimum wage to keep up with the cost of living in the United States, and that minimum wage earners, who by definition are working men and women, are able to keep their families out of poverty.

Thank you for your consideration of our position; the NAACP is proud to endorse H.R. 582, the Raise the Wage Act. Should you have any questions or comments, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

HILARY O. SHELTON,
*Director, NAACP Washington Bureau &
Senior Vice President for Policy and Advocacy*

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, one additional point that I wanted to make listening to my friend and colleague who talks about, during the last several years, the income and the wages of the lowest earning Americans have gone up. I do note with some irony that the reason for that, largely, is due to the increases in the minimum wage at the State levels: California, New York, many places around the country, Missouri. The list goes on and on.

About half of the States in the United States have now raised the minimum wage beyond the Federal number. That is the signal significant reason for wage rates going up for the lowest earning Americans. That is exactly the point of doing this, so that all Americans at the lowest end of the economic scale, the lowest wage earners, will see a significant increase in their earning power.

That will expand further the number of people at the lowest end in terms of increases in their wages. That will benefit their families—those families benefit—and make stronger neighborhoods and stronger communities and, ultimately, a stronger nation. That is why this needs to get done.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) pointing that out because I think it helps make our case.

Mr. Speaker, can I ask the gentleman whether he is prepared to close.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, in closing, with this bill, the Democrats seek to increase wages for millions of low wage earners, but the Congressional Budget Office estimates that it will also result in nearly 4 million lost jobs. These job losses will disproportionately impact entry-level workers and students.

That is why I offered an amendment to allow a market-based entry-level wage for workers with less than a year of experience, but Democrats on the Committee on Rules rejected that amendment during the Rules meeting. There was no reason not to make the amendment in order; they just rejected it.

A \$15 Federal minimum wage is a one-size-fits-all Federal mandate that does not consider differences in cost of living or employment patterns across the country.

Federal assistance is meant to be a temporary hand up to aid individuals on the path to a better economic future, but rather than pulling people up, this bill will leave more Americans reaching for assistance.

Republican concerns with this bill are not partisan; they are American.

If the majority is serious about increasing the wages of all Americans throughout the country, they should work—they should work—in a bipartisan manner to draft a bill that has a chance of passing in the Senate and making it to the President's desk. Unfortunately, this bill is another partisan political priority that really has no chance of becoming law.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on the previous question, on the underlying measure, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to spend some time on the floor with my distinguished colleague from Texas, though we disagree strongly about this.

I would just once again reiterate that the CBO estimate on this is nowhere near 4 million jobs lost. That is not mentioned anywhere in the CBO report. It talks about a range from zero to 3.7 million. The median is 1.3 million.

But, again, this is as much a question of values and what we stand for and a moral imperative as it is for statistics, because the statistics would argue for it.

1.3 million Americans would be lifted out of poverty the moment we pass this and this becomes law. Nearly 30 million Americans would see their annual wage increased, in some cases dramatically.

And this, as I indicated earlier, makes certain that, as a matter of public policy, we make certain that there is no erosion of the purchasing power of the minimum wage because of the indexing on this.

I really feel, Mr. Speaker, that those are the statistics that we ought to be mindful of, not just the worst possible, which is overstated by my colleague and friend.

There should be, Mr. Speaker, no place in this great Nation where a minimum wage employee working full-time cannot afford the basic essentials.

The work we are doing here today does not dictate a one-size-fits-all model for every State. It simply creates a floor, but a floor that is important, a Federal standard that says, if you work full-time in this country, if you put in the effort to earn for yourself and your family, you will achieve, at a minimum, a wage that lets you afford the basic necessities of life.

I believe this bill is just; I believe it is moral; I believe it is long overdue;

and I look forward to supporting its passage.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleagues for their words of support for H.R. 582, the Raise the Wage Act. I would especially like to thank Chairman SCOTT for his leadership and his commitment to this effort, and Chairman MCGOVERN of the Rules Committee for his work to move this significant legislation to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote on the rule; I urge a "yes" vote on the previous question.

The material previously referred to by Mr. BURGESS is as follows:

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

Sec. 2. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall proceed to the consideration in the House of the bill (H.R. 748) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on high cost employer-sponsored health coverage. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. An amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the texts of H.R. 748, H.R. 1398, and H.R. 2207, each as introduced, 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 Ways and Means; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Sec. 3. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 748.

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. 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. BURGESS. 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 question will be postponed.

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, July 17, 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 July 17, 2019, at 11:33 a.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 375.

With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely,

CHERYL L. JOHNSON.

COMMUNICATION FROM DISTRICT DIRECTOR, THE HONORABLE CATHY MCMORRIS RODGERS, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Traci Couture, District Director, the Honorable CATHY MCMORRIS RODGERS, Member of Congress:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
July 8, 2019.

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

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I, Traci Couture, have been served with a subpoena for testimony in a criminal trial issued by the United States District Court for the Western District of New York.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the privileges and rights of the House.

Sincerely,

TRACI COUTURE,
District Director.

COMMUNICATION FROM LEGISLATIVE AIDE, THE HONORABLE STEVE SCALISE, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Fred Trowbridge, Legislative Aide, the Honorable STEVE SCALISE, Member of Congress:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, July 16, 2019.

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

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I, Fred Trowbridge, have been served with a subpoena for testimony in a criminal trial issued by the United States District Court for the Western District of New York. This criminal trial is in relation to alleged threats made against Congressman Steve Scalise and his family, received through Congressman Scalise's official government office.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the privileges and rights of the House.

Sincerely,

FRED TROWBRIDGE,
Legislative Aide.

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF THE PROPOSED TRANSFER TO THE KINGDOM OF SAUDI ARABIA OF CERTAIN DEFENSE ARTICLES AND SERVICES

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to section 3 of House Resolution 491, I call up the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 36) providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed transfer to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Kingdom of Spain, and the Italian Republic of cer-

tain defense articles and services, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 491, the joint resolution is considered read.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

S.J. RES. 36

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the issuance of a manufacturing license, technical assistance license, or export license with respect to any of the following proposed agreements or transfers to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Kingdom of Spain, and the Italian Republic is prohibited:

(1) The transfer of the following defense articles, including defense services and technical data, described in Executive Communication 1427 (EC-1427) submitted to Congress pursuant to subsections (c) and (d) of section 36 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2776) and published in the Congressional Record on June 3, 2019:

(A) Coproduction and manufacture in Saudi Arabia of Paveway Pre-Amp Circuit Card Assemblies (CCA), Guidance Electronics Assembly (GEA) CCAs, and Control Actuator System (CAS) CCAs for all Paveway variants.

(B) Coproduction and manufacture in Saudi Arabia of Paveway II Guidance Electronics Detector Assemblies (GEDA) and Computer Control Groups (CCG).

(C) The transfer of up to 64,603 additional kits, partial kits, and full-up-rounds.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include in the RECORD extraneous material on the measure under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, the three measures the House will now consider are extraordinary, extraordinary but necessary, because they respond to what I view as an extraordinary abuse of power by the Trump administration, using a phony emergency to override the authority of Congress and push through \$8 billion in arms sales.

Each of these resolutions would prohibit a specific license for the export of precision-guided munitions, or smart bombs, and related components. We are focusing on these three licenses because the weapons would be the first ones shipped.

Mr. Speaker, it is no secret that Congress has serious concerns about the Saudi-led coalition's war in Yemen. The Saudis and their partners and, for that matter, the United States do have legitimate security concerns about the

efforts of Iran and its proxies to destabilize the Gulf region.

But as this war has dragged on, it has become clear that the coalition has carried out its campaign with little regard for innocent life: schoolbuses full of children destroyed in a fiery flash, weddings and funerals incinerated with no warning, civilian buildings and communities targeted.

Reckless doesn't begin to describe it. It is gruesome. It has contributed to the worst humanitarian crisis in the world.

□ 1315

To make matters worse, many of the weapons used in this carnage were built in America, sold by American companies to the Saudis and their partners.

Starting in the last Congress, when the administration told us they were planning to go ahead with another massive sale of offensive weapons to the Saudis and Emiratis, Senator MENENDEZ and I used the tools at our disposal to place informal holds on these transfers. We hoped that the administration would work with us and dial up pressure on these nations to start acting responsibly.

Now, the administration has complained that we stopped these sales from going through for months and months. But, as I said, this was an informal mechanism. The law—and I emphasize it is the law—says that, at any point, if an administration wants to go ahead with a weapons sale, it has to send a formal notification to Congress. That starts a 30-day clock. During that time, Congress can vote to stop a weapons sale.

Did the administration stop us to try to find a way forward? No.

Did they send a formal notification, starting the process laid out in the law under which Congress can legislatively block the sale? No.

What did they do? They dug up an obscure provision of the arms export law and declared an emergency to justify moving ahead with these sales.

What does that mean? It means, they went around Congress. It means, they went around the law.

Now, the emergency provision exists in law for a good reason. And if there were a real emergency—if the United States or our citizens or our allies were in immediate danger—we wouldn't be standing here today. There would be no objection.

But here is the thing, Mr. Speaker. There is no emergency.

Do you know how I know? I know because nearly 2 months down the line, not a single weapon has been shipped. Most of the weapons haven't even been built. In fact, one of the phony emergency declarations lets the Saudis build new facilities to manufacture weapons in their country, which I only presume would mean the Americans currently building these weapons in the United States would be out of a job.

That is right. Donald Trump declared an emergency to move jobs out of the United States—good manufacturing jobs, the kind Americans fight for. He abused the law to send them abroad.

What kind of emergency requires weapons that will be built months and months down the road? Or requires building a new factory on foreign soil? Especially when the law only gives Congress a 30-day review period.

The answer is clear, Mr. Speaker: a phony emergency. An emergency designed to make yet another end run around Congress, to undermine the separation of powers, to trample on this body's constitutional duties.

I am sick and tired of it, Mr. Speaker.

The State Department sent an assistant secretary up to the Hill to testify about this fiasco. He told us in the Foreign Affairs Committee that the administration took this brazen action out of respect for Congress' oversight role. Mr. Speaker, that is really, really hard to believe.

The other body passed 22 bipartisan resolutions stopping all these sales from going forward. The three measures we are considering today deal with weapons that are already manufactured, sitting in a warehouse, and, if we don't act, will be loaded onto a ship and sent to Saudi Arabia and the UAE within the next 2 months.

This resolution would prohibit the use of an emergency declaration to move ahead with the transfer of 64,000 Paveway precision-guided munitions, or, as we call them, smart bombs. Sixty-four thousand, Mr. Speaker, which would be added to the stockpile of 58,000 the Saudis previously purchased starting in 2015.

What will all these weapons be used for? No one knows.

If the administration wants to sell these weapons, they should follow the law, not misuse it, and they should come to Congress for its approval.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this dangerous resolution. Right now, as I speak, Iran is stretching its tentacles of terror across the Middle East.

By aiding the Houthis in Yemen, arming Hezbollah and Lebanon, and supporting the Shiite militias in Iraq and Syria, Iran is creating a Shia Crescent that can dominate the region. Their goal is to build a strategic land bridge from Tehran to the Mediterranean Sea. If we allow them to succeed, terrorism will flourish, instability will reign, and the security of our allies, like Israel, will be threatened.

One of the ways we can push back against Iran's murderous aggression is by empowering our partners in the region. Unfortunately, this irresponsible resolution handcuffs our ability to do so.

Specifically, this legislation would prohibit an export license and stop the

United States from providing our partners with the arms that they need to defend themselves. This particular license first came before members of the Foreign Affairs Committee in January of 2018. When I became the lead Republican in January of 2019, I reviewed this case and maintained the informal approval granted by my predecessor, Chairman Royce.

The administration has been criticized for bypassing Congress to push these sales through. But the Democrats, in fairness, placed informal holds on the sale for more than 13 months, a total of 407 days, which I believe abuses the process that we have in place in Congress.

During that time, the State Department continued to pursue this case with Congress. They also sent forward additional cases to help support the Saudis, the UAE, and Jordan. And, by the time the State Department submits such cases to Congress, they have already undergone a thorough inter-agency review process.

This important process ensures compliance with the President's conventional arms transfer policy intended to support our partners and strengthen our national security. Other critics are worried that these weapons will increase civilian casualties in Yemen.

However, the precision-guided munitions that we were trying to send to the Saudis will actually lower the risk of civilian casualties in Yemen as it counters attacks from Iranian-backed Houthis.

Now is not the time to deny our partners what they need for their defense. Nor is it time to hold precision-guided munitions that could minimize the risk to civilians.

Recently, after Iran attacked civilian ships and shot down drones—a U.S. military asset—the President brought together a bipartisan group of congressional leaders, including the chairman and myself, to discuss an appropriate response. He listened to our advice and made a prudent decision to exercise restraint.

The President has made it explicitly clear the United States is not looking for war. The decision to move forward with these arms sales is part of a larger effort to deter Iran. A key part of that effort is to empower greater burden sharing by enhancing the defense capabilities of our allies. These sales provide more options for deterring Iran that do not all depend on U.S. intervention.

I support these sales, even though I do not think that all 22 required emergency certification—this is a point the chairman and I actually agree on—especially those that will not be ready for delivery until later this year. I support revising the law with Chairman ENGEL to ensure and enhance the role of Congress in future emergency sales.

I thank the chairman for his bipartisan work with me on that amendment to the NDAA that was passed by a wide margin.

But I do oppose relitigating prior, lawful sales to partners who face growing threats to their security, which is what today's resolutions attempt to do.

Mr. Speaker, we face many dynamic challenges. Iran threatens the Middle East, it continues to pursue the eradication of Israel, and it remains the number one state sponsor of terrorism around the world. That threat is growing, not waning. For that reason, I believe that Members should oppose today's resolution.

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support S.J. Res. 36 and the other measures related to arms sales being considered this afternoon, which will prevent three sets of arms sales to Saudi Arabia and the UAE without undergoing the proper congressional notification process.

We are here today because rather than come and make their case to Congress, the administration invented a phony emergency to bypass the legal process for approving arms sales. There is no justification for this decision, other than the administration knew that these sales would be met with scrutiny from Congress and didn't want to deal with it.

Well, they were right. Congress is concerned about these proposed sales, and we should not sit back and allow the administration to continue with the charade of claiming an emergency exemption for them. I am glad that these measures of disapproval have bipartisan support and have already passed the Republican-led Senate. I urge all of my colleagues to support them today.

The administration briefed this body on Iran just days before the supposed emergency was declared and never mentioned an emergency. We are supposed to believe that, within a matter of days, the situation escalated so quickly that they were forced to bypass Congress. Most of the weapons included in the emergency sales are offensive weapons, and much of the sale will be delivered months or years from now, further evidence that no emergency exists.

The egregious and legally questionable move to put more weapons into the hands of regimes who are responsible for perpetrating horrific civilian casualties in Yemen comes as no surprise from an administration that has cozied up to the Saudi Crown Prince, even as we have credible evidence that he and his government are responsible for the cold-blooded murder of an American resident and journalist.

Just because you don't like the process doesn't mean you get to ignore it. This action has implications far beyond the current sale. If Congress doesn't reassert our proper role in the

process, we risk giving up the authority in the arms sale process entirely.

This isn't and shouldn't be a partisan issue. It is our job, as Congress, to represent the American people in matters of war. If we let this action go without a strong congressional response, the repercussions will be wide-ranging and longstanding.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support these resolutions of disapproval and block these arms sales once and for all.

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. MILLER).

Mrs. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in opposition to S.J. Res. 36. This legislation is bad policy and it sets a bad precedent.

Today, Congress is attempting to block legal U.S. arms sales to strategic partners who face increased threats from Iran and terrorist proxies.

The administration is ensuring that our allies in the Middle East have the capabilities to defend themselves and protect the hundreds of thousands of Americans who live and work in the Gulf states. These allies depend on military equipment from the U.S. to hold the line against Iran, al-Qaida, ISIS, and other threats. If we don't supply it, they will buy it elsewhere.

Russian arms dealers are already seeking to exploit the reluctance. At this point in history, we need to do what we can to decrease Iran's influence in the region.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote against the resolution.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Virginia (Ms. SPANBERGER).

Ms. SPANBERGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S.J. Res. 36, a joint resolution which I am leading in the House.

The evidence is clear: the Saudi Government continues to disregard the vital distinction between combatants and innocent civilians in Yemen.

In February, Congress voted to end U.S. support to the Saudi-led campaign against the Houthis that have left thousands of civilians dead and created one of the largest humanitarian crises in modern times.

However, the President not only vetoed a resolution, but the administration is now ramping up support for Saudi Arabia's offensive actions in Yemen, while simultaneously escalating tensions with Iran.

As I made clear during Foreign Affairs Committee hearings in May, not only is the administration trying to sell the Saudis more powerful weapons, but we are giving them the opportunity to build their own. With this latest proposal, the administration would be transferring sensitive technology that would allow Saudi Arabia to manufacture these high-tech weapons directly.

Congress needs to reassert its authority now as a coequal branch of government. This resolution, which I have led in the House, would make sure that

blatantly offensive weapons aren't sold to the Saudi military under the guise of defensive uses without congressional review.

I am proud to work with my colleagues in the Senate to block the sale of precision-guided munitions, which are responsible for some of the most horrific examples of targeted attacks against civilians.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to stand up against this misguided decision, protect innocent lives, and reassert the authority of Congress.

□ 1330

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

Mr. Speaker, I just want to go back to when we debated the Yemen resolution, which I thought was, once again, pro-Iran and pro-Houthi rebel, and anti-Israel. It is interesting that after that passed this Chamber, that the Houthi rebels celebrated a victory in the Congress, thinking that the American people, through the Congress, actually supported them.

We have to be responsible in our rhetoric on this floor and what we stand for. Many in this body favor asking our partners around the world to step up and do more to help protect our shared interests.

The President has called on other nations to take on the burden of defeating terrorism in the Middle East and has commended our partners for their contributions to regional security. Sharing this burden of collective security interest is really vital to ensuring the United States is not the only one bearing the costs in blood and treasure, for we have borne way too much in the Middle East.

But these arms sales are where the rubber hits the road for burden sharing. We cannot ask for partners to take on additional burdens while withholding from them the tools to do so. We should and do work with our partners to train them to use U.S.-origin equipment effectively and responsibly. This is an ongoing process.

My fear is that if we are unwilling to provide our partners with the means to ensure their own security and to invest the resources to turn them into responsible users, then the United States will find itself as a main guarantor of Middle East security. We have borne that burden for the last several decades. We also need to be wary of our partners turning to China and Russia for their defense needs.

Mr. Speaker, it was unfortunate how the current law, I believe, was utilized for these 22 sales. That is where Chairman ENGEL and I agree. And that is why we have worked on a bipartisan basis to refine this process for invoking an emergency moving forward. We have the informal congressional review process to try to resolve concerns regarding sales.

But when Members place indefinite holds on sales and place a stop to our

ability to share burdens with our partners—for 18 months in some cases—it undermines our entire security strategy and the important bilateral partnerships we worked so hard to establish and grow. For that reason, I oppose the resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, may I ask how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close debate on this measure.

I will wrap up quickly, as we have two more of these measures to consider.

It is important that we pass this measure now, along with the two we will soon consider, because these deal with weapons that could soon be on their way across the ocean.

I think the Iranian regime is dangerous. I think the Houthis are dangerous. No one is denying the Saudis the right to go after them. What we are saying is, don't go after them and kill thousands of civilians in the process with American weapons.

And also, separation of powers, the President cannot try to get around Congress with phony emergencies. I urge a "yes" vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 491, the previous question is ordered on the joint resolution.

The question is on the third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

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

Mr. MCCAUL. 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 question will be postponed.

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF THE PROPOSED EXPORT TO THE UNITED ARAB EMIRATES OF CERTAIN DEFENSE ARTICLES AND SERVICES

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to section 3 of House Resolution 491, I call up the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 37) providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed export to the United Arab Emirates, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the Republic of France of certain defense articles and services, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 491, the joint resolution is considered read.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

S.J. RES. 37

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the issuance of an export license with respect to any of the following proposed exports to the United Arab Emirates, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, or France is prohibited:

(1) The transfer of the following defense articles, including defense services and technical data, described in Executive Communication 1425 (EC-1425) submitted to Congress pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2776(c)) and published in the Congressional Record on June 3, 2019: The proposed transfer of 44,000 GBU-12 Paveway II Kits and the proposed transfer of 16,000 GBU-10 Paveway II Kits.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KINZINGER) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include in the RECORD extraneous materials on the measure under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, the second resolution we are debating is very similar to the first. But in this case, it would nullify the administration's phony emergency being used to transfer 60,000 precision-guided bombs to the United Arab Emirates. That is on top of the 40,000 we estimate the Emiratis already have on hand.

I won't rehash the same argument, but I would like to make a point why, when we see what is going on in Yemen, it is so important for the United States to take a stand.

Mr. Speaker, one of the things the Foreign Affairs Committee has focused on this year is trying to put American values back at the center of our foreign policy: Democracy, human rights, the rule of law.

Frankly, this administration has acted like it cannot be burdened with these fundamental things that make America America. It just boggles the mind that any great country can throw weight around, but we are not China. We are not Russia. Our foreign policy should show the world the character of our country, our compassion, our belief that people everywhere should be able to live prosperously, productively, and have healthy lives.

These ideas go hand in hand with promoting our security. We want more

stable, secure countries and communities. Democratic countries are stronger partners for the United States on the world's stage. And if we are serious about those values, it means speaking out when we see them trampled, whether they are trampled by an adversary or by a friend.

When we turn our back on these ideals; when we strip the word "democracy" out of the State Department's mission statement; when we look the other way when friendly regimes carry out horrific human rights abuses; when we slash investments in the diplomacy and development efforts that help us build bridges of friendship and understanding; when we walk away from all of that, what signal does it send to the world?

What does it say about the sort of behavior that we are willing to tolerate? I have supported our partners and our partnerships in the Gulf region. I think they are an important counterbalance to the threat Iran poses, and I recognize that our partners face real threats from Iranian-backed Houthis who are themselves guilty of serious human rights abuses.

But that doesn't mean we should just look the other way in the face of violence and slaughter of civilians perpetrated by our partners. It doesn't mean we look the other way and let the President ride roughshod over Congress so there is no separation of powers and whatever the President wants, he gets, and Congress just rubberstamps it. It can't be that way.

So even if this administration will not stand up for values, the Congress should, and the Congress will. These measures, along with much of the Foreign Affairs Committee's work this year, sends a strong message that our values must guide our foreign policy.

So, again, it is important for us to help Saudi Arabia. It is important to realize Iran is making trouble. It is important to note the Houthis are not good people. But it doesn't mean that we give Saudi Arabia or any other country a blank check to do whatever they want, dropping bombs indiscriminately on school children, on buses. We can't just sit idly by and let that happen and continue to send weapons that are perpetrating these crimes.

So, this is a strong message, I think, that our values must guide our foreign policy, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, just a quick point on that. We don't like when innocent people are bombed, and when we look at Yemen, I think it is really incumbent on us to see what is happening.

A legitimate government in Yemen was overthrown by Iranian-supported rebels, and Iran, who has not sent one dollar of humanitarian aid to support the people who have been killed. What we are talking about in this specific resolution is actually UAE.

So, I rise in opposition to S.J. Res. 37. Since the emergency declaration to

expedite arms sales to the Saudi-led coalition to defeat the Houthi rebels, Congress has debated the President's exercise of the emergency clause of the Arms Export Control Act.

This joint resolution of disapproval, along with 21 other JRDs, intends to stop transfers to Saudi Arabia, the United Arab Emirates, and Jordan.

S.J. Res. 37 specifically blocks the transfer of Paveway precision-guided munitions to the United Arab Emirates. This technology converts dumb bombs, like the ones used by Russia to kill innocent men, women, and children in Syria, into precision-guided munitions, ones that are intended to avoid civilian casualties.

We can debate whether shipments that aren't ready to be delivered require an emergency declaration, but at the end of the day, some of the munitions that we are discussing today have already left the shores of the United States and are en route to the UAE. In fact, the first tranche is en route now, and the second tranche will be leaving in September.

Mr. Speaker, this JRD and the two up for debate today are not about timelines for shipment. We have heard my colleagues on the other side of the aisle argue that these arms could be used in Yemen to target civilians. Yet, there are reports that the UAE has already withdrawn from Yemen.

The UAE serves as a bulwark against Iranian aggression, the ongoing threat of al-Qaida, and other terrorist groups wishing to harm the United States, our allies, and our interests.

In contrast, the Iranian-backed Houthis, through missiles and UAE strikes, are a threat to stability in the region. Iran and the forces it supports, like the Houthis, are a threat to our national security and the security of our allies. They are the number one contributor to human suffering in Yemen.

We have seen the Iranian regime threaten international shipping in the Strait of Hormuz, including ships belonging to the U.K., Japan, and Norway. They have shot down an expensive military asset flying in international airspace.

Prior to the President's emergency declaration, the head of Iran's Quds Force called on terror groups to prepare for a proxy war with United States and our allies. Since then, we have seen these proxies become emboldened in their actions. Yet, we are here today debating arms sales to the UAE on the basis that these arms transfers may be used by our strategic ally in Yemen.

While there is no guarantee that these weapons will ever be used in Yemen—will ever not be used in Yemen either—there are facts that show exactly why we must continue to provide these arms to the UAE.

As a former Air Force pilot and a current pilot in the Air National Guard, I am proud that our government would not send our Air Force to fly sor-

ties without the munitions needed to defend themselves. Similarly, we should not have an ally flying our F-16s without the necessary tools it needs to complete its mission.

The Iranians have shown that they have the capacity and ability to fire upon military aircraft with no regard for whether the platform is manned or unmanned. When our allies are in a dogfight, we can't leave them without the means to defend themselves and our shared interests.

I also want to point out that there is a lot of discussion about offensive or defensive weapons. A bomb can be used defensively or offensively. I can't think of many weapons that are actually defensive in nature because they are used to destroy an enemy. So it is all about how you employ that weapon.

Saying that we want to send only defensive weapons, shows our allies to be weak against an Iran that is shown that it wants to go on the offensive continually. I can name basically every country in the Middle East and show Iranian influences there.

On the broader picture, we have got to debate how this went out. I fully agree with everybody on that. But we cannot leave our allies in the lurch. We cannot leave them unprotected because our big, chief enemy is Iran. I know there is broad-based agreement on that, and we cannot show weakness in the eyes of that.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. KINZINGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT), a senior member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

□ 1345

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his leadership on this and many other issues.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to S.J. Res. 37 which would prevent the transfer of Paveway precision-guided munitions to the United Arab Emirates.

There are numerous reasons to oppose this resolution. Let me list three:

First, and most obviously, some Paveways have already left the U.S., and this fact alone shows that this resolution is more about messaging than action and demonstrates the urgent need the UAE has for these munitions.

Second, the UAE is a steadfast partner against Iran. Tehran is our foremost opponent in the region right now and a critical threat to our interests there. I would note that the very flawed Iran deal put millions—in fact, billions and billions—of dollars of cash into the pockets of Iran, and they are now using those dollars to support terrorism, foment instability, put mines on ships, and attack ships in international waters. So they are now a threat not just in the region but a threat around the world. So, thank God, President Trump had the good

sense to get us out of that terrible deal.

If we want the UAE's continued help, we need to make sure that we are a reliable partner and that they are properly armed.

The third item is that the U.S. needs to continue its leadership in the region. If the UAE and Saudi Arabia cannot buy arms from us, that doesn't mean they won't get arms. It just means that they will buy them from the Russians. This will diminish our standing, weaken our leverage with our partners, and call into question our reliability as a partner.

For these reasons and others, I urge my colleagues to oppose this resolution. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. KINZINGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remainder of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend on the other side of the aisle. It is a good debate here. The bottom line on this is, I think if the concern is Saudi Arabia—I understand the concern, I may not share it in the same level of depth—then vote "no" on the last resolution or vote for the last resolution.

This one is on UAE, and whether it is Saudi, UAE, or Jordan, I think it is important for us, Mr. Speaker, to constantly show that we have our allies' back, especially an ally like UAE.

We know that Iran likes to go on the offensive. We know that the only thing that stops Iran from broader encroachments in the Middle East is the United States and our allies. We know that a good offensive posture is the best defensive posture to prevent a shooting war from ever happening.

So, again, we can all debate the process and how this went down, but the bottom line is we must reject this resolution. This is a resolution that I think is a result of political pressure, and we must send this back to the Senate where it belongs, or if this passes then I am sure the President will veto it.

Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for the debate, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Again, Mr. Speaker, let me say that I certainly respect my colleagues on the other side of the aisle for the points they have raised. We have similar concerns, but I think the way we handle it or the way we have proposed to handle it is a little bit different.

That is why I am saying if we don't pass this measure, then these bombs will be on their way to the Emirates very soon.

If we do pass this resolution, then it will go to the President's desk and it will put him on the spot to answer whether he agrees that our values need to be central to America's work around the world.

Again, I am very concerned and aware of the malign role that the Iranians play in the region. I am very concerned about the Houthis who also play a bad role in the region. But that

doesn't mean that we should just give blank checks or give them arms. I think it would just be a mistake to let them think that they don't have to have any conduct in trying to conduct this war into diminishing civilian casualties.

The other point I want to raise, again, is the fact that, Mr. Speaker, do you remember when you were a kid in school and you learned how a bill became a law?

Well, there is something called separation of powers, checks and balances. It is not right for the President to declare an emergency when there really is no emergency in order to get around Congress' disapproval of something. So I feel it is important to fight for the institution as well.

So, again, if we do pass this resolution, it will go to the President's desk, and it will let him answer whether he agrees that our values need to be central to our work around the world.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 491, the previous question is ordered on the joint resolution.

The question is on the third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

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

Mr. KINZINGER. 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 question will be postponed.

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF THE PROPOSED EXPORT TO THE KINGDOM OF SAUDI ARABIA OF CERTAIN DEFENSE ARTICLES AND SERVICES

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to section 3 of House Resolution 491, I call up the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 38) providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed export to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland of certain defense articles and services, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 491, the joint resolution is considered read.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

S.J. RES. 38

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in

Congress assembled, That the issuance of an export license with respect to the following proposed exports to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland is prohibited:

(1) The transfer of the following defense articles, including services and technical data, described in Executive Communication 1422 (EC-1422) submitted to Congress pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2776(c)) and published in the Congressional Record on June 3, 2019: The proposed transfer of defense articles, defense services, and technical data to support the manufacture of the Aurora Fuzing System for the Paveway IV Precision Guided Bomb Program.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MAST) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include in the RECORD extraneous materials on the measure under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, this final measure we will consider would stop the transfer of fuses for precision-guided munitions—critical components that allow these weapons to be armed and detonated. Like the bombs, these components have already been manufactured, and we need to act quickly to stop their shipment.

As we wrap up this debate, Mr. Speaker, I want to make an appeal to my friends on the other side of the aisle: You can be for or against these weapons sales and still understand that these resolutions are the right thing to do, if for nothing else than the integrity of this body.

I spoke earlier about the rule of law. This phony emergency declaration is a message to the Congress and to the American people that when the law gets in the way, this administration is just going to find a way around it. They will twist the law into pretzels or just throw it out the window entirely if it allows them to sidestep Congress. We cannot stand for that.

This administration should have played by the rules, and we could have done that and probably still gotten these sales through. They could have sent up a notification and allowed Congress to have a debate. But instead, they want to shut us out of this process.

With these resolutions, we are taking some of that power back. We are saying that we won't allow the laws written in this body to be ignored. If nothing else, this is an opportunity to stand up and say: We took an oath to uphold the Constitution, and that means Congress remains a coequal branch of government.

Let me say that again: that means Congress is a coequal branch of government. We will not be a rubberstamp for any administration, not only this administration, but any administration. Congress has its duties. We will not be a rubberstamp.

I have felt for a long time that administrations of both parties, quite frankly, have ignored Congress when it comes to foreign policy and national security. We shouldn't stand for it any longer. No more do we give a blank check to any President of any party who wants to cut Congress out of the decisionmaking and subvert the Constitution.

So, Mr. Speaker, we shouldn't agree to it, we shouldn't stand for it, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to S.J. Res. 38. And I want to focus my remarks on the rationale behind the President's emergency declaration and ask that we think about the definition of the word "declaration", what that means to each of us.

My friends on the other side of the aisle would prefer to forget that these arms sales were expedited for a very specific reason. They are omitting this information because it doesn't fit into their narrative that the President is doing a favor to Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates. I can tell you that defense is no favor.

The threat that emanates from Iran that precipitated this emergency declaration is very, very real, and, as a result, so is the need for the weapons sales to our partners.

So let's think about it: Are these situations emergencies?

Do they pose an immediate risk to life—an immediate threat to life?

In May in the days leading right up to this emergency declaration, Iran and its proxies executed several attacks throughout the Middle East over just 2 weeks.

Four oil tankers were attacked in the Gulf of Oman. I would say that is an emergency and a threat to life.

Armed drones struck Saudi oil fields. I would say that is an emergency and a threat to life.

The head of the Quds Force called on terror groups to prepare for a proxy war. I would certainly call that an emergency and a very direct threat to life.

A rocket was launched near the U.S. embassy in Baghdad. I would call that an emergency and a threat to life.

A bomb-carrying drone was launched by Houthi rebels targeting a Saudi airport on May 21. I would say that is an emergency and a threat to life.

Now in the weeks since the emergency declaration, Iran has only ramped up its attacks and it is precipitating the need to have this emergency declaration.

Houthi rebels have continued attacks on civilian airports in Saudi Arabia. That is an emergency and a direct threat to life.

The IRGC perpetrated another attack on commercial shipping, this time targeting Japanese and Norwegian oil tankers transiting through the Strait of Hormuz. I would say that that is an emergency and a threat to life.

A rocket hit an oil drilling site in Iraq's southern Basra Province striking inside a compound that housed contractors and employees of Exxon Mobil. I would say that is an emergency and a threat to life.

Iran shot down a U.S. military asset over international waters. I would say that is an emergency.

Just last week three Iranian paramilitary vessels tried to impede the passage of a British oil tanker transiting the Strait of Hormuz, and I would say that is an emergency and a threat to life.

Now, even as Iran continues to threaten international shipping and civilians in the Middle East, there are Members of this body who want to create doubts about the commitments that we have to our partners on the front lines. Now for Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates, this is not an abstract threat. It is their tankers that are being attacked, their airports that are being targeted, and their oil fields.

Now, our bilateral relationship with Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates undoubtedly is complicated, and we absolutely have to press for improvements in domestic human rights for both countries. I think we can agree on this wholeheartedly: we have to seek justice and accountability in the murder of Jamal Khashoggi, undoubtedly. In fact, earlier this week this body voted overwhelmingly for Mr. MALINOWSKI's H.R. 2037 which imposes sanctions on those responsible for Mr. Khashoggi's murder.

Even as the United Arab Emirates draws down its position in Yemen, we must press Saudi Arabia to minimize civilian casualties in that conflict, but none of these challenges justify whatsoever abandoning our partners as they face down a threat from an Iranian regime that is on the march throughout the Middle East. In fact, we must continue to show our investment in our strategic partnerships in order to incentivize our partners to make the changes that we are asking them to make.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have had a longstanding concern about these sales. We have a codified congressional review process precisely to address such concerns, however it is my assessment that my Democratic colleagues abused this review process.

Prior to the emergency notification, Republican Members had supported these sales, but Democrat Members subjected them to informal holds—in some cases for over a year—without any clear path to resolution. Now, given the wide range of conflicts and threats in the Middle East, I do not understand why my colleagues were sur-

prised when, after months and even over a year of delay, it was assessed that our partners urgently needed these defense articles and services for their national security in these emergency situations.

□ 1400

Perhaps if my colleagues had taken a more active approach to resolving their concerns, we would have avoided the situation in which additional capabilities were needed to respond to the elevated threat, this emergency situation that has been posted by Iran.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there has long been a consensus in this body that Iran's malign activities in the Middle East are a threat to the United States' national security and to our partners. In the past 3 years alone, we have passed legislation responding to Iran's support for terrorism, growing ballistic missile arsenal, and human rights abuses. The Iranian regime has not backed down from these malign activities, and it is my sincere hope that this body will not back down from its resolve to counter Iran's destabilizing agenda.

Unfortunately, this resolution and the other joint resolutions of disapproval for the 22 sales are very much a step in the wrong direction.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. TAYLOR).

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, from its inception, the Islamic Republic of Iran had an anti-American bent: what it did in our Embassy, its attack on the Marines in Beirut in 1983, its efforts in Iraq.

In 2003, I was part of the invasion force. I saw with my own eyes the Iranian efforts to destabilize Iraq, and they continue to do that there today.

They continue to support the Assad regime in Syria. They continue to overthrow the regime in Yemen, support the Houthi rebels attacking Saudi Arabia.

Around the Middle East, Iran has become the enemy of freedom and democracy.

If America is going to succeed, we need to have allies; we need to have friends. We need to support those allies and those friends. Making sure that Saudi Arabia or UAE have the weapons that they need to fight back against Iran's terrorism and warmongering around this region is mission-critical for the survival of our Republic.

Mr. Speaker, I stand against this resolution.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time for the purpose of closing.

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close debate on this measure.

I am glad we had a spirited debate on the issues. As always, I am grateful to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL), my friend, the ranking mem-

ber, for his collegiality. We are generally bipartisan on the Foreign Affairs Committee, and when we do disagree, we do so on the issues and not on the politics and the personalities.

I have enormous respect for Mr. MAST, which he knows about, but I would say that this, today, is not a referendum on Iran. I agree with everything that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have said about Iran: its bad intention, its bad behavior. I agree.

But, again, I say, as I said before, it doesn't mean we give another country, being an ally or not, a blank check to do whatever it pleases. And in this particular case, the conduct of the war in Yemen is something that we cannot just turn our heads away and say: "Oh, well, this is the war and the Iranians are bad, so, therefore, we are going to look the other way." I think if we are talking about American weapons, we can demand better.

So I think that these measures are a chance for the Congress to take back some of the power granted by the Constitution, to say that we won't stand by when any administration—this administration, administrations to come in both parties—we won't stand by when any administration ignores Congress, plays fast and loose with the law, and fails to demand accountability for human rights abuses around the world.

I encourage all my colleagues to support this measure and the two others that we have just considered.

I thank Mr. MAST and my friends on other side of the aisle for a spirited debate, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 491, the previous question is ordered on the joint resolution.

The question is on the third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

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

Mr. MAST. 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 question will be postponed.

RECOMMENDING THAT THE HOUSE FIND WILLIAM P. BARR AND WILBUR L. ROSS, JR., IN CONTEMPT OF CONGRESS

Mr. CUMMINGS. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Oversight and Reform, I call up the report (H. Rept. 116-125) to accompany the resolution recommending that the

House of Representatives find William P. Barr, Attorney General of the United States, and Wilbur L. Ross, Jr., Secretary of Commerce, in contempt of Congress for refusal to comply with subpoenas duly issued by the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

The Clerk read the title of the report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. DEGETTE). Pursuant to House Resolution 491, the report is considered read.

(For text of the report, see proceedings of the House in Books II and III of July 17, 2019.)

Mr. CUMMINGS. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Oversight and Reform, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 497) recommending that the House of Representatives find William P. Barr, Attorney General of the United States, and Wilbur L. Ross, Jr., Secretary of Commerce, in contempt of Congress for refusal to comply with subpoenas duly issued by the Committee on Oversight and Reform, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 491, the resolution is considered read.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

HOUSE RESOLUTION 497

Resolved, That William P. Barr, Attorney General of the United States, and Wilbur L. Ross, Jr., Secretary of Commerce, shall be found to be in contempt of Congress for failing to comply with subpoenas authorized by the Committee on Oversight and Reform and duly issued by Chairman Elijah E. Cummings relating to the 2020

Resolved, That the Attorney General (i) Census, failed to comply with a Committee subpoena issued on April 2, 2019, to produce documents, and (ii) ordered a Department of Justice employee, John Gore, not to comply with a Committee subpoena requiring him to appear for deposition testimony before the Committee on April 11, 2019.

Resolved, That the Secretary of Commerce failed to comply with a Committee subpoena issued on April 2, 2019, to produce documents.

Resolved, That the Report of the Committee on Oversight and Reform details the refusal of the Attorney General to produce documents to the Committee as required by subpoena, the order from the Attorney General directing John Gore to defy a duly authorized Committee subpoena for deposition testimony, and the refusal of the Secretary of Commerce to produce documents to the Committee as required by subpoena.

Resolved, That pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 192 and 194, the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall certify the Report of the Committee on Oversight and Reform, detailing the refusal of William P. Barr, Attorney General of the United States, to produce documents to the Committee on Oversight and Reform as directed by subpoena, to the United States Attorney for the District of Columbia, to the end that Mr. Barr be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

Resolved, That pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 192 and 194, the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall certify the Report of the Committee on Oversight and Reform, detailing the refusal of Wilbur L. Ross, Jr., Secretary of Commerce, to produce documents to the Committee as directed by subpoena, to the

United States Attorney for the District of Columbia, to the end that Mr. Ross be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

Resolved, That the Speaker of the House shall otherwise take all appropriate action to enforce the subpoenas.

Resolved, That the Chairman of the Committee on Oversight and Reform shall take all necessary steps to enforce the above-referenced subpoenas, including, but not limited to, seeking authorization from the House of Representatives through a vote of the Bipartisan Legal Advisory Group pursuant to clause 8(b) of rule II, and H. Res. 430, to initiate or to intervene in proceedings in any federal court of competent jurisdiction, to seek judgements affirming the duty of the subpoena recipients to comply with the above-referenced subpoenas, and to seek any appropriate ancillary relief, including injunctive relief.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The resolution shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) and the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. COMER) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CUMMINGS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to insert extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Madam Speaker, I support this bipartisan resolution to hold Attorney General William Barr and Commerce Secretary Wilbur Ross in contempt of Congress because it is necessary to preserve the integrity of this body and of the Census.

The Constitution mandates that we conduct a Census every 10 years, and that the Census count every person. A full, fair, and accurate account is critical to ensuring that we properly allocate Federal funding and congressional apportionment.

I do not take this decision lightly. Holding any Cabinet Secretary in criminal contempt of Congress is a serious and somber matter, one that I have done everything in my power to avoid. But in the case of the Attorney General and the Secretary, Secretary Ross, they blatantly obstructed our ability to do congressional oversight into the real reason Secretary Ross was trying, for the first time in 70 years—in 70 years—to add a citizen question to the 2020 Census.

Secretary Ross testified under oath that he added a citizenship question solely—I want you to concentrate on that word, “solely”—to help the Justice Department enforce the Voting Rights Act. But we now know that claim was nothing but a pretext.

And do not take my word for that, Madam Speaker. The Supreme Court said that.

Our committee’s investigation uncovered evidence that Secretary Ross launched a secret campaign to add the citizenship question within days of assuming his post.

We learned that Secretary Ross ignored warnings from experts inside and outside the Census Bureau, including the Bureau’s chief scientist, that adding a citizenship question will be costly and harm the accuracy of the Census.

In other words, they were saying: If you do this, you are not going to have an accurate Census.

Our investigation also revealed that Secretary Ross spoke with Attorney General Sessions, Steve Bannon, and Kris Kobach. Contrary to his testimony to Congress, the Commerce Department conjured up the voting rights rationale to hide these interactions.

This entire Congress should be insulted by this.

Committee Democrats first asked for documents from the Department of Commerce and the Department of Justice when we were in the minority in April and May of 2018. Both departments ignored us.

When I became chairman, I renewed these requests on behalf of the committee. Since then, the administration has engaged in a purposeful effort to obstruct—and I do not use that word lightly—our investigation. The Departments have refused to provide key unredacted documents that we need to understand the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, about why they really made this decision.

Instead, what did they do? They produced thousands of pages that were largely nonresponsive, heavily redacted, or publicly already available.

□ 1415

When they let us interview witnesses, what did they do? They ordered the witnesses not to answer more than 500 of our questions. Secretary Ross even refused my request to meet to try to work this out.

Like I said, I do not come to this floor lightly. This is not an easy decision. But there comes a time when the Congress must be for the Congress.

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

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

As a result, on April 2, more than 3 months ago, after a bipartisan vote, the committee subpoenaed these key documents, including a secret memo that the Department of Commerce wrote about the citizenship question and gave to the Department of Justice.

The Departments have admitted to us that this memo does exist, but they refuse to produce this document and many others.

I must say, to give credit where credit is due, that my good friend and colleague on the other side, Mr. MEADOWS,

worked tirelessly to try to help us get the things that we needed. I appreciate that, trying to work in a bipartisan way.

Going on from there, last month, in light of this obstruction, the Committee on Oversight and Reform passed a resolution to hold Attorney General Barr and Secretary Ross in contempt of Congress. The vote was also bipartisan. However, many of our Republican colleagues apparently support the Trump administration's refusal to comply with duly authorized congressional subpoenas.

Let me say to my colleagues that we need to be clear that we, as a body, have a constitutional duty to be a check on the executive branch. That is our job. Every 2 years, we swear to uphold the Constitution of the United States of America. That is what we are supposed to do.

Some of my colleagues claim that we were interfering with the Supreme Court's decision on this issue. That argument never did make any sense to me since we launched our investigation in 2018, more than 10 months before the Supreme Court took up the case.

Even if you accept that misguided argument, the Supreme Court case is now over. That argument is gone.

The President announced last week that he would no longer pursue adding a citizenship question to the Census. However, in that same speech, the President admitted that he wanted citizenship data to implement partisan gerrymandering.

The President's statements directly contradict Secretary Ross' sworn testimony that the only reason, the sole reason, the Trump administration wanted this data was to help the Justice Department enforce the Voting Rights Act.

The Departments of Justice and Commerce have been engaged in a campaign to subvert our laws and the process Congress put in place to maintain the integrity of the Census.

I would say to all of our Members: Let's be very careful about what we do with regard to the Census. It has a tremendous impact for 10 years on how more than \$660 billion in Federal funds are appropriated, over and over again—apportionment, redistricting, and making sure that every American gets their fair share back of their taxpayer dollars; that is, the money of the hard-working people who raised the money for our taxes.

The resolution before us today is about protecting our democracy. It is about protecting the integrity of this body. It is bigger than the Census. It is about protecting the integrity of the Congress of the United States of America.

We need to understand how and why the Trump administration tried to add a question based on a pretext so that we can consider reforms to ensure that this never happens again.

There are those who will ask the question: Why, with the Supreme Court

having decided what they have decided, do you want the documents? We want the documents because we want to make sure that we do not, in the future, spend a year or a year and a half chasing something that is not accurate—in the words of the Supreme Court, a pretext—delaying our process of getting an accurate account, which is exactly what the Constitution says we must do.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support our resolution to hold Attorney General Barr and Secretary Ross in contempt of the Congress of the United States of America.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COMER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I rise in opposition.

Madam Speaker, we are here today debating a premature and ill-advised resolution to hold Attorney General William Barr and Secretary of Commerce Wilbur Ross in contempt of Congress.

In the eyes of the Democratic majority, their crime is not cooperating enough with the Democrats' investigation into the reinstatement of the citizenship question on the 2020 Census.

First, this contempt citation is a misuse of one of the most powerful tools available to this body.

Second, the idea that the Trump administration is stonewalling this investigation or even, in Chairman CUMMINGS' words, engaged in a coverup from the top, is simply wrong.

The bottom line is, the Department of Justice and the Department of Commerce are cooperating with the committee's investigation into the reinstatement of the citizenship question on the 2020 Census. The administration has produced a total of 31,000 pages of documents to the committee, 14,000 pages from the Commerce Department and 17,000 pages from the Justice Department.

The committee had heard testimony from six witnesses, with more interviews expected this month. Secretary Ross himself testified for over 6 hours about his decision to reinstate the citizenship question on the Census.

The real issue we should be debating is why the Democrats are afraid to ask how many citizens are in the United States of America.

Let's remember, just 1 month ago, the Supreme Court ruled that asking a citizenship question on the Census is constitutional. Since the Supreme Court ruling, the President has said a citizenship question will not appear on the 2020 Census.

To put away all doubt about asking a citizenship question on the Census and all future Censuses, I introduced a bill last night to add a citizenship question to the 2020 Census. My bill is intended to put away all doubt about asking a citizenship question on this and future Censuses.

If the Democrats can't impeach President Trump, they will, instead,

hold his Cabinet in contempt of Congress. This is just another episode in political theater. This exercise is not a responsible use of the contempt authority.

This is just another attempt for the Democrats to delegitimize the efforts to accurately count the number of United States citizens in the United States, something that should not be controversial. This is all part of the same game plan to manufacture controversy around anything associated with the Trump administration.

These are the sort of abusive tactics that we should reject. These are the sort of tactics that give Congress a bad reputation. We should be better than this.

Madam Speaker, I urge all Members of the House to vote against moving this partisan contempt legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Let me be very clear: This is not theater. I wish it was theater. It is not theater.

This is about us making sure that we protect the integrity of the Census and of this Congress.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. LAWRENCE).

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of this resolution to hold Attorney General Barr and Commerce Secretary Ross in contempt of Congress.

Madam Speaker, we have reached a point that we, as Congress, must have the courage—and we have a duty to our constituents of these United States of America—to uphold the Constitution.

Congress has an obligation to conduct oversight of the executive branch, yet this administration complains each time we request information critical to fulfilling our investigative responsibilities.

Today, the full House will vote to hold Attorney General Barr and Secretary Ross in criminal contempt of Congress for their complete disregard of the Constitution—not of Democrats, of the Constitution—and their refusal to provide our committee with relevant documents relative to the investigation of our 2020 Census.

It is 100 percent within our congressional responsibility to ensure the Federal Government is ultimately working in the best interests of the people it serves.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution, to stand up and fulfill their duty and responsibility to the Constitution, which says we must take care of the people of this great country and that Congress will maintain its power as a separate but equal branch of government.

Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman for his leadership.

Mr. COMER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLER).

Mr. KELLER. Madam Speaker, every Member of Congress was elected to work on issues that will positively impact their districts.

As we stand here today, our Nation is dealing with a crisis at our southern border; our seniors are struggling with rising prescription drug prices; our farmers are waiting for a free and fair trade deal with Mexico and Canada; and our veterans deserve the care they have earned.

Yet, today, House Democrats are, once again, putting off these important issues and continuing with their partisan investigations of President Trump and his administration.

Madam Speaker, this administration has produced 31,000 pages of documents related to the Census. This administration has made five senior officials available for interview. All this is due to a disagreement over a citizenship question on the Census.

Madam Speaker, a citizenship question is not new, nor should it be controversial. Every Census conducted by the United States Government from 1820 to 1950 asked about citizenship.

Other countries ask about citizenship. The United Nations recommends it as a best practice. The Census Bureau today already asks a segment of the population about citizenship.

Let's set these facts aside. Given that President Trump is no longer seeking to add a citizenship question to the 2020 Census, voting on a resolution to hold two Cabinet members in contempt of Congress is simply a Democratic tactic to waste this Chamber's time and avoid working on the serious issues facing our Nation.

Madam Speaker, I urge Members to vote against the resolution so the House can stop this partisan nonsense and focus on meaningful policy.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY), a member of our committee.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his great leadership.

Madam Speaker, today, we vote to defend the interests of the American people, our system of checks and balances, and our very Constitution with this resolution to hold Secretary Ross and Attorney General Barr in criminal contempt.

For well over a year, Trump administration officials have lied through their teeth about the reason for adding a citizenship question to the 2020 Census.

□ 1430

They have repeatedly lied to Congress, the Supreme Court, and the American people.

In an effort to cover up their lies, they blocked every demand from our committee, every demand to comply with reasonable oversight, withholding documents, asserting illegitimate executive privilege, and blatantly ignoring bipartisan subpoenas, all to a degree

that would literally break the Constitution if allowed to stand.

New evidence in court, which I shared on this floor, revealed that the real reason for the question was to disenfranchise non-White voters. The Supreme Court ruled that the administration's explanation was contrived.

A functional democracy depends on accountability. Accountability requires real oversight.

The passage of this criminal contempt resolution is necessary to preserve the integrity of all congressional oversight on this and so many other issues now and into the future. This contempt resolution, in fact, allows both Democrats and Republicans to do their job.

Never, ever during my time in Congress have I encountered such complete contempt for the law, and that contempt deserves to be punished.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote for this. Our democracy depends on it.

Mr. COMER. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS), one of the great leaders of this body.

Mr. MEADOWS. Madam Speaker, let me give you a quote: "Holding someone in contempt of Congress is one of the most serious and formal actions our committee can take, and it should not be used as a political tool to generate press as part of an election-year witch hunt."

Who is responsible for that quote? It is not Ranking Member JIM JORDAN. It is not Leader MCCARTHY. It is not Conference Chair LIZ CHENEY. It is Chairman ELIJAH CUMMINGS. Those are his words.

What we need to do is understand that we are using this as a political tool, and we are better than that. We are better than that.

I am going to quote from another letter from Chairman CUMMINGS. At that time, he was not the chairman. Chairman CUMMINGS wrote a letter to Speaker Boehner. He said, "A fundamental problem with conducting such a partisan investigation is that the results are not even-handed but instead are skewed, incomplete, and inaccurate."

Chairman CUMMINGS went on further. He said: "These deficiencies are magnified when we rush from a committee vote to a floor vote at breakneck speed, with little concern for the facts or the law."

What was he referring to? He was referring to a contempt vote on Eric Holder.

Here we are today, in the same venue. I am using the chairman's words, so I am going to make an appeal to the chairman, with the hope that my good friend opposite will heed these words because, in that same letter, he made a direct appeal to the Speaker of the House at that particular time. He said that he hoped that the chairman would accept that the Attorney General is willing to come in to meet per-

sonally and enter into direct negotiations in good faith to try to resolve the matter.

I am hoping that the gentleman opposite will withdraw his contempt resolution, not force a vote on this, but enter into a direct negotiation with the Attorney General of this great country and, hopefully, resolve this without taking this particular action.

Madam Speaker, I think it is critically important that we understand why we are here today. It is because we are using two standards, one standard for the minority party at one time and one standard for a majority party at another time. Let's use the same standard and make sure that we give the Attorney General the ability to negotiate directly with the gentleman opposite.

Madam Speaker, I certainly hope that cooler heads will prevail and that we get to the bottom of this. It is about allowing Congress to do its job but do it with respect.

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

Let me be clear. First of all, I thank the gentleman for quoting me so much. I am tremendously honored. I think the quotes that he used just reiterate what I said when I began about how seriously I take this matter. I wouldn't be here if I did not consider this to be very serious.

The other thing I would say is that we have made tremendous efforts, and the gentleman knows it because he has helped, working with me to try to get the documents and the things that we need. We have not been able to get them.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GOMEZ).

Mr. GOMEZ. Madam Speaker, the Census can be used to either marginalize or to empower communities. This President decided on the path of marginalization.

They did that by coming up with an idea to silence the voices of immigrant communities throughout the country by adding a citizenship question that they deemed necessary to enforce the Voting Rights Act.

For 53 years, no Department of Justice had a problem enforcing the Voting Rights Act without Census block data on citizenship. All of a sudden, 2017 comes around, and you know what? We have a problem.

This is the excuse that they had. This is the reason they had to add this question to the Census. It is just completely false, even to the extent that we saw that they said that the Department of Justice was the one that asked for it.

Then, we find out later that they had to shop around to the Department of Homeland Security and other Departments in order to get somebody to try to ask the Census Bureau to add the question. Then, they went back to Jeff Sessions, who carried out their request.

We are investigating because everything that they have said, the Department of Commerce and Wilbur Ross, has been a complete lie.

If you don't believe me, the recent Supreme Court decision said, "Unlike a typical case in which an agency may have both stated and unstated reasons for a decision . . . the sole stated reason seems to have been contrived."

What does "contrived" mean? It means forced, artificial, manufactured, false. False, that is what it is. It is a contrived reason.

The American people have a right to know the real reasons, not the contrived reasons, not the ones that were manufactured, not the ones that were made up. That is why we are asking for these documents. That is why, when Congress cannot perform its obligations for oversight and as a check on the executive branch, then we must hold these individuals in contempt.

I ask my colleagues to do the same thing.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind Members to use the proper designation for the presiding officer.

Mr. COMER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia (Mrs. MILLER).

Mrs. MILLER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to oppose the resolution before us.

Knowing who is in our country should not be controversial. Let me repeat that: Knowing who is in our country should not be controversial.

Although my colleagues across the aisle have blurred fact and fiction on this issue, the truth is, asking a citizenship question is standard operating procedure. It is currently asked on censuses throughout the world, in Australia, Canada, Germany, Ireland, Mexico, the U.K., and many others. The United Nations even recommends asking the citizenship question as a census best practice so countries can gather accurate information about their citizens.

It is not a new idea in the U.S. either. We first asked the citizenship question on the Census in 1820 and continued the practice for the next 130 years. It is still asked every year on the American Community Survey. The information collected is protected by Federal law, and our Justice Department uses the information to enforce the Voting Rights Act.

We still ask the citizenship question on I-9 employment eligibility forms.

Right here in the District of Columbia, a citizenship question is asked on driver's license applications. They do the same in Wisconsin.

In California, anyone who applies for a firearm license has to answer a citizenship question. In Ohio, concealed-carry applicants must verify if they are citizens or not.

These States believe it is fine to ask this question to obtain a firearm or

driver's license, but it is not okay to ask on the Census?

For anyone to claim that this is a hot-button issue, I just don't buy it. It seems a little bit more like hot air.

I am glad that President Trump is working across Federal agencies to ensure that we can get this crucial information.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this resolution so that we can get back to actual work.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN), the chairman of our Subcommittee on Civil Rights and Civil Liberties.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, like the chairman, I am charmed and tickled by the argument offered by our friend Mr. MEADOWS, who quotes our beloved chairman in resisting a rush to a contempt vote against Attorney General Holder.

Of course, two sides can play this game because the gentleman from North Carolina, of course, voted for and championed a contempt citation against the Attorney General in that case.

Why would he support a contempt finding as appropriate against one Attorney General who is acting in a recalcitrant way but not against another?

Madam Speaker, this is not a policy battle about the citizenship question, although my friends seem to think that it is. They have already lost that battle. They lost it in the Federal district courts three times. They lost it in the United States Supreme Court. They lost it with Chief Justice John Roberts. They lost it with the majority of the Supreme Court, a Supreme Court that was gerrymandered by Senator MCCONNELL for precisely occasions like this, so they could get the outcome they wanted, but even that Court rejected the contrived rationale that was offered by the Commerce Department.

It has been rejected by six former Census Directors. It was rejected by their own chief scientist in the Commerce Department and the Census Bureau. They lost the case under the Census Act. They lost the case under the Administrative Procedure Act.

Even President Trump acknowledges that they lost. At least, I think he acknowledges it today, although he does waver back and forth. And I hope nothing that we say today will prompt him to start over again.

They lost because their justification was contrived, according to Chief Justice Roberts. It was made up, completely pretextual, according to the Federal district courts, arbitrary, capricious, irrational, silly.

We get the citizenship information we need right now, and we have for the last 70 years, under what was called the long form. Now it is called the American Community Survey.

It has been rejected, but six former Census Bureau Directors said that if we did what they wanted to do, we would

get a far more inaccurate counting. We would get a far less accurate portrait of America.

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

Mr. CUMMINGS. I yield the gentleman from Maryland an additional 1 minute.

Mr. RASKIN. If the minority wants to talk about the policy, we can, but we don't need to. They have already lost repeatedly on that, and they seem not to want to acknowledge that basic fact of this discussion.

This is about congressional power, Madam Speaker, and that is something that should unify every Member of this body and institution. We must stand together.

The Supreme Court and the Federal courts have said repeatedly that our factfinding power is inextricable, essential, and indispensable to our legislative power.

We have the power of the people. The sovereign political power of the people has been given to us to legislate. We can't legislate if we can't get the information that we need.

Sometimes we disagree, when they are in the majority, with the stuff that they want. I wasn't here then, but I would have disagreed maybe with some of the Fast and Furious stuff or the millions of documents that they got in the Benghazi investigation. It makes no difference. The majority has a right to get what it wants. We have a right to get what we want.

If you act with contempt for the Congress of the United States of America and the people of the United States, we will hold you in contempt of the Congress and United States of America. I support these contempt resolutions.

Mr. COMER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), the great minority leader.

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

Before I walked out of my office, I first looked at my calendar. I knew it was July, but I wondered if it was back in February. It is another day on the floor, and it is like "Groundhog Day" all over again.

Yesterday on this floor was a sad day. It is not a day about decorum. It is not a day about any of the issues that any of my constituents ask about.

□ 1445

They ask me when I go home, and, Madam Speaker, I envision that they ask most every Member in this body: Have you done anything about surprise billing? Have you made sure pre-existing conditions are protected like that bill GREG WALDEN has with so many cosponsors? Have you done anything to make sure the economy continues to grow?

No, I go home, and I tell them: They had another resolution to attack President Trump or the administration. So we may be in July, but it is Groundhog Day all over again.

Are we doing anything about a budget? Because, Madam Speaker, I listened to my colleagues when they say: Show me your budget; show me your values.

And I know winning a majority is important, and I knew, Madam Speaker, when we were in the majority putting a budget out is not easy, but it is the fundamental responsibility of a majority. So, yes, I came to this floor hoping we would have that debate. But, no, no debate about a budget. I can't tell my constituents that the majority did a budget this year.

When they ask me: Well, what about I read all these things about caps, that you have got to come into agreement to ever make something happen together.

No, I am coming back down to the floor this time, and we are talking about contempt.

They ask me, Madam Speaker: What contempt are you talking about?

I said: Well, it is regarding the Census.

Well, wasn't that all solved?

Well, yes, that has already been solved and already been decided, but, Madam Speaker, this majority thinks it is another political opportunity.

Then I listened and I heard this comment the other day. Madam Speaker, they said: I challenge you to find voters who can name a single thing House Democrats have done for their kitchen table this year, a single thing, challenging all voters to name one thing.

And I wondered: Did my press operation put that out? No, it didn't come from my office.

And then I wondered: Maybe it was another Republican inside this body. No, it wasn't. It wasn't one Member elected on the Republican side.

This quote actually came from a chief of staff of one of the most prominent Members on the other side of the aisle. I agree with that chief of staff. Name me one thing that we have done for the kitchen table.

Yesterday we did a resolution attacking the President, but we couldn't even get to that because, Madam Speaker, we couldn't even have decorum in this body.

We set a record that we have never seen before based upon a Speaker's action. The very first page in Thomas Jefferson's manual talks about decorum. But not only did this body try to change the rules after the fact, they don't think everybody is equal, Madam Speaker. Because if your words get taken down, you don't have a right to speak that day. But, no, we should change that. We should show them. The majority should get what they want.

Madam Speaker, I guess the majority doesn't want a budget. I guess the majority doesn't want to do anything about surprise billing. I guess the majority doesn't want to find, when it comes to our national defense to keep a 58-year history of bipartisanship, they broke that record, too. They made it partisan. And that is what we did last week.

Well, now we are right back at Groundhog Day, and we are going to have contempt votes today. But that is not all we are going to do today. We are going to go for the third time on impeachment—impeachment.

Madam Speaker, I watched a crisis on the border. I listened to the other side, who asked the President if he would pause a court action so we could deal with it, and I patiently waited those 2 weeks to have a hearing on it because, Madam Speaker, I am not in the majority. I can't control these committees. The majority party can.

They didn't have one hearing on it, but they have scheduled another one. They have got Mueller coming in. They even postponed it so they could have more time. I guess 22 months, \$40 million, 13 countries, I guess that is not enough.

Madam Speaker, I wonder if it is only one chief of staff challenging to find voters that can name a single thing House Democrats have done for the kitchen table this year, because when I am home, they don't come up to me and talk to me about party; they talk to me about what the House is doing. In their house, at their kitchen table, you know what they talk about there? They talk about their budget, because they do know their budget is their values, and they value having a budget. They will talk politics, but I don't think they get too petty.

It is interesting, at the kitchen table in the House of Representatives, there are rules for different people. I thought the rule of law mattered in this country, and I was kind of excited when I watched a Problem Solvers Caucus stand up together, Republicans and Democrats, before there was a vote for a Speaker in this Congress, and they requested a Consensus Calendar. And what does a Consensus Calendar mean? It means, if a Member from any side of the aisle works really hard, that they believe in the issue, that they get 290 cosponsors—and you have to understand what that means.

That doesn't mean walking up to a Congresswoman or Congressman and saying? Will you support my bill? Will you put your name on this? Do you believe this policy is so great you will put your name on this?

It takes 218 to pass a bill, but that is not the number they put out—290, to get above politics. If you made that happen, your bill would come to the floor.

Well, that was the rule. That is what we just put in.

Madam Speaker, do you know what happened? There was this Congressman from South Carolina. He didn't get 290. He is up to 370. He followed the exact rule that the majority just put in. And do you know what happened the day that he was going to be the very first bill on a Consensus Calendar? And what was the topic that really brought people together? Survivor benefits for those who gave their life to defend this Nation.

I was proud. I was proud that more than 370 people in this body did not play politics with that issue.

But do you know what happened when that day came? The rules are not equal. The rules are not equal. They are written, but they are changed. They were changed last Friday. They were changed so he could not have his vote. So Congressman JOE WILSON could not come to this floor.

Was it changed in a committee? No. They put it in a rule, self-executing.

Yesterday, when I watched decorum on this floor, any other Member of this body would not have the right to speak if their words were taken down, if it were me, you, anybody else. But, no, the rules were changed once again, and everybody on one side of the aisle, Madam Speaker, voted to change those rules; they hold people who seem to be different, seem to be special, seems to be that they can break the rules.

I guess the majority should get what they want, not what the people around the kitchen table of America want.

I wonder, Madam Speaker, I wonder, when I watch people campaign and they talk about what they want to achieve here, how many said they wanted to have a week of contempt, of impeach and resolution, all after one entity, the President of the United States?

I didn't have anybody on any side of the aisle ever ask me that question.

I hold this job with a great deal of respect. There are less than 12,000 people who ever had the privilege to serve here. I travel a long way each week to have that opportunity. I spend a lot of time thinking about it. I spend a lot of time listening and talking to my constituents.

Last night I went home and I did a telephone townhall. Thousands of people were on that call. Not one person asked me about the contempt of a Census form that is already going out. They talked about an earthquake. They wondered if they would have enough money. I said: I don't know; we don't have a budget.

The hospital, because this community is not very big, Ridgecrest, about 30,000, the earthquake did damage to the hospital. People can get some surprise billings, not anything their fault, but we are not talking about it on this floor. We are not solving that problem. But we are holding another person in the administration in contempt.

Is this going to go anywhere? Is this going to do anything for anybody's kitchen table?

I know some people on the other side of the aisle, Madam Speaker, might get mad at this chief of staff, but sometimes you get upset when people speak the truth. Sometimes it hurts.

What hurts more to the American public is more of this, if it is just going to be Groundhog Day every day that we serve here, because once we get done with this, we will debate impeachment for the third time. For the third time, we will debate impeachment.

□ 1500

When we go home this week and we talk about what we achieved, I don't know what I can say. That is not why we ran. We are better than this.

When I watched the decorum yesterday, I know we are better than that. But what is most disturbing to me is, when somebody did not abide by the rules of the House, the rules were changed to protect that person.

America is more than a country. America is an idea, an idea of self-governance, an idea of rule of law, of respect. If you care so much to change the rule that you would have a Consensus Calendar, abide by it, not just because somebody on the other side of the aisle worked harder. If you cared so much that you said a budget matters, that it sets the tone of who you are, produce one.

I understand there are winners and losers in elections, but, Madam Speaker, when I heard what a Member said of why they wanted to battle, they admitted to their colleagues they were using the Census investigation to gather information that, in his words, the courts could use in ongoing litigation.

So are we really here because your constituents asked about it? Are we here because you just want to play a little more politics? Because I would tell you this: You have got another thing coming up right after they can play politics on it one more time.

I would ask deep inside that, for once, let's put it aside. I know that election didn't turn out the way you wanted it, but at the end of the day, people expect us to find common ground. They expect us to give on both sides.

I will guarantee you no one ever went to the polls to say: I want you to go there to spend a whole week just attacking an administration. I imagine the majority of people who voted for you had the same question as that chief of staff. They wanted you to change the kitchen table. So let's start focusing on the issues that the American public is talking about around their kitchen tables.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are directed to address their remarks to the Chair.

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

I just want to make it clear, Madam Speaker, as I listened to the comments of our very distinguished minority leader, the fact is that what we are doing today is trying again to protect the integrity of this House and to protect the integrity of the Census and make sure that we get the records that we need to do our job, and I would hope that he would join us in making sure that that happens. Because it is not just about us; it is about people who will come and fill these seats when we are dancing with the angels.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY), the very distinguished gentleman who leads our Government Operations Subcommittee excellently.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Madam Speaker, I thank my good friend, the distinguished chairman of the Oversight and Reform Committee, for yielding.

Madam Speaker, what we just heard might be described as hyperanimated chutzpa to bemoan accountability, to talk about a kitchen table that is, I think, imaginary.

I can tell you it doesn't characterize the kitchen tables in my district, and it probably doesn't characterize them all across America, which is maybe why the minority leader is called that instead of the "majority leader" in this Congress, because my Republican friends abrogated any accountability, any oversight of this administration in the 2 years they were in the majority and Mr. Trump was in the White House.

Americans are focused on economic and health issues, but that doesn't mean they don't care about what is happening to their country. They do.

The Census, the distinguished minority leader doesn't want you to focus on why the Census question was so important because it is in a context that is disturbing. It is in a context of voter suppression all across America: Get rid of early voting; restrict absentee voting; have stricter ID laws; make it harder for students and people of color to vote; purge voting rolls; have manufactured assertions about phony voting, as if that were the major problem in America.

Asking the citizenship question on the Census is part and parcel of that scheme to discourage minority voting in America, to frighten immigrant communities.

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

Mr. CUMMINGS. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Finally, Madam Speaker, maybe the worst of all, to bemoan the change yesterday to allow the Speaker to have her words considered and to allow her back on the floor. Why? Because we don't care about rules? No. Because we care about the impact on millions of Americans of harmful, racist words, and we felt that the duty to provide some comfort to those people that this House cared was more important than a juridical commitment to an ancient rule.

Mr. COMER. Madam Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining for each side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky has 18½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Maryland has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. COMER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN).

Mr. GROTHMAN. Madam Speaker, prior to talking about the Census, I just want to make one brief point in response to some of the debate on the other side. I will give some of the speakers a little bit of a project here.

When we say the Pledge of Allegiance, we pledge allegiance to the flag and the Republic for which it stands, and perhaps some of the speakers on the other side can do a little research as to why we pledge allegiance to the Republic.

Today, again, we are debating because of a potential question on the Census. There are certain people who feel that it would be wrong to ask about citizenship on the Census.

I can tell you, as a lawmaker, I would certainly like to know how many people in this country are citizens. I would also like to know how many people are legal or illegal, both of which may affect decisions we make, formulas we make here.

I have a bill up—in the past; I already introduced it this year—that says that people who are noncitizens shouldn't be eligible for public benefits. If that bill were ever to become law, I can easily imagine distributions of money from this place being affected by the results on a Census like that.

Other countries do not have problems getting numbers if they ask about citizenship. Canada doesn't have a problem. Mexico doesn't have a problem. That is why the United Nations recommends we ask about citizenship.

It didn't result in bad Censuses until 1950. It doesn't result in bad results on the long form or bad results on the Community Survey. It doesn't result in problems in the State of Wisconsin, where we have a citizenship question that you have to answer prior to getting a driver's license.

So I wish we would put away this resolution today. I don't think it is right to spend more time debating the Census question.

I hope if this does not appear on this Census, that it is eventually put on the Census for 2030.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I thank my good friend for courageously bringing this contempt resolution to the House today.

The authority and the very integrity of the House of Representatives has been challenged by this administration as never before in American history. If it were not for the Supreme Court, this administration's determination to deliberately prevent an accurate Census count would have succeeded.

Neither the President nor the Republican House has the support of a majority of the American people.

Using Secretary Ross, the administration tried to cheat its way to an undercount. Both Attorney General Barr and Secretary Ross have gone out of their way to refuse to provide needed documents or offered pretexts for not providing them pursuant to valid subpoenas.

So serious has been this obstruction that the House must seek criminal contempt, which can carry stiff penalties

and prison time, or simply surrender to the administration and invite continuing obstruction of our ability to perform our legislative and oversight functions.

To be sure, we fully recognize the difficulty of enforcement of criminal contempt against this administration by this administration, but the House would as soon surrender its authority as to take no action in the face of historic and willful defiance.

Mr. COMER. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN), my friend, the distinguished ranking member of the Oversight Committee.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. COMER) for yielding and for his great work on the committee.

Secretary Ross and Attorney General Barr are doing their jobs. So what is their reward? Democrats are going to hold them in contempt.

Both agencies, the Commerce Department and the Justice Department, have submitted 31,000 documents to the committee. They have made available all kinds of witnesses for depositions and transcribed interviews. In fact, we have got another one happening later this month.

And the Secretary himself sat for over 6 hours in a hearing answering every single question the committee had. He raised his hand, said he swore to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help him God, and answered all the questions. And what does he get for it? Democrats are going to hold him in contempt.

And why are they doing this? All because they don't want a simple question on the Census: Are you a citizen of the United States of America? That one sentence is driving it all.

Are you a citizen of the greatest nation in history is driving it all.

They are going to hold two people doing their jobs in contempt, all because we don't want to do what has been done for 200 years in this country. Since 1820, in one form or another, we have been asking the citizenship question on the Census. They are going to hold them in contempt.

All because they don't want to do what the U.N. says is the best practice, they are going to hold them in contempt.

All because they don't want to do what is just plain old common sense.

Listen to what Justice Alito said in his opinion a couple weeks ago: "No one disputes that it is important to know how many inhabitants of this country are citizens, and the most direct way to gather that information is to ask it in a Census."

Shazam. Imagine that. The best way to figure it out is to ask people in the country that you are surveying. Holy cow.

And here is the kicker; here is the final thing: You go anywhere—go anywhere—in this country, any State you want to go to, some small town, some

big city, walk up the street and ask someone on the street: Do you think when we do the Census to figure out how many people are in this country, it is appropriate to ask if you are a citizen?

Every person you talk to, every single one of them will say: Well, heck yeah. And, oh, by the way, aren't we doing that already.

You would have to say: Yes. We have been doing it for 200 years.

This resolution is ridiculous, and we should vote it down.

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

Madam Speaker, I want to just remind our distinguished ranking member, when he talks about quoting from the courts, we might want to look at what the Supreme Court said about the language that Secretary Ross used in our committee, because it is the same language used in the Supreme Court case.

What the Supreme Court said was that that was "contrived," and that is a quote, and incongruent with what the record reveals. In other words, he was saying it was not accurate. He may have come to testify before us, but it wasn't accurate.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Ms. PLASKETT), a member of our committee.

Ms. PLASKETT. Madam Speaker, I want to respond first to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), the minority leader, when he talked about us doing work. He asked us if work was being done here in Congress and said that we weren't responding to the daily needs of America.

Madam Speaker, I would remind him and remind the Speaker that we, in fact, have passed the Violence Against Women Act in the Judiciary Committee. The Energy and Commerce Committee passed the prescription drug bill that came to this floor. The Energy and Commerce Committee is working on Medicaid as we speak, right now.

So 150 bills have been passed by this body and are sitting on the desk of his friend, the Senate leader, MITCH MCCONNELL, who has decided that he is not interested in the work of the people of the United States.

But guess what. We can walk and chew gum at the same time, as I have said. This committee's responsibility is oversight, not anything else. And that is what we are doing is oversight of this administration.

I know that is difficult for that side of the aisle to want to think about, overseeing and reining in individuals who may be acting outside of the law.

Last year when Secretary Ross testified before Congress, he said he added the citizenship question solely to help the Department of Justice enforce the Voting Rights Act. We understand now that may not have been true.

And he has given us unresponsive—that is a legal term—unresponsive documents in those thousands of documents that he has turned over to us, not the documents that we have asked for.

It is our responsibility as the Oversight Committee to hold individuals responsible. I would ask that my colleagues across the aisle consider their responsibility on this committee if you want to sit on the committee, to do the work of the committee, and that is overseeing this administration. I think that we have done our job, and we are doing it well.

Madam Speaker, if he has not been responsive, we must hold him in contempt.

Mr. COMER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. HICE).

Mr. HICE of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The problem is that this is not the way we are supposed to go about the business of oversight. Contempt resolutions are generally something that happens deep inside and deep within an ongoing investigation when the committee has run up against brick walls and has exhausted all possibilities before then.

That is certainly not the case here. We are in the middle of an investigation into Federal agencies that are complying with our requests. This is absurd.

□ 1515

The Oversight and Reform Committee has held six transcribed interviews with witnesses. Another one is on the way within days. The Commerce Department and the Justice Department have produced over 31,000 pages, documents, combined—14,000 from Commerce and 17,000 from Justice. These are not things that happen when we are talking about Federal agencies that are stonewalling an investigation. That simply is not what is happening here.

This investigation has only been going on for a couple of short months. I would like to remind this Chamber that it wasn't too long ago that then-Ranking Member CUMMINGS was cautioned himself against pursuing a resolution of contempt in 2012, and that was after a year of stonewalling by the Obama administration. We are just a couple of months into this one.

If these Federal agencies were legitimately stonewalling an investigation, as the Obama administration did, I would certainly feel differently, and I am sure others here would, as well. But they are not stonewalling, and the facts simply don't support this contempt resolution.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues not to support this.

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

Mr. COMER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS).

Mr. MEADOWS. Madam Speaker, I want to make a point that in this body now on 2 consecutive days, we have broken the rules of Congress to expedite things.

In this particular contempt resolution, I want to make sure that the RECORD reflects that we broke rule 2(f) on the committee about notice. It was brought to the attention of the chairman, and here we are again going and violating the rules of this House, not rules that the minority put in place, but rules that the majority put in place. We gave the chairman the chance to perfect this procedural problem, and yet they continued on to hold this contempt violation.

I can tell you, they may vote today to hold them in contempt, but it is a violation of Congress' very rules itself that should have been remedied. I ask that the gentleman opposite withdraws his resolution so that we can perfect this.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COMER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. ARMSTRONG).

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Madam Speaker, upon assuming the chairmanship of the committee in January 2019, the chairman of the Oversight and Reform Committee formally initiated an inquiry into Secretary Ross' decision to reinstitute the citizenship question on the 2020 census.

Just recently, as of June 27, 2019, the Supreme Court has issued a ruling. The Supreme Court ruled that the administration may ask a citizenship question, but rejected the rationale presented by Secretary Ross for adding the question on the 2020 census.

The committee's fact-finding is still active and ongoing. The administration is cooperating with the investigation. The DOC and the DOJ have produced 31,000 responsive documents—14,000 from the DOC and 17,000 from the DOJ. The committee has held six transcribed interviews with witnesses, and a seventh interview is expected.

In short, Madam Speaker, the Judiciary Committee has already held Bill Barr in contempt for not violating Federal law. And now the Oversight and Reform Committee is about to hold Bill Barr in contempt for cooperating with the committee. This is wrong. This is not how we are supposed to do business in this Chamber.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COMER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, this is such a disturbing time for those of us who have spent our adult lives trying to see that justice is done, laws are followed, and yet here we again come after Attorney General Bob Barr and another Cabinet official, Ross.

The truth is, I didn't really know Bob Barr when he got nominated. I knew that he was friends with Bob Mueller. That caused me concern. But it appears we have an attorney general who is concerned about justice and he is concerned about stopping injustices. And yet, we still have people who are wanting to cause as much trouble for the President and stop his administration from getting as much accomplished for the American people as possible.

It has got to stop at some point. It is like a game, we come here and we are going to hold him in contempt again. This is a double secret probation against Bob Barr. How many double, triple, quadruple secret probations are we going to do? This isn't going to amount to anything.

If you take this to any Federal judge to try to enforce it, he or she will look at the procedure and go: This is ridiculous. You are not going to have me hold the attorney general in contempt for trying to follow the law, and you are wanting to interrupt his efforts to follow the law. That is not happening.

So this is all about a show, when there is true injustice going on. Thank God that we have a President who wanted to see justice done. He knew he didn't collude. And now we have an attorney general who is trying to do the same thing.

Madam Speaker, let's say no to this contempt. Let's get back to doing the job that the American people want us to do.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I think that just about everyone who spoke on our side of the aisle made the factual points that this is not necessary. This resolution is an ongoing attempt by the majority party to try to do anything they can to disrupt the Presidency of our President of the United States.

Every country, just about, in the world asks the citizenship question. Mexico and Canada ask the citizenship question. In fact, the United Nations recommends that countries ask the citizenship question.

I don't for the life of me know why we would resort to this type of action in this body, especially after what happened yesterday. I wonder, Madam Speaker, is this an attempt to try to move the direction of the American people from their frustration at the lack of achievement by the majority party from a legislative standpoint to try to somehow enrage their anger at the President?

This is unnecessary. This is more political theater, and I urge the Members of this fine body to oppose this resolution.

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

Mr. CUMMINGS. Madam Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is left?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland has 2 minutes remaining.

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

Madam Speaker, some of my colleagues have argued that holding Secretary Ross and Attorney General Barr in contempt of Congress is premature. That is simply not true. If anything, it is long overdue.

The Department of Commerce and the Department of Justice have failed to comply with congressional requests for more than a year. The Oversight and Reform Committee Democrats first asked for documents from the Department of Commerce in April of 2018 and from the Department of Justice May of 2018. Those requests were ignored.

When I became chairman, I renewed those requests. In response, the administration produced thousands of pages. But most of the documents were either heavily redacted, already public, or nonresponsive to the committee's request. So the committee narrowed its request and issued bipartisan subpoenas to compel production of that narrow group of documents. That was in April, more than 3 months ago.

I even asked Secretary Ross to meet with me personally. He refused.

And, last month, the committee passed the bipartisan resolution before us to hold Secretary Ross and Attorney General Barr in contempt of Congress. Still neither department has provided the documents that we have asked for.

So I have come to the floor to urge our Members to vote in favor of this. I do not, again, bring this lightly. This is not theater. This is about doing our job. This is about protecting the integrity of not only our census, but of our Congress.

Madam Speaker, I urge all Members to vote for this resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the previous question is ordered on the resolution.

The question is on adoption of the resolution.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. PINGREE). 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.

INSPECTOR GENERAL PROTECTION ACT

Mr. ROUDA. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1847) to require congressional notification for certain changes in status of inspectors general, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1847

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 "Inspector General Protection Act".

SEC. 2. CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION OF CHANGE IN STATUS OF INSPECTOR GENERAL.

(a) CHANGE IN STATUS OF INSPECTOR GENERAL OF OFFICES.—Section 3(b) of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended—

(1) by inserting " , is placed on paid or unpaid non-duty status," after "is removed from office";

(2) by inserting " , change in status," after "any such removal"; and

(3) by inserting " , change in status," after "before the removal".

(b) CHANGE IN STATUS OF INSPECTOR GENERAL OF DESIGNATED FEDERAL ENTITIES.—Section 8G(e)(2) of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended—

(1) by inserting " , is placed on paid or unpaid non-duty status," after "office";

(2) by inserting " , change in status," after "any such removal"; and

(3) by inserting " , change in status," after "before the removal".

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 3. PRESIDENTIAL EXPLANATION OF FAILURE TO NOMINATE AN INSPECTOR GENERAL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter III of chapter 33 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 3349d the following new section:

"§ 3349e. Presidential explanation of failure to nominate an Inspector General

"If the President fails to make a formal nomination for a vacant Inspector General position that requires a formal nomination by the President to be filled within the period beginning on the date on which the vacancy occurred and ending on the day that is 210 days after that date, the President shall communicate, within 30 days after the end of such period, to Congress in writing —

"(1) the reasons why the President has not yet made a formal nomination; and

"(2) a target date for making a formal nomination."

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 33 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to 3349d the following new item:

"3349e. Presidential explanation of failure to nominate an Inspector General."

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act and shall apply to any vacancy first occurring on or after that date.

SEC. 4. DETERMINATION OF BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be deter-

mined by reference to the latest statement titled "Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation" for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the House Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROUDA) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROUDA. 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 before us.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, I am proud to support the Inspector General Protection Act, which would improve the independence of inspectors general.

This bipartisan bill, introduced by Representative TED LIEU and Representative JODY HICE, would also address the disturbingly slow nomination of IGs that have been the norm across multiple administrations.

The bill would require notification of Congress 30 days prior to an IG being placed on leave. Such notification is already required prior to an IG being removed from duty.

The bill would also require the President to report to Congress if he has not nominated an IG after 210 days of a vacancy occurring.

The report must include the reasons for failing to make the nomination and a target date for doing so. The requirement will hopefully prod the executive branch to nominate IG's in a more timely manner.

□ 1530

Inspectors general provide critical oversight and accountability within Federal agencies, and the positions need to be filled more quickly than is currently the case.

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

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

I rise in support of H.R. 1847, the Inspector General Protection Act. I thank Representative TED LIEU for working in a bipartisan manner on this legislation. H.R. 1847 will help ensure that inspectors general vacancies across Federal agencies will be filled in a timely manner.

Inspectors general play an important role in improving the operations of the Federal Government. They help combat fraud, waste, and abuse throughout executive branch departments and

agencies and promote a resourceful and effective Federal Government.

They have assisted us with discharging one of our most important responsibilities, shining the light on areas of the government that need improved efficiency and economy.

However, throughout both Republican and Democratic administrations, there have been numerous vacant inspector general positions. Certain agencies have experienced prolonged periods of absent inspector general leadership.

For example, the Department of the Interior has been without a permanent inspector general since 2009. Likewise, there are approximately 13 vacant inspector general positions for agencies covered by the Inspector General Act.

This bill would require the President to timely notify Congress of a failure to nominate an inspector general for a given agency. The President would also be required to explain why a nomination has not yet been made and provide a target date for that nomination.

The bill also calls for increased transparency by requiring the President to notify Congress if an inspector general is placed on leave or changes status.

Inspectors general are an indispensable tool to Congress. By ensuring the Federal Government is adequately staffed with inspectors general, we are reaffirming our commitment to rooting out government fraud, waste, and abuse.

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

Mr. ROUDA. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. TED LIEU), the sponsor of this legislation.

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Madam Speaker, first, let me thank the gentleman from California (Mr. ROUDA) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLER) for their comments in support of this legislation.

I rise today in support of my bipartisan bill, H.R. 1847, the Inspector General Protection Act, which will enhance the independence and integrity of our IGs.

Since Congress passed the original Inspector General Act in 1978, these government watchdogs have played a crucial role in our democracy. They root out waste, fraud, mismanagement, and abuse at all levels of government, saving American taxpayers billions of dollars annually and ensuring that government programs benefit the people.

According to the nonpartisan Council of the Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency, taxpayers saved \$32.7 billion in fiscal year 2017 from audit recommendations. That is a \$22 return on every dollar invested.

Unfortunately, both Democratic and Republican administrations have hamstrung our IGs with persistent vacancies and underfunded budgets. According to the Project on Government

Oversight, vacancies of permanent inspectors general is not a new problem or one that is unique to this administration. This issue has persisted for years under both Democratic and Republican leadership. The Department of the Interior, for example, has lacked a Senate-confirmed inspector general for over a decade.

But it is not just vacancies that have been problematic. In a committee report, the Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs noted that “another type of personnel action has the potential for doing significant damage to OIG independence if abused: placing an IG on indefinite paid or unpaid nonduty status.”

My bill will address both of these problems.

First, H.R. 1847 requires notification of Congress in advance of an inspector general being placed on administrative leave. This ensures Congress is aware of any potential attempts to improperly sideline an inspector general.

Second, the bill requires the President to report to Congress if an inspector general has not been nominated within 210 days after a vacancy occurs for the position, including the reasons a nomination has not been made and a target date for doing so.

This reasserts Congress’ oversight role and allows Members to question, on an informal basis, the decision of any future administration to leave core offices vacant.

As Senator CHUCK GRASSLEY told The Washington Post in 2017, “Independent, nonpartisan IGs can be some of the President’s best allies in finding and cutting waste, fraud, and abuse in the bureaucracy.”

I agree with that statement. That is why I look forward to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, as well as the U.S. Senate, toward getting this commonsense bill signed into law.

I am grateful to my colleague from Georgia (Mr. HICE) for partnering with me on this legislation and to Chairman CUMMINGS and Ranking Member JORDAN for recognizing the importance of strengthening our Nation’s inspectors general.

I am also proud that this bill has received the endorsement of good-government groups across the ideological spectrum, including Project on Government Oversight, R Street Institute, American Oversight, Campaign for Accountability, Common Cause, and Public Citizen.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting good governance by voting “yes.”

Mr. KELLER. Madam Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROUDA. Madam Speaker, I have no further speakers. I urge all of my colleagues to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr.

ROUDA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1847, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ACCESS TO CONGRESSIONALLY MANDATED REPORTS ACT

Mr. ROUDA. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 736) to require the Director of the Government Publishing Office to establish and maintain an online portal accessible to the public that allows the public to obtain electronic copies of all congressionally mandated reports in one place, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 736

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 “Access to Congressionally Mandated Reports Act”.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) CONGRESSIONALLY MANDATED REPORT.—The term “congressionally mandated report”—

(A) means a report that is required by statute to be submitted to either House of Congress or any committee of Congress or subcommittee thereof; and

(B) does not include a report required under part B of subtitle II of title 36, United States Code.

(2) DIRECTOR.—The term “Director” means the Director of the Government Publishing Office.

(3) FEDERAL AGENCY.—The term “Federal agency” has the meaning given that term under section 102 of title 40, United States Code, but does not include the Government Accountability Office.

(4) OPEN FORMAT.—The term “open format” means a file format for storing digital data based on an underlying open standard that—

(A) is not encumbered by any restrictions that would impede reuse; and

(B) is based on an underlying open data standard that is maintained by a standards organization.

(5) REPORTS ONLINE PORTAL.—The term “reports online portal” means the online portal established under section (3)(a).

SEC. 3. ESTABLISHMENT OF ONLINE PORTAL FOR CONGRESSIONALLY MANDATED REPORTS.

(a) REQUIREMENT TO ESTABLISH ONLINE PORTAL.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director shall establish and maintain an online portal accessible by the public that allows the public to obtain electronic copies of all congressionally mandated reports in one place. The Director may publish other reports on the online portal.

(2) EXISTING FUNCTIONALITY.—To the extent possible, the Director shall meet the requirements under paragraph (1) by using existing online portals and functionality under the authority of the Director.

(3) CONSULTATION.—In carrying out this Act, the Director shall consult with the

Clerk of the House of Representatives, the Secretary of the Senate, and the Librarian of Congress regarding the requirements for and maintenance of congressionally mandated reports on the reports online portal.

(b) CONTENT AND FUNCTION.—The Director shall ensure that the reports online portal includes the following:

(1) Subject to subsection (c), with respect to each congressionally mandated report, each of the following:

(A) A citation to the statute requiring the report.

(B) An electronic copy of the report, including any transmittal letter associated with the report, in an open format that is platform independent and that is available to the public without restrictions, including restrictions that would impede the re-use of the information in the report.

(C) The ability to retrieve a report, to the extent practicable, through searches based on each, and any combination, of the following:

(i) The title of the report.

(ii) The reporting Federal agency.

(iii) The date of publication.

(iv) Each congressional committee or subcommittee receiving the report, if applicable.

(v) The statute requiring the report.

(vi) Subject tags.

(vii) A unique alphanumeric identifier for the report that is consistent across report editions.

(viii) The serial number, Superintendent of Documents number, or other identification number for the report, if applicable.

(ix) Key words.

(x) Full text search.

(xi) Any other relevant information specified by the Director.

(D) The date on which the report was required to be submitted, and on which the report was submitted, to the reports online portal.

(E) To the extent practicable, a permanent means of accessing the report electronically.

(2) A means for bulk download of all congressionally mandated reports.

(3) A means for downloading individual reports as the result of a search.

(4) An electronic means for the head of each Federal agency to submit to the reports online portal each congressionally mandated report of the agency, as required by section 4.

(5) In tabular form, a list of all congressionally mandated reports that can be searched, sorted, and downloaded by—

(A) reports submitted within the required time;

(B) reports submitted after the date on which such reports were required to be submitted; and

(C) reports not submitted.

(c) NONCOMPLIANCE BY FEDERAL AGENCIES.—

(1) REPORTS NOT SUBMITTED.—If a Federal agency does not submit a congressionally mandated report to the Director, the Director shall to the extent practicable—

(A) include on the reports online portal—

(i) the information required under clauses (i), (ii), (iv), and (v) of subsection (b)(1)(C); and

(ii) the date on which the report was required to be submitted; and

(B) include the congressionally mandated report on the list described in subsection (b)(5)(C).

(2) REPORTS NOT IN OPEN FORMAT.—If a Federal agency submits a congressionally mandated report that is not in an open format, the Director shall include the congressionally mandated report in another format on the reports online portal.

(d) **DEADLINE.**—The Director shall ensure that information required to be published on the online portal under this Act with respect to a congressionally mandated report or information required under subsection (c) is published—

(1) not later than 30 calendar days after the information is received from the Federal agency involved; or

(2) in the case of information required under subsection (c), not later than 30 calendar days after the deadline under this Act for the Federal agency involved to submit information with respect to the congressionally mandated report involved.

(e) **EXCEPTION FOR CERTAIN REPORTS.**—

(1) **EXCEPTION DESCRIBED.**—A congressionally mandated report which is required by statute to be submitted to a committee of Congress or a subcommittee thereof, including any transmittal letter associated with the report, shall not be submitted to or published on the reports online portal if the chair of a committee or subcommittee to which the report is submitted notifies the Director in writing that the report is to be withheld from submission and publication under this Act.

(2) **NOTICE ON PORTAL.**—If a report is withheld from submission to or publication on the reports online portal under paragraph (1), the Director shall post on the portal—

(A) a statement that the report is withheld at the request of a committee or subcommittee involved; and

(B) the written notification specified in paragraph (1).

(f) **FREE ACCESS.**—The Director may not charge a fee, require registration, or impose any other limitation in exchange for access to the reports online portal.

(g) **UPGRADE CAPABILITY.**—The reports online portal shall be enhanced and updated as necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

SEC. 4. FEDERAL AGENCY RESPONSIBILITIES.

(a) **SUBMISSION OF ELECTRONIC COPIES OF REPORTS.**—Not earlier than 30 calendar days or later than 45 calendar days after the date on which a congressionally mandated report is submitted to either House of Congress or to any committee of Congress or subcommittee thereof, the head of the Federal agency submitting the congressionally mandated report shall submit to the Director the information required under subparagraphs (A) through (D) of section 3(b)(1) with respect to the congressionally mandated report. Nothing in this Act shall relieve a Federal agency of any other requirement to publish the congressionally mandated report on the online portal of the Federal agency or otherwise submit the congressionally mandated report to Congress or specific committees of Congress, or subcommittees thereof.

(b) **GUIDANCE.**—Not later than 240 calendar days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, in consultation with the Director, shall issue guidance to agencies on the implementation of this Act.

(c) **STRUCTURE OF SUBMITTED REPORT DATA.**—The head of each Federal agency shall ensure that each congressionally mandated report submitted to the Director complies with the open format criteria established by the Director in the guidance issued under subsection (b).

(d) **POINT OF CONTACT.**—The head of each Federal agency shall designate a point of contact for congressionally mandated reports.

SEC. 5. CHANGING OR REMOVING REPORTS.

(a) **LIMITATION ON AUTHORITY TO CHANGE OR REMOVE REPORTS.**—Except as provided in subsection (b), the head of the Federal agency concerned may change or remove a con-

gressionally mandated report submitted to be published on the reports online portal only if—

(1) the head of the Federal agency consults with each committee of Congress or subcommittee thereof to which the report is required to be submitted (or, in the case of a report which is not required to be submitted to a particular committee of Congress or subcommittee thereof, to each committee with jurisdiction over the agency, as determined by the head of the agency in consultation with the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate) prior to changing or removing the report; and

(2) a joint resolution is enacted to authorize the change in or removal of the report.

(b) **EXCEPTIONS.**—Notwithstanding subsection (a), the head of the Federal agency concerned—

(1) may make technical changes to a report submitted to or published on the online portal; and

(2) may remove a report from the online portal if the report was submitted to or published on the online portal in error.

SEC. 6. RELATIONSHIP TO THE FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Nothing in this Act shall be construed to—

(1) require the disclosure of information, records, or reports that are exempt from public disclosure under section 552 of title 5, United States Code; or

(2) impose any affirmative duty on the Director to review congressionally mandated reports submitted for publication to the reports online portal for the purpose of identifying and redacting such information or records.

(b) **REDACTION OF INFORMATION.**—The head of a Federal agency may redact information required to be disclosed under this Act if the information would be properly withheld from disclosure under section 552 of title 5, United States Code, and shall—

(1) redact information required to be disclosed under this Act if disclosure of such information is prohibited by law;

(2) redact information being withheld under this subsection prior to submitting the information to the Director;

(3) redact only such information properly withheld under this subsection from the submission of information or from any congressionally mandated report submitted under this Act;

(4) identify where any such redaction is made in the submission or report; and

(5) identify the exemption under which each such redaction is made.

SEC. 7. IMPLEMENTATION.

(a) **REPORTS SUBMITTED TO CONGRESS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—This Act shall apply with respect to any congressionally mandated report which—

(A) is required by statute to be submitted to the House of Representatives or Senate at any time before, on, or after the date of the enactment of this Act; or

(B) is included by the Clerk of the House of Representatives or the Secretary of the Senate (as the case may be) on the list of reports received by the House of Representatives or Senate (as the case may be) at any time before the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) **TRANSITION RULE FOR PREVIOUSLY SUBMITTED REPORTS.**—The Director shall ensure that any congressionally mandated report described in paragraph (1) which was required to be submitted to Congress by a statute enacted before the date of the enactment of this Act is published on the online portal under this Act not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) **REPORTS SUBMITTED TO COMMITTEES.**—In the case of congressionally mandated re-

ports which are required by statute to be submitted to a committee of Congress or a subcommittee thereof, this Act shall apply with respect to—

(1) any such report which is first required to be submitted by a statute which is enacted on or after the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(2) to the maximum extent practical, any congressionally mandated report which was required to be submitted by a statute enacted before the date of enactment of this act unless—

(A) the chair of the committee, or subcommittee thereof, to which the report was required to be submitted notifies the Director in writing that the report is to be withheld from publication; and

(B) the Director publishes the notification on the online portal.

SEC. 8. DETERMINATION OF BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled "Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation" for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the House Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROUDA) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROUDA. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the measure before us.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, I thank Representative MIKE QUIGLEY for his persistence in pursuing this good-government legislation. Hopefully, we can get this bill enacted this Congress.

H.R. 736, the Access to Congressionally Mandated Reports Act, is a non-controversial bill that has been approved by the Oversight and Reform Committee many times. The bill is a commonsense measure that would make the government more transparent and accountable. It would create a one-stop-shop where Congress and members of the public could access agency reports to Congress.

Federal agencies submit thousands of reports to Congress each year. This bill will improve congressional oversight by making it easy to find and access these reports. H.R. 736 would also give the public access to agency reports.

Currently, members of the public often have to file requests under the Freedom of Information Act to obtain some agency reports to Congress. Many of these reports are not available online.

An online library of Federal reports would improve the ability of our staffs

to use the information in them to make sound policy. It also would encourage agency compliance with reporting requirements. Finally, it would support timely access to the reports by State and local governments, students, academics, and others, with the additional benefit of decreasing the burden on agencies to process FOIA requests.

The Access to Congressionally Mandated Reports Act has been endorsed by over 25 organizations from across the political spectrum. I have a letter from those groups that I include in the RECORD.

JULY 16, 2019.

DEAR SPEAKER PELOSI, REPUBLICAN LEADER MCCARTHY, AND MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: We, the 27 undersigned organizations, write to express our strong support for the bipartisan Access to Congressionally Mandated Reports Act ("ACMRA") and to respectfully urge you to vote in favor of the legislation on the House floor. If enacted, the ACMRA will strengthen Congressional oversight and improve government transparency.

The ACMRA will establish a central repository of agency reports submitted to Congress and will track whether agencies have submitted required reports. This will improve Members of Congress's access to the reports and ensure Congress knows when they become available.

The ACMRA also directs agencies to provide the Government Publishing Office (GPO) any report that is both required by law to be submitted to Congress and is releasable under the Freedom of Information Act ("FOIA"), subject to certain limitations. The legislation will not change what information is in the public sphere, but it will improve accessibility. Nor does the legislation affect in any way what information is provided to Congressional committees or place any burden upon them.

Under the ACMRA, agency reports will become publicly available on GPO's website within 30 days of submission to Congress, and will be redacted in accordance with FOIA's provisions, which include the removal of classified or otherwise confidential material. Reports will be assigned a unique identifier that will make it easy to track reports as new editions are released.

Additionally, the Congressional Research Service will supplement work already performed by the Clerk of the House to identify all agency reports the law requires be submitted to Congress. This will tell us whether an agency has complied with its obligation to submit reports in a timely fashion.

The Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee favorably reported a similar version of the bill in April. Additionally, the legislation was repeatedly favorably reported by both the Committee on House Administration and the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform during prior Congresses.

The ACMRA was first introduced in 2010, and we are hopeful it will become part of this Congress's transparency legacy.

We appreciate your thoughtful consideration of the measure and are hopeful the ACMRA will be enacted shortly.

Sincerely yours,

American Association of Law Libraries, American Library Association, Americans for Prosperity, Campaign for Accountability, Center for Data Innovation, Center for Responsive Politics, Demand Progress, Data Coalition, Essential Information, Free Government Information, Freedom Works, Government Information Watch, GovTrack.us, Judicial Watch.

Liberty Coalition, Lincoln Network, National Coalition for History, National Immigrant Justice Center, National Security Archive, PEGI Project, Project On Government Oversight, R Street Institute, Senior Executives Association, Society of Professional Journalists, Sunlight Foundation, Taxpayers for Common Sense, Win Without War.

Mr. ROUDA. Madam Speaker, legislation similar to this bill has been introduced in the Senate and favorably reported by the Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

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

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

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 736, the Access to Congressionally Mandated Reports Act sponsored by my colleague from Illinois (Mr. QUIGLEY).

Federal agencies are required to produce numerous reports to Congress each year. The reports cover a wide range of topics that give valuable insight into government activities.

While some reports are posted on agency websites, most are not available online. It is incredibly difficult for the general public to find reports, especially older reports. Keep in mind that these are reports that the taxpayers paid for in the first place.

H.R. 736 will solve this problem. The bill directs the Federal Government to compile all congressionally mandated reports in a central location.

The Government Publishing Office would be required to establish an online database where agencies would submit congressionally mandated reports. In order to protect sensitive information, the bill allows agencies to redact information in reports that would otherwise not be releasable to the public under the Freedom of Information Act.

The database would provide access to reports free of charge. The reports would be searchable, sortable, and available to be downloaded in bulk.

H.R. 736 ensures that these taxpayer-funded reports are transparent and accessible. It will make it easier for both the public and Congress to review and evaluate Federal agency activities. Increased transparency under this bill will allow the public to help Congress hold the government accountable.

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

Mr. ROUDA. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. QUIGLEY), a distinguished Member and sponsor of this legislation.

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

Madam Speaker, I will keep my comments brief because this bipartisan, commonsense bill is simple.

H.R. 736 would make all agency reports to Congress, and releasable under FOIA, available on one website at no cost to the American public.

Each year, Federal agencies submit thousands of reports to Congress that contain a wealth of information that enables the public to better understand how Federal agencies are, or are not, fulfilling their respective missions, from ensuring the safety of our drugs and food supply to protecting the environment and monitoring the soundness of our financial institutions.

Unfortunately, many, if not most, of these reports simply sit collecting dust in the committees they are delivered to or are posted in numerous and confusing places on dozens of agency websites, rarely to be seen or thought of again.

In fact, the only comprehensive list of congressionally mandated reports is printed in paper format each year by the Clerk of the House and is available only by request, provided that one knows it exists.

My bill would, for the first time, create a single website where the public and Members of Congress can easily search, sort, and download all congressionally mandated reports from agencies.

Ultimately, this will help us conduct better research and oversight of these agencies and will allow the public to learn about what agencies are doing with their hard-earned tax dollars.

This bill is meant to be a window into the workings of government to ensure that the government's business is done transparently and is accountable to the people it serves.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this straightforward, commonsense bill and vote "yes" on H.R. 736.

Mr. KELLER. Madam Speaker, I have no further speakers. I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROUDA. Madam Speaker, I have no further speakers. I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROUDA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 736, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LUCAS LOWE POST OFFICE

Mr. ROUDA. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1250) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 11158 Highway 146 North in Hardin, Texas, as the "Lucas Lowe Post Office", as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1250

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

SECTION 1. LUCAS LOWE MEMORIAL POST OFFICE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 11158 Highway 146 North in Hardin, Texas, shall be known and designated as the “Lucas Lowe Memorial Post Office”.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROUDA) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROUDA. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on this measure.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1545

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

Madam Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in consideration of H.R. 1250 to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 11158 Highway 146 North in Hardin, Texas, as the Lucas Lowe Memorial Post Office.

Chief Warrant Officer Lucas Lowe's life was defined by a call to service. On July 6, 2004, Lucas enlisted in the United States Army. He was deployed to Afghanistan for 11 months from 2005 and 2006, and Iraq for 14 months from 2007 to 2008. Lucas later attended Warrant Officer Candidate School at Fort Rucker, Alabama, where he also enrolled in flight school to become an AH-64 Apache attack helicopter pilot.

On December 28, 2016, Chief Warrant Officer Lucas Lowe passed away during a training flight with the Army National Guard. Lucas demonstrated in his short life the kind of commitment to service that should be an example to all of us. He leaves behind to cherish his memory his wife, Kami; sons, Clayton, Lance, and Logan; and daughters, Alysen and Tenley Lowe.

Naming a post office in Lucas Lowe's honor in Hardin, Texas, is a fitting tribute to honor and remember a young man who made the ultimate sacrifice in service to all of us.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KELLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BABIN).

Mr. BABIN. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1250, a bill to designate the U.S. Postal Service facility in Hardin, Texas, as the “Lucas Lowe Memorial Post Office”.

As my colleagues know, to fast-track a postal legislation, we collect co-

ponsorships from every other member of the State's delegation. When you come from a State as large as the State of Texas, this can certainly be easier said than done. Although everything is bigger in Texas, I am proud to inform you that we have the support of all 36 members of the Lone Star State of Texas' delegation to honor this American hero, Lucas Maurice Lowe, with the naming of a memorial post office.

Chief Warrant Officer 2nd Lucas Lowe of Hardin, Texas, was tragically lost to us during a training flight just after Christmas in 2016 during his time in the Texas Army National Guard. A hardworking man who loved being in the service, Lowe especially loved to fly.

After enlisting in the Army in 2004, Lowe completed an 11-month tour in Afghanistan in 2005 to 2006 and a 14-month tour in Iraq in 2007 to 2008. He later attended Warrant Officer Candidate School in Fort Rucker, Alabama, where he also attended flight school to become an AH-64 Apache attack helicopter pilot. He was an amazing soldier who faithfully served both God and his country.

However, when the world lost Lucas, we lost more than a dedicated pilot. We lost a man who always went out of his way to lift others' spirits and encouraged them to reach for higher success in life.

Lucas was a wonderful family man who loved his wife, his children, and his family more than anything else. He loved his children more than life itself. He loved camping in the woods, hunting, fishing, campfires, and good music. He enjoyed dancing, playing golf, cooking, and singing to brighten someone's day. He always had a way of making someone's day better.

Admired by all, his courage and dedication made him a natural-born leader. He touched the lives of all who knew him, and he lived his life with an optimistic spirit, always ready to take on the next big challenge.

Lucas is survived by his wife, Kami; and five children, Clayton, Lance, Alysen, Logan, and Tenley.

He is dearly, dearly missed throughout the Texas Guard, the entire Hardin community and Liberty County, and by those family and friends he left behind.

Mr. ROUDA. Madam Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1250 introduced by Representative BABIN. The bill names a post office located in Hardin, Texas, in honor of Army Chief Warrant Officer Lucas Lowe.

Lucas Lowe joined the United States Army in 2004. He served an 11-month deployment in Afghanistan, followed by a 14-month deployment in Iraq. While deployed, Lowe served as a field artillery radar operator and then as a paratrooper.

When he returned home, Lowe attended Warrant Officer Candidate School and flight school at Fort Rucker, Alabama. Chief Warrant Officer Lowe was then assigned to the 149th Aviation Regiment in the Texas National Guard.

On December 28, 2016, Chief Warrant Officer Lowe lost his life during a training accident while flying an Apache helicopter.

He left behind a wife, three sons, and two daughters.

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

Mr. ROUDA. Madam Speaker, I have no further speakers, I urge all the Members to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROUDA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1250, as amended.

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

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: “A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 11158 Highway 146 North in Hardin, Texas, as the ‘Lucas Lowe Memorial Post Office’.”

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EVA G. HEWITT POST OFFICE

Mr. ROUDA. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1526) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 200 Israel Road Southeast in Tumwater, Washington, as the “Eva G. Hewitt Post Office”.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1526

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

SECTION 1. EVA G. HEWITT POST OFFICE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 200 Israel Road Southeast in Tumwater, Washington, shall be known and designated as the “Eva G. Hewitt Post Office”.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the “Eva G. Hewitt Post Office”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROUDA) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in consideration of H.R. 1526, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 200 Israel Road Southeast in Tumwater, Washington, as the "Eva G. Hewitt Post Office."

Eva Hewitt was not just a business woman and postmaster, but she was often described as the heart and soul of Tumwater.

With her husband, Charles Hewitt, Eva established the Hewitt Drug Store which housed the Tumwater Post Office. Eva Hewitt started as an assistant, and later assumed the role of postmaster in 1915. Following the death of her husband in 1927, Eva Hewitt took over business operations of the drugstore with the help of her daughter, Laura.

Eva would continue to serve as postmaster until 1942. At the time, Eva Hewitt was the longest serving postmaster in Tumwater, where she oversaw a massive growth in the volume of mail in the Pacific Northwest.

Eva Hewitt also was a community leader and was widely regarded as Tumwater's local historian. She was also active in the Daughters of the Pioneers of Washington and was the namesake of the Eva Hewitt Orthopedic Guild. The Hewitt Drug Store was eventually demolished for the construction of Interstate 5.

Naming a post office to honor Ms. Hewitt's public service would help ensure that her pivotal legacy to her home of Tumwater, Washington, lives on.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1526 introduced by Representative HECK. The bill names a post office located in Tumwater, Washington, after Eva Hewitt.

Eva Hewitt was Tumwater's first female postmaster. Before becoming postmaster, Eva and her husband owned and operated a drugstore in the small town they called home. The drugstore housed the Tumwater Post Office, and Eva started working there as an assistant.

In 1915 she assumed the role of postmaster and served there nearly three decades. Following the death of her husband in 1927, Eva took over the family business and served in both positions until her retirement in 1942.

Often described as the heart and soul of Tumwater, Eva was a community leader and a local historian. She spent her free time researching, preserving, and educating the public on the history of the Pacific Northwest.

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

Mr. ROUDA. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Washington (Mr. HECK), who is the sponsor of the legislation.

Mr. HECK. Madam Speaker, today indeed I do rise in strong support of H.R. 1526, a bill to honor the life and legacy of Eva G. Hewitt by renaming the Post Office in Tumwater, Washington, in her honor.

A few blocks from where we stand today is the Smithsonian Postal Museum, a museum that preserves and promotes postal history from every era. In it you can read about the rural letter carriers. This is personal with me. As it turns out, my grandfather was a rural postal delivery member of the post office from 1905 to 1944. Out of Henrietta, Texas, he for many years delivered the mail on horseback. One of the biggest days of his life was when he got a Model T. He, in fact, delivered letters right up to the day he died in 1944. You can read about him and a lot of other people in the museum.

Most notably you can learn about the women trailblazers who built the postal service into what it is today, women like Sarah DeCrow who in 1792 became the very first woman postmaster; or Ethel Hill, who in 1900 became the first woman listed as a full-time rural delivery carrier.

This year, in celebration of the city of Tumwater's 150th anniversary—they call that the sesquicentennial—they are sharing many of the stories there about their own women trailblazers, women like Eva G. Hewitt. She was indeed Tumwater's first woman postmaster during a very pivotal time in Tumwater's history. So it is fitting to rename the post office for her.

In 1893 she and her husband, Charles, purchased that drugstore alluded to earlier right in the heart of Tumwater, and their drugstore became known as Hewitt Drug Store. It was the center of the community, and it housed a store and, yes, a soda fountain, and the post office, all under one roof.

She started as an assistant there, but—get this—prior to that time her husband was the postmaster, but it turns out when the Postal Service adopted civil service rules, she and her husband both took the examination. And guess what?

She passed; he didn't; she became the postmaster in 1915. It sounds like something that would happen in my home.

So following the death of her husband in 1927, she took over the business and served there until her retirement in 1942. She was the very first person to hold the position of Tumwater postmaster. At the time of her retirement she was also the longest serving postmaster in that city's history which dates back to 1824.

During her decades at the store, she saw a massive growth in mail volume throughout the Pacific Northwest. As a matter of fact, she once remarked that the volume at the Tumwater Post Office in terms of monthly mail in 1942

was equivalent to annual mail at the turn of the century.

Yes, indeed, the store was torn down and the post office was torn down to help make way for Interstate 5, the main arterial between Canada and Mexico that runs throughout the West Coast.

Although the drugstore may be gone, her legacy isn't. As postmaster, as business woman, and as community member, it lives on. So I was delighted when the city approached me about this long overdue recognition for Eva. Very few post offices, let us note, are named for women, much less the women who carried out the mission of the Postal Service.

In fact, take note, of the 823 post offices that have been renamed, only 98 of them have been renamed for women—less than 12 percent. We have got a parity issue here, Madam Speaker. That is why I am even more than proud to introduce and support this bill.

Madam Speaker, I want to thank the Olympia Tumwater Foundation for helping to tell Eva's story. I thank the city of Tumwater for sharing her story with our community. And I want to thank all the members of my delegation who joined in to cosponsor this. Eva has earned her place in the South Sound history books that she helped write.

Madam Speaker, it is my honor to support this bill to rename the Tumwater Post Office in her honor, and I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

□ 1600

Mr. KELLER. Madam Speaker, I have no further speakers. I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROUDA. Madam Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Washington for his comments and also encourage all of the Members to support this bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROUDA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1526.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CORPORAL ALEX MARTINEZ MEMORIAL POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. ROUDA. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1844) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 66 Grove Court in Elgin, Illinois, as the "Corporal Alex Martinez Memorial Post Office Building".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1844

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

SECTION 1. CORPORAL ALEX MARTINEZ MEMORIAL POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 66 Grove Court in Elgin, Illinois, shall be known and designated as the “Corporal Alex Martinez Memorial Post Office Building”.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROUDA) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROUDA. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend remarks and include extraneous material on this measure.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in consideration of H.R. 1844, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 66 Grove Court in Elgin, Illinois, as the Corporal Alex Martinez Memorial Post Office Building.

Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY).

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. ROUDA).

Madam Speaker, I would like to rise in support of my own legislation, H.R. 1844, to designate the facility of the U.S. Postal Service located at 66 Grove Court in Elgin, Illinois, as the Corporal Alex Martinez Memorial Post Office Building.

Corporal Alex Martinez, a lifelong Elgin resident, wanted to join the Marine Corps since he was a little boy. From a young age, he yearned to follow in the footsteps of his father, Enrique Martinez, who was a longtime Navy reservist, and an aunt who served in the Army.

As a senior in high school, with his whole life ahead of him, he decided to follow his dreams. He surprised his friends and family by attending summer school to graduate early, enlist in the Marine Corps, and marry his high school sweetheart, Juliana Martinez, at the age of 18.

After graduation from basic training, Corporal Martinez was assigned to the 1st Combat Engineer Battalion, 1st Marine Division, One Marine Expeditionary Force, where he excelled as a combat engineer. In this role, he had the dangerous but crucial responsi-

bility to guide ground forces away from life-threatening obstacles, such as lethal improvised explosive devices.

In his second deployment on April 5, 2012, a unit that Corporal Martinez was guiding began receiving enemy fire. Despite facing an immediate threat to his own life, he continued to calmly and systematically clear lanes for marines to maneuver against the enemy.

Tragically, Corporal Martinez was killed after an explosive device detonated in Helmand province. In that moment, Alex Martinez became the first and only Elgin native to fall in combat since the terror attacks on September 11.

While in Afghanistan, Corporal Martinez would tell his loved ones his plans to start a family and to continue his selfless service by becoming a fireman or a police officer. But as a consequence of his sacrifices to this great Nation and the people who inhabit it, he never could pursue those dreams.

Madam Speaker, you and I and the many Members of this Chamber are fortunate to live in a diverse nation with innumerable freedoms, but we can only enjoy these freedoms and the peace and prosperity that accompany them because of the sacrifices made by Corporal Martinez and the millions of men and women who dedicate their lives to defend our democracy.

To honor Corporal Martinez’s honorable sacrifices to this country, to recognize the sacrifice of his loved ones, and to express solidarity with all servicemembers and veterans in the United States, I strongly urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1844.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1844, introduced by Representative KRISHNAMOORTHY. This bill names the post office located in Elgin, Illinois, in honor of Marine Corporal Alex Martinez.

Alex Martinez knew he was destined for public service since he was a little boy. He had a two-phased plan. First, he would join the military, following in his father’s footsteps. Then, upon retirement, he would continue in public service as a police officer or firefighter.

Shortly after high school, Alex joined the United States Marine Corps, filling step one of his boyhood dream. After boot camp, he was assigned to the 1st Combat Engineer Battalion, 1st Marine Division.

Corporal Martinez was deployed twice to Afghanistan in support of Operation Enduring Freedom. On April 5, 2012, Corporal Martinez was conducting combat operations in the Helmand province of Afghanistan and was killed after an explosive device detonated.

While Corporal Martinez’s life of service was tragically cut short, his sacrifice and bravery will not be forgotten. I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROUDA. Madam Speaker, I have no further speakers.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROUDA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1844.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RYAN KEITH COX POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. ROUDA. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3305) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2509 George Mason Drive in Virginia Beach, Virginia, as the “Ryan Keith Cox Post Office Building”.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3305

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

SECTION 1. RYAN KEITH COX POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2509 George Mason Drive in Virginia Beach, Virginia, shall be known and designated as the “Ryan Keith Cox Post Office Building”.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the “Ryan Keith Cox Post Office Building”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROUDA) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in consideration of H.R. 3305, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2509 George Mason Drive in Virginia Beach, Virginia, as the Ryan Keith Cox Post Office Building.

Madam Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Virginia (Mrs. LURIA) to further explain her bill.

Mrs. LURIA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and heroic actions of Ryan Keith Cox.

On May 31, the year’s largest mass shooting in America struck in our Virginia Beach community. Keith was

amongst the 12 wonderful people who lost their lives in the tragedy. In his final moments, Keith showed extraordinary bravery.

Keith was an active and irreplaceable member of our community. He regularly attended his father's church, New Hope Baptist Church, where he sang in the choir with his renowned golden voice. He had hoped to follow his calling and his father's footsteps and become more active in the ministry.

For 12 years, Keith served the city of Virginia Beach as a public utilities employee. His coworkers described him as someone who was always nice to others and treated colleagues to lunch. One colleague called Keith a "teddy bear" who always knew what to say to make an upset colleague smile.

Those who knew him said Keith embodied leadership. Keith's friends and family agreed that he made his impact by putting the needs of others before his own. Keith's last day on Earth was no different.

During the shooting, Keith led several of his coworkers to safety. Keith then refused to take refuge, stating: "I've got to see if anybody else needs help."

Keith stood watch and checked on his colleagues, voluntarily exposing himself to a deadly line of fire. One of Keith's colleagues summed it up: "If it wasn't for him, there would have been several more people who perished."

In our community's darkest hour, Keith prioritized the safety of his colleagues over his own. He was a true servant leader who made the ultimate sacrifice.

This is our chance to tell Keith's story, to showcase his heroism to our community, our Commonwealth, and our Nation. I was proud to introduce this bill to name a local post office after Keith. When we walk by that post office and see Keith's name, we will think of the sacrifice and of the lives that he saved.

I thank the Virginia delegation for supporting this bipartisan legislation to honor Keith's legacy and impact on our Virginia Beach community.

Madam Speaker, I urge support of this bill.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3305, introduced by Representative LURIA. The bill names a post office located in Virginia Beach, Virginia, in honor of Ryan Keith Cox.

Ryan Keith Cox served the city of Virginia Beach for 12 years. He worked in the Public Works Department as an account clerk until he was murdered, saving the lives of his friends and coworkers earlier this year.

On the morning of May 31, 2019, a city employee resigned from his job at the municipal building where Cox work. That afternoon, the former employee returned with evil intentions.

When a coworker ran into the office with news that there was an active

shooter, Keith remained calm and thought only of how to keep other coworkers safe. He led them to the safety of a small room and directed them to barricade the door.

Then, despite the danger, he continued to look for more of his colleagues. By the time the shooting stopped, Keith was among the 12 innocent victims who were killed. His surviving colleagues remember him as a kind, soft-spoken, and big teddy bear.

Madam Speaker, Keith's heroics will not be forgotten. I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3305, Designating the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2509 George Mason Drive in Virginia Beach, Virginia as the "Ryan Keith Cox Post Office Building." I appreciate my colleague, the gentlelady from Virginia, Mrs. LURIA, for introducing this bill.

Ryan Keith Cox is a Virginia Beach hero, a distinguished public servant and one whose legacy will live on forever. We will remember Ryan for his heroic actions during the Virginia Beach massacre on May 31, 2019. He saved dozens of lives by helping his colleagues find a safe space to hide during the mass shooting at the Virginia Beach Municipal Center. He was killed protecting two of his coworkers guarding a cubicle door while his coworkers huddled on the floor beneath two desks.

The Virginia Beach community will remember Ryan as a cherished friend and one who always put others before himself. He was soft spoken, encouraging, positive and considered by all to be "a good man".

He was active in his Church and participated in Anointed Voices, Men of Hope, the Male Chorus and the Men's Ministry at New Hope Baptist Church.

Madam Speaker, the designation of this post office in Ryan Keith Cox's honor will forever remind us of his valor and his 12-year long career with the City of Virginia Beach. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROUDA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3305.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

65TH INFANTRY REGIMENT POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. ROUDA. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2325) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 100 Calle Alondra in San Juan, Puerto Rico, as the "65th Infantry Regiment Post Office Building".

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2325

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

SECTION 1. 65TH INFANTRY REGIMENT POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 100 Calle Alondra in San Juan, Puerto Rico, shall be known and designated as the "65th Infantry Regiment Post Office Building".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "65th Infantry Regiment Post Office Building".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROUDA) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in consideration of H.R. 2325, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 100 Calle Alondra San Juan, Puerto Rico, as the 65th Infantry Regiment Post Office Building.

In 1899, a year after the Spanish-American War, Congress authorized the creation of a unit of volunteer soldiers in the new territory of Puerto Rico. Redesignated in 1920 as the 65th Infantry Regiment of the United States Army, this unit served admirably in World War II and the Korean war.

In World War II, the 65th Infantry Regiment suffered casualties defending against enemy attacks, with regiment members earning one Distinguished Service Cross, two Silver Stars, two Bronze Stars, and 90 Purple Hearts.

In the Korean war, when General MacArthur ordered the evacuation of the Hungnam enclave, the 65th Infantry Regiment played a crucial role, and ultimately, under the Regiment's protection, 105,000 troops and 100,000 refugees were evacuated.

These brave Americans protected the very foundation of this great country. Naming a post office to honor the 65th Infantry Regiment who served and sacrificed for us is but a small price of what these brave men and women deserve from the country to whom they have given so much.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I yield as much time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Puerto Rico (Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN), my friend.

□ 1615

Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico. Madam Speaker, I thank Mr. KELLER for the opportunity.

I am very humbled but, at the same time, very proud to rise in support of H.R. 2325, legislation that I introduced to designate the United States Postal Service facility located at 100 Calle Alondra in San Juan, Puerto Rico, as the “65th Infantry Regiment Post Office Building.”

Shortly after Puerto Rico became a U.S. territory in 1898, Congress authorized the creation of a unit of volunteer soldiers on the island. Then, in 1920, the unit was redesignated as the 65th Infantry Regiment of the United States Army, and it served as the Nation’s last segregated unit, composed mainly of Hispanic soldiers coming from Puerto Rico.

Members of this regiment—commonly known as The Borinqueneers after the Taino word for “Puerto Rico” meaning “land of the brave lord”—represent the best of our island’s proud and rich tradition of military service.

Despite their relatively limited combat service in World War II, the regiment suffered casualties defending against enemy attacks. Individual soldiers from this unit earned one Distinguished Service Cross, two Silver Stars, two Bronze Stars, and 90 Purple Hearts.

However, it was during the Korean war that the 65th Infantry Regiment’s patriotism and courage came to be widely known and admired.

Fighting as a segregated unit from 1950 until 1952, the Borinqueneers participated in some of the fiercest and toughest battles of the war.

The Borinqueneers not only fought the enemy on the battlefield, but they also had to overcome negative stereotypes held by some of their commanders and fellow soldiers.

Brigadier General William Harris, who commanded the regiment during the early stages of the Korean war, would recall that he had been reluctant to assume command of the unit just because of the prejudice within the military, but that his experience eventually led him to regard the members of the 65th Infantry Regiment as the best soldiers he had ever seen.

General Douglas MacArthur, commander in chief of the United Nations Command in Korea, would similarly write that “The Puerto Ricans forming the ranks of the gallant 65th Infantry give daily proof on the battlefields of Korea of their courage, determination, and resolute will to victory, their invincible loyalty to the United States and their fervent devotion to those immutable principles of human relations which the Americans of the continent and Puerto Rico have in common. They are writing a brilliant record of her-

oism in battle, and I am indeed proud to have them under my command. I wish that we could count on many more like them.”

For its extraordinary service during the Korean war, the Borinqueneers received many unit-level awards, including two Presidential Unit Citations. Soldiers in the regiment earned a total of nine Distinguished Service Crosses, approximately 250 Silver Stars, over 600 Bronze Stars, and more than 2,700 Purple Hearts.

Even 60 years later the laurels continued, as Master Sergeant Juan Negron, who served in the 65th Infantry Regiment, was posthumously awarded the Medal of Honor, our Nation’s highest military decoration.

In 2014, actually, this same House enacted legislation to award the Congressional Gold Medal to the Borinqueneers. The 65th, consequently, became the first Hispanic unit and the sole unit from the Korean war to receive this distinction, and they were the last unit to launch a battalion-sized bayonet attack by the U.S. Army.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 2325 allows us to continue honoring the Borinqueneers’ service by designating the U.S. Post Office in San Juan as the “65th Infantry Regiment Post Office Building.”

This recognition is made even more significant when considering that this Federal building is located adjacent to one of Puerto Rico’s main avenues. Do you know the name? It is the 65th Infantry Regiment Avenue. That is how proud we feel about our Borinqueneers.

The story of these soldiers is emblematic of the courage of thousands of Puerto Rican soldiers who, for generations, have fought and bled alongside their fellow Americans to defend the United States across the world.

Madam Speaker, as Puerto Rico’s sole representative in this Congress, I urge my colleagues to join me in further recognizing their sacrifice, their legacy, by supporting this bill.

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

Mr. KELLER. Madam Speaker, I think that Representative GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN articulately pointed out why we should all support H.R. 2325.

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

Mr. ROUDA. Madam Speaker, I, too, encourage my colleagues to support this bill.

Madam Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for leading the minority discussion today, the newest Member of Congress. It is an honor to serve with him.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROUDA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2325.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the

rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REQUEST TO CONSIDER H.R. 2447, JOBS AND PREMIUM PROTECTION ACT

Mrs. WALORSKI. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Energy and Commerce be discharged from further consideration of the bipartisan bill H.R. 2447, the Jobs and Premium 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.

REQUEST TO CONSIDER H.R. 2207, PROTECT MEDICAL INNOVATION ACT

Mrs. WALORSKI. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means be discharged from further consideration of the bipartisan bill H.R. 2207, the Protect Medical Innovation 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.

CONSENSUS CALENDAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker’s designation, pursuant to clause 7(a)(1) of rule XV, of H.R. 748 as the measure on the Consensus Calendar to be considered this week.

MIDDLE CLASS HEALTH BENEFITS TAX REPEAL ACT OF 2019

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 748) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on high cost employer-sponsored health coverage, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 748

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 “Middle Class Health Benefits Tax Repeal Act of 2019”.

SEC. 2. REPEAL OF EXCISE TAX ON HIGH COST EMPLOYER-SPONSORED HEALTH COVERAGE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 43 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking section 4980I.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 6051 of such Code is amended—
(A) by striking “section 4980I(d)(1)” in subsection (a)(14) and inserting “subsection (g)”, and

(B) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(g) APPLICABLE EMPLOYER-SPONSORED COVERAGE.—For purposes of subsection (a)(14)—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘applicable employer-sponsored coverage’ means, with respect to any employee, coverage under any group health plan made available to the employee by an employer which is excludable from the employee’s gross income under section 106, or would be so excludable if it were employer-provided coverage (within the meaning of such section 106).

“(2) EXCEPTIONS.—The term ‘applicable employer-sponsored coverage’ shall not include—

“(A) any coverage (whether through insurance or otherwise) described in section 9832(c)(1) (other than subparagraph (G) thereof) or for long-term care,

“(B) any coverage under a separate policy, certificate, or contract of insurance which provides benefits substantially all of which are for treatment of the mouth (including any organ or structure within the mouth) or for treatment of the eye, or

“(C) any coverage described in section 9832(c)(3) the payment for which is not excludable from gross income and for which a deduction under section 162(l) is not allowable.

“(3) COVERAGE INCLUDES EMPLOYEE PAID PORTION.—Coverage shall be treated as applicable employer-sponsored coverage without regard to whether the employer or employee pays for the coverage.

“(4) GOVERNMENTAL PLANS INCLUDED.—Applicable employer-sponsored coverage shall include coverage under any group health plan established and maintained primarily for its civilian employees by the Government of the United States, by the government of any State or political subdivision thereof, or by any agency or instrumentality of any such government.”

(2) Section 9831(d)(1) of such Code is amended by striking “except as provided in section 4980I(f)(4)”.

(3) The table of sections for chapter 43 of such Code is amended by striking the item relating to section 4980I.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2019.

SEC. 3. BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

(a) STATUTORY PAYGO SCORECARDS.—The budgetary effects of this Act shall not be entered on either PAYGO scorecard maintained pursuant to section 4(d) of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010.

(b) SENATE PAYGO SCORECARDS.—The budgetary effects of this Act shall not be entered on any PAYGO scorecard maintained for purposes of section 4106 of H. Con. Res. 71 (115th Congress).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on this bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 748, the Middle Class Health Benefits Tax Repeal Act of 2019.

After a decade of fiercely debating the merits of the Affordable Care Act, I hope we have turned a corner today and can now focus on strengthening the parts of the law that work in the manner we had intended and changing the parts of the law, which is not unusual, that we believe could be improved.

This legislation, tirelessly championed by Representative JOE COURTNEY of Connecticut, with 367 bipartisan cosponsors, addresses the so-called “Cadillac tax,” a part of the law that had the unintended consequences of reducing healthcare benefits that were provided to certain American workers.

More than 181 million Americans currently depend upon employer-sponsored health insurance. That is the majority of the American people, including retirees, low-and moderate-income families, public-sector employees, small business owners, and nonprofit workers.

While the name “Cadillac tax” implies this excise tax only applies to luxury health coverage, the truth is it will eventually apply to almost every American with employer-sponsored health insurance.

At a time when American families are already worried about the healthcare costs that apply to them, the Cadillac tax has had the effect of increasing deductibles and out-of-pocket costs as employers make changes in their plans designed to avoid the tax.

We have also found that the Cadillac tax affects health plans that have higher numbers of workers with chronic diseases or serious illnesses, that cover more than a million women or families, or that offer coverage to part-time workers because premiums for those plans are often higher.

This was not the goal of this tax when it was originally included in the ACA. I know because I helped to negotiate and to write the Affordable Care Act.

Congress wanted to encourage employers and insurance companies to find ways to offer better coverage at lower costs. And, while many actions in the ACA did bend the cost curve, leading to better care and slower cost growth, this excise tax, indeed, did not.

We want employers to cover their workers with robust, meaningful benefits. A good American job with a strong health benefit is part of security.

Employers want this for their employees, labor wants this for their members, and American workers and their families want to know they can get the care they need when they need it.

This legislation, as I noted earlier, has strong bipartisan support with a di-

verse group of stakeholder organizations endorsing the legislation, from labor to chamber of commerce to patient organizations.

If we fail to repeal the Cadillac tax, we will leave working families with less healthcare coverage, higher out-of-pocket healthcare costs, and little to no resultant wage increases.

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

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, this is a great day for us. We worked with Chairman NEAL on this and JOE COURTNEY. I don’t normally go out on a limb, but it is nice to see a bunch of Irish guys get together—I am not sure you can say that anymore in the people’s House—to make sure that we are protecting so many people who have earned healthcare through their employer.

I think the last couple days, if you were to look at what happened here in the House and you were to go back home and talk to people back home, they would ask, “Can’t you guys get along on anything? Can’t you put away these things you fight over and actually start to talk about the things that help us? Can’t you do things like that?”

We have watched it, Madam Speaker, and I am sure people are back home saying, “They can’t do anything.”

Well, I am here to tell you today that is just not true. You are going to see a bipartisan effort today on a bipartisan bill to make sure that hardworking Americans get to keep their employer-sponsored healthcare.

Those are people in labor unions. Those are people in everyday businesses: small businesses, big businesses, all across the board.

What we are doing today is a move in the right direction. What we are doing today is truly bipartisan, and we hope it becomes bicameral.

Today you are going to see both Republicans and Democrats come together to do the right thing for the right reasons, and good things are going to come of that.

It just doesn’t get any better than this, especially at a time when you go back home and people just look at us and say, “Holy smokes. On the floor of the people’s House, you guys can’t get along on anything?”

Well, we are. We are going to get along on something. And we are going to do something that is really big, and we are going to pass H.R. 748, the Middle Class Health Benefits Tax Repeal Act. It is also known as the Cadillac tax.

I happen to be a Cadillac dealer. Cadillac has forever been described as the standard of the world.

The healthcare piece we are talking about is a standard of the world. And so many times in the past it was described as, this is just too darn generous for generations of people who

went to the bargaining table and negotiated, as part of their labor agreements, healthcare.

□ 1630

Too generous? Too good?

For all those who thought that was a good statement or a good idea, that is just too bad because it was terrible. It made no sense.

Today, we are going to change that. We are going to take the time we have today on the floor to talk about it, to talk to our colleagues and say we all need to be on board with this.

By the way, the gentleman knows this because we have been working on it for a long time. It is the gentleman's bill this session, but it has gone back and forth, depending on who the majority is.

This is the end of today's talking when it comes to partisan gridlock because it is not going to happen. Much like Mark Twain when he was overseas one time, in London, and somebody printed in the paper that Mark Twain was not only ill but that he had died. Mark Twain replied, "The reports of my death are greatly exaggerated."

Let's use that today when we talk about the fact that we can't get along here in the people's House.

The gentleman and I have worked hard on this. Last Congress, we had 304 cosponsors. This Congress, our legislation has more than 370 cosponsors. That is the majority of both parties, Democratic and Republican.

Our bill is going to repeal this onerous tax, originally passed as part of the Affordable Care Act, that would have been assessed on any health plan that would provide more than \$10,200 for individual coverage, \$27,500 for family coverage.

I deplore the fact that it was called too generous for hardworking Americans who get up every day and go off to work to make sure they can put a roof over the head of their family, food on the table, clothes on the backs of their kids, and somehow plan for the future. If that is a bad benefit, I want to see what a good one looks like.

According to researchers, it is projected—I think Chairman NEAL just went over some of these numbers—that 75 percent of employer-sponsored health plans would be affected if we allow this tax to stand.

That was put in the Affordable Care Act, but it was never enforced. Today, we have a chance to do away with it fully, just repeal it. That is what we are trying to get to.

The groups that support this legislation go across the board. There are millions of workers waiting for us to do something today to act in their best interests. More than 665 organizations have weighed in, in support of repealing this tax.

It is absolutely an incredible effort that is going to take place today. I can't say this enough: It is a bipartisan effort by the majority of both parties to get this done for hardworking Amer-

icans, to protect not only themselves but their families.

It is a benefit of generational negotiations. It is an incredible piece of legislation that we are going to get through today.

I could keep talking about this forever. I can't wait to get back home again to tell people we got it done. Keep in mind, I am going to say that "we got it done," not that "I got it done."

I have never seen another place where people take credit for legislation that they had nothing to do with, that they kind of inherited from previous sessions and say, "Well, this is my bill."

This is not my bill. This is a bill that we have been trying to pull off for many, many years, not just me, not just JOE COURTNEY, but together, all of us, Republicans and Democrats, acting in the best interests of the people we represent here on the floor of the people's House.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Washington (Ms. DELBENE) is designated to control the balance of the time and is recognized.

There was no objection.

Ms. DELBENE. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY), the lead sponsor of this legislation.

Mr. COURTNEY. Madam Speaker, I thank Congresswoman DELBENE for her leadership managing this bill and the Ways and Means Committee for embracing it. Their advocacy sends a powerful message to the House to pass the Middle Class Health Benefits Tax Repeal Act of 2019.

I also thank my friend, Representative MIKE KELLY, for his bipartisan support of the bill, defying the polarized politics that too often dominates the healthcare debate.

Madam Speaker, this bill today comes with the support of more than 660 healthcare groups that represent millions of Americans who have joined together to repeal the 40 percent excise tax on health plans scheduled to go into effect in 2022.

Madam Speaker, this tax was a late add-on to the Affordable Care Act deliberations and has been rattling around inoperable in the Federal Tax Code since 2010, never actually having collected a penny of revenue but, nonetheless, casting a statutory shadow over 180 million Americans' health plans, which we know, from HR administrators and employee reps in real life, has added pressure to shift coverage into higher deductible plans, which falls on the backs of working Americans.

As the Commonwealth Fund recently reported, the number of Americans who are underinsured as a result of high deductibles has grown by over 50 percent since 2005. The Kaiser Family Foundation just reported that 31 per-

cent of employer health plans will get hit by the excise tax in 2022, and that number will skyrocket soon after.

Passage of this bill will lift the shadow that hangs over employer-sponsored plans and stop the high deductible trend from worsening.

As the bill's lead sponsor, I want to foot stomp that the repeal of the tax does not touch the architecture of the ACA's patient protections. Repeal is completely severable from the other 440 sections of the law and leaves intact essential health benefits and the elimination of preexisting condition exclusions and lifetime limits.

Given that those patient protections have been in full operation for the last 10 years, during which this zombie tax has been in a coma, it is abundantly clear that the tax is disconnected from the rest of the law.

Lastly, I want to underscore the CBO determination that passage will not result in any increase in the number of uninsured.

Madam Speaker, with 370 House cosponsors, I am hopeful that an overwhelming tally tonight will send a laser-like message to the Senate to adopt this bill as soon as possible, as is.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD letters from Families USA, a strong advocate for the ACA, as well as the Council of Insurance Agents & Brokers, in support of the bill, and a 2009 letter signed by 188 supporters of the ACA in support of this repeal of the excise tax.

FAMILIESUSA,
July 15, 2019.

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

Hon. KEVIN MCCARTHY,
Minority Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER PELOSI AND LEADER MCCARTHY: On behalf of Families USA, a leading national voice for health care consumers, I write to offer our support for legislation that will be considered by the full House of Representatives this week, H.R. 748, the Middle Class Health Benefits Tax Repeal Act of 2019. This bipartisan legislation would repeal the excise tax on high value employer-sponsored health care coverage, also known as the "Cadillac Tax". At a time when almost half of our nation's families report that they are forgoing needed medical care because they cannot afford the care, policymakers should make sure that employers doing the right thing and providing high value health insurance to their employees are supported, not penalized with an egregious tax.

More than 181 million people—a majority of the country—receive employer-sponsored insurance. The Affordable Care Act (ACA) included a provision to impose a 40 percent excise tax on high-cost and high-value employer-sponsored insurance (ESI) coverage. This provision was recently delayed for a second time, until 2022. While the tax would be levied on employers, experts expect its costs largely would be shifted to employees and their families.

The Cadillac Tax is built on the supposition that by exposing our nation's families to even more financial vulnerability in their health care, families will manage to bring their own health care costs down. Creating greater financial insecurity for families is

not the answer. It is the primary responsibility of policy makers, the health care sector, and the government to solve the health care cost crisis. And your constituents agree. More than 80 percent of people in this nation—both Democrats and Republicans—believe it's the responsibility of the government to get control of out-of-control health care costs.

H.R. 748 is an important opportunity for Congress to support high quality health care and the employers that provide it. In recent years, deductibles in ESI plans have risen considerably while costs have continued to grow. The so-called "Cadillac Tax" creates the wrong incentive to employers around the nation. What we need now is higher value insurance, not lower value coverage.

H.R. 748 has widespread, bipartisan support, and boasts 361 cosponsors, including 199 Democrats and 162 Republicans. We urge the House of Representatives to support working families and the employers providing these families high quality health insurance and pass H.R. 748 when it comes to the floor.

Sincerely,

FREDERICK ISASI,
Executive Director.

THE COUNCIL,
July 15, 2019.

Re H.R. 748, The Middle Class Health Benefits Tax Repeal Act of 2019.

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

DEAR MADAME SPEAKER: On behalf of The Council of Insurance Agents and Brokers ("The Council"), I write to express our members' strong support for H.R. 748, The Middle Class Health Benefits Tax Repeal Act of 2019. The legislation repeals the looming "Cadillac Tax" that undermines the employer sponsored insurance market. The "Cadillac tax" is a 40% tax on the value of employer-sponsored health coverage that exceeds certain benefit thresholds—estimated to be \$11,100 for self-only coverage and \$29,750 for family coverage in 2022. We thank Congressman Joe Courtney and Mike Kelly for their leadership on this important issue, and urge members of the House of Representatives to support H.R. 748.

By way of background, The Council represents the largest and most successful employee benefits and property/casualty agencies and brokerage firms. Council member firms annually place more than \$300 billion in commercial insurance business in the United States and abroad. Council members conduct business in some 30,000 locations and employ upwards of 350,000 people worldwide. In addition, Council members specialize in a wide range of insurance products and risk management services for business, industry, government, and the public.

The "Cadillac Tax," has been delayed twice by Congress to protect Americans from its harmful impact. But the latest implementation date of 2022 continues to cause an adverse effect on the affordability and quality of health coverage available to employees and their families. The Kaiser Family Foundation notes that deductibles have risen 89% since 2010, while wage growth has remained comparatively flat.

The tax was intended to impact Americans with "gold-plated" plans, but the reality is that very modest plans covering low- and moderate-income working families will trigger the tax. More than 181 million Americans—including retirees, low- and moderate-income families, public-sector employees, small business owners, nonprofit workers and the self-employed—currently depend on employer-provided health coverage. Employer provided coverage covers more Ameri-

cans than Medicare and Medicaid combined. This tax has real and harmful consequences—Americans cannot afford to pay more for their health care.

Thank you again for your continued efforts to address these important issues.

Best,

KEN A. CRERAR,
President/CEO, The Council.
JOEL WOOD,
SVP, Government Affairs, The Council.
JOEL KOPPERUD,
VP, Government Affairs, The Council.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, October 7, 2009.

Speaker PELOSI,
Office of the Speaker,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER PELOSI: As Congress continues to consider revenue sources for America's Affordable Health Choices Act and other health insurance reform proposals, we strongly encourage you to reject imposing an excise tax on so called high cost insurance plans. Such a tax would impact regions with high health care costs in the short-term, and, in the long-term, inevitably extend to more and more middle-income Americans across the country.

As you know, the Senate Finance Committee reform proposal, America's Healthy Future Act, currently includes a 40 percent excise tax on insurers for plans that exceed certain cost thresholds. Real life experience with both health insurers and inelastic markets for services such as health insurance has clearly warned us that this tax will be passed along to insurance payers. Beginning in 2013, the threshold for individual plans will be \$8,000 and \$21,000 for family coverage. In subsequent years, increases in the cost thresholds will be tied to the Consumer Price Index for urban consumers (CPI-U) plus one percent. The proposal also includes a transition relief rule, which will set cost thresholds 20 percent higher for the 17 highest cost states. The transition relief rule will be phased out by 2016. It is important to note that the proposed thresholds for such a tax already have been surpassed for many middle-income Americans in 2009.

For middle-income Americans that have forgone wage and salary increases for strong insurance benefits, these thresholds are simply too low. And, for middle-income Americans who live in the nation's highest cost regions for health care, the transition relief rule is also too low and phased out far too soon.

A Commonwealth Fund report issued on August 20, 2009, "Paying the Price: How Health Insurance Premiums Are Eating Up Middle-Class Incomes," outlined projected increases in insurance premiums if nothing is done to change the current cost trajectory. According to the report, average insurance premiums will increase 94 percent over the next ten years, with average annual increases of 5.7 percent. The report went on to conclude that average premium costs for family coverage in 2015 will range from \$15,508 in the lowest cost state to \$19,731 in the highest cost state. Considering high and low cost states will be treated the same with regard to the proposed excise tax in 2015, the average premium projections in high cost regions teeter on the projected cost thresholds of the excise tax.

Further, the lessons learned from the alternative minimum tax (AMT) should also serve as a warning for the creation of an excise tax on high cost insurance plans. Over the past four decades, the AMT has morphed from a tax on the wealthiest Americans to a tax on the middle class. In 1969, when the

AMT was first enacted, the tax impacted only the wealthiest of Americans. In 2010, nearly one in five Americans will be subjected to the tax. A similar situation with the proposed excise tax is possible considering our experiences with medical inflation.

While America's Affordable Health Choices Act will work to rein in insurance premium costs, these savings will be generated from long-term fixes and may not substantially mitigate premium costs in the short-term before the costs of such an excise tax are passed from the insurer to the customer, including middle-income families.

Beyond these other arguments, there is a fundamental flaw in assuming a tax on so called high cost plans will sway choice of insurance coverage, and in turn, discourage wasteful health care spending. This assumption is based on access to a substantial choice in coverage, which is certainly not the case under our current system. Today, small employers pay more for a given insurance plan than a large employer—not because of benefit quality or an employees' excessive use of plan benefits, but due to smaller risk pools. While America's Affordable Health Choices Act will help close most of these price discrepancies, this won't be achieved until 2018 when all reforms are enacted. Further, America's Affordable Health Choices Act will allow for continued use of age rating with determining premium costs. While age rating will be restricted, the practice underscores limited choice for cheaper coverage options.

America's Affordable Health Choices Act includes sensible revenue sources to pay for the legislation. However, inclusion of an excise tax on high cost insurance plans, as proposed by the Senate Finance Committee, could have significant and detrimental implications for millions of middle-class Americans. The short-term impact would be greatest on individuals and families living in high cost regions and for those that have sacrificed pay increases for strong benefits. Over the long term, the number of individuals and families subjected to the tax would likely continue to grow. To this end, we urge you to continue to reject proposals to enact an excise tax on high cost insurance plans that could be potentially passed on the middle class families.

We look forward continuing to work with you to advance health care reform legislation that expands coverage and lowers care costs.

Sincerely,

JOE COURTNEY,
TIM WALZ,
ALLYSON SCHWARTZ,
MIKE ROSS.

COSIGNATORIES (190)

Courtney, Joe; Abercrombie, Neil; Ackerman, Gary; Andrews, Robert; Arcuri, Mike; Baca, Joe; Baldwin, Tammy; Berkley, Shelly; Bishop, Sanford; Bishop, Tim; Blumenauer, Earl; Boccieri, John; Boren, Dan; Boswell, Leonard; Boucher, Rick; Brady, Robert; Braley, Bruce; Brown, Corrine; Capps, Lois; Capuano, Michael; Cardoza, Dennis; Carnahan, Russ; Carson, Andre; Chandler, Ben; Christensen, Donna; Chu, Judy; Clarke, Yvette; Clay, Lacy; Cleaver, Emanuel; Cohen, Steve; Conyers, John; Costello, Jerry; Crowley, Joseph; Cummings, Elijah; Dahlkemper, Kathy; Davis, Danny; Davis, Lincoln; DeFazio, Peter; Delahunt, Bill; DeLauro, Rosa; Dicks, Norman; Dingell, John; Doggett, Lloyd; Doyle, Mike; Driehaus, Steve; Edwards, Donna; Ellison, Keith; Ellsworth, Brad; Engel, Eliot; Eshoo, Anna; Farr, Sam; Fattah, Chaka; Filner, Bob.

Foster, Bill; Frank, Barney; Fudge, Marcia; Gonzalez, Charles; Garamendi, John;

Grayson, Alan; Green, Al; Green Gene; Grijalva, Raul; Gutierrez, Luis; Hall, John; Halvorson, Debbie; Hare, Phil; Harman, Jane; Hastings, Alcee; Heinrich, Martin; Higgins, Brian; Himes, Jim; Hinchey, Maurice; Hirono, Mazie; Hodes, Paul; Holden, Tim; Holt, Rush; Honda, Mike; Inslee, Jay; Israel, Steve; Jackson Jr., Jesse; Jackson-Lee, Sheila; Johnson, Eddie Bernice; Johnson, Hank; Kagen, Steve; Kaptur, Marcy; Kennedy, Patrick; Kildee, Dale; Kilpatrick, Carolyn Cheeks; Kilroy, Mary Jo; Kucinich, Dennis; Langevin, James; Larson, John; Lee, Barbara; Levin, Sander; Lewis, John; Lipinski, Dan.

Loeb sack, David; Lofgren, Zoe; Lowey, Nita; Lujan, Ben; Lynch, Stephen; Maffei, Dan; Maloney, Carolyn; Markey, Edward; Massa, Eric; Matsui, Doris; McCarthy, Carolyn; McCollum, Betty; McDermott, Jim; McGovern, Jim; McMahan, Michael; Meek, Kendrick; Meeks, Gregory; Michaud, Michael; Miller, Brad; Miller, George; Mollohan, Alan; Moore, Dennis; Moore, Gwen; Murphy, Chris; Murphy, Scott; Murtha, John; Nadler, Jerrold; Napolitano, Grace; Neal, Richard; Norton, Elanore Holmes; Oberstar, James; Olver, John; Ortiz, Solomon; Owens, Bill; Pascrell, Bill; Pastor, Ed; Payne, Donald; Perlmutter, Ed; Perriello, Thomas; Peters, Gary; Pingree, Chellie; Quigley, Mike; Rahall, Nicek; Reyes, Silvestre; Richardson, Laura; Rodriguez, Ciro; Ross, Mike.

Rothman, Steve; Royal-Allard, Lucille; Rush, Bobby; Ryan, Tim; Salazar, John; Sanchez, Linda; Sanchez, Loreta; Sarbanes, John; Schakowsky, Janice; Schauer, Mark; Schiff, Adam; Schrader, Kurt; Schwartz, Allison; Scott, Bobby; Scott, David; Serrano, Jose; Sestak, Joe; Shea-Porter, Carol; Sherman, Brad; Shuler, Health; Sires, Albio; Slaughter, Louise; Space, Zach; Speier, Jackie; Stark, Peter; Stupak, Bart; Sutton, Betty; Teague, Harry; Thompson, Bennie; Tierney, John; Titus, Dina; Tonko, Paul; Towns, Edolphus; Van Hollen, Chris; Velazquez, Nydia; Visclosky, Peter; Walz, Tim; Wasserman Shultz, Debbie; Waters, Maxine; Watson, Diane; Weiner, Anthony; Welch, Peter; Wexler, Robert; Wilson, Charlie; Woolsey, Lynn; Wu, David; Yarmuth, John.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. NUNES).

Mr. NUNES. Madam Speaker, I thank Mr. KELLY for giving me time to speak in support of H.R. 748, the Middle Class Health Benefits Tax Repeal Act of 2019. This bill will provide much-needed relief from one of the most burdensome and blunt taxes in ObamaCare.

By repealing this tax, we will save employers from paying a 40 percent tax on high-cost employer-sponsored health coverage. The bill will provide much-needed relief not only for employers but for employees, some of whom are low-income earners with high-cost health benefits who are forced to bear the repercussions of this tax.

That said, I am disappointed that the majority chose not to repeal the medical device tax or the health insurance tax, both of which are harming hard-working Americans across the country.

The medical device tax is a 2.3 percent excise tax on the value of medical devices sold domestically. Making life-saving products more expensive is not good policy and should be included in this repeal bill.

The health insurance tax, or HIT, is a more than \$100 billion sales tax on pri-

vate health insurance that affects every private plan in the country. At a time when we are all trying to lower the cost of healthcare, why are the Democrats in the majority preventing us from removing this unnecessary and burdensome tax?

This bill could do so much more, but I am happy that the majority is finally admitting that the ObamaCare tax increases are bad for the country and that good tax policy doesn't need to be replaced with more bad tax hikes.

At a time when much of our healthcare system is failing, when healthcare costs are still unaffordable for many, when Medicare will be insolvent within a decade, and when Medicaid's uncontrollable costs are bankrupting our States, it still leaves millions of low- and middle-income earners without access to doctors. We should be working harder to provide more access and choice to the American people in a fiscally responsible way.

Madam Speaker, I support the repeal of this tax, and I urge adoption of the bill.

Ms. DELBENE. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON).

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Madam Speaker, I commend my colleague on the Ways and Means Committee, MIKE KELLY, for his hard work and diligence in bringing this bill to the floor, as he acknowledged, in a bipartisan way.

I think the gentleman and everybody in this body understand and respect the persistence, hard work, and dedication of JOE COURTNEY. From its introduction and inception, from its first letter to its more than 370 sponsors, ultimately, he has demonstrated that, yes, in this body, we can arrive at solutions across the aisle, working together in the common interest of every American citizen.

JOE COURTNEY was chairman of the Public Health Committee in the Connecticut Legislature. He has forgotten more about these programs than most people will ever remember. But it is his diligence, persistence, and ability to work across the aisle that has brought this legislation here today to be passed unanimously.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. ESTES).

Mr. ESTES. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 748, the Middle Class Health Benefits Tax Repeal Act of 2019.

This important bill repeals the so-called Cadillac tax, a policy implemented through ObamaCare that would have placed a 40 percent tax on high-cost employer healthcare plans.

The tax was originally included as a way to help pay for the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, commonly called ObamaCare, by targeting expensive health plans and insurance companies. However, in practice, it would have been middle-class workers bearing the real burden to pay for it

through taxes. It would have hurt union members, nonunion members, small businesses, and nonprofits.

In fact, the Joint Committee on Taxation and the Congressional Budget Office predicted that a whopping 70 percent of the revenue collected by the Cadillac tax would have come from higher income and payroll taxes rather than excise taxes on insurers.

This massive tax increase would have devastated middle-class workers and families, many of whom continue to struggle with the rising costs of ObamaCare as it is.

I thank my colleagues for realizing the bad implications of this failed policy and for working in a bipartisan way to repeal the Cadillac tax.

I am hopeful that today's action will allow us to move forward to address similar policies, like the health insurance tax and the medical device tax.

Instead of propping up the failed Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act through higher taxes and reduced choices, we must get serious about improving healthcare and our economy.

Madam Speaker, I believe H.R. 748 is a great first step, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Ms. DELBENE. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

Mr. PASCRELL. Madam Speaker, I include the letters that I have in my hand in the RECORD.

INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION OF PROFESSIONAL & TECHNICAL ENGINEERS, AFL-CIO & CLC,

Washington, DC, July 15, 2019.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of 90,000 workers represented by the International Federation of Professional and Technical Engineers (IFPTE), we are writing to urge you to vote for the passage of H.R. 748, the Middle Class Health Benefits Tax Repeal Act. This important bipartisan legislation repeals the 40 percent "Cadillac Tax" on high-cost employer-sponsored health care plans—set to take effect in 2022—that millions of working and retired Americans depend on.

Since the 40 percent excise tax was enacted as part of the Patient Protection & Affordable Care Act, out of pocket health care costs have continued to increase faster than wages. At the bargaining table, workers in all sectors of the economy are accepting lower or no pay increases, and cuts to other important benefits in exchange for an employer-provided health benefit that is both affordable and meets the health needs of their families. If this tax is not repealed, millions of workers and retirees will see the gains from these tradeoffs fall by the wayside, while the underlying issues driving health care costs will go unaddressed.

Analysis by the Congressional Research Service and the Congressional Budget Office shows that the costs of this tax will be passed onto workers in the form of lower wages, reduced benefits, and the loss of coverage options. Even though the excise tax has not taken effect yet, it has already affected the benefits and quality of employer-sponsored health insurance. Employers themselves admit that they have little appetite for providing a health care benefits that could end up triggering the 40% excise tax. In anticipation of the tax's original effective date in 2018, the American Health Policy Institute reported in 2015 that "Almost 90 percent of large employers are taking steps to

try to prevent their company from having a plan that triggers the excise tax.” In the federal sector, the OPM’s Federal Employees Health Benefits Program carrier guidance tells insurance companies to design plans to avoid triggering the excise tax.

If the excise tax is allowed to take effect, it will further burden working families instead of addressing the factors that continue to drive up the cost of health care. As it stands, the excise tax will go into effect in 2022 on plans that exceed annual limits of \$11,500 for individual coverage and \$31,100 for family coverage and will be chained to inflation. By and large, plans that will be subject to the excise tax have high costs not due to generous benefits, but because of demographic factors, geographic disparities, market concentration, and risk pool size.

H.R. 748 has board support from affected stakeholders, including unions, public and private sector employers, health advocacy organizations, and health insurance providers. Today, a bipartisan majority in the House recognizes that the excise tax will result in reduced health benefits and coverage options, lower wages and pension benefits, hurt employers who are trying to provide competitive benefits to employees, while failing to address the real cost drivers in the health care system.

Therefore, we urge you to vote for H.R. 748. Sincerely,

PAUL SHEARON,
President.

MATTHEW BIGGS,
*Secretary-Treasurer/
Legislative Director.*

INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF
MACHINISTS
AND AEROSPACE WORKERS,
Upper Marlboro, MD, July 15, 2019.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers (IAM), I strongly urge you to support working families and vote “Yes” on the bipartisan Middle Class Health Benefits Tax Repeal of 2019, H.R. 748. This vital legislation introduced by Representatives Joe Courtney (D-CT) and Mike Kelly (R-PA) would rightly repeal the 40% health benefits tax on employer-sponsored healthcare before working Americans and their families are further impacted by this onerous tax.

In a time where so many Americans are feeling the pinch of rising healthcare costs, the so-called “Cadillac Tax”, as it is commonly known, is a gut punch directed squarely at the middle class and working families. Despite several delays in its implementation, millions of Americans are already feeling the impact of the 40 percent health benefits tax. They feel its impact at the doctor’s office and at the bargaining table as employers increase deductibles, reduce benefits, and drop plan options to prepare for the tax’s looming threat. In order to halt its harmful repercussions on American workers, the tax must not simply be further delayed, but swiftly repealed.

Originally, the 40% health benefits tax was intended only to be levied only on “gold-plated” health insurance plans with very rich benefits. However, the realities of continued medical cost inflation, an aging workforce, and new medical technologies are pushing the cost of even modest plans above the tax’s threshold. We also know that the impact of the tax would disproportionately burden certain demographics that often face higher healthcare premiums. Plans hit by the tax often cover more female employees, more workers with dependent children, more senior workers, employees at smaller businesses, and employees with physically demanding jobs.

To be clear, it is not employers or insurance companies who will end up shouldering the tax’s burden; it is workers and middle-class families who end up floating the bill for this regressive tax. Researchers at CUNY School of Public Health found the 40 percent health benefits tax will “disproportionately harm families with incomes between \$38,550 and \$100,000, while sparing the wealthy”. This tax will only serve to increase healthcare costs and reduce benefits for working Americans in a time where they simply cannot afford to pay more for less coverage.

For all of these reasons, I urge you to support working families and vote “Yes” on H.R. 748, the Middle Class Health Benefits Tax Repeal of 2019.

Thank you,

ROBERT MARTINEZ, Jr.,
International President.

INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD
OF TEAMSTERS,
Washington, DC, July 15, 2019.
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: This week, the House of Representatives will consider H.R. 748, the Middle Class Health Benefits Tax Repeal Act of 2019. On behalf of the more than 1.4 million members of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, I ask you to vote yes on H.R. 748. This bipartisan legislation would repeal the excise tax on high value employer sponsored health insurance (ESI), often referred to as the “Cadillac Tax”.

The Teamsters have long opposed proposals that tax worker health benefits. Attempts to tax employer provided health care benefits through the 40 percent excise tax on high quality health care plans reduce the health benefits that hard working Americans receive and increase their out of pocket costs. Policy makers should not penalize, with an egregious tax, employers that do the right thing and provide high value health insurance to their workers.

More than 181 million people (a majority of the country) receive employer sponsored insurance. While the tax is “levied” on employers, experts expect costs largely to be shifted to workers and their families. And, it is unconscionable that hard working Americans will continue to have this 40 percent penalty on benefits that they have fought hard to achieve/receive looming over them. While this tax does not take effect until 2022, having twice been delayed by Congress, this egregious tax is already hollowing out the benefits of working people who have employment-based coverage. Indeed, employers are already scaling back their health care benefits and offerings, and/or increasing workers’ out of pocket costs.

In recent years, deductibles and out of pocket costs of ESI plans have risen considerably, while costs continue to grow. According to the CUNY School of Public Health research, the health benefits tax predominantly impacts the middle class. Congress should be looking for ways to strengthen the middle class instead of promoting policies that will ultimately take money from their hard earned paychecks and reduce, and make more costly, the health care benefits they receive.

I call on you to support the full and permanent repeal of the so-called “Cadillac Tax”. I hope that I can report to our members that you stood with the International Brotherhood of Teamsters family to pass this important legislation. Vote yes on H.R. 748.

Sincerely,

JAMES P. HOFFA,
General President.

INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION

OF FIRE FIGHTERS,

Washington, DC, July 16, 2019.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The International Association of Fire Fighters represents more than 316,000 professional fire fighters and emergency medical personnel, working in every state in the nation. We strongly support the bipartisan Middle-Class Health Benefits Tax Repeal Act of 2019 (HR 748) and request that you vote YES this Wednesday when it is considered under suspension of the rules.

Voting yes on HR 748 would repeal the 40 percent tax on employer-provided health insurance and protect the healthcare that so many public safety workers have fought to get and protect.

This ill-conceived tax was originally sold to lower and slow the rate of healthcare costs. What the tax actually does is shift more costs onto consumers through higher deductibles, copays and coinsurance. Taxing health plans with high premiums will do nothing to drive down costs because the real drivers of those costs are age, gender and geography. As a result, this tax will punish fire fighters based on who they work with or where they live, and that is both bad policy and unfair to workers.

Proponents of the tax argued it would only target the richest Americans, but that too turned out to be untrue. Most plans that would fall victim to this tax cover working class, middle-income Americans. Fire fighters in particular, fall into this category. The dangerous nature and high risks associated with working in the fire service make fire fighters’ health plans critically important; workers will often choose to protect their health care over increased pay.

Taxing health benefits will undermine an integral component of our health care system. One of the primary reasons why most Americans receive health care coverage through their employer is owed to the fact that their benefits are not taxed. At the risk of weakening health benefits, depressing wages and burdening workers with higher taxes, we should not support policies that tax health care for American workers.

While the tax does not go into effect until 2022, the IAFF seeks its immediate repeal. Many of our members negotiate multi-year contracts that are directly impacted by the eventual implementation of this tax. The time for incremental relief is over. Congress must pass HR 748 and fully repeal the excise tax on employer-provided health insurance.

When the House votes tomorrow on this measure, I ask that you stand with all public safety workers and vote YES. Thank you for your considered support on this important issue.

Respectfully,

HAROLD A. SCHAIBERGER,
General President.

INTERNATIONAL UNION
OF OPERATING ENGINEERS,
July 16, 2019.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Washington, DC.

Hon. KEVIN MCCARTHY,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER PELOSI AND LEADER MCCARTHY: On behalf of 400,000 members of the International Union of Operating Engineers and their families, I respectfully request that you support H.R. 748, the Middle Class Health Benefits Tax Repeal Act of 2019.

The International Union of Operating Engineers (IUOE) represents nearly 400,000 working men and women in the United States and Canada, thousands of whom would be affected by this 40% tax on high-cost health insurance premiums.

As you know, Congress has acted twice to delay this tax—its current effective date is

January 1, 2022—but multi-year collective bargaining negotiations are now underway and the uncertainty surrounding the possible imposition of the tax is already pushing employers to hollow out the health-care benefits of their workers. The excise tax on high-premium health plans should be permanently repealed.

Proponents of the tax argued that it would incentivize employers to move away from “overly generous” health care coverage. They argued that forcing workers to have more “skin in the game” would reduce “overutilization” of health care services, forcing people to consider the financial implications of seeking care. Surveys of employers over the years have shown that they have reduced coverage under their health plans in anticipation of the tax. The tax, however, would have no effect on a “unit cost” of health care.

In the decade since the tax was enacted, it is clear that the health care affordability crisis now affects millions of individuals with employment-based coverage. From 2008–2018, the general annual deductible for family coverage has increased 212 percent, while workers’ earnings have only increased 26 percent. This tax is clearly having a negative impact on working families, and its repeal is overdue.

The International Union of Operating Engineers supports H.R. 748 and respectfully requests that you repeal the tax on high-cost health insurance premiums as quickly as possible. We believe that permanent repeal of the 40-percent tax should be a top priority for this 116th Congress, and we look forward to working with you to enact it into law.

Thank you for your leadership on this vital issue for Operating Engineers and their families.

Sincerely,

JAMES T. CALLAHAN,
General President.

Mr. PASCRELL. Madam Speaker, I support this legislation, H.R. 748.

During our discussions on health reform in 2009, many of us strongly opposed the excise tax on so-called Cadillac employer-provided health plans. We were successful in keeping it out of the House version of the bill, but we all know it ended up in the final bill. It has been delayed since then, but now it is enactment time. This is imminent. We need to do something now.

The Cadillac tax would impact employers and families whose health insurance plans cost more than \$11,100 for an individual and \$29,750 for family coverage. This is not a small universe, and the effects will be highly negative.

If we do nothing, this tax would fall squarely on employees, encouraging employers to shift away from tax-free health benefits to taxable wages.

As deductibles have risen more than 200 percent in the employer-sponsored insurance plans, the cost of care has continued to grow while wages remain flat. We must ensure that employers can continue to provide high-quality healthcare.

I urge my colleagues to support the bipartisan repeal of the Cadillac tax.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BANKS).

Mr. BANKS. Madam Speaker, this is a historic day. We have finally found a tax that Members and my friends on both sides of the aisle agree needs to be cut.

I am proud to be a cosponsor of today’s legislation, and I am excited that many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle as well are prepared to get rid of this destructive tax that was put in place by ObamaCare.

□ 1645

But while we are at it, while we are repealing ObamaCare taxes, we should include an equally destructive tax in today’s repeal: the medical device tax.

I am very proud to serve the residents of Warsaw in northeast Indiana, the region that is often referred to as the orthopedic capital of the world. Unfortunately, companies in my district and all across this country have been needlessly hampered by the inability of this Congress to fully and permanently repeal the onerous medical device tax. When it was enforced, this tax destroyed 29,000 jobs and caused a \$34 million reduction in investments in life-saving research and development.

So today, while we are here voting on this bipartisan legislation to repeal the Cadillac tax, I ask that all Members of this body be equally mindful in moving swiftly to also repeal the medical device tax.

Ms. DELBENE. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS).

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I strongly support this bill to eliminate the 40 percent tax on high-quality healthcare benefits.

Americans are facing a healthcare affordability crisis. Employers and insurers are already using this tax to justify raising the cost of healthcare for hard-working Americans by increasing copays, deductibles, and out-of-pocket expenses.

In the last decade, annual deductibles for families have exploded by 212 percent, and spending on coinsurance has increased nearly 50 percent. A Kaiser Family survey reveals that these changes create alarming barriers to healthcare for working families, with almost 50 percent of respondents indicating that someone in their family postponed care due to costs.

I stand with the 43 national labor unions and the dozens of patient organizations, healthcare advocates, and business leaders who support this important bill to protect healthcare benefits for American workers. Healthcare is a right. I am pleased to support this bill.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Madam Chair, may I inquire how much time is left.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has 9½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from Washington has 10½ minutes.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. DELBENE. Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD letters of support for H.R. 748.

THE ERISA INDUSTRY COMMITTEE,
Washington, DC, July 15, 2019.

DEAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS: This week, the House is expected to vote on H.R. 748, the

“Middle Class Health Benefits Tax Repeal Act of 2019.” The ERISA Industry Committee (ERIC) is the only national trade association that advocates exclusively for large employer plan sponsors on health, retirement, and compensation public policies on the federal, state, and local levels. ERIC member companies employ workers in every state and community and provide health coverage that is valued and relied upon by families across the country. ERIC urges members of Congress to vote YES and support this legislation.

H.R. 748, supported by more than 360 cosponsors in the House, would eliminate the impending 40% “Cadillac” excise tax on high-cost employer-sponsored health insurance. The tax does not target overly-generous benefits; instead, it attacks plans based upon their costs. As such, plans that insure more individuals with chronic conditions, more seniors, more women, and populations more likely to incur health care costs will be unfairly taxed at an unsustainable rate—as will those based parts of the country where health care is more expensive.

If Congress fails to repeal the Cadillac tax, employers may have to:

Directly shift costs to employees. This could include increasing the portion of the plan premium employees pay, increasing deductibles, copays and coinsurance.

Eliminate employer contributions to consumer-directed accounts. This includes Health Savings Accounts (HSAs), Health Reimbursement Arrangements (HRAs), or Flexible Spending Accounts (FSAs).

Reduce access to care. This includes tightening networks and excluding high-cost providers, implementing barriers to high cost treatments and providers (step therapy, prior authorization), moving expensive medicines deeper into Rx formularies, and eliminating coverage for some medications.

Eliminate coverage for spouses and dependents, and separate out or eliminate excepted benefits. These include dental, vision, hospital indemnity, cancer-only, or other “add-on” benefits.

Drastically redesign plans. For instance, ending preferred provider organization (PPO) or similar plans, and implementing a high-deductible health plan (HDHP) or a health maintenance organization (HMO).

Eliminate investments in health. Investments that plan sponsors make to improve health may save money later, but the costs of those investments could be considered to add value to the plan. As such, plans may consider eliminating on-site clinics, wellness programs, telehealth benefits, health information technology investments, and other health improvement efforts that have up-front costs.

As we have previously reported to Congress, the Cadillac tax is an existential threat to employer-sponsored health benefits. Repealing the Cadillac tax is ERIC’s top priority on behalf of our member companies. While employers support efforts to reduce health care costs, a tax on benefits will do the opposite, making health insurance less affordable for workers, their families, and retirees.

As such, when H.R. 748 comes to a vote, ERIC urges members to vote YES. We look forward to working with Congress to finally repeal this damaging tax, to ensure affordability of health benefits for patients.

Sincerely,

JAMES P. GELFAND.

AMERICAN BENEFITS COUNCIL,
Washington, DC, July 14, 2019.

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

Hon. KEVIN MCCARTHY,
Minority Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER PELOSI AND LEADER MCCARTHY: We are very gratified that the Middle Class Health Benefits Tax Repeal Act (H.R. 748) will be voted upon shortly in the House of Representatives. This widely bipartisan measure sponsored by Representatives Joe Courtney and Mike Kelly would fully and immediately repeal the 40 percent "Cadillac Tax" that threatens the high-value, high-quality health coverage that 181 million Americans receive through employers. We ask that you strongly urge the members of your respective caucuses to support this measure. Passage of H.R. 748 with a large bipartisan majority will send a powerful signal to the Senate of the need to quickly approve this legislation.

The American Benefits Council's members either directly sponsor or support sponsors of health and retirement benefits for virtually all Americans covered by employer-provided plans. Consequently, we are keenly aware of the drastic impact the "Cadillac Tax" would have on health care benefits. We have already witnessed some of the negative consequences, even though the tax does not technically go into effect until 2022.

Starting that year, a 40 percent excise tax will be imposed on employer-sponsored coverage that exceeds certain dollar thresholds. For millions of Americans who rely upon health insurance coverage through an employer, the looming implementation of the tax has already resulted in reduced coverage and increased out-of-pocket costs. The reason for this is, to ensure the impact of the tax on participants is not imposed suddenly and severely in 2022, many employers have already reluctantly been compelled to make plan changes: reducing important benefits or asking workers to assume a larger share of deductibles and copayments. This trend will accelerate without swift action by Congress.

AGC KEY VOTE: VOTE "YES" ON H.R. 748, THE MIDDLE CLASS HEALTH BENEFITS TAX REPEAL ACT OF 2019

JULY 16, 2019.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the Associated General Contractors of America (AGC), I write to urge you to support the Middle Class Health Benefits Tax Repeal Act (H.R. 748). This bipartisan legislation would repeal the 40 percent excise tax on employer-sponsored health coverage and employee benefits under the Affordable Care Act (ACA). Because ensuring the ability to provide affordable health care is a critical issue for the construction industry, AGC reserves the right to record your vote on this bill as a "key vote" for the education of its membership.

The 40 percent excise tax, also known as the "Cadillac tax," would force contractors to cut or limit employee benefits for millions of employees. Though dubbed the Cadillac tax because the provision was targeting "high cost" employer-sponsored health coverage, it is causing an adverse effect on the affordability and quality of health coverage available to construction employees and their families even before it has taken effect.

While we appreciate prior delays of this tax, uncertainty remains in the employer health market as the U.S. Treasury Department begins to develop proposed rules for implementation. As construction employers make health plan decisions well in advance of a coverage year beginning, looming pro-

posed rules have a direct impact on their planning process for the next several coverage years.

AGC supports the affordability and viability of providing employersponsored coverage now and in the future. As such, the 40 percent excise tax should be permanently repealed. Again, AGC reserves the right to record your vote as a "key vote" for the education of its membership.

Sincerely,

JIMMY CHRISTIANSON,
Vice President, Government Relations.

NATIONAL BUSINESS GROUP ON HEALTH,
July 16, 2019.

Hon. JOE COURTNEY (D-CT)
Washington, DC.

Hon. MIKE KELLY (R-PA)
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVES COURTNEY AND KELLY: The National Business Group on Health (Business Group) again writes in strong support of your bipartisan bill (H.R. 748) that would eliminate the 40 percent tax on the value of health benefits above a government-determined amount imposed by the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (ACA), commonly referred to as the "Cadillac Tax". Any tax that raises the cost of health benefits will harm the more than 181 million Americans who rely on and value employer-sponsored health coverage. Even though the Cadillac Tax is delayed to 2022, the Business Group urges the 116th Congress to pass this important bipartisan legislation early in 2019 to provide permanent relief and clarity to employees that this fundamentally flawed tax will not impact their health benefits.

According to our survey data, absent plan changes, 73% of companies who responded will have at least one plan that triggers the tax in 2022 and 94% will in 2026. In a few short years, if the tax is not repealed, it will affect nearly 100% of employer plans since the tax is indexed to general inflation, not medical inflation, which is consistently much higher.

Furthermore, the National Business Group on Health, which represents 440, primarily large, employers (including 75 of the Fortune 100) who voluntarily provide health benefits and other health programs to over 55 million American employees, retirees, and their families, believes that not only is this tax flawed, it is also not the most effective way to tackle rising health care costs. Rather than focus on demand-side taxes that will raise costs for working Americans and their employers, Congress should focus on supply-side drivers of medical inflation and unnecessary.

Sincerely,

BRIAN J. MARCOTTE,
President and CEO.

NATIONAL COALITION ON BENEFITS,
July 17, 2019.

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: The National Coalition on Benefits (NCB), a coalition of businesses and associations committed to protecting the ability of employers to provide uniform employee health benefits across the country, strongly supports the passage of H.R. 748, the "Middle Class Health Benefits Tax Repeal Act of 2019." This legislation would repeal the looming "Cadillac Tax," a 40 percent excise tax imposed on employee health benefits above a certain threshold.

Employers strongly support the full repeal of the Cadillac Tax because this tax inevitably forces the reduction of employee benefits and, because of the flawed indexing provisions of the underlying Affordable Care Act, this tax will affect most plans in a few years, even those with reduced benefits. Em-

ployers devise benefit plans two years in advance of the actual plan year. As a result, employers are being forced now to reduce employee benefits in order to avoid the impending reach of the Cadillac Tax.

Working Americans don't want their health benefits taxed at a time when they're already confronting higher premiums and out-of-pocket costs. Indeed, a 2018 election night poll, conducted by pollster Frank Luntz, highlights that 81 percent of voters oppose taxes on employer-provided health coverage.

The Cadillac Tax presents a direct threat to the more than 181 million Americans who rely on employer-sponsored coverage to meet their health care needs. The NCB thanks Reps. Joe Courtney and Mike Kelly for their dogged and unwavering commitment to repealing this onerous tax on employee benefits and urges the House to approve H.R. 748.

Sincerely,

NATIONAL COALITION ON BENEFITS.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of NFIB, the nation's leading small business advocacy organization, I write in support of H.R. 748, the Middle Class Health Benefits Tax Repeal Act of 2019. This legislation repeals the 40 percent excise tax on employer-sponsored health insurance, also known as the "Cadillac tax." This bill will be considered an NFIB Key Vote for the 116th Congress.

The cost of health insurance continues to be the number one problem for small business owners, according to NFIB's Problems and Priorities survey. As health insurance costs increase, fewer small business owners are able to offer coverage to employees. In 2010, 39 percent of small businesses offered health insurance. In 2018, fewer than 30 percent of small businesses offered coverage, a net decrease of 24 percent. The Cadillac tax will exacerbate this trend. Health insurance cost increases will accelerate as more small businesses are subject to the Cadillac tax.

The Cadillac tax will also be an administrative nightmare for small business owners. Early guidance from the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) proposed requiring small business owners to calculate their tax liability, notify the IRS and health insurers of their tax liability, and remit the tax liability to the health insurers. Small business owners do not have time or resources for significant new compliance and reporting burdens.

NFIB supports passage of H.R. 748 and will consider a vote in favor of the legislation as an NFIB Key Vote for the 116th Congress. H.R. 748 will help mitigate health insurance cost increases and relieve administrative burdens for small business owners and employees. We look forward to working with you to protect small business as the 116th Congress moves forward.

Ms. DELBENE. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SANCHEZ).

Ms. SANCHEZ. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the Middle Class Health Benefits Tax Repeal Act, and I want to thank Chairman NEAL and Mr. COURTNEY for their tireless efforts to get this legislation passed.

I have been proud to support the repeal of the Cadillac tax for many years. Last Congress, I offered an amendment to repeal the tax during the healthcare repeal and replace debate.

It is important to remember that the Cadillac tax does not just affect high-value plans. If Congress does not act, the tax will hit hardworking Americans and their families who receive employer-sponsored insurance. Employers

have already started shifting costs to their workers in anticipation by increasing deductibles, copays, and coinsurance.

Congress has voted twice to delay the tax, but now is the time to officially repeal it. I am pleased that we are finally taking this vote today. I look forward to passage today and will keep working to strengthen and protect America's healthcare.

I include in the RECORD letters from CWA, UAW, AFSCME, AFT, and AFGE and the AFL-CIO in support of this bill.

COMMUNICATIONS WORKERS OF AMERICA,

July 15, 2019.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE NEAL: On behalf of the officers and 700,000 members of the Communications Workers of America (CWA), I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of H.R. 748, the Middle Class Health Benefits Tax Repeal Act of 2019, when it comes before the House this week.

This bill will permanently repeal the 40% tax on employer health benefits which is currently scheduled to take effect in 2022. It will provide relief to our members, and working people everywhere, whose health benefits are under continual attack by employers looking to shift the cost of care to workers.

A recent study by the Commonwealth Fund found that the number of Americans who are underinsured as a result of high out-of-pocket costs and deductibles has grown by over 50% since 2010. The fastest growth in under-insurance has come from Americans with employer-provided coverage.

This is consistent with our members' experience at the bargaining table, where fights to preserve affordable coverage and prevent plan cuts dominate our negotiations at every employer. The 40% benefit tax will exacerbate this trend and force cuts across our health plans, making health care less affordable.

Our members are currently negotiating agreements with employers that extend to 2022. Current data indicates many of our largest member health plans will be subject to this tax immediately when it goes into effect that year. That is why action now to resolve this issue now is critical.

H.R. 748, the Middle Class Health Benefits Tax Repeal Act, will improve health care for working people across the country, providing relief to workers who are paying high prices for their negotiated healthcare. CWA will consider votes on this bill on our Congressional Scorecard.

Thank you in advance for your consideration.

Sincerely,

SHANE LARSON,
Director of Legislative, Political and
International Affairs.

INTERNATIONAL UNION, UNITED
AUTOMOBILE, AEROSPACE & AGRICULTURAL
IMPLEMENT WORKERS
OF AMERICA—UAW

Detroit, MI, July 16, 2019.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the more than one million active and retired members of the International Union, United Automobile, Aerospace & Agricultural Implement Workers of America (UAW), we urge you to vote yes on the Middle Class Health Benefits Tax Repeal Act (H.R. 748). This bill would permanently repeal the excise tax on high cost employer-sponsored health coverage. The tax is scheduled to be levied on the aggregate amount of employer-sponsored coverage exceeding thresholds established in the law (\$11,200 for individual coverage and \$30,100 for family coverage). The excise tax is currently set to take effect in 2022.

The UAW believes affordable comprehensive health care should be a right for every American. That is why we strongly support the Affordable Care Act (ACA) and vehemently oppose all efforts to repeal the law. The ACA has made important strides towards the goal of universal, comprehensive, affordable coverage. In fact, since its passage in March 2010, more than 20 million people have gained health care coverage. In addition, tens of millions more with preexisting conditions have been able to get affordable and comprehensive insurance because discriminating against people with pre-existing conditions is prohibited under the ACA. Workers with employer sponsored coverage have benefited from this and other protections, like the prohibition on lifetime caps, found in the law. Without these protections, unionized workers would have to collectively bargain for these essential, common sense protections.

Like any comprehensive law, the ACA needs to be refined and repealing the scheduled tax on employer sponsored coverage would improve our health care system.

As the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) and prominent economists have predicted, employers have responded to the impending tax by increasing worker's deductibles, copays, and/or coinsurance in order to avoid being hit by the tax. Employers have increased cost sharing under their plans, switched to lower cost benefits, eliminated plan options, or narrowed provider networks in anticipation of the tax, according to a 2016 national survey of employers conducted by the Kaiser Family Foundation.

The percentage of employers with a plan reaching the threshold is projected to grow fairly rapidly over time, to 28% in 2025 and 37% in 2030.

If Congress fails to act, working families will be negatively impacted as employers turn to a range of options to avoid the tax by reducing the value of health care coverage, which could include increasing deductibles, copays, coinsurance and out-of-pocket limits. This tax places a disproportionate burden on working families and makes health care less affordable.

We urge you to vote in support of the Middle-Class Health Benefits Tax Repeal Act (H.R. 748).

Sincerely,

JOSH NASSAR,
UAW Legislative Director.

AFSCME,
Washington, DC, July 16, 2019.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the members of American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME), I urge you to support passage of the bipartisan "Middle Class Health Benefits Tax Repeal Act of 2019" (H.R. 748), which would repeal the 40 percent ("Cadillac") tax on employer-sponsored high cost worker and retiree health benefits. AFSCME strongly supports H.R. 748 to prevent further increases in workers' health costs and erosion of their health benefits.

Repealing the 40 percent tax is needed because it encourages employers and insurers to reduce working families' health benefits thereby raising medical copays, coinsurance, deductibles, and related out-of-pocket health expenses. AFSCME seeks immediate repeal because, while the tax does not take effect until 2022, it already is reducing benefits—as AFSCME (and other stakeholders) are already negotiating multi-year contracts extending beyond early 2022. This tax is troubling because it is regressive, disproportionately burdens working families, and discriminates against female dominated occu-

pations like nurses and teachers. Groups of workers who are relatively older, less healthy, or working jobs with relatively high health risks will also suffer additional health costs.

More broadly, America's health care system faces an escalating affordability crisis and this 40 percent tax worsens it. For example, the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) analysis of this tax states, "empirical evidence suggest that it will be passed on to employers who purchase or provide insurance that is subject to the tax—and then ultimately passed on to workers." To help workers and improve affordability, this 40 percent tax should be repealed now. This tax also is a poorly targeted and ineffective tool. It will soon affect tens of millions of working families and recently released data reports 21 percent to 31 percent of employers offering health benefits in 2022 will owe this tax. Others estimate more large employers will owe this tax, dispelling the myth that this tax only affects plans with strong benefits.

H.R. 748 has diverse and broad support, including endorsements from 43 national labor unions, many patient and consumer organizations, such as Families USA, groups that treat and cure diseases such as American Cancer Society Cancer Action Network, and prominent business interests like the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and Business Roundtable. Furthermore, the public has opposed this tax for years and a 2018 Election Day poll reported 81 percent of voters oppose taxing employer-provided health coverage. Repealing the 40 percent tax is a vital step to help make health care more affordable. We urge you to support the bipartisan "Middle Class Health Benefits Tax Repeal Act," H.R. 748, and vote yes on this important legislation.

Sincerely,

SCOTT FREY,
Director of Federal Government Affairs.

AFT,

Washington, DC, July 15, 2019.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the 1.7 million members of the American Federation of Teachers, I urge you to vote YES on H.R. 748, the Middle Class Health Benefits Tax Repeal Act.

The AFT has always opposed the 40 percent excise tax on high-quality healthcare plans, included in the Affordable Care Act, which will negatively impact families that have worked for, and earned, strong healthcare coverage. We have been gratified that Congress has pushed back the implementation date of this tax in the past. It is clear, however, that full repeal of this excise tax is needed to prevent employers from using the threat of the tax as a cudgel to demand reduced benefits or coverage from educators, nurses, bus drivers, social workers and other AFT members.

The AFT strongly supports the ACA's expansion of health insurance, as well as the act's consumer protections and emphasis on preventive care. We know firsthand that having affordable, high-quality health insurance is a key component to upward mobility and a sustainable middle class. Under current law, the number of insured Americans is higher than ever before; that includes the large number of contingent workers we represent, who make up an increasing share of today's workforce.

The ACA was intended to help ensure that we all have access to high-quality healthcare without depleting our paychecks and compromising our ability to save for the future. The excise tax, rather than expanding high-quality healthcare, would do the opposite. If

the 40 percent excise tax on the cost of employer-sponsored health insurance plans is implemented, working families will be hurt.

Some analysts argue that this tax will lead employers and employees to seek out “more efficient” plans and perhaps to an increase in wages. However, we have not seen an increase in wages and remain concerned that workers will be moved to high deductible/cost-pay health plans as a result of this tax. The cost curve will not bend; costs will simply be shifted over to those lower- and middle-income workers already struggling because of stagnant wages. This will lead to more workers forgoing necessary care or going into debt to pay for the high out-of-pocket costs.

In addition to having the potential to shift costs to working families, the excise tax will disproportionately affect older workers and women. This is of particular concern to the AFT, as a substantial number of our members are female, and many live in high-cost regions. Congress did recognize the obvious impact on women and older workers by trying to mitigate it with the “age and gender adjustment” provisions in the law. However, these provisions are insufficient, and implementation of the tax would almost certainly lead to higher healthcare costs for these groups.

There is near-universal agreement between employers and employees that the excise tax is bad policy for American workers, and must be repealed. That is why more than 360 members of the House have co-sponsored this much-needed, bipartisan legislation. I urge you to join them and vote YES on H.R. 748.

Finally, I want to thank Rep. Joe Courtney, who introduced H.R. 748, for his relentless efforts and commitment to repealing this counterproductive tax. His determination and leadership on this issue have been remarkable, and our members appreciate his dedication.

Thank you for considering our views on this important matter.

Sincerely,

RANDI WEINGARTEN,
President.

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES, AFL-CIO.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the more than 700,000 federal and District of Columbia employees represented by the American Federation of Government Employees, AFL-CIO (AFGE), I write to urge your support for the bipartisan “Middle Class Health Benefits Tax Repeal Act of 2019” (H.R. 748) which would eliminate the unfair and unwarranted 40 percent tax on relatively high cost employer-sponsored health insurance. We ask that you vote “YES” when the bill comes to the floor later this week.

Most federal employees and federal retirees participate in the Federal Employee Health Benefits Program (FEHBP). The premiums for almost every plan that participates in FEHBP would be hit by this tax, making a very expensive program even more expensive for both taxpayers and participants. FEHBP plans are expensive, and thus are subject to this tax, not because the benefits they provide are so comprehensive, but because the structure of FEHBP leads to high premiums. FEHBP plans yield enormous political power to charge high prices, escape audit by virtue of their exemption from application of the government’s cost accounting standards, and are characterized by risk segmentation that raises their premiums above the actuarial value of their benefits. Indeed, the generosity of benefits is a relatively insignificant factor in the overall size of FEHBP’s premiums. Age, gender, health status and program structure are the most important factors in determining premiums, and premiums determine whether a plan is subject to the tax.

The 40 percent excise tax is not scheduled to take effect until 2022, so now is the time for repeal, before it has any further deleterious effect on the working and middle class families that are its targets. Support for repeal of this regressive tax is widespread. There is no doubt that its effect will be to make health insurance less affordable. That is certainly true for federal employees and retirees whose compensation has declined in real terms over the past decade due to pay freezes and retirement benefit reductions. AFGE strongly urges you to support H.R. 748, the “Middle Class Health Benefits Tax Repeal Act of 2019.”

Sincerely yours,

J. DAVID COX, SR.

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

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 748, repealing the so-called Cadillac tax.

I believe that we in Congress should be incentivizing employer-sponsored insurance to be more generous, not less; and at a time when the President is working to dismantle the Affordable Care Act and pushing through regulations that allow junk plans to flourish, we need to stand with American workers and fight for more generous health plans.

The plans that are hit by this tax cover more female employees, more workers with dependent children, more older workers, and employees at small businesses. These are the people who are being hit by high deductibles, rising premiums, and more cost sharing in the health system than ever before.

A recent study showed that in 2018, 58 percent of Americans do not have \$1,000 of savings in case of an emergency, and yet the average deductible in 2018 was \$1,350.

We must pass this bill.

I include letters of support for H.R. 748 into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD from organizations such as the Alliance for Retired Americans, the Alliance to Fight the 40, and the College and University Professional Association for Human Resources.

ALLIANCE FOR RETIRED AMERICANS,

Washington, DC, July 15, 2019.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the 4.4 million members of the Alliance for Retired Americans, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of H.R. 748, the Middle Class Health Benefits Tax Repeal Act, when it comes up for a vote on the House floor this week.

As you know, approximately 181 million Americans rely on employer-provided health insurance to pay for the medical care that they need. The 40% excise tax, originally passed as a part of the Affordable Care Act, is assessed on any health plan that provides more than \$10,200 for individual coverage and \$27,500 for family coverage.

While intended to target high-premium plans for the wealthy to expand benefits and coverage for uninsured individuals, the tax squarely affects middle class workers and their families. Johns Hopkins University researchers projected that 75% of employer-sponsored plans will be affected by the tax.

Retirees are especially vulnerable to higher health care costs and will be hurt if the tax goes into effect. Older Americans’ retiree insurance plans typically have higher premiums. If not repealed, employers may reduce the benefits provided to their retirees

who are younger than 65 and eliminate supplemental coverage altogether for Medicare eligible retirees age 65 and over. In addition, the tax disproportionately hurts women, low- to middle-class individuals and families, people with disabilities, workers with high-risk occupations, and those with chronic medical conditions.

Many workers are already experiencing the effects of the tax. Some employers are reducing health coverage for their employees to avoid the tax. Others are increasing premiums and deductibles to shift costs to workers. The Middle Class Health Benefits Tax Repeal Act will eliminate this looming danger facing millions of American workers.

I urge you to vote in favor of H.R. 748 to protect quality health coverage for older Americans and millions of workers and their families. The importance of this vote cannot be overstated.

Sincerely,

RICHARD J. FIESTA,
Executive Director.

ALLIANCE TO FIGHT THE 40,
July 15, 2019.

Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

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

Hon. CHARLES SCHUMER,
Minority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

Hon. KEVIN MCCARTHY,
Minority Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR LEADER MCCONNELL, MINORITY LEADER SCHUMER, SPEAKER PELOSI, AND MINORITY LEADER MCCARTHY: We are writing on behalf of the 181 million Americans who receive health care coverage through an employer. This coverage is threatened by the looming 40% tax on employer-provided coverage. We applaud the House for the bipartisan support and for bringing H.R. 748, a bill that fully repeals the “Cadillac Tax,” to the floor for a vote this week. We urge the Senate to approve quickly, and send this bill to the president before the end of the year.

The tax is having a real impact, today, on the lives and pocketbooks of American workers. A poll conducted July 12, 2019, found that 86% of voters oppose taxing employer-provided health insurance.

The “Cadillac Tax” increases the health care cost burden for working Americans, threatens patient access to care, and targets vulnerable populations such as the families and sick individuals most needing care. A significant majority of voters—across party lines—oppose this tax because it increases out-of-pocket costs for older, sicker and underserved communities. Taxing workers trying to manage chronic conditions fails to address our most urgent health care challenges.

At 40%, the tax is twice the top corporate rate and will have significant consequences. Waiting to address the tax forces employers to adjust benefits now in anticipation of the tax. Several studies have shown that the “Cadillac Tax” would have a direct and negative impact on the continued affordability of employer-provided health insurance because employers will be compelled to reduce benefits and increase deductibles and other out-of-pocket costs to avoid the tax.

We need to protect the millions of American families with employer-provided health care coverage from further benefit losses and cost hikes. A healthy workforce drives a healthy economy, but the so-called “Cadillac Tax” will drive America’s health care—and workforce—in the wrong direction.

There is strong support for repealing the 40% tax from both sides of the aisle and both

sides of the Capitol—and all across the country. Currently, there are more than 360 cosponsors in the House and 42 cosponsors in the Senate who support legislation to repeal the tax. In addition, 665 organizations including, businesses, nonprofits, cities, chambers of commerce, insurers, brokers, unions, and patient advocacy groups recently signed a letter supporting full repeal of the “Cadillac Tax.”

We urge you to keep health care affordable for working families by including full repeal of the “Cadillac Tax” in any package under consideration before the end of this year.

Thank you for your consideration of this request.

ALLIANCE TO FIGHT THE 40.

COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY PROFESSIONAL
ASSOCIATION FOR HUMAN RESOURCES,
Knoxville, TN, July 17, 2019.

Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

Hon. CHARLES SCHUMER,
Minority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

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

Hon. KEVIN MCCARTHY,
Minority Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR LEADER MCCONNELL, MINORITY LEADER SCHUMER, SPEAKER PELOSI, AND MINORITY LEADER MCCARTHY: On behalf of the College and University Professional Association for Human Resources (CUPA-HR), I write in support of H.R. 748, a bill that fully repeals the “Cadillac Tax,” and urge members of the House to vote “YES” when the bill comes to the floor for a vote this week. I also urge the Senate to approve this bill quickly and send the bill to the President’s desk before the end of the year.

CUPA-HR serves as the voice of human resources (HR) in higher education, representing more than 31,000 human resources professionals and other higher education leaders at over 2,000 colleges and universities across the country. Its membership includes 93 percent of all U.S. doctoral institutions, 79 percent of all master’s institutions, 58 percent of all bachelor’s institutions and over 500 two-year and specialized institutions. Higher education employs over 3.9 million workers nationwide, with colleges and universities in all 50 states.

CUPA-HR members collectively provide comprehensive health benefits to millions of employees, retirees, students and their families. As such, CUPA-HR supports and encourages employer efforts to provide benefits that enhance employees’ health and wellness—including efforts to keep healthcare affordable.

For these reasons we urge the full House to vote “yes” on this legislation. Please do not hesitate to reach out to me to discuss this issue further.

Sincerely,

JOSHUA A. ULMAN,
Chief Government Relations Officer,
College and University Professional Association for Human Resources.

SHRM,

Alexandria, VA, July 15, 2019.

Speaker NANCY PELOSI,
House of Representatives.

Leader KEVIN MCCARTHY,
House of Representatives.

Leader CHARLES SCHUMER,
U.S. Senate.

Leader MITCH MCCONNELL,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SPEAKER PELOSI, LEADER MCCARTHY, LEADER SCHUMER, AND LEADER MCCONNELL: For over seventy years the Society for Human Resource Management (SHRM) has represented the interests of our nation’s Human Resources (HR) professionals. Today, with more than 300,000 members who impact the lives of 115 million employees each day we use our voice to elevate issues squarely at the intersection of work, workers and the workplace. Workplace healthcare is one of those issues.

SHRM believes public policy must strengthen the employer-based health care system, which provides coverage to more than 181 million Americans. As the bedrock of the U.S. health care system, employer-sponsored plans are the largest providers of health insurance (66 percent of the workforce) to individuals in the United States. Therefore, I write to share SHRM’s strong support of H.R. 748 and S. 684, the Middle Class Health Benefits Tax Repeal Act.

Although not effective until 2022, employers are already restructuring their health care benefit offerings to avoid the tax. According to a new analysis by the Kaiser Family Foundation, the anticipated tax would affect one in five (21%) employers offering health benefits when it takes effect in 2022 unless employers change their health plans.

As 2022 approaches, more employers will have to closely scrutinize their health benefit offerings and make the necessary changes to avoid the tax, which may include reducing benefits and/or altering wellness and chronic care prevention programs. While the excise tax is only intended to target high-value plans, modest plans will also be impacted, meaning millions of Americans and their families could face higher copays and deductibles, causing some to decline employer-provided health care.

The Cadillac Tax must be dealt with well in advance of its proposed implementation date, otherwise employees could see further changes in their benefit options. For these reasons, I urge you to support H.R. 748 when it is considered on the House floor this week and encourage swift action in the Senate.

Sincerely,

JOHNNY C. TAYLOR, JR., SHRM-SCP,
President & CEO.

PARTNERSHIP FOR
EMPLOYER-SPONSORED COVERAGE,
July 15, 2019.

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

Hon. KEVIN MCCARTHY,
Minority Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER PELOSI AND LEADER MCCARTHY: As members of the Partnership for Employer-Sponsored Coverage, we write with our strong support for passage of the Middle Class Health Benefits Tax Repeal Act (H.R. 748), to repeal the 40 percent excise tax on employer-sponsored health coverage and employee benefits under the Affordable Care Act (ACA). This important reform effort impacts the over 181 million Americans covered through employment-based benefits plans.

The Partnership for Employer-Sponsored Coverage is committed to ensuring that employer-sponsored coverage is strengthened and remains a viable, affordable option for

decades to come. Employer-sponsored coverage has been the backbone of our nation’s health system for nearly eight decades. Employers have a vested interest in health care quality, value, and system viability.

The 40 percent excise tax, also known as the Cadillac tax, would force employers to cut or limit employee benefits. The tax is a blunt instrument that proponents envision will address the demand side of rising health costs. While dubbed the Cadillac tax because the provision was targeting “high cost” employer-sponsored health coverage, it would impact the vast majority of employee benefits plans.

While we appreciate prior delays of this tax, uncertainty remains in the employer health market as the U.S. Treasury Department begins to develop proposed rules for implementation. Employers make plan decisions well in advance of a coverage year beginning and looming proposed rules have a direct impact on plan decisions that are being made now for the next several coverage years.

Full repeal of the Cadillac tax is extremely timely. H.R. 748 will bring certainty to millions insured under an employer plan.

Sincerely,

American Hotel & Lodging Association.

American Rental Association.

American Staffing Association.

Associated General Contractors of America.

Auto Care Association.

The Council of Insurance Agents & Brokers.

Food Marketing Institute.

HR Policy Association.

International Franchise Association.

National Association of Health Underwriters.

National Association of Wholesaler-Distributors.

National Restaurant Association.

National Retail Federation.

Retail Industry Leaders Association.

Society for Human Resource Management.

Ms. DELBENE. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE).

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend from Washington State for yielding.

More than anything, today is about fairness for America’s workers. I come to this issue with the experience of remembering on several occasions when I was growing up, my parents, who were both hardworking members of organized labor, going through a contract negotiation and wondering, if they were going to go out on strike, what was going to happen.

On more than one occasion, it would end like this. They would say: Well, I think we got a fair deal. We are forgoing a pay increase, but thank God we are able to save our healthcare and our benefits.

Time and time again, thousands—indeed, millions—of American workers made that decision that they would forgo pay raises, forgo pay increases, so they could save their healthcare. So then, decades later, to face a 40 percent tax on that healthcare just is not right and not fair to America’s workers.

So I am proud to stand here today with my fellow Pennsylvanian on the other side of the aisle, with colleagues

of mine on both sides of the aisle, in order to repeal this Cadillac tax which never should have been passed in the first place.

Madam Speaker, I will enter into the RECORD a number of letters from organizations all supporting this piece of legislation to repeal the Cadillac tax.

NRF,
July 16, 2019.

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

Hon. KEVIN MCCARTHY,
Minority Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER PELOSI AND MINORITY LEADER MCCARTHY: I write to share the strong support of the National Retail Federation (NRF) for H.R. 748, the Middle Class Health Benefits Tax Repeal Act of 2019. Please note that NRF may consider votes on the strongly bipartisan H.R. 748 and related procedural motions as Opportunity Index Votes for our annual voting scorecard.

The National Retail Federation, the world's largest retail trade association, passionately advocates for the people, brands, policies and ideas that help retail thrive. From its headquarters in Washington, D.C., NRF empowers the industry that powers the economy. Retail is the nation's largest private-sector employer, contributing \$2.6 trillion to annual GDP and supporting one in four U.S. jobs—42 million working Americans. For over a century, NRF has been a voice for every retailer and every retail job, educating, inspiring and communicating the powerful impact retail has on local communities and global economies.

H.R. 748, introduced by Representatives Joe Courtney (D-CT) and Mike Kelly (R-PA), will repeal the Affordable Care Act's 40% excise tax on the excess value of employer-sponsored health plans. Though portrayed as being targeted at rich "gold-plated" benefit plans, the "Cadillac Tax" is projected to hit much more mainstream plans covering low- and middle-class families in the coming years because of how it is indexed.

This legislation helps protect health insurance coverage enjoyed by 181 million Americans. According to 2018 mid-term election polling, 81 percent of voters oppose taxing employer-provided health coverage.

NRF appreciates Congress' past two successful efforts to delay the "Cadillac Tax." We urge its full repeal, however, because this tax forces the reduction of benefits well in advance of its effective date. Employers generally craft benefit plans two or more years in advance of the actual plan year. Benefits are being reduced now (increasing employee cost-sharing) to avoid the unfair tax on "excess" benefits.

We strongly urge your support for H.R. 748, bipartisan legislation to repeal the "Cadillac Tax."

Sincerely,

DAVID FRENCH,
Senior Vice President, Government Relations.

NECA,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the National Electrical Contractors Association (NECA), I am writing in strong support of H.R. 748—Middle Class Health Benefits Tax Repeal Act of 2019, introduced by Rep. Joe Courtney (D-CT) and Rep. Mike Kelly (R-PA).

This critically needed legislation seeks to repeal the "Cadillac tax," which if implemented would levy a 40 percent tax on "high-end" employer-sponsored health insurance

plans with benefits valued at \$10,200 per year per individual or \$27,500 per family. This tax ignores significant demographic and geographic factors and applies to benefits that help keep employees healthy, such as health savings accounts. Most importantly, it penalizes employers, including NECA contractors, for providing their employees with quality health coverage.

NECA contractors work to provide quality, affordable health coverage through self-insured, employer-sponsored group plans to well over 500,000 employees across our nation. Employer-sponsored health insurance provides affordable quality coverage in the best interest of American businesses and their workers. Although the tax does not go into effect until 2022, employers are already being compelled to reduce benefits or implement increased cost-sharing to avoid being on a trajectory to trigger the tax thresholds. If Congress does not act now, the tax will hurt millions of Americans with employer-sponsored health care.

Thank you for your consideration of these views. As the nationally recognized voice of the \$171 billion electrical construction industry, NECA, and our 118 local chapters nationwide urge you to vote yes on H.R. 748. Please note that we will include this vote in our NECA Legislative Report Card for the 116th Congress.

Thank you for your consideration of our views.

Sincerely,
MARCO A. GIAMBERARDINO, MPA,
Vice President, Government
and Public Affairs.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF
HEALTH UNDERWRITERS,
Washington, DC, July 15, 2019.

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

Hon. KEVIN MCCARTHY,
Minority Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER PELOSI AND LEADER MCCARTHY: The National Association of Health Underwriters (NAHU) endorses the passage of H.R. 748, a repeal of the 40% excise tax on certain employer-sponsored health insurance plans, known as the "Cadillac Tax." NAHU represents 100,000 licensed agents and brokers who are engaged in the sale and service of health insurance and other ancillary products. NAHU members serve employers and consumers around the country. Our members work to help millions of employers of all sizes finance, administer and utilize their group health benefit plans on a daily basis, and they know firsthand how the 40% excise tax on health benefits will hurt middle-class consumers.

H.R. 748 has received bipartisan support with 361 co-sponsors with a majority of each party caucus supporting repeal of the Cadillac Tax. The Cadillac Tax, set to go into effect in 2022, will impose a 40% excise tax on health plans that exceed certain cost thresholds beginning in 2022. Specifically, the law calls for a 40% excise tax on the amount of the aggregate monthly premium of each primary insured individual that exceeds the year's applicable dollar limit, which will be adjusted annually to the Consumer Price Index plus one percent. The current threshold for when the tax applies is set to \$11,100 for individual coverage and \$29,750 for "other than self-only" coverage. Because of the wide-ranging benefits that can be counted towards the tax, including HSAs, HRAs, FSAs and other cost-containment measures, many employers will find their plans exceeding these thresholds when the tax takes effect. While designed as a disincentive for employers offering the most benefit-rich plans,

in reality the tax will impact a majority of plans, including those that aren't benefit-rich and were not the intended targets of this provision.

All employers could be subjected to this tax, with various factors determining the likelihood of a plan's costs exceeding the threshold. These include family size, state benefit mandates, high-cost geography, age, health status, the size of the employer and other factors. In addition to paying the tax, employers will be forced to handle onerous compliance requirements on a monthly basis to record and pay the tax to insurers. In turn, insurers will be required to treat the tax as revenue and will be taxed on that amount, which will increase the size of the tax for everyone. Individuals and families who are already struggling to afford existing plan premiums and higher deductibles will also be hit by the tax, further increasing their costs.

We appreciate your consideration on this issue that is important for businesses and their employees so that all families can afford quality healthcare. We look forward to working with you and your colleagues in enacting this bipartisan legislation this year.

Best regards,

JANET TRAUTWEIN,
Executive Vice President and CEO.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF
MANUFACTURERS,
July 16, 2019.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the National Association of Manufacturers (NAM), the largest manufacturing association in the United States representing 14,000 manufacturers in every industrial sector and in all 50 states, I am writing to urge you to support the Middle Class Health Benefits Tax Repeal Act of 2019 (H.R. 748) introduced by Representatives Joe Courtney (D-CT) and Mike Kelly (R-PA).

Manufacturers consistently rank the rising cost of health care as a primary business challenge in the NAM's Quarterly Outlook Survey. Despite the challenge, approximately 98 percent of NAM members continue to provide health insurance to employees. The manufacturing industry is committed to providing quality health benefits to employees to maintain a healthy workforce, attract and retain talent and because it is the right thing to do. Many are leading new health benefit initiatives to provide quality care that reduces growing health benefits costs. Additionally, manufacturers oppose applying heavy federal tax burdens on employers' and workers' health bills.

H.R. 748 would permanently repeal the 40 percent tax-hike on "high-cost" health benefits, commonly referred to as the Cadillac Tax. While this tax was initially intended to impact high-cost employer-sponsored health care plans, it is expected to burden a broad crosssection of small and large employers across the country and to discourage employer innovations that are improving benefits for manufacturing workers. Manufacturers have been forced to begin plan preparations even though the tax is scheduled to go into effect in 2022. Fully repealing the Cadillac tax, health insurance tax and medical device tax remain top health care priorities for manufacturers.

The NAM urges strong support for H.R. 748 and appreciates ongoing efforts to eliminate the looming threat of health care taxes on manufacturers. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

ROBYN M. BOERSTLING,

Vice President, Infrastructure, Innovation and Human Resources Policy.

NATIONAL TAXPAYERS UNION
50TH ANNIVERSARY, JULY 16, 2019

NTU urges all Representatives to vote "YES" on H.R. 748, the Middle Class Health Benefits Tax Repeal Act of 2019. This legislation would permanently repeal the flawed "Cadillac tax" scheduled to go into effect in 2022, which could impact up to one in five employers immediately. Congress should also work to permanently repeal the medical device tax and the Health Insurance Tax (HIT), both of which are scheduled to go into effect in 2020.

NTU has noted before that the Affordable Care Act's excise tax on high-cost employer-sponsored insurance (ESI), popularly known as the "Cadillac tax," is a poor solution to a real policy dilemma—addressing the employer-sponsored health insurance tax exclusion that has distorted markets. Even though the intent of the tax was to reduce health care costs and boost the economy, the Joint Committee on Taxation (JCT) and the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) have estimated that the Cadillac tax will depress wages.

The Cadillac tax would also have a far-reaching impact on ESI plans. The Kaiser Family Foundation (KFF) recently reported that the Cadillac tax could impact more than one in five employers (21 percent) in 2022, when the tax is scheduled to go into effect. Since the cost of ESI plans is expected to rise faster than inflation, a growing proportion of plans will likely become subject to the tax over time. KFF estimates that nearly two in five ESI plans (37 percent) will be subject to the tax by 2030.

When it comes to taxes imposed by the Affordable Care Act, though, Congress should not stop with Cadillac tax repeal. Both the medical device tax and the Health Insurance Tax (HIT) have been suspended by Congress, but are scheduled to resume in 2020. The costs of these taxes will ultimately be borne by consumers, in the form of higher health spending and higher premiums. Additionally, Congress should examine the tax treatment of health care in a holistic fashion and work toward a minimally distortionary environment that empowers consumers to make decisions about their own health care needs.

NTU strongly urges Representatives to support H.R. 748, and additionally to permanently repeal both the medical device tax and HIT.

Roll call votes on H.R. 748 will be included in our annual Rating of Congress and a "YES" vote will be considered the pro-taxpayer position.

Ms. DELBENE. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HORSFORD).

Mr. HORSFORD. Madam Speaker, thank you to my colleague from Washington for managing this important bill.

I rise today to speak in support of the Middle Class Health Benefits Tax Repeal Act. We cannot afford to let this 40 percent excise tax on employer-sponsored health plans to take effect. This tax would increase costs for America's working and middle-class families.

For many working families, necessary medical treatment remains tragically unaffordable due to exorbitant out-of-pocket costs and deductibles. If this so-called Cadillac

tax isn't repealed, this crisis of affordability for medical care will only worsen.

To avoid the excise tax, employers will, in all likelihood, reduce the value of their plans and reduce benefits and even increase their workers' share of the cost. This would result in increases in out-of-pocket costs for more than 180 million workers, including 1.3 million people in my home State of Nevada, and it would decrease access to quality insurance plans across the country.

This vote helps labor throughout the country, including the Culinary Workers Union in my home State. Members' benefits, wages, and overall compensation allow them to stay afloat financially, and to quote the international union president for UNITE HERE, D. Taylor: "They drive used cars, not Cadillacs, and their healthcare does not include spa treatments."

At a time when this is the reality for our constituents, Congress should make sure that employers doing the right thing and providing high-value health insurance to their employees are supported.

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

Ms. DELBENE. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Nevada.

Mr. HORSFORD. Madam Speaker, Congress should make sure that employers doing the right thing and providing high-value health insurance to their employees are supported, not penalized with an egregious tax.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from UNITE HERE and several other national organizations.

UNITEHERE!

Las Vegas, NV, July 15, 2019.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of UNITE HERE and the 300,000 men and women and their families from the fastest growing private sector labor union in America, I am asking for your vote to approve H.R. 748, the "Middle Class Health Benefits Tax Repeal Act of 2019."

It is time to finally put a marker down and bring real tax relief to hard pressed working Americans, not just to health insurance and medical device companies who have a legion of lobbyists at their disposal. At a time when consumer anxiety is high and where only one job should be enough to make a living but isn't, the 181 million middle-class Americans who receive their health benefits from a private employer need an economic boost and some good news. I want to make the position of our union and membership clear: We support tax relief for middle-class Americans, starting with the repeal of the 40% excise tax on employer-sponsored health insurance.

The so-called "Cadillac Tax" impacts far more health plans than many members of Congress, including some Democrats, who characterize these hard-earned health benefits "overly generous." In fact, the 40% excise tax unfairly taxes our own members who make—all in, salary and benefits—under \$50,000 a year. UNITE HERE members' benefits, wages, and overall compensation allow them to stay afloat financially. They drive used cars, not Cadillacs, and their health care does not include spa treatments.

Delayed but not yet repealed, this tax has already incentivized employers to dramatically reduce their health benefits and overall compensation to avoid the tax thresholds. As you should be aware, health care costs are soaring. In fact, 73% of employers have changed, or plan to change, their health insurance offerings to avoid the tax, according to a recent survey by the International Foundation. Many of our low-income members reject pay raises just to maintain their health benefits.

Our union is already doing its part to keep health costs down among our members. Ken Blair, President of UNITE HERE Local 217 says: We're fighting hard to keep our costs down inside our union by making sure our members stay healthy or making sure they use the most cost effective way to keep our insurance low. Now we're going to be taxed!

Our membership is majority minority, a majority of women, and represent workers from over (11) countries. On behalf of our members, I again urge you to vote for H.R. 748 and stand up for millions of middle-class Americans who receive modest health insurance coverage through their jobs.

D. TAYLOR,
International President,
UNITE HERE.

SERVICE EMPLOYEES
INTERNATIONAL UNION,
Washington, DC, July 17, 2019.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the two million members of the Service Employees International Union (SEIU), I urge you to vote for H.R. 748, Middle Class Health Benefits Tax Repeal Act, which will eliminate the 40 percent "Cadillac" tax on health benefits. Employers are using the tax as justification to shift more costs to employees, raising costs for workers and their families. Congress must take action to ensure that everyone has access to affordable coverage whether that coverage comes through an employer-sponsored plan, private non-group coverage, or public programs.

Too many working families are struggling to afford high out of pocket costs—including deductibles, co-insurance, and co-payments required under their employer sponsored insurance (ESI) plans. Unfortunately, the impending 40 percent health benefits tax has exacerbated the trend of shifting health costs to working people by creating new pressure for employers to reduce the generosity of coverage in order to avoid triggering the tax. Though some claim providing consumers more "skin in the game" through increased cost-sharing will encourage them to use care more efficiently and reduce costs, research demonstrates that high cost-sharing requirements prevent people from accessing even necessary care, including care for chronic illnesses that could prevent more expensive interventions in the future. For example, a 2019 survey of adults with employer health benefits conducted by the Kaiser Family Foundation/LA Times found that half of respondents said that they or someone in their family went without or postponed needed care or medication as a result of cost. Given the economic stress working people face, policies should encourage high-value comprehensive coverage. The 40 percent health benefits tax acts to discourage it.

Furthermore, since their inception, unions have advocated and bargained on behalf of their members for comprehensive affordable healthcare. As a union, we value the robust health insurance coverage we fought for at the bargaining table for so many years, often at the expense of higher wages. Many of our members live in geographic areas with higher living expenses that include significant

health costs. The majority of our membership is comprised of women; as they are likely to need health services that will cost more than their younger male counterparts, their coverage plans will be more expensive. We should not punish workers who, through their union, are able to have a voice in their pay and benefits and in fact should honor the choices and decisions workers make through negotiations with their employers.

For decades, SEIU members have fought for healthcare as a basic human right, not a privilege. We believe that everyone in America has a right to quality, affordable healthcare. SEIU members support all legislation that improves and strengthens our healthcare system—including expanding coverage and lowering excessive out-of-pocket costs—that are a huge financial burden on working American families today and a major cause of economic stress. We view repeal of the excise tax as a necessary improvement that is consistent with our goal to support policies that make healthcare more affordable. While some in the Administration and Congress actively work to sabotage our healthcare system, whether through regulation or legal attacks, it is heartening to see that others are taking seriously their obligation to try and improve America's healthcare seriously.

For all these reasons, we ask you to support the Middle Class Health Benefits Tax Repeal Act (H.R. 748).

Sincerely,

MARY KAY HENRY,
International President.

—
LIUNA!,
Washington, DC, July 15, 2019.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the 500,000 members of the Laborers' International Union of North America (LIUNA), I urge you to support and vote for H.R. 748, bipartisan legislation to repeal the so-called Cadillac Tax provision of the Affordable Care Act (ACA).

Since the ACA became law, this regressive tax has been a looming dark cloud above every union member's health benefits and the remaining 181 million Americans who rely on their employer-sponsored insurance. For the half-million members of LIUNA whose healthcare benefits are collectively bargained for and essentially self-funded in order to provide good healthcare for themselves and their families, this is unacceptable and it needs to end now.

For nearly ten years, unions, businesses, patient advocates, and consumer groups have supported repeal of the Cadillac Tax, and, with over 350 cosponsors, we finally have the opportunity to repeal it.

We urge you to support H.R. 748 and vote to end this unfair tax on America's working class.

With kind regards, I am
Sincerely yours,

TERRY O'SULLIVAN,
General President.

—
AIR LINE PILOTS
ASSOCIATION INTERNATIONAL,
Washington, DC, July 16, 2019.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the 62,000 professional pilots represented by the Air Line Pilots Association, International (ALPA), I write in support of the bipartisan Middle Class Health Benefits Tax Repeal Act of 2019 (H.R. 748). H.R. 748, introduced by Representative Joe Courtney (D-CT), repeals the 40% excise tax on health care plans.

H.R. 748 currently has 361 bipartisan cosponsors, and polls conducted in 2018 revealed that taxing employer provided health care benefits is opposed by over 81% of Amer-

icans. The excise tax on employer provided health care benefits is predicated on the flawed economic assumption that the cost of a health insurance plan is the main driver of health care costs. Detailed analysis of our health insurance system has demonstrated that the real drivers of health care costs are location, occupation, gender and age.

Without a repeal, many employers are necessarily preparing for the introduction of the excise tax by increasing copays, deductibles and out of pocket maximums in their health care plans. The excise tax will further erode the health care protection provided by our plans and drive out of pocket costs up for professional pilots and other workers.

When H.R. 748 comes up for a vote this week, I urge you to support it. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

CAPT. JOSEPH G. DEPETE,
President, Air Line Pilots Association Intl.

—
JULY 15, 2019.

HON. RICHARD E. NEAL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN NEAL: On behalf of our 3 million members and the 50 million students they serve, we urge you to VOTE YES on the Middle Class Health Benefits Tax Repeal Act (H.R. 748), which would eliminate the 40 percent excise tax on "high cost" employer-sponsored health plans scheduled to take effect in 2022. Votes on this issue may be included in NEA's Report Card for the 116th Congress.

Under the Affordable Care Act, "high cost" employer-sponsored health benefits whose value exceeds specified thresholds will be subject to a 40 percent excise tax starting in 2022: \$11,200 for single coverage and \$30,150 for family coverage, the Tax Policy Center projects. We support repeal because:

The tax would take money out of the pockets of educators who have accepted lower wages in return for decent health care coverage—just when there's growing recognition among lawmakers and the American people that educators deserve better compensation. Moreover, educators would be among those hit hardest by the tax as noted in an analysis published in Health Affairs.

The tax applies equally to plans for lower- and higher-income employees, as well as retirees, regardless of whether they live in areas with unusually high health care costs.

The tax is far likelier to hit plans due to factors beyond employees' control—their age, gender, and location—than because of the benefits provided.

Initially, the Kaiser Family Foundation estimates, the tax would affect 21 percent of employers who provide health coverage—31 percent when workers' voluntary contributions to Flexible Spending Accounts are taken into account as the law requires.

Over time, more and more workers would be subject to the tax since health care costs continue to rise at a faster rate than inflation.

Educators are already struggling to make ends meet—they cannot afford to pay even more for health care. Please VOTE YES on the Middle Class Health Benefits Tax Repeal Act (H.R. 748).

Sincerely,

MARC EGAN,
Director of Government Relations,
National Education Association.

UNITED STEELWORKERS,

Pittsburgh, PA, July 16, 2019.

Re United Steelworkers support H.R. 748, the Middle Class Health Benefits Repeal Act of 2019.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the 850,000 members of the United Steelworkers (USW), I urge you to support the Middle Class Health Benefits Repeal Act of 2019 (H.R. 748).

With more than half of Americans covered under employer-sponsored healthcare, the so-called "Cadillac Tax" could affect the healthcare costs of more than 181 million Americans across the country. By allowing this excise tax to go into effect, hardworking middle-class families with employer-sponsored healthcare plans could face reduced benefits and increased out-of-pocket costs as employers push to restructure and renegotiate workers' hard-earned healthcare benefits.

The bipartisan Middle Class Health Benefits Repeal Act of 2019 (H.R. 748) would repeal the 40 percent excise tax on the value of employer-sponsored health plans, ensuring that workers and their families retain access to the care they need. Although the tax has been delayed multiple times since its inception, its looming nature impacts the bargaining of multi-year contracts between USW members and employers. The USW is currently negotiating contracts including healthcare plans that will be subject to the tax without congressional action, and workers are facing the potential costs at a time when out-of-pocket healthcare expenses are already rising.

Despite hefty increases in premiums, deductibles and co-pays, workers are not experiencing equivalent increases in their wages. According to the Kaiser Family Foundation's 2018 Employer Health Benefits Survey, workers' healthcare costs are increasing faster than both inflation and wages. Since 2008, deductibles on workers' plans have increased 212 percent and family premiums have risen 55 percent. Further taxing workers' healthcare benefits will only add to the burden of these increased healthcare costs, not reduce them.

It is time for Congress to permanently repeal the misguided excise tax on employer-sponsored health plans. The USW urges you to support the Middle Class Health Benefits Repeal Act of 2019 (H.R. 748) and pass this important legislation.

Sincerely,

THOMAS M. CONWAY,
International President.

Mr. HORSFORD. Madam Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues today to stand with America's working men and women and support the Middle Class Health Benefits Tax Repeal Act and vote in favor of abolishing this tax.

Ms. DELBENE. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, it is always a pleasure to be able to come to this floor and join in agreement with the gentleman from Pennsylvania. It does not happen very often, but I am glad we can be here.

This is about the working class. I represent a district in northeast Ohio that has high union membership. As the gentleman from Pennsylvania stated a few minutes ago, there are a lot of

contract negotiations. They are always happening. And more often than not, over the last 20 or 30 years, the men and women of labor have been forced to negotiate contracts where they didn't get an increase, maybe a 1 percent, 1½ percent increase, but they were always able to sustain their healthcare. So this is a very important piece of legislation, one I know we have been working on.

I want to thank the gentlewoman from Washington State. I want to thank Chairman NEAL from the Ways and Means Committee. This has been a long time coming. I hope we can fix this, and I hope it is the first step to us building out a better healthcare system that is more affordable, more accessible, more innovative, and more focused on prevention as we move down road in the next several months.

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

I want to thank my colleagues on the other side.

There is an old saying in life that sometimes you get a second chance to do the right thing. Eight years ago when the Affordable Care Act was passed, I am sure it was an oversight or an undersight or just not actually understanding what was taking place that day, my colleagues on the other side at that point were looking to pass the Affordable Care Act, and one of the victims in that was employer-sponsored insurance.

We referred to it today as the "Cadillac tax," and I am glad we used that term, quite frankly. I told you earlier I am a Cadillac dealer, so I am really happy to hear it. Any time anybody thinks something is outstanding, they call it a Cadillac.

But what we are going to do today has nothing to do with fancy cars. It has nothing to do with extravagant health plans, but it does have everything to do with punishing hardworking Americans and their families. What we are doing today is a crucial step toward protecting employer-sponsored health insurance for all Americans.

Again, as I said earlier, we are doing the right things for the right reasons for the right people, not just Republicans, not just Democrats, but every single American out there who gets his or her health insurance through their employer.

It is a remarkable thing to see happen here on the people's floor, the people's House, where we come together and agree that we can fix a wrong, we can right a wrong, we can make things right that we maybe had a different look at 8 years ago but we decided today that it just really makes sense to do that.

I want to give a special thank-you, though, to my good friends TOM REED and JOSH GORTHEIMER for forming the Problem Solvers Caucus. In the rules package this year, they were able to bring up a rule that says if you get 290

sponsors or cosponsors on a piece of legislation, that needs to come forward.

JOE COURTNEY has worked on this for many years, and we have already talked about the number of people who were already on board and ready to see this come forward, but it just couldn't get through the procedures to get to the floor. And I think when I go back home, people would say to me, if you have so many people that agree on the same thing and are doing the right thing for the right reasons, why can't you get it done? And then you have to say: Well, you know what? Not only do you not understand it, I don't either.

□ 1700

If we are acting in the best interests of the people we represent, then we should be able to do these things. So sometimes you take a look at what is holding you back from doing the right thing and you say there is something in the rules that needs to change, and that has taken place today.

But the really great part of it is—the really great part, is that Republicans and Democrats are coming together in the peoples' House and doing the right thing, ensuring, at least from our part of the Congress, that we can repeal this onerous tax on hardworking Americans.

So I am so glad to be here today and I am so thankful. Working with JOE COURTNEY has been absolutely marvelous. The gentleman has really had staying power. He has never given up on this. He has stayed on it and stayed on it and stayed on it. There is an old saying: Play through the whistle.

I have got to tell you, Madam Speaker, in this case, JOE COURTNEY played through the echo of the whistle. He never gave up.

So to be here with my colleagues today and coming to a conclusion that this is the right thing for us to do is really good.

Madam Speaker, I want to thank my friends that came here and spoke today on behalf of our side of the aisle for supporting this.

We have had an opportunity this afternoon to do something, to do something not for ourselves, but for the people who sent us here to represent them.

Madam Speaker, having said that, I would urge all of my colleagues to vote in support of this piece of legislation and pass it and send it on to the Senate, where we would hope they would understand that at this end of the Capitol, there is overwhelming support for hardworking Americans and their healthcare.

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

Ms. DELBENE. Madam Speaker, I strongly support H.R. 748, the Middle Class Health Benefits Tax Repeal Act of 2019.

This legislation has been a bipartisan goal since I came to Congress in 2012, the permanent repeal of the Cadillac tax. The original design of the Cadillac

tax was meant to be a narrowly targeted tax on the most extravagant plans.

Instead, the tax will hit working families for a variety of factors far beyond their control. That includes age, geography, and occupation.

A recent analysis from the Kaiser Family Foundation found that the Cadillac tax will impact over 20 percent of employers when the tax goes into effect in 2022. When flexible spending account contributions are included, that number jumps to over 30 percent and would affect just under half of all workers by 2030.

While the intended goal of the Cadillac tax was to put downward pressure on plan costs, the mechanics of the tax will simply put more costs onto working families in the form of higher deductibles and greater cost-sharing so employers can avoid the tax.

Madam Speaker, I remind my colleagues that healthcare costs are a top concern of the American people, and today we can take a meaningful step to address that concern.

Madam Speaker, I urge all Members to vote "yes" on this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LYNCH. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 748, the Middle-Class Health Benefits Tax Repeal Act. This important, bi-partisan legislation will finally repeal, once and for all, the excise tax on employer and labor union sponsored health plans, also known as the "Cadillac Plan Tax." This fix is long overdue.

This egregious tax, if allowed to take effect, would have hit the health insurance that 181 million working Americans and many union members and their families rely on. It would have likely resulted in increased costs, and ultimately lesser access to health care, thereby defeating the purpose for passing the A.C.A. in the first place.

This was one of the reasons why I voted against the final compromise version of the A.C.A. in 2010: because while the Cadillac Tax was not in the House-passed bill, the Senate added it into the legislation that came back to the House. I believed then, and still do now, that imposing a 40 percent tax on health insurance for union workers would hurt hardworking American families—the very people who sent us here to make their lives better.

Madam Speaker, before coming to Congress and before becoming a labor rights lawyer, I was an ironworker for 18 years. I worked side-by-side with men and women in the building trades who wanted nothing more than to work hard and be able to take care of their families. When I was President of my local union, I was acutely aware of the importance of the benefits, such as health care, that we would negotiate on behalf of our members. It is important to remember that generations of union workers have stood on the picket line or taken less pay in their paycheck in order to get better health care coverage. The Cadillac Tax included in the A.C.A. actually sought to punish those workers for standing up for their families. Imposing this tax would have broken the good-faith promises made to these hardworking Americans.

I am not alone in recognizing the serious harms of the proposed excise tax, because

members of Congress from both sides of the aisle came together to delay this tax again and again, moving its effective date from 2018 to 2022. In addition, today's legislation, H.R. 748, has an astounding 369 cosponsors. I think that must be some kind of record. That kind of bipartisanship has sadly become rarer these days, but this level of agreement only goes to show that passing this bill is the right thing to do.

Madam Speaker, this fix for the A.C.A. has been long-needed and I am pleased that we are finally taking this important step to protecting health care for hundreds of thousands of hard working, middle-class Americans. I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 748, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

RAISING A QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise to a question of the privileges of the House and offer a resolution previously noticed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 498

Resolved, that Donald John Trump, President of the United States, is unfit to be President, unfit to represent the American values of decency and morality, respectability and civility, honesty and propriety, reputation and integrity, is unfit to defend the ideals that have made America great, unfit to defend liberty and justice for all as extolled in the Pledge of Allegiance, is unfit to defend the American ideal of all persons being created equal as exalted in the Declaration of Independence, is unfit to ensure domestic tranquility, promote the general welfare and to ensure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity as lauded in the preamble to the United States Constitution, is unfit to protect the government of the people, by the people, for the people as elucidated in the Gettysburg Address, and is impeached for high misdemeanors that the following Article of Impeachment be exhibited to the Senate:

Article of Impeachment exhibited by the House of Representatives of the United States, in the name of itself, of the people of the United States, against Donald John Trump, President of the United States, in maintenance and support of its impeachment against him for high misdemeanors committed as President constituting harm to American society to the manifest injury of the people of the United States:

Article I.

The House of Representatives on July 16, 2019, strongly condemned President Donald

Trump's racist comments that have legitimized and increased fear and hatred of new Americans and people of color by saying that our fellow Americans who are immigrants, and those who may look to the President like immigrants, should "go back" to other countries, by referring to immigrants and asylum seekers as invaders," and by saying that Members of Congress who are immigrants, or those of our colleagues who are wrongly assumed to be immigrants, do not belong in Congress or in the United States of America.

In all of this, the aforementioned Donald John Trump has, by his statements, brought the high office of the President of the United States in contempt, ridicule, disgrace, and disrepute, has sown seeds of discord among the people of the United States, has demonstrated that he is unfit to be President, and has betrayed his trust as President of the United States to the manifest injury of the people of the United States, and has committed a high misdemeanor in office.

Therefore, Donald John Trump by causing such harm to the society of the United States is unfit to be President and warrants impeachment, trial, and removal from office.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The resolution qualifies.

MOTION TO TABLE

Mr. MCCARTHY. Madam Speaker, I have a motion to table the articles of impeachment at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. McCarthy moves to lay the resolution on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to lay the resolution on the table.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 332, nays 95, answered "present" 1, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 483]
YEAS—332

Aderholt	Burchett	Crawford
Aguilar	Burgess	Crenshaw
Allen	Bustos	Crist
Allred	Byrne	Crow
Amash	Cuellar	Cuellar
Amodei	Carbajal	Cummings
Armstrong	Carter (GA)	Cunningham
Arrington	Carter (TX)	Curtis
Axne	Cartwright	Davids (KS)
Babin	Case	Davidson (OH)
Bacon	Casten (IL)	Davis (CA)
Baird	Castor (FL)	Davis, Rodney
Balderson	Chabot	DeLauro
Banks	Cheney	DelBene
Barr	Chu, Judy	Delgado
Bera	Cisneros	Demings
Bergman	Cleaver	DesJarlais
Beyer	Cline	Deutch
Biggs	Cloud	Diaz-Balart
Billirakis	Clyburn	Duffy
Bishop (GA)	Cole	Duncan
Bishop (UT)	Collins (GA)	Dunn
Blunt Rochester	Collins (NY)	Emmer
Bost	Conaway	Emmer
Brady	Connelly	Estes
Brindisi	Cook	Ferguson
Brooks (AL)	Cooper	Finkenauer
Brooks (IN)	Correa	Fitzpatrick
Brownley (CA)	Costa	Fleischmann
Buchanan	Courtney	Fletcher
Buck	Cox (CA)	Flores
Bucshon	Craig	Fortenberry
Budd		Foster

Foxx (NC)	Latta	Rutherford
Frankel	Lawson (FL)	Ryan
Fulcher	Lee (NV)	Sánchez
Gaetz	Lesko	Sarbanes
Gallagher	Lewis	Scalise
Gallego	Lipinski	Schiff
Garamendi	Loeback	Schneider
Gianforte	Long	Schrader
Gibbs	Loudermilk	Schrier
Gohmert	Lucas	Schweikert
Golden	Luetkemeyer	Scott (VA)
Gonzalez (OH)	Luján	Scott, Austin
Gonzalez (TX)	Luria	Sensenbrenner
Gooden	Lynch	Serrano
Gosar	Malinowski	Sewell (AL)
Gottheimer	Maloney, Sean	Shalala
Granger	Marchant	Sherrill
Graves (GA)	Marshall	Shimkus
Graves (LA)	Massie	Simpson
Graves (MO)	Mast	Sires
Green (TN)	McAdams	Slotkin
Griffith	McBath	Smith (MO)
Grothman	McCarthy	Smith (NE)
Guest	McCaul	Smith (NJ)
Guthrie	McClintock	Smith (WA)
Haaland	McEachin	Smucker
Hagedorn	McHenry	Soto
Harder (CA)	McKinley	Spanberger
Harris	Meadows	Spano
Hartzler	Meeks	Stanton
Hastings	Meuser	Staubert
Hayes	Miller	Stefanik
Heck	Mitchell	Steil
Hern, Kevin	Moolenaar	Steube
Herrera Beutler	Mooney (WV)	Stevens
Hice (GA)	Morelle	Stevens
Higgins (LA)	Mucarsel-Powell	Stewart
Hill (AR)	Mullin	Stivers
Hill (CA)	Murphy	Suozi
Himes	Neal	Takano
Holding	Newhouse	Taylor
Hollingsworth	Norman	Thompson (PA)
Horn, Kendra S.	Nunes	Thornberry
Horsford	O'Halleran	Timmons
Houlahan	Olson	Tipton
Hoyer	Palazzo	Torres Small
Huizenga	Palmer	(NM)
Hunter	Panetta	Trone
Hurd (TX)	Pappas	Turner
Jeffries	Pence	Underwood
Johnson (GA)	Perlmutter	Upton
Johnson (LA)	Perry	Van Drew
Johnson (OH)	Peters	Veasey
Johnson (SD)	Peterson	Visclosky
Jordan	Phillips	Wagner
Joyce (OH)	Porter	Walberg
Joyce (PA)	Posey	Walden
Kaptur	Price (NC)	Walorski
Katko	Quigley	Waltz
Keating	Ratcliffe	Wasserman
Keller	Reed	Schultz
Kelly (MS)	Reschenthaler	Watkins
Kelly (PA)	Rice (NY)	Weber (TX)
Khanna	Rice (SC)	Webster (FL)
Kilmer	Riggleman	Wenstrup
Kim	Roby	Westerman
Kind	Rodgers (WA)	Wexton
King (IA)	Roe, David P.	Wild
King (NY)	Rogers (AL)	Williams
Kinzinger	Rogers (KY)	Wilson (SC)
Krishnamoorthi	Rooney (FL)	Wittman
Kuster (NH)	Rose (NY)	Womack
Kustoff (TN)	Rose, John W.	Woodall
LaHood	Rouda	Wright
LaMalfa	Rouzer	Yarmuth
Lamb	Roy	Yoho
Lamborn	Ruiz	Young
Langevin	Ruppersberger	Zeldin
Larson (CT)	Rush	

NAYS—95

Adams	Davis, Danny K.	Higgins (NY)
Barragán	Dean	Huffman
Bass	DeGette	Jackson Lee
Beatty	DeSaulnier	Jayapal
Blumenauer	Dingell	Johnson (TX)
Bonamici	Doggett	Kelly (IL)
Boyle, Brendan	Doyle, Michael	Kennedy
F.	F.	Kildee
Brown (MD)	Engel	Kirkpatrick
Butterfield	Escobar	Larsen (WA)
Cárdenas	Espallat	Lawrence
Carson (IN)	Evans	Lee (CA)
Castro (TX)	Fudge	Levin (CA)
Cicilline	Garcia (IL)	Levin (MI)
Clark (MA)	Garcia (TX)	Lieu, Ted
Clarke (NY)	Gomez	Lofgren
Clay	Green, Al (TX)	Lowenthal
Cohen	Grijalva	Lowey

Maloney, Pallone
 Carolyn B. Pascrell
 Matsui Payne
 McCollum Pingree
 McGovern Pocan
 McNerney Pressley
 Meng Raskin
 Moore Richmond
 Moulton Roybal-Allard
 Nadler Scanlon
 Napolitano Schakowsky
 Neguse Scott, David
 Norcross Sherman
 Ocasio-Cortez Speier
 Omar Swalwell (CA)

Thompson (CA) Blumenauer
 Thompson (MS) Blunt Rochester
 Titus Bonamici
 Tlaib Boyle, Brendan
 Tonko F.
 Torres (CA) Brindisi
 Trahan Brown (MD)
 Vargas Brownley (CA)
 Vela Bustos
 Velázquez Butterfield
 Waters Carbajal
 Watson Coleman Cárdenas
 Welch Carson (IN)
 Wilson (FL) Cartwright
 Case Jayapal
 Casten (IL) Jeffries
 Castor (FL) Johnson (GA)
 Castro (TX) Johnson (TX)
 Chu, Judy Kaptur
 Cicilline Keating
 Cisneros Kelly (IL)
 Clark (MA) Kennedy
 Clarke (NY) Khanna
 Clay Kildee
 Cleaver Kilmer
 Clyburn Kim
 Cohen Kind
 Connolly Kirkpatrick
 Cooper Krishnamoorthi
 Correa Kuster (NH)
 Costa Lamb
 Courtney Langevin
 Cox (CA) Larsen (WA)
 Craig Larson (CT)
 Crist Lawrence
 Crow Lawson (FL)
 Cuellar Lee (CA)
 Cummings Lee (NV)
 Cunningham Levin (CA)
 Davids (KS) Levin (MI)
 Davis (CA) Lewis
 Davis, Danny K. Lieu, Ted
 Dean Lipinski
 DeFazio Loebsock
 DeGette Lofgren
 DeLauro Lowenthal
 DelBene Luján
 Delgado Luria
 Demings Lynch
 DeSaulnier Malinowski
 Deutch Maloney,
 Dingell Carolyn B.
 Doggett Matsui
 Doyle, Michael F. McAdams
 Engel McBath
 Escobar McCollum
 Eshoo McEachin
 Espaillat McGovern
 Evans McNerney
 Finkenauer Meeks
 Fletcher Meng
 Foster Moore
 Frankel Morelle
 Fudge Moulton
 Gallego Mucarsel-Powell
 Garamendi Murphy
 Garcia (IL) Nadler
 Garcia (TX) Napolitano
 Golden Neal
 Gomez Neguse
 Gonzalez (TX) Norcross
 Gottheimer O'Halleran
 Green, Al (TX) Ocasio-Cortez
 Grijalva Omar
 Haaland Pallone

Panetta Pappas
 Pascrell Pascrell
 Payne Payne
 Perlmutter Perlmutter
 Peters Peters
 Peterson Peterson
 Phillips Phillips
 Pingree Pingree
 Pocan Pocan
 Porter Porter
 Pressley Pressley
 Price (NC) Price (NC)
 Quigley Quigley
 Raskin Raskin
 Rice (NY) Rice (NY)
 Richmond Richmond
 Rose (NY) Rose (NY)
 Rouda Rouda
 Ruiz Ruiz
 Ruppertsberger Ruppertsberger
 Rush Rush
 Ryan Ryan
 Sanchez Sanchez
 Sarbanes Sarbanes
 Scanlon Scanlon
 Schakowsky Schakowsky
 Schiff Schiff
 Schneider Schneider
 Schrader Schrader
 Schrier Schrier
 Scott (VA) Scott (VA)
 Scott, David Scott, David
 Serrano Serrano
 Sewell (AL) Sewell (AL)
 Shalala Shalala
 Sherman Sherman
 Sherrill Sherrill
 Sires Sires
 Slotkin Slotkin
 Smith (WA) Smith (WA)
 Soto Soto
 Spanberger Spanberger
 Speier Speier
 Stanton Stanton
 Lowey Lowey
 Stevens Stevens
 Suozzi Suozzi
 Swalwell (CA) Swalwell (CA)
 Takano Takano
 Thompson (CA) Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS) Thompson (MS)

Gohmert Gohmert
 Gonzalez (OH) Gonzalez (OH)
 Gooden Gooden
 Gosar Gosar
 Granger Granger
 Graves (GA) Graves (GA)
 Graves (LA) Graves (LA)
 Graves (MO) Graves (MO)
 Green (TN) Green (TN)
 Griffith Griffith
 Grothman Grothman
 Guest Guest
 Guthrie Guthrie
 Hagedorn Hagedorn
 Harris Harris
 Hartzler Hartzler
 Hern, Kevin Hern, Kevin
 Hice (GA) Hice (GA)
 Higgins (LA) Higgins (LA)
 Hill (AR) Hill (AR)
 Holding Holding
 Hollingsworth Hollingsworth
 Huizenga Huizenga
 Hunter Hunter
 Hurd (TX) Hurd (TX)
 Johnson (LA) Johnson (LA)
 Johnson (OH) Johnson (OH)
 Johnson (SD) Johnson (SD)
 Jordan Jordan
 Joyce (OH) Joyce (OH)
 Joyce (PA) Joyce (PA)
 Katko Katko
 Keller Keller
 Kelly (MS) Kelly (MS)
 Kelly (PA) Kelly (PA)
 King (IA) King (IA)
 King (NY) King (NY)
 Kinzinger Kinzinger
 Kustoff (TN) Kustoff (TN)
 LaHood LaHood
 LaMalfa LaMalfa
 Lamborn Lamborn
 Roy Roy
 Lesko Lesko

Scalise Scalise
 Schweikert Schweikert
 Scott, Austin Scott, Austin
 Sensenbrenner Sensenbrenner
 Shimkus Shimkus
 Simpson Simpson
 Massie Massie
 Smith (MO) Smith (MO)
 Smith (NE) Smith (NE)
 Smith (NJ) Smith (NJ)
 Spano Spano
 Stauber Stauber
 Stefanik Stefanik
 Steil Steil
 Steube Steube
 Stewart Stewart
 Stivers Stivers
 Taylor Taylor
 Thompson (PA) Thompson (PA)
 Thornberry Thornberry
 Timmons Timmons
 Tipton Tipton
 Turner Turner
 Upton Upton
 Wagner Wagner
 Walberg Walberg
 Walden Walden
 Walorski Walorski
 Waltz Waltz
 Watkins Watkins
 Weber (TX) Weber (TX)
 Webster (FL) Webster (FL)
 Wenstrup Wenstrup
 Westerman Westerman
 Williams Williams
 Wilson (SC) Wilson (SC)
 Wittman Wittman
 Womack Womack
 Woodall Woodall
 Wright Wright
 Yoho Yoho
 Young Young
 Zeldin Zeldin

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

DeFazio

NOT VOTING—4

Abraham
 Gabbard

Hudson
 Walker

□ 1738

Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Ms. WILSON of Florida changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Ms. KAPTUR, Messrs. TAYLOR and HASTINGS changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion to table was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. PIN-GREE). Proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed. Votes will be taken in the following order:

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 492;

Adoption of House Resolution 492, if ordered;

- Passage of S.J. Res. 36;
- Passage of S.J. Res. 37;
- Passage of S.J. Res. 38; and
- Adoption of H. Res. 497.

Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 582, RAISE THE WAGE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 492) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 582) to provide for increases in the Federal minimum wage, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 231, nays 194, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 484]

YEAS—231

Adams Axne
 Aguilar Barragan
 Allred Bass

Bera Beyer
 Bishop (GA)

Buchanan

NAYS—194

Aderholt
 Allen
 Amash
 Amodei
 Armstrong
 Arrington
 Babin
 Bacon
 Baird
 Balderson
 Banks
 Barr
 Bergman
 Biggs
 Bilirakis
 Bishop (UT)
 Bost
 Brady
 Brooks (AL)
 Brooks (IN)
 Buchanan

Buck
 Bucshon
 Budd
 Burchett
 Burgess
 Byrne
 Calvert
 Carter (GA)
 Carter (TX)
 Chabot
 Cheney
 Chene
 Clout
 Cole
 Collins (GA)
 Collins (NY)
 Comer
 Conaway
 Cook
 Crawford
 Crenshaw

Curtis
 Davidson (OH)
 Davis, Rodney
 DesJarlais
 Diaz-Balart
 Duffy
 Duncan
 Dunn
 Emmer
 Estes
 Ferguson
 Fitzpatrick
 Fleischmann
 Fortenberry
 Foxx (NC)
 Fulcher
 Gaetz
 Gallagher
 Gianforte
 Gibbs

Adams
 Aguilar
 Allred
 Axne
 Barragan
 Bass
 Beatty
 Bera
 Beyer
 Bishop (GA)
 Blumenauer
 Blunt Rochester
 Bonamici
 Boyle, Brendan
 F.
 Brindisi
 Brown (MD)
 Brownley (CA)
 Bustos
 Butterfield
 Carbajal
 Cárdenas
 Carson (IN)
 Cartwright

Case
 Casten (IL)
 Castor (FL)
 Castro (TX)
 Chu, Judy
 Cicilline
 Cisneros
 Clark (MA)
 Clarke (NY)
 Clay
 Cleaver
 Clyburn
 Cohen
 Connolly
 Cooper
 Correa
 Costa
 Courtney
 Cox (CA)
 Craig
 Crist
 Crow
 Cuellar
 Cummings

Davids (KS)
 Davis (CA)
 Davis, Danny K.
 Dean
 DeFazio
 DeGette
 DeLauro
 DelBene
 Delgado
 Demings
 DeSaulnier
 Deutch
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Doyle, Michael
 F.
 Engel
 Escobar
 Eshoo
 Espaillat
 Evans
 Finkenauer
 Fletcher
 Foster

NOT VOTING—7

Abraham
 Beatty
 Gabbard

Herrera Beutler
 Hudson
 Roybal-Allard

□ 1746

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. BURGESS. 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 231, nays 197, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 485]

YEAS—231

Frankel
Fudge
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Haaland
Harder (CA)
Hastings
Hayes
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Hill (CA)
Himes
Horn, Kendra S.
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski

Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McBath
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Murphy
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rose (NY)
Rouda
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger

Rush
Ryan
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schradler
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stanton
Stevens
Suoizzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small
(NM)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Van Drew
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Newhouse
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Riggleman
Roby
Rodgers (WA)
Roe, David P.
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rooney (FL)

Rose, John W.
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spano
Staub
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry

Timmons
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Waltz
Watkins
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Wright
Yoho
Young
Zeldin

Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Espallat
Evans
Finkenauer
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel
Fudge
Gallagher
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Golby
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Haaland
Harder (CA)
Hastings
Hayes
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Hill (CA)
Himes
Hollingsworth
Horn, Kendra S.
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence

Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Malinowski
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Murphy
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)

Richmond
Rose (NY)
Rouda
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Lowey
Lujan
Schiff
Schneider
Schradler
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stanton
Stevens
Suoizzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small
(NM)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Van Drew
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—4

□ 1754

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.

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF THE PROPOSED TRANSFER TO THE KINGDOM OF SAUDI ARABIA OF CERTAIN DEFENSE ARTICLES AND SERVICES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on passage of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 36) providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed transfer to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Kingdom of Spain, and the Italian Republic of certain defense articles and services, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 238, nays 190, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 486]
YEAS—238

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Amash
Axne
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brindisi
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield

Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Cawse
Casten (IL)
Cantor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Ciilline
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clever
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa

Courtney
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Cummings
Cunningham
Davids (KS)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell

NAYS—190

Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bergman
Biggs
Billirakis
Bishop (UT)
Bost
Brady
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Conaway
Cook
Crawford
Crenshaw

Conaway
Cook
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
Davidson (OH)
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Estes
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxy (NC)
Fulcher
Gaezt
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gonzalez (OH)
Gooden
Gosar
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie

Hagedorn
Harris
Hartzler
Hern, Kevin
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill (AR)
Diaz-Balart
Huizenga
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Katko
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (IN)
Kinzinger
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
Lesko
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Marchant
Marshall

NAYS—197

Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bergman
Biggs
Billirakis
Bishop (UT)
Bost
Brady
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Conaway
Cook
Crawford
Crenshaw

Cunningham
Curtis
Davidson (OH)
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Estes
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxy (NC)
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gonzalez (OH)
Gooden
Gosar
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Marchant
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McAdams
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
Meadows
Meuser
Higgins (LA)

Hill (AR)
Holding
Hollingsworth
Huizenga
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Katko
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
Lesko
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Marchant
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McAdams
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
Meadows
Meuser
Miller

Mast	Rodgers (WA)	Thompson (PA)	Doggett	Lawson (FL)	Richmond	Mast	Rodgers (WA)	Thompson (PA)
McCarthy	Roe, David P.	Thornberry	Doyle, Michael F.	Lee (CA)	Rose (NY)	McCarthy	Roe, David P.	Thornberry
McCaul	Rogers (AL)	Timmons	Engel	Lee (NV)	Rouda	McCaul	Rogers (AL)	Timmons
McClintock	Rogers (KY)	Tipton	Fletcher	Levin (CA)	Roybal-Allard	McClintock	Rogers (KY)	Tipton
McHenry	Rooney (FL)	Turner	Eshoo	Levin (MI)	Ruiz	McHenry	Rooney (FL)	Turner
McKinley	Rose, John W.	Upton	Espallat	Lewis	Ruppersberger	McKinley	Rose, John W.	Upton
Meadows	Rouzer	Wagner	Evans	Lieu, Ted	Rush	Meadows	Rouzer	Wagner
Meuser	Roy	Walberg	Finkenaue	Lipinski	Ryan	Meuser	Roy	Walberg
Miller	Rutherford	Walden	Fletcher	Loebsack	Sánchez	Miller	Rutherford	Walden
Mitchell	Scalise	Walorski	Foster	Maloney,	Sarbanes	Mitchell	Scalise	Walorski
Moolenaar	Schweikert	Waltz	Frankel	Carolyn B.	Scanlon	Moolenaar	Schweikert	Waltz
Mullin	Scott, Austin	Watkins	Fudge	Maloney, Sean	Schakowsky	Mullin	Scott, Austin	Watkins
Newhouse	Sensenbrenner	Weber (TX)	Gallagher	Massie	Schiff	Newhouse	Sensenbrenner	Watkins
Norman	Shimkus	Webster (FL)	Luria	Matsui	Schneider	Norman	Shimkus	Webster (FL)
Nunes	Simpson	Wenstrup	Lynd	McAdams	Schrader	Nunes	Simpson	Wenstrup
Olson	Smith (MO)	Westerman	Malinowski	McBath	Schrier	Olson	Smith (MO)	Westerman
Palazzo	Smith (NE)	Williams	Maloney,	McCollum	Scott (VA)	Palazzo	Smith (NE)	Westerman
Palmer	Smith (NJ)	Wilson (SC)	Garcia (TX)	McEachin	Scott, David	Palmer	Smith (NJ)	Williams
Pence	Smucker	Wittman	Golden	McGovern	Serrano	Pence	Smucker	Wilson (SC)
Perry	Spano	Womack	Gomez	McNerney	Sewell (AL)	Perry	Spano	Wittman
Posey	Staubert	Woodall	Gonzalez (TX)	Hastings	Shalala	Posey	Staubert	Womack
Ratcliffe	Stefanik	Wright	Gottheimer	Hayes	Sherman	Ratcliffe	Stefanik	Womack
Reed	Steube	Yoho	Green, Al (TX)	Heck	Sherrill	Reed	Steube	Wright
Reschenthaler	Stewart	Zeldin	Grijalva	Higgins (NY)	Sires	Reschenthaler	Stewart	Yoho
Rice (SC)	Stivers		Haaland	Hill (CA)	Slotkin	Rice (SC)	Stivers	Young
Riggleman	Taylor		Harder (CA)	Himes	Smith (WA)	Riggleman	Taylor	Young
Roby			Hastings	Hollingsworth	Soto	Roby		Zeldin

NOT VOTING—4

Abraham
Gabbard

Hudson
Walker

□ 1801

So the joint resolution was passed.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF THE PROPOSED EXPORT TO THE UNITED ARAB EMIRATES OF CERTAIN DEFENSE ARTICLES AND SERVICES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York). The unfinished business is the vote on passage of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 37) providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed export to the United Arab Emirates, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the Republic of France of certain defense articles and services, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 238, nays 190, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 487]

YEAS—238

Adams	Carbajal	Courtney
Aguilar	Cárdenas	Cox (CA)
Allred	Carson (IN)	Craig
Amash	Cartwright	Crist
Axne	Case	Crow
Barragán	Casten (IL)	Cuellar
Bass	Castor (FL)	Cummings
Beatty	Castro (TX)	Cunningham
Bera	Chu, Judy	Davids (KS)
Beyer	Cielline	Davis (CA)
Bishop (GA)	Cisneros	Davis, Danny K.
Blumenauer	Clark (MA)	Dean
Blunt Rochester	Clarke (NY)	DeFazio
Bonamici	Clay	DeGette
Boyle, Brendan	Cleaver	DeLauro
F.	Clyburn	DeBene
Brindisi	Cohen	Delgado
Brown (MD)	Connolly	Demings
Brownley (CA)	Cooper	DeSaulnier
Bustos	Correa	Deutch
Butterfield	Costa	Dingell

NAYS—190

Aderholt	Conaway
Allen	Cook
Amodei	Crawford
Armstrong	Crenshaw
Arrington	Curtis
Babin	Davidson (OH)
Bacon	Davis, Rodney
Baird	DesJarlais
Balderson	Diaz-Balart
Banks	Duffy
Barr	Duncan
Bergman	Dunn
Biggs	Emmer
Bilirakis	Estes
Bishop (UT)	Ferguson
	Fitzpatrick
	Fleischmann
	Flores
	Fortenberry
	Foxx (NC)
	Fulcher
	Gaetz
	Gianforte
	Gibbs
	Gohmert
	Gonzalez (OH)
	Gooden
	Gosar
	Granger
	Graves (GA)
	Graves (LA)
	Graves (MO)
	Green (TN)
	Griffith
	Grothman
	Guest
	Guthrie

Hagedorn
Harris
Hartzler
Hern, Kevin
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill (AR)
Holding
Huizenga
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Katko
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
Lesko
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Marchant
Marshall

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF THE PROPOSED EXPORT TO THE KINGDOM OF SAUDI ARABIA OF CERTAIN DEFENSE ARTICLES AND SERVICES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on passage of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 38) providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed export to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland of certain defense articles and services, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 237, nays 190, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 488]

YEAS—237

Adams	Brownley (CA)	Clyburn
Aguilar	Bustos	Cohen
Allred	Butterfield	Connolly
Amash	Carbajal	Cooper
Axne	Cárdenas	Correa
Barragán	Carson (IN)	Costa
Bass	Cartwright	Courtney
Beatty	Case	Cox (CA)
Bera	Casten (IL)	Craig
Beyer	Castor (FL)	Crist
Bishop (GA)	Castro (TX)	Crow
Blumenauer	Chu, Judy	Cuellar
Blunt Rochester	Cielline	Cummings
Bonamici	Cisneros	Cunningham
Boyle, Brendan	Clark (MA)	Davids (KS)
F.	Clarke (NY)	Davis (CA)
Brindisi	Clay	Davis, Danny K.
Brown (MD)	Cleaver	Dean

NOT VOTING—4

Abraham
Gabbard

Hudson
Walker

□ 1808

So the joint resolution was passed.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

DeFazio Kuster (NH)
 DeGette Lamb
 DeLauro Langevin
 DelBene Larsen (WA)
 Delgado Larson (CT)
 Demings Lawrence
 DeSaulnier Lawson (FL)
 Deutch Lee (CA)
 Dingell Lee (NV)
 Doggett Levin (CA)
 Doyle, Michael Levin (MI)
 F. Lewis
 Engel Lieu, Ted
 Escobar Lipinski
 Eshoo Loeb sack
 Espaillat Lofgren
 Evans Lowenthal
 Finkenauer Lowey
 Fletcher Luján
 Foster Luria
 Frankel Lynch
 Fudge Malinowski
 Gallagher Maloney,
 Gallego Carolyn B.
 Garamendi Maloney, Sean
 Garcia (IL) Massie
 Garcia (TX) Matsui
 Golden McAdams
 Gomez McBath
 Gonzalez (TX) McCollum
 Gottheimer McEachin
 Green, Al (TX) McGovern
 Grijalva McNerney
 Haaland Meeks
 Harder (CA) Meng
 Hastings Mooney (WV)
 Hayes Moore
 Heck Morelle
 Higgins (NY) Moulton
 Hill (CA) Mucarsel-Powell
 Himes Murphy
 Hollingsworth Nadler
 Horn, Kendra S. Napolitano
 Horsford Neal
 Houlahan Neguse
 Hoyer Norcross
 Huffman O'Halleran
 Jackson Lee Jackson Lee
 Jayapal Jayapal
 Jeffries Jeffries
 Johnson (GA) Johnson (GA)
 Johnson (TX) Johnson (TX)
 Kaptur Kaptur
 Keating Keating
 Kelly (IL) Kelly (IL)
 Kennedy Kennedy
 Khanna Khanna
 Kildee Kildee
 Kilmer Kilmer
 Kim Kim
 Kind Kind
 Kirkpatrick Kirkpatrick
 Krishnamoorthi Krishnamoorthi

NAYS—190

Aderholt Collins (GA)
 Allen Collins (NY)
 Amodei Comer
 Armstrong Conaway
 Arrington Cook
 Babin Crawford
 Bacon Crenshaw
 Baird Curtis
 Balderson Davidson (OH)
 Banks Davis, Rodney
 Barr DesJarlais
 Bergman Diaz-Balart
 Biggs Duffy
 Bilirakis Duncan
 Bishop (UT) Dunn
 Bost Emmer
 Brady Estes
 Brooks (AL) Ferguson
 Brooks (IN) Fitzpatrick
 Buchanan Fleischmann
 Buck Flores
 Bucshon Fortenberry
 Budd Foxx (NC)
 Burchett Fulcher
 Burgess Gaetz
 Byrne Gianforte
 Calvert Gibbs
 Carter (GA) Gohmert
 Carter (TX) Gonzalez (OH)
 Chabot Gooden
 Cheney Gosar
 Cline Granger
 Cloud Graves (GA)
 Cole Graves (LA)

Quigley Raskin
 Rice (NY) Rice (NY)
 Richmond Richmond
 Rose (NY) Rose (NY)
 Rouda Rouda
 Roybal-Allard Roybal-Allard
 Ruiz Ruiz
 Ruppertsberger Ruppertsberger
 Rush Rush
 Ryan Ryan
 Sánchez Sánchez
 Sarbanes Sarbanes
 Scanlon Scanlon
 Schakowsky Schakowsky
 Schiff Schiff
 Schneider Schneider
 Schriener Schriener
 Scott (VA) Scott (VA)
 Scott, David Scott, David
 Serrano Serrano
 Norman Norman
 Nunes Nunes
 Olson Olson
 Palazzo Palazzo
 Palmer Palmer
 Pence Pence
 Perry Perry
 Posey Posey

Graves (MO) Graves (MO)
 Green (TN) Green (TN)
 Griffith Griffith
 Grothman Grothman
 Guest Guest
 Guthrie Guthrie
 Hagedorn Hagedorn
 Harris Harris
 Hartzler Hartzler
 Hern, Kevin Hern, Kevin
 Herrera Beutler Herrera Beutler
 Hice (GA) Hice (GA)
 Higgins (LA) Higgins (LA)
 Hill (AR) Hill (AR)
 Holding Holding
 Huizenga Huizenga
 Hunter Hunter
 Hurd (TX) Hurd (TX)
 Johnson (LA) Johnson (LA)
 Johnson (OH) Johnson (OH)
 Johnson (SD) Johnson (SD)
 Jordan Jordan
 Joyce (OH) Joyce (OH)
 Joyce (PA) Joyce (PA)
 Katko Katko
 Keller Keller
 Kelly (MS) Kelly (MS)
 Kelly (PA) Kelly (PA)
 King (IA) King (IA)
 King (NY) King (NY)
 Kinzinger Kinzinger
 Kustoff (TN) Kustoff (TN)
 LaHood LaHood
 LaMalfa LaMalfa

Lamborn Lamborn
 Latta Latta
 Lesko Lesko
 Long Long
 Loudermilk Loudermilk
 Lucas Lucas
 Luetkemeyer Luetkemeyer
 Marchant Marchant
 Marshall Marshall
 Mast Mast
 McCarthy McCarthy
 McCaul McCaul
 McClintock McClintock
 McHenry McHenry
 McKinley McKinley
 Meadows Meadows
 Meuser Meuser
 Miller Miller
 Mitchell Mitchell
 Moolenaar Moolenaar
 Mullin Mullin
 Newhouse Newhouse
 Norman Norman
 Nunes Nunes
 Olson Olson
 Palazzo Palazzo
 Palmer Palmer
 Pence Pence
 Perry Perry
 Posey Posey

NOT VOTING—5

Abraham Abraham
 Gabbard Gabbard

Ratcliffe Ratcliffe
 Reed Reed
 Reschenthaler Reschenthaler
 Rice (SC) Rice (SC)
 Riggelman Riggelman
 Roby Roby
 Rodgers (WA) Rodgers (WA)
 Roe, David P. Roe, David P.
 Rogers (AL) Rogers (AL)
 Rogers (KY) Rogers (KY)
 Rooney (FL) Rooney (FL)
 Rose, John W. Rose, John W.
 Rouzer Rouzer
 Roy Roy
 Rutherford Rutherford
 Scalise Scalise
 Schweikert Schweikert
 Scott, Austin Scott, Austin
 Sensenbrenner Sensenbrenner
 Shimkus Shimkus
 Simpson Simpson
 Smith (MO) Smith (MO)
 Smith (NE) Smith (NE)
 Smith (NJ) Smith (NJ)
 Smucker Smucker
 Spano Spano
 Stauber Stauber
 Stefanik Stefanik
 Steil Steil
 Steube Steube

NOT VOTING—5

Hudson Hudson
 Speier Speier

Stewart Stewart
 Stivers Stivers
 Taylor Taylor
 Thompson (PA) Thompson (PA)
 Thornberry Thornberry
 Timmons Timmons
 Tipton Tipton
 Turner Turner
 Upton Upton
 Wagner Wagner
 Walberg Walberg
 Walden Walden
 Walorski Walorski
 Waltz Waltz
 Watkins Watkins
 Weber (TX) Weber (TX)
 Webster (FL) Webster (FL)
 Wenstrup Wenstrup
 Westerman Westerman
 Williams Williams
 Wilson (SC) Wilson (SC)
 Wittman Wittman
 Womack Womack
 Woodall Woodall
 Wright Wright
 Yoho Yoho
 Young Young
 Zeldin Zeldin

NOT VOTING—5

Walker Walker

□ 1815

So the joint resolution was passed.
 The result of the vote was announced
 as above recorded.

RECOMMENDING THAT THE HOUSE
 FIND WILLIAM P. BARR AND
 WILBUR L. ROSS, JR., IN CON-
 TEMPT OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on agreeing to the resolution (H. Res. 497) recommending that the House of Representatives find William P. Barr, Attorney General of the United States, and Wilbur L. Ross, Jr., Secretary of Commerce, in contempt of Congress for refusal to comply with subpoenas duly issued by the Committee on Oversight and Reform, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 230, nays 198, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 489]
 YEAS—230

Adams Adams
 Aguilar Aguilar
 Allred Allred
 Amash Amash
 Axne Axne
 Barragán Barragán
 Bass Bass
 Beatty Beatty
 Bera Bera
 Beyer Beyer
 Bishop (GA) Bishop (GA)
 Blumenauer Blumenauer
 Blunt Rochester Blunt Rochester
 Bonamici Bonamici
 Boyle, Brendan Boyle, Brendan
 F. F.
 Brown (MD) Brown (MD)
 Brownley (CA) Brownley (CA)
 Butterfield Butterfield
 Carbajal Carbajal

Cárdenas Cárdenas
 Carson (IN) Carson (IN)
 Cartwright Cartwright
 Case Case
 Casten (IL) Casten (IL)
 Castor (FL) Castor (FL)
 Castro (TX) Castro (TX)
 Chu, Judy Chu, Judy
 Cicilline Cicilline
 Cisneros Cisneros
 Clark (MA) Clark (MA)
 Clarke (NY) Clarke (NY)
 Clay Clay
 Cleaver Cleaver
 Clyburn Clyburn
 Cohen Cohen
 Connolly Connolly
 Cooper Cooper
 Correa Correa
 Costa Costa
 Courtney Courtney

Cox (CA) Cox (CA)
 Craig Craig
 Crist Crist
 Crow Crow
 Cuellar Cuellar
 Cummings Cummings
 Cunningham Cunningham
 Davids (KS) Davids (KS)
 Davis (CA) Davis (CA)
 Davis, Danny K. Davis, Danny K.
 Dean Dean
 DeFazio DeFazio
 DeGette DeGette
 DeLauro DeLauro
 DelBene DelBene
 Delgado Delgado
 Demings Demings
 DeSaulnier DeSaulnier
 Deutch Deutch
 Dingell Dingell
 Doggett Doggett

Doyle, Michael Doyle, Michael
 F. F.
 Engel Engel
 Escobar Escobar
 Eshoo Eshoo
 Español Español
 Evans Evans
 Finkenauer Finkenauer
 Fletcher Fletcher
 Foster Foster
 Frankel Frankel
 Fudge Fudge
 Gallego Gallego
 Garamendi Garamendi
 Garcia (IL) Garcia (IL)
 Garcia (TX) Garcia (TX)
 Gomez Gomez
 Gonzalez (TX) Gonzalez (TX)
 Gottheimer Gottheimer
 Green, Al (TX) Green, Al (TX)
 Grijalva Grijalva
 Haaland Haaland
 Harder (CA) Harder (CA)
 Hastings Hastings
 Hayes Hayes
 Heck Heck
 Higgins (NY) Higgins (NY)
 Hill (CA) Hill (CA)
 Himes Himes
 Hollingsworth Hollingsworth
 Horn, Kendra S. Horn, Kendra S.
 Horsford Horsford
 Houlahan Houlahan
 Hoyer Hoyer
 Huffman Huffman
 Jackson Lee Jackson Lee
 Jayapal Jayapal
 Jeffries Jeffries
 Johnson (GA) Johnson (GA)
 Johnson (TX) Johnson (TX)
 Kaptur Kaptur
 Keating Keating
 Kelly (IL) Kelly (IL)
 Kennedy Kennedy
 Khanna Khanna
 Kildee Kildee
 Kilmer Kilmer
 Kim Kim
 Kind Kind
 Kirkpatrick Kirkpatrick
 Krishnamoorthi Krishnamoorthi

NAYS—198

Aderholt Aderholt
 Allen Allen
 Amodei Amodei
 Armstrong Armstrong
 Arrington Arrington
 Babin Babin
 Bacon Bacon
 Baird Baird
 Balderson Balderson
 Banks Banks
 Barr Barr
 Bergman Bergman
 Biggs Biggs
 Bilirakis Bilirakis
 Bishop (UT) Bishop (UT)
 Bost Bost
 Brady Brady
 Brindisi Brindisi
 Brooks (AL) Brooks (AL)
 Brooks (IN) Brooks (IN)
 Buchanan Buchanan
 Buck Buck
 Bucshon Bucshon
 Budd Budd
 Burchett Burchett
 Burgess Burgess
 Byrne Byrne
 Calvert Calvert
 Carter (GA) Carter (GA)
 Carter (TX) Carter (TX)
 Chabot Chabot
 Cheney Cheney
 Cline Cline
 Cloud Cloud
 Cole Cole
 Collins (GA) Collins (GA)

Levin (CA) Levin (CA)
 Levin (MI) Levin (MI)
 Lewis Lewis
 Lieu, Ted Lieu, Ted
 Lipinski Lipinski
 Loeb sack Loeb sack
 Lofgren Lofgren
 Lowenthal Lowenthal
 Lowey Lowey
 Luján Luján
 Luria Luria
 Lynch Lynch
 Malinowski Malinowski
 Maloney, Carolyn B. Maloney, Carolyn B.
 Maloney, Sean Maloney, Sean
 Matsui Matsui
 McAdams McAdams
 McBath McBath
 McCollum McCollum
 McEachin McEachin
 McGovern McGovern
 McNerney McNerney
 Meeks Meeks
 Meng Meng
 Moore Moore
 Morelle Morelle
 Moulton Moulton
 Mucarsel-Powell Mucarsel-Powell
 Murphy Murphy
 Nadler Nadler
 Napolitano Napolitano
 Neal Neal
 Neguse Neguse
 Norcross Norcross
 O'Halleran O'Halleran
 Ocasio-Cortez Ocasio-Cortez
 Omar Omar
 Pallone Pallone
 Panetta Panetta
 Pappas Pappas
 Pascrell Pascrell
 Payne Payne
 Perlmutter Perlmutter
 Peters Peters
 Peterson Peterson
 Phillips Phillips
 Pingree Pingree
 Pocan Pocan
 Porter Porter
 Pressley Pressley
 Price (NC) Price (NC)

NAYS—198

Collins (NY) Collins (NY)
 Comer Comer
 Conaway Conaway
 Cook Cook
 Crawford Crawford
 Crenshaw Crenshaw
 Curtis Curtis
 Davidson (OH) Davidson (OH)
 Davis, Rodney Davis, Rodney
 DesJarlais DesJarlais
 Diaz-Balart Diaz-Balart
 Duffy Duffy
 Duncan Duncan
 Dunn Dunn
 Emmer Emmer
 Estes Estes
 Ferguson Ferguson
 Fitzpatrick Fitzpatrick
 Fleischmann Fleischmann
 Flores Flores
 Fortenberry Fortenberry
 Foxx (NC) Foxx (NC)
 Fulcher Fulcher
 Gaetz Gaetz
 Gallagher Gallagher
 Gianforte Gianforte
 Gibbs Gibbs
 Gohmert Gohmert
 Golden Golden
 Gonzalez (OH) Gonzalez (OH)
 Gooden Gooden
 Gosar Gosar
 Granger Granger
 Graves (GA) Graves (GA)
 Graves (LA) Graves (LA)
 Graves (MO) Graves (MO)

Roybal-Allard Roybal-Allard
 Ruiz Ruiz
 Ruppertsberger Ruppertsberger
 Rush Rush
 Ryan Ryan
 Sánchez Sánchez
 Sarbanes Sarbanes
 Scanlon Scanlon
 Schakowsky Schakowsky
 Schiff Schiff
 Schneider Schneider
 Schrader Schrader
 Schrier Schrier
 Scott (VA) Scott (VA)
 Scott, David Scott, David
 Serrano Serrano
 Sewell (AL) Sewell (AL)
 Shalala Shalala
 Sherman Sherman
 Sherrill Sherrill
 McEachin McEachin
 McGovern McGovern
 McNerney McNerney
 Meeks Meeks
 Meng Meng
 Moore Moore
 Morelle Morelle
 Moulton Moulton
 Mucarsel-Powell Mucarsel-Powell
 Murphy Murphy
 Nadler Nadler
 Napolitano Napolitano
 Neal Neal
 Neguse Neguse
 Norcross Norcross
 O'Halleran O'Halleran
 Ocasio-Cortez Ocasio-Cortez
 Omar Omar
 Pallone Pallone
 Panetta Panetta
 Pappas Pappas
 Pascrell Pascrell
 Payne Payne
 Perlmutter Perlmutter
 Peters Peters
 Peterson Peterson
 Phillips Phillips
 Pingree Pingree
 Pocan Pocan
 Porter Porter
 Pressley Pressley
 Price (NC) Price (NC)

NAYS—198

Green (TN) Green (TN)
 Griffith Griffith
 Grothman Grothman
 Guest Guest
 Guthrie Guthrie
 Hagedorn Hagedorn
 Harris Harris
 Hartzler Hartzler
 Hern, Kevin Hern, Kevin
 Herrera Beutler Herrera Beutler
 Hice (GA) Hice (GA)
 Higgins (LA) Higgins (LA)
 Hill (AR) Hill (AR)
 Holding Holding
 Hollingsworth Hollingsworth
 Huizenga Huizenga
 Hunter Hunter
 Hurd (TX) Hurd (TX)
 Johnson (LA) Johnson (LA)
 Johnson (OH) Johnson (OH)
 Johnson (SD) Johnson (SD)
 Jordan Jordan
 Joyce (OH) Joyce (OH)
 Joyce (PA) Joyce (PA)
 Katko Katko
 Keller Keller
 Kelly (MS) Kelly (MS)
 Kelly (PA) Kelly (PA)
 King (IA) King (IA)
 King (NY) King (NY)
 Kinzinger Kinzinger
 Kustoff (TN) Kustoff (TN)
 LaHood LaHood
 LaMalfa LaMalfa
 Lamb Lamb
 Lamborn Lamborn

Latta	Posey	Stube
Lesko	Ratcliffe	Stewart
Long	Reed	Stivers
Loudermilk	Reschenthaler	Taylor
Lucas	Rice (SC)	Thompson (PA)
Luetkemeyer	Riggleman	Thornberry
Marchant	Roby	Timmons
Marshall	Rodgers (WA)	Tipton
Massie	Roe, David P.	Turner
Mast	Rogers (AL)	Upton
McCarthy	Rogers (KY)	Van Drew
McCaul	Rooney (FL)	Wagner
McClintock	Rose, John W.	Walberg
McHenry	Rouzer	Walden
McKinley	Roy	Walorski
Meadows	Rutherford	Waltz
Meuser	Scalise	Watkins
Miller	Schweikert	Weber (TX)
Mitchell	Scott, Austin	Webster (FL)
Moolenaar	Sensenbrenner	Wenstrup
Mooney (WV)	Shimkus	Westerman
Mullin	Simpson	Williams
Newhouse	Smith (MO)	Wilson (SC)
Norman	Smith (NE)	Wittman
Nunes	Smith (NJ)	Womack
Olson	Smucker	Woodall
Palazzo	Spano	Wright
Palmer	Staubert	Yoho
Pence	Stefanik	Young
Perry	Steil	Zeldin

NOT VOTING—4

Abraham	Hudson
Gabbard	Walker

□ 1822

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.

DAMON PAUL NELSON AND MATTHEW YOUNG POLLARD INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEARS 2018, 2019, AND 2020

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 491 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 3494.

Will the gentleman from New York (Mr. ESPAILLAT) kindly take the chair.

□ 1825

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 3494) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes, with Mr. ESPAILLAT (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Tuesday, July 16, 2019, amendment No. 31 printed in part B of House Report 116-154 offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. CROW) had been disposed of.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part B of House Report 116-154 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 7 by Mr. CHABOT of Ohio.

Amendment No. 11 by Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. CHABOT

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 178, noes 255, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 490]

AYES—178

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

Womack	Wright	Young
Woodall	Yoho	Zeldin

NOES—255

Adams	Gottheimer	Omar
Aguilar	Graves (LA)	Pallone
Allred	Green, Al (TX)	Panetta
Axne	Grijalva	Pappas
Barragán	Haaland	Pascrell
Bass	Harder (CA)	Payne
Beatty	Hastings	Perlmutter
Bera	Hayes	Peters
Beyer	Heck	Peterson
Bishop (GA)	Herrera Beutler	Phillips
Blumenauer	Higgins (NY)	Pingree
Blunt Rochester	Hill (CA)	Plaskett
Bonamici	Himes	Pocan
Boyle, Brendan F.	Hollingsworth	Porter
Brindisi	Horn, Kendra S.	Pressley
Brown (MD)	Horsford	Price (NC)
Brownley (CA)	Houlihan	Quigley
Buchanan	Hoyer	Raskin
Butterfield	Huffman	Reed
Carbajal	Hurd (TX)	Rice (NY)
Cárdenas	Jackson Lee	Richmond
Carson (IN)	Jayapal	Rooney (FL)
Cartwright	Jeffries	Rose (NY)
Case	Johnson (GA)	Rouda
Casten (IL)	Johnson (TX)	Royal-Allard
Castor (FL)	Kaptur	Ruiz
Castro (TX)	Katko	Ruppersberger
Chu, Judy	Keating	Rush
Cicilline	Kelly (IL)	Ryan
Cisneros	Kennedy	Sablan
Clark (MA)	Khanna	Sánchez
Clarke (NY)	Kildee	Sarbanes
Clay	Kilmer	Scanlon
Cleaver	Kim	Schakowsky
Clyburn	Kind	Schiff
Cohen	Kirkpatrick	Schneider
Connolly	Krishnamoorthi	Schrader
Cooper	Kuster (NH)	Schrier
Correa	Lamb	Scott (VA)
Costa	Langevin	Scott, David
Courtney	Larsen (WA)	Serrano
Cox (CA)	Larson (CT)	Sewell (AL)
Craig	Lawrence	Shalala
Crist	Lawson (FL)	Sherman
Crow	Lee (CA)	Sherrill
Cuellar	Lee (NV)	Sires
Cummings	Levin (CA)	Slotkin
Cunningham	Levin (MI)	Smith (NJ)
Davids (KS)	Lewis	Smith (WA)
Davis (CA)	Lieu, Ted	Soto
Davis, Danny K.	Lipinski	Spanberger
Dean	Loeb sack	Speier
DeFazio	Lofgren	Stanton
DeGette	Lowenthal	Stefanik
DeLauro	Lowe y	Stevens
DelBene	Lujan	Suo zvi
Delgado	Luria	Swalwell (CA)
Demings	Lynch	Takano
DeSaulnier	Malinowski	Takano
Deutch	Maloney,	Thompson (CA)
Dingell	Carolyn B.	Thompson (MS)
Doggett	Maloney, Sean	Thompson (PA)
Doyle, Michael F.	Mast	Titus
Engel	Matsui	Tlaib
Escobar	McAdams	Tonko
Eshoo	McBath	Torres (CA)
Espallat	McCaul	Torres Small (NM)
Evans	McCollum	Trahan
Finkenauer	McEachin	Trone
Fitzpatrick	McGovern	Underwood
Fletcher	McHenry	Upton
Fortenberry	McNerney	Van Drew
Foster	Meeks	Vargas
Frankel	Meng	Veasey
Fudge	Moore	Morelle
Gaetz	Foster	Moulton
Gallagher	Frankel	Mucarsel-Powell
Galleo	Fudge	Murphy
Garamendi	Gaetz	Nadler
Garcia (IL)	Gallagher	Napolitano
Garcia (TX)	Galleo	Neal
Golden	Garamendi	Neguse
Gomez	Garcia (IL)	Norcross
Gonzalez (TX)	Garcia (TX)	Norton
	Golden	O'Halleran
	Gomez	Ocasio-Cortez

NOT VOTING—5

Abraham	Hudson	Walker
Gabbard	San Nicolas	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR
The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1828

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana and Ms. HAALAND changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. KENNEDY

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 237, noes 196, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 491]

AYES—237

Adams DeSaulnier Larson (CT)
Aguilar Deutch Lawrence
Allred Dingell Lawson (FL)
Axne Doggett Lee (CA)
Barragan Doyle, Michael Lee (NV)
Bass F. Levin (CA)
Beatty Engel Levin (MI)
Bera Escobar Lewis
Beyer Eshoo Lieu, Ted
Bishop (GA) Espallat Lipinski
Blumenauer Evans Loebsock
Blunt Rochester Finkenaer Lofgren
Bonamici Fletcher Lowenthal
Boyle, Brendan Foster Luján
F. Frankel Luria
Brindisi Fudge Lynch
Brown (MD) Gallego
Brownley (CA) Garamendi Malinowski
Bustos Garcia (IL) Maloney,
Butterfield Garcia (TX) Carolyn B.
Carbajal Golden Maloney, Sean
Cárdenas Gomez Matsui
Carson (IN) Gonzalez (TX) McAdams
Cartwright Gottheimer McBeth
Case Green, Al (TX) McCollum
Casten (IL) Grijalva McEachin
Castor (FL) Haaland McGovern
Castro (TX) Harder (CA) McNerney
Chu, Judy Hastings Meeks
Cicilline Hayes Meng
Cisneros Heck Moore
Clark (MA) Higgins (NY) Morelle
Clarke (NY) Hill (CA) Moulton
Clay Himes Mucarsel-Powell
Cleaver Horn, Kendra S. Murphy
Clyburn Horsford Nadler
Cohen Houlihan Napolitano
Connolly Hoyer Neal
Cooper Huffman Negue
Correa Jackson Lee Norcross
Costa Jayapal Norton
Courtney Jeffries O'Halleran
Cox (CA) Johnson (GA) Casio-Cortez
Craig Johnson (TX) Omar
Crist Kaptur Pallone
Crow Keating Panetta
Cuellar Kelly (IL) Pappas
Cummings Kennedy Pascarell
Cunningham Khanna Payne
Davids (KS) Dildee Perlmutter
Davis (CA) Kilmer Peters
Davis, Danny K. Kim Peterson
Dean Kind Phillips
DeFazio Kirkpatrick Pingree
DeGette Krishnamoorthi Plaskett
DeLauro Kuster (NH) Pocan
DelBene Lamb Porter
Delgado Langevin Pressley
Demings Larsen (WA) Price (NC)

Quigley Raskin Scott, David
Rice (NY) Serrano Torres (CA)
Richmond Sewell (AL) Torres Small
Rooney (FL) Shalala (NM)
Rose (NY) Sherman Trahan
Rouda Sherrill Trone
Roybal-Allard Sires Underwood
Ruiz Slotkin Van Drew
Ruppersberger Smith (WA) Vargas
Rush Soto Veasey
Ryan Speier Vela
Sablan Stanton Velázquez
Sánchez Stevens Visclosky
Sarbanes Suozzi Wasserman
Scanlon Swalwell (CA) Schultz
Schakowsky Takano Waters
Schiff Thompson (CA) Watson Coleman
Schneider Thompson (MS) Welch
Schrader Titus Weston
Schrier Tlaib Wild
Scott (VA) Tonko Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—196

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

NOT VOTING—5

Abraham Hudson Walker
Gabbard San Nicolas

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1833

So the amendment was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR. There being no further amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York) having assumed the chair, Mr. ESPALLAT, 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. 3494) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 491, he reported the bill, as amended by that resolution, back to the House with sundry further amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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. SCHIFF. 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 5-minute vote on passage of the bill will be followed by a 5-minute vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 748.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 397, nays 31, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 492]

YEAS—397

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

Cloud	Himes	Neal	Tipton	Velázquez	Wenstrup	Buck	Garcia (TX)	Lowey
Clyburn	Holding	Neguse	Titus	Visclosky	Westerman	Bucshon	Gianforte	Lucas
Cohen	Hollingsworth	Newhouse	Tonko	Wagner	Wexton	Budd	Gibbs	Luetkemeyer
Cole	Horn, Kendra S.	Norcross	Torres (CA)	Walberg	Wild	Burchett	Gohmert	Lujan
Collins (GA)	Horsford	Nunes	Torres Small	Walden	Williams	Burgess	Golden	Luria
Collins (NY)	Houlihan	O'Halleran	(NM)	Walorski	Wilson (FL)	Bustos	Gomez	Lynch
Conaway	Hoyer	Ocasio-Cortez	Trahan	Waltz	Wilson (SC)	Butterfield	Gonzalez (OH)	Malinowski
Connolly	Huizenga	Olson	Trone	Wasserman	Wittman	Byrne	Gonzalez (TX)	Maloney,
Cook	Hunter	Omar	Turner	Schultz	Womack	Calvert	Gooden	Carolyn B.
Cooper	Hurd (TX)	Palazzo	Underwood	Waters	Woodall	Carbajal	Gosar	Maloney, Sean
Correa	Jackson Lee	Pallone	Upton	Watkins	Wright	Cárdenas	Gottheimer	Marchant
Costa	Jayapal	Palmer	Van Drew	Watson Coleman	Yarmuth	Carson (IN)	Granger	Marshall
Courtney	Jeffries	Panetta	Vargas	Weber (TX)	Yoho	Carter (GA)	Graves (GA)	Massie
Cox (CA)	Johnson (GA)	Pappas	Veasey	Webster (FL)	Young	Carter (TX)	Graves (LA)	Mast
Craig	Johnson (LA)	Pascrell	Vela	Welch	Zeldin	Cartwright	Graves (MO)	Matsui
Crawford	Johnson (SD)	Payne				Case	Green (TN)	McAdams
Crenshaw	Johnson (OH)	Pence				Casten (IL)	Green, Al (TX)	McBath
Crist	Johnson (TX)	Perlmutter	Amash	Duncan	McClintock	Castor (FL)	Griffith	McCarthy
Crow	Joyce (OH)	Peters	Biggs	Gaetz	Meadows	Castro (TX)	Grijalva	McCaul
Cuellar	Joyce (PA)	Peterson	Blumenauer	Gohmert	Mooney (WV)	Chabot	Grothman	McClintock
Cummings	Kaptur	Phillips	Brooks (AL)	Gosar	Norman	Cheney	Guest	McCollum
Cunningham	Katko	Pingree	Brooks	Grothman	Perry	Chu, Judy	Guthrie	McEachin
Curtis	Keating	Pocan	Burchett	Harris	Posey	Ciilline	Hagedorn	McGovern
Davids (KS)	Keller	Porter	Burgess	Huffman	Roe, David P.	Cisneros	Harder (CA)	McHenry
Davidson (OH)	Kelly (IL)	Pressley	Cline	Jordan	Roy	Clark (MA)	Hartzler	McKinley
Davis (CA)	Kelly (MS)	Price (NC)	Comer	Lee (CA)	Tlaib	Clarke (NY)	Hastings	McNerney
Davis, Danny K.	Kelly (PA)	Quigley	DeFazio	Lofgren		Clay	Hayes	Meeks
Davis, Rodney	Kennedy	Raskin	DelBene	Massie		Cleaver	Heck	Meng
Dean	Khanna	Ratcliffe				Cline	Hern, Kevin	Meuser
DeGette	Kildee	Reed				Cloud	Herrera Beutler	Miller
DeLauro	Kilmer	Reschenthaler	Abraham	Hudson		Clyburn	Hice (GA)	Mitchell
Delgado	Kim	Rice (NY)	Gabbard	Walker		Cohen	Higgins (LA)	Moolenaar
Demings	Kind	Rice (SC)				Cole	Higgins (NY)	Mooney (WV)
DeSaulnier	King (IA)	Richmond				Collins (GA)	Hill (AR)	Moore
DesJarlais	King (NY)	Riggleman				Collins (NY)	Hill (CA)	Morelle
Deutch	Kinzinger	Roby				Comer	Himes	Moulton
Diaz-Balart	Kirkpatrick	Rodgers (WA)				Conaway	Holding	Mucarsel-Powell
Dingell	Krishnamoorthi	Rogers (AL)				Connolly	Hollingsworth	Mullin
Doggett	Kuster (NH)	Rogers (KY)				Cook	Horn, Kendra S.	Murphy
Doyle, Michael	Kustoff (TN)	Rooney (FL)				Correa	Horsford	Nadler
F.	LaHood	Rose (NY)				Costa	Houlihan	Napolitano
Duffy	LaMalfa	Rose, John W.				Courtney	Hoyer	Neal
Dunn	Lamb	Rouda				Cox (CA)	Huffman	Neguse
Emmer	Lamborn	Rouzer				Craig	Huizenga	Newhouse
Engel	Langevin	Roybal-Allard				Crawford	Hunter	Norcross
Escobar	Larsen (WA)	Ruiz				Crenshaw	Hurd (TX)	Norman
Eshoo	Larson (CT)	Ruppersberger				Crist	Jackson Lee	Nunes
Espallat	Latta	Rush				Crow	Jayapal	O'Halleran
Estes	Lawrence	Rutherford				Cuellar	Jeffries	Ocasio-Cortez
Evans	Lawson (FL)	Ryan				Cummings	Johnson (GA)	Olson
Ferguson	Lee (NV)	Sánchez				Cunningham	Johnson (LA)	Omar
Finkenauer	Lesko	Sarbanes				Curtis	Johnson (OH)	Palazzo
Fitzpatrick	Levin (CA)	Scalise				Davids (KS)	Johnson (SD)	Pallone
Fleischmann	Levin (MI)	Scanlon				Davidson (OH)	Johnson (TX)	Palmer
Fletcher	Lewis	Schakowsky				Davis (CA)	Jordan	Panetta
Flores	Lieu, Ted	Schiff				Davis, Danny K.	Joyce (OH)	Pappas
Fortenberry	Lipinski	Schneider				Davis, Rodney	Joyce (PA)	Pascrell
Foster	Loeb sack	Schrader				Dean	Kaptur	Payne
Foxx (NC)	Long	Schrier				DeFazio	Katko	Pelosi
Frankel	Loudermilk	Schweikert				DeGette	Keating	Pence
Fudge	Lowenthal	Scott (VA)				DeLauro	Keller	Perlmutter
Fulcher	Lowey	Scott, Austin				DelBene	Kelly (IL)	Perry
Gallagher	Lucas	Scott, David				Delgado	Kelly (MS)	Peterson
Galleo	Luetkemeyer	Sensenbrenner				Demings	Kelly (PA)	Phillips
Garamendi	Lujan	Serrano				DeSaulnier	Kennedy	Pingree
Garcia (IL)	Luria	Sewell (AL)				DesJarlais	Khanna	Pocan
Garcia (TX)	Lynch	Shalala				Deutch	Kildee	Porter
Gianforte	Malinowski	Sherman				Diaz-Balart	Kilmer	Posey
Gibbs	Maloney,	Sherrill				Dingell	Kim	Pressley
Golden	Carolyn B.	Shimkus				Doggett	King (IA)	Price (NC)
Gomez	Maloney, Sean	Simpson				Doyle, Michael	King (NY)	Quigley
Gonzalez (OH)	Marchant	Sires				F.	Kinzinger	Raskin
Gonzalez (TX)	Marshall	Slotkin				Duffy	Kirkpatrick	Ratcliffe
Gooden	Mast	Smith (MO)				Duncan	Krishnamoorthi	Reed
Gottheimer	Matsui	Smith (NE)				Dunn	Kuster (NH)	Reschenthaler
Granger	McAdams	Smith (NJ)				Emmer	Kustoff (TN)	Rice (NY)
Graves (GA)	McBath	Smith (WA)				Engel	LaHood	Rice (SC)
Graves (LA)	McCarthy	Smucker				Escobar	LaMalfa	Richmond
Graves (MO)	McCaull	Soto				Eshoo	Lamb	Riggleman
Green (TN)	McCollum	Spanberger				Espallat	Lamborn	Roby
Green, Al (TX)	McEachin	Spano				Estes	Langevin	Rodgers (WA)
Griffith	McGovern	Speier				Evans	Larsen (WA)	Roe, David P.
Grijalva	McKinley	Stanton				Ferguson	Larson (CT)	Rogers (AL)
Guest	McKinley	Stauber				Finkenauer	Latta	Rogers (KY)
Guthrie	McNerney	Stefanik				Fitzpatrick	Lawrence	Rooney (FL)
Haaland	Meeks	Steil				Fleischmann	Lawson (FL)	Rose (NY)
Hagedorn	Meng	Steube				Fletcher	Lee (CA)	Rose, John W.
Harder (CA)	Meuser	Stevens				Flores	Lee (NV)	Rouda
Hartzler	Miller	Stewart	Adams	Banks	Blunt Rochester	Fortenberry	Lesko	Rouzer
Hastings	Mitchell	Stivers	Aderholt	Barr	Bonamici	Foster	Levin (CA)	Roybal-Allard
Hayes	Moolenaar	Suoizzi	Aguilar	Barragán	Bost	Foxx (NC)	Levin (MI)	Ruiz
Heck	Moore	Swalwell (CA)	Allen	Bass	Boyle, Brendan	Frankel	Lewis	Ruppersberger
Hern, Kevin	Morelle	Takano	Allred	Beatty	F.	Fudge	Lieu, Ted	Rush
Herrera Beutler	Moulton	Taylor	Amodei	Bera	Brady	Fulcher	Lipinski	Rutherford
Hice (GA)	Mucarsel-Powell	Thompson (CA)	Arrington	Bergman	Brindisi	Gaetz	Loeb sack	Ryan
Higgins (LA)	Mullin	Thompson (MS)	Axne	Beyer	Brooks (AL)	Gallagher	Lofgren	Sánchez
Higgins (NY)	Murphy	Thompson (PA)	Babin	Biggs	Brooks (IN)	Galleo	Long	Sarbanes
Hill (AR)	Nadler	Thornberry	Bacon	Bishop (GA)	Brown (MD)	Garamendi	Loudermilk	Scalise
Hill (CA)	Napolitano	Timmons	Baird	Bishop (UT)	Brownley (CA)	Garcia (IL)	Lowenthal	Scanlon
			Balderson	Blumenauer	Buchanan			

NAYS—31

NOT VOTING—4

□ 1842

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2018, 2019, and 2020 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MIDDLE CLASS HEALTH BENEFITS TAX REPEAL 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. 748) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on high cost employer-sponsored health coverage, as amended, 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 Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 419, nays 6, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 493]

YEAS—419

Schakowsky	Steil	Visclosky
Schiff	Steube	Wagner
Schneider	Stevens	Walberg
Schrader	Stewart	Walden
Schrier	Stivers	Walorski
Schweikert	Suozzi	Waltz
Scott (VA)	Swalwell (CA)	Wasserman
Scott, Austin	Takano	Schultz
Scott, David	Taylor	Waters
Sensenbrenner	Thompson (CA)	Watkins
Serrano	Thompson (MS)	Watson Coleman
Sewell (AL)	Thompson (PA)	Weber (TX)
Shalala	Thornberry	Webster (FL)
Sherman	Timmons	Welch
Sherrill	Tipton	Wenstrup
Shimkus	Titus	Westerman
Simpson	Tlaib	Wexton
Sires	Tonko	Wild
Slotkin	Torres (CA)	Williams
Smith (MO)	Torres Small	Wilson (FL)
Smith (NE)	(NM)	Wilson (SC)
Smith (NJ)	Trahan	Wittman
Smith (WA)	Trone	Womack
Smucker	Turner	Woodall
Soto	Underwood	Wright
Spanberger	Upton	Yarmuth
Spano	Van Drew	Yoho
Speier	Vargas	Young
Stanton	Veasey	Zeldin
Stauber	Vela	
Stefanik	Velázquez	

NAYS—6

Amash	Harris	Peters
Cooper	Kind	Roy

NOT VOTING—8

Abraham	Gabbard	Meadows
Armstrong	Haaland	Walker
Bilirakis	Hudson	

□ 1856

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 3494, DAMON PAUL NELSON AND MATTHEW YOUNG POLLARD INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEARS 2018, 2019, AND 2020

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the engrossment of the bill, H.R. 3494, the Clerk be authorized to make technical corrections and conforming changes to the bill.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. 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. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I urge the Speaker to immediately schedule this bill.

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

□ 1900

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CISNEROS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

CONGRATULATING TYKHIL GREENE ON BEING FIRST AFRICAN AMERICAN VALEDICTORIAN OF UNIVERSITY ACADEMY CHARTER HIGH SCHOOL

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to acknowledge Tykhil Greene. Mr. Greene is the first African American valedictorian of the University Academy Charter High School in Jersey City, New Jersey.

Mr. Greene's hard work over the past 4 years is an incredible feat. He achieved the highest level of academic success in his class. He also received the Salutatorian Award from the Jersey City Community Middle School. These honors are so well-deserved.

At University Academy, Mr. Greene challenged himself by taking AP classes every year. Each summer, Mr. Greene worked for the Jersey City Department of Recreation. Even with this rigorous schedule, Mr. Greene had only 10 absences in 4 years.

He continues to pursue these challenges as he prepares for college. Mr. Greene will study international business and prelaw at Seton Hall University.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Tykhil Greene on his hard work and success. He has a very bright future ahead of him, and we are proud of him in the 10th Congressional District in the State of New Jersey.

OPPOSING RAISING THE FEDERAL MINIMUM WAGE

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

Mr. SPANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 582, which would more than double the Federal minimum wage.

Numerous studies show that doubling the minimum wage to \$15 an hour would be catastrophic for small businesses. The Congressional Budget Office estimates that this bill would re-

sult in the loss of up to 3.7 million jobs, which is approximately the same number of people who live in the State of Oklahoma.

When I started my own business, I went without a salary for a full year to invest in the business, to pay for overhead, and to keep my employees paid. I could not have borne these expenses under a \$15 minimum wage.

I think of my scheduler, Naomi Hilton. As a teenager, I hired her in my small business to be the receptionist in my office. She worked hard, and within a year she was promoted to legal assistant, and then to paralegal, and eventually she earned more than \$15 an hour.

If not for a much lower minimum wage, I would never have been able to start my business, hire Naomi, and pay her more than the minimum wage proposed in this bill.

I support higher wages for all, and the economy has given us these jobs without costing millions of jobs and thousands of small businesses.

INCLUSIVITY AND DIVERSITY, NOT BIGOTRY AND DISCRIMINATION

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I am a Congressman in no small part due to civil rights legislation: the ADA that passed 29 years ago next week. Inclusivity is not abstract to me. Diversity is not just a buzzword.

This weekend, our Nation confronted bigotry and discrimination, the vile opposites of these virtues. That we did so is not surprising. Our country is not perfect, built as it is on the original sin of slavery, but the source of these racist remarks should shock all of my colleagues, as they came from the President himself.

The President's tweets attacking my fellow Representatives is inexcusable. There is no explanation, no possible context in which they would be acceptable. They are the product of his world view that prizes division and conflict.

I believe in compromise. I believe in trying to work together to better our country even when we disagree, but that spirit of tolerance cannot extend to the blatantly racist and xenophobic rhetoric.

I voted yesterday to condemn the President's remarks, but that should never have been necessary. Our country is better than the example this President is setting. I only hope that we can heal after this dark chapter.

ADDRESSING THE MURDER OF ROSENDA STRONG

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

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, sadly, I rise again today to speak about the epidemic of missing and murdered indigenous women.

After 300 days of searching, the body of Rosenda Strong was finally found on the Yakima Nation reservation in central Washington.

The life of this young mother of four was not lost, but taken, as are the lives of many other Native American women across the Nation.

Rosenda is a citizen of the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla, and her case is one of 71 unsolved cases involving missing and murdered indigenous women in Washington State.

Since she went missing last October, her loved ones have rallied to bring national attention to the alarming high number of murder and violence rate facing Native American women across the country. Children are left without mothers, parents are left without daughters, and communities are left questioning their safety and their future.

This crisis can no longer be ignored. Congress must act to deliver justice to victims like Rosenda and so many others like her.

ENCOURAGING WOMEN TO PURSUE CAREERS IN STEM

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

Ms. MURCARSEL-POWELL. Mr. Speaker, oftentimes Latinas in STEM are used to being the only women in the room and often the only people of color. Women make up only 24 percent of the STEM workforce, and Latinas only 2 percent of the entire STEM workforce, but the future is changing.

I rise today to celebrate the accomplishments of Laura and Natalia Coronado, twin sisters who recently graduated from Florida International University with bachelor's degrees in computer engineering. Now they are each starting careers working for Intel. Laura and Natalia are making south Florida proud and setting an example for women and girls everywhere.

Breaking into a career field that is dominated by men is not easy. Believe me, I know. It is up to all of us to create a society where women are encouraged to pursue careers in STEM, and that means promoting diversity and supporting equal opportunities.

CONGRATULATING COASTAL MIDDLE SCHOOL

(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. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Coastal Middle School in the First Congressional District of Georgia for being distinguished as a Lighthouse School to Watch.

Organized by the National Forum to Accelerate Middle-Grades Reform, the Lighthouse Schools to Watch program celebrates high-performing middle schools based on four factors: academic

excellence, developmental responsiveness, social equity, and organizational structure.

In Savannah, Coastal Middle School has been surpassing the norm in all of these areas, while also taking the initiative to go the extra mile in others. The school teaches classes in both Arabic and Chinese, values quality writing skills, embraces students with disabilities, serves students from abroad, and provides opportunities for students to serve the local community.

While Coastal Middle School continues to excel, schools across Georgia are also raising the bar. Georgia was the first of three States in the Nation to qualify for the National Forum Schools to Watch program.

Congratulations, Coastal Middle School. Keep up the good work, and thank you for your commitment to providing students in our area with an exceptional education.

RETIREMENT OF ST. CLAIR SHORES CITY MANAGER MIKE SMITH

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

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate my constituent in St. Clair Shores, City Manager Mike Smith, on his upcoming retirement after nearly two decades of service to the community.

Mike Smith has been a true hands-on leader. I ran into him at St. Clair Shores Memorial Day parade, which is one of the biggest in the country, where he was rushing around on a golf cart, as ever, personally managing this huge event.

Mike has also been a leader on an issue extremely important to me and my fellow Michiganders: water quality. He has fought for improvements to the Chapaton Retention Basin, a project I have made it my mission to help fund in order to protect water quality in Lake St. Clair and the Great Lakes system.

While I will miss Mike's partnership, I wish him the very best in his retirement, and I thank him for his tremendous service.

OUR JOB IS TO DO THE PEOPLE'S WORK

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

Mr. FULCHER. Mr. Speaker, in the last few days, we spent a lot of time in session in the U.S. Congress reviewing and debating tweets and personal comments of individuals. In the meantime, policy debate and the urgent work of the people are excluded from the agenda.

As I speak, among other things, we are apprehending some 3,000 immigrants per day on our southern border,

we will lose around 130 people today due to the opioid crisis, and our national debt will increase another \$3 billion or so in just the next 24 hours.

It is clear that the majority leadership does not want to have policy initiatives that are desired by our current administration to even get a debate, but, Mr. Speaker, we have an election process to deal with those concerns.

It is our job to do the people's work. Please, let's go to work.

THE AMERICAN PEOPLE NEED HEALTHCARE SOLUTIONS THAT WILL WORK FOR THEM

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

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, for years Republicans in Congress and the White House have made it a top priority to end healthcare protections for millions of Americans. They voted more than 60 times to repeal the Affordable Care Act, but when the time came, they had no replacement to offer.

Since President Trump took office, more than 3 million fewer Americans have health insurance. They have removed healthcare information from government websites and arbitrarily shut down the Federal marketplace website at peak times to drive down enrollment.

Now the Trump administration is at it again, pushing the extreme Texas v. U.S. lawsuit that would repeal the entire ACA and throw America's healthcare system into total disarray. More than 130 million Americans with preexisting conditions would lose their healthcare protections, out-of-pocket costs would jump for millions of America's seniors and families, and some 53 million more Americans would lose access to quality, affordable health coverage before 2024.

My Democratic colleagues and I are fighting back to improve coverage and lower more Americans' health premiums, bring down prescription drug costs, and strengthen Medicare and Medicaid for this generation and the next.

The American people are right not to trust this Republican Congress or President with their healthcare. Let's stop this endless repeal without replace effort and get back to solutions that will work for the people.

RECOGNIZING DR. MARK CRUMMEY

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

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Speaker, school principals are more than just managers of educators and school activities. These individuals become students' friends, mentors, coaches, and advocates.

Today, I have the distinct honor of recognizing Dr. Mark Crummey, principal of Highland Park Elementary

School in Roanoke, Virginia. Dr. Crummey was recently named Elementary Principal of the Year by the Virginia Parent Teacher Association.

Dr. Crummey has over 25 years of experience in education. As both an educator and administrator, his life has been dedicated to service. His quarter century of experience continues to enrich the lives of the students who pass through the doors of Highland Park.

During Dr. Crummey's tenure, students have shown improvements in both grades and test scores, a testament to his and the staff of Highland Park Elementary's efforts.

Mr. Rogers once said: "Anyone who does anything to help a child in his life is a hero to me." I agree with that statement and want to recognize Dr. Crummey as a hero in our community. His continued dedication to the students of Highland Park Elementary is commendable, and I congratulate him on this incredible honor.

□ 1915

RAISING THE MINIMUM WAGE

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

Ms. GARCIA of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 created a minimum wage for all workers to ensure a livable wage. However, it has been over a decade since the last increase of the Federal minimum wage, the longest period without any raise since the minimum wage was established.

Sadly today, \$7.25 an hour forces many Americans to work two, many times three, jobs to make ends meet.

Someone living in my district making minimum wage must work 112 hours a week to afford a two-bedroom apartment for their family. That is 16 hours a day, 7 days a week. That is two shifts with no day off.

181,000 workers in my district would receive a pay raise by increasing the minimum wage to \$15 an hour.

Raising the minimum wage would help many hardworking Americans rise out of poverty and reach financial stability that, right now, is simply out of reach. We must increase the minimum wage.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of us to vote for the minimum wage bill tomorrow.

50TH COMMEMORATION OF APOLLO 11

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, what a glorious week to celebrate the 50th commemoration of Apollo 11.

I rise as someone whose eyes were wide open when this magnificent act occurred.

I had the privilege of serving on the House Science, Space, and Technology

Committee, as well, and on the Space and Aeronautics Subcommittee. I even served as they were building this massive space station.

It is likewise a privilege to represent the area on which NASA's Johnson Space Center is located. Just a few weeks ago, I walked through mission control and saw those outstanding men and women symbolizing those who were at their station on the very day that Neil Armstrong touched this magnificent planet. And then to be able to say, "one small step for man, and one large step for mankind," but to know what the astronauts go through, and the stars in the eyes of children.

Every year, I hold a Christmas party of 15,000 for the children in our community. The most popular people that come are the astronauts that I invite.

I am excited about celebrating this 50th commemoration of Apollo 11. I salute the astronauts, the teams, and NASA because it opens our eyes to the wideness of space, the wonderment of science, and the greatness of America.

God bless them. Congratulations. And God bless America.

CONGRATULATING BRADLEY FERGUSON

(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. Mr. Speaker, I want to take a moment to talk about an exceptional young person from Mainland Regional High School in South Jersey. Bradley Ferguson of Mainland Regional High School was recently selected as a United States Presidential scholar.

The U.S. Presidential Scholars Program was founded in 1964. Since 1964, it has honored over 7,500 graduating high school seniors for academic achievements and contributions to their communities.

One hundred and twenty-one U.S. Presidential Scholars are honored annually for their academic excellence and their service. I am so excited that Bradley is representing South Jersey with his great achievement. All the young people being honored with this award are proof that education brings forth excellence.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Bradley for his accomplishment. I can't wait to see whatever his future is going to hold, but we all know that he is going to achieve greatness.

HONORING HILTON RAY SEGLER

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

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of my constituent and friend of longstanding, Hilton Ray Segler. On July 4, 2019, Hilton, a loving husband, father, and grandfather, passed away at the age of 82 in Albany, Georgia.

He dedicated his professional life to agriculture. He began in 1957 selling ag chemicals, was co-owner of NIPAN, and later sold crop insurance. He is most remembered for his leadership in the pecan industry.

Hilton developed a special interest in pecans and became a leading State leader and advocate for the pecan industry. He served as president of the Georgia Pecan Growers Association for two terms. As president, and a pecan grower himself, he testified before Congress on behalf of pecan growers for three of the last four farm bills.

Hilton's hard work and desire to better the industry led to many accomplishments, including crop insurance, ensuring that conservation and emergency programs were available to pecan growers; and the Market Access Program, to aid in building the pecan export market. His passion and leadership will be sorely missed by the industry.

On a personal note, Hilton was my friend. I will miss his sage advice and his wise counsel. He never told me what I wanted to hear. He always told me what I needed to hear. The State of Georgia and our Nation have been truly blessed to benefit from Hilton's leadership and his advocacy.

RAISING THE MINIMUM AGE

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Raise the Wage Act.

For the last 10 years, the minimum wage has remained stagnant as the cost of living has skyrocketed across the country. Low-income families and minimum wage workers have carried the brunt of this burden.

Working Americans deserve sustainable living wages, and we should not accept an economy where parents working full-time jobs cannot support their families. A vital part of the American promise is the right to a decent livable wage.

This legislation will empower our workforce, strengthen the economy, and support families across the United States of America. I look forward to voting in favor of this important legislation, and I encourage my colleagues to do the same.

COLLEGE AFFORDABILITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PORTER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Ms. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Georgia (Mrs. MCBATH).

Mrs. MCBATH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on the issue of college affordability. Too many of our students are

finding themselves saddled with student loan debt after attending predatory institutions. We cannot expect our students to repay these loans when they were not given the quality education and degree that they paid for.

Students who pursue higher education degrees are sometimes faced with sudden school closures, or the institution's loss of accreditation. When this happens, students are often left with incredible debts, but no degree to show for it.

This issue hits very close to home for me. In March, approximately 1,500 of my constituents became all too familiar with this situation. Argosy University, an institution ran by Dream Center Education Holdings, LLC, closed, leaving its students with large debts and class credits they could not transfer. Student veterans were told their GI benefits were depleted, and that they would be unable to continue, or even start over, at another institution.

That is why I am so very proud to have introduced H.R. 3662, the Relief for Defrauded Students Act. In 2016, the Department of Education issued a ruling allowing for students to have their debts relieved when it was found their universities severely misrepresented their services. My bill would codify this rule and protect students from the impacts of predatory institutions.

Currently, there are over 180,000 applications for debt relief claims sitting at the Department of Education awaiting decisions. These students deserve action from the Department, not silence. H.R. 3662 would provide them a quick and fair process for resolving these issues.

I am happy to have introduced the Relief for Defrauded Students Act, along with Representatives KATIE PORTER, ABBY FINKENAUER, CINDY AXNE, MARY GAY SCANLON, and SHARICE DAVIDS. Together, we are committed to protecting our students and holding these institutions accountable.

Ms. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Georgia for her leadership on this issue and for being here tonight to talk about those defrauded students who are being hurt and suffering around this country and whose voices are not being heard here in Congress.

I also rise to talk about the college affordability crisis in our country.

Next week, freshmen in college and their families will be faced with their first tuition bill. According to the National Center for Education Statistics, the average cost per year is just over \$19,000 for a public 4-year university and nearly \$40,000 for a private university. The price tag for postsecondary education is spiraling out of control, and the cost of college is increasing at a rate almost eight times faster than wages.

Today, nearly 43 million Americans—that is one in six adults—have Federal student loan debt. The Federal student loan portfolio has risen to over \$1.5 trillion, more than doubling from just a decade ago.

Tomorrow's graduates will face an average debt of \$30,000, a crippling amount for any young person to shoulder, before they have even entered the workforce. That amount of debt, that figure, increases every single year, while students' ability to pay off this debt does not.

Even with the most generous interest rate—4 percent for Federal direct student loans—borrowers will owe over \$300 a month on a standard repayment timeline of 10 years, and they will pay \$6,500 in interest alone.

In 2017, Young Invincibles released a report on the financial decline of millennials compared to baby boomers. Their findings are unsurprising for those of us familiar with college debt.

Despite low unemployment and economic growth, young adults are significantly worse off than those in the generation before them. And for those students who are unable to complete their college degrees, the forecast is even worse. This is where the real problem lies. According to the Department of Education, only 56 percent of borrowers who left before completing their degrees are able to lift themselves out of that debt.

In 2012, in my book, "Broke: How Debt Bankrupts the Middle Class," I wrote about the financial risks of attending college, especially for those who are unable to complete their degrees.

It is true that the typical worker with a bachelor's degree earns 71 percent more than a worker with only a high school diploma. But those caught in the middle between the high school degree and the bachelor's degree are at the highest risk of financial instability.

While the overall level of education in our country has increased, the largest group of people in bankruptcy remains those with some college.

And let's be clear: Many of these students who are unable to complete degrees are not uninterested in an education. They enrolled in college and they wanted to earn that degree. And many would still love to finish their degrees. But according to the Department of Education, the majority of those who leave college do so because of job or financial demands. In fact, fewer than 8 percent of student loan debtors in bankruptcy reported that they left college because they did not want to continue their education.

Many of these families and students face demands to care for family members or are unable to continue to pay their tuition or meet their living expenses.

□ 1930

And those who are most harmed are those who come from economically disadvantaged backgrounds to begin with.

The power of Pell grants and other Federal funding streams has dropped dramatically as the cost of a college education has skyrocketed. And to make matters worse, this administra-

tion is rolling back protections for students attending for-profit colleges where some of the worst abuses have occurred.

I recently spoke with one of my constituents, a 30-year-old man named Tom who lives in Irvine. Tom's parents didn't earn high school degrees. Not only did he want to finish high school, he wanted to get a college degree.

A few years after graduating from high school, after working multiple jobs to make ends meet, Tom started searching for a program that would help him pursue his passion for graphic design.

He found The Art Institute of California online and filled out an interest form. A recruiter soon called him, and he was incredibly excited to join the program and work toward a degree. He didn't realize at that time that "anyone who could find a way to pay" would likely be accepted.

Tom explained to me that the tools and code that they taught were outdated and that his access to his instructors was nearly nonexistent. He graduated with an associate's degree and with more than \$50,000 in debt.

But he graduated with none of the skills that he needed for success. While working jobs completely unrelated to his field of study, Tom worked to teach himself the skills he actually needed, and today he has managed to become a senior designer for a digital marketing agency. But his student loan debt is a constant weight on his shoulders.

He recently got married, and as he considers starting a family, he finds himself wondering if he will be able to financially provide for his children when he, himself, still owes tens of thousands of dollars.

I recently joined with my colleagues in introducing the Relief for Defrauded Students Act of 2019, which would help borrowers who were defrauded or misled by their colleges, as the Department of Education Undersecretary Betsy DeVos has failed to follow through with promises made to protect borrowers.

But this is not enough. As we have seen all too frequently, the Department of Education and Secretary DeVos cannot be trusted to safeguard the interests of students whom, by law, they are obligated to protect. Because of that, I believe that we should require information sharing between the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau and the Department of Education and that this information sharing would help make sure that the consumer agency's student loan ombudsman has the data necessary to understand the challenges that borrowers are facing.

That is why I introduced the CFPB Student Loan Integrity and Transparency Act. The bill does just what its name suggests. It mandates that the Department of Education and student loan servicers share information and cooperate with the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau's student loan education ombudsman. That ombudsman

is the number one Federal official tasked with advocating for students struggling to repay Federal student loans.

The bill also requires that the ombudsman's office be fully staffed at all times so that the office can conduct the level of oversight necessary to protect student borrowers.

On the ninth anniversary of the passage of Dodd-Frank, it is time that we take stock of the protections of that landmark legislation that prevents another financial crisis. Many of these protections, the administration and my Republican colleagues have chosen to strip away. Even if piecemeal, we must reanimate those protections established under Dodd-Frank or we will again face the kind of dire consequences that fell on the shoulders of American families in 2008.

I wrote my book, "Broke: How Debt Bankrupts the Middle Class," in 2012. That was 7 years ago. The college affordability crisis is not new to this country, and it is not new to this Congress. The crisis has been going on for years.

While students are unable to finish their educations because of the financial burdens and lack of student supports, while thousands face bankruptcy because of the high costs of college, Congress has done nothing. In the 7 months that I have been here, Congress has done nothing.

How much longer will we wait to address the student loan crisis? Because the students who are buried in debt, many from degrees that they were unable to finish because of financial pressure, cannot keep waiting.

Every day that we do nothing, we are failing every single person in this country who pursues a postsecondary education. We are stifling our economy and actively preventing the most vulnerable people from achieving economic stability and success. No one in Congress, Democrat or Republican, should accept this. We are failing our Nation's students.

As a mother of three young children, I refuse to stand by and let this happen. That is why I have joined with my colleague, Representative JAHANA HAYES, to found the first-ever Congressional College Affordability Caucus.

Before being elected to Congress, I was a university professor, and I spent nearly two decades helping consumers who were facing bankruptcy. The mission of the College Affordability Caucus is to convene a diverse group of Congress Members to discuss the main drivers of the increasing cost of higher education and the resulting accessibility barriers to students who are seeking a postsecondary degree or credential.

The College Affordability Caucus will highlight solutions to the student loan default crisis, ensure that adequate guardrails are in place to protect every student from predatory actors, and reduce barriers to college completion that subsequently heighten college

debt repayment problems for far too many students.

As we move forward to a reauthorization of the Higher Education Act, I hope that the College Affordability Caucus can work with other congressional leaders for whom this is a priority to make sure that we are protecting our students and ensuring that everyone has access to a high-quality, affordable education.

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

SOUTHERN BORDER CRISIS

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

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, I am excited tonight to talk to this audience here and at home about a serious situation that has plagued America and American politics since the mid-1980s.

But that is not what I am excited about. I am excited to offer a bipartisan legislation solution to fix our broken immigration system.

Before I get into the nuts and bolts of what we are going to talk about, we need to look back on past efforts of what worked and efforts that did not work.

This body, along with President Reagan, did immigration reform that gave approximately 3.5 million individuals amnesty. Reforms were put in place to prevent a repeat of the illegal immigration challenge this Nation has had.

America, time and time again, has been said to be the most generous country when it comes to immigration policies, and I think we can all agree with that. Over 1 million people migrate to America, legally, per year.

Unfortunately, this body became divided and has continued to be divided over the enforcement of current laws and border security and making the needed reforms and revisions and adaptation to the times and needs of today to ensure our Nation's borders are secure.

There are many programs where individuals can migrate to America legally, whether it is for work, to get an education, to become a citizen, to seek refuge from a national disasters, fear for one's safety because of bad government, corrupt government, or fear of life.

However, this body has become so divided and the situation since 1986 has grown to the point that we now have a conservative estimate of over 12 million individuals in America illegally, and the number continues to grow.

The number will continue to grow until this body stops playing politics with policies and people's lives and puts forth a policy that is best for America—not best for a political party, not best for the next election.

If a policy is best for America, the question is asked: Is it not best for

all—our citizens, the immigrant, and national security?

What must happen is for this body to stop playing the political divisive game that has divided this Nation over the immigration policies.

The Democratic side, Mr. Speaker, claims the Republicans are running concentration camps, tearing children away from their parents, and throwing children in cages with no food, no water, no toothbrushes, et cetera.

The Republicans claim, Mr. Speaker, the other side wants to have open borders, and I have to admit, the Democratic Presidential candidates have talked about that. The Democrats, Mr. Speaker, want to give everyone amnesty.

Therefore, nothing gets resolved because the narrative becomes political, the canyon that has grown between us grows larger, and nothing gets done.

I am a veterinarian by trade, and what I have learned is you have got to look at the facts in front of you; you have got to diagnose the condition; you have got to look at the underlying cause; and then you have to treat accordingly.

In order for a problem to be solved, there must be the recognition that there is a problem.

Let me reference some of the rhetoric spoken by the very people tasked with solving this challenge to our great Nation, and this was at the beginning of the year.

House Speaker NANCY PELOSI called the situation: "A fake crisis at the border."

Senate Minority Leader CHUCK SCHUMER called it: "A crisis that does not exist."

House Majority Leader STENY HOYER said: "There is no crisis at the border."

And I can read on and on with the individuals' names, but there is no need to because they are talking points that don't change.

Another Member: "There is no crisis at the border."

Another Member: "A fake crisis at the border."

"There is no crisis at the border."

"We don't have a border crisis."

"A phony border crisis."

"A fake crisis at the border."

"A crisis that does not exist."

"Nonexistent border crisis."

"There is no border crisis."

This comes from a piece in the Washington Examiner that Byron York wrote: "This moment might be a time for introspection for those who have consistently downplayed the urgency of the situation on the border. Earlier this year, with the number of illegal crossings rising; with the nature of the crossers changing, more families and more children than in earlier years; with the testimony of border officials that they were unable to handle the situation; with all that happening, many Democrats and their supporters in the media forcefully denied that there was a crisis on the southern border."

Here are a few more examples, Mr. Speaker.

“In the media, ‘Never Trump’ Republicans, former Republicans, and other commentators have joined in.”

“Former Rep. Joe Scarborough, now with MSNBC, called the situation ‘an imaginary border crisis.’

“Former Bush White House official Nicolle Wallace, also with MSNBC, said, ‘There’s not a crisis.’”

“Former Weekly Standard editor Bill Kristol called the situation ‘a fake crisis.’”

Another one says: “A fake crisis.”

Another one: “There is no crisis on the border.”

Another one: “There is no crisis at the border.”

They are the same talking points that get passed from one person to another.

Another one: “A faux crisis.”

“A make-believe crisis.”

Even the comedians on late-night television weighed in and said: “A fake border crisis.”

In this one article, there are over 26 examples, and there are plenty more where this came from.

□ 1945

“The situation at the border is so terrible in part because those in power, and those cheering them on in the media, have steadfastly resisted commonsense measures to reduce the flow of illegal migrants, the large majority of whom do not have a valid claim of asylum, across the border. The resulting paralysis in border policy encourages more migrants to come, making the situation worse by the day.

“Perhaps some of those quoted above only want to deny the President a victory,” which is shameful. No matter how sensible the results are, they can’t give in so that the situation is resolved.

The bottom line is, the American people are less safe; the immigrants are less safe; and America’s national security is threatened.

“Perhaps others are simply looking for a partisan advantage” for the next election. “Perhaps some sincerely believe in open or virtually open borders.”

As I said, the Democratic Presidential candidates have all expressed their views on that.

“It does not matter what their motives are. The crisis—yes, crisis—at the border worsens every day that we do not act.”

I am happy to say that I think people have come to their senses, that there is recognition today that there is a crisis at our border. The important thing to note is that if we recognize there is a crisis at the border, then you can start to heal the problem, and then you can start fixing that problem. It starts with border security and the enforcement of the laws already on the books.

People want to put in new laws and do all these things. The laws are already on the books. There are some

flawed laws, like the Flores agreement, that need to be changed.

I just spoke to a Member of Congress who returned from the border, and he has spoken to the border security people. He was down there, and he saw firsthand. He had a shocking report. The coyotes bringing people in have control of what we call parishes or little neighborhoods. They have control of an area, and they bring people in. They are working with the narcotraffickers. They are bringing individuals into this country.

Understand what is happening here. An individual who comes in will pay a coyote up to \$8,000 for entry to come into America. It is more difficult to bring one individual in than it is with a child. A person who comes in with a child only has to pay \$5,000 to a coyote. The reason is that they have to smuggle an individual in, get them on a bus, and they give them a boxed lunch.

This was just reported to us, and that was from last week.

The person with a child who comes in only has to pay \$5,000 because we have to process that, so it is easier to get them in. They can just come across the border, and our system rolls them in, so it is only \$5,000 to come in.

The coyotes—understand this—and human traffickers, which are the same, are advertising in other countries, Africa, the Middle East, the Asia-Pacific region, and South and Central America on TV ads. Ads in print say: Come to America. We can get you in.

They have the prices printed. The coyotes, the human traffickers, and the narcos are getting rich at the expense of the immigrant and the refugee who truly need to come into America, and the children.

We always hear on the other side that it is for the children. Well, by God, if you believe that, then fix the dang problem.

It is also at the expense of our American citizens and our children. I was elected by American citizens, and my first job is to uphold the Constitution. My first job is to the people of my district who sent me here. My first job is to protect our constitutional principles for the people of this Nation.

The other thing that gets threatened is our national security. The reports we have right now indicate there are over 60 countries represented from around the world, from China and Africa, that are coming into this country at the hands of the coyotes.

I want to drop back to 2014. I think it is interesting that Members on the other side of this very body who were saying there is no crisis at the border, if you look at my first poster here, it is from June 2014. Let me read you the headline here, “Sickening Photos of the Humanitarian Crisis at U.S. Border Detention Centers.” This was June 16, 2014, and it was written by Brett Logiurato.

There were Members who are serving in this Congress today who took these photos, and they said what a shame it

is that we have these situations at the border.

You can see this picture. People are laying on concrete floors.

But then they turn around and accuse President Trump of laying these people on concrete floors with no pillows and no blankets. That is 2014, when President Obama was in charge.

Here is another picture. “A staggering humanitarian crisis on the U.S.-Mexico border has left Federal officials scrambling to provide the basic human necessities to thousands of undocumented immigrants, most of them unaccompanied children.”

The other side will say, well, it is for the children. I agree. No child should have to go through that. No parent should have to go through that in 2014. Yet, this is 2019. Not a dang thing has been done in this body to fix this problem because politicians—and I am almost embarrassed to say that I am a politician—are afraid to fix this problem.

Do you know why? They will get political arrows thrown at them. Somebody will say: Oh, you want amnesty. You want to deport everybody.

They stay away from this, another election comes, and nothing happens other than the situation gets worse.

Let me go to another picture of sickening photos of the humanitarian crisis at the border detention center. Business Insider all the way in Australia is highlighting how dysfunctional the American immigration system is. You see kids running around. They are barefoot. People are laying on aluminum blankets, heat shields.

People are in this situation. This is not a new crisis. This is something that has been going on since 1986. It is coming to a head, and it is going to get worse if this body does not get the backbone to do what is right and do what is right for America. As I said, if it is right for America, then it is going to be right for the immigrant, right for the American citizen, and right for this country. If we don’t do those things, then it is going to get worse.

Let’s go to that other picture. There is a graph here that I want to highlight before I turn it over to my good friend. On this graph, I think it is interesting because numbers and pictures speak lots of words. This is the southwest border apprehension for fiscal year 2019.

Before I get into this, President Trump has taken a lot of heat for trying to resolve a situation that gets worse every day. He has to do that only because this body is inept at what it is tasked to do. This body is the one that is supposed to write immigration laws. This body is the one that is supposed to do the enforcement laws. The President is tasked with executing the laws. According to Article II, Section 3, he shall faithfully execute the laws of the land. But if Congress does not solve the problem, then he has no other choice.

He has called this an emergency. He has taken flack for that. He has taken

all kinds of criticism for trying to do what is right for this country, trying to protect our national security, and trying to have some kind of common-sense way to slow this down.

Yet my colleagues on the other side who acknowledged in 2014 that this was a crisis, at the beginning of this year, they said there was no crisis. They criticized him for trying to act.

I want to show this graph. I know it is probably hard to see from TV, but look at this graph. We have different years represented here. We go from 2014 all the way up to 2019. The bottom line is, 2016, we were actively deporting people. There was a bad economy. We weren't getting as many people into this country.

What I want to show is in October 2018. Look at 2019. If we start at January, we are at 54,000 people apprehended at the border. This was when there was no crisis at the border, 58,000 while there was no crisis at the border. By the time June came around, that number had grown to 104,000 apprehensions at the border.

There was no crisis, according to my colleagues on the other side who won't come together to solve this problem.

President Trump acted, and he acted strongly. He appealed to Mexico to help us with this situation. I commend the President of Mexico for coming to terms with President Trump. They put in enforcement at their southern border.

You can see exactly the effect of that when it happened. It happened right here in the end of June. Since then, the illegal apprehensions have dropped precipitously down to under 110,000 in just a month and a half.

We haven't changed the laws in this country. We haven't increased border security in this country. But the Mexicans came to rescue and help us. In fact, the Mexican Government is doing more to solve this problem for America, American citizens, and immigrants than my colleagues on the left side.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING), who is a great friend of mine and a great proponent of legal immigration.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for taking the initiative to claim this time on the floor of the House of Representatives and bring up this topic.

I point out, Mr. Speaker, to the people who are paying attention here at least, whether or not that is you, that this is the most complex issue that the United States of America faces and has ever faced.

We might face a tax issue or a national defense issue, and we might face a healthcare issue. They are very complex and very detailed. But almost everything else, you can make your mistakes, fix them, and move on, but it doesn't multiply itself throughout the multiple generations that we have.

Immigration is very complex. At the heart of it is something that I heard the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOHO) reference, and that is the word "1986."

I revere Ronald Reagan, and I always have, except for the two times in all of history that he let me down. 1986 was the time he did that, when he granted amnesty to what turned out to be more than 3 million illegal aliens in this country.

It wasn't the number of illegal aliens who were granted a reward for breaking our laws. Instead, it was the destruction of the rule of law. Once you reward people for breaking the law, you get more lawbreakers. More lawbreakers destroy the law.

In the center of everything that I have done on immigration here in this Congress in 16½ years has been about the restoration of the respect for the rule of law, in particular with regard to immigration. Yet I see on the other side of the aisle a constant push to erode and degrade the respect for the rule of law and the rule of law itself.

We are dealing with sanctuary cities, sanctuary counties, sanctuary States, and sanctuary jurisdictions. In the last Congress, we passed sanctuary legislation that went over to Senator MCCONNELL's desk that would have shut it all off and given a victim standing to go to court to sue the political subdivision for compensation for the damage caused by turning people loose on the streets who should have been interdicted, put back in the condition they were in before they broke the law.

I am a little bit extra emotional about this tonight, Mr. Speaker, because I get the news from Des Moines, Iowa. I am going to be delicate about how I say this because I don't want to prejudice an impending prosecution.

We have a triple murder that took place in Des Moines, Iowa, that peaceful city, a triple murder. The individual who was arrested for that triple homicide went into the custody of the Des Moines police for maybe a few hours. Shortly, his name came off the roster for being in their custody.

When you check, he is in ICE's custody. It has now been announced that the individual who is a suspect for a triple homicide in the peaceful city of Des Moines, Iowa, is an illegal alien, a criminal alien.

He also had been interdicted for a hit-and-run just a couple of months ago, turned loose on the streets of Iowa, now potentially becoming guilty of killing three individuals, a mother, an 11-year-old daughter, and a 5-year-old son.

□ 2000

"Illegal alien," well, we are not supposed to say that because it hurts their feelings.

And one of our Members of this Congress has introduced legislation—now, by the way, it is JOAQUIN CASTRO, whose brother is running for President of the United States. He has introduced legislation to eliminate the use of the term "illegal alien" in Federal statute because it hurts people's feelings.

Hurts people's feelings, when we have people going to their graves at their

hands. I think their feelings are hurt a lot worse. And our compassion needs to be for those who have been killed and those who have been injured and those who have been abused in many ways. But to just change the terminology of the reality is just a political statement.

And I would add, on top of that, the policies that have been advocated on the other side of the aisle are the policies that culminate in open borders.

Open borders mean, picking a particular number that came out of DHS, in April, 4,117 illegal aliens interdicted in a single day.

So I got out my little calculator, and I divided 4,117 into 710,000, which is the average size of a congressional seat. That meant that every 24 weeks another congressional district, an entire congressional district in Iowa, is supplanted by illegal aliens coming into America. And that number could well be as many as 50, 60, or 70 seats over the period of a Census time.

So I point this down, in conclusion here, and compress it so that even those folks who are the least likely to understand this will understand what I am about to describe.

If you were to clear out a county in the desert of Nevada so that there wasn't a single person living there, and then as we interdict these folks on the border at the rate of 4,117 in a single day, and over 24 weeks you accumulate the equivalent of an entire congressional district, you put them into that county, the Census shows up and counts them—710,000. 710,000 of them then become an entire congressional district. That entire congressional district couldn't elect a single person because there wouldn't be a single citizen there in 24 weeks.

So that means anybody can move there and vote for themselves, come to Congress, and represent 710,000 illegals—that is how bad it is—in only 24 weeks.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. KING, his passion for this. And I want to run through a few numbers before I go to Mr. CHIP ROY from Texas.

Southwest border apprehensions by U.S. Customs, total apprehensions from October 2018 to May of 2019, 593,507.

May of 2019, apprehensions alone, 138,887—highest month in over a decade.

Total inadmissibles in October of 2018 to 2019, 82,808.

Inadmissibles, these are people who can't come into the country because of their record.

Mr. Speaker, 2019, 6 months total already has exceeded the total for the year of 2015.

At this time, I yield to Mr. CHIP ROY from Texas, a passionate individual about this. And I, again, thank Mr. KING.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his leadership tonight in

bringing an opportunity for us to speak on the floor of the House of Representatives on an issue that is front and center for most of the American people. It is, by far, the number one issue that the American people care about. I can particularly speak to the people of Texas, who are bearing the brunt of the failed border security, the failed immigration policies of the Federal Government.

I had the opportunity to visit an ICE detention facility in Aurora, Colorado, this past Saturday. I was out in Denver for a Western Conservative Summit. I was visiting family members, and I saw this terrible story of individuals rushing the ICE facility in Aurora, Colorado, and taking down the American flag, defacing the American flag, then raising the Mexican flag.

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, I was going to bring this up, and I am glad the gentleman from Texas did.

What happened to the day when migrants came to this country to cherish liberty and freedom and become enrolled in the beliefs that we have to assimilate?

I appreciate the gentleman bringing that up because those aren't friendly signs, to take down the American flag and put up the Mexican flag in our country.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's question. I think it is an important question.

To take down the American flag, deface the American flag with the words "abolish ICE," to turn it upside down and re-raise it; to raise, then, the Mexican flag alongside of it over this ICE detention facility, I went there the day after this occurred. I met with the individuals running this facility, both ICE as well as the private individuals, GEO, that were running it.

What did I find in the facility? It is a detention facility that houses 1,200 individuals. It was clean.

There were doctors' offices. There was medicine.

There were ping-pong tables.

There were iPads to watch news in home countries.

There were televisions.

There were video game stations.

There were three square meals.

There were clean bunk beds.

There were people from 57 countries. Only 29 percent of the people in there are from Mexico.

Traditionally, this ICE facility has 80 percent of its occupants coming from individuals who are brought in there from interior enforcement, usually violent criminals or people who have violated our laws other than immigration laws, and 80 percent are usually of that population.

Now, 80 percent of that is from people who are flooding across our border, overwhelming Border Patrol. ICE has no beds, no place to put these individuals who have violated our laws. As a result, you see the overcrowding in the Border Patrol facilities.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle have, for months on end, been

refusing to acknowledge that there is a border crisis, only awakening in the last several weeks to finally acknowledge that there is a crisis, to finally agree to pass only humanitarian aid, that is, dollars to go to HHS, ORR to take in individuals, unaccompanied children, to place them, but then restricting dollars for ICE.

Why? Because I think that the Democratic Caucus is run by four members of the Caucus. I don't think there is a single Speaker. I think there are four Speakers, and I think those four Speakers are deciding the policy for the Democrat Party. I think, as a result, we saw precisely what is happening. We have no resources for ICE—none.

We are vilifying ICE. We are vilifying Border Patrol. Speak to the Border Patrol agents on the border who are holding the line defending the United States of America while cartels have operational control of our border, while the Gulf Cartel, the Reynoso faction, Los Zetas, the Cartel de Noreste, the Sinaloa, they are using human beings for profit. They are using children as tickets to sell access to the United States.

Why are they doing that, and how are they doing that? My Democrat colleagues know full well the answer to that, and they don't care. They don't care that cartels are abusing our laws for profit, that they are doing so in a way that violates children, violates women on the journey, a third of whom are abused along the journey. And they do so knowing that Border Patrol is overwhelmed and refuse to do anything about it.

Now, what I want to know, and I don't know what my colleagues think about this, but why is it that we have got about 1 week left before we are going to adjourn for a 6-week recess, and yet my Democrat colleagues are going to do nothing, nothing on the floor of this body, the people's House, to address this calamitous situation, nothing to provide the resources necessary for ICE, nothing to address the fact that they only provided \$200 million for ICE with restrictions on how the money may be used?

When Barack Obama, former President, asked for \$762 million for ICE in the wake of the unaccompanied alien children who were coming in 2014—and this crisis is multiple times worse—what are my Democrat colleagues going to do next week to solve this problem before they leave for 6 weeks?

What are my Democrat colleagues going to do to save the little girls and the women who are going to get abused in the next 6 weeks when everybody adjourns for this body to go off to fundraisers and trips and go back to their districts while our border is on fire?

What are my Democrat colleagues going to do? I will tell you what they are going to do. Absolutely nothing, and it is an embarrassment.

It is an embarrassment to this body, the people's House, that we are looking

at a southern border that is being violated. We are looking at a sovereignty of the United States being violated. We are looking at little girls and women being violated by dangerous cartels. And my Democrat colleagues would rather waste time on the floor of this body with meaningless resolutions.

We spent time yesterday doing what? Taking down the words and having a vote on words that were a result of a resolution against a tweet. That is what this august body did yesterday. That is what they spent their time doing.

Did they address the border crisis? No.

Are they going to address the border crisis next week? No. They are going to send us into the August recess, barreling towards deficits well over a trillion dollars, with people streaming across our border in violation of our sovereignty to the detriment of our security, to the detriment of the well-being of the migrants who seek to come here, and they are going to do that, to go home and do absolutely nothing about the problem.

So I would ask my colleagues: Are we going to allow this body to adjourn next week? Are we going to leave the floor and go home for 6 weeks and allow that to continue to be the state of affairs at our southern border?

I think this country deserves better. I think the migrants who seek to come here deserve better.

I think we should sit down and roll up our sleeves and do the job the American people sent us here to do: secure the border, balance the budget, provide healthcare freedom, make sure our men and women have a clear mission and the tools to do it, and get the hell out of the way of the American people.

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's passion, and appreciate him bringing these things out.

And this is something we have sent President Trump, and I am going to say tonight, I implore President Trump—in fact, I am going to challenge President Trump to reconvene this Congress at the beginning of the August recess. And I would do it every recess from here on out until this body comes to grips and solves this problem in a bipartisan, bicameral way; because, if you don't do that, Congress will run out.

Like the gentleman said, they are going to go fundraise. They are going to get ready for the next election and tell everybody how great they did, yet this problem is getting worse.

President Trump, you can do this. It hasn't been done since 1948. That was President Truman, and he did what was best for this body.

I can tell you one thing. When you invade the personal time of Members of Congress, you get their attention. I think it is time we do that. I, for one, will stay here. I think this needs to be done. This is such a critical issue.

At this time, I would like to go over a couple more facts, these numbers, the

sources, total CBP enforcement, Custom Border Patrol.

Apprehensions in 2017, total for the year was 526,901. 2018, that number—because the word had gotten out. The drug cartels are very good business people, unfortunately. They are not ethical people. They are not people I would want to have next to us. I don't want them in my country. But they are very good at what they do. The apprehensions in 2018 was 683,178.

Now, get this. If people will not come together in a bipartisan way, they don't need to be in Congress.

When you hear these numbers, apprehensions year-to-date 2019—keep in mind, 2017 is 527,000; 2018, 683,000 for the years. 2019, to date, the end of June, 787,161.

Folks, when are we going to do this? If not now, when? Are we going to wait until there are 20 million people here? 40 million people? 50 million people?

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT), a great friend of mine, another great Texan.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida, and I appreciate him yielding.

This is something we ought to be talking about every day because it is a crisis. It makes a difference. It is helping destroy our country.

And it is really tragic, though, and I would not superimpose any type of attack on personalities, however, I think what we really have is not evil intentions. I think it is just massive ignorance. Because we have heard over and over: Oh, if you want to secure the border, you want just U.S. citizens, then you are a racist.

So that just reflects an ignorance.

Mr. YOHO. Does the gentleman feel like it is politics being played over policy for the next election?

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, there is no question about that.

Mr. YOHO. Absolutely. It is sickening, sickening for this body, sickening for America.

Mr. GOHMERT. No, it is.

But American citizens are comprised of every race, of every nationality, all walks of life. It is one of our strengths, people coming from so many different walks of life, countries, races. Yet when we have applied the standard “from out of many, one,” then we have been our strongest, all different races, nationalities.

□ 2015

But now, in order to tear down this country and the greatness in the way of opportunities and help around the world for other countries, not seeking some hegemony, not seeking imperialist motives, we want everyone to be better off. We want peace. We want good for everyone.

But if you destroy our borders and people flood in who are not educated on what it takes to keep a self-governing country, you won't keep it.

Eric Metaxas has a book out on this, but it goes back to what Benjamin

Franklin said when he was asked at the end of the convention, “What did you give us?” And they wondered if it was another monarchy.

“A Republic, Madam, if you can keep it.”

The one thing we know: No country has lasted, either as a complete democracy like the Athenian city-state or whether it is a parliamentary country—they don't last 200 years.

We are 230 now. We are moving on. So, we are in a very desperate situation to try to keep this shining light on a hill that shines light for the world.

So, it is important that we have borders. If we don't have borders, if we don't secure our borders, then we will come—as many have wanted. They wanted to see America fall from within.

As Lincoln said, if death be our light, then we will die by suicide is basically what he was saying.

We have got to secure our borders so that we can welcome people continuing at the rate faster—more people coming in than any other country in the history of the world.

But I have had people in my district say, “We went to the border. We went through these facilities. We have all this information. People are being kept in cages. It is horrible.”

Well, I go down a lot, have been down many times. And I started going down during the Obama administration. That is when the cages were built. They were built by the Obama administration. That is when overcrowding was started, during the Obama administration.

But it is like there is an intent, as my friend from Florida was pointing out, for political purposes, that we want to try to make the Trump administration look bad, so we will take all the wrongdoing that occurred during the Obama years, the mistreatment of people that have come in illegally, and project that onto the Trump administration, and we will push to have even less enforcement on our borders.

We will make these promises of, gee, we are working on all these kinds of things. Here is an article from The Hill: “Democrats calling for decriminalization of illegal entry abandoning national sovereignty.”

They want to decriminalize—it is against the law, it is a crime to come into the country illegally. They are sending every message they possibly can. It is not a dog whistle. It is a big neon sign saying “Come.” Whether you are coming from Asia, Africa, South America, Central America, we don't care. Just come illegally, as many as you can. We will overwhelm these folks. We are going to be able to probably get a lot of people that are here illegally voting, and then will be the end of the Republican Party.

And what they don't say—maybe they don't realize—is that it will also be the end of a self-governing nation as we knew it. Because the way this normally works out—and we are well be-

yond the maximum, basically, 200 years. When we lose our freedom, it won't come back. We are done. And there will be no place for people being mistreated around the world to come after that.

It is interesting, though, when I have been down to the border, especially during the Obama years, the Obama administration personnel kept me out of some of those facilities. We had to really raise Cain and get in there.

So, we have got people who are not part of the government, and they go waltzing into these facilities. That is ridiculous.

Then we know that there were two pictures that were initially—they had to be withdrawn, but they were from 2014, about people in cages. I had seen that my friend, Mr. YOHO, had the pictures. Those are from the Obama administration.

Mr. Speaker, let me just finish by pointing out, this truly is a threat to the existence of a self-governing country as we have known it. This is serious stuff.

For those who have big hearts, those of us that want to help as many people as we can, destroying the fabric of a self-governing country will not allow better fabric to take its place.

You will have another Venezuela. It always works out. People try to self-govern for so long, and then, eventually, untoward efforts bring about chaos.

And, normally, the way chaos is dealt with is push for a monarchy, a totalitarian government, a Putin, a Chavez, a Hitler. There is some effort to get somebody in that can get all of this under control, and it is the end of a democratic republic.

So, I am really pleased that my friend, Dr. YOHO—I tell friends, he is a guy, having been a veterinarian, that was best equipped to work in Congress because he has had so much experience dealing with the south end of a north-bound horse. So I thank him for bringing about this Special Order, and I am looking forward to many more. We need to talk about this, this is a threat.

Mr. YOHO. This is a threat. This is not about being racist. It is about doing rule of law.

Our good friend STEVE KING brought up a great point. This is rule of law. That is all we are asking: Follow the rule of law.

This body has been derelict in their duty, and that is why this problem is growing, because they put politics above policy. They are afraid to stand up.

It is like I said. We have asked President Trump, reconvene Congress, bring us back in at the August recess. And I would bring us back every time until we fix this problem, period.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, our Border Patrol agents are exhausted. They have worked so many hours.

We had a hearing today in Judiciary on a bill adding requirement after requirement, millions and millions of dollars. They didn't give them any money in the 4.6 to do the job of enforcing the border. Our Border Patrol agents need help. They are in big trouble.

Mr. YOHO. They do. I appreciate the gentleman bringing that up. I will talk about that at the end.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY), my good friend and colleague, the brigadier general.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for hosting this Special Order and continuing to elevate this issue and keep talking about it.

The last time that we were speaking on this floor about the crisis on our southern border with Mexico, our colleagues on the other side of the aisle were still denying there was a crisis, if you remember.

In report after report—if you watched CNN, MSNBC, et cetera—they said it was a manufactured crisis, manufactured by Donald Trump.

To their credit, they finally agreed that there is a crisis. I just thought, well, such is the state of the Democrats on the other side of the aisle. But mere acceptance of reality counts for progress around here. But we have got to be thankful that we are at least having a conversation sometime.

But you would think, with this crisis on our border—5,000 people a day coming illegally. That doesn't count the ones coming at points of entry. Those are in between the points of entry. And that also doesn't count the ones that weren't caught, right? Those are the ones we caught.

Usually, Border Patrol says you can times two whatever we caught because others are getting through. You would think that we would be working around the clock here to fix this crisis at the border since we all now agree that there is a crisis.

But, instead, my good friends on the other side of the aisle are focused on smearing the President. I get the partisanship, but what really troubles me is they are also focused on smearing Border Patrol and ICE agents that are duty bound. They raise their right hand and take an oath to uphold and defend the Constitution and the laws that we created, that this body created. They are just doing their job that we asked them to do, and for that, they are being criticized, demonized, and smeared.

To add further insult to injury, some of our colleagues are now saying that they want to abolish these folks, the agencies—ICE and Homeland Security. You didn't hear that wrong. That is a solution.

So, a solution to the problem of people coming illegally, pouring across the border, offered by the other side of the aisle, in some cases, is to abolish the agencies and the people who are working to stop it.

This completely sounds wrongheaded to me. I don't know who that makes sense to, but it doesn't make any sense to me.

Now, what other ideas have we heard? Of course, amnesty for illegal foreign nationals. That is going to fix the problem, because if you know that you can break the law and nothing is going to happen to you, I am sure that is not an encouragement to keep on breaking the law. I am sure that is not somehow.

Decriminalizing illegal entry. So, if you have somebody trespassing on your land and you go to the police and you say, "Hey, these folks keep trespassing on my land," the police say, "Well, here is our solution. We are just going to make trespass legal now. Are you good with that?"

Well, that doesn't seem like much of a solution.

Eliminating detention facilities. So, recently, a study maintains that 30 percent of the young people—usually young girls, but not exclusively, but young people that are being brought in—because these folks know that if they bring a child with them, it is tantamount to just immediate entry—30 percent of them had no connection, had no familial—family connection to the person that they are with.

So, the reason to have detention facilities, among other things, is to try and figure out: Is this child with a parent or a relative, or is this child being trafficked?

A solution to this overwhelming problem offered by my friends on the other side of the aisle is to just get rid of the detention facilities.

So, the last place that this small child is looking for salvation, for safety, to stop the trafficking that is happening at that time, looking to America, probably praying and hoping that, finally, when I get to America, they are going to find out that I am being exploited in horrific ways.

Our good friends on the other side of the aisle say, No, we are not going to do any of that. Just keep on exploiting the kids, but don't do it here. Don't do it in Mexico either. Now, just keep exploiting them in your town.

Well, that is not much of a solution. To me, that is horrific, thinking about that.

Of course, then, another solution is providing taxpayer-funded healthcare for people that came here illegally.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know where everybody lives, but I know that people in the community that I am privileged to represent are having a hard time paying for their own healthcare now, let alone paying for people that came here illegally.

And, again, that is a solution to stop people from coming across the border offered from our friends on the other side of the aisle.

Let's face it, these are incentives. These aren't solutions to fix this problem; these are incentives to exacerbate the problem.

I don't know what reality my good friends on the other side of the aisle are residing in, but, so far, it seems to me their platform has been amnesty, apathy, or apoplexy.

And we are frustrated because we know that the solutions are out there. We have worked on them here, and we are happy and willing to work with our friends and colleagues on the other side of the aisle, but they seem paralyzed by theatrics in politics.

We know that loopholes in our immigration laws are being exploited by human traffickers and drug cartels. They are taking laws designed to help the most helpless, and they are using them for profit at a tragic cost to children and families.

Yet, the policies and the solutions proposed by our good friends on the other side of the aisle expand those loopholes or create even brand-new ones.

And we know, with hundreds of thousands of people streaming across the border, we need funds for beds and detention space.

Some of our friends on the other side of the aisle say, "Well, we don't want you to detain these people, and we are not going to provide any funding for beds."

So the answer is, when they come across the border, don't even talk to them. Just let them keep on going. Let the children stay with their trafficker, end detention altogether, leaving the trafficked child at the mercy of their trafficker.

Then there is the dangerous transnational criminal organization, not only trafficking in children, but the drugs that are ravaging your very community.

□ 2030

They are coming across our southern border. Barriers, fencing, and wall, they are a force multiplier, because if our Border Patrol agents don't have to stare at this place right here on the border because there is a barrier there, they can look over here where traffickers are coming across. Without any barrier, they have to look everywhere, and there is just simply not enough of them.

The other side shut the government down, trying to stop us from securing the border.

These cartels make massive profits. You heard about El Chapo's sentence today. It is estimated he was making \$3 billion a year trafficking children and drugs into your community, \$3 billion a year.

El Chapo is in jail. Do you think somebody else didn't take over? Do you think he was the only cartel in Mexico?

The other side is wasting time on this floor passing partisan bills that have no hope of becoming law. Meanwhile, ICE made more than 1,500 human trafficking arrests, and 97 percent of those were for sex trafficking. 20,000 children were illegally smuggled into the United States in December of

last year alone, 20,000 children. These are little kids.

I know the statistics start to run together, but these numbers must be recited. As of March this year, CBP has seen over a 50 percent spike in gang members apprehended at the southern border.

Did you look to see what happened in Los Angeles just this week, the arrests and the horrific crimes? Is this what we want in our communities, people hatcheting and macheteing each other to death, cutting each other apart?

We have a great country. There is no reason to do this.

In the last 2 years, ICE has arrested 266,000 aliens with criminal records. Those aliens had convictions, including 100,000 assaults, 30,000 sex crimes, and 4,000 homicides.

If you believe the cartels are going to stop making millions a year if we decriminalize the border and abolish ICE, you are not living in reality.

Every day, children are being recycled across the border, serving as human shields. They send them across with somebody; they send them back; and then, they come back with somebody else. That is trafficking. There is no consequence to it.

It is time to stop just talking about protecting the children being exploited. It is long past time to start protecting them and our communities by closing the loopholes that are used to hurt them.

A famous quote we have all heard goes like this: "The only thing necessary for the triumph of evil is that good men and women do nothing." That is happening, Mr. Speaker, in this House.

The country is still waiting on the leadership of this House of Representatives to do something.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOHO) for inviting me and keeping this issue front and center.

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Pennsylvania's passion and leadership on the things he has done.

He talked about it. Mr. ROY talked about it. Mr. GOHMERT talked about it. It is edifying.

The ICE agents and the Customs and Border Patrol agents are doing a job that this body created with laws and policies, and then hired them. We have people on the other side of the aisle who are criminalizing the very people we hired to do this job that they have to do. And it is a thankless job.

I know our side, the Republican Party, and, I am sure, some Democrats are truly thankful that our ICE agents and Customs and Border Patrol are there. They are taking time away from their families, and they are taking the time that they could be doing other things, but they are keeping our Nation safe.

As Members of Congress, we here are thankful for them, and I know our Nation is thankful for them.

I implore, again, President Trump to reconvene Congress, if it leaves without solving this problem, in the August recess and every time. He can be the first President since President Truman in 1948 to do this.

I implore anybody who is watching to call your Members and tell them you want this problem solved. There is no reason that this does not get solved. This is something we can do.

Throw politics out of it. Let's get good policies. Good policies for America are good policies for the migrant, good policy for our citizens, and good policy for our country.

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

KEEPING THE PROMISE OF SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, tonight is a continuation of a series I have been doing on the floor every other week, depending on the chaos of the floor schedule. I take about a half an hour and walk through things I see in the numbers and, in many ways, express my intense frustration at both the Democrats and many of my brothers and sisters on the Republican side for not taking a step backward from the daily chaos that has become the House of Representatives to realize that the single biggest threat to the cohesion of our society is demographics. I am going to walk through what that means.

The reason I always put up this particular board is that we have developed, in our office, a five-prong attack on what society does financially to be able to keep the promises of Social Security and Medicare.

The demographics I was speaking of are those of us who are baby boomers. There are 74 million of us born, functionally, in an 18-year period, with 10,300 of us retiring or turning 65 every single day.

The math is devastatingly ugly. My instinct is maybe that is why it is avoided in conversation around here, because the math is difficult. It is uncomfortable. It is also real.

Something I don't often do, but I want to read a simple paragraph from a June 11, 2019, analysis from the Manhattan Institute that was analyzing the numbers from the Congressional Budget Office. They are talking, right now, about just Social Security and Medicare. "Over the next decade, 91 percent of the projected increase in budget deficits, which are set to approach \$2 trillion, comes from the increased cost" of Social Security, Medicare, and the associated interest.

Think of that. In the next decade, when we talk about the growth of the debt and deficit, 91 percent of that is just, functionally, the demographic

growth for Social Security and Medicare.

Another way to think about that is, every 5 years, just the growth in Social Security and Medicare equals the entire Defense Department.

If we are going to keep our promises as a society—these are earned benefits. We made a promise as a society, avoiding the reality of the math.

Think about this part of this paragraph. "Over the next 30 years, Social Security and Medicare are projected to run a \$100 trillion cash shortfall, including resulting interest costs, while the rest of the budget is projected to run a \$16 trillion surplus." Think about that one more time—over the next 30 years.

I have a 3½-year-old little girl. Doesn't she deserve to live in an America that continues to be prosperous?

With these sorts of numbers, it is impossible. Functionally, our debt deficits, the attempt to try to keep some of our promises, is going to consume everything around us.

In previous times on the floor, and I know I am going to be doing it again, we brought in a series of what the left often says: "Well, we will tax the rich more. We will do this and this." They only cover tiny portions. The scale of this doesn't work in our modern rhetoric.

Think about that last sentence again. If you remove Social Security and Medicare, over the next 30 years, the budget has a \$16 trillion surplus. One of our boards has a higher number because the board is a bit out-of-date. But the budget is what we call a cash surplus. The associated revenues exceed the associated expenses.

If you add in Social Security and Medicare, it is a \$100 trillion deficit, with its associated interest costs.

What are we going to do? We believe we have a fighting chance. There was a time, a decade ago, if you did certain senior options and those things in Medicare, gave some pricing power and options, you could see where you could flatten out some of that debt-to-GDP curve and make the baby boomers survivable, economically.

We have waited too long. We have missed that window. Now our argument is that we have to do everything. We have to do things that grow the economy, a Tax Code that maximizes economic expansion, trade that maximizes economic expansion, regulations, smart regulations, using technology that maximizes economic expansion.

Labor force participation, what do you do to encourage workforce entry? We are doing remarkably well right now. We still have a problem with millennial men. We still need to find ways to create some spiffs within the Tax Code, within the retirement parts of the code, to encourage seniors who are healthy, wish to do it, and are prepared to do it, to stay in the labor force.

We have to do things to encourage family formation and to move to an immigration system that is talent-

based, so it maximizes economic vitality.

We are going to have to look at the earned entitlement and things we can do to put spiffs and incentives within there to change the cost of healthcare, to encourage staying in the labor force, smart decisionmaking.

One of these is really important to me. I have spent a lot of time on the floor—aggressive adoption of disruptive technology, particularly in healthcare.

In this body, we have a running debate. The Republicans say our healthcare reform is who should get subsidized, who shouldn't, and we will add some market forces. The Democrat side is: Well, we won't add market forces. We will do a collectivization, but we will see who pays and who gets subsidized.

We are having an argument about the money, on who gets to pay, not what to pay.

There is technology, and we have done this over and over on the floor, that is about to crash the price of healthcare. If this body is prepared to have that Blockbuster moment—and when I say, “Blockbuster moment,” I mean Blockbuster video moment, where technology changes things. We no longer go down to the neighborhood shopping center and get a little silver disk to shove into our player at home. Instead, we go home and hit a button.

It turns out, in healthcare, you have two sides. You have technology, everything from something you can blow into that tells you if you have the flu, to the thing you wear on your body that helps diagnose you, to the autonomous healthcare clinics that are going up around Phoenix, to the other side, the single-shot cure for hemophilia, things that actually cure disease.

If we can get our heads straight and say we need to crash the price of healthcare—it will be hard. That type of economic technology disruption is going to scare a lot of our friends, whether those in certain medical practices or those who offer certain services. But we don't have a choice.

I want to walk through some. First, some of the good news and the reality on the math because this place is substantially a math-free zone.

Last week, I had floor time scheduled, but the floor ran long because, well, the chaos on the floor. I ran into one of my friends, a Democrat from the Midwest, and we were talking about the speech I was about to give.

His immediate reaction was: Well, David, you had that tax reform a couple of years ago, and that is the real reason.

You look and say, no. If you think about what has happened in labor, in tax revenues, in the dramatically fewer people who actually need social services, it has been incredibly positive for the economy.

□ 2045

So I put this board up for him. Take a look. If you actually take a look at

these years, the middle bar chart, that is 2018. The blue is 2017. The gray is 2019 fiscal year.

This is the first 9 months of what we call receipts. For those of us on the Ways and Means Committee, this is substantially our responsibility is these receipts. Highest revenue first 9 months in U.S. history. Adjusted for constant dollars, the second highest in U.S. history. The doom and gloom and the crazy things that were said about tax reform aren't true, and the math says so.

We don't have a choice. If we do not substantially grow this economy, dramatically grow this economy over the next couple decades—not the next couple years, but next couple decades—you can't mathematically cover the promises we have made on Social Security and Medicare.

And I don't know why it is so terrifying for elected Members to actually be honest about the math. The chart is there. If you don't believe me, go onto the Treasury's website, look at the receipts that have come in—highest in history; adjusted for inflation, constant dollar, second highest in history.

It is working. It is working.

There are other things that are also really optimistic. We are getting one of those—do you remember our five points? Getting the economy to grow long term with stability, you all saw the June labor force report, jobs report—incredibly good numbers, far beyond our expectation.

But what was also really optimistic for those of us who are trying to build these models is the number of the population who were coming back into the labor force.

And I know this is geeking out, but when you actually see more job postings than you have available workers, amazing. If I told you that a couple years ago, you would have laughed at me, but it has happened.

But the other thing we also start to look for is, even if you see little ticks up in the unemployment, the number going up, if it is not because of the falling available jobs but because those re-entering are choosing to enter the labor force, that is really powerful because that labor force participation number has a sense of the productivity of our society.

We have already seen some pretty impressive productivity step-ups. We have actually seen a constant wage gain, particularly for our brothers and sisters who were at, the technical term, the lower quartiles, which I always thought would bring joy across the body.

But it almost now seems this body is incapable of embracing good, optimistic, joyous numbers of how many of our brothers and sisters out there who had a pretty crappy previous decade are actually doing well now. There should be optimism about this. There should be joy about this, but would that be giving one party kudos against the other?

How about for a moment you just drop the party labels and understand the math? There are pretty impressive numbers coming out of this economy right now. What do we do as policy-makers to keep it going as long as possible?

So let's go back to that other leg. How many of our brothers and sisters are actually in the labor force? I can show you some papers from just a few years ago that, as the baby boomers are starting to move into retirement, labor force participation numbers were supposed to collapse, and you actually see a little bit of that. If you look at the 10-year labor force participation and then overlay our demographics as we are getting older as a society, you see those numbers fall.

But take a look at this chart, and this is just the last couple years. We are back up kissing up against a 63 percent labor force participation. I know this is geeky, but I can show you papers from a few years ago. It said we were never getting back close to this number again, at least not for decades and decades and decades. Well, we are there.

This is really important to the economic vitality of the society. And it is not just tax revenues. When you have a population that is working, you have more of your Americans who are receiving employer-based healthcare. They are not receiving certain social welfare benefits. They may not be prospering as you might turn on television and look at the dreams of people who win lotteries, but there are things working.

You can drive through some of the neighborhoods in parts of my district and you just look around at the number of people who are remodeling their homes or putting a new roof on. There are good things happening out there in society, and you see it in the data.

So why do I come to the microphone almost every week with this sort of chagrined look, terrified we are not having the difficult conversation of what do we do to deal with the reality of the promises we as a society have made to our seniors, that retirement security, to keep those promises?

Well, let's actually walk through some of the really difficult math, because this is what drives that \$100 trillion, and that is inflation-adjusted dollars, \$100 trillion shortfall that comes from Social Security and Medicare in the next 30 years. This board right here is the number one driver.

If you need to understand something, just understand this board. This is basically someone who moves into retirement today, they will have paid about \$161,000 in Medicare taxes. That is a lot of money. But that senior who has paid in \$161,000 in Medicare taxes, they will be taking out, and this is the average, \$498,000.

So take that differential, multiply it times 74 million baby boomers, and that is the math. That is substantially the driver of a completely

unsustainable math that blows up everything in our lives. Yet we are terrified to talk about this. We all know it. We all walk around with these reports here, though I wonder how many people ever open them up and read them. But that is the math.

We can manage this, but we have to do it with a level of creativity and understanding that it is not one solution; it is dozens of policies coming together to make it work. So let's see what that shortfall actually does.

This board now is maybe a year out of date, so I need some updating on it, but it functionally shows the shortfall in Social Security. Total Social Security shortfall over the 30 years is about \$31 trillion.

What you see in the blue is interest. What you see in the purple is just what we call the cash balance shortfall. But the real difficulty, the honest difficulty is Medicare.

Medicare produces about a \$72 trillion cash shortfall over the next 30 years, where, if you look at the last bar, it is actually green. It is in the positive. The rest of the budget is positive.

This isn't Republican or Democrat math. It is just demographics. It is what we are as a society. But yet we will weaponize this.

So if the Democrats do certain things, we are going to attack them on it. If we do certain things, they are going to attack us. Yet this is the fragility of our society, and it is almost impossible around here to talk about because there is folklore around here.

I can't tell you how many public events I have done over the years where you will get someone to come up to you and say, "Hey, if you just take care of waste and fraud," "if you just take care of this," "if you take care of that"; anyone who says that today, particularly if they are an elected Member of Congress and they come behind a microphone and say, "If I take care of waste and fraud, that deals with the debt and deficits that are coming," they are not telling you the truth. That is not what the calculator says. It is a rounding error. But that is not part of our political folklore in this culture.

So back to analyzing these numbers. Projected 2049 deficit, solely Social Security and Medicare. If you actually see the dedicated revenues, this one is purely on GDP, the percentage of the GDP in 30 years that is going to have to be dedicated just to covering Social Security and Medicare. We will be taking in about 5.8 percent of taxes equal to GDP, that is dedicated to Social Security and Medicare, but we are going to be spending 17.9.

Remember, if we are going to tell the truth, for many of us, it is now a battle to keep the ratio of our Nation's debt to the size of our economy from blowing through that 100 percent. Can we find a way to stabilize it in that 90, 95 percent area?

It is my goal, it is my dream to come behind this microphone and say we

have balanced the budget, we are paying off the debt. But demographically, that math is almost impossible.

So our job is to balance it, so, as we are getting older as a society, we don't blow through that debt-to-GDP ratio which all the sudden blows up our interest costs, which consumes every next incremental dollar.

And you start to see, when you look at charts like this, it helps you understand the growth and the amount of our entire society's economic productivity that is just going to go to cover these promises. They are earned benefits, but it is going to consume a huge portion of our entire economy's vitality just to cover those benefits.

So my friends on the left will often come and say, well, raise tax rates. Except you have a classic problem. We actually have decades and decades and decades and decades of data.

So you see the black line here? It is when we have had very high marginal tax rates. It is when we have had low marginal tax rates. It is when we have taxed capital gains aggressively, when we haven't taxed capital gains aggressively. The reality of it is, or somehow it may be a law of nature or maybe a law of economics or a law of taxation, taxes always fall back into a certain range of the amount of GDP, the size of the economy. And this has been under liberal Congresses, conservative Congresses, liberal Presidents, conservative Presidents.

If you look at that black line, it has always fallen back into, sort of, a certain range of a percentage of the size of our economy comes in as Federal taxes: payroll taxes, the FICA we are talking about, and income taxes over here. It is just history. And there has been all types of tax schemes attempted.

So from a public policy standpoint, adopt those policies that grow, that grow the size of the economy, because if you are always going to come back and get a certain percentage of the size of the economy, how do you get more revenue? You grow the size of the economy.

Mr. Speaker, may I request the amount of time remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Arizona has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. I have come up this year, this may be the two dozenth time, walking through both the math, the reality. Some of the times I am behind the mike I am much more optimistic because there is a technology disruption, there is economic growth, there are things happening around us that give us a fighting chance.

But some nights I will sit down and I sit here and highlight the different reports, and I am terrified for my little girl and what her future will be like because, right now, the math says her marginal tax rates have to be more than double what I pay today just to maintain, just to keep the wheels on. The economic growth crashes in our society. The opportunity is taken away.

And then we have crazy around here where we are getting proposals from the majority that offer another \$40 trillion-plus of spending in the next 30 years.

Help us find our calculators. Help us find some compassion, some soul that we can make this society work. But you can't do it by living in a fantasy world. The math is the math, and pretending it isn't dooms our future.

□ 2100

I truly believe we are at a moment of inflection where if we do the right things, we actually could have a couple of great decades ahead of us, my three-and-a-half-year-old can have an amazing future, every other child can have an amazing future, every retiree will know they are secure.

But if we don't take care of these things, how do we deal with the other wave that is coming at us: the multi-employer pension crisis, the municipal pension crisis, the State pension crisis, the amount of our brothers and sisters heading towards retirement that actually have almost no capital set aside for their retirement other than that Social Security and those medical benefits that are Medicare?

If you love and care about people, learn the math, tell the truth about it, and work with those of us who are passionate on working to a solution, instead of chasing the shiny object of the daily chaos that is the House of Representatives right now, on what gets you the most clicks on your social media, what might get you a television hit tonight.

This is not particularly sexy, this is not exciting, this is not what a lot of our constituents want to hear, because it is painful.

It is also the single most important thing any elected Member of this Congress can do, is fixing the greatest threat to our society, and that is \$100 trillion of promises over the next 30 years to our seniors that there is no mathematical way to cover.

Let's go do the right thing.

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

THE THREAT COMING OUT OF WASHINGTON TO WORK CENTERS OR COMMUNITY REHABILITATION PROGRAMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss the current threat coming out of Washington to work centers or community rehabilitation programs.

So people understand, these are what used to be referred to as sheltered workshops.

People born with disabilities that cause people to have different abilities than most of the rest of us have, frequently now they work in work centers, frequently packaging or other

light manufacturing sort of jobs. They sometimes make minimum wage, they sometimes make less than minimum wage.

If you have not toured one of these facilities, you have really missed out on one of the joys of life.

Here we find people working hard, earning their own paycheck, proud to go to work each day with friends and a social network, sometimes working in the same place for 20 or 25 years, who feel very good about themselves, and, quite frankly, should make the rest of us ashamed if we are ever unhappy in our own life, seeing people so happy with the jobs they have.

However, friends of people with different abilities, be they family members, be they guardians, be they just next-door neighbors, have to wake up, because there are small, powerful forces who want to shut down these work centers.

Why do they want to do so and how are they going to do it?

They are going to do it two ways. Tomorrow, or soon, in this place, we are going to take up what will be publicly discussed as the increase the minimum wage bill.

However, the increase the minimum wage bill is going to do something more than just that. It is going to get rid of 14(c) waivers for minimum wage, which allows people to work for less than minimum wage.

This is not an oversight. We tried, in something called the Rules Committee, to amend the minimum wage bill.

There are people out there who feel it is below people's dignity to ever work for less than minimum wage.

People familiar with the sheltered workshops and the abilities of the people there know that already there are people who are not going to be able to find employment at \$7.50 an hour. There is no way these folks are going to find employment, or many of these folks are going to find employment, at \$15 an hour.

What is going to happen when you lose the ability to grant waivers and have somebody make \$3 or \$4 or \$5 an hour? What happens when that disappears?

People are no longer going to be able to work in the community, they are no longer going to be able to work at the community rehabilitation centers.

These folks are going to wind up sitting at home. They might wind up in day services, but in day services, you don't get the pride of going to work. You aren't going to work every day like your parents did or like your siblings do or like your friends do. You will no longer have the social network that comes with every job, in which you will be able to have the same friends, which are so vital, because family members, parents eventually pass away. It is so important to have this other social network.

It is so important to have the self-satisfaction that comes with getting your own paycheck, the self-satisfac-

tion that comes with buying your own clothes, maybe buying gifts for relatives, that people are going to lose if there are no jobs at all.

The people who don't like community work centers are also on the attack in the Department of Education. And there, they want to remove the ability for folks in this situation to have competitive integrated employment. They feel we are isolating people in these facilities.

First of all, I implore all of my colleagues and anybody who cares about people born with different abilities, to tour facilities like this. Folks in these facilities are not segregated away in some dark corner.

Like I said, if you meet them, they are so happy and proud to show visitors the work they are doing. They are more happy than even the average citizen in our society to get their own paycheck and deposit it in a bank and know that they are buying their own clothes or buying things for other people.

Everybody should see what we have an opportunity to lose and everybody should ponder what will happen when these facilities are gone, because we are in a situation in which employers are not going to be able to afford to spend \$15 an hour for a lot of these folks, just as right now employers are not able to spend \$7.50 for these folks.

What they will also find is many folks like working in the work centers and prefer working in the work centers to other places in society.

Just as people with different abilities perhaps prefer participating in Special Olympics or prefer going to special church services with people in similar situations, folks like this frequently prefer working with their friends in the sheltered workshop. They feel very good about the situation.

When these radicals succeed in closing the local work center, it is very difficult for folks like this. Even if you were able to find another job in the community with a work coach, you are no longer working with your friends, you no longer have the continuity of perhaps working with the same people, both in management and on the floor, for 20 or 25 years.

If you get a job at a fast food restaurant, even if you are able to work a few hours a week there, there is much more turnover. And frequently people do not like the stress that comes with not working with other people in their own situation.

It is time for the parents, the employees, just friends of people with disabilities to stand up and tell Congress, "Do not be swayed by a loud minority."

It bothers me when bossy people in Washington think they know what is best for people around the country. It bothers me when they feel that way about anybody, but it especially bothers me when they feel that way about the most vulnerable members of society, because I am convinced there is a

loud majority of people, both the people with disabilities and relatives of people with disabilities, who just think that the work centers are going to be there forever.

The time has come to fight for the work centers, because there is a radical group who philosophically, apparently, thinks that when the minimum wage is \$15 an hour, that jobs are going to spring up for these folks, and that they can shut down the work centers, and that employers are going to say, Sure. We can afford—whatever that is—\$600 a week to have someone like this work for us.

Guess what? You are going to find almost no jobs. You may find a few employers, kind of as a charity type of thing, will take people in for 3 or 4 hours a week, but that is not like having a job for 30 or 40 hours a week like everybody else in society has.

These folks do not want to feel different. They do not want to be different than everybody else. They want to be like their siblings and their friends and their parents and go to work 30 or 35 hours in a week.

Just like the rest of us, they like to socialize and have friends who have worked in the same offices or the same factories for years.

They do not want to be working 2 or 3 hours a week or not at all. They do not want to be in a situation in which they are stuck with a job coach.

Now, I happened to bring along some testimonials that have floated onto my desk as examples, from either people who work in the work centers or parents of people who work in the work centers, and this is typical of what you will find, whether you talk to the parents or the employees.

Here is a story, Yael Kerzan's story. And I will just read bits of them.

"Yael does not feel segregated at Northwoods"—which is the local community rehabilitation work center—"because it is a community to her. She values socializing with her longtime friends. The work she does at her CRP helps her be more productive and appropriate" at a job outside of the work center. "In addition, Yael's CRP provides a place for her to work when she is not at her" independent job.

"She does not want to stay home, watch TV and do nothing. If she was not working, she would be miserable. In fact, Yael happily gets up every morning at 4:30a so she has plenty of time to be ready by 6:50a for her ride to work."

Which, by the way, is typical. I think folks like this have much more pride with their job than a lot of people who at least appear to be born with more.

"Yael wants to work and feel valued. She takes great pride in earning her paychecks and contributing to the household expenses. Yael does not care if she earns minimum wage or not. She feels she is compensated fairly by the special wage she is paid. She understands that she does not work as fast as" some other folks, "and therefore is paid according to her productivity.

“Yael would rather be paid the special wage than participate in day services”, which amounts to babysitting, whatever else they call it.

Next, another woman from Wisconsin.

I want to voice my opinion of passing the bill affecting 14(c).

“I do not want to see sheltered workshops close. Workshops are a meaningful way of life for many people born with disabilities.

“I am not against rehabilitation for individuals that rehabilitation may work for. But believe me, not all individuals born with disabilities are able to work outside of sheltered employment.

“My sister is one. She has been through DVR, has been employed several times, at several different jobs, only to fail. All was well when the job coach was present; not so when they weren’t.

“She was abused emotionally and physically by employers. She got the jobs no one else wanted or would do. I could go on and on.”

This woman, again, says her sister would be incredibly damaged if they got rid of the local sheltered workshop.

Another person, talking about his daughter. “Save for 200 sight-words, she remains illiterate, unable to read or write at a level commensurate with the rest of the adult world, unable to discern character differences in others (which has led to others taking unfair advantage of her time and again), unable to grasp complex subject matter or multipart instruction, unable to understand numbers, let alone grasp the concept of arithmetic,” it makes it very difficult for her to do normal independent employment.

“Thankfully, the only positive light in her” life “has been the Black Hills Works here in Rapid City, South Dakota . . .”, here again, a community support provider.

Another example of a person with different abilities, whose joy in life comes from working at the work center. And we have people who want to shut down these work centers because they feel the people are segregated there.

□ 2115

And we have people who want to shut down the work centers because they feel, for some bizarre reason, that there is no dignity in working for less than \$7.50 an hour, or soon to say there is no dignity in working for less than \$15 an hour.

I realize this isn’t primarily what the minimum wage bill is about. But, again, I will emphasize, it is not accidental that they are getting rid of the right to work for less than minimum wage. These people know exactly what they are doing.

There were opportunities to amend this bill in committee and opportunities to amend this bill in the Rules Committee, and we will not have a chance to make exceptions for these people with different abilities on the

floor. There are radicals who believe it should be against the law for them to work for less than \$15 an hour, which means, as a practical matter, it will be against the law for them to work.

And what it will do is it means they will have to go back either to sitting at home watching TV or going to work centers, which is, like I said, tantamount to babysitting. Maybe nice babysitting. But they will know very well they are no longer working like normal productive people. They will know very well that now they are just being taken care of and babysat.

These adult people should have the right to work. It is not up to these people in Congress, or people in the Department of Education, or the Department of Labor to tell them it is against the law to work for \$5 an hour, particularly given their situation.

Another testimonial:

“My husband and I are parents of identical twin sons, 35 years of age, who have autism, schizophrenia, seizure disorder, and they stutter.

“They have received services from Black Hills Works, a community support provider, in Rapid City, South Dakota, since the end of the fiscal year when they reached their 21st birthday.

“Because of this sheltered work environment, they were able to learn basic job skills, which have now enabled them to obtain employment in the competitive work realm.

“Because of their autism and mental health issues, it takes a long time and a lot of patience to develop routines that help them adjust to the rigors of a workplace . . .”

They were only able to do this because of the 14(c) waivers, which allow them to work for less than minimum wage.

“My son Jonathan is a delightful, nonverbal, autistic 20-year-old man. Powerfully built, he has a supercharged energy and a deep well of affection for loved ones and his iTunes library.

“But Jonny is also profoundly intellectually impaired. Accomplishing even simple tasks requires vigorous prompting and continuous oversight, and chances are that along the way he might bite, stand on, or even throw his chair. As muscular and lovable though he may be, his chances of landing a competitive job are exactly zero.”

But I am sure Jonathan, right now, is proud of the job he has. I am sure, like all the people I see when I tour my workshops, they are so proud to show me what they have accomplished, they are so proud to talk about their paycheck, and they are so proud to talk about the new Packers jersey they bought or whatever. You are taking that right away from people by having people in Washington, who think they know better, say: No, Jonathan, just go out in the community. Find your \$15-an-hour job.

Guess what? Jonathan ain’t going to find a \$15-an-hour job, and Jonathan is going to lose the joy he has and the satisfaction he has in the job he currently has.

I am Leslie and I am disabled. Eventually I will be able to go in the community and make minimum wage, maybe, although some people may not be able to work out in the community.

I think it would be sad if they do not have the option to make less than minimum wage. These folks look out for each other.

I started my first support employment program in 1985 and strongly believe in the right to access employment and to receive necessary accommodations.

The use of 14(c) is a necessity. Many people with significant disabilities cannot successfully perform a job to industry standards. 14(c) opens the door to those who fit in this picture. It allows the person to actually set his or her own standard and to increase pay as their performance improves. We need a full range of services and to recognize the reality of challenges many people have and then to support their strengths through 14(c) and other accommodations.

I will also point out that people who are asked to work in the community may be able to work in the community but don’t like it because of the stress it puts on them to do a job that is very difficult for them to do. A lot of times what happens is some of these folks find a job for maybe 4 or 5 hours a week in the community and 30 hours a week in the work center. Frequently, they prefer their job in the work center because it is at a pace which they are more comfortable handling. And they are working with people who are the same people they have worked with over a period of years.

Another testimonial:

I like working here and I make less than minimum wage. People should have the option to work at a company that pays less than minimum wage or work in the community and make minimum wage. I don’t want to work in the community. I like coming here and making friends also with my co-workers and making money.

What these people are doing is they are taking away the freedom from people. I think it is so arrogant for people who purport to be looking out for the disabled people in our society to say, I am taking away an option from you because I know best. Again and again you meet people who are very happy in the work centers and it is horrible to take away that option.

I had a job about 10 years ago, but I got very sick and I lost it. I am here making boxes and palletizing and going to class and stuff. I like to come to work and continue making money every day.

I know I don’t make minimum wage. It is okay I don’t make minimum wage. I am not as fast as I used to be. I like my friends. I love my job. I don’t like to stay at home. It is boring.

I hope we don’t take away this guy’s option.

I work in the community at Publix, but I don’t get very many hours.

14(c) helps me supplement my hours so I have something to do when I am not at the grocery store and can still make some money.

If the workshop went away, I would have to find someplace else. I like coming here and it gives me something to do and helps my friend.

Here, I am going to make a point. A lot of these folks do find something in the community for 4 or 5 hours a week. Now, I am going to let people wonder when somebody works only 4 or 5 hours a week, particularly in this employment, why that is. Some of these lack-of-common-sense advocates feel that if somebody is able to find a job for 4 hours a week at the local grocery store, they should be able to find a job for 36 hours a week at the local grocery store.

I will tell you, if you talk to the owners of these places, which are very nice people, frequently they are giving out jobs kind of as a community service, which is why these folks are only working 4 to 6 hours a week at one of these places. They are not going to be able to get jobs for 35 or 36 hours a week.

And when the sheltered workshop closes, it is not going to be replaced with a job in the community. It is going to be hour after hour sitting at home watching TV, or it is going to be at day services, which amounts to babysitting.

They are going to lose the satisfaction and pride that comes with work, and they are going to lose the independence of getting their own paycheck and not being as dependent on government support.

I like getting a paycheck. I used to have a job in the community, but I fell and couldn't keep up. I love working in the workshop until I can get another job in the community. If there was no workshop, I would just color all day. I like having work to do.

Bingo. And there are people who would be happy to just have day services and have somebody color all day and not have the satisfaction of having a job.

I am a person with a disability who knows that not everyone can work in a job in the community. It takes hard work in being able to follow directions. Sometimes bosses are hard on you and want you to do more than you can. It is not easy to have a job and follow all the rules. I have friends who got fired or quit because it is hard.

Why can't people with disabilities have choices?

Some people might say they want to work, but when they do leave a sheltered workshop, they come back because it is hard out there in the work world. Maybe there are some agencies holding people back who really can work, bagging groceries or doing janitorial work. But there are very good agencies out there who are giving people with significant disabilities an opportunity to earn money because they can't work in the community. Please, please, please consider people with IDD and low IQ and not make this work go away.

I have many regular jobs, but I like my program because it is not as stressful and more understanding. Staff are easy to talk to and you don't have to worry if the place will be staffed. Someone is there.

Regular jobs are a lot harder. Applications are online, and that is not easy. Some people are not understanding in a competitive job. Communication is hard. They don't understand disabilities.

I don't get minimum wage, but it is not worth it. The more work I do, my pay goes up. I am not forced to do anything I can't do. Breaks and hours are better than at another job. I feel like I work more on a team than I ever have. Other jobs don't give you enough time. I think my program is cool and gets people ready for regular jobs, if they want to.

Don't take away 14(c). It would hurt me. I get to be with my friends and make money, too.

Again, this person is pointing out that frequently people in these work centers are working with people with similar abilities, they enjoy being with people with similar abilities, and it is more stressful not being with people with these abilities. So even if other jobs are available, you are sometimes hurting these people, and you should not be telling them what they should be doing.

I work at a 14(c) program. Programs like mine perform a valuable service by offering much-needed alternatives to workplace environments that people with intellectual disabilities may not be totally comfortable with. The staff are much more tolerant and understanding of the difficulties that people with disabilities have versus staff at a CI environment.

Ever since I was a little kid, people such as teachers and relatives have all tried to push

me to be as normal as possible, but with programs like this I can be myself.

I guess I will wrap it up. There are other testimonials that I can read. I will wrap it up by saying that the silent majority has to speak up.

And I would strongly encourage my colleagues to tour the local work centers. It will make them feel better to see how these people are working. It will make them feel better to see the pride that these folks take in a job.

If they talk to them, they will tell them how much they enjoy working in the work center. And then they can ask themselves, if this minimum wage bill passes as is, if the new rules that are proposed in the Department of Education go forward, they will ask themselves, What will become of these folks?

They should feel very guilty when they charge ahead, not paying attention to what the most vulnerable members of society will have happen to them, because people in this institution, or bureaucrats a few buildings away, have decided that they know best what is for people other than themselves and have decided against all common sense that everybody in our society is capable of making \$15 an hour.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HUDSON (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on account of an official visit to Fort Bragg with Vice President MIKE PENCE.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 375. An act to improve efforts to identify and reduce Governmentwide improper payments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

NOTICE

Incomplete record of House Proceedings. Except for concluding business which follows. House Report 116–125 will be continued in Book II and Book III.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 28 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, July 18, 2019, at 9 a.m.

BUDGETARY EFFECTS OF PAYGO LEGISLATION

Pursuant to the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (PAYGO), Mr. YARMUTH hereby submits, prior to the vote on passage, for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that H.R. 736, the Access to Congressionally Mandated Reports Act, as amended, would have no significant effect on direct spending or revenues, and therefore, the budgetary effects of such bill are estimated as zero.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1646. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility [Docket ID: FEMA-2019-0003] [Internal Agency Docket No.: FEMA-8583] received July 15, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public

Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1647. A letter from the Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Removal of Transferred OTS Regulations Regarding Lending and Investment; and Conforming Amendments to Other Regulation (RIN: 3064-AE22) received July 15, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1648. A letter from the Deputy Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's Major final regulations — Program Integrity: Gainful Employment [Docket ID: ED-2018-OPE-0042] (RIN: 1840-AD31) received July 15, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1649. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — New Animal Drugs; Updating Tolerances for Residues of New Animal Drugs in Food [Docket No.: FDA-2012-N-1067] (RIN: 0910-AG17) received July 15, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1650. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; "Other Flatfish" in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 170817779-8161-02] (RIN: 0648-XG491) received July 15, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1651. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Yellowfin Sole for Vessels Participating in the BSAI Trawl Limited Access Fishery in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 170817779-8161-02] (RIN: 0648-XG472) received July 15, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1652. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Catcher Vessels Greater Than or Equal to 60 Feet Length Overall Using Pot Gear in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 170817779-8161-02] (RIN: 0648-XG477) received July 15, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1653. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Catcher Vessels Less Than 60 Feet (18.3 Meters) Length Overall Using Hook-and-Line or Pot Gear in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 170817779-8161-02] (RIN: 0648-XG467) received July 15, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110

Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1654. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Non-American Fisheries Act Crab Vessels Operating as Catcher Vessels Using Pot Gear in the Western Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 170816769-8162-02] (RIN: 0648-XG672) received July 15, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1655. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Catcher Vessels Less Than 50 Feet Length Overall Using Hook-and-Line Gear in the Central Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 170816769-8162-02] (RIN: 0648-XG470) received July 15, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1656. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Exchange of Flatfish in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 170817779-8161-02] (RIN: 0648-XG648) received July 15, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1657. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; 2018 Commercial Accountability Measure and Closure for South Atlantic Gray Triggerfish; July Through December Season [Docket No.: 141107936-5399-02] (RIN: 0648-XG592) received July 15, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1658. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; 2018 Commercial Accountability Measure and Closure for South Atlantic Red Snapper [Docket No.: 1710319998630-02] (RIN: 0648-XG594) received July 15, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1659. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Snapper-Grouper Resources of the South Atlantic; Vermilion Snapper Trip Limit Reduction [Docket No.: 130312235-3658-02] (RIN: 0648-XG569) received July 15, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1660. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Coastal Migratory Pelagic Resources of the Gulf of Mexico and Atlantic Region; Re-

opening of the Commercial Sector for King Mackerel in the Gulf of Mexico Western Zone [Docket No.: 160426363-7275-02] (RIN: 0648-XG595) received July 15, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1661. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Magnuson-Stevens Act Provisions; Fisheries Off West Coast States; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery; 2017-2018 Biennial Specifications and Management Measures; Inseason Adjustments [Docket No.: 160808696-7010-02] (RIN: 0648-BI47) received July 15, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1662. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Snapper-Grouper Fishery of the South Atlantic; 2018 Commercial Closure for Hogfish in the Florida Keys/East Florida Area of the South Atlantic [Docket No.: 160906822-7547-02] (RIN: 0648-XG618) received July 15, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1663. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Reef Fish Fishery of the Gulf of Mexico; 2018 Commercial Accountability Measure and Closure for Gulf of Mexico Gray Triggerfish [Docket No.: 121004518-3398-01] (RIN: 0648-XG524) received July 15, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1664. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Magnuson-Stevens Act Provisions; Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Herring Fishery; Adjustment to Atlantic Herring Specifications and Sub-Annual Catch Limits for 2019 [Docket No.: 181031994-9022-02] (RIN: 0648-XG608-X) received July 15, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1665. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Authorization of Revised Reporting Requirements Due to Catastrophic Conditions for Federal Seafood Dealers and Individual Fishing Quota Dealers in Portions of Florida [Docket Nos.: 090206140-91081-03 and 120405260-4258-02] (RIN: 0648-XG550) received July 15, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1666. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Reallocation of Pacific Cod in the Western Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 170816769-8162-02] (RIN: 0648-XG676) received July 15, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1667. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule

— Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Shortraker Rockfish in the Central Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 170816769-8162-02] (RIN: 0648-XG625) received July 15, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1668. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Catcher/Processors Using Trawl Gear in the Central Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska Docket No.: 170816769-8162-02] (RIN: 0648-XG639) received July 15, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1669. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Atka Mackerel in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 170817779-8161-02] (RIN: 0648-XG427) received July 15, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1670. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Ocean Perch in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 170817779-8161-02] (RIN: 0648-XG116) received July 15, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1671. A letter from the Regulations Development Coordinator, Office of Regulation Policy and Management, Office of the Secretary, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — Case Management Services Grant Program (RIN: 2900-AQ15) received July 15, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

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. BARR (for himself, Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Mr. BOST, Mr. DUNN, Mr. BERGMAN, Mr. BANKS, Mr. MEUSER, Mr. WATKINS, and Mr. STEUBE):

H.R. 3788. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of Veterans Affairs from making payments to child care providers that employ individuals charged with certain offenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. DELBENE (for herself and Mr. KATKO):

H.R. 3789. A bill to direct the Federal Communications Commission to collect and maintain data on the growth in the use of Internet of Things devices and devices that use 5G mobile networks in order to determine the amount of electromagnetic spectrum required to meet the demand created by such use, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DUNN:

H.R. 3790. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a credit against tax for homebuyers purchasing residences in residential recovery zones, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MASSIE (for himself and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 3791. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to make modifications to the passenger facility charge program administered by the Federal Aviation Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma:

H.R. 3792. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide for deferment for Federal loans prior to the beginning of the repayment period; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma:

H.R. 3793. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to include interest rate provisions for Federal loans made on or after July 1, 2020; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GOSAR (for himself, Mr. LEVIN of California, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. TIP-TON, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. DELBENE, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. GAETZ, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. STAUBER, Mr. STEWART, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. COOK, Mr. MARSHALL, and Mr. GIANFORTE):

H.R. 3794. A bill to promote the development of renewable energy on public lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, 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. BASS:

H.R. 3795. A bill to enable incarcerated persons to petition a Federal court for a second look at sentences longer than 10 years, where the person is not a danger to the safety of any person or the community, and has shown they are ready for reentry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BERA (for himself and Mr. SMITH of Missouri):

H.R. 3796. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that coverage under Medicare is permissible for purposes of contributions to health savings accounts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself, Mr. HARRIS, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. GRIF-FITH, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, and Mrs. DINGELL):

H.R. 3797. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to make marijuana accessible for use by qualified marijuana researchers for medical purposes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. BROWNLEY of California:

H.R. 3798. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for limitations on co-

payments for contraception furnished by the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. JUDY CHU of California (for herself, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. MOORE, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. GALLEG0, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SOTO, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. NADLER, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. LEVIN of California, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. TLAI B, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. CISNEROS, Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. NORTON, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK):

H.R. 3799. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to promote family unity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio (for himself, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. MOORE, Mr. SIMPSON, and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 3800. A bill to modify the Federal TRIO programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California (for herself and Mr. YOUNG):

H.R. 3801. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to establish a basic needs allowance for low-income regular members of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. DELAUR0:

H.R. 3802. A bill to prohibit the award of Federal Government contracts to inverted domestic corporations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DESAULNIER (for himself, Mr. ZELDIN, and Mr. KING of New York):

H.R. 3803. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude Federal Pell Grants from gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. FRANKEL (for herself, Ms. HAALAND, and Ms. CASTOR of Florida):

H.R. 3804. A bill to amend chapter 2205 of title 36, United States Code, to ensure pay equity for amateur athletes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 3805. A bill to reform prescription drug pricing and reduce out-of-pocket costs by ensuring consumers benefit from negotiated rebates; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GALLEG0 (for himself, Mr. SOTO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, and Ms. ESCOBAR):

H.R. 3806. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to limit the grounds of deportability for certain relatives of members of the Armed Forces and veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. KAPTUR (for herself, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. TONKO, Mr. RYAN, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. NORTON, Ms. TLAI B, and Mr. RUSH):

H.R. 3807. A bill to require that any trade agreement eligible for expedited consideration by Congress include enforceable labor standards and protections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KILMER (for himself, Mr. REED, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio, Mr. RYAN, Mr. RIGGLEMAN, Mr. MORELLE, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, and Mr. CASTEN of Illinois):

H.R. 3808. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to include teacher preparation for computer science in elementary and secondary education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LAWSON of Florida (for himself, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. MOORE, Ms. NORTON, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. SOTO):

H.R. 3809. A bill to amend the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 to expand the eligibility of students to participate in the supplemental nutrition assistance program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, 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 Mrs. LEE of Nevada:

H.R. 3810. A bill to modify the penalties for violations of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act of 1993; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. MATSUI (for herself and Mr. MCCAUL):

H.R. 3811. A bill to direct the Secretary of Commerce to conduct a study and submit to Congress a report on the processes of international standards-setting with respect to internet-connected devices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MCKINLEY (for himself and Mr. WELCH):

H.R. 3812. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to approval of abbreviated new drug applications; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MEADOWS (for himself and Mrs. RADEWAGEN):

H.R. 3813. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to ensure that certain health care contractors of the Department of Veterans Affairs are subject to Federal tort claims laws, to improve the accountability of physicians of the Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RICHMOND (for himself and Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana):

H.R. 3814. A bill to amend the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act of 2006 and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SCHIFF (for himself, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, Mr. RUSH, Mr. CRIST, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. COX of California, Mr. COHEN, and Ms. PRESSLEY):

H.R. 3815. A bill to increase access to pre-exposure prophylaxis to reduce the transmission of HIV; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Oversight and Reform, Veterans' Affairs, Ways and Means, Natural Resources, Armed Services, and Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SPANO (for himself, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. DUNCAN,

Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. POSEY, Mr. COLE, Mr. HAGEDORN, Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. BARR, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. SCALISE, and Mr. TAYLOR):

H.R. 3816. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for the forfeiture of Federal retirement benefits for Federal employees convicted of certain crimes relating to the sexual abuse of children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ (for herself, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois):

H.R. 3817. A bill to cancel the registration of all uses of the pesticide paraquat, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, 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. YOUNG:

H.R. 3818. A bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture to allow infant food combinations and dinners as WIC-eligible foods; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CUMMINGS:

H. Res. 497. A resolution recommending that the House of Representatives find William P. Barr, Attorney General of the United States, and Wilbur L. Ross, Jr., Secretary of Commerce, in contempt of Congress for refusal to comply with subpoenas duly issued by the Committee on Oversight and Reform; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. GREEN of Texas:

H. Res. 498. A resolution impeaching Donald John Trump, President of the United States, of high misdemeanors.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself,

Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. BASS, Mr. BEYER, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. CLAY, Mr. DEFazio, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. ESCOBAR, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. GALLEG0, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. HAALAND, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEVIN of California, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MENG, Ms. MOORE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NEGUSE, Ms. NORTON, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Ms. OMAR, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. POCAN, Ms. PORTER, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RUSH, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. TONKO, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. STUOZZI, and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK):

H. Res. 499. A resolution condemning the Trump Administration's systematic cruel and inhumane treatment of migrants, particularly children, at the southern border; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DUFFY:

H. Res. 500. A resolution recognizing the benefits of digitization of the mortgage process; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. LEWIS (for himself, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. BASS, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. CISNEROS, Mr. CLYBURN, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. COSTA, Mr.

CUMMINGS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. EVANS, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. GALLEG0, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MOORE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NORTON, Ms. OMAR, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. RUSH, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. TLAIB, Ms. WATERS, and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN):

H. Res. 501. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives on Nelson Mandela International Day; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

108. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey, relative to Assembly Resolution No. 237, urging Congress to pass and fund the federal "Excellence in Mental Health and Addiction Treatment Expansion Act"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

109. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, relative to House Resolution No. 343, urging the Congress of the United States to reauthorize and fully fund the September 11th Victim Compensation Fund; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

110. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of New Jersey, relative to Senate Joint Resolution No. 73, respectfully urging the Congress of the United States to pass the "Military Hunger Prevention Act"; jointly to the Committees on Armed Services and Agriculture.

111. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Rhode Island, relative to Senate Resolution 19R403 (S1010), respectfully urging the United States Congress to adopt the "Unemployment Compensation for Federal Employees Exempted from Furlough Program"; jointly to the Committees on Oversight and Reform, Education and Labor, and Appropriations.

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. BARR:

H.R. 3788.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 12 and 13, which gives Congress the power "To raise and support Armies," and "To provide and maintain a Navy."

By Ms. DELBENE:

H.R. 3789.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. DUNN:

H.R. 3790.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, United States Constitution: Congress shall have the power "to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Mr. MASSIE:

H.R. 3791.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, Clause 3, and Clause 18 of the Constitution.

By Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma:

H.R. 3792.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Taxing & Spending Clause (Art. I, §8, cl. 1)

The Necessary & Proper Clause (Art. I, §8, cl. 18)

By Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma:

H.R. 3793.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Taxing & Spending Clause (Art. I, §8, cl. 1)

The Necessary & Proper Clause (Art. I, §8, cl. 18)

By Mr. GOSAR:

H.R. 3794.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2. (The Property Clause.)

The Property Clause gives Congress the power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States; and states that nothing in the constitution shall be so construed as to prejudice any claims of the United States, or of any particular state. The U.S. constitution specifically addresses the relationship of the federal government to land. The Property Clause gives Congress plenary power and full-authority over federal property. The U.S. Supreme Court has described Congress's power to legislate under this Clause as "without limitation." This Act falls squarely within the express constitutional power set forth in the Property Clause as this bill pertains to certain activities that occur on federal lands.

By Ms. BASS:

H.R. 3795.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clauses 1 and 18 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. BERA:

H.R. 3796.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 3797.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Ms. BROWNLEY of California:

H.R. 3798.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. JUDY CHU of California:

H.R. 3799.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section XIII of the Constitution: The Congress shall have power to lay and

collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States;

By Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio:

H.R. 3800.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California:

H.R. 3801.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 3802.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 3 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. DESAULNIER:

H.R. 3803.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

By Ms. FRANKEL:

H.R. 3804.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Commerce Clause. See U.S. CONST. Article I, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 3805.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. GALLEGRO:

H.R. 3806.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Ms. KAPTUR:

H.R. 3807.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, the power to regulate Commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian Tribes

By Mr. KILMER:

H.R. 3808.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. LAWSON of Florida:

H.R. 3809.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, 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 Mrs. LEE of Nevada:

H.R. 3810.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the constitution gives Congress the power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defence and general welfare of the United States.

By Ms. MATSUI:

H.R. 3811.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. MCKINLEY:

H.R. 3812.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

Section 8—Powers of Congress. 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. MEADOWS:

H.R. 3813.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1: "The Congress shall have the Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States" and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: "The Congress shall have Power To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Mr. RICHMOND:

H.R. 3814.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is introduced pursuant to the powers granted to Congress under the General Welfare Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 1), the Commerce Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 3), and the Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 18).

Further, this statement of constitutional authority is made for the sole purpose of compliance with clause 7 of Rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives and shall have no bearing on judicial review of the accompanying bill.

By Mr. SCHIFF:

H.R. 3815.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SPANO:

H.R. 3816.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. VELAZQUEZ:

H.R. 3817.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to . . . provide for the . . . general Welfare of the United States; . . .

By Mr. YOUNG:

H.R. 3818.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 61: Mrs. LEE of Nevada.

H.R. 98: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 139: Mr. BOST.

H.R. 216: Mr. GUEST and Mr. HARRIS.

H.R. 218: Mr. HURD of Texas and Mr. MCCAUL.

H.R. 273: Mr. COSTA.

H.R. 295: Mr. PHILLIPS.

H.R. 307: Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.

H.R. 369: Mr. GAETZ.

H.R. 372: Mr. BROWN of Maryland.

H.R. 397: Mr. HUFFMAN, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mr. HOYER, Ms. WEXTON, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, and Ms. FRANKEL.

- H.R. 497: Mr. RUSH and Mrs. WALORSKI.
H.R. 499: Mr. BALDERSON.
H.R. 586: Mr. GUEST and Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.
H.R. 587: Mr. LEVIN of California.
H.R. 647: Mr. CARBAJAL, Mrs. FLETCHER, and Mr. COSTA.
H.R. 712: Ms. PORTER.
H.R. 724: Mr. RATCLIFFE and Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico.
H.R. 728: Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. TED LIEU of California, and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 737: Mrs. DEMINGS.
H.R. 763: Mrs. MCBATH.
H.R. 849: Mr. SERRANO and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H.R. 865: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 913: Mr. CRENSHAW, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, and Mrs. AXNE.
H.R. 943: Mr. CALVERT, Mr. KEATING, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. TONKO, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. CRIST, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. DELGADO, Mr. LONG, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. GARAMENDI, and Mr. BUCHANAN.
H.R. 945: Mr. NEGUSE.
H.R. 948: Mr. STIVERS.
H.R. 953: Mr. BROWN of Maryland.
H.R. 1012: Mr. LEVIN of California.
H.R. 1013: Mr. LEVIN of California.
H.R. 1058: Mr. MARSHALL and Mr. BARR.
H.R. 1108: Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee.
H.R. 1109: Mrs. TORRES of California.
H.R. 1110: Mr. PHILLIPS.
H.R. 1111: Ms. PRESSLEY.
H.R. 1120: Ms. LOGGREN.
H.R. 1135: Mr. KHANNA.
H.R. 1153: Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL.
H.R. 1154: Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. TRONE, and Ms. FUDGE.
H.R. 1174: Mr. BROWN of Maryland.
H.R. 1223: Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 1243: Mr. CISNEROS and Mr. TED LIEU of California.
H.R. 1266: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Ms. WILSON of Florida.
H.R. 1289: Mrs. AXNE.
H.R. 1309: Mrs. TORRES of California.
H.R. 1350: Ms. BASS.
H.R. 1374: Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. CONAWAY, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, and Mr. NORMAN.
H.R. 1398: Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. HILL of Arkansas, and Ms. FOX of North Carolina.
H.R. 1406: Mr. FULCHER.
H.R. 1441: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.
H.R. 1450: Mr. LEVIN of Michigan.
H.R. 1511: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN and Mr. KILDEE.
H.R. 1570: Mr. CORREA and Mr. NORCROSS.
H.R. 1605: Mr. CRENSHAW.
H.R. 1629: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 1636: Mr. VARGAS and Mr. DEUTCH.
H.R. 1641: Mr. BACON, Mr. TIPTON, Ms. WATERS, Ms. SHALALA, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. ROUZER, and Mr. VELA.
H.R. 1705: Mr. JEFFRIES.
H.R. 1713: Mr. HASTINGS and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H.R. 1730: Mr. GRIFFITH and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 1771: Mr. ZELDIN and Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.
H.R. 1786: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.
H.R. 1792: Mr. CISNEROS and Mr. WESTERMAN.
H.R. 1824: Mr. VISCLOSKY.
H.R. 1837: Ms. WILD, Ms. SHERRILL, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. JORDAN, and Mr. LAMBORN.
H.R. 1840: Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. CUELLAR.
H.R. 1850: Mr. YOHO.
H.R. 1858: Mr. AMASH.
H.R. 1869: Mr. FLORES, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. CURTIS.
H.R. 1878: Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. GALLEGGO, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. DELGADO, Mr. BOST, and Mr. STIVERS.
H.R. 1897: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 1903: Mr. THOMPSON of California and Mr. AMODEI.
H.R. 1925: Mr. ENGEL, Mr. ROSE of New York, Mr. TONKO, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. MORELLE, and Ms. MENG.
H.R. 1934: Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois.
H.R. 1954: Mr. NORMAN.
H.R. 1975: Mr. CISNEROS.
H.R. 1980: Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Ms. SHERRILL, Ms. SHALALA, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. LUJÁN, Ms. STEVENS, Mrs. MCBATH, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. BEYER, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. ALLRED, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. VELA, and Mr. EVANS.
H.R. 1981: Mr. AGUILAR and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
H.R. 2000: Mr. AGUILAR.
H.R. 2075: Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mr. NEGUSE.
H.R. 2093: Mr. PETERS and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 2096: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 2097: Mr. SCHNEIDER.
H.R. 2148: Ms. DELBENE.
H.R. 2149: Mrs. AXNE and Mr. STIVERS.
H.R. 2156: Mr. PERLMUTTER.
H.R. 2164: Mr. NEGUSE.
H.R. 2168: Mr. BACON.
H.R. 2178: Mr. CRIST and Mr. NEGUSE.
H.R. 2203: Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. CARBAJAL, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Mr. LEVIN of California.
H.R. 2213: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama and Mr. KATKO.
H.R. 2214: Mr. SHERMAN.
H.R. 2218: Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois.
H.R. 2219: Mr. WATKINS, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.
H.R. 2222: Mr. RASKIN.
H.R. 2225: Mr. COSTA.
H.R. 2249: Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas.
H.R. 2256: Mr. BROWN of Maryland and Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL.
H.R. 2264: Mr. SIREs and Mr. SOTO.
H.R. 2314: Mr. BUCSHON and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 2315: Mr. POCAN, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. ENGEL, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 2328: Mr. BISHOP of Utah.
H.R. 2336: Mrs. HARTZLER and Ms. SLOTKIN.
H.R. 2343: Mr. HASTINGS.
H.R. 2377: Mr. CISNEROS, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
H.R. 2382: Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. AGUILAR, and Mr. HASTINGS.
H.R. 2420: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York and Mr. THOMPSON of California.
H.R. 2433: Mrs. LURIA.
H.R. 2441: Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. CASE, Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, and Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 2443: Mr. RATCLIFFE and Mr. GREEN of Tennessee.
H.R. 2508: Mr. COHEN, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. AGUILAR, and Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.
H.R. 2513: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.
H.R. 2517: Mrs. AXNE.
H.R. 2543: Mr. COLE.
H.R. 2571: Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.
H.R. 2577: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 2591: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 2733: Mr. BACON.
H.R. 2770: Mr. YARMUTH and Mr. PERLMUTTER.
H.R. 2805: Mr. WATKINS.
H.R. 2825: Mr. TONKO.
H.R. 2847: Mrs. AXNE.
H.R. 2896: Mr. COHEN and Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 2897: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
H.R. 2912: Mr. COSTA.
H.R. 2977: Mr. PERLMUTTER and Mr. CONNOLLY.
H.R. 2986: Mr. KENNEDY and Mr. GALLAGHER.
H.R. 2995: Mr. CISNEROS.
H.R. 3019: Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 3040: Mr. ROUDA.
H.R. 3048: Mr. HECK.
H.R. 3104: Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. ESTES, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. RIGGLEMAN, Mr. RASKIN, and Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.
H.R. 3133: Mr. DESAULNIER and Mr. CORREA.
H.R. 3138: Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 3192: Mr. TED LIEU of California.
H.R. 3181: Mrs. AXNE.
H.R. 3189: Mr. HASTINGS.
H.R. 3192: Mr. TED LIEU of California.
H.R. 3222: Mr. KENNEDY.
H.R. 3246: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.
H.R. 3262: Mr. LIPINSKI and Mr. WRIGHT.
H.R. 3267: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 3295: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 3299: Ms. NORTON, Ms. BASS, and Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 3328: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 3369: Ms. SCHRIER.
H.R. 3375: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. NEGUSE, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mrs. WALORSKI, Ms. HILL of California, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. NADLER, Mr. MEADOWS, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mr. KEATING, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. BEYER, Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. BALDERSON, Mr. WRIGHT, and Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee.
H.R. 3378: Mr. DEFAZIO and Mr. HASTINGS.
H.R. 3391: Ms. MENG.
H.R. 3402: Mr. NEGUSE.
H.R. 3412: Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 3414: Mr. SUOZZI.
H.R. 3463: Mr. RUSH, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. CISNEROS, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mrs. AXNE, Mr. CROW, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. ROSE of New York, and Mr. PASCRELL.
H.R. 3473: Mr. BEYER.
H.R. 3497: Mr. JOYCE of Ohio.
H.R. 3501: Mr. KEATING.
H.R. 3511: Ms. SHALALA and Ms. SPEIER.
H.R. 3525: Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. EVANS, Ms. PRESSLEY, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. RUSH, Mr. LEWIS, and Mr. CLYBURN.
H.R. 3539: Mr. PETERS and Mr. BILIRAKIS.
H.R. 3562: Ms. PINGREE.
H.R. 3589: Ms. HOULAHAN, Mr. CASE, Ms. SLOTKIN, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. RUSH, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. ROBY, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. UNDERWOOD, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Ms. WATERS, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. SHERRILL, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. NADLER, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Ms. STEVENS, Ms. SPANBERGER, Mr. WOMACK, Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. GOLDEN, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, and Mrs. MURPHY.
H.R. 3602: Mr. HASTINGS.
H.R. 3623: Mr. CISNEROS and Ms. WILD.
H.R. 3629: Mr. CLEAVER.
H.R. 3632: Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.
H.R. 3633: Ms. BASS.
H.R. 3637: Ms. KELLY of Illinois and Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 3655: Mr. GIBBS and Mr. STEUBE.
H.R. 3660: Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CARBAJAL, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr.

CISNEROS, Ms. SHALALA, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. TAKANO, Miss RICE of New York, and Mr. POSTER.
H.R. 3661: Mr. FITZPATRICK and Mr. CROW.
H.R. 3663: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 3668: Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. GALLEGRO, Ms. SHALALA, and Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 3685: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 3701: Mr. CLEAVER.
H.R. 3734: Mr. BALDERSON.
H.R. 3739: Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, and Mr. WRIGHT.
H.R. 3742: Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. AGUILAR, and Ms. SLOTKIN.

H.R. 3747: Mr. PERLMUTTER.
H.R. 3748: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. CISNEROS.
H.R. 3749: Mrs. LURIA and Mr. TAYLOR.
H.R. 3751: Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL.
H.R. 3759: Mr. WRIGHT.
H.J. Res. 20: Mr. WATKINS.
H.J. Res. 34: Mr. BUDD.
H.J. Res. 67: Ms. SHERRILL and Mr. PASCRELL.
H. Res. 230: Ms. TITUS.
H. Res. 246: Mr. MOULTON.
H. Res. 255: Mr. GALLAGHER.
H. Res. 310: Mr. HASTINGS.
H. Res. 326: Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. TITUS, Mr. DEUTCH, and Mr. NADLER.

H. Res. 374: Mr. WATKINS, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. GRIFFITH, and Mr. ESTES.
H. Res. 478: Mr. ROUZER and Mr. RUIZ.
H. Res. 485: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.
H. Res. 487: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. MEEKS.
H. Res. 490: Mr. LOWENTHAL and Mr. TED LIEU of California.
H. Res. 495: Mr. WELCH, Ms. DEGETTE, and Mr. DEFAZIO.
H. Res. 496: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.