The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MALINOWSKI).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC.
July 16, 2019,

I hereby appoint the Honorable Tom MALINOWSKI to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER
The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer:

We give You thanks, O God, for giving us another day.

This has been a difficult and contentious week in which darker spirits seem to have been at play in the people’s House.

In Your most Holy name, I now cast out all spirits of darkness from this Chamber, spirits not from You.

I cast out the spirit of discouragement, which deadens the hope of those who are of good will.

I cast out the spirit of petty divisiveness, which clouds the sense and the desire to be of fruitful productivity in addressing the issues more appropriately before this House.

I cast out any sadness brought on by the frustration of dealing with matters detrimental to the honorable work each Member has been called to engage in.

Pour out, O Lord, Your sacred oil, as Your spirit of comity, of brother and sisterhood, and love of our Nation and of all colleagues in this Chamber, empower our better angels to be at play in the common work to be done for the benefit of all Your people.

May all that is done within the people’s House be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL
The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day’s proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

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

Mr. PAPPAS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker’s approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the Speaker’s approval of the Journal.

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

Mr. PAPPAS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. KUSTOFF) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee 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.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to five requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Speaker of the House of Representatives.
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minute and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, as the Representative of Cincinnati, Ohio, I rise this morning to recognize an Ohioan who was a professor of aerospace engineering at the University of Cincinnati. Prior to that, he was a naval aviator, a test pilot, and, later, an astronaut.

Mr. Speaker, 50 years ago, the words he spoke now reside in history: “That’s one small step for man, one giant leap for mankind.”

Everyone on Earth at that time remembers when Neil Armstrong took that step. His contributions to space exploration did not end on the surface of the Moon. Neil Armstrong was also on the team that investigated the Apollo 13 accident, and he was vice chairman of the commission that investigated the space shuttle Challenger disaster.

Ohioan Neil Armstrong is a true American hero, and his extraordinary service to our country—to all of humankind, really—will be forever remembered.

HONORING THE MEMORY OF PHIL FREelon

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Phil Freelon, who passed away on July 9 at his home in Durham, North Carolina.

While attending Central High School in Philadelphia, he was drawn to art and the technique of designing and building. He was one of two Black architect students at North Carolina State University’s College of Design, where he had a passion for increasing diversity within his profession.

One of the contributions to our Nation was the building of the National Museum of African American History and Culture.

Mr. Speaker, we mourn the passing of Mr. Freelon, but his legacy and passion lives on to educate and empower the next generation of architects.

NATIONAL PENNSYLVANIA DAY

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize this Saturday, July 20, as National Pennsylvania Day.

The Keystone State has played a historic role in our Nation’s founding and continues to shape our future. It is the birthplace of the Declaration of Independence and home to our Nation’s very first capital, Philadelphia.

Pennsylvania is also the site of several historic battles, including the Battle of Valley Forge during the Revolutionary War and the Battle of Gettysburg during the Civil War. It is where Betsy Ross handcrafted the first American flag and Colonel Edwin Drake drilled the first commercial oil well, in 1859.

Pennsylvania has a proud history of innovation and work ethic, from our steel mills and coal mines to our farmlands and forests.

This Great State’s many contributions to our Nation are a strong testament to the diverse, industrious citizens who call Pennsylvania our Commonwealth.

Mr. Speaker, today and every day, I am proud to call Pennsylvania my home.

HIGH COST OF PRESCRIPTION DRUGS

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

Mr. PAPPAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of my constituents, Bob and Cathy, who shared their story recently with me at a roundtable discussion in Manchester.

When Bob needed a kidney transplant, his wife, Cathy, was a match, and she donated her own kidney to overcome extensive wait times. Today, 15 years after Bob’s successful surgery, he must continue to take anti-rejection drugs. This prescription has always been covered by Cathy’s private insurance.

Even as Bob and Cathy are near retirement age, retirement is not an option for them because Bob’s life is dependent on a prescription drug that costs $3,000 a month out of pocket.

Nobody in America should be deprived of the dignity of retirement after a lifetime of hard work because of the outrageous costs of lifesaving drugs. I am committed to working with my colleagues to ease the significant burden and anxiety that so many Americans unnecessarily face every day.

We must tackle the high cost of prescription drugs now. The American people are counting on us to do just that.

VALERIE CALHOUN: A TENNESSEE JOURNALISM LEGEND

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

Mr. KUSTOFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Valarie Calhoun.

Valarie is the cohost of “Good Morning Memphis” on WHBQ-TV, and she is the recipient of five Emmy awards. Most recently, Valarie was recognized and honored as an inductee into the Tennessee Journalism Hall of Fame.

Anyone who knows Valarie Calhoun recognizes how well-deserved this honor is for her and her family. Valarie is someone who puts passion and dedication behind everything that she does.

Through Valarie’s lifelong commitment to journalism, she has brought news from around the world into every home in Memphis, west Tennessee, and the Memphis metropolitan community.

On top of her skills in journalism, Valerie and her family have become an integral part of the Memphis community through their volunteer work. You can always find Valerie and her husband, John, volunteering at Southern Reins, at Beau's school, and hosting numerous charitable events throughout the community.

Through her hard work and dedication to journalism, Valerie has become an inspiration to many looking to make their career in broadcasting and in journalism.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulateg Valarie on her induction into the Tennessee Hall of Fame.

HONORING JANE BLOCK

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

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate a dear friend whom I greatly admire, Jane Block.

Jane has dedicated her life to our community, to activism, and to making our society more just and equal for everyone.

She has been instrumental in leading the women’s movement in Riverside by serving on the committee that led to the founding of UCR’s Women’s Resource Center and chairing the Riverside County Commission on the Status of Women.

Apart from her work to advance women’s issues, Jane is president of the Riverside Land Conservancy and has helped to establish the Box Springs Mountain Reserve in Moreno Valley, which declared the region as a park instead of a development area.

Jane’s work has not gone unnoticed, and my district is a better place because of her. It is an honor not only to have her as a member of my community, but also to call her my friend.

Mr. Speaker, I wish Jane a happy 90th birthday.

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF “APOLLO 11”

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

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, in July of 1969, Neil Armstrong, Buzz Aldrin, and Michael Collins achieved something once thought impossible: successfully landing on the Moon and returning safely to the Earth.

They succeeded despite the many dangers they faced and the countless things that could have gone wrong during their pioneering 240,000-mile journey.

As we mark the 50th anniversary of Apollo 11, I take special pride in representing Neil Armstrong’s birthplace, Wapakoneta, Ohio.

The Neil Armstrong Air and Space Museum.

The museum has on display many artifacts from the mission and other
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END SURPRISE MEDICAL BILLS

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

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise to celebrate an important milestone in the fight to protect patients from unfair and expensive surprise medical bills.

For too many middle-class families, receiving an unexpected and very expensive bill from an out-of-network provider is devastating and can lead to severe anxiety, depression, and financial ruin.

That is why, yesterday, the House Energy and Commerce Committee passed H.R. 5830, the No Surprises Act, a bill that will protect millions of hardworking Americans from receiving a surprise medical bill through no fault of their own.

I am fighting to end surprise medical bills once and for all. The No Surprises Act includes my bipartisan amendment to create an independent arbitration process that keeps patients out of the middle and off the hook for surprise medical bills.

As an emergency medicine physician, my life’s work has been about putting patients first, and I am still fighting to put their health above all else.

I thank Chairman Pallone for leading an open, inclusive, and collaborative process that has brought us one step closer to a bipartisan solution that protects patients and ends surprise medical bills.

WORK ON KITCHEN-TABLE ISSUES

(Mr. LA MALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)
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with subclause (II) or (III) of section 3(m)(2)(A)(ii)

(3) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by paragraphs (1) and (2) shall take effect on the date after the date on which the hourly wage under subparagraph (II) of section 3(m)(2)(A)(ii) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 206(m)(2)(A)(ii)), as amended by subsection (a), takes effect.

SEC. 4. NEWLY HIRED EMPLOYEES WHO ARE LESS THAN 20 YEARS OLD.

(a) Base Minimum Wage for Newly HIRED Employees Who Are Less Than 20 Years Old.—Section 6(g)(1) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 206(g)(1)), as amended by striking “a wage which is not less than $4.25 an hour,” and inserting the following: “a wage at a rate that is not less than—

“(A) for the 1-year period beginning on the effective date under section 7 of the Raise the Wage Act, $8.75 an hour; and

“(B) for each succeeding 1-year period until the hourly wage under this paragraph equals the wage in effect under section 6(a)(1) for such period, an hourly wage equal to the amount determined under this paragraph for the preceding year, increased by the lesser of—

“(i) $0.25; or

“(ii) the amount necessary for the wage in effect under such paragraph to equal the wage in effect under section 6(a)(4) for such period, rounded to the nearest multiple of $0.05; and

“(C) for each succeeding 1-year period after the increase made pursuant to subparagraph (B)(ii), the minimum wage in effect under section 6(f)(1).”

(b) SCHEDULED REPEAL OF SEPARATE MINIMUM WAGE FOR NEWLY HIRED EMPLOYEES WHO ARE LESS THAN 20 YEARS OLD.—Section 6(g)(1) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 206(g)(1)), as amended by subsection (a), shall be repealed. (2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The repeal and amendment made by paragraphs (1) and (2), respectively, shall take effect on the date that is one day after the date on which the hourly wage under subparagraph (C) of section 6(f)(1) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 206(f)(1)), as amended by subsection (a), takes effect.

SEC. 5. PUBLICATION OF NOTICE.

Section 6 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 206), as amended by the preceding section, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(i) Not later than 60 days prior to the effective date of any increase in the required wage determined under subsection (a)(1) or subparagraph (B) or (C) of subsection (g)(1), or in accordance with subclause (II) or (III) of section 3(m)(2)(A)(ii) or section 14(c)(1)(A), the Secretary shall publish in the Federal Register notice of the increase in the required wage in such notice announcing each increase in such required wage."

SEC. 6. PROMOTING ECONOMIC SELF-SUFFICIENCY FOR INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES.

(a) WAGES.

(1) TRANSITION TO FAIR WAGES FOR INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES.—Subparagraph (A) of section 14(c)(1) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 214(c)(1)), as amended by this Act, is amended to read as follows:

“(A) at a rate that equals, or exceeds, for each year, the greater of—

“(i) $8.75 an hour, beginning 1 year after the date the wage rate specified in section 6(a)(1)(A) takes effect; and

“(ii) $6.40 an hour, beginning 2 years after such date;

“(III) $8.55 an hour, beginning 3 years after such date;

“(IV) $10.70 an hour, beginning 4 years after such date;

“(V) $12.85 an hour, beginning 5 years after such date; and

“(VI) the wage rate in effect under section 6(a)(1), on the date that is 6 years after the date the wage rate specified in section 6(a)(1)(A) takes effect; or

“(ii) if applicable, the wage rate in effect on the day before the date of enactment of the Raise the Wage Act for the employment, under a special certificate issued under paragraph (1)(A), of the individual for whom the wage rate is being determined under this subparagraph."

(b) PROHIBITION ON NEW SPECIAL CERTIFICATES.—Subsection (a) of section 14(c)(1)(A) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 214(c)(1)(A)), as amended by this Act, is amended by striking “(i)” and inserting the following: “(i) transitioning the practices of such employers to comply with this subsection, as amended by the Raise the Wage Act; and

“(ii) ensuring continued employment opportunities for individuals with disabilities receiving a special minimum wage rate under this subsection; and

“(B) information to individuals employed at a special minimum wage rate under this subsection, which may include referrals to Federal or State entities with expertise in competitive integrated employment.”

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this subsection shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

(d) PUBLICATION OF NOTICE.—(1) AMENDMENT.—Subsection (i) of section 6 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 206), as amended by section 4(b)(2), is further amended by striking “or section 14(c)(1)(A)”.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall take effect on the date on which the wage rate described in paragraph (1)(A)(i)(VI) of section 14(c) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 214(c)), as amended by subsection (a)(1), takes effect.

SEC. 7. GENERAL EFFECTIVE DATE.

Except as otherwise provided in this Act or the amendments made by this Act, this Act and the amendments made by this Act shall take effect:

(1) subject to paragraph (2), on the first day of the third month that begins after the date of enactment of this Act; and

(2) with respect to the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, on the date that is 18 months after the effective date described in paragraph (1).

SEC. 8. GAO REPORT.

Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit to the Congress a report that, with respect to the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands:

(1) assesses the status and structure of the economy (including employment, earnings and wages, and key industries); and

(2) for each year in which a wage increase will take effect under subsection (a)(1) or (g)(1) of section 6, section 3(m)(2)(A)(ii), or section 14(c)(1)(A) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 206, 214 or 214(c)(1)(A)), as amended by this Act, estimates the proportion of employees who will be directly affected by each such wage increase taking effect for such year, disaggregated by industry and occupation.

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

After 1 hour of debate, it shall be in order to consider the further amendment printed in part B of House Report 116-155, if offered by the Member designated in the report, which shall be considered 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 a division of the question.

The gentlewoman from Virginia (Ms. FOXX) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

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

Mr. Speaker, the ideal behind the Federal minimum wage is simple: Hardworking Americans should be paid at least a wage that is good for workers. It is good for the economy (including employment, earnings and wages, and key industries); and

The Raise the Wage Act, H.R. 582, gradually increases the Federal minimum wage to $15 an hour by 2025. After 2025, this legislation indexes future increases to the minimum wage, the longest stretch since the minimum wage was established in 1938, it is no longer serving that purpose.

Today, the Federal minimum wage is a poverty wage in every region of our Nation. Our Nation’s workers deserve better.

The Raise the Wage Act, H.R. 582, gradually increases the Federal minimum wage to $15 an hour by 2025. After 2025, this legislation indexes future increases to the minimum wage, the longest stretch since the minimum wage was established in 1938, it is no longer serving that purpose.

Today, the Federal minimum wage is a poverty wage in every region of our Nation. Our Nation’s workers deserve better.

The Raise the Wage Act, H.R. 582, gradually increases the Federal minimum wage to $15 an hour by 2025. After 2025, this legislation indexes future increases to the minimum wage, the longest stretch since the minimum wage was established in 1938, it is no longer serving that purpose.
While the Republican tax bill gave the largest benefits to corporations and the wealthy, this bill puts money directly into the hands of workers, who will spend that money in their communities.

Today is a historic day. For the first time in more than 12 years, the House is voting to restore the value of the Federal minimum wage and restore the value of work in America.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all of my colleagues to support the Raise the Wage Act, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in complete opposition to H.R. 582, a radical, risky, and unnecessary bill that puts party politics above the best interests of American workers and their families.

Increasing the Federal minimum wage by 107 percent is a harmful and unprecedented mandate that would result in millions of job losses for vulnerable Americans, small business closures, and significant damage to the U.S. economy.

A detailed study issued this month by the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, CBO, estimates a $15 minimum wage would cause up to 3.7 million lost jobs—3.7 million jobs. One job lost is too many; 3.7 million jobs lost is unconscionable.

Those hurt the most by this bill would be female workers, young workers, workers with less than a high school diploma.

In our committee earlier this year, we heard testimony from Ms. Simone Barron, a restaurant worker from Seattle, Washington, where the minimum wage has already been raised to $15 per hour. Simone said that, after the city of Seattle raised the minimum wage, her employer moved her from standard a tip line to a service charge model, which resulted in her taking home less pay.

Small businesses will also suffer if this far-left policy is implemented. Without the cash reserves or profit margins to absorb the increase in labor costs, small businesses will have a choice of several bad options. Among their choices are laying off workers, raising prices on their customers, replacing workers with robots, or going out of business.

The National Federation of Independent Business estimates that businesses with fewer than 500 employees will account for 57 percent of job losses, and businesses with fewer than 100 employees will account for 43 percent of job losses.

Still, many Democratic colleagues are trying to sell this radical wage hike by claiming it will redistribute wealth and provide poor Americans with a “living wage.” Yet, the CBO predicts that, by 2025, there would be a $9 billion decline in family income resulting from a $15 minimum wage. This so-called raise would reduce pay for many American families.

Let’s not forget, the U.S. economy is booming, and lesser-skilled workers are benefiting. Earlier this month, The Wall Street Journal reported that “wages are rising at the fastest rate in a decade for lower-skilled workers, and unemployment among less-educated Americans and minorities is near a record low.”

We know from the latest jobs report that progrowth policies like the Republican Tax Cuts and Jobs Act and eliminating unnecessary regulations are raising wages, jobs, and reducing unemployment.

With 7.3 million unfilled jobs nationwide, job creators know they must offer competitive wages and benefits to attract and retain workers, so it is bewildering that Democrats refuse to acknowledge or celebrate the victories of our present economy and continue to call for socialist policies. Instead, they want to pass this ill-advised legislation, which would weaken the economic progress we have achieved over the last few years.

The cost of living in New York City is much higher than the cost of living in my hometown in North Carolina. With such disparities in the cost of living across the country, making a one-size-fits-all wage hike will cause job losses and harm entry-level workers in many regions around the country.

Even President Obama’s former chairman of economic advisers, Alan Krueger, argued in October 2015 that raising the minimum wage to $15 would “put us in uncharted waters and risk undesirable and unintended consequences.”

H.R. 582 is deeply irresponsible. Workers, families, small businesses, and the U.S. economy will suffer as a direct result of this drastic mandate.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I remind my colleagues that a vote against this bill is a vote to deny about 37 percent of workers in her district of North Carolina a raise of about $3,800 a year.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI), the chair of the Education and Labor Subcommittee on Civil Rights and Human Services.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman Thompson.

The Federal minimum wage has been stagnant for too long, exacerbating income inequality and leaving working families behind.

A recent study from the National Low Income Housing Coalition found that someone working 40 hours a week who is earning the Federal minimum wage or the prevailing State minimum wage cannot afford a two-bedroom rental home at fair market rent in any State, metropolitan area, or county in the country.

Workers working full-time should be able to afford basic needs like food, housing, healthcare, and childcare.

Today, we can support working families by passing the Raise the Wage Act. This bill will gradually raise the minimum wage to $15 an hour by 2025 and make sure that tipped workers, youth, and individuals with disabilities are paid a full, not a subminimum, wage.

We are supported by the Economic Policy Institute found that raising the Federal minimum wage to $15 an hour would benefit close to 27,000 workers just in northwest Oregon alone.

The Raise the Wage Act is good for workers and good for the economy.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman Scott for his leadership, and I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Thompson).

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairwoman from North Carolina for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly rise in favor of upward mobility, and I rise in favor of greater opportunity. But this bill doesn’t do that. I rise in opposition to this underlying bill.

Mr. Speaker, increasing the Federal minimum wage by 107 percent is an extreme and unprecedented policy that will have a severe and unprecedented impact on many American families, our Nation’s workforce, our economy, and once again, most importantly, hard-working American families.

According to the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, if enacted, this legislation would cause approximately 3.7 million workers—let’s extrapolate that to families—across this Nation to lose their jobs by 2025.

My home State of Pennsylvania has estimated that more than 120,000 individuals, thereby families, would be negatively impacted through the loss of their jobs. That is not upward mobility. That is downward mobility.

Mr. Speaker, the majority of Americans, 54 percent, think losing up to 3.7 million jobs for a $15 minimum wage is not a good idea. And 42 percent of families with a minimum-wage earner would see a net reduction in total family income under the $15 minimum wage. That is according to the Congressional Budget Office.

Mr. Speaker, that is totally unacceptable.

Now, I have always been a proponent of Federal policies that aim to lift individuals out of poverty and provide them with skills necessary to gain good-paying, family-sustaining jobs. We have to time that in this body, and it is working.

We should be promoting bipartisan policies that are proven to enhance workforce development. For example, last Congress we passed the Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century Act, restoring rungs on a ladder of opportunity.

The President has signed that bill into law, and we are working diligently
with the States to ensure that they are doing everything possible to fill the 7.5 million open jobs in this country, most of them good, family-sustaining jobs. We need to ensure that policies enhance job-training programs; so we are not talking about a minimum wage but, rather, ensuring individuals with skills to compete and to earn well above a minimum wage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired. Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. I yield the gentleman from Pennsylvania an additional 20 seconds.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, 63 percent of Americans support our leadership expanding pathways to greater opportunity through CTE, the better way.

I want everyone who is willing to work in this country to succeed, but this legislation is not the answer. I encourage my colleagues to oppose the bill, take this debate so we can get to work on legislation to make sure job seekers have the skills to compete and succeed in the modern workforce.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker. I remind my colleague that his vote against the bill is a vote to deny about 38 percent of the workers in his district in Pennsylvania an average wage of about $3,300 a year.

Mr. Speaker. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO), the chair of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker. I include in the RECORD a letter from the National Employment Law Project in support.

JULY 16, 2019.

The undersigned organizations enthusiastically support the Raise the Wage Act of 2019, introduced by Senators Bernie Sanders (VT) and Patty Murray (WA), and Representatives Robert C. “Bobby” Scott (VA), Mark Pocan (WI), and Patty Murray (WA), Representatives of the House.

If enacted, this legislation would:

- Gradually raise the federal minimum wage to $15 an hour in 2025.
- Allow the minimum wage each year to keep pace with growth in the typical worker’s wages.
- Phase out the outdated subminimum wage for tipped workers, which has been frozen at a meager $2.13 since 1991; and
- Sunset the much criticized ability of employers to pay workers with disabilities a subminimum wage through certificates issued by DOL.

Phase out the subminimum wage for workers until all workers are paid a living wage.

At a time when wage stagnation and income inequality pose serious threats to our families and our economy, the Raise the Wage Act of 2019 will begin to reverse that cycle and raise pay broadly across the bottom of the workforce. According to the Economic Policy Institute, this Act will deliver long-overdue raises for more than 1 in 4 2 workers, 90% of whom are over the age of 20. The average age of workers who will get a raise is 35, nearly half have some years of college education. In fact, those who work year-round would see a raise in the order of $3,000 a year, which is enough to make a tremendous difference in the life of a preschool teacher, bank teller, or fastfood worker who today struggles to get by on around $20,000 per year.

28 percent are working parents with children, and half have family incomes of less than $40,000 per year. Women make up nearly 58 percent of the workers who would benefit from a $15 wage. Raising the minimum wage would be instrumental in helping to close the gender-wage-gap. Raising the minimum wage to $15 would also significantly benefit workers of color. African American workers and 33 percent of Latinos seeing a pay increase once this law goes into effect.

These are the people who make America run—yet due to the erosion of the real value of the minimum wage over the last half century, they are struggling even as our economy booms.

The time for the Raise the Wage Act is long overdue, and we cannot delay in working toward its passage. We call on Congress to act and to enact this legislation as quickly as possible, and for President Trump to sign it when it comes to his desk.

Sincerely,

Robert C. "Bobby" Scott (VA)
Mark Pocan (WI)
Patty Murray (WA)

Representatives of the House

There is currently no place in America where a worker making $7.25 per hour can afford a two-bedroom apartment. Millions of families are struggling to make ends meet. As one of the richest countries in the world, we should be ashamed.

This bill will give 27 million workers a raise and lift 1.3 million people out of poverty. Helping low-income workers is long overdue.

Contrary to what my Republican colleagues have been saying, raising the minimum wage is popular among American workers. That is why voters in States like California, Arkansas, Arizona, and Missouri have voted to increase their State minimum wages.

Congress has the opportunity to restore the value of work, lift families out of poverty, and ensure a fair wage for workers everywhere in America.

I urge all my colleagues to vote in support of workers by voting in support of the Raise the Wage Act.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. RICE).

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the Democrats’ assault on rural America continues.
The Congressional Budget Office estimates that if this minimum wage law were enacted, up to 3.7 million jobs in America would vanish. And what areas would lose the most? Obviously, the areas with the most minimum wage jobs, rural areas.

You know these areas have a much lower cost of living. You can rent an apartment for $500 per month, instead of $3,000 per month in San Francisco, where Nancy Pelosi is from. Food costs are lower, taxes are lower, utilities are lower, and an American family can have a comfortable living on half what it takes in San Francisco, Seattle, or New York.

One size does not fit all. A $15 minimum wage would cost these poor rural counties thousands of jobs. Even Blue State Oregon recognized this fact when it adopted a tiered minimum wage with one rate for urban areas, another for suburban, and another for rural.

I represent three poor South Carolina counties—Calhoun, Colleton, and Marlboro. These are majority African American and suffered stagnation over a lost decade following the financial crisis and the stifling government overreach of the Obama administration.

After tax and regulatory reform, these poor counties are finally recovering. Two years ago, when Donald Trump took office, the unemployment rate in Marion County was 9.6 percent. Today it is 4.6 percent. What a turnaround.

And yet, even in the face of this, Democrats haven’t learned their lesson and want to return to the days of big government, big regulation overreach that will hurt these poor rural counties the worst.

Everyone is concerned about income inequality. Here is a suggestion, to stop complaining and actually do something about it. Let’s work together to fix our broken immigration system.

Hundreds of thousands of illegal aliens cross our southern border every year. This limitless supply of cheap labor steals from our children and holds down wages for the hardworking, law-abiding Americans. The most affected are the most vulnerable at the bottom of the income ladder, and particularly those in rural areas.

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

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. Harvard professor George Borjas estimates that competition from low-skilled immigrants has reduced the American lower middle-class wages by $800 to $1,500 yearly.

Stop the endless flow of illegal labor and watch wages rise. For once, let’s put the American worker first. For once, let’s put America first.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I remind my colleagues that his vote against this bill is a vote to deny about 41 percent of the workers in his district in South Carolina a raise of about $3,800 a year.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. Wilson), the chair of the Health, Employment, Labor, and Pension Subcommittee.

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter in support of H.R. 582, the Raise the Wage Act of 2019, from the U.S. Women’s Chamber of Commerce.

U.S. WOMEN’S CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, WASHINGTON, DC, July 15, 2019.

LETTER IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 582, THE RAISE THE WAGE ACT OF 2019

My name is Margot Dorfman and I am the CEO of the U.S. Women’s Chamber of Commerce. I represent women business owners across America, who support raising the minimum wage.

INTRODUCTION

The U.S. Women’s Chamber of Commerce was founded to support the continued economic advancement of women in America. The Women’s Chamber has more than 500,000 members—mostly business owners. We have members in every state.

The business owners with whom I talk every day are watching and worrying about how their businesses, raising the minimum wage in fact helps small businesses, women workers and the broader economy. Raising the minimum wage reinforces their business strategies, while an inadequate minimum wage undermines them.

It is vitally important to understand that the number one problem I hear from my members is that consumer demand is still weak. Raising the minimum wage helps directly with that by putting more money in the pockets of workers who will spend it at our local businesses.

The migration of women from the workforce into business ownership has been one of the great economic achievements of the American dream. As women moved from employees to business owners, we have brought a new perspective to America’s business leadership. Women make up about 40 percent of all privately held firms in the United States and are exercising the decision-making authority that comes with that role to effect positive changes in the workplace.

My member business owners realize that most of the people working for low pay across the country—the waitresses, the grocery store clerks, the food stamp recipients. Many of my members were once employees themselves. They know that raising the minimum wage helps working women and families in their struggle to make ends meet. Our members know that a minimum wage of $7.25 an hour is much too low.

As a matter of fact, large national chains that pay low wages may actually be competing unfairly with women-owned small businesses that work hard to assure that their employees are paid a living wage. In short, keeping the minimum wage low keeps women and families down.

For these reasons and more, the U.S. Women’s Chamber of Commerce supports raising the federal minimum wage to $15 per hour by 2024 and then indexing it to median hourly wages so that it doesn’t erode again. And we also support getting the minimum wage for tipped workers until it equals the regular minimum wage as called for in the Raise the Wage Act.

SMALL BUSINESS SHOW THAT PAYING HIGHER WAGES IS ECONOMICALLY REALISTIC

There are two roads to profitability: the high road and the low road. Businesses can invest in their workforces with decent wages and benefits, and enjoy the benefits of a dedicated workforce with lower turnover, higher productivity and better customer service. Or businesses can pay pocket change through employees. These businesses may save on immediate payroll, but they experience the significant expense of higher turnover, constant recruiting, higher absenteeism, and a less experienced, less productive workforce.

Only one road to profitability delivers us a strong floor under our vulnerable middle class, upward mobility and the promise of the American Dream. The business owners supported by the U.S. Women’s Chamber of Commerce have a high road strategy for building their businesses: they pay better wages and their businesses benefit as a result. They report to me that this approach attracts more stable, dependable, productive employees. That’s not surprising since better wages enable workers to concentrate on their job without continually worrying about how they will put gas in their cars, pay for day care or keep up with their rent.

At small businesses, the owners and employees work side by side on a daily basis. They are working together to offer the best goods and services to their customers. My members know they cannot generally compete with the big box stores or the chain restaurants on price. Instead, their competitive advantage is higher quality service and a real connection to the community and its residents.

The reality is that my members and other Main Street businesses have a lot in common with low-wage workers: both are being squeezed by big corporations. The low wages that big retailers and restaurant chains pay to their workforce allows them to pass on price. Instead, their competitive advantage is higher quality service and a real connection to the community and its residents.

WEAK CONSUMER SPENDING IS HURTING SMALL BUSINESSES AND RAISING THE MINIMUM WAGE CAN GIVE IT A BOOST

My members see the stagnant wages and economic anxiety that most American families—men, women, blue and white collar—are experiencing. They see the significant expense of higher turnover, constant recruitment and training, and benefits, and enjoy the benefits of a dedicated workforce.

This is why local businesses support raising the minimum wage—because that additional money in the pockets of low-wage paid workers will be spent immediately in the local economy. These workers are not taking fancy trips abroad or speculating on Wall Street. They are shopping at the grocery store, the pharmacy and the auto-repair in their communities.
Finally, as a representative of women-owned businesses, I want to emphasize that working women represent the greatest percentage of workers to benefit from increasing the minimum wage. The typical low-wage worker is an adult woman. Think of your waitress at Applebee’s, or the checker who rings up your groceries. Think of the childcare center worker who takes care of your son or daughter, or the health aide who helps your mother or grandfather. Many of the women business owners who belong to the U.S. Women’s Chamber of Commerce left the workforce to start their own businesses because they felt that the jobs where women worked were not being fairly paid. In building their own companies and becoming employers, they have created working environments where they try to do better by paying and playing fairly. That’s why women-owned businesses tend to pay above minimum wage. Women business owners understand and value security for families. In sum, a $15 minimum wage by 2024 would offer all of the benefits that I have outlined: it will offer small business owners like my members by putting more money in the pockets of workers, which will boost spending and job creation on Main Street; it will help level the playing field for small, main street, and big businesses; and it will bring fairer pay to American women, who hold the majority of the low-wage jobs that will see a raise.

While some try to portray a minimum wage increase as a fight between business and workers, raising the minimum wage is in reality the right thing for both.

It is for these reasons that the U.S. Women’s Chamber of Commerce supports the Raise the Wage Act of 2019.

Thank you.

MARGOT DORFMAN,  
Chief Executive Officer, U.S. Women’s Chamber of Commerce.

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is amoral that millions of people in this country are forced to work so hard for so little in return.

Believe me, Congress knows, because there is a serious bipartisan movement afoot to lower prices for small and cash businesses with a cost-of-living raise. Congress realizes that they do not earn enough and, hopefully, they realize that people earning $7.50 an hour are definitely not earning enough.

So today, I call on CNN, MSNBC, FOX News, to let the American people know that we are attempting to raise the minimum wage. Herald it from the loudest bully pulpit you have. Listen to the facts given today by Chairman Scott and my colleagues and share them.

News outlets all over America, you have a responsibility to let the American people know that we hear them, we support them, and we understand. We are doing our very, very best to help them. We are fighting for them.

Raise the wage, colleagues. Raise the wage today.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DAVID P. ROE).

Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to encourage my colleagues to vote against H.R. 582, the so-called Raise the Wage Act, which is nothing more than another baseless, irrational attack on President Trump’s successful economic record.

Just this week, House Democrats voted to condemn the President, hold his advisers in contempt, and many House Democrats have reach out to the President. Today, they are working to undo the economic gains seen under the Trump administration’s leadership and undermine the best economy in my lifetime.

This legislation will arbitrarily double the Federal minimum wage to $15 an hour, despite plenty of evidence that employers are fairly compensating employees. This bill will hurt the very low-income people House Democrats claim they want to help by reducing employment opportunity and hours. In fact, the CBO estimated that this legislation will cost the American economy up to 3.7 million jobs and reduce real wages by $9.5 billion.

I offered an amendment to prevent this bill from taking effect unless the GAO could show this legislation would eliminate fewer than 200,000 jobs in rural America, where I live, but House Democrats wouldn’t even allow a debate.

Just in Tennessee, this bill is predicted to eliminate more than 66,000 jobs, roughly the size of my hometown, which is the largest city in my district. In 2016, Seattle’s minimum wage increased to $13 an hour, $2 shy of what the House Democrats are proposing today, and it has already reduced hours for low-income jobs. If legislation like this is hurting large areas like Seattle, it will have even a worse impact on rural America.

I think my colleague across the aisle said the States had raised this. I think that is a perfect thing, the States ought to. They know their local economies better than we do here in Washington, D.C.

I urge my Democratic colleagues to work with Republicans to implement policies to give every American the tools to seek higher-paying jobs and, once again, encourage my colleagues to vote against H.R. 582.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I remind my colleague that his vote against this bill is a vote to deny about 6 million workers whose wages are just above minimum wage make $7.25 an hour—about 29 percent less per hour than their counterparts were paid a half century ago.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. ADAMS), the chair of the Subcommittee on Workforce Protections.

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in strong support of H.R. 582, the Raise the Wage Act.

I have been fighting for working families for 3 decades now, from the State House in North Carolina, to here in the U.S. House. I led the successful effort in my State to raise the State’s minimum wage in 2006 from $5.15 to $6.15 an hour. Then, in 2009, the Federal Government raised the wage to $7.25. That was 12 years ago, and the minimum wage hasn’t increased since. Only the cost of living has increased.

Folks working full-time earning the minimum wage aren’t making enough to feed their families, and that is not acceptable. No one working full-time should struggle to make ends meet. Working hard is not enough if you don’t make enough.

That is why I am a proud supporter of H.R. 582, the Raise the Wage Act. The Raise the Wage Act would increase wages for over 150,000 people in my district in North Carolina. It is not just good for workers; it is good for the economy.

Unlike the GOP tax cut, which benefited corporations and the wealthy, this bill will put money in the pockets of hardworking Americans, who will spend it in the local economy.

My friends on the other side of the aisle will use outdated, misleading data to say that it will kill jobs. But the most comprehensive and recent research shows no job loss in cities that have already raised the wage to $15.

The American people are with us on this. A vast majority support raising the minimum wage.

You already know folks can’t survive on $7.25. We don’t have to do that in Congress. My folks on the other side of the aisle, you are making six figures. Can you survive on $7.25? I urge my colleagues, do what is right because it is right. America needs a raise. Join me in voting for this bill. Give the American people a long overdue raise.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the Record a letter from 100 economists in support of the $15 minimum wage.

(From the Economic Policy Institute, Feb. 6, 2019)

Today, workers who earn the federal minimum wage make $7.25 an hour—about 29 percent less per hour than their counterparts were paid a half century ago. Workers produce more today from what their counterparts were paid a half century ago. Workers produce more today from what their counterparts were paid a half century ago. Workers produce more today from what their counterparts were paid a half century ago. Workers produce more today from what their counterparts were paid a half century ago. Workers produce more today from what their counterparts were paid a half century ago. Workers produce more today from what their counterparts were paid a half century ago. Workers produce more today from what their counterparts were paid a half century ago.

No one working full-time should struggle to make ends meet. We, the undersigned, support gradually increasing the minimum wage to $15 by 2024, and then indexing it to median wages to protect against future erosion. We also support gradually phasing out the outdated subminimum wage for tipped workers, which has been frozen at $2.13 since 1997. This policy would directly lift the wages of 28.1 million workers by 2024. Another 11.6 million workers whose wages are just above the new minimum wage would likely see a wage increase through “spillover” effects, as employers adjust their internal wage scales. The vast majority of employees who would benefit are adults—disproportionately women—in working families, who work at least 20 hours a week and depend on their earnings to make ends meet.

A $15 minimum wage by 2024 would result in $121 billion in higher wages for 39.7 million low-wage workers, which would also benefit their families and their communities. Since low-wage workers spend a large share of their additional earnings, this injection of wages would modestly stimulate consumer
demand, business activity, and job growth. Further, modest and infrequent minimum wage increases are directly responsible for growing inequality between the bottom and the middle of the wage distribution. An increase would provide a significant and much needed boost to the earnings of low-wage workers. And, because it would be indexed to growth in the median wage, it would ensure that the wage floor keeps up with growth of middle-wage workers going forward.

The benefits of gradually phasing in a $15 minimum wage by 2024 would be far-reaching, lifting pay for tens of millions of workers and helping reverse decades of growing pay inequality. The benefits of a $15 minimum wage in 2024 for workers, their families, and their communities far outweigh the potential costs. Of course, the minimum wage is just one of many policies designed to help low-wage workers. We believe that an increase in the minimum wage should be accompanied by complementary policies such as an expanded Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC), enhanced safety net, increased job training, and policies to generate full employment.

Sincerely,

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I do agree with one thing one of our colleagues across the aisle said a few minutes ago. We do need to let the American people know what this House is about to do; kill millions of jobs. The CBO’s estimate was that 1.3 million jobs would be lost, minimum. Of those jobs lost, 60 percent would be female workers, 46 percent would be young workers, and 38 percent would have less than a high school diploma. These are the people that our colleagues claim they care about.

However, what they want to do here today is harm those very people. So I think it is important that we let the American people understand what this legislation does.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 1⁄2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG).

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 582, better known as the Raising Unemployment for American Workers Act.

The bill’s desired outcome may be well-intentioned, and you will hear hypothetical numbers from my good friend and chairman of the committee, and, if the jobs are kept, which they won’t be.

In reality, it causes harm to the very people it is supposed to help. Just ask the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office.

According to a CBO analysis of this legislation, it could eliminate up to 3.7 million jobs with a minimum wage increase, but the loss of millions of jobs, and reduce family income by $9 billion. Low-income workers without a high school degree would be hit the hardest.
We have seen the real-world consequences of a $15 minimum wage in cities like Seattle. It resulted in small businesses cutting jobs and workers receiving fewer hours and overall take-home pay. Instead of a one-size-fits-all approach, there is a better way to boost income for hardworking families. Let’s focus on policies that keep our economy thriving and create more opportunities for all Americans to find good-paying, living-wage jobs that allow advancements as well, not just minimum wage.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I remind my colleague that his vote against this bill is a vote to deny about 32 percent of the workers in his district in Michigan an average raise of about $2,300 a year. And in the CBO report that he cited, three of the most recent studies cited in that report show an actual increase in jobs, not a decrease.

I yield to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL), the co-chair of the Progressive Caucus, a gentlewoman who can talk specifically about Seattle.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Speaker, this is a big day. Today we pass the first minimum wage increase for workers in decades.

And, yes, I am proud to represent Seattle, a leader in the Fight for $15, where I served on the committee that actually drafted the legislation that passed, ultimately.

It has been 4 years since Seattle raised the wage, and I want to tell my colleagues across the aisle what the effect of that increase has been.

Seattle is flourishing. Today we have one of the lowest unemployment rates in the country, and jobs are growing steadily.

Last year, Forbes ranked Seattle the number one city for business and careers in 2018, and despite the doom and gloom predictions from the National Restaurant Association when we passed the bill, what we have seen is what the Seattle Times called “a crazy restaurant boom”—that is a quote—with new jobs created every day.

The most recent and credible research shows that wages for Seattle’s low-wage workers went up without any negative impact on employment, and local food prices remained constant so that families would better afford to buy healthy food.

When we increased the minimum wage in Seattle, Mr. Speaker, we got strong businesses, healthy families, and vibrant communities. All American workers deserve the same thing. Let’s raise the wage today.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a second letter from the National Employment Law Project in support of this legislation.

If enacted, this legislation would:

- Gradually raise the federal minimum wage to $15 an hour in 2025;
- After 2025, adjust the minimum wage each year to keep pace with growth in the typical worker’s wages;
- Phase out the outdated subminimum wage for tipped workers who are frozen at a meager $2.13 since 1991; and
- Sunset the much criticized ability of employers to pay workers with disabilities a subminimum wage through certificates issued by DOL.

Phase out the subminimum wage for workers under the age of 20.

At a time when wage stagnation and income inequality pose serious threats to our families and our economy, the Raise the Wage Act of 2019 will begin to reverse that trend and make a dent at the bottom of the workforce. According to the Economic Policy Institute, this Act will deliver long-overdue raises to more than 1 in 4 workers, 90% of whom are over the age of 20. The average age of workers who would get a raise is 35, nearly half have some years of college education. In fact, those who work year-round and who earn in the range of $3,000 a year, which is enough to make a tremendous difference in the life of a preschool teacher, bank teller, or fast-food worker who today struggles to get by on around $20,000 per year.

28 percent are working parents with children, and half have family incomes of less than $40,000 a year. Take up nearly 58 percent of the workers who would benefit from a $15 minimum wage, which would be instrumental in helping to close the gender-wage gap. Raising the minimum wage to $15 would also significantly benefit workers of color, with 38 percent of African American workers and 42 percent of Latino workers seeing a pay increase once this law goes into effect.

These are the frontline workers who make America run—yet due to the erosion of the minimum wage over the last half century, they are struggling even as our economy enjoys a solid recovery.

The time for the Raise the Wage Act is long overdue, and we cannot delay in working toward its passage. We call on Congress to enact this important piece of legislation as quickly as possible, and for President Trump to sign it into law when it comes to his desk.

Sincerely,

Jackson State University; Jewish Women International; Jobs with Justice; Just Harves-Ted: A Community Project; Justice and Advocacy Committee of the Lehigh Conference of Churches; Justice for Migrant Women; Kalamazoo Leavrs & Fishes; Kansas Association of Community Action Programs; Kentucky Equal Justice Center; Kentucky State AFL-CIO; Keystone Progress; Kentucky Research Center; Kings Food Pantry; Korean-American Historical Center; KWH Law Center for Social Justice and Change.

La Frontera Ministries; La Plata County Thrive! Living Wage Coalition; Labor Education Program, School of Labor and Employment Relations, University of Illinois; Lamonile Family Center; Law Foundation of Silicon Valley; Law Students in Court; Lawyers’ Committee for Civil Rights Under Law; Leadership Conference of Women Voters; Legal Services Corporation; Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Rights; Leadership Team, Sisters of the Presentations; Legal Aid at Work; Legal Aid Service of Broward County; Legal Momentum; The Legal Aid Society; Defense and Education Fund; Legal Voice; Let Justice Roll; Living Wage Campaign; Lincoln Hills Development Corporation; Louisville Neighborhood Network; May Panthers; Los Angeles Alliance for a New Economy; Louisiana Budget Project; Louisiana Progress Action; Main Street Alliance; Maine Coalition to End Domestic Violence; Maine Women’s Lobby; Maimers for Accountable Leadership; Make the Road PA; Maryland Consumer Law Enforcement; Maryland Council on Economic Opportunity; Maryland Hunger Solutions; Maryland National Organization for Women; Massachusetts Law Reform Institute; Matthew and Child Health Access; MCCA/MTA; Men of All Colors Together (MACT)/Philia.; Mercyhoven Inc.; Methodist Federation for Social Action; Metro-Detroit Chapter of the Coalition of Labor Union Women (CLUW); Metropolitan Community Church of Washington, D.C.; Metropolitan Washington Legal Services Association; Michigan League for Public Policy; Michigan’s Children; Middlesex Coalition for Children; Milwaukee Area Service & Hospitality Workers Organizing Committee; Missouri Mothers for the Homeless; Mississippi Families for Kids; Mississippi Low Income Child Care Initiative. Missouri CLUW Chapter; MomRising; Mountain State Justice; MWC, AFL-CIO; NAACP; NARAL Pro-Choice North Carolina; Nashua Soup Kitchen and Shelter; National Advo-cacy Project Women’s Caucus of the Governing Shep-herd; National Asian Pacific American Women’s Forum (NAPAWF); National Association of Social Workers; National Association of Social Workers—NJ Chapter; National Association of Social Workers Connecticut Chapter; National Association of Social Workers, West Virginia Chapter; NationalAssociationontheDead; National Black Justice Coalition.


National Women’s Law Center; National Women’s Law Center—New York; National Work Rights Institute; NC Justice Center; NC State AFL-CIO; Nebraska Appleseed; Nebraska Chapter of the National Association of Social Workers— Nebraska—Teton County MT; NELA Hawaii Chapter; NELA—Kansas City Affiliate; NELA—Saint Louis; NELA—Alabama; Nena Caucus on Access to Work; National Council on Environmental & Economic Responsibility; NETWORK Lobby for Catholic Social Justice.

The New Jersey Policy Perspective; New Jersey State Coalition of Labor Union Women; New Jersey Tenants Organization; New Mexico Coalition of community Partners; New Mexico Legal Aid Society; New Mexico Center on Law and Poverty; New Or-leans Associates of the Sisters of the Blessed
Sacramento; New Voices for Reproductive Justice; New York Paid Leave Coalition; North American Climate, Conservation and Environment (NACCE); North Carolina Alliance; North Carolina Coalition Against Domestic Violence; North Carolina Council of Churches; North Dakota Chapter of the National Association of Social Workers; Oregon Economic Security and Prosperity Alliance.

Northwest Indiana Community Action; Northwest Indiana Housing Action; Oakland Park Democratic Club; Oasis Legal Services; Ohaha Family Foundation; Ohio Coalition of Labor Union Women; Ohio Domestic Violence Network; Oklahoma Policy Institute, Women’s Coalition; One Pennsylvania; One Stop Career Center of PR Inc; Orange County Poverty Alleviation Coalition; Organize Florida; OURNOVA.

Oxfam America; Pathways PA; Patriotic Millionaires; Pax Christi Florida; Pax Christi Illinois; Pax Christi USA; Peace, Justice, Sustainability Florida; Pennsylvania Budget and Policy Center; Pennsylvania Council of Churches; Pennsylvania Together; People Demand Action; People’s Institute for Housing Policy; Philadelphia Coalition of Labor Union Women; Philly Neighborhood Networks; Piedmont Housing Alliance.

Planet Earth; Policy Matters Ohio; Poor People’s Campaign; Positive Women’s Network-USA; PowHer New York; Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.); Pringle at Work; Princeton Community Housing; Professional Child Care Provider Network of Prince George’s Co., Inc; Project Bread-The Walk for Hunger; Promise The Children; Provincial Council Clerics of St. Viator; Public Advocacy for Kids; Public Citizen; Public Citizens for Children and Youth (PCCY); Public Justice Center.

Ms. FOX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, as our colleagues have noted, States and localities may enact higher minimum wages than the Federal minimum wage, and there are examples of that. But let’s leave freedom in the hands of the people, in the hands of the States. That is what this country is all about.

In socialist regimes, all decisions are made by a small group of people at a central government. That is not the American way.

Mr. Speaker. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY).

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina for yielding.

Mr. Speaker. I think dates matter and I think votes matter, and I think that sometimes because of where we are, this is kind of this Potomac amnesia.

We say we want to raise people’s wages, we want to create jobs, we want to be able to do things that lift every single boat because that is what a rising tide does. It is not a Democrat tide; it is not a Republican tide; it is a rising tide for the American people.

I would just want to remind my colleagues, in December of 2017, not one of you was on board with the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act. You could not vote for it in the House; you could not vote for it in the Senate.

And we come here today and we talk about minimum wage and raising minimum wages, and I would just suggest to you that America is not about minimal. Nobody comes to America because I may get a minimum wage increase. They come to America because of maximum opportunity.

Why would we dwell on a minimum wage when we do not take change, in December of 2017 to lift all boats?

Why would we turn our back on an opportunity to completely change the economy of the United States?

Why would we turn our back on workers who had not been employed for many years, and we sit today with millions of open jobs and we don’t have enough workers to fill them?

And what are we talking about today? We are trying to right a wrong. We are trying to fix, somehow, a wrongheaded decision to vote against the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act.

And a lot of it had to do with not because we were Republicans, but because we have somebody in the White House that we just don’t like; and, my God, if I did something that lifts the hopes of all Americans and the wishes of all Americans and Donald Trump gets credit for it, that just won’t work in 2020.

I would ask my friends on the other side, if you really want to see America soar, stop putting roadblocks in the way. Stop standing in the way of hard-working American taxpayers who couldn’t care less what your political affiliation is but watch the legislation that you pass and, more importantly, that the legislation that you passed.

I would just remind you—and I know you are going to tell me the average wages in Pennsylvania—those wages are only available if you get hired.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman has suggested, his vote against the bill is a vote to deny those working people who, for many years in his district in Pennsylvania an average raise of $3,900 a year, while the tax bill that he supported, 80 percent of the benefits of that bill went to the top 1 percent and corporations.

Mr. Speaker. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the House majority leader.

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

I like the gentleman from Pennsylvania. He and I are friends. We disagree.

I proudly voted against the tax bill which, I think, spiked the deficit, and we had a continuation of the extraordinary growth of jobs and the economy under the Obama administration, and that has continued in a straight line. It didn’t spike up—straight line.

Mr. Speaker. I rise in strong support of the Raise the Wage Act. This is direct—not indirect, not trickle down, direct—saying to some of the people who worked hardest and make the least: We are going to help. We think what you worked hardest and make the least: We are going to help. We think what you

We need to make certain that wages keep pace with the cost of living. We haven’t done that. For 10 years, we haven’t given a raise.

We need to value the labor that our people contribute into the economy. That is why we have a Federal minimum wage that doesn’t allow anyone who works hard, full time, ought to be able to afford, not simply to get by, but to try to get ahead.

I have heard from many in my district who have told me that increasing the minimum wage will have a major impact on their incomes and their lives.

Dana Hudson from Owings in Calvert County, Maryland, makes the minimum wage of $10.10 an hour and supplements his income with farming on his land. He is 60 years old and looking ahead to retirement, knowing that a higher minimum wage in his final years of working will go a long way towards giving him and his wife retirement security.

Delano Alexander of Clinton, Maryland, is an environmental services aide at Prince George’s Hospital Center. He earns $12.85 an hour, presently; and if we pass this bill, he will get an income boost through the Network of Prince George’s Co., Inc; Project Bread-The Walk for Hunger; Promise The Children; Provincial Council Clerics of St. Viator; Public Advocacy for Kids; Public Citizen; Public Citizens for Children and Youth (PCCY); Public Justice Center.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, as our colleagues have noted, States and localities may enact higher minimum wages than the Federal minimum wage, and there are examples of that. But let’s leave freedom in the hands of the people, in the hands of the States. That is what this country is all about.

In socialist regimes, all decisions are made by a small group of people at a central government. That is not the American way.

Mr. Speaker. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY).

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina for yielding.

Mr. Speaker. I think dates matter and I think votes matter, and I think that sometimes because of where we are, this is kind of this Potomac amnesia.

We say we want to raise people’s wages, we want to create jobs, we want to be able to do things that lift every single boat because that is what a rising tide does. It is not a Democrat tide; it is not a Republican tide; it is a rising tide for the American people.

I would just want to remind my colleagues, in December of 2017, not one of you was on board with the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act. You could not vote for it in the House; you could not vote for it in the Senate.

And we come here today and we talk about minimum wage and raising minimum wages, and I would just suggest
to $15 an hour by 2025, 6 years from now.

This bill also eliminates the subminimum wage for those with disabilities, which will ensure their equal pay and the ability to live with independence.

Many major corporations and municipalities have already raised their minimum wages to this level, and it has not caused the dire consequences that some on the other side of the aisle have predicted. My home State of Maryland took action earlier this year to raise the minimum wage to $15 an hour, I am proud of that fact.

The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office has determined that raising the minimum wage to $15 an hour would lift 1.3 million Americans directly out of poverty.

Isn’t that a good thing to do? Doesn’t that make you feel better that we are helping to lift people out of poverty?

And the Economic Policy Institute says that doing so would cause wages to go up for 32 million Americans. That is good for them.

What I suggest is, well, it is good for our economy and it is good for all of us, because it will help grow the economy, make folks more independent, and make us all better about ourselves and about what they are doing.

We campaigned on a promise to raise wages and make sure that American workers can access all the opportunities that make the American Dream possible. That is what we are doing today.

I thank Chairman BOBBY SCOTT and Democrats on the Committee on Education and Labor for their hard work on this legislation.

We said we were going to raise the wage. Today we are going to raise the wage. It is the right thing to do. I urge every Member to support it.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, Speaker PELOSI promised that a $15 an hour wage hike would be passed by the House in the first 100 hours of this Congress, so it is not surprising that 7 months later the Rules Committee accepted a manager’s amendment to add a modest amount of extra time for small businesses to feel the full effect of this bill.

Also, our colleague has said that this will lift 1.3 million people out of poverty, but it is also going to knock 3.7 million people out of jobs. So, let’s keep it all in perspective.

I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I think it is laughable for anybody in this House to say that the government is going to raise your wages. The government doesn’t raise wages. What the government does is provide an environment for businesses to raise wages, and that is where the decision should be.

And it is laughable to me that Members of Congress actually believe that they can raise the wages of people in this country by this legislation. The Congressional Budget Office recently released a report saying that almost 4 million jobs could be lost if this legislation were implemented.

I remind my colleagues that we had an 8-year war on business, and, guess what. In 2016, we said that war is over. America is open for business.

With Georgia being the number one State to do business in for the past 6 years, this damaging Federal mandate would reverse all the great work our State has done to grow jobs and the economy.

And I am telling you, we are getting it done in Georgia, but I don’t want Maryland to determine what Georgia is going to do, and I don’t want Seattle to determine what Georgia is going to do.

As a businessman, I know that our economy is all about supply and demand, and with more job openings, then job seekers’ wages are going to go up. You have to pay more to keep talent. It is supply and demand, folks.

In fact, in 2018, wages and salaries saw the largest increase in more than a decade, thanks to the economic environment led by a Republican-led Congress and President Trump that has spurred economic growth and prosperity.

The last thing we need are more one-size-fits-all Washington mandates that would lead to 40 workers’ hours for automation, and ultimately shut the doors of our Nation’s small businesses.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a “no” vote on this legislation.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I remind my colleague that his vote against this bill is a vote to deny 41 percent of the workers in his district in Georgia an average raise of about $3,800 a year, and I don’t think they are laughing about that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN), the co-chair of the Progressive Caucus.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. Scotty for yielding.

I do find it interesting to sit and listen to a debate today where people who make $17,000 a year and half of which are millionaires are telling people they should be satisfied trying to exist on $15,000 a year, which is the very reason we are here today: to try to raise the wage for 33 million people, a quarter of the workforce in this country.

No family in the United States can live on $7.25 an hour and make ends meet.

In my home State of Wisconsin, you would have to work 93 hours a week at minimum wage in order to afford a modest two-bedroom apartment, and there is not a single county in the country where a worker earning the minimum wage for 40 hours a week can afford a two-bedroom apartment.

I come to Congress with 3 decades as a small business owner. Small business owners know our workers are our customers, our neighbors, and our community members.

When workers have more money in their pockets, they have more money to spend to care for their families and stimulate our economy.

This is especially true in rural areas, where workers have only a handful of employment options. If the primary employer in a rural town is a multi billion-dollar corporation like Walmart, then job seekers’ wages are going to go up. They have to pay more to keep talent. It is supply and demand, folks.

Across the country, there is overwhelming momentum in favor of raising wages for our nation’s lowest-wage workers. Since 2014, twenty-one states, plus D.C., have approved minimum wage increases. In 2020, the minimum wage would begin to reverse decades of pay inequality.

Raising the minimum wage will be good for the economy and stimulate consumer spending. Today’s low-wage workers earn less per hour than their counterparts did 50 years ago but productivity has nearly doubled in that time. If the minimum wage had been raised at the same pace as productivity, it would be over $20 an hour today. Increasing the minimum wage would generate $14 billion in additional wages and most of those extra earnings would go to small stores and other main street businesses because lower-paid workers spend a greater proportion of their earnings.

The Raise the Wage Act would deliver long-overdue raises to a large segment of the workforce. Gradually raising the federal minimum wage to $15 by 2024 would lift pay for nearly 40 million workers—28.6 percent of the U.S. workforce. An $15 minimum wage would begin to reverse decades of pay inequality for the lowest-paid workers and the middle class.

Raising the minimum wage would significantly benefit workers of color and women. Nearly two-fifths (36 percent) of African Americans and one-third (35 percent) of Latinos would get a raise and 56 percent of women workers would benefit.

But, in the country, there is overwhelming momentum in favor of raising wages for our nation’s lowest-wage workers. Since 2014, twenty-one states, plus D.C., have approved minimum wage increases. In 2020, the minimum wage would begin to reverse decades of pay inequality. In 2014, twenty-one states, plus D.C., have approved minimum wage increases. In 2020, the minimum wage would begin to reverse decades of pay inequality.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from the United Food and Commercial Workers.


To All Members of the U.S. House of Representatives.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the United Food and Commercial Workers International Union (UCFW) which represents nearly 1.3 million working Americans in food and non-food retail, pharmacy, food processing, and manufacturing, I urge you to vote for the Raise the Wage Act (H.R. 582) which would raise the minimum wage to $15 an hour and gradually increase it over the next five years until it reaches $15 an hour in 2024.

After 2024, the minimum wage will be increased to $15 per hour and gradually rise along with a typical workers wage. The Raise the Wage Act would also end unfair exceptions for tipped workers, people with disabilities, and youth so that they, too, can benefit from a decent minimum wage.

Raising the minimum wage will be good for the economy and stimulate consumer spending. Today’s low-wage workers earn less per hour than their counterparts did 50 years ago but productivity has nearly doubled in that time. If the minimum wage had been raised at the same pace as productivity, it would be over $20 an hour today. Increasing the minimum wage would generate $14 billion in additional wages and most of those extra earnings would go to small stores and other main street businesses because lower-paid workers spend a greater proportion of their earnings.

The Raise the Wage Act would deliver long-overdue raises to a large segment of the workforce. Gradually raising the federal minimum wage to $15 by 2024 would lift pay for nearly 40 million workers—28.6 percent of the U.S. workforce. An $15 minimum wage would begin to reverse decades of pay inequality for the lowest-paid workers and the middle class.

Raising the minimum wage would significantly benefit workers of color and women. Nearly two-fifths (36 percent) of African Americans and one-third (35 percent) of Latinos would get a raise and 56 percent of women workers would benefit.

But, in the country, there is overwhelming momentum in favor of raising wages for our nation’s lowest-wage workers. Since 2014, twenty-one states, plus D.C., have approved minimum wage increases. In 2020, the minimum wage would begin to reverse decades of pay inequality. In 2014, twenty-one states, plus D.C., have approved minimum wage increases. In 2020, the minimum wage would begin to reverse decades of pay inequality.
Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BYRNE).

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 582. This is not a tradeoff that Congress should make for a variety of social, political, and economic reasons would effectively have their low-wage status locked in. The power of the minimum wage to boost worker incomes, and thus consumer buying power, would be legislatively kneecapped for the areas that could most use a boost in local consumer demand.

Raising the minimum wage is long overdue. I call on every member of Congress to vote for the Raise the Wage Act and enact this import piece of legislation as quickly as possible.

Sincerely,
ADREMOLA OYEFESO,
International Vice President, Director, Legislative and Political Action Department.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BYRNE).

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, today in opposition to H.R. 582. The House disruptive job losses and harm entry-level workers in many regions around the country, effectively knocking the bottom rung off the career ladder and especially hurting young workers.

Last month, the CBO issued a long-awaited study, which estimates that up to 3.7 million jobs would be lost from a $15 minimum wage, with a median estimate of 1.3 million jobs lost. That includes 44,000 jobs that would be lost in my home State of Alabama, and those under 21 will suffer half those job losses.

When comparing those numbers with the report's estimate that only 1.3 million individuals would be lifted out of poverty, H.R. 582 would cost at least one job to be lost for every person who moved out of poverty. In the CBO's high-impact scenario, as many as three jobs would be lost for every individual moving out of poverty.

This is not a tradeoff that Congress should make for a variety of social, political, and economic reasons would effectively have their low-wage status locked in. The power of the minimum wage to boost worker incomes, and thus consumer buying power, would be legislatively kneecapped for the areas that could most use a boost in local consumer demand.

Raising the minimum wage is long overdue. I call on every member of Congress to vote for the Raise the Wage Act and enact this import piece of legislation as quickly as possible.

Sincerely,
ADREMOLA OYEFESO,
International Vice President, Director, Legislative and Political Action Department.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill. As a former grocery clerk and President of UFCW, I know how hard working families are struggling to make ends meet.

I raised the minimum wage to $8.70 in 2014, and it has been stagnating ever since. Today is the day that we set the record straight and give opportunities to those who need it the most. Henry Ford said it: Make sure you pay your employees enough money so they can buy your product and services.

That is the true case of what is going on here today. You give a raise to the people who need it the most to survive, not to invest in the shore home. They will spend it right in their neighborhood going to the supermarket and drugstore.

They shouldn't have to make the decision whether or not to put clothes on their kids' backs or to feed them, but that is what is going on today.

Those in the top 1 percent got their raise. It is time that those who work hard and have the dignity of a job get their raise.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from the United Steel Workers.

UNITED STEELWORKERS,
Pittsburgh, PA, July 15, 2019.

Dear Representative:

On behalf of the 850,000 members of the United Steelworkers (USW), I urge this committee to support the Raise the Wage Act (H.R. 582).

In the 10 years since Congress last took action, the federal minimum wage has remained stagnant, eroding the earnings and purchasing power for millions of American wage workers and their families. According to the Economic Policy Institute, the current federal minimum wage is worth 17 percent less than it was 10 years ago, down a staggering 31 percent from its peak value in 1968. It is past time for America to address the growing needs of low-wage workers and low-income families and raise the federal minimum wage. In 1968, the Wage Act (H.R. 582), the value of the federal minimum wage would be restored by incrementally raising the nation's wage floor to $15.00 an hour by 2024 and indexing it to inflation. The legislation would also eliminate the subminimum wages currently in effect for tipped workers and workers with disabilities, ensuring that all groups have access to consistent wages.

Everyone benefits when the floor is raised. According to the Congressional Budget Office, raising the wage to $15.00 an hour would boost the earnings of 27 million workers and their families, lifting some of America's poorest out of poverty. Through this wage increase, the Raise the Wage Act (H.R. 582) will not only help low-wage workers to meet their basic needs, but it will incentivize workers' purchasing power, helping to stimulate and grow America's economy.

All workers deserve to make a livable wage. Combined with critically needed labor law reforms, this legislation will serve as an important step to empowering workers. USW urges you to give America’s lowest paid workers a raise and enact the Raise the Wage Act (H.R. 582).

Sincerely,
THOMAS M. CONWAY,
International President.
you can work hard, play by the rules, and you can live your dream.

The question is the prescription, and it is a fundamental choice. It is a choice of believing in our free enterprise system, believing in our economic system that has provided more opportunity than ever before in the history of the world, or believing in more government control.

Today, someone can apply at the construction company that I operated for many years.

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

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 20 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. SMUCKER. Today, someone can apply at that company and have no experience and start at $16 an hour. That wasn’t a government prescription. That is the free enterprise system at work.

I am very, very proud, as the result of the work that we have done over the last 2 years, the tax reform act, for the first time, we are seeing wages rise.

Again, it is not as a result of a bill like this, which would have exactly the opposite effect on that ability to achieve upward mobility.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I remind my colleague that his vote against the bill is a vote to deny about 34 percent of the workers in his district in Pennsylvania an average raise of $3,200, and that, in fact, wages for low-income workers have been going up, but only because States and localities have been increasing the minimum wage, just like this bill does.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), the vice chair of the Education and Labor Committee.

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman BOBBY SCOTT for his incredible leadership on this bill, and the strong support of the Raise the Wage Act.

Mr. Speaker, I would remind the previous speaker and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN) that we are proposing precisely zero more regulation than exists. In fact, the Federal Government has set a minimum wage in this country since 1938, all the great growth years of this economy. We are just saying that the rate should be sensible.

I came to Washington to raise the standard of living for working people in Michigan’s Ninth District and all across this country, and that is exactly what this bill does.

Working a full-time job should guarantee that you can provide for your family, and a $7.25-an-hour minimum wage doesn’t cut it, especially when worker productivity has increased exponentially, and executive salaries have skyrocketed.

Working a full-time job should guarantee that you can provide for your family, and a $7.25-an-hour minimum wage doesn’t cut it, especially when worker productivity has increased exponentially, and executive salaries have skyrocketed.

Mr. Speaker, I want to remind all of my colleagues that in 2018, the Bureau of Labor Statistics said that 7,769,000 American workers were working multiple jobs because one job didn’t cut it, and that, in fact, was almost certainly an undercount, according to all experts.

Phasing in a $15 minimum wage would benefit 41 million workers and begin to address the growing crisis of wage inequality. More than half of the workers who would benefit are adults between the ages of 25 and 54, and nearly two-thirds work full time. More than half (56 percent) are women, nearly 30 percent of whom have children.

According to the Economic Policy Institute, an adult without children will need at least $31,200 ($15 per hour on an annual basis) to achieve an adequate standard of living in all parts of the country. Allowing for a lower regional minimum wage, as some have suggested, would lock millions of workers into poverty, and would be especially harmful to color and women who would benefit most from a minimum wage increase.

Multiple studies have shown that modest increases in the minimum wage have not resulted in significant job loss, and the income boost experienced by low-income families benefits the country overall by reducing both poverty and income inequality. Raising the minimum wage to $15 has the support of an overwhelming majority of Americans, and the economic potential cost. Once again, we urge you to vote YES on the Raise the Wage Act and NO on any weakening amendments. In addition, since any Motion to Reconsider would be the equivalent of voting against the Raise the Wage Act, we urge you to vote no on the MTR.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM SAMUEL,
Government Affairs Department.

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman BOBBY SCOTT for his incredible leadership on this bill, and the strong support of the Raise the Wage Act.

Mr. Speaker, I would remind the previous speaker and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN) that we are proposing precisely zero more regulation than exists. In fact, the Federal Government has set a minimum wage in this country since 1938, all the great growth years of this economy. We are just saying that the rate should be sensible.

I came to Washington to raise the standard of living for working people in Michigan’s Ninth District and all across this country, and that is exactly what this bill does.

Working a full-time job should guarantee that you can provide for your family, and a $7.25-an-hour minimum wage doesn’t cut it, especially when worker productivity has increased exponentially, and executive salaries have skyrocketed.

The gentile from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) said the CBO score said a minimum of 1.3 million jobs would be lost. I want to correct that record. They said a minimum of zero would be. The median projection is that 1.3 million might be.

Mr. Speaker, I want to remind all of my colleagues that in 2018, the Bureau of Labor Statistics said that 7,769,000 American workers were working multiple jobs because one job didn’t cut it, and that, in fact, was almost certainly an undercount, according to all experts.

If just one in five of those people being forced to work multiple jobs could quit their second and third job because one job paid enough, that would take care of 1.6 million jobs we wouldn’t need, because workers were being paid a living wage.

We have waited more than 10 years to give American families a raise. And I called on the people of Michigan’s Ninth District, where about 104,800 people would get a raise under this bill, have waited long enough.

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

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the distinguished Speaker of the United States House of Representatives.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I thank him for his extraordinary leadership, historic, really, for giving us this opportunity today to do something very special for the American people, for America’s working families.

This is an historic day, yes, because we are raising the minimum wage here in the House of Representatives, because we are channeling the energy of so many people across the country for fairness in the workplace, but it also happens to be the 171st anniversary of the Seneca Falls Convention.

The Seneca Falls Convention shook the world, when they had that convention, with the simple proclamation that all men and women are created equal.

This bill achieves that equality, giving nearly 20 million working women, that is nearly one-third of all working women, a raise. And it helps narrow the gender wage gap that disproportionately targets women of color, putting more money in the pockets of more than one-third of working women of color.

Today, we wake up for a day of jubilation because of the sense of fairness that this legislation engenders. We wake up every morning with a smile on our face, showing the world all the love and kindness in our hearts, and that love in our hearts is about fairness for the American people.

It is interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, as has been acknowledged—as I just heard Congressman LEVIN mention, and others as well—10 years since the Federal minimum wage was raised in the previous Democratic majority. It had been 11 years before then, when we passed it in 2007, and it was signed by President Bush.

It was bipartisan, and we were thrilled about that.

It is interesting to see what has happened in the time since then. While families work hard to make ends meet, the cost of living has surged to unsustainable highs. Inflation has eaten nearly 20 percent of their wages, and the GOP special interest agenda has left them far behind.

I mentioned that this is about equality for women. It is about 30 million people in our country getting a raise—30 million people—and so many people being lifted out of poverty.

I talked about 2007. That is when we first passed it in the House. It took a little more time for it to be law, going through the Senate and the rest.

When we passed it, we were so thrilled, knowing that the President
would sign it. We had a big rally outside the Capitol. As soon as the rally was finished, Senator Ted Kennedy, who had been a really important part of the Senate action on raising the minimum wage, said: "You know what we have to do now? We have to raise the minimum wage!"

We always have to be injecting fairness, all the time. We must never stop fighting to honor the dignity of work and pushing forward for working families and women, again, affected so drastically.

American workers deserve a raise. No one can live with dignity on a $7.25 per hour wage. Can you?

'The Raise the Wage Act honors workers and supports families, giving 33 million Americans a long-overdue raise and lifting many out of poverty.'

The bill grows our economy, increasing families' purchasing power, which drives economic growth that lifts up all communities. The consumer confidence of America's working families is an important element in growing our economy.

It brings our democracy closer to the founding ideals, upholding the bedrock idea of fairness in our country, that all communities. The consumer confidence of America's working families is an important element in growing our economy.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. TRONE), the distinguished member of the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. TRONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Raise the Wage Act.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter signed by over 1,000 businesses supporting the Raise the Wage Act. My constituents and I are fighting to put more money in the pockets of workers in their community.

BUSINESS FOR A FAIR MINIMUM WAGE

FEDERAL $15 SIGN ON STATEMENT

PART 2 OF LIST OF ABOUT 1,000 SIGNERS AND COUNTING AS OF JULY 17, 2019

Alan Chebot, Owner, Parallax Productions, Allston, MA; David Byrson, CEO, Dean’s Beans Organic Coffee Company, Orange, MA; Fred Davis, President, Fred Davis Corporation, Medfield, MA; Megan Driscoll, CEO, Phare, Cambridge, MA; Quinny Walker, Owner, Chelsea, MA; Julie Emerson, Co-founder, Rainbow Solutions, Medford, MA; Paul English, CTO and President, Lola.com Boston, MA; Rob Everett, Managing Director, Royal Exchange West Bridgewater, MA; Jen Falgel, Executive Director, CommonWealth Kitchen, Dorchester, MA; Nancy Fenon, Co-owner, Badseed Magazine, MA; Laura Fisher, Owner, Fisher Agencies—American Income Life, Builing, MA; Tim Fisk, Owner, Salon Herds, Northampton, MA; Vincent Frano, Owner, Shannon, MA; Jon G footer, Co-Owner and Creative Director, The Boston Globe, MA; Julie Fraser, Principal & Director, Lyno Advisors Inc & Present Source, Cambridge, MA; David Gardner, President/Owner, Boys & Girls Clubs of Greater Washington, MA; Julie Goodridge, CEO, Northstar Asset Management, Inc., Boston, MA.

Myrna Greenfield, Owner, Good Egg Marketing, Jamaica Plain, MA; Jeff Greim, Founder/CEO, Your Choice Brands, Longmeadow, MA; Tim Greiner, Owner, Pure Kitchen Strategies & Lipan, MA; Jack Gulard, Owners, Formaggio Kitchen, Boston, MA; Abhiman Guch, President & CEO, AG Mehndi, Inc., Boston; Laury Hammel, Owner, Beyond's Kendall Square Clubs, Wayland, MA; Laurence Hammel, Executive Director, Sustainable Business Network of Massachusetts, Wayland, MA; Jackie Horowitz von Rass, Founder and President, Teak Media + Communication, Boston, MA; Shel Horowitz, Owner, Going Beyond SUS- tainable, Boston, MA; Luztona and In- vestment Advisor, Greenview, West Wattholl, CA; Carol Marsh, Owner, Helios Design Group, Jamaica Plain, MA; Philip Mccorran, Owner, Gail Leondar, Arlington, MA; Anna McEvon, Hospital Administrator, Riverbend Animal Hospital, Hadley, MA; Tim McNer- ney, Founder, Repair Collective, Shutesbury, MA; Kim Mitchell, Owner, Boing! IPS Toy Shop, Jamaica Plain, MA; Nick Moore, Owner, Moore Agencies, Marlborough, MA; Merry Nasser, Partner, Lesser Newman Aleo & O’Toole, MA; Dean Cycon, CEO, Dean's Beans & Nasser, Northampton, MA; Larry O'Toole, Merry Nasser, Partner, Lesser Newman Aleo & Nasser, Northampton, MA; Larry O'Toole, Merry Nasser, Partner, Lesser Newman Aleo & Nasser, Northampton, MA; Larry O'Toole, Merry Nasser, Partner, Lesser Newman Aleo & Nasser, Northampton, MA; Larry O’Toole, Merry Nasser, Partner, Lesser Newman Aleo & Nasser, Northampton, MA.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a strong, bipar- tisan vote for this victory for working families and for America because every Member of this institution should be fighting to put more money in the pockets of workers in their community.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. TRONE), the distinguished member of the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. TRONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Raise the Wage Act.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter signed by over 1,000 businesses supporting the Raise the Wage Act. My constituents and I are fighting to put more money in the pockets of workers in their community.

BUSINESS FOR A FAIR MINIMUM WAGE

FEDERAL $15 SIGN ON STATEMENT

PART 2 OF LIST OF ABOUT 1,000 SIGNERS AND COUNTING AS OF JULY 17, 2019

Alan Chebot, Owner, Parallax Productions, Allston, MA; David Byrson, CEO, Dean’s Beans Organic Coffee Company, Orange, MA; Fred Davis, President, Fred Davis Corporation, Medfield, MA; Megan Driscoll, CEO, Phare, Cambridge, MA; Quinny Walker, Owner, Chelsea, MA; Julie Emerson, Co-founder, Rainbow Solutions, Medford, MA; Paul English, CTO and President, Lola.com Boston, MA; Rob Everett, Managing Director, Royal Exchange West Bridgewater, MA; Jen Falgel, Executive Director, CommonWealth Kitchen, Dorchester, MA; Nancy Fenon, Co-owner, Badseed Magazine, MA; Laura Fisher, Owner, Fisher Agencies—American Income Life, Builing, MA; Tim Fisk, Owner, Salon Herds, Northampton, MA; Vincent Frano, Owner, Shannon, MA; Jon G footer, Co-Owner and Creative Director, The Boston Globe, MA; Julie Goodridge, CEO, Northstar Asset Management, Inc., Boston, MA.

Myrna Greenfield, Owner, Good Egg Marketing, Jamaica Plain, MA; Jeff Greim, Founder/CEO, Your Choice Brands, Longmeadow, MA; Tim Greiner, Owner, Pure Kitchen Strategies & Lipan, MA; Jack Gulard, Owners, Formaggio Kitchen, Boston, MA; Abhiman Guch, President & CEO, AG Mehndi, Inc., Boston; Laury Hammel, Owner, Beyond's Kendall Square Clubs, Wayland, MA; Laurence Hammel, Executive Director, Sustainable Business Network of Massachusetts, Wayland, MA; Jackie Horowitz von Rass, Founder and President, Teak Media + Communication, Boston, MA; Shel Horowitz, Owner, Going Beyond SUS- tainable, Boston, MA; Luztona and In- vestment Advisor, Greenview, West Wattholl, CA; Carol Marsh, Owner, Helios Design Group, Jamaica Plain, MA; Philip Mccorran, Owner, Gail Leondar, Arlington, MA; Anna McEvon, Hospital Administrator, Riverbend Animal Hospital, Hadley, MA; Tim McNer- ney, Founder, Repair Collective, Shutesbury, MA; Kim Mitchell, Owner, Boing! IPS Toy Shop, Jamaica Plain, MA; Nick Moore, Owner, Moore Agencies, Marlborough, MA; Merry Nasser, Partner, Lesser Newman Aleo & O’Toole, MA; Dean Cycon, CEO, Dean's Beans & Nasser, Northampton, MA; Larry O'Toole, Merry Nasser, Partner, Lesser Newman Aleo & Nasser, Northampton, MA; Larry O’Toole, Merry Nasser, Partner, Lesser Newman Aleo & Nasser, Northampton, MA; Larry O’T...
Heather Leavitt, Owner, Sweet Heather Anne, Arbor, MI; Katherine Lesse, Co-owner, Atraco de Art, Santa Fe, NM; William Martin, Founder and Director, Bio-Health Research, MI; Joel Schiller, Co-founder & Co-owner, The Lunch Room Diner and Canteen & The Detroit Filling Station, Ann Arbor, MI; Nat Perrin, CEO, Pathway, LLC, Cape Girardeau, MO; Dorian Oldham, Owner, Oldham & Humas, MO; Paul Saginaw, Co-Founder & Co-owner, Bob McCroskey Real Estate, Inc., West Plains, MO; Peter Wallach, Director, Office of Public Strategy, Brooklyn, NY; Jeffrey Jones, Owner, Rock Pianos, St. Louis, MO; Dorothy Jones, Owner, Bespoke, St. Louis, MO; Stacy Jones, Vice President, Coca-Cola, St. Louis, MO; Chris Jones, Founder, The Vecino Group, Springfield, MO; Karen Karabell, Managing Partner, S.F. Shannon Real Estate Management LLC, St. Louis, MO; Ken Keating, Owner, Bridgeton Spa and Bodyworks, Springfield, MO; Laurie Knowlton, Owner, Pickwick Underground Framing, Springfield, MO; Liz Kuba, Owner, Tea, Ha, & Chocolate, Springfield, MO; Al Lauffer, Owner, The Ink Spot, St. Louis, MO; Paul Lauritzen, General Manager, Mooney’s, St. Louis, MO; Ronnie Light, Owner, Sam Light Loan Co., St. Louis, MO; Leigh Lockhart, Owner, Main Squeeze, Columbia, MO; Katie McCrosey, Co-founder, Olayt, Springfield, MO; Andrea McCullon, Founder, Hart-McCallum Agency, Earth City, MO; Chris Meyers, Owner, Crane Brewing Company, Raytown, MO; Alwyn Miller, Executive Director, Partners for Just Trade, St. Louis, MO; Andrew Montee, Owner, Mokaska Coffee Company, St. Joseph, MO; Erin Noble, VP of Business Development, Up Solar, St. Louis, MO; Matthew Oldham, Owner, KDLO Radio, St. Louis, MO; Dave Rogers, Owner, The Old Market, Kansas City, MO; Lew Prince, Co-founder & CEO (Ret.), Vintage Vinyl, St. Louis, MO; Marissa Rosen, Owner, Climate Social, St. Louis, MO; Michael Schubert, Owner & Operating Manager, Sommer Property Investments, LLC, St. Louis, MO; Matthew Thenhaus, Owner & General Manager, The Fortune Teller Bar, St. Louis, MO; Phil Wages, Co-owner, Wages Brewing Company, West Plains, MO; Peter Wallach, Director, Peter Wallach Fine Art, St. Louis, MO; Nick Ward-Bruhl, Owner, Maker Village, Kansas City, MO.

Bridge Weible, Owner, Flowers to the People, St. Louis, MO; William Handsack, Partner, C&K Painting, Roseville, MN; Alex Alexander, Owner, Authentic Alternatives, Inc., Pleasant Forest, NC; Elizabeth Altman, Owner, New Bridge Organic Market, Jacksonville, NC; Philip Chagnon, Owner/Manager, Residential Rental Properties, Raleigh, NC; Kristen Daniels, Owner, Kambishi Corporation, Leicester, NC; Susan Inglis, Executive Director, Kildare School for the Blind, Edenton, NC; Jeffrey Jones, Owner, Rock Hard Media Group, Bovina, NC; Angela Laughlin, Owner, Bristle, Brevard, NC; Antonio Reyes, Owner, Reyes Agency, Mathews, NC; Lloyd Smith, President and CEO, Cortech Solutions, Wilmington, NC; Daniel Swimm, Founder, Grow Fragrance, Durham, NC; Gunnar Berg, Partner, Hill People LLC, N. Sandwich, NH; Jessica Christoferson, Owner, Cymbidium Floral, Exeter, NH; Will Mankowski, CEO and Family Owner, W.S. Badger Company, Gilsum, NH; Kyle Swan, Owner, Angelica’s Muse, Portsmouth, NH; Anthony Del Col, Owner, Kris Trans, Thiene Agency, Londonderry, NH; Esteve Torres, CEO, Stonyfield Farm, Londonderry, NH; Bill Whyte, Co-founder, W.S. Badger Company, Gilsum, NH; Jeffrey Axelbank, Owner, Jeffrey Axelbank, PAY.D., Highland Park, NJ; Alicia Biasotti Belotta, Owner, AOB Consulting Services, Verona, NJ; Mitch Cahn, President and CEO, Vincents, NJ; Cluyne, Managing Partner, PAIRINGS, Cranford, NJ; James Devine, Owner, CEO, Devine Advertising Associates, Rahway, NJ; Dan Dubitzky, CEO, Aluminum Manufacturing Company, Newark, NJ; Timothy Giordano, Attorney, Timothy K. Giordano, Esq., Montclair, NJ; Richard Lawton, Founder and CEO, Recipe, NJ; Richard Lawton, Executive Director, New Jersey Sustainable Business Council, Point Pleasant Beach, NJ; Sally Malanga, CEO, Ecco Bella, West Orange, NJ; Myles Mendoza, Owner and Design Director, Designmaster Group, Edgewater, NJ; Eric Thompson, President and CEO, Basking Ridge, NJ; Andy Smith, Owner, Andy Smith Photography, Newtown, NJ; Chet Van Wert, President, Sustainable Business Fund, Scoth Peat, NJ; Kelly Viahakis-Hanks, President and CEO, Earth Friendly Products (Makers of ECOS), New York, NY; Paul Kalkbrenner, Owner, The Fair Lawn, NJ; Adam Woods, CEO, Camden Printworks, Camden, NJ; Dr. Kathleen Burke, MD, Las Cruces, NM; Beatriz Neves, Owner, Las Cruces, NM; Elena Gusch, CEO, Kuan Yin Acupuncture, Albuquerque, NM; Linda Lillow, Owner, Triple L, Ink Graphic Design, Albuquerque, NM; Al Simonetti, Owner (retired), Alston C Lundgren, MD, PC, Santa Fe, NM; Judith Shipkeys, President, Solutions!, Albuquerque, NM; Drew Tulchin, Owner, UpSpring, Santa Fe, NM; Anam Kinsey, Owner, BnB SEO, Reno, NV; Corey Neff, Owner, Neff Agency, Las Vegas, NV; Steven Abel, CEO, Center for Media and Democracy, Madison, WI; Charles Leon, Owner, President, Nick Balaban Music, Inc., Brooklyn, NY; Sebastian Bardin-Greenberg, Owner, World Music Network, NY; John Bauer, President & Owner, The Change Circle, Inc, Williamsburg, NY; David Bolotsky, Founder and CEO, UncommonGoods, Brooklyn, NY; Nancy Boyd, President, Bright Wings Inc., Briarcliff Manor, NY; Richard Brook, Member, Meyer, Suozzi, English & Klein, New York, NY; Ann Bryan, Owner, Ann Krupp Design Goldsmith, Saugerties, NY; Simon Burke-Lipicky, Owner, Build Smart With Simon, Troy, NY; Linda Christensen, Owner, Cerberus Design, Kirkland, WA; John Cooper, President, Spectronics Corporation, Westbury, NY; Jennifer Dotson, Executive Director, Ithaca Carshare, Ithaca, NY; Marie Duryea, President, Special Instruction, Northport, NY; Kathie Fox, Co-owner, Fanciful Fox, New York, NY; Jeff Furman, Board Member Emeritus, Ben & Jerry’s, Ithaca, NY; Ajay Greene, Founder/CEO, On Belay Business Advisors Inc., Gardiner, NY; Brett Gyska, Owner, Oldham-Gyska Agency, Rochester, NY; Valerie J. Gurdal, President, The Doe Fund, New York, NY; Amy Hall, Vice President, Social Consciousness, EILEEN FISHER, Irvington, NY; Susan Hanan, President, Hand to Heart Services, Edgemont, NY; John Jonson, President, Equus Bloodstock LLC, North Woodmere, NY; Kathleen Hoffman, Owner, Law Office of Thomas Hoffman, New York, NY; Brian Hogan, Owner, ICT, Bronx, NY; Jeffrey Hohrell, Founder, Jeffrey Hohrell Partners, New York, NY; Eric Horowitz, Owner, The Double Winning Edge, Old Saybrook, CT; Gintas Janusonis, Owner, Janusonic Music, Brooklyn, NY; Margaret Johnson, Owner, BEZ Services LLC, Binghamton, NY; Heidi Martin, Partner, Allen & Company, Buf- falo, NY; Iva Kaufman, Principal, Iva Kaufman Associates, New York, NY; Jenny Krause, President, Jenny Krause, New York, NY; Carole Lathem, CEO, Domini Impact Investments, New York, NY; David Levine, President, American Sustainable Business Council, New York, NY; Paul Lightfoot, Founder, Bright Horse Farm, Inc, New York, NY; Bright Limm, Owner, Principal, Bright D Limm, ESQ, Flushing, NY; George McDon- ald, President, The Doe Fund, New York, NY; Robert Messick, CEO, Resurgam Bank, New York, NY; Jeff Mikkelson, Owner, Jeff Mikkelson Photography, New York, NY; Michael Miller, Managing Partner, National Archives, New York, NY; Leann Howard, CEO, The Wells Group, New York, NY; Leon Miller-Out, President/CTO, Singlebrook Technology, Ithaca, NY.
Prish Moran, Owner, Sweet, New 7 Café, Buffalo, NY; Joshua Morton, Owner, Proof of Concept, LLC, Brooklyn, NY; Ean Murphy, Managing Partner, Moxie Bookkeeping, New York, NY; Graham, Owner, MediaCom, New York, NY; Clayton Pat- rick, Owner, Clifton Patrick & P.C. Insurance, Chester, NY; Del Pedro, Managing Partner, Toker, New York, NY; Greg Bennett, Owner, Prior Beezewax, Germantown, NY; Erwin Rakoczy, Director, CUFF, Clare- nce, NY; Jan Rhodes Norman, Owner, Silk Oak, Ithaca, NY; John Rakoczy, Director, Jonathan Rose Companies, New York, NY; Darius Ross, Managing Partner, D Alexander Ross, New York, NY; Patrick Rousseau, Owner, Iris MediaWorks, Brooklyn, NY; Lesli Sagan, Owner, Aivtal's Apiraries, Ithaca, NY; Steven Salenga, Global Access, New York, NY; Jeffrey Scales, Managing Principal, JSA Financial Group, Rhinebeck, NY; Elizabeth Scalisi, Owner/President, Green Effects Landscaping Services, Inc., Manlius, NY; Jason Schuler, Founder and President, Drink More Good, Beacon, NY.

Elizabeth Schwartz, Co-Owner, Better Speech Now, Long Island City, NY; Dylan Skolnick, Co-Director, Cinema Arts Centre, Huntington, NY; Esther Sokolsky, Co-Owner, S. Feinberg, NY; Kate Thoresen, Owner, Thoresen and Linard Architects, New York, NY; Scott Tiltitt, Founder, Antidote Collective, Beacon, NY; Scott Tiltitt, CEO, BEAHIVE, New York, NY; Brad Wadro, President, Kenzo Type, Inc., Kenzo Lake, NY; Steve Zorn, Racing Manager/Owner, Castle Village Farm, Garden City, NY; Pat Beneduce, Owner, The SS Bredure-Hartwig Group, Columbus, OH; Nicholas Eastman, President, Electroschield, Yellow Springs, OH; Kevin Holtz, Owner, Holtz, OH; John calculations, President, API Contractors, Toledo, OH; Chris Kloth, Owner, ChangeWorks of the Heartland, Columbus, OH; Steve Mokris, Owner, Kosada, Athens, OH; Matthew Parks, Owner, SS-Parks-Salvaggi Agency, North Royalton, OH; Jim Surace, Owner, Surace-Smith Agency, North Royalton, OH; Paul Akins, Owner, Distinctive Designs Salon, The Village, OK.

Andrea Anderson, Owner, AM Artistry Printing & Vinyl, Oklahoma City, OK; Doshun, Owner, R. Reader, Oklahoma City, OK; William Bourne, Owner, Bachel's Fireplace Furnishings, Oklahoma City, OK; Leanna Jackson, Owner, A. Popular, OK; Kevin Lenox, Owner, API Contractors, OK; Kenny Brandow, Owner, BMK, Hill Camp, PA; Chelsa Chang, CEO, Vault+Vine, Philadelphia, PA; Matt Cleveland, Owner, Occasions Disc Jockeys, Elizabethtown, PA; Charlie Crystle, Principal, Crystle Consulting, Lancaster, PA; Amy Edelman, Owner, Night Kitchen Bakery, Philadelphia, PA; Ryan et al, Owner, Lancaster, PA; Kenny Grondon, President, Buckminster Green, Philadelphia, PA; Steve Hebert, Owner, Coffee Souderton, PA; Michaelastor, Founder and CEO, &pia, Philadelphia, PA; Cindy Lou, Owner, Cindy's Pet Care, Philadelphia, PA; Patrick McMahan, CEO, One Point, Scranton, PA; Scott Nash, Owner, CEO, MOM's Organic Market, Bryn Mawr, PA; Michael O'Connor, Owner, La Barberia Jenkins, Philadelphia, PA; Mike's Auto, West Side Auto Repair, Uniontown, PA.

Jesse Peimann, Co-Owner, Longview Structures Lancaster, PA; Salam Quadi, Owner, P&Q Fabricating, PA; Joseph Shuplan, Executive Director, Sustainable Business Network of Greater Philadelphia, Philadelphia, PA; Brian Taussig-Lax, Co-founder, Utouros, PA; John Traynor, Executive Director, Sustainable Business Network of Greater Philadelphia, PA; Katie Dyer, Owner, Cadeaux du Maine, Philadelphia, PA; Peggy Zwerter, Owner, Philly Food Hub, Philadelphia, PA; Michael Barbasso, Owner, Ziad's Beauty Bar, Austin, TX; Ben and Jerry's, South Burlington, VT; Elizabeth Glenshaw, President, Clean Yield
I rode my bike to a nearby farm, and I picked fruit. I didn’t make minimum wage because I couldn’t pick fruit fast enough, because I didn’t have the skills to do that when I was 13 years old, but I learned to show up on time with a good attitude. That is a valuable thing. That job wouldn’t have been available if this minimum wage of $15, enacted from the Federal level, would have forced that employer to make a choice between hiring me or hiring somebody else. I didn’t want to make the minimum wage. I wanted to make the maximum wage, but I had to have some skills.

The next job I got still wasn’t minimum wage, but I worked hard. Now, I had the skill of showing up on time with a good attitude. I kept on doing better and better and better for myself because the jobs were available.

Mr. Speaker, if this legislation is enacted, young people and people at the bottom of the economic spectrum that I am privileged to represent, young people and people at the bottom of the economic spectrum that I am privileged to represent, would do better and better and better for myself with a good attitude. That is a valuable thing. That is a valuable thing.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY).

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, I started, like many folks did, working when I was a young man. People have different reasons for leaving employment. Sometimes we needed to get out of the house, as some things were happening at the house, but I didn’t have any skills.

I support this bill because, while corporations are making record profits off the backs of workers, wage stagnation and increased cost of living have bankrupted hardworking families across my district.

This bill would increase the minimum wage gradually.

This is not a “bad for business” piece of legislation, as my colleagues across the aisle allege. It is a “good for everyone” bill that puts more money into our workers’ pockets.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Ms. WILD).

Ms. WILD. The Federal Labor Standards Act was passed in 1938 for the explicit purpose of protecting workers from substandard wages. That landmark bill passed the House by a vote of 291–89.

By the letter of that law, the minimum standard of living necessary for a worker’s well-being is in Congress’ hands. Members of both parties chose not to leave it up to market forces because poverty-level wages, sweatshops, and poor working conditions should not happen in the United States of America in 1938 or in 2019.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Wright).

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 582, the Raise the Wage Act, or, as it should be called, the Raising Unemployment for American Workers Act.

I was disappointed to hear that Democratic members on the Rules Committee failed to make my amendment in order. The amendment prohibited H.R. 582 from going into effect if the Government Accountability Office found that over 500,000 jobs would be lost to automation as a direct result of this legislation, a very reasonable amendment.

This amendment was intended to make sure that, in seeking to improve economic outcomes for workers, especially lower-wage and lesser-skilled workers, we don’t adopt policies that have the opposite effect.

This radical legislation would more than double the Federal minimum wage, the largest-ever increase since its creation. The recent Congressional Budget Office report on this bill paints a bleak picture of the consequences if it ever becomes law.

When fully implemented, this legislation would result in as many as 3.7 million, almost 270,000 from the State of Texas, jobs lost. Across the country, total real family income would drop by $9 billion.

At a time when the economy is expanding, wages are rising above inflation, and unemployment is the lowest it has been in decades, we should not be considering job-killing, income-reducing legislation.
The negative impacts of such a disastrous bill would be felt in high-income urban areas, but they would be even more severe in lower income rural areas. The economic conditions of Navarro County, Texas, in my district, where the median income is $45,000 a year, are not the same as San Francisco, where the median income is more than double that. A federally mandated doubling of the minimum wage would burden these people and businesses, forcing them to cut hours, let employees go, and close business doors.

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

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. WRIGHT. My colleagues across the aisle like to point to the number of people who will be lifted out of poverty but consistently fail to acknowledge that the same number of Americans are expected to lose their jobs. It seems to me that this bill is a sweet deal, but only if you get to keep your job.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is left on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia has 10½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from North Carolina has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I remind my colleagues from Texas that a vote against this bill is a vote to deny about 30 percent of the workers in his district in Texas an average raise of about $3,800 a year.

I also will point out that the same CBO report that he cited cites the three most recent studies showing the number of jobs will actually go up as a direct result of the passage of this bill, and 27 million people are getting a raise.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Mrs. TRAHAN), a distinguished member of the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mrs. TRAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from women’s community groups in support of this legislation.

JULY 15, 2019.

Pass the Raise the Wage Act

DEAR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS: As members of a broad coalition of organizations that promote economic security and equity for women, we strongly urge you to pass the Raise the Wage Act as a top priority of the 116th Congress.

The Raise the Wage Act will raise the federal minimum wage from $7.25 to $15 an hour by 2024, then index the minimum wage so that it continues to rise along with wages overall. It will also end unfair exclusions for tipped workers, people with disabilities, and youth so that they, too, can benefit from a decent minimum wage.

Women across the country—especially women of color—continue to experience a pay gap and a higher risk of poverty than men. Nationwide, women have a median income typically make only 80 percent of what their male counterparts make, leaving a wage gap of 20 cents on the dollar. This wage gap varies by race and is larger for women of color: Black women working full time, year round typically make only 61 cents, Native women only 57 cents, and Asian women only 69 cents, for every dollar paid to their white, non-Hispanic male counterparts. While Asian American and Pacific Islander (AAPI) women are making steady improvements to close this gender wage gap, non-Hispanic men, many AAPI communities experience drastically wider pay gaps.

Women’s overrepresentation in low-wage jobs is a driving force behind the gender pay gap. Women are close to two-thirds of the workforce in jobs that pay the minimum wage or just a few dollars above it, as well as nearly all tipped workers. Women of color are particularly overrepresented among tipped workers and other low-wage workers. They are particularly harmed by the $7.25 federal minimum wage that has not gone up in a decade and by the $2.13 tipped minimum cash wage that has been frozen for an astonishing 28 years.

Poverty-level wages heighten women’s economic vulnerability, which in turn heightens their vulnerability to sexual harassment on the job. While women are surviving a hostile work environment, they often feel compelled to tolerate inappropriate behavior from customers so as not to jeopardize their income and employers are unwilling to lose employees for fear of upsetting a customer. Women’s lack of economic power in these workplaces perpetuates the already pervasive cultural and gendered iniquities that employ large numbers of tipped workers.

The Raise the Wage Act is critically needed to advance women’s economic security and dignity in the workplace. The Economic Policy Institute estimates that increasing the federal minimum wage to $15 by 2024 would give nearly three working women a raise, including 41 percent of Black working women, 38 percent of working Latinos, 29 percent of white working women, and 18 percent of Asian working women. Women and people of color 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 they can work with equity, dignity, and safety. There is no more fitting way to begin this historic Congress than by making real, concrete progress in ensuring all women receive adequate pay.

We urge you to prioritize the Raise the Wage Act for the 116th Congress by swiftly passing this legislation.

Sincerely,

9to5, National Association of Working Women; 9to5 Georgia; A Better Balance; Abortion Access Front; ACCESS; African American Health Alliance; All-Options; Amara Legal Center; American Association of University Women; American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees (AFSCME); American Federation of Teachers, AFL-CIO;APT Local 1766 (Union of Rutgers Administrators); American Medical Student Association; American Psychological Association; American Council on Economic Generations; Center for American Progress; Center for Economic & Demographic Action (ADA); Arizona Coalition to End Sexual & Domestic Violence; Asian Pacific American Labor Alliance; AFL-CIO; Black Women’s Roundtable; MS Black Women’s Roundtable; Bucks County Women’s Advocacy Coalition; California Child Care Resource & Referral Network; Cambridge Committee to Raise the Minimum Wage; Camden Coalition of Health Care Providers; Center for American Progress; Center for Frontline Retail; Center for Law and Social Justice; CLASP; Center for Popular Democracy; Center for Popular Democracy Area Collaborative; Citizen Action of New York; Clearinghouse on Women’s Issues.

Coalition of Labor Union Women (CLUW); California Capital Chapter, CLUW; Capital Area Chapter, CLUW; Chesapeake Bay Chapter, CLUW; Chicago Chapter, CLUW; Cleveland Chapter, CLUW; Columbus Chapter, CLUW; Dallas Chapter, CLUW; DC Area Chapter, CLUW; Des Moines Chapter, CLUW; Detroit Chapter, CLUW; Down East Chapter, CLUW; D.C. Urban Workers Chapter, CLUW; Florida Chapter, CLUW; Greater Florida Chapter, CLUW; Greater Midwest Chapter, CLUW; Greater Oklahoma City Chapter, CLUW; Houston Chapter, CLUW; Kate Mullan Chapter, CLUW; King County Chapter, CLUW; Lorain County Chapter, CLUW; Los Angeles Chapter, CLUW; Metro-Detroit Chapter, CLUW; Metropolitan District of Columbia Chapter, CLUW; Missouri Chapter, CLUW; New Jersey Chapter, CLUW; New York Chapter, CLUW; Northeast Cleveland Chapter, CLUW; Pennsylvania State Chapter, CLUW; Philadelphia Chapter, CLUW; Philadelphia Chapter, CLUW; San Diego Chapter, CLUW; San Francisco Chapter, CLUW; Southwestern Pennsylvania Chapter, CLUW; St. Louis Chapter, CLUW; Western New York Chapter, CLUW; Western Virginia Chapter, CLUW; Coalition on Human Needs; Color of Change; Connecticut Women’s Education and Legal Defense Fund (CWEALDF); Connecticut Women’s Rights Project at the Institute for Policy Studies; Day One; Domestic Violence Legal Empowerment & Appeals Project; Economic Opportunity Institute; Center for Economic Justice; Center for Economic Justice; Center for Economic Justice; Center for Economic Justice; Center for Economic Justice; Equal Rights Advocates; Equality North Carolina; Equality Ohio; Fair World Project; Federal Employees; Feminist Majority Foundation; Food Chain Workers Alliance; Forward Together; Freedom Industrial Union; Friends Committee on National Legislation; Futures Without Violence; Gender Justice; Health Care for America Now; If/When/How: Reclaiming Justice for Race & Class; Illinois Coalition Against Sexual Assault; In Our Own Voice: National Black Women’s Reproductive Justice Agenda; Innovation Ohio Education Fund; Institute for Women’s Policy Research; Interfaith Worker Justice; Jewish Alliance for Law and Social Action; Jewish Women International; Jobs With Justice; Jobs With Justice; Jobs With Justice; Jobs With Justice; Justice for Migrant Women; Kentucky Equal Justice Center; Labor Center for Commonwealth Services; Leonard Williams Center; Las Hermanas USA; Laundry Workers Center; Legal Momentum, The Women’s Legal Defense and Education Fund; Maine Women’s Lobby; Milwaukee Area Service & Hospitality Workers Organization (MASH); Mississippi Coalition Against Domestic Violence.

MNCASA; Moms Demand Action, Triad North Carolina; MomsRising; NAACP; NARAL Pro-Choice, North Carolina; National Alliance to End Sexual Violence; National Domestic Workers Organization (NAPAWF); National Association of Social Workers, Massachusetts Chapter; National Center for Lesbian Rights; National Coalition for the Homeless.

National Coalition of 100 Black Women; Central Ohio Chapter; National Coalition of 100 Black Women, Queen City Metropolitan Chapter; National Committee on Pay Equity; National Council of Jewish Women; National Council of Jewish Women, Arizona; National Council of Jewish Women, Greater New England; National Council of Jewish Women, Pennsylvania; National Domestic Workers Alliance; National Employment Law Project; National Employment Lawyers Association; National Immigration Law Center; National Institute for Reproductive Health; National LGBTQ Taskforce; National Network of Abortion Funds; National Network of Abortion Funds; National Organization for Women (NOW); National Organization for Women; National Women’s Law Center.
NOW, Louisiana; NOW, North Carolina; NOW, Raleigh; NOW, Southwest Pennsylvania; NOW, Triad North Carolina.

National Partnership for Women & Families: National Women’s Law Center of the United States; Women’s Health Network; NETWORK Lobby for Catholic Social Justice; Nevada Coalition to End Domestic and Sexual Violence; New Mexico Coalition for Sexual Assault Programs; New Voices for Reproductive Justice; New York Union Child Care Coalition; North Carolina State AFL-CIO; North Carolina Women’s Hold.

Nurses for Sexual and Reproductive Health; Ohio Alliance to End Sexual Violence; Ohio Coalition for Reproductive Choice; Oklahoma Women’s Coalition; Organization United for Respect; Oxfam America; Path Ways PA; Pennsylvania NOW; People For the American Way.

PHENOM (Public Higher Education Network of Massachusetts); Physicians for Reproductive Health; PL-US: Paid Leave for the United States; Powell New York; Project IRENE; Public Justice Center; PW-USA; Racial and Ethnic Health Disparities Coalition; Rosenberg Institute for Community Engagement and International Security; Sacramento Women’s Empowerment Opportunities Centers United; Restaurant Opportunities Center, Pennsylvania.

Sexuality Information and Education Council of the United States (SIECUS); Shriver Center on Poverty Law; Solace Crisis Treatment Center; Tennessee Valley Coalition to End Homelessness; Twea Women United; The Women’s Law Center of Maryland; Union for Reform Judaism; Unitarian Universalist Mass Action Network; United Church of Christ; Justice and Witness Ministries.

United Democratic Women of MD, Inc.: URGE; Unite for Reproductive & Gender Equity; V.I. Domestic Violence & Sexual Assault; Vermont Network Against Domestic and Sexual Violence; Voices for Progress; Washington Lawyers’ Committee for Civil Rights and Urban Affairs; Washington State Coalition of Sexual Assault Programs; West Virginia Center on Budget and Policy; Western Center on Law and Poverty.

Women & Girls Foundation of Southwest Pennsylvania; Women Employed; Women Lawyers of Sacramento; Women of Reform Pennsylvania; Women of Reform Virginia Center on Budget and Policy; Western Center on Law and Poverty.

Women Center on Law and Poverty; Western Coalition on Sexual Assault Programs; West Virginia Center on Budget and Policy; Western Center on Law and Poverty.

Wyche, Power, O’Douglas; YWCA of Greater Dayton; YWCA, Dayton; ZERO TO THREE.
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Wage Act.
cans a raise by voting for the Raise the Wage Act for all Americans, we must ensure that our workers can make a good living and have a good life. Let’s do the same for the rest of America by passing the Raise the Wage Act. It is time for us to give her a raise.

Let’s do the same for the rest of America by passing the Raise the Wage Act. It is time for us to give her a raise.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. Velázquez), the chair of the Committee on Small Business.

Ms. Velázquez. Mr. Speaker, I am from New York, and I rise in support of the Raise the Wage Act of 2019 for workers in my district and workers everywhere, particularly rural America.

The Raise the Wage Act is a long overdue minimum wage increase that will lift wages for millions of Americans and boost the small business economy. Today, under the current minimum wage of just $7.25 per hour, American workers and their families are living on the margins. They spend nights at the dinner table having to decide whether to pay for their child’s school trip or groceries for the week. If we are to build a better economy for all Americans, we must ensure that our workers can make a good living and have a good life.

Poll after poll shows that small business owners support raising the minimum wage. This is because so has been proven to help small firms better retain employees who, in turn, are more productive and higher performing.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a sign-on statement from Business for a Fair Minimum Wage.


to build a better economy for all Americans, we support gradually raising the federal minimum wage to $15 by 2024. It’s good for business, good for customers and good for our economy.

Workers are also customers. Today’s $7.25 minimum wage—just $15,080 a year for full-time workers—doesn’t even cover the basics. Raising the minimum wage puts money in the pockets of people who most need to spend it, increasing sales at businesses and boosting the economy.

Raising the minimum wage makes good business sense. Low pay typically means high turnover. Raising the minimum wage pays off in lower employee turnover, reduced training and turnover costs, lower error rates, national increased productivity and better customer service. Employees often make the difference between repeat customers or lost customers.

ABOVE 1,000 SIGNERS AND COUNTING AS OF JULY 17, 2019

Holly Sklar, CEO, Business for a Fair Minimum Wage; Jennifer；Jen Landry, Owner, Steller Books, Tuscaloosa, AL; Jeni Sevastopoulous, Owner, TechniGO, Tuscaloosa, AL; Nate Johnson, Owner, Teamwork Barber Shop, S Now, Walter L. Wood, Owner, Village East Shoe Center, Montgomery, AL; Raymond Josof, Owner, Five Points Hotdogs, Birmingham, AL; Melissa Kendrick, CEO, Sojourns, Birmingham; Khorsanov, Owner, Prof Alterations, Tuscaloosa, AL; Dr. Jerry Kirby, Owner, Kirby Chiropractic Clinic, Montgomery, AL; Laketha Knox, Owner, The Head Doctor, Tuscaloosa, AL; Nicholas Lewis, Owner, Tha Cutting Zone, Tuscaloosa, AL; Brandan MacDonald, Owner, MacDonald Insurance Group, Birmingham, AL; Alexia Mathews, CEO, Couture Boutique, Selma, AL; Chari Matthews, CEO, Empowering Brands, Tuscaloosa, AL; Marissa Mitchell, Owner, Swaddle, Birmingham, AL; Kenya Mitchell, Owner, SKT Hair Salon, Selina, AL; Byong Hyon Moon, Owner, Tyn Custom T-shirts, Montgomery, AL.

Nahoo A. Obeid, Owner, Makano’s Kabob Express, Birmingham, AL; Derrick Pauletto, Owner, The Record Stop, Montgomery, AL; Salisha Parker, Owner, This & That LLC, Selma; Kirsten Fedor, Owner, Bridal & Prom, Selma, AL; Brittney Powell, Owner, Kay Couture, Montgomery, AL; Jim Reed, Owner, Reed’s Book Store, Birmingham, AL; Sarah Rengers, Owner, The Abbey, Birmingham, AL; Juan Rivera, Owner, Rivera’s Barber Shop, Northport, AL; Jim Robertson, Owner, Robertson’s Health Food Center, Northport, AL; Betty Rollins, Owner, Cloverdale Laundry & Dry Cleaners, Montgomery, AL; Chris Roycroft, Owner, Tree, Tuscaloosa, AL; Jeff Sanders, Owner, Kut N Go, Montgomery, AL; Craig Shaw, Owner, True Story Brewing Co., Birmingham, AL; William Sheppard, Owner, Sheppard’s Pet Supply, Birmingham, AL; Muhammad Sikander, Owner, Shoe Times, Montgomery, AL; Melissa Smith, Owner, Island Delight, Montgomery, AL; Jarrell Smith, Owner, Cuts & Budz, Montgomery, AL; Gregory Smitherman, Owner, Anatomy of PI, Dora, AL; Justin Snipes, Owner, The Comic Strip, Tuscaloosa, AL; Casey Snipes; Owner, Downtown, AL; Stephanie Brown, Owner, Trix Vintage, Birmingham, AL; Mark Snyder, Owner, Mark’s Joint Restaurant, Homewood, AL; Bobby Spaeth, Owner, Capital City Tire & Auto Sales, Birmingham, AL; Stephanie Curtis Starks, Co-owner, Train & Burn, Birmingham, AL; Cheri Stewart, Owner, Trim Tab Brewing, Birmingham, AL; Deon Trone, Owner, Trone’s Eyewear, Tuscaloosa, AL; Deon Trone, Owner, Deon’s Automotive, Tuscaloosa, AL; Teresa Vickrey,
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner Name</th>
<th>City, State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Owner, Natural Healing, Montgomery, AL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnny Weatherspoon, Owner, Style Connection Barber Shop, Tuscaloosa, AL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaTessa Wells, Owner, Salon Ambience, Tuscaloosa, AL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham, AL</td>
<td>Tim Williamson, Owner, Carter Drug, Selma, AL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kandice Wright, Owner, Quick Fix Total Spa, Pass Christian, MS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradley Wyatt, Owner, Copper Top, Tuscaloosa, AL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blake Ralston, Owner, Ralston Agency, Fort Smith, AR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Svensson, Owner, Svensson Auctions, AR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Aguilera, Owner, 480 Barber Shop, Chandler, AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janice Brian, Owner, Alley Cats Haircutting Salon, Flagstaff, AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malcolm Bates, Owner, Owner, Antique Retro and Vintage, Flagstaff, AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paula Beifran, Owner, V.I. Alterations &amp; Tailor, Longmont, CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natasha Winnik, Owner, Original Native Building Materials Showroom, Tuscon, AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn Young, Owner, West of the Moon Jewelry &amp; Art, Fishkill, NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rigoberto Zuloaga, Co-Owner, Pete’s Turners Restaurants, Tucson, AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alvaro Velasquez, Owner, Fresh As Can ‘V’, Chandler, AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Vasquez, Owner, Dapper Dan’s Barber Shop, Scottsdale, AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dustin Venekamp, Owner, Altig-Venekamp Agency, Phoenix, AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marie Verdugo, Owner, NuYou Life Center, Phoenix, AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamie Warner, Owner, Yellow Jacket Comics LLC, Tempe, AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emek Clark, Owner, Born to BBQ, Phoenix, AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raul Espinosa, Owner, The Country Clipper Barber Shop, Phoenix, AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natasha Winnik, Owner, Original Native Building Materials Showroom, Tuscon, AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn Young, Owner, West of the Moon Jewelry &amp; Art, Fishkill, NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rigoberto Zuloaga, Co-Owner, Pete’s Turners Restaurants, Tucson, AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alvaro Velasquez, Owner, Fresh As Can ‘V’, Chandler, AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Vasquez, Owner, Dapper Dan’s Barber Shop, Scottsdale, AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dustin Venekamp, Owner, Altig-Venekamp Agency, Phoenix, AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marie Verdugo, Owner, NuYou Life Center, Phoenix, AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamie Warner, Owner, Yellow Jacket Comics LLC, Tempe, AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maury Williamson, Owner, The Country Clipper Barber Shop, Phoenix, AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natasha Winnik, Owner, Original Native Building Materials Showroom, Tuscon, AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn Young, Owner, West of the Moon Jewelry &amp; Art, Fishkill, NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rigoberto Zuloaga, Co-Owner, Pete’s Turners Restaurants, Tucson, AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alvaro Velasquez, Owner, Fresh As Can ‘V’, Chandler, AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Vasquez, Owner, Dapper Dan’s Barber Shop, Scottsdale, AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dustin Venekamp, Owner, Altig-Venekamp Agency, Phoenix, AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marie Verdugo, Owner, NuYou Life Center, Phoenix, AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamie Warner, Owner, Yellow Jacket Comics LLC, Tempe, AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&amp;Teddy Weir, Owner, The Mad Bird, Phoenix, AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Williams, Chef, Smoke Dem Bones BBQ, Phoenix, AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maury Williamson, Owner, The Country Clipper Barber Shop, Phoenix, AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natasha Winnik, Owner, Original Native Building Materials Showroom, Tuscon, AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn Young, Owner, West of the Moon Jewelry &amp; Art, Fishkill, NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rigoberto Zuloaga, Co-Owner, Pete’s Turners Restaurants, Tucson, AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alvaro Velasquez, Owner, Fresh As Can ‘V’, Chandler, AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Vasquez, Owner, Dapper Dan’s Barber Shop, Scottsdale, AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dustin Venekamp, Owner, Altig-Venekamp Agency, Phoenix, AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marie Verdugo, Owner, NuYou Life Center, Phoenix, AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamie Warner, Owner, Yellow Jacket Comics LLC, Tempe, AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Britanny Weir, Owner, The Mad Bird, Phoenix, AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Williams, Chef, Smoke Dem Bones BBQ, Phoenix, AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maury Williamson, Owner, The Country Clipper Barber Shop, Phoenix, AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natasha Winnik, Owner, Original Native Building Materials Showroom, Tuscon, AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn Young, Owner, West of the Moon Jewelry &amp; Art, Fishkill, NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rigoberto Zuloaga, Co-Owner, Pete’s Turners Restaurants, Tucson, AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alvaro Velasquez, Owner, Fresh As Can ‘V’, Chandler, AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Vasquez, Owner, Dapper Dan’s Barber Shop, Scottsdale, AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dustin Venekamp, Owner, Altig-Venekamp Agency, Phoenix, AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marie Verdugo, Owner, NuYou Life Center, Phoenix, AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamie Warner, Owner, Yellow Jacket Comics LLC, Tempe, AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Britanny Weir, Owner, The Mad Bird, Phoenix, AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Williams, Chef, Smoke Dem Bones BBQ, Phoenix, AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maury Williamson, Owner, The Country Clipper Barber Shop, Phoenix, AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natasha Winnik, Owner, Original Native Building Materials Showroom, Tuscon, AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn Young, Owner, West of the Moon Jewelry &amp; Art, Fishkill, NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rigoberto Zuloaga, Co-Owner, Pete’s Turners Restaurants, Tucson, AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alvaro Velasquez, Owner, Fresh As Can ‘V’, Chandler, AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Vasquez, Owner, Dapper Dan’s Barber Shop, Scottsdale, AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dustin Venekamp, Owner, Altig-Venekamp Agency, Phoenix, AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marie Verdugo, Owner, NuYou Life Center, Phoenix, AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamie Warner, Owner, Yellow Jacket Comics LLC, Tempe, AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Britanny Weir, Owner, The Mad Bird, Phoenix, AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Williams, Chef, Smoke Dem Bones BBQ, Phoenix, AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Zalman Niktalov, Owner, North Point Upholstery, Atlanta, GA.
Nataki Minix, Owner, Star Taki Hair Lounge, Atlanta, GA; Co-Owner, Joystick Gamebar, Atlanta, GA; Johnny Martinez, Co-Owner, Georgia Beer Garden, Atlanta, GA; Ruth E. Levy, Owner, Oy Toys, Des Moines, IA; William Herman, Co-Owner, Raging Shades of Green Permaculture Design, Des Moines, IA; Brandy Hall, Founder, Shermans, Chicago, IL; Saba Gebrekiedan, Owner, Village Coffee Bar, Alpharetta, GA; Frederiksen, Owner, Happy Mango, Atlanta, GA; Lisa Bobb, Owner, Squash Blossom Boulangerie, Alpharetta, GA; Toula Argentis, Owner, Sisters at Work & Play, West Des Moines, IA; Toula Argentis, Owner, Sisters at Work & Play, West Des Moines, IA.

Kai Cauthen, Owner, KC Groomer & Beauty Bar, Alpharetta, GA; Bruce Champeau, President and CEO, Burks Jewelers, Atlanta, GA; Rand Cabus, Owner, Mojo Vinyl Records, Roswell, GA.
Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), the chair of the Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, let's be clear. Since Franklin Roosevelt, the Federal Government has been increasing the Federal wage.

Don't let them get away with this hogwash about what we do and what we don't do here.

Wages for the top 1 percent have grown 150 percent since 1979.

Wages for middle-class families and working families have stagnated. Their wages do not keep up with the skyrocketing costs of healthcare, prescription drugs, childcare, housing, and a college education.

This is the single biggest economic challenge of our time. So, today, full-time, year-round work at the Federal minimum wage of $7.25 leaves a family of three below the Federal poverty line. It is unacceptable, because working people have more than a raise.

According to the Economic Policy Institute, if the minimum wage increased equal to the increases in workers' productivity, it would be more than $20 an hour.

Congress needs to make this right.

Clearly, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle do not respect the work of 31 million Americans. They don't respect the dignity of the work that these folks do.

It is our job. Let us pass the Raise the Minimum Wage Act. Working people are doing their jobs. Let us do ours.

I include in the RECORD a letter from the American Federation of Teachers.

DEAR REP. SCOTT: On behalf of the 1.7 million members of the American Federation of Teachers, I thank you for voting to raise the Federal minimum wage.

The federal minimum wage was last raised to $7.25 in 2009, and, over the past decade, the cost of living has increased at a pace that significantly exceeds the average earnings of a minimum wage worker.

Raising the wage is a matter of economic and social justice, and it is a necessary investment in our nation's future.

This legislation would substantially increase the Federal minimum wage from $7.25 to $15 by 2024.

It would not only lift millions out of poverty, help close the racial wealth gap, and help reverse decades of growing pay inequality.

The Economic Policy Institute estimates that increasing the federal minimum wage to $15 by 2024 would give more than 1 in 3 working women a raise, including 43 percent of African American working women, 38 percent of working Latinas, 32 percent of white working women, and 20 percent of Asian and Pacific Islander working women.

Of particular note for the AFT, our research tells us that one-fifth of educators and one-fourth of healthcare workers would get a raise.

I reserve the balance of my time.
The Leadership Conference on Civil & Human Rights entitled "Gradually Raising the Federal Minimum Wage" raised the federal minimum wage of $7.25 an hour since 2007. The tipped minimum wage has been stuck at $2.13 an hour since 1991.

Raising the federal minimum wage is a racial and gender justice issue. The National Women's Law Center has noted that women make up nearly two-thirds of those earning the federal minimum wage. Women of color are more likely than any other group to be paid the lowest wages.

Paying tipped workers the full minimum wage would rectify longstanding injustices and ensure that no one works for pennies in America. The subminimum wage that tipped workers receive is rooted in the history of slavery. The practice of tipping proliferated in the United States after the Civil War when the restaurant and hospitality industry, exemplified by the Pullman Company, "hired" newly freed slaves without paying them base wages. The effect was to create a permanent slave class, for whom the remuneration of paying a wage was shifted from employers to customers. Today, poverty rates for people who work for tips are more than twice as high as rates for working people overall—with female tipped workers, especially women of color, at a particular disadvantage. According to the 2012-2013 ACS data on gender and race for tipped occupations, of the approximately tipped working people in our country, 66 percent are women. And women of color are disproportionately represented in this workforce.

As with the tipped minimum wage, the subminimum wage under Section 14(c) of the Fair Labor Standards Act that allows people with disabilities working in segregated settings to be paid less than the minimum wage leaves this community vulnerable to poverty and exploitation. The National Disability Rights Network has reported that sheltered workshops have replaced institutions in many states as the new warehousing system and are the new favored locations where people with disabilities are sent to occupy their "days.”

Enacted in 1938, Section 14(c) reflects what should be a bygone era of how we as a nation treat people with disabilities. The time has come for federal action to support and fully integrate people with disabilities into the workforce.

The Congressional Budget Office (CBO) recently released a report looking at the potential effects of increasing the federal minimum wage to $15 an hour incrementally through 2025 and found that the benefits strongly outweigh its costs. The CBO report predicted that this gradual increase would decrease the number of individuals living in poverty by 12 percent and proportionately increase the incomes of families that are low-income.

The civil rights community has long supported a universal floor for wages that would provide a base line for all people in our country. Indeed, one of the core demands of the 1963 March on Washington for Jobs and Freedom was for “[a] national minimum wage that will give all Americans a decent standard of living.” Cost of living data show that in 50 states, a tipped worker with no children currently needs or will soon need a wage of at least $15 per hour to cover basic living costs. Working people with children and those in high-cost states will need even more.

Fair wages are essential for working people to cover all their expenses, including costs of transportation, childcare, health care, and other necessities. We urge you to vote for clean passage of the Raise the Wage Act of 2019, which would incrementally raise the federal minimum wage from $2.13 to $15 per hour over the next 5 years. Beyond raising the wage, this bill’s important provisions include phasing out the subminimum wages for tipped workers, people with disabilities, and youth. As organizations committed to the well-being and economic security of young people, we are united in our goal of ensuring all youth are paid a livable wage to provide for themselves and their families.

I urge a “yes” vote on raising the wage to $15 per hour. I thank Chairman Scott, again, for his leadership.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire again as to the time remaining on both sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia has 4 3/4 minutes remaining. The gentleman from North Carolina has 1 1/2 minutes remaining.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY), the vice chair on the Joint Economic Committee.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Raise the Wage Act, which will raise the Federal minimum wage to $15 per hour by 2025.

In conclusion I would like to note that signed by many youth organizations in support of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is long overdue. The current minimum wage of $7.25 is a poverty wage, plain and simple. I, too, am a former business owner with hundreds of employees who saw firsthand how productivity was achieved and increased by paying good wages. These poverty wages must end for everyone. Homelessness is rising. People can’t afford to pay their rent. They are living on the edge.

No one in the richest nation on Earth should be struggling like this, working two and three jobs just to survive.

Mr. Speaker, I have been proud to have joined my union brothers and sisters, along with the attorney general of Minnesota, former co-chair of the Progressive Caucus, Keith Ellison, and my union brothers and sisters on the picket lines, in rallies, and marches in the fight for $15. I want to thank them for their bold and committed leadership. When we fight, we win.

I urge a “yes” vote on raising the wage to $15 per hour.

I thank Chairman Scott, again, for his leadership.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire again as to the time remaining on both sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia has 4 3/4 minutes remaining.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is long overdue. The current minimum wage of $7.25 is a poverty wage, plain and simple. I, too, am a former business owner with hundreds of employees who saw firsthand how productivity was achieved and increased by paying good wages. These poverty wages must end for everyone. Homelessness is rising. People can’t afford to pay their rent. They are living on the edge.

No one in the richest nation on Earth should be struggling like this, working two and three jobs just to survive.

Mr. Speaker, I have been proud to have joined my union brothers and sisters, along with the attorney general of Minnesota, former co-chair of the Progressive Caucus, Keith Ellison, and my union brothers and sisters on the picket lines, in rallies, and marches in the fight for $15. I want to thank them for their bold and committed leadership. When we fight, we win.

I urge a “yes” vote on raising the wage to $15 per hour.

I thank Chairman Scott, again, for his leadership.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire again as to the time remaining on both sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia has 4 3/4 minutes remaining. The gentleman from North Carolina has 1 1/2 minutes remaining.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY), the vice chair on the Joint Economic Committee.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Raise the Wage Act, which will raise the Federal minimum wage to $15 per hour by 2025.

In conclusion I would like to note that signed by many youth organizations in support of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is long overdue. The current minimum wage of $7.25 is a poverty wage, plain and simple. I, too, am a former business owner with hundreds of employees who saw firsthand how productivity was achieved and increased by paying good wages. These poverty wages must end for everyone. Homelessness is rising. People can’t afford to pay their rent. They are living on the edge.

No one in the richest nation on Earth should be struggling like this, working two and three jobs just to survive.

Mr. Speaker, I have been proud to have joined my union brothers and sisters, along with the attorney general of Minnesota, former co-chair of the Progressive Caucus, Keith Ellison, and my union brothers and sisters on the picket lines, in rallies, and marches in the fight for $15. I want to thank them for their bold and committed leadership. When we fight, we win.

I urge a “yes” vote on raising the wage to $15 per hour.

I thank Chairman Scott, again, for his leadership.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire again as to the time remaining on both sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia has 4 3/4 minutes remaining. The gentleman from North Carolina has 1 1/2 minutes remaining.
is 16.1 percent, which is higher than the national rate of 12.3 percent. Existing law allows employers to pay youth under age 20 a subminimum wage of $4.25 for the first 90 days of employment. The Raise the Wage Act will benefit millions of low-wage workers by increasing their income to a wage that would allow them to meet their financial needs.

Young, like many others in this country, use their wages to support themselves and their families. For example, young people use their earnings to purchase school supplies and assist family with buying food and contributing to college costs. Some use their wages to support their own children, pay rent, and buy other basic necessities. According to the Census Bureau, approximately 27 percent of young adults with children live in poverty. Low wages make it increasingly difficult for these parents to appropriately care for their children.

Congress has not raised the minimum wage in over a decade. Studies show that one in nine U.S. workers are paid wages that leave them in poverty, even when working full time and year-round. The economy is leaving too many people behind—including youth and young adults. Because poverty is structural and caused by systems and policies—like discrimination, segregation, and low-quality jobs—policymakers have an important role in addressing it.

Congress must act to raise the wage because it’s the equitable thing to do for workers and it’s a financial imperative—providing individuals with the means to meet their basic financial needs. By raising the minimum wage and eliminating the subminimum wage for youth, Congress would support young people in becoming more economically secure to help provide for their families, pay rent, and buy other basic necessities. We urge Congress to pass the Raise the Wage Act for the good of our country’s economy and the youth who will play a critical role now and in our future.

Sincerely,

National Organizations: America’s Promise Alliance; Center for Law and Social Policy; Heartland Alliance for Immigrants’ Rights; National Black Churches; National Immigration Law Center; Opportunity Youth United; Project Z; SparkAction; Strive International; YouthconUSA;

State and Local: Arizona: Opportunities for Youth: California: KIWA (Koreatown Immigrant Workers Alliance); Georgia: Georgia Shift; Illinois: We Are Worth More; Maryland: Baltimore Algebra Project; New York: City of Albany, Department of Recreation; Pennsylvania: E3, LLC;

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the minimum wage has been stuck at $7.25 for the past 10 years. During that time, the cost of housing, food, childcare, education, all of this has risen higher and higher, but the minimum wage has been stuck.

This week, the Joint Economic Committee, where I serve as vice chair, released a report on the Federal minimum wage, and it begins with this chart. It shows that, in 1968, a full-time worker making $7.25 would take home roughly $21,000 a year.

Now, 15 years later, a worker working full-time making minimum wage earns only $15,000 a year in the same dollars, and in real 2018 dollars, $8,000 a year. That is a 30 percent drop.

A full-time worker earning $7.25 minimum wage earns roughly $1,250 per month. That is not enough to cover even half of the monthly expenses of an average family, which total roughly $3,000. It is not enough to live on, let alone, to support a family.

Now, some critics say the minimum wage is earned impractically by teenagers, but that is wrong. More than half of those working at or below the minimum wage are above 25 years of age. It ignores the fact that the typical minimum wage worker earns half of their family’s income as a result, boosting the wage will support millions of children and families across our Nation.

Workers with more money in their pockets will spend it, stimulating the economy.

It is important to end the gender gap, because half the people working for minimum wage are women.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentleman.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I just want to applaud the gentleman from Virginia, BOBBY SCOTT, for his selfless and bold work. He faced many obstacles.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. I yield the gentlewoman because she may comment.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I urge a very strong vote on this to support the minimum wage and to get millions of workers the raise they so justly deserve. Over 33 million Americans deserve this raise. This chart shows it all.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I compliment my colleague on his sense of humor, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I am standing with working people and unions. I am standing with the American people and 41.3 percent of my district.

Let us raise the minimum wage. That is the right thing to do. It is for our children.

Mr. Speaker, as an original cosponsor, I rise in strong support of H.R. 582, the “Raise the Wage Act.”

With the passage of this bill, the House of Representatives will take another step in making good on its commitment to working families and individuals to put their economic interests and concerns first and attach the highest priority to making the real economy work for ordinary Americans who work hard, play by the rules, and are struggling to get by through no fault of their own.

We Democrats promised to chart a new direction for America if the voters entrusted us with the majority. They did and with our votes today in support of H.R. 582, we are making good on our promise.

Mr. Speaker, before I discuss the importance of this bill in detail, I wish to commend Chairman SCOTT, Speaker PELOSI, Majority Leader HOYER, Majority Whip CLYBURN, and the rest of the Democratic leadership, as well as my colleagues in the Congressional Black Caucus, which is led so ably by Congressman BASS.

Because of their resolve and visionary leadership, more than 27 million workers, and as many as 34 million, will soon receive a long overdue raise.
H.R. 582 helps the most deserving American families by raising the minimum wage from $7.25 to $15.00 over six years, and indexing increases after that to median wage growth. Mr. Speaker, did you know that the value of the current minimum wage represents a 51-year low?

Had the minimum wage kept pace with inflation, it would be $10.15 today, nearly $3 more per hour than it is currently. If the wages of that worker had kept up with the pace of productivity growth, the minimum wage would be $19.33, over $40,000 per year. It is scandalous, Mr. Speaker, that a person can work full-time, 40 hours per week, for 52 weeks, earning the minimum wage and would gross just $15,000, which is $6,100 below the $21,100 needed to lift a family of three out of poverty.

In 2018, the average CEO was paid 1,140 times the amount earned yearly by a minimum wage worker. Mr. Speaker, since 2009 the cost of college tuition has risen more than 40 percent and health insurance premiums have skyrocketed by 41 percent. But during that time, the minimum wage has not increased one cent.

That is unconscionable and downright un-American. H.R. 582, the Raise the Wage Act, will change this sorry state of affairs. Mr. Speaker, today more than ever America’s hard-working families are feeling squeezed, living paycheck to paycheck.

I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that prices at the pump, skyrocketing health care costs and the rising cost of college in the face of failing or flat wages, are squeezing hard-working Texans in my Houston-based Congressional District as they struggle to make ends meet. That is why I support increasing the minimum wage.

For Texas workers the basic cost of living is rising: it is only fair that the pay for hard-working Texans does too. Mr. Speaker, 29 states and the District of Columbia have increased their minimum wage above the federal minimum of $7.25 per hour, but regrettably my home state of Texas is not one of those.

For approximately 4.7 million Texans and nearly 155,800 hardworking persons in the 18th Congressional District of Texas, passage of the Raise the Wage Act would bring immediate, tangible, and substantial economic benefits.

Increasing the minimum wage would give these families a much needed additional $4,100 a year to meet critical needs such as rent, health care, food and child care. The minimum wage is $7.25 per hour over the next six years will not allow workers to live as large as the typical CEO, who now earns 1,140 times more than a minimum wage worker, but at least it will allow these low-wage workers to make a little better life for themselves and their families.

Raising the minimum wage will benefit working families:

1. Benefit 19 million children whose parents will get a raise;
2. Increase worker productivity by incentivizing people to work harder;
3. Reduce the gender wage gap, as women make up a disproportionate share of minimum wage workers; and
4. Reduce the rate at which renters default on their leases by giving families more money to spend on their household budgets.

Increasing the minimum wage will also provide a boost to the economy, since lower wage workers are more likely than other income groups to spend extra earnings immediately and researchers estimate that a 10 percent increase in the minimum wage would increase sales by around $2 billion each year. Mr. Speaker, the earnings of minimum wage workers are crucial to their families’ wellbeing since the minimum wage brings home more than half (51.9 percent) of his or her family’s weekly earnings. Raising the minimum wage helps women and workers of color.

More than 48,000, or 41 percent, of African American workers and 89,100, or 53.2 percent of Hispanic workers in my congressional district would get a raise under the Raise the Wage Act.

The Raise the Wage Act would substantially increase the purchasing power of 83,900, or 48.5 percent, of low-wage women workers in my district.

Since women make up nearly two-thirds of all minimum wage workers, the Raise the Wage Act would provide the greatest benefit to workers of color and women.

Single mothers would benefit disproportionately from an increase—single mothers are 10.4 percent of workers affected by an increase, but they make up only 5.3 percent of the overall workforce. Approximately 1.8 million Texas parents with children under 18 would benefit.

Contrary to popular myths and urban legends, adults make up the largest share of workers (60 percent) who would benefit from a minimum wage increase. More than half (54 percent) of workers who would benefit from a minimum wage increase work full time and another third (34.5 percent) work between 20 and 34 hours per week.

Minimum wage increases benefit disadvantaged workers, and women are the largest group of beneficiaries:

1. More than 23 million (66 percent) of workers who would benefit from an increase to $15.00 are women.
2. Approximately 11.2 million (28 percent) of workers who would benefit from an increase to $15.00 are the parents of 14.4 million children, and of these, 5.4 million (48 percent) are single parents. In my District in Texas, 41.3 percent of the workers would benefit.

A disproportionate share of persons of color would benefit from a minimum wage increase:

1. African Americans represent 11.1 percent of the total workforce but are 15.3 percent of workers affected by an increase.
2. Similarly, 13.4 percent of the total workforce is Hispanic, but Hispanics are 19.7 percent of workers affected by an increase.

The benefits of an increase minimum wage disproportionately help those working households at the bottom of the income scale.

Although households in the bottom 20 percent of income receive only 1.1 percent of national income, 38.1 percent of the benefits of a minimum wage increase to $15.00 would go to these workers.

Thirty-six percent of such workers actually contribute 100 percent of their family’s earnings.

A minimum wage increase would help reverse the trend of declining real wages for low-wage workers.

Between 2009 and 2018, the minimum wage lost 29 percent of its real value. In contrast, between 1989 and 1997, the year it was raised to $5.15, the minimum wage was raised four times and recovered about one-third of the value it lost in the 1980s.

Income inequality has been increasing, in part, because of the declining real value of the minimum wage.

Mr. Speaker, the opponents of the minimum wage often claim that increasing the wage will cost jobs and harm the economy. Of course, Mr. Speaker there is no credible evidence to support such claims.

The truth is that following the most recent increase in the minimum wage in 2009, and the rescue of the economy by President Barack Obama after the Great Recession, the country went on to enjoy one the most sustained period of economic prosperity in history. Mr. Speaker, studies have shown that the best performing small businesses are located in states with the highest minimum wages.

The job growth for small businesses in states with a minimum wage higher than the federal level was 9.4 percent compared to a 6.6 percent growth in states where the federal level prevailed.

So much for the discredited notion that raising the minimum wage harms the economy; it does not. But raising the minimum wage helps the economy by increasing the purchasing power of those who need it the most, which is far more than can be said of the Republicans’ devotion to cutting taxes for billionaires and multimillionaires.

Mr. Speaker, Americans overwhelmingly side with progressive principles of rewarding hard work with a living wage. A post-election Hill-Harris poll found that 82 percent of Americans favored the hourly minimum wage and a clear majority, 55 percent, favored increasing the minimum wage to $15.00, while only 14 percent favored keeping it at the current $7.25 wage rate.

Mr. Speaker, it is time that the Americans we represent support a long-overdue pay raise by increasing the minimum wage to $15.00 over six years and indexing future increases to the growth in median wages so that a full-time worker making the minimum wage can afford the basic essentials, which is not the case today anywhere in America.

I urge all members to support this necessary and timely legislation.

Vote aye on H.R. 582, the “Raise the Wage Act.”
be lost for every one person pulled out of poverty.

So will the Democrats who vote for this bill come to our congressional districts and answer for the jobs lost? Will they look at the women and young people and those without a high school degree who will face the brunt of the job losses from this bill in our congressional districts?

The harm inflicted by this bill far outweighs the benefits. We should not inflict that pain on our constituents just to create false, socially wasteful ethical promise. The economy is growing, wages are rising, and opportunities are increasing. We should not dampen this progress with any kind of policy.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this costly, job-killing bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD letters from the following organizations in support of the Raise the Wage Act: the National Employment Law Project, cosigned by 500 other organizations, AFSCME, the National Women’s Law Center, Lawyers’ Committee for Civil Rights Under Law, National Urban League, Disability Coalition, healthcare groups, Interreligious Working Group on Domestic Human Needs, First Focus Campaign for Children, NETWORK Lobby for Catholic Social Justice, Oxford, Americans for Democracy and Social Justice, National Women Lawyers Association, and a recent article in Politico by Reverend William Barber.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The National Employment Law Project (NELP), a non-profit organization that advocates on behalf of workers in low-wage jobs, enthusiastically supports the Raise the Wage Act of 2019. We urge you to vote Yes on the bill and No on any Motion to Recommit when the measure comes to the House later this week.

Last month, our nation marked a shameful milestone when the longest period passed without an increase since the 1938 enactment of the minimum wage. Nearly ten years have passed since the last increase to $7.25 on July 24, 2009. The cost of wage stagnation for workers making wages at or near the federal minimum wage is inexcusable in a country with the collective wealth we enjoy and with an economy that is booming for those who already live comfortable lives.

The Raise the Wage Act will gradually raise the federal minimum wage to $15 by 2025, gradually eliminate the subminimum wages for tipped, disabled and youth workers, and index the federal minimum wage so that it rises as all other wages rise.

The Raise the Wage Act will gradually raise the federal minimum wage to $15 by 2025, gradually eliminate the subminimum wages for tipped, disabled and youth workers, and index the federal minimum wage so that it rises as all other wages rise.

If signed into law, this Act will not only dramatically decrease poverty and income inequality. By phasing out subminimum wages and restoring the value of the federal minimum wage, this Act will also help address the systemically lower wages disproportionately affecting people of color, women and disabled workers as a result of the structural inequities baked into our current federal minimum wage policy.

Thus phasing out the minimum wage will claim that it will result in job loss, these prophecies of doom have no basis in fact. Just two weeks ago, a detailed and rigorous study of minimum wage increases since 2005, including the first increases that went to $5.15, demonstrated that there are no discernible negative employment or hours worked. Rather, it found that minimum wage increases lead to substantial declines in household and child poverty. Further, the increase of the federal minimum wage also leads to a reduction in suicides, a decrease in criminal recidivism, improved maternal and child health, increased consumer spending, increased worker productivity, lower turnover in jobs, and rise in employment of older workers.

It’s no wonder that the minimum wage enjoys such broad support, with polling showing 65% for a $15 federal minimum wage even in battleground Congressional districts. The evidence in the United States as a whole to move to raise wages, fight income inequality, reduce poverty, and eradicate at least some measure of racial, gender and disability discrimination that is inherent in our federal minimum wage policy. It is also an important step in making sure that working people achieve a more equitable share of the rewards that the market brings.

We hope that you will stand with the nearly 35 million workers who will receive a raise if the Raise the Wage Act is passed and vote Yes on the bill and on any Motion to Recommit that is offered.

Sincerely, CHRISTINE L. OWENS, Executive Director, AFSCME, Washington, DC, July 15, 2019.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the members of the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME), I am writing in support of the “Raise the Wage Act of 2019” (H.R. 582). This legislation would have a critical impact on millions of workers by gradually lifting the current federal minimum wage.

The current federal minimum wage rate of $7.25 an hour makes it very difficult for workers to meet basic family needs. The last federal minimum wage increase was in 2009. This unjustifiable delay contributes to wage stagnation for American workers. As the evidence shows, every minimum-wage worker earning the federal minimum wage makes barely $15,000 per year. A worker supporting two kids on an equivalent salary would barely make enough to reach the poverty level. Taking that into consideration with the fact that most minimum-wage jobs rarely include health insurance coverage or child-care assistance, it should be easy to understand why working families in America deserve better. As a result of wage stagnation and income disparity nearly 40 percent of American families struggle with basic needs.

Raising the minimum wage lifts the wages of low-wage workers to raise the wages of all workers. H.R. 582 allows for a raise in the federal minimum wage to $8.55 this year and increases over the next six years until it reaches $15 an hour at the end of that period. The new minimum wage will adjust each year to keep pace with the wages of all workers. The Economic Policy Institute (EPI) estimates that the bill (as in H.R. 582) would give three working women a raise, including 41 percent of Black working women, 38 percent of working Latinas, 29 percent of white working women, and 18 percent of Asian working women. Because women are the majority of workers who would see their pay go up, wage gaps would likely narrow as well; indeed, NCC research shows that women working a full-time, year round in states with a minimum wage of at least $10 per hour face a gender wage gap that is one-third smaller than the state average wage gap across all workers, and $7.25 minimum wage. And in “One Fair Wage” states where employers already have to pay their tipped workers the regular minimum wage, tips, the federal minimum wage rate for tipped workers is lower—and wage gaps for women overall are smaller.
WASHINGTON, DC.

or scope.

We urge you to vote for final passage of the Raise the Wage Act and against any motion to recommit because all workers, especially workers of color, need and deserve adequate wages to achieve economic security.

Respectfully submitted,

KIRSTEN CLARK,
President & Executive Director.

The Raise the Wage Act is critically needed to raise the federal minimum wage by $1.25 per hour each year to keep pace with growth in the average worker’s wages. If enacted, this legislation would:

• Gradually raise the federal minimum wage to $15 an hour by 2025.
• Phase out the outdated subminimum wage for tipped workers, which has been frozen at a meager $2.13 since 1991.
• Sunset the ability of employers to pay workers with disabilities a subminimum wage through certificates issued by DOL.

The Raise the Wage Act, we hereby urge you to support, is an essential step toward ensuring that women of color can work with equity, dignity and safety. We urge you equally strongly to address the sexual harassment from customers that women in tipped jobs have a paycheck they can work with dignity.

Hispanics would receive a raise, lifting many of them out of poverty, with 38% of Hispanic women living in poverty. Latinas are the backbone of our economy, working in 49% of full-time jobs in the United States. By establishing a $15 federal minimum wage by 2025 and phasing out harmful exclusions, the Raise the Wage Act gradually reaches a single wage floor that will benefit working people and our economy nationwide.

The House Committee on Education and Labor unanimously recommends passage of the Raise the Wage Act. This legislation is an urgent and necessary step to increase the federal minimum wage for tipped workers, which has been frozen for ten years, and phase out the subminimum wage for tipped workers, which has been frozen at $2.13 for nearly three decades. The Act would raise wages for tipped workers of color and reverse the growing trend of pay inequality that disproportionately impacts African Americans, Hispanics and other people of color.

The Committee strongly believes the Raise the Wage Act is an essential step towards reducing pay inequality and achieving economic fairness for communities of color. Our economy has grown immensely over the past several decades, but wages have not—particularly for people of color. Workers of color are more likely to be among the working poor, with African American and Hispanic women respectively making up 35% and 16% of the nation’s working poor. Additionally, people of color disproportionately live in poverty, with 20% of African Americans and 15% of Hispanics living in poverty, compared to 11% of white women. Additionally, people of color disproportionately live in poverty, with 20% of African Americans and 15% of Hispanics living in poverty, compared to 11% of white women.

With the Raise the Wage Act, nearly two-thirds of African Americans and one-third of Hispanics would receive a raise, lifting many of these families out of poverty. Ensuring that tipped workers can work with equity, dignity and safety.

With the Raise the Wage Act, nearly two-thirds of African Americans and one-third of Hispanics would receive a raise, lifting many of these families out of poverty. Ensuring that tipped workers can work with equity, dignity and safety.

We urge you to vote for final passage of the Raise the Wage Act and against any motion to recommit because all workers, especially workers of color, need and deserve adequate wages to achieve economic security.

Sincerely,

EMILY J. MARTIN,
Vice President for Education & Workplace Justice.
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The undersigned organizations enthusiastically support the Raise the Wage Act of 2019, introduced by Senators Bernie Sanders (VT) and Patty Murray (WA), Representatives Robert C. ‘Bobby’ Scott (VA), Mark Pocan (WI) and Stephanie Murphy (FL). If enacted, this legislation would:

• Gradually raise the federal minimum wage to $15 an hour by 2025.
• Phase out the outdated subminimum wage for tipped workers, which has been frozen at a meager $2.13 since 1991.
• Sunset the ability of employers to pay workers with disabilities a subminimum wage through certificates issued by DOL.

The Raise the Wage Act is an essential step toward ensuring they can work with equity, dignity, and safety.

Hispanics would receive a raise, lifting many of them out of poverty, with 38% of Hispanic women living in poverty. Latinas are the backbone of our economy, working in 49% of full-time jobs in the United States. By establishing a $15 federal minimum wage by 2025 and phasing out harmful exclusions, the Raise the Wage Act gradually reaches a single wage floor that will benefit working people and our economy nationwide.

The time for the Raise the Wage Act is now. We urge you to reject any amendments or alternatives that would establish a regional minimum wage at the federal level, which would leave women of color behind and continue to disenfranchise workers of color benefit from a raise. Adopting the Raise the Wage Act is an essential step toward ensuring they can work with equity, dignity and safety. We urge you to vote for final passage of the Raise the Wage Act and against any motion to recommit because all workers, especially workers of color, need and deserve adequate wages to achieve economic security.

Sincerely,

KRISTEN CLARK,
President & Executive Director.

In adopting the Raise the Wage Act, we urge you equally strongly to address the sexual harassment from customers that women in tipped jobs have a paycheck they can work with dignity.
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Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say that youth workers—we have heard about youth workers—should not be paid less for the same work than anyone else. Several of my colleagues have pointed out that there may be a $9 billion loss in income. According to the CBO, that comes from families making more than $232,000 a year. Families making less than that will get an increase in pay.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank all of my colleagues, including members of the Committee on Education and Labor and Representatives across the Nation who have been instrumental in advancing this legislation. But most of all, I want to recognize the workers in communities across the country who stood up and demanded a fair day’s pay for a fair day’s work. There are some of them with us today, the Fight for $15 workers, the SEIU workers, and others from across the country.

I also want to acknowledge a broad coalition of business support, including Business for a Fair Minimum Wage and the U.S. Women’s Chamber of Commerce.

Prosals to increase the minimum wage are always met with the same baseless predictions we have heard today. Opponents cried wolf in the 1930s, and we should not fear the impact of putting money in workers’ pockets or, as President Roosevelt said in a fireside chat way back in 1938: “Do not let any calamity-howling thatagalve with an income of $1,000 a day... tell you... that a wage of $11 a week is going to have a disastrous effect on all American industry.”

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to take that advice, pass the Raise the Wage Act and give a raise to 33 million Americans. It is a raise that is long overdue.

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

Mr. Cuellar. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the importance of raising the minimum wage for millions in our country. This important legislation raises the wage for 45 percent of workers in my district, and provides a wage increase of nearly $640,000.

The Raise the Wage Act will indeed lift thousands of my constituents out of poverty and provide opportunity for economic mobility. However, I would like to highlight the work I have done on this legislation to make it more amenable to small, family owned businesses. While I acknowledge that many Americans deserve a raise, we in Congress must be above rhetoric and talking points. With such a significant change proposed to the minimum wage, this must be carried out in a precise, tactful manner. As of June of this year, the employment rate in the United States is a mere 3.7 percent. It is critical that policies we pass through this Congress’ ability to make policy changes based on the actual economic effects of this legislation.

Lastly, I submitted two amendments that exempt local and small farms, as well as small businesses from the $15 minimum wage. These amendments delayed the minimum wage from reaching $15 until the year 2029, as well as kept the current “tipped-wage” provision for restaurant workers. I also sought to create a small business tax credit, along with providing two additional years to comply with a doubling of the federal minimum wage.

By providing tax credits, compliance exemptions, and a longer runway to $15, my amendments intended to give small businesses the tools they need to thrive in the economy this bill will create.

I was disappointed that my amendments were not included in this measure, but will work for their inclusion elsewhere given the vast economic benefits that small businesses provide in my community, and around the country. There are near 30 million small businesses in the United States today. Additionally, there are 24.3 million individually operated businesses with no employees. Small businesses employ over 60 million Americans—nearly half of the private workforce—and are now over 287,000 small business exporters.

The United States small business community contributes approximately $8.5 trillion to the economy, roughly half of the United States total $17 trillion GDP. Small businesses are the backbone of our country, and the engine that drives our economy. While I will vote in favor of this legislation, I hope to have my amendments incorporated as this bill moves through the legislative process. I include them for the RECORD.

As this legislation heads over to the Senate, I look forward to working with my friends to improve this bill and ensure further small business provisions are included, as well as with my colleagues in the House on future legislation that will help address these concerns.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for the time to recognize the importance of small businesses to our great nation, and the need to pay Americans a living wage.

Amendment to H.R. 582, as reported by Mr. Cuellar of Texas

Mr. Cuellar of Texas. Strike section 3 and insert the following new section:

SEC. 3. MINIMUM WAGE FOR SMALL BUSINESS EXPORTERS.

Section 6 of the Fair Labor Standards Act, as amended, is hereby added by adding at the end the following:

(1) SMALL BUSINESS MINIMUM WAGE RATE.—With respect to an employer that is a small business exporter, the wage in effect under subsection (a)(1) shall be—

(1) $9.00 an hour during the calendar year 2019;

(2) $9.50 an hour during the calendar year 2020;

(3) $10.00 an hour during the calendar year 2021;

(4) $10.50 an hour during the calendar year 2022;

(5) $11.00 an hour during the calendar year 2023;

(6) $11.50 an hour during the calendar year 2024;

(7) $12.00 an hour during the calendar year 2025;

(8) $12.50 an hour during the calendar year 2026;

(9) $13.00 an hour during the calendar year 2027;

(10) $13.50 an hour during the calendar years 2028, 2029, and 2030; and

(11) $15.00 an hour during the calendar year 2031 and each year thereafter.

Add at the end the following new section:

SECTION 45T. MINIMUM-WAGE EMPLOYEE CREDIT FOR SMALL EMPLOYERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subpart D of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following:

"Sec. 45T. Minimum-wage employee credit for small employers.

(a) Minimum-wage employee credit for small employers."

(b) Credit to be part of general business credit."

(c) Credit for small employers."

(d) Effective date."

"(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years ending after the date of the enactment of this Act."
across the nation, helping them pay their bills, support their children, and grow our economy via their increased spending power.

Many do not remember that—from the outset—the intent was that the minimum wage should be a livable wage. The federal minimum wage was part of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938; critical legislation supporting workers and children by setting a federal minimum wage, requiring time-and-a-half pay, and banning the atrocity of child labor in factories. President Franklin Delano Roosevelt even said, “I see no reason to be any more plain than that no business which depends for existence on paying less than living wages to its workers has any right to continue in this country . . . and by living wages I mean more than a bare subsistence level—I mean the wages of decent living.”

At a time in our country when the wealth gap is appalling large, I am proud that the Democratic Leadership is prioritizing a livable wage. For over a decade millions of hard-working Americans worked full-time making just $7.25 an hour. Tipped workers, teen workers, or workers with disabilities have made even less. Current law allows tipped workers to make just $2.13 an hour plus tips, allows teen workers to be paid just $4.25 an hour for their first 90 days, and allows a subminimum wage for people with disabilities, unjustly denying them the very opportunity that they deserve. Men and women throughout the nation work full-time yet remain trapped in poverty by their low-wages. According to the Economic Policy Institute, a single mom raising two kids while working a full-time minimum wage job earns only about $14,500 or $5,000 below the poverty line. Clearly, the current minimum wage is not a living wage but a policy that systematically grows the divide between the poor and the secure, creating barriers for low-income workers to break out of poverty.

The minimum wage increase in this bill will help close the wage gap that women—especially African-American and Latina-American women—face due to their disproportionate overrepresentation in tipped employment. Even more concerning, H.R. 582 contains a provision to remove choices for disabled workers and their families. Section 6 of this bill would eliminate the 14(c) certificates which enable Sheltered Workshops to operate. Sheltered Workshops are non-profit, local, or state-run workshops that provide sheltered employment opportunities for individuals who are developmentally, physically, or mentally impaired. These opportunities are enabled by the 14(c) certificates which allow individuals to be paid a wage commensurate with their ability level. Sheltered Workshops also provide the necessary tools for those with disabilities to succeed in their jobs and can help these individuals acculturate to the workforce, and even learn and hone their life and social skills. The level of training and support provided by Sheltered Workshops is essential to the success of the individuals who work there.

No family wants fewer options when deciding how to help their child with disabilities succeed. That is why the 14(c) provision and the Sheltered Workshops provide more options, especially for those who desire Vocational Rehabilitation services or Medicaid Waiver services. Without the 14(c) provision, many of the people working in sheltered workshops would be left to fend for themselves in the “competitive workforce” or stay home. The 14(c) provision is necessary for providing these individuals the tools they need to succeed.

That is why I submitted an amendment to strike Section 6 from H.R. 582. Unfortunately, my amendment was not made in order which is one more reason why we must oppose this flawed legislation, defeat this bill and preserve job choices for Americans.

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 582, the Raise the Wage Act. We must advocate for an increase in the minimum wage, as stagnant wages imperil economic growth and are a detriment to our nation’s working class. According to the Economic Policy Institute, the current minimum wage places nearly 78,000 Texans at this unlivable income, while 118,000 Texans earn even less. The Raise the Wage Act will result in a significant increase in the average annual earnings for Texans. In my home district, this figure is estimated to increase by 18.2 percent, which will make an immeasurable difference in our communities.

Many people in my district are forced to work multiple jobs for long hours to ensure food is on the table for their families. This legislation will eliminate this burden on our working families. The economy may be growing, and wages may be rising, but the benefits of economic and wage growth are not felt equally. Individuals working 40 hours a week should be able to afford the basic necessities for themselves and their family.

I proudly stand in this chamber as a co-sponsor of H.R. 582, the Raise the Wage Act. I urge my colleagues on both sides to join me in voting for this legislation to promote economic freedom and equity for all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of H.R. 582, the Raise the Wage Act, a bill that would radically improve the lives of millions of Americans. For ten years, the longest period in United States history, workers have suffered as the federal minimum wage stayed the same as inflation rose. With the same wages and rising prices, workers essentially received a 17 percent pay cut. That’s unacceptable, and it’s about time we give American workers a raise. Americans are working just as hard as any generation, and yet, they are receiving less than their parents and they are struggling to afford basic necessities and claim their share of the American dream.

Families in every state tell me that raising the minimum wage is simply another way to help our constituents improve their lives and boost the economy.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill. The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate on the bill has expired.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 Offered by MR. O’HALLERAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk.
(1) identifies and analyzes the effects, in the aggregate, of the first wage increases and second wage increases after such date of enactment on business enterprises (including small business enterprises) including the effects, with respect to such enterprises, on—
   (A) the wages and compensation of employees;
   (B) the number of employees, disaggregated by full-time and part-time employees;
   (C) the prices, sales, and revenues;
   (D) employee turnover and retention;
   (E) hiring and training costs; and
   (F) productivity and absenteeism;
(2) to the extent practicable, identifies such effects from various other factors that may affect business enterprises (including small business enterprises), including—
   (A) broader economic conditions;
   (B) changes in Federal, State, and local law, policy, and regulation;
   (C) industry consolidation;
   (D) natural disasters; and
   (E) significant demographic changes;
(3) to the extent practicable, identifies and analyzes such effects for the Nation as a whole, and, separately, for—
   (A) each metropolitan statistical area and nonmetropolitan portion (as such terms are defined in the Census and Budget with respect to 2013); and
   (B) each census division, as designated by the Bureau of the Census;
(4) each rural area, as designated by the Bureau of the Census; and
(4) describes the methodology used to generate the information in the report.

(c) EXPERT CONSULTATION.—The persons described in this subsection are—
   (1) labor economists with expertise in minimum wage and low wage labor markets;
   (2) workers in small businesses, agricultural workers, the food service industry, and State and local governments.
   (3) representatives of businesses, including small businesses, agricultural employers, and businesses in the accommodation and food services sector;
   (4) State and local governments; and
   (5) the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

(d) WAGE INCREASE DEFINED.—The term "wage increase" means an increase in wages that takes effect under subsection (a)(1) or (g)(1) of section 6, section 3(k)(2)(A)(i), or section 402(d) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 201 et seq.), as amended by this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 492, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. O'HALLERAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. O'HALLERAN. This prudent, commonsense amendment is necessary to ensure that once this legislation is passed, it has the positive effects we intended. I strongly support the Raise the Wage Act, and I believe it will positively affect millions of Americans nationwide and lift families out of poverty.

The State of Arizona and my constituents in the First District voted overwhelmingly to raise the minimum wage in 2016. It is currently $11 an hour. During this implementation of this minimum wage increase, Arizona has seen a 4.3 percent growth in State GDP—the third fastest growing economy in the Nation. We have seen in Arizona (Mr. O'HALLERAN) that increasing the wage pays off for our economy and our families.

My amendment will only strengthen the underlying bill. It requires independent, objective analysis of the economic and employment impacts of this legislation and would require the Government Accountability Office to submit a report to Congress on the effects of the first two wage increases in the legislation.

Specifically, the GAO must report on the effects on small businesses and on wages and compensation. The report also includes an analysis of the law's effects on urbanized and rural areas.

Importantly, this amendment would require the GAO to consult various stakeholders when developing its report. These would include small business owners, labor economists, agricultural workers, the food service industry, and State and local governments.

It would allow constituents to provide their input on how their families, businesses, and communities have been affected.

This thoughtful, data-driven approach will allow us to see the real impacts of this legislation.

I believe as lawmakers we do the best job of responding to the needs of our constituents when we are best informed.

I want to thank the cosponsors of the amendment and the Education and Labor Committee for working with us and the Rules Committee for making this amendment in order.

I urge my colleagues to see this amendment for what it is: an attempt to provide public policy over to Democrat Members who are justifiably concerned about the negative impact of a $15 Federal minimum wage in their districts.

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

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, a hot economy is leading to higher wages. There are 7.3 million unfilled jobs which puts all workers in a good position to receive higher minimum wages. We do this by requiring the Government Accountability Office to analyze and produce a study of the impact of the first two scheduled wage increases on our Nation's small businesses, our agriculture industry, and our workers.

The study will consider the specific effects of raising the minimum wage in each Census tract and rural area, so families, like those I serve in the Central Valley of California, aren't left behind.

If we find the negative impacts are too great, the relevant committees are required to make recommendations to Congress which may include actions as damaging as the increase to $15. So the results of the proposed GAO study are rigged to avoid use the damaging 107 percent hike as the appropriate benchmark.

Second, this amendment has no teeth. It merely says that Congress can make recommendations after the first two wage hikes have gone into effect. Give me a break. But there is no requirement that Congress do anything in response to these recommendations, and there is no fast-track authority in this amendment.

Third, we already have in our possession a recent detailed and highly credible study of the effects of a 107 percent wage hike to the current Federal minimum wage. With regard to GAO's studies, at the Education and Labor Committee markup of H.R. 582 in March, Chairman SCOTT already dismissed the effectiveness and conclusions of a potential GAO report that might show jobs lost.

Essentially, using his opposition to a proposed GAO study, Mr. SCOTT said, This amendment suggests that there will be job loss. All of the studies show otherwise.

I urge my colleagues to see this amendment for what it is: an attempt to provide public policy over to Democrat Members who are justifiably concerned about the negative impact of a $15 Federal minimum wage in their districts.

Vote "no" on this amendment and "no" on H.R. 582.

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

Mr. O'HALLERAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. COX).

Mr. COX of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of our amendment to the Raise the Wage Act. I joined this amendment to look out for the small businesses and the agricultural businesses that are so vital to the Central Valley of California and to our Nation.

The minimum wage has not been raised since 2009. In the decade since, due to inflation and rising costs, the paychecks of millions of hardworking Americans naturally don't go as far as they used to.

Every worker deserves a living wage, and this amendment ensures that we can give at least 17 million Americans a raise while also protecting farms and small businesses. We do this by requiring the Government Accountability Office to analyze and produce a study of the impact of the first two scheduled wage increases on our Nation's small businesses, our agriculture industry, and our workers.

The study will consider the specific effects of raising the minimum wage in each Census tract and rural area, so families, like those I serve in the Central Valley of California, aren't left behind.

If we find the negative impacts are too great, the relevant committees are required to make recommendations to Congress which may include actions.
necessary to delay the next scheduled increases, if necessary.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, as said earlier, the chairman of that action labor committee already has a low opinion of these types of studies, and his mind is made up about a $15 Federal minimum wage.

This amendment sets up a rigged process in which House Democrat leaders will already support a $15 per hour hike and will decide whether to move forward with it. There is no doubt how they will decide.

Congressman GRIJALVA agrees with Chairman SCOTT. He is quoted in a July 15 article in The Hill regarding the amendment’s proposed study: “It’s almost perfunctory. Look what we did. So I don’t think it’s consequential. But I don’t think it’s needed, either.”

Mr. Speaker, this amendment is not necessary. Let the Democrats vote for the $15 wage hike and take the consequences of it. Democrats should stop trying to provide political cover for themselves with this amendment which does absolutely nothing.

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

Mr. O’HALLERAN. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Arizona has 1 1/2 minutes remaining.

Mr. O’HALLERAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to point out that the discussion in Chairman SCOTT’s comments were not about this bill.

They were about another bill. My time.

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

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding I am allowed to close, so I will reserve until Speaker, it is my understanding I am my time.

As my colleagues well know, the first two wage hikes will not be as damaging as the increase to $15, so the results of the proposed GAO study are rigging to avoid using the damaging 107 percent hike as the appropriate benchmark.

This amendment, has no teeth. It merely says that Congress can make recommendations after the first two wage hikes have gone into effect, but there is no requirement that Congress do anything in response, and there is no fast-track authority in this amendment.

Again, I will say that this amendment is not necessary.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to see this amendment for what it is: an attempt to provide political cover to Democrat Members who are justifiably concerned about the negative impacts of a $15 Federal minimum wage in their district.

Vote “no” on this amendment and “no” on H.R. 582.

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

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to see this amendment for what it is: an attempt to provide political cover to Democrat Members who are justifiably concerned about the negative impacts of a $15 Federal minimum wage.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. O’HALLERAN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the previous question is ordered on the bill and on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. O’HALLERAN).

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. O’HALLERAN).

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 248, noes 181, for the amendment to the bill, if agreed to, and Passage of the bill, if ordered; and

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 248, noes 181, for the amendment to the bill, if agreed to, and Passage of the bill, if ordered; and

A motion to recommit, if offered; and Passage of the bill, if ordered; and

Agreeing to the Speaker’s approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 248, noes 181, for the amendment to the bill, if agreed to, and Passage of the bill, if ordered; and

A motion to recommit, if offered; and Passage of the bill, if ordered; and

Agreeing to the Speaker’s approval of the Journal, if ordered.
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Mr. Speaker, I am here to offer a motion to reconsider the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I am here to offer a motion to reconsider the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. MEUSER. Mr. Speaker, this legislation is about protecting the 8 million minority-owned businesses survival. It is about promoting the 8 million minority-owned small businesses, the 9.9 million women-owned small businesses, and the 2.5 million veteran-owned small businesses around the country from the devastating repercussions of H.R. 582.

With this motion to reconsider, employers with fewer than 10 employees or owners under $1 million will not be forced to implement a $15-per-hour minimum wage.

If this amendment is adopted, mom-and-pop shops across the country will be protected from this bill’s extreme and unnecessary one-size-fits-all Washington mandate.

Small businesses employ almost half of all U.S. employees and account for two-thirds of net new jobs. 99.9 percent of U.S. businesses are small.

We know small businesses and their employees are the most vulnerable to this radical and unprecedented increase in the Federal minimum wage. The National Federation of Independent Business estimates that businesses with fewer than 100 employees will account for 57 percent of jobs lost due to this bill, and businesses with fewer than 10 employees will account for 43 percent of jobs lost.

Yet my Democrat colleagues have done nothing to protect these job creators from a 107 percent minimum wage hike. Instead, this legislation treats big and small businesses exactly same.

Without the financial resilience needed to absorb the increase in bottom-line costs that this legislation will bring about, small businesses and towns in every congressional district will be forced to make very tough choices: Do they lay off workers? Raise prices on their customers? Replace workers with robotics? Or shut their doors completely?

Congress should not force our Nation’s smallest and most vital job creators to make those kinds of decisions. Small businesses and their families will also take a significant hit. The nonpartisan CBO backs up this reality, reporting that mandating a $15 minimum wage would ‘reduce business income and raise prices as higher labor costs would be absorbed by business owners and then passed on to consumers.’

From coast to coast, we have already seen real-world examples of how workers and employers would be punished by this socialist policy. One study found that Washington-knows-best mandates that stretch across our Nation—or better known as socialist policies—we have real-world examples showing that they simply do not work. There was a very thorough study by Washington State University which showed, in Seattle, a $15 minimum wage law reduced total income paid to the city’s low-wage workers by $120 million per year in that one city alone.

The current minimum wage in Seattle, Los Angeles, and New York City, where a $15 minimum wage is already in place, or soon to be, is much higher than my district in Pennsylvania. With such disparities in the cost of living across the country, imagine what a wage hike will do to rural areas, rural workers represented by many of us in Congress.

Mr. Speaker, despite today’s booming economy and rising wages, supporters of H.R. 582 think it is best to force Washington one-size-fits-all wage hike on small businesses across America.

A small business owner in the State of Washington actually said it best:

‘Congress should not and cannot mandate its way toward wage growth in America, because those mandates hit small business hardest.’

Mr. Speaker, even the liberal Washington Post said yesterday: ‘There is a trade-off in raising the minimum wage so substantially.’

The Washington Post went on to say: ‘Those who would lose out, in the form of no job at all, would wind up not with less pay but with no pay.’

I urge all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this modest but important amendment to H.R. 582. The small businesses and their workers back home in each and every one of our districts will thank us for protecting their livelihood.

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

Mrs. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to reconsider.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, there has been an awful lot of talk recently about what it means to be a patriotic American, and the fact is the answer for each of us is deeply personal.

I wasn’t blessed to be born an American citizen. I was born in Vietnam, where my parents faced persecution by a communist government, in part, for their wartime affiliation with the U.S. military.

When I was a baby, we fled Vietnam by boat, running out of fuel in the South China Sea when a U.S. Navy ship came to our rescue, helping us reach a Malaysian refugee camp. A Lutheran church then sponsored our passage to America, where we became proud citizens.

Although we were eternally grateful to be here, life wasn’t always easy. My mom worked as a seamstress and my dad at a power plant, and together, they could afford to support this modest but important amendment to H.R. 582. The small businesses and their workers back home in each and every one of our districts will thank us for protecting their livelihood.

My parents didn’t speak English well or have a community of close friends, but what they did have, like so many immigrants, was a strong work ethic. My dad also had a labor union in his corner, and the union spoke for him and they fought for him.

My parents worked hard to make ends meet so that their children would have opportunities that they themselves never had. And that is the American Dream, which brings me back to the question of what it means to be a patriot.
For me, it starts with gratitude for this country and an appreciation for its exceptional qualities. This country saved my family's life. It gave us refuge and opportunity, and it has done for so many across generations.

But I think patriotism goes beyond singing “My Country ’Tis of Thee” and reciting the Pledge of Allegiance. It is about trying to make life a little bit easier for Americans who work hard and play by the rules, folks like my parents and like so many of my constituents.

I support this bill for a simple reason: In the greatest country on Earth, nobody with the dignity of a full-time job should suffer the indignity of not being able to provide for themselves or their loved ones.

For a decade, the minimum wage has been stuck at $7.25 an hour, while the cost of living has skyrocketed, and there is no part in this great country where the $7.25 is a living wage anymore.

It is past time we gave hardworking American families a raise. They have earned it.

This bill gradually increases the minimum wage in seven steps, reaching $15 by 2025. This is a reasonable bill, not a radical one.

CBO estimates this bill will raise wages for nearly 30 million workers and lift millions out of poverty. They will have more money to spend in the local economy, because workers are consumers, too, and they will be less reliant on government programs.

And given that our deficit will exceed a trillion dollars this year, that should be music to my Republican colleagues’ ears.

I oppose this MTR because every American who works hard deserves a fair shot at the American Dream. Whether you live in Pennsylvania or Arizona or Minnesota or Florida, you deserve a raise. And whether you work for a large corporation or a small business, you deserve a raise; you deserve a living wage; and you certainly deserve $15 an hour.

Public polling shows strong bipartisan support for increasing the minimum wage.

Make no mistake: This MTR is simply a Republican attempt to defeat this bill because they oppose any increase to the Federal minimum wage. Some opposed the concept of a minimum wage at all. Well, the American people disagree, and as Democrats, we stand with the American people.

The contrast is clear: Our Republican colleagues made working families pay for tax cuts for the wealthiest individuals and corporations. Yes, they did. And now they are opposing our efforts to give those working families a raise. That is not just bad policy; that is shameful.

When I vote “yes” on final passage, I will be thinking about my parents and my hardworking constituents; and thank God families like these have labor unions fighting for them in the workplace and in the Halls of Congress. This will be one of the proudest votes I cast.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the MTR. Let’s pass this bill. Let’s continue this fight in the Senate and in State capitols across this country.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The result of the vote was announced, and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes had it.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ays 210, noes 218, 5-minute vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the clerk was directed to enter the vote as follows: [Roll No. 495]
Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rolloca No. 495.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and the ayes appeared to have it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore announced that the ayes had prevailed and that the bill had passed, as follows:

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rolloca No. 495.

The question is on the passage of the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and the ayes appeared to have it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore announced that the ayes had prevailed and that the bill had passed, as follows:

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rolloca No. 495.

The SPEAKER pro tempore announced that the ayes had prevailed and that the bill had passed, as follows:

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rolloca No. 495.

The SPEAKER pro tempore announced that the ayes had prevailed and that the bill had passed, as follows:

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rolloca No. 495.

The SPEAKER pro tempore announced that the ayes had prevailed and that the bill had passed, as follows:

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rolloca No. 495.

The SPEAKER pro tempore announced that the ayes had prevailed and that the bill had passed, as follows:

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rolloca No. 495.

The SPEAKER pro tempore announced that the ayes had prevailed and that the bill had passed, as follows:

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rolloca No. 495.

The SPEAKER pro tempore announced that the ayes had prevailed and that the bill had passed, as follows:

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rolloca No. 495.

The SPEAKER pro tempore announced that the ayes had prevailed and that the bill had passed, as follows:

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rolloca No. 495.

The SPEAKER pro tempore announced that the ayes had prevailed and that the bill had passed, as follows:

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rolloca No. 495.

The SPEAKER pro tempore announced that the ayes had prevailed and that the bill had passed, as follows:

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rolloca No. 495.

The SPEAKER pro tempore announced that the ayes had prevailed and that the bill had passed, as follows:

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rolloca No. 495.

The SPEAKER pro tempore announced that the ayes had prevailed and that the bill had passed, as follows:

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rolloca No. 495.

The SPEAKER pro tempore announced that the ayes had prevailed and that the bill had passed, as follows:

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rolloca No. 495.

The SPEAKER pro tempore announced that the ayes had prevailed and that the bill had passed, as follows:

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rolloca No. 495.

The SPEAKER pro tempore announced that the ayes had prevailed and that the bill had passed, as follows:

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rolloca No. 495.

The SPEAKER pro tempore announced that the ayes had prevailed and that the bill had passed, as follows:

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rolloca No. 495.

The SPEAKER pro tempore announced that the ayes had prevailed and that the bill had passed, as follows:

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rolloca No. 495.

The SPEAKER pro tempore announced that the ayes had prevailed and that the bill had passed, as follows:

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rolloca No. 495.

The SPEAKER pro tempore announced that the ayes had prevailed and that the bill had passed, as follows:

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rolloca No. 495.

The SPEAKER pro tempore announced that the ayes had prevailed and that the bill had passed, as follows:

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rolloca No. 495.

The SPEAKER pro tempore announced that the ayes had prevailed and that the bill had passed, as follows:

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rolloca No. 495.

The SPEAKER pro tempore announced that the ayes had prevailed and that the bill had passed, as follows:

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rolloca No. 495.

The SPEAKER pro tempore announced that the ayes had prevailed and that the bill had passed, as follows:

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rolloca No. 495.

The SPEAKER pro tempore announced that the ayes had prevailed and that the bill had passed, as follows:
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(Mr. SCALISE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the majority leader, for the purpose of inquiring about next week’s schedule.

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

Madam Speaker, on Tuesday, the House will meet at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business, with votes postponed until 6:30 p.m.

On Wednesday and Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate and noon for legislative business.

On Friday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business, and last votes on each will be expected no later than 3 p.m.

We will consider several bills, Madam Speaker, under suspension of the rules. The complete list of suspension bills will be announced by close of business tomorrow.

The House will also consider H.R. 397, the Rehabilitation for Multiemployer Pensions Act, commonly referred to as the Butch Lewis Act.

The 10 million Americans who have paid into multiemployer pensions deserve to know they will receive the benefits they have earned when they retire. The bill will help ensure a secure retirement for these workers and retirees.

In addition, Madam Speaker, the House will consider H.R. 2203, the Homeland Security Improvement Act. This legislation introduced by Congresswoman ESCOBAR will ensure that the Department of Homeland Security addresses border issues in a responsible and humane manner. The bill fosters greater accountability when it comes to the handling of children and migrant families at all levels within the Department of Homeland Security.

The House is also expected to consider additional legislation. Madam Speaker, related to the current humanitarian crisis on the southern border.

Members are advised that additional legislative items are expected. As we know, it is the last week before we adjourn, and there is an effort to try to get things done that can, in fact, be done within the timeframe we have available to us.

It is my sincere hope that an agreement is reached to raise budget caps and the debt limit. The Speaker and Secretary Mnuchin and others have been working very hard on this objective, and I am hopeful that they will reach an agreement that we can agree on as a House and as a Senate. Assuming an agreement is reached, we will consider that as soon as they reach it, and hopefully, that will be next week.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for giving that update on the schedule.

I know that we have been in talks on a budget caps agreement. I met with the Vice President earlier this morning, talking through some of the things that may come.

Obviously, there is no final agreement. We would hope that those talks go on, and we, hopefully, reach an agreement where we can give real certainty, especially to our Department of Defense, that we will look at what sequestration would do to defense. We have been able to rebuild our defense over the last 2 years. We would like to see that progress continue.

A lot of our agreements are at stake there, and we encourage those talks to move forward. We will be ready to move if there is an agreement reached between all the parties, including the White House.

I did not hear mention of anything regarding the BDS legislation. We have heard that there might be some movement on standing up against the BDS movement.

I know that when we looked at a number of bills, there are some resolutions that are out there, some good, some bad. As we know, there is time for talk, and then, there is time for action. The resolutions are only talk.

The legislation, H.R. 336 by Mr. McCaul, is the only bill out there. S. 1 moved through the Senate with a large, overwhelming bipartisan vote. It is similar legislation that would actually have teeth, not just words, which were important words followed up with action, real teeth to help not only this country but our States that are also standing up against the BDS movement, to give them some muscle, some ability to stand up to the BDS movement.

Madam Speaker, I would ask the gentleman, is there any indication that there might be movement on H.R. 336, to follow up the words with real action against the BDS movement?

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. In response to my friend, Madam Speaker, I will tell him that the committee did, in fact, mark up bills this past Wednesday, yesterday, and those bills are being looked at to possibly move to the floor.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, specifically, if I could ask my friend, H.R. 336 was not one of those bills that was marked up. The ones that were marked up were resolutions.

Again, while some of those resolutions might have some good language in them, there are no actual teeth. There is no policy. There is no change in law to give us more tools as a country to stand up to the BDS movement, to defend our friend Israel.

As we know, the BDS movement really is rooted in anti-Semitism to undermine Israel’s economy, which none of us should want to see. I know my friend doesn’t want to see Israel’s economy undermined, but there is a movement to do that. If we are going to truly stand up against it, words are not enough. We need action.

H.R. 336, again, reflects similar legislation that passed the Senate with an overwhelming vote of Republicans and Democrats coming together to give real tools to stand up to this movement and support our friend Israel.

Madam Speaker, I would inquire of the gentleman, would that bill be considered? It was not part of the package of bills that were brought up in committee this week. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, again, I will tell my friend, as he has articulated, that bill has not been marked up in committee. There are two bills that were marked up in committee, and there is a possibility that we will consider those, but the other bill was not marked up.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I would encourage that we go back and look. This committee can do better. If we are going to stand up against this movement and our friend Israel against this attempt to undermine their economy, we need real tools.

H.R. 336 is the only instrument out there. It is similar to S. 1. We would love to see S. 1 passed. There have been questions about whether or not it has an origination problem, so that is why H.R. 336 was filed.

But, again, H.R. 336 has the same language that passed with 77 votes in the Senate, overwhelmingly. Republicans and Democrats coming together. I would encourage us to follow that lead of bipartisanship, standing with Israel.

I am disappointed that it is not included in the package. It moved out of committee. I would hope we would go back and consider bringing that bill to the floor.

Again, words are nice, but words without action don’t give us the tools we need to stand with our friend Israel against this undermining attempt known as BDS.

I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.
Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman’s comments. Unfortunately, of course, three of the component parts of the bill, to which the gentleman refers, we are strongly for. Unfortunately, they were held up in the Senate, as the gentleman may know.

We want to see the MOU for Israel assistance package, which we strongly support, which was negotiated by the Obama administration and which we strongly support in terms of the amount that is available not only on a general basis, but also a specific basis, for support of Israel’s defense against rockets and other munitions that would be sent into Israel.

We also support the Syria sanctions and the Jordan MOU, so we hope, at some point, they will move. I will reiterate, however, there have been two bills marked up, and the possibility of considering those for next week is there.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, clearly, if there are issues that need to be worked out, differences that might exist between the chairman and the lead Republican on the committee, that work needs to be done. There have been no indications given to us of some counteroffer, some different way to do it, some better way to do it, than what is in H.R. 336.

But again, the language in H.R. 336 is the same language that was in the Senate bill which the Senate passed with a 77-23 vote. It doesn’t mean that the Senate has the idea, but it shows there was a way that Republicans and Democrats could come together to stand with Israel against this movement.

If there is a better way to do it, we would be more than happy to work through those better ideas. None of those better ideas have been presented to us. They just shut down that bill. They shut down the ability to have a bill come to the floor to actually put teeth in law to give us more tools.

I would urge that if there is a better alternative, that the chairman of the committee or the leadership on your side has, please present that and let’s negotiate it, but none of that has been presented up until now.

So, I would just encourage us to do better as we try to give more support to our friend Israel against this growing movement.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask about the agenda as we have seen it so far in the decorum. The agenda we have seen this week alone, multiple pieces of legislation—whether it is targeted for the border, or dealing with homeland security are known by many in the homeland security field as the open borders bill, not a bipartisan approach to solving our problem at the border. We need a secure border. We need to solve the border.

Fix our broken asylum laws. We want to encourage asylum to work. There ought to be a way to apply for asylum. But, in all honesty, if somebody goes through other countries and turns down asylum in those countries and comes here and just reads a script, because they know there is a loophole in our law, we ought to work together to fix those broken loopholes and the things that are causing an overwhelming crisis at our border. That has not been done.

Bills to lower drug prices. We had a bipartisan agreement in the Committee on Energy and Commerce, to lower drug prices that was abandoned when that bill came to the floor and sent in a way that became a partisan bill. These shouldn’t be partisan issues.

I would hope that we would move away from the harassment agenda and get back to an agenda that is focused on Republicans and Democrats working together, not in a partisan way to say, hey, we passed some bill out of the House, that everybody knows is going nowhere because it was a partisan approach.

Look at what the Senate has done to move bipartisan bills through their Chamber. We can do the same. We can do better than the Senate, but we are not.

When the Speaker breaks the House rules, when you see this break down, it just raises the ire because there is not that much crying in the bipartisan way to solve these problems. And there are a lot of good ideas that are bipartisan to solve these problems. The disappointment is that we don’t see those coming to the House floor.

The bills that deal with real policy coming to the House floor are only brought, by and large, from a partisan perspective, and the bipartisan approaches are being discarded.

BDS is one clear example where there is a way to tackle the problem, where Republicans and Democrats came together. Even from the gentleman’s acknowledgement, there is no indication that it is going to move out of committee any time soon. It ought to be under the committee and it ought to be on the House floor, so that we can not only debate it, but pass it, and get a bill to the President’s desk to allow us to stand up more against the BDS movement in support of Israel.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

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

First of all, let me say two things: We are confronting, in my view, an unprecedented refusal of an administration to cooperate with the Congress in the exercise of its constitutional duties. I refer specifically to the issuance of subpoenas, either for testimony or for documentary evidence, so the Congress can properly exercise its oversight responsibilities under the Constitution.

I have been here for some almost four decades, and I have never seen any administration, essentially, direct across the board no response to the Congress of the United States or to its committees. So, yes, we are pursuing.

The gentleman referred to the contempt citation dealing with Mr. Barr and Mr. Ross. Now, the issue at the center of that, as the gentleman knows, is the administration ultimately decided it would not pursue the policies that were the subject of that investigation. However, it is not about specific, but the specific constitutional responsibility that this Congress has to the American people.

We ask for information not on behalf of ourselves individually, but on behalf of the American people, so they will know what their government is doing, there will be a transparency to the operations of government, and they will be able to determine whether or not any administrative official, or the administration generally, is acting on its behalf. Personally or whether it is acting on behalf of the American people.

So, from that perspective, I think the resolutions that we have offered, of which there, essentially, have been two dealing with this issue, and maybe more, the refusal to cooperate with subpoenas has continued.

I hope the gentleman will understand that we are trying to protect the responsibilities and authority of the Congress of the United States, the people’s body, the article I body, to do its duty properly.

Secondly, yes, we did have a very difficult day yesterday. But I will tell my friend from Louisiana that I think it is the absolute responsibility of this body to respond if it sees things that are being done by the administration or by others that it perceives to be contrary to the ideas of this country, contrary to the declaration that we believe that all men and, yes, all women are created equal, the 1960s, looking racism in the States to determine that all were created equal. And a construction period.

And then, as I grew up in the 1950s and the 1960s, looking racism in the face and saying, we reject it, that we reject racism, we reject prejudices, we reject simplifying if people are a certain color, a certain race, a certain nationality, or a certain gender, that somehow, they are less than other Americans. I think it is our responsibility to confront that.

That is what we did yesterday. It was difficult, I understand. I was sorry that it was not a bipartisan vote, because I
don’t believe that Members on your side of the aisle want to tolerate racism any more than we want to tolerate racism. And if we see it, I think we have a responsibility to speak out, to stand up, and to say this is not right in America, this is not America.

So, we had a resolution yesterday that the gentlemen refers to in response to a tweet. It was not the tweet, it was what the tweet said, what it implied, what it diminished in terms of America’s sense of decency and equality and tolerance and inclusion for our people.

Now, let me go to legislation. As the gentleman knows, we have passed substantial pieces of legislation.

We passed H.R. 1. No Republicans voted for that, but it seeks to make it easier for people to vote in America, make sure their vote is protected and counted.

It made sure that we have transparency in the financing of campaigns. It also said that our redistricting was fair to our citizens and that we politicians were not drawing the districts, but that the districts are drawn in fairness to the American people.

It also demanded ethics performance. But there was an anti-hate resolution. It overwhelming passed bipartisan. We passed a Land and Water Conservation Fund that made that fund permanent, a very important bill for a State like Louisiana and, quite frankly, my own State of Maryland, who are all surrounded by water, have a lot of water. That bill got 133 Republicans. It languishes still in the Senate.

We passed the SECURE Act, which makes it easier for people to get retirement security. That was supported by 187 Republicans.

We passed the violence against women reauthorization. Unfortunately, it died because of orining votes, but it got 33 Republicans voting for it. It languishes in the Senate.

We passed a provision that said we want to protect preexisting conditions in the Affordable Care Act. We got 8 Republicans. I would have wished we had gotten more.

We passed disaster relief. The gentleman knows a lot about disaster relief, important to his State. Unfortunately, my own State of Maryland, who are are surrounded by water, have a lot of water. That bill got 133 Republicans. It languishes still in the Senate.

We passed the SECURE Act, which makes it easier for people to get retirement security. That was supported by 187 Republicans.

We passed the violence against women reauthorization. Unfortunately, it died because of orining votes, but it got 33 Republicans voting for it. It languishes in the Senate.

We passed a provision that said we want to protect preexisting conditions in the Affordable Care Act. We got 8 Republicans. I would have wished we had gotten more.

We passed disaster relief. The gentleman knows a lot about disaster relief, important to his State. Unfortunately, we only got 34 Republicans, but it was still 34 Republicans.

We have also passed background checks, which are supported by 90 percent of the American people, to try to make gun violence lessened in the United States of America. For that bill, we only got 8 Republicans.

But those two bills, supported by 90 percent of the American people, languishes in the United States Senate, the majority leader not bringing up that legislation.

We have also passed a national emergency resolution, which said, Mr. President, you can’t take money that we appropriated for X and just send it over to Y. That was, I thought, a protection of our constitutional authority. The Constitution says we raise, and we spend money and we direct the executive—we direct the executive—how to do that. That got 13 Republicans supporting it, a major piece of legislation.

We passed a Cancer Patient Bill. We have been asking for that legislation for almost a decade, or at least 6 years, I should say. And that legislation got no vote over the last 5 years. It got a vote this year. We got a number of Republicans—7 to be exact—to vote for that.

Now, I could go through a number of other pieces of legislation, including, lastly, the minimum wage bill. This was about capitalism, not socialism. We are capitalists over here. We believe in the free market system. We believe the free market system has been the system that has provided the most benefits for the broadest number of people.

I believe that is one of the great facets of our democracy, our free market system. And I will tell my friend, Madam Speaker, that it was Democrats in the 1930s that saved the free market system. It was Democrats in December of 2007 that came in and made sure that the free market system did not crash after 8 years of Republican leadership.

I would hope that the gentleman would not make the assertion that surely he knows is not true, Madam Speaker, that we on this side are looking to support a socialist agenda. We are promoting and continue to promote a socially sensitive agenda for the American people to make sure that they have healthcare.

Medicare was a called a socialist program when it was adopted. That is a program that millions and millions of Americans rely on and have been brought out of poverty. Medicare was a called a socialist program when it was adopted. That program, combined with Social Security, has millions of Americans having a sense of security, a sense of independence, a sense that they are not going to fall through the cracks.

So we ought not to be debating, I say, Madam Speaker, this phony shibboleth of socialism.

The minimum wage is simply saying, in America, we value people who work, who work and we want to make sure that people who work are not living in poverty and have some ability to support themselves and their families in a decent way. We passed that bill today. We are proud of passing that bill.

Very frankly, for 10 years of Republican control of the House of Representatives, we pleaded with them to bring a minimum wage bill of whatever number to the floor, and they didn’t bring a single cent raise in a decade, the longest time since the minimum wage was adopted in the 1930s, to make sure that Americans were lifted out of the deepest recession that this country has ever had.

And so I say to my friend, we have done a lot. I wish the Senate would move it. Let me close in terms of this response. I am very proud of this. We have passed 10 appropriations bills out of 12, the most since 2006. In 2006, the Republicans were in charge. I don’t refer to the gentleman personally, but the Republicans were in charge, and they didn’t bring the Labor-Health bill to the floor. I am not sure why, but I had offered a minimum wage increase in that bill, in the Labor-Health Subcommittee, and they never brought it to the floor.

It passed in committee, even though the Republicans were in charge and the majority of Members in the committee were Republicans. That minimum wage increase passed, but they refused to bring it to the floor. I can only conclude that they are not for increasing the minimum wage.

We disagree with that position. We believe that in America, if you are working, playing by the rules, and making our economy grow, then you ought to be paid a wage that you can survive on and, better than that, live on.

And so I am proud of the legislation that we passed, and I am proud of the 10 appropriations bills, which, by the way, fund 96 percent of the government.

Our colleagues in the Senate, Madam Speaker, have not passed a single appropriations bill through committee, not one.

So we are doing our job, Madam Speaker, and we are addressing the issues of the American people.

I agree 100 percent with the minority, we need to deal with drug pricing. We have pledged to do that. We are working together. The President says he wants to do that. Hopefully, we can get to a consensus.

I agree with the gentleman from Louisiana, Madam Speaker, we haven’t gotten there yet. Hopefully, we can get there. Hopefully, we can strengthen the Affordable Care Act so that people will have the confidence that it will be available to them.

I know that was a relatively—maybe not relatively—a long answer, but I think we have done a lot of work. I am very proud of the 6 months that we have had.

So, we spent the first 35 days trying to open up the government. This is the first Congress in the history of the United States in which the government was shut down when the new Congress started. It has been shut down before, but this was the first time when we started. It took us 35 days to get it open. And when we did get it open, we started on an agenda of which I am proud.
Do we have more work to do? We do. Madam Speaker, I intend to continue on an agenda that does that work.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, there is clearly a lot to cover there. Let’s start with the big debate, and that is what the gentleman alluded to, and that is government control versus freedom, because that is going to be the debate over the next year where there is already a Presidential primary debate process going on.

When you see every candidate for President on one side saying that they want to give free healthcare benefits to people who are here illegally, yet many of them embrace a plan that would literally end private insurance for families that enjoy the healthcare plans they have in the private marketplace, the Medicare for All proposal, there are so many different areas where we see this debate about government control versus freedom.

And, yes, to the gentleman, there are some on his side who refer to themselves as socialist Democrats. And so if they want to call themselves that, then at least own the things that go with socialism and recognize the damage that is done by socialism.

To think that any one party has some kind of ownership of capitalism in the free market system, I would be more than happy to see us engage in a debate about capitalism, because there are some on the other side that attack it on a regular basis.

But if you look at how Republican policies have gotten us to where we are with the economy, taking the economy of the world, our economy is the envy of the world. People’s wages are rising. Low-income people, in fact, are benefiting the most. And we are seeing the increase in the rebuilding of our middle class that was evaporating.

For 8 years in a row under the previous administration, every single quarter, our economy had less than 2 percent growth. The economy wasn’t even growing at the Great Depression that the gentleman cited.

So when we came in with the Republican majority and the Republican President, we were able to pass actual policies like the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, like reversing so many of the radical regulations that we saw that had nothing to do with health and safety but had to do with carrying out an agenda to shut down industries in this country like the fossil fuel industry and everything that are providing not only jobs, lower carbon emission, dominance in the world, helping our friends around the world, and lowering energy prices for families in America.

Those policies have actually been increasing low-income people, not government-controlled prices as passed today where the government is going to try to come in and set artificial rates for what people ought to make as opposed to letting this great market that is working incredibly well raise wages for families.

We have seen the studies. We have seen the University of Washington study, which was cited today, where we can look at real examples of communities that have had artificially high minimum wages, like Seattle, where they put in place a $15 minimum wage. It sounds great. The government is going to set everybody’s rates and tell everyone what they are going to be and how they are going to make, and what it resulted in is over 5 million hours lost for workers.

In fact, the lower income families in Seattle were hurt the most by that policy by a margin of 3 to 1. It damages low-income families and carriers of jobs in America.

Again, it might sound good that the government is going to tell everyone what they can make, but most of us who believe in the free market system reject that idea that we should set policies that are crushing jobs in America.

There is a bar in New York that was closed because of the increase in the minimum wage that one of our colleagues used to work at. It was closed because of an artificially set price, minimum wage, in the city of New York.

So when you look at jobs that are fleeing some communities and going to other communities, that ought to tell you how those policies are working.

But we have an economy, not because we had a lot of government control out of Washington, but, in fact, because we allowed freedom. We allowed people to keep more of what they earned. We allowed people to make their own choices. And it is a successful formula. We want to see more of it.

Now, if we can get into the issue of the harassment agenda, the subpoenas, the finding people in contempt, let’s talk about Secretary Ross and the work that was done to comply with the committee’s request.

If you look, and this is reading from a document sent by Secretary Ross and Attorney General Barr to the committee, it says:

The Department’s engagement with the committee is in good faith compliance, rooted in the separation of powers. As part of that process, both Departments have made multiple witnesses available for voluntary, transcribed interviews and have produced more than 30,000 pages of documents to the committee.

Before the committee abruptly and prematurely terminated the accommodation process last month, the Department of Justice intended to provide a significant number of additional documents identified as responsive to the committee.

They go on to talk about how they were complying with the committee, producing over 30,000 pages of documents just related to the Census. And then the committee abruptly decides they just want to hold him in contempt because there were some documents they wanted that the Attorney General would have actually broken the law if he turned them over.

So you saw a Department complying and going overboard to ensure that the separation of powers and the oversight that existed would continue.

Of course, when we were in the majority and the previous administration of the other party was there, we had a lot of oversight hearings, exercising our Article I powers as we all should, but we didn’t go week after week.

Just this week alone, there was a resolution condemning the President’s tweets, an impeachment resolution, a resolution to hold Secretaries in contempt, and three resolutions of disapproval on policy. That was just this week.

The American people don’t want to see us fighting over power. They want to see us fighting for their needs, the needs of hardworking families.

Again, I identified so many things.

Just to finish up on the resolution that was discussed earlier, the gentleman said we need to respond to things that violate this country’s principles.

First of all, we reject racism wholeheartedly. We reject hate. We reject anti-Semitism.

There have been comments made by Members of the gentleman’s party that have not been addressed on this floor that violate those principles.

We can all bring resolutions broadly stating things, but if the intention is to identify people by name, it is to us, rather conspicuous that, when people of the other party say those things, they are not addressed on this floor by name. And so we know that happened.

Again, the way that the Speaker violated the rules of the House, and then a vote was brought to this floor to basically say that those rules don’t apply to the Speaker.

If the rules don’t apply to the Speaker, then who do they apply to? They ought to apply to all of us equally.

If any of us break the rules of the House and are called out on it and are found by the Chair to be in violation of the rules, then we ought to accept that. We ought not have the vote on the House floor to say, well, the rules apply to some people, but not everybody.

If the rules are in place, they ought to be in place to be enforced equally, not that some in power have an exemption and have a free pass to break those rules.

So if we are going to talk about what we reject, let’s be fair and equal about it.

I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

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

Madam Speaker, I want to go back to this free market and the minimum wage.

The gentleman, Madam Speaker, projects that: Let the free market operate.

We do not allow employers to hire people under a certain age because we want to protect children. I suppose that is interfering with the free market because we know that, throughout the world, we have 8-, 9-, and 10-year-old children being asked to work 10-, 12-, 14-hour days at rudimentary tasks.
Perhaps he believes that we ought to have people work 80, 90 hours a week trying to manage their families and their lives and not have a 40-hour week because of the free market. After all, individuals can decide whether they are going to work 80 or 90 hours a week. We have known that in our history. Perhaps we ought to have a free market that doesn’t worry about whether workers are safe on the job. Whether it is in a mine or a factory, we require places to be safe so that we can protect workers. We don’t believe that undermines the free market system. We think that improves the free market system. So there are rules.

Mr. SCALISE. If I could interject, we share that. That is not an us versus them issue. We agree with those. Obviously, there are some that we disagree with. The ones that the gentleman mentioned are things that we agree with.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, my point to the gentleman is, yes, we think that we need to be paid a decent wage, and we know there are people in our workplace and in our community who have no bargaining power whatsoever. They don’t have fancy college educations, and they don’t have fancy skills but they are needed in our economy. They are needed to do things that the community needs done. When you go to a hotel, you hope that bed is made up. You hope the bathrooms are clean. When you go to the grocery store, you hope that the peas and corn have been picked.

We believe that those folks are necessary for our community and need to be paid a decent wage, just as we think they need to be safe. I am glad the gentleman agrees on that. I thought he did.

But my point, Madam Speaker, is that there is an analogy here to safety, to hours, to working conditions, and yes, to wages.

I don’t know that the party that the gentleman represents has ever offered an increase in the minimum wage. I am going to check on that. I don’t know. Since I have been here, they have not. It has always been us offering the increase.

President George Bush, to his credit, signed the Fair Minimum Wage Act in 2007, which was still less than it was in 1968. As a matter of fact, it is 40 percent less today than it was in 1968. Workers are being paid 40 percent less. Lastly, I will say, Madam Speaker, one thing our party agrees with is that men and women have a right to come together and bargain collectively for their wages, their working conditions, and their benefits. They need to be on some degree of parity because we know that with big employers, and even small employers, individuals are not on parity. They either do this or don’t, and if there are no rules, then people are subject, in my view and in my observation, to unfair tactics that they have no defense against other than us. I say to my friend, I think he and I agree on hours, hopefully, the age at which people can work, and on safety conditions in workplaces. I am not sure about bargaining collectively in unions. I think they are critical to the creation of a middle class and the maintenance of a strong middle class. We also strongly believe in the free market.

I could pick out one or two of your Members who may have some differences of agreement. I won’t mention any names, but I can think of some names on the gentleman’s side of the aisle. I am sure the gentleman can as well and, in fact, does disagree, from his perspective, with some people on my side of the aisle. But we intend to continue to be very supportive of building jobs.

My friend knows that I have an agenda. I call it Make It In America. It is about growing jobs, growing enterprises, helping entrepreneurs, and making sure that people have good wages and a good future through the free enterprise system.

Mr. SCALISE. Clearly, Madam Speaker, if we talk about what makes this country great, it is the freedoms and the economic success that we have seen for families, businesses, and everyone. It is everybody who comes here from all around the world. What we have done to create this great free market system has unleashed potential for anybody to come here and be anything they want to be.

I have been proud to help pass policies that have actually increased wages for families not through government price controls but through economic growth and through giving people more of their money back instead of their having to come to Washington to get a handout or come to union boss to get the amount that they can earn. They can actually do it on their own.

It is playing out in reality, not in theory, but in reality, where we are seeing the lowest-income workers benefiting the most from our policies of cutting taxes, not by telling people how much they can make but by letting them go out and make even more on their own.

They are doing it. It is the lower-income people who are benefiting the most from those policies. We ought to encourage more of that.

The unemployment rate amongst African Americans and Hispanics is at the lowest rate in our country’s history not through government controls but by cutting taxes and letting them have more of their money, by seeing businesses grow, and by hiring more people.

We are seeing more job openings today than there are people looking for work. That is what is so exciting.

We see that women-owned businesses are up 20 percent over the last few years because of these conservative policies that I have helped pass.

Yes, when I support right-to-work laws, if a person wants to go work for a company that happens to be in a union-based industry or a union-based State, and they say they don’t want dues forced out of their paychecks, to give dues to somebody who believes in things that they don’t agree with, they shouldn’t be forced to do that. In many places, they are.

I want more individual freedom. I want more ability for people to go out and live that American Dream, to start up their own business in their garage and then one day maybe become a billion-dollar company. That was that opportunity provided to them, not our telling them how much they can make, but our allowing them, in a safe way, the ability to go be the best they can be.

I will use an example because I know the gentleman and I share the belief that people need to be safe in the workplace, and we need to do all we can to ensure that. Look at deepwater drilling in the Gulf of Mexico, which is based on parts of my State. Port Fourchon in Louisiana is the hub of all that deepwater drilling that we saw.

There was the horrible tragedy, the Deepwater Horizon. People died, and the environment was polluted. That was done not because there weren’t enough laws in place but because a company broke the laws. A company went around those safety standards that we put in place. They went out and polluted them. We fined them. I passed a bill out of this House in a very bipartisan way called the RESTORE Act that ensured that they pay billions of dollars back to fix the damage that they had done and to hold that company accountable for what they had done. Its purpose was not to shut the whole industry down, because every other company that was out there had done things the right way.

What we saw from the previous administration was a rule that came out called the Well Control Rule that wasn’t rooted in safety. After industry did an even better job to put well containment in place so that, if something like that ever happened again, they could quickly move to stop it, instead of government working to help expedite that process, government sat back and waited until industry came up with the right way to solve that problem on their own. Then, it came up with a rule that actually would have undermined the new safety standards they put in place. It would have made it difficult because Washington would have been able to shut this company down in the middle of the Gulf of Mexico instead of understanding that pressure changes instantly and that they have to be able to respond to it.

Government was setting a standard that would have undermined safety. Luckily, we reversed that Obama-era rule that would have made things less safe.

Lastly, I will say, Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.
Let's not think that every regulation is about increasing safety. We ought to stand together to support safety standards and strengthen them where we can. There may be rules and regulations that undermine safety because some people just don't want drilling for oil, and some people support the Green New Deal kind of approaches that I and many don't. But don't try to undermine safety just to shut an industry down because people don't believe in it.

After September 11, our government came in many ways, politically and policy-wise, to address what had happened. We didn't shut down the entire airline industry. We made safety standards at airports better so that people who get on a plane feel more comfortable that somebody doesn't have box cutters, guns, or knives that can undermine the safety of those people and of our country. Then, we got planes back up and running very quickly.

Safety standards are something we both share. But when government gets in the way just because they don't agree with what somebody is doing, that is a different story. That is the kind of government control versus freedom that are seeing play out and will continue seeing play out. I am sure, over the next year and a half between now and next November.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, we could go another another minutes, but I am going to comment on one of the things the gentleman said about the person who wanted to go to work for a company but didn't want to join the union and right-to-work. The probability is the reason you wanted to work for that company was because the wages were good, the benefits were good, and safety conditions were good, which the union got, but he or she doesn't want to pay dues to the union. They don't have to join the union; they have to pay dues to the union.

I think it is somewhat ironic but demonstrative that when the gentleman speaks of safety regulations, very frankly, Republicans spent a lot of time, when they were in charge, passing reductions of regulations that we think undermine the safety of consumers, workers, and individuals.

We have a disagreement on that, Madam Speaker, but that is what we believe, and that is the tension here. We represent, I think, an attitude that we need to make sure that everybody plays by the rules so that people are safe.

In any event, we will discuss that further. I am sure, in the coming days, weeks, and maybe years.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's comments. I respect our ability to have these disagreements but, again, to disagree in a civil way where we can at least talk about the policy and keep it focused that way and, hopefully, one day address those areas of concern that we both share and that we can both solve working together.

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

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW, AND ADJOURNMENT FROM FRIDAY, JULY 19, 2019, TO TUESDAY, JULY 23, 2019

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9:30 a.m. tomorrow; and, further, when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet on Tuesday, July 23, 2019, when it shall convene at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

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

There was no objection.

PROTECT RETIREES' EARNED PENSIONS

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, pensioners have afforded millions of middle-class Americans the opportunity to enjoy their golden years with economic peace of mind.

Congress did not ensure that security for all retirees when it passed the Multiemployer Pension Reform Act in December 2014, attaching it to unrelated, must-pass legislation.

For the past 5 years, I have listened to the anxiety of thousands of retirees from Ohio and across our Nation, and I have fought for a better solution for them.

Next week, this body will consider the Rehabilitation for Multiemployer Pensions Act, better known as the Butch Lewis Act. This bill is long overdue and a great step toward restoring economic security for over 1,300,000 pensioners in our country.

Congress can provide relief for these 1.3 million workers and retirees in plans running out of money through no fault of the workers. Many of these hardworking individuals worked 30 years or more but now, every day, they live with economic uncertainty, some facing drastic cuts, as much as 70 percent, to their earned pensions. Many of these individuals are too old to return to the workforce. This is criminal.

Madam Speaker, Congress should improve our constituents' lives. It is with great anticipation that next week we offer a glimmer of hope for millions of pensioners caught far out on the ledge of economic disaster. The Butch Lewis Act is overdue and a reasonable solution to address this multi-employer pension crisis and end the economic terror that affects these retirees' lives.

LITTLE LEAGUE TEAM FROM HUMBOLDT PARK

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

Mr. GARCIA of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I would like to today, recognize the historic feat from a team of boys aged 11 to 13 in my district.

The Roberto Clemente Little League of Humboldt Park in Chicago made history on Monday, July 15, by becoming Illinois champions and advancing to the regionals. They are the first Little League team from Humboldt Park to ever qualify and represent the city and the State of Illinois. It is exciting to know that these kids have a real chance of making it to the Little League World Series.

As a father, grandfather, and an avid baseball fan, their achievement makes me extremely proud. They are showing us the power of sports and community, and I would like to congratulate them, their coaches, and their families, for their determination.

The Roberto Clemente Little League of Humboldt Park is bringing a lot of joy and pride to the Fourth Congressional District and the State of Illinois. We are just getting started. Go Roberto Clemente Little Leaguers.

IN RECOGNITION OF MAJOR GENERAL MARK BERRY

(Mr. WESTERMAN asked and was given permission to address the House
IN RECOGNITION OF STENNIS SPACE CENTER TEAM

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

Mr. GUEST. Madam Speaker, 50 years ago, rockets tested at the Mississippi Test Facility, now known as the Stennis Space Center, carried Neil Armstrong, Buzz Aldrin, and Michael Collins high above the Earth’s atmosphere.

These brave Americans were aided by the technical and engineering expertise of Mississippi engineers. The men and women at the Stennis Space Center conducted 2,475 man-years of rocket engine testing to ensure that the astronauts successfully carried American ingenuity toward the stars and returned home safely to a proud nation.

Following the successful mission, the Stennis Space Center team continued to support the Apollo program by performing tests on the Saturn V rockets and continues today to support NASA in our exploration of space.

As a Mississippian, I join the rest of our States as we remember the crucial role we played in this historic accomplishment of our great Nation.

Betsy gave her time and energy selflessly for the people of the Fifth District, working many, many late nights, many weekends, and long days. She has taken meetings with every organization and visited nearly every school and medical facility-based government office in the counties I represent.

Betsy Bossart has been so successful as my district director because she is an excellent listener and has a deep wellspring of empathy for people.

She has been a role model, Madam Speaker, for others on my staff and a champion, an advocate for young people coming into public service and waiting to make differences in their communities and in their country.

She has been an unsung hero of my team for three decades. It is largely because of Betsy’s hard work behind the scenes that we are able to make the Fifth District and our country.

Because of her, we have robust support for the network of early childhood centers in Maryland named in memory of my wife, Judy, who had a wonderful relationship with Betty Richardson.

Maryland’s Judy Centers will always be a major part of Betsy’s legacy, and the thousands of children and families who benefited from their services may not know Betsy or what she did to make these centers possible, but they will always owe her and her colleagues who partnered with her on that effort a debt of gratitude.

Along with her friend and my friend, Betty Richardson—another longtime member of my team who has retired but remains very active in my district—as partners, Betty and Betsy were also instrumental in launching the annual Fifth District Black History Luncheon, dedicated to advancing women’s equality and raising awareness of women leaders in the Fifth District and our country.

Because of her, we have robust support for the network of early childhood centers in Maryland named in memory of my wife, Judy, who had a wonderful relationship with Betty Richardson.

Maryland’s Judy Centers will always be a major part of Betsy’s legacy, and the thousands of children and families who benefited from their services may not know Betsy or what she did to make these centers possible, but they will always owe her and her colleagues who partnered with her on that effort a debt of gratitude.

Along with her friend and my friend, Betty Richardson—another longtime member of my team who has retired but remains very active in my district—as partners, Betty and Betsy were also instrumental in launching the annual Fifth District Black History Luncheon, dedicated to advancing women’s equality and raising awareness of women leaders in the Fifth District and our country.
As majority leader and Democratic whip over the past 16 years, I have had to balance service to our district with my responsibilities to our Caucus and to our country. Betsy has spent every single day of that time making sure that our district comes first. I will miss Betsy. I expect to remain her friend throughout my life, but I will miss her daily advice and expertise, though I am relieved that she will always be just a phone call away.

As she retires, Madam Speaker, to spend more time with her husband and their family in Pennsylvania, I hope my colleagues will join me in thanking Betsy Bossart for 30 dedicated years, yes, to me, but, more importantly, to our constituents, to our State, and to our country.

Madam Speaker, were I to speak another 2 hours—as some fear—I could not thank Betsy Bossart enough.

God bless Betsy Bossart, a wonderful friend, a wonderful American.

SUPPORT MILITARY SURVIVING SPOUSES

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, today is legislative day 5 since House Democrats subverted the House Rules Committee to force an amendment on the Military Surviving Spouses Equity Act. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, who were recruited by individual citizens. This would end the widow's tax.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, our country, to our constituents, to our State, and to our country. My amendment would eliminate political action committees and “dark money.” Funding for a candidate or ballot measure would be limited to the use of a public financing system or donations given directly to the campaign by individual citizens. This would end much of the corruption in Washington.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to do everything possible to help limit corruption in Washington, including supporting this legislation.

ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CARTER), a former district judge.

SPEAKING IN O F THE HONORABLE RICHARD HUDSON INTO THE TEXAS NAVY

Mr. CARTER of Texas. Madam Speaker, I thank my good friend, Mr. GOHMERT, for yielding.

I rise today to honor my dear friend, Congressman Richard Hudson of North Carolina.

Congressman Hudson served as my chief of staff from 2006 to 2008 and is now forging his own path right here on Capitol Hill.

Some time ago, Congressman Hudson gave me a hard time about other Members being recognized as “Honorary Texans” by Governor Abbott. Well, after speaking with the Governor, we have gone one step further with our recognition here today, and I am pleased to swear in Richard L. Hudson to the Texas Navy.

I will now read the certificate granting his commission:

“In the name and by the authority of The State of Texas to all to whom these presents shall come, Greetings. Know ye, that Richard Hudson is hereby commissioned an honorary Admiral in the Texas Navy with all rights and privileges appertaining thereto and with the duty of assisting in the preservation of the history, boundaries, water resources, and defense of the State.

“In testimony whereof, I have signed my name and caused the Seal of the State of Texas to be affixed at the City of Austin, this the 10th day of May, 2019.”

Signed: Greg Abbott, Governor of Texas.

I am now going to read the oath that Mr. Hudson will take as he takes this commission:

“I, Richard Hudson, do solemnly swear that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States and the State of Texas against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; and that I will obey the orders of the President of the United States, the Governor of Texas, and the orders of the officers appointed over me, according to regulations and the Uniform Code of Military Justice. And I will re-member the Alamo. So help me God.”

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. Hudson).

Mr. HUDSON. Madam Speaker, I thank Mr. GOHMERT for yielding, and I thank Judge Carter for this incredible honor. The gentleman is a dear friend and someone I admire very much. His love for the State of Texas is unmatched.

This truly is an honor. I am proud to be a North Carolinian, but I do love the State of Texas.

I would first suggest that we should all remember that seven North Carolinians, if my recollection is correct, died defending the Alamo.

I also have family ties to Texas. My great uncle Joseph Wesley Humphrey was a deputy sheriff, a member of the Texas legislature, and county judge in Rains County, Texas.

Another great uncle, Reverend Daniel A. McRae, was a Methodist minister in San Augustine County, Texas. I believe that might even be in Mr. Gohmert’s district. And the church and the cemetery there is still named “McRae” after my great uncle.

So I do have family ties. I do love the State. I am deeply honored to receive this commission, honorary as it may be, and I will be proud to recite the oath:

I, Richard Hudson, do solemnly swear that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States and of the State of Texas against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; and that I will obey the President of the United States, the Governor of Texas, and the orders of the officers appointed over me, according to regulations and the Uniform Code of Military Justice. And I will re-member the Alamo. So help me God.

Madam Speaker, I thank Judge Carter.

Mr. CARTER of Texas. Madam Speaker, I congratulate Mr. Hudson.

Mr. GOHMERT. It is wonderful to have a new admiral in the Texas Navy, and we welcome Congressman Hudson to that role, that honorary role, in the Texas Navy.

And we are grateful to Judge Carter for his role in making that happen and to our great Governor Greg Abbott. I thank both the gentlemen.
It is nice to be able to do something that brings a smile. But I think, for Texans to ask that people remember the Alamo harkens back to feelings within us that freedom and liberty are something worth dying for. That is what all of those Texans did.

And with due deference to my friend from Tennessee, MARSHA BLACKBURN—yes, I know—we are grateful to Tennessee for their contribution at the Alamo and to Texas as well.

But if the Alamo has a choice: Were they going to run or were they going to stand for freedom, stand against despotism. And they chose to stand.

And here it is 163 years later, and we still remember, and we are still inspired. Liberty comes at great cost, and we are forever grateful to our God and to our predecessors who took such a stand against tyranny.

There is a lot of tyranny going on in the Middle East, and there will be until the end of time. But each of us has a responsibility to keep those things that we can do to help accommodate and protect those who can’t help themselves.

That is why some of us are pro-life. But when it comes to life in the Middle East, it has been shocking now for years to see how the previous administration, the people that were supported, the weapons that were provided to people that were called the “vetted moderate rebels” against the leader of Syria.

Yet we saw over and over again those so-called “vetted moderate rebels” were constantly allowing their weapons to be seized—there is some question whether they were actually turned over—to radical Islamists who hate Americans, who made clear, yeah, they are not crazy about some fellow Muslims, but they like them a whole lot better than they do the United States and Christians.

So it was tragic, in years prior, when our current president, now general secretary was in charge of the refugee program at the U.N. and people were noticing, under the then head of the refugee program at the U.N., how general secretary—they were noticing that, gee, you are helping all these Muslims, which is wonderful, but there is a significant percentage in those areas, some areas there, that are being overrun by ISIS, where there are Christians and the Christians appear to be the target of genocide.

And it has been a long time since I read his quote, but in essence it was basically, well, those Christians are very important to those areas historically where they are, and so we think it is important to just let them stay in those areas.

Well, what Christians had found was, if they tried to go to the refugee camps where they were unwelcome and brutalized, they were lucky if they got out with their lives. But they weren’t welcome.

And the head of the refugee program did nothing that we can find to accommodate Christians to the extent that he was accommodating Muslims. I don’t know if it was an innate bias, prejudice, bigotry that he had—maybe still has—or whether it was just sheer ignorance on his part, deciding to save some people and not save a bigbulk of the Christians.

So they were being wiped out. There was a genocide going on.

I saw this story today by Edwin Mora. The title of the article is, “Hope is Back: Trump Helps Save Christians, Yazidis in Iraq From Extinction.”

It goes on to say, “U.S. President Donald Trump’s administration is helping bring Christians and Yazidis in Iraq back from the brink of extinction—fomented by a radical campaign against the hands of the Islamic State, religious minority representatives declared this week at the second Ministerial to Advance Religious Freedom convened by the Department of State.

“The U.S. Government has officially determined that ISIS committed genocide against Christians, Yazidis, and other religious minorities during its reign of terror in the Middle East that began in 2014.

“Of course, that was when the Obama administration was in its heyday. Of course, we didn’t realize how much the DOJ, FBI, and some of the Intel community had been weaponized and actually corrupted.

“The article goes on, “Echoing Yazidis activists and a U.S.-based Syrian Catholic Iraqi priest who spoke to Breitbart News, a Chaldean Catholic priest from a parish in a Christian Iraqi town who donated his personal fortune to the future along with security improvements have returned to religious minority communities devastated by ISIS, courtesy of the Trump administration efforts.’’

“Those comments came during the 3-day ministerial summit.

“While delivering a speech during the event on Wednesday, Father Thabet Habib Youssef, a Chaldean Catholic priest from the town of Karamles in Iraq’s Nineveh Province, thanked the Trump administration for its assistance.’’

And this is what Father Youssef had to say:

“I wish to give thanks to the government of the United States for including us in this important conference and a special thanks to the administration of President Trump for his concern and commitment to the persecuted minority communities in Iraq.

“I can say this conference gives us hope. Our greatest fear in the early years was that the world would forget us. This conference tells us we are not forgotten.”

“Nearly half of the Christian families who fled Karamles, liberated by U.S. and local forces in November 2016, have returned, and Father Thabet expects many more to come back in the coming years.

“Although ISIS burned down the homes and churches in the Christian town, ‘We are determined to return and rebuild.’

“Today we have 45 percent of our families returned, and we hope in this next year we will see many more.’

“He went on to say that the Iraqi government needs to do more to bring about ‘real change and support for the protection, safety, and equal rights for the minority communities.’

“The U.S.-funded nation-building efforts, coupled with”—and let me make myself clear on this, I’m talking about helping others build their nations—for those who claim that America is trying to do some good in the world, there is no more imperialistic notions, as it always has—it just tells us they had terrible history teachers.

They are not intentionally spreading untruths. They are just ignorant. They don’t know what the real truth is because the real truth is, we have never been an imperialistic nation. If we were, if we had been then English would be all that was spoken in France, and Germany, and Japan, and many other nations. That is not who we are. That is not who we have been.

We have given our most precious commodity, American lives, for another people’s freedom.

Back to this article. It says: ‘The U.S.-funded nation-building efforts, coupled with assistance from the Catholic group Knights of Columbus and the government of Hungary, have rendered the town of Karamles a ‘story of success and we are optimistic it will survive,’” Father Thabet also said.

“Northern Iraq’s Nineveh province is the historical homeland of Iraqi Christians and home to the largest concentration of religious minorities in the country.’

So it goes on and also talks about the help this has been to Yazidis.

And I note this week we had resolutions or amendments and express the majority of the House’s sentiment that we shouldn’t do anything to help in the effort against those who are killing, persecuting, and trying to commit a genocide against the Yazidis in Yemen. But, thankfully, that is only from the majority in the House. That is really unfortunate.

But there has also been news this week that we may have a very strong anti-Israeli resolution filed. Why not? The majority doesn’t ever condemn the anti-Semitism by Members here in the House; so why not file a resolution? We will see if it gets filed. That is the news.

That resolution supports the boycott against Israel; even though the people it supports, that resolution would support, would be the very people that have said they want Israel wiped off the map. They want no Israel from the river to the sea. They want it gone. They want a genocide. They want the Jews wiped out, and that is a goal.

It was a goal of why, when Ehud Barak, as prime minister of Israel, when President Clinton was twisting his arm so strongly, basically
offered Arafat virtually everything he wanted. I, personally, knowing biblical history, I think you had a case where, just as God hardened the heart of Pharaoh, initially, when Moses was asking to let his people go, I think Arafat’s heart was hardened. But, as our President did, you take an innocent man like that and have him put to death simply because you had too many jurors that got each other worked up. So that is where Rome made a great stride forward. They said, you know what? This way you have a system. It was a good idea, but there were problems with a complete democracy, where everybody participates in all governing decisions, except jurors, and that is 501.

But for those of us who do, when we are told that any nation that divides or attacks Israel, or supports the people that are there, he had jurors, they would have 501 jurors in a democracy. They said, you know what? This way you have a system. It was a good idea, but there were problems with a complete democracy, where everybody participates in all governing decisions, except jurors, and that is 501.

So the point is, too late to rein it in and, for all of these factors, and others coming into play, people crossing the borders, and taking a toll, the Roman Empire was eventually lost. No country is going to last forever. I love this country. I have offered to die for this country. That is what you do when you sign up and take an oath in the United States military than anybody else in recent decades. It is amazing what President Trump not to recognize Jerusalem as the capital. He knew in his heart it was the right thing to do. He had said he would do it; he did it. I know some can’t find anything at all admirable about President Trump; they are so blinded by their hatred, or whatever it is, that a good thing that President Trump has done. And now, to hear from Christians in the Middle East who were the objects of genocide, being wiped out, being destroyed, taken off the map completely, without much of anything helpful from the so-called United Nations, it is amazing what President Trump has done in that regard.

So when I hear friends across the aisle saying we have lost respect around the world, they are not seeing and hearing what I am. The last polls I saw were that, around the world, there is more respect for our President than the prior administration. And the truth is, in respect, there is a little element of fear. You can not like somebody, but still respect them, and fear can be involved.

We have a reputation that is growing again, that we have a President that will do what he said. Sometimes he is talked about like somebody, but still respect them, and fear can be involved.

And I would humbly submit, this will not be a President who, in response to the biggest supporter of terrorism in world history, sends them pallets filled of billions and billions of dollars in cash to help the biggest supporter of terrorism, who has killed and been responsible for the deaths of more Americans military than anybody else in recent decades. So they can say what they want about our President. He is doing amazing work.

And it is interesting, I keep hearing this term “racist” and the President keeps talking about American citizens. Well, until recent days, it has never been racist to talk about American citizens.

In fact, going back again to the comment of Benjamin Franklin after the Constitutional Convention: “It’s a republic, if you can keep it.” He knew that republics, the very few that have been established, that just means they elect representatives. It is not the totally democratic governing that was, for example, in Athens, as a city state. They had a democracy. And what historians have seen, clearly, is that when it is a true democracy, where everybody participates—they had jurors, they would have 501 jurors in just a court case. And what that would lead to, what would be mob action. I mean, people get stirred up, and they end up coming out with a sentence like they did for Socrates, that was far beyond anything appropriate whatsoever. You take an innocent man like that and have him put to death simply because you had too many jurors that got each other worked up.

So that is where Rome made a great stride forward. They said, you know what? This way you have a system. It was a good idea, but there were problems with a complete democracy, where everybody participates in all governing decisions, except jurors, and that is 501.
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We have a reputation that is growing again, that we have a President that will do what he said. Sometimes he is talked about like somebody, but still respect them, and fear can be involved.

And I would humbly submit, this will not be a President who, in response to the biggest supporter of terrorism in world history, sends them pallets filled of billions and billions of dollars in cash to help the biggest supporter of terrorism, who has killed and been responsible for the deaths of more American citizens than anybody else in recent decades. So they can say what they want about our President. He is doing amazing work.

And it is interesting, I keep hearing this term “racist” and the President keeps talking about American citizens. Well, until recent days, it has never been racist to talk about American citizens.

In fact, going back again to the comment of Benjamin Franklin after the Constitutional Convention: “It’s a republic, if you can keep it.” He knew that republics, the very few that have been established, that just means they elect representatives. It is not the totally democratic governing that was, for example, in Athens, as a city state. They had a democracy. And what historians have seen, clearly, is that when it is a true democracy, where everybody participates—they had jurors, they would have 501 jurors in just a court case. And what that would lead to, what would be mob action. I mean, people get stirred up, and they end up coming out with a sentence like they did for Socrates, that was far beyond anything appropriate whatsoever. You take an innocent man like that and have him put to death simply because you had too many jurors that got each other worked up.
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But for those of us who do, when we are told that any nation that divides or attacks Israel, or supports the people that are there, they are not seeing and hearing what I am. The last polls I saw were that, around the world, there is more respect for our President than the prior administration. And the truth is, in respect, there is a little element of fear. You can not like somebody, but still respect them, and fear can be involved.

We have a reputation that is growing again, that we have a President that will do what he said. Sometimes he is talked about like somebody, but still respect them, and fear can be involved.

And I would humbly submit, this will not be a President who, in response to the biggest supporter of terrorism in world history, sends them pallets filled of billions and billions of dollars in cash to help the biggest supporter of terrorism, who has killed and been responsible for the deaths of more American citizens than anybody else in recent decades. So they can say what they want about our President. He is doing amazing work.

And it is interesting, I keep hearing this term “racist” and the President keeps talking about American citizens. Well, until recent days, it has never been racist to talk about American citizens.

In fact, going back again to the comment of Benjamin Franklin after the Constitutional Convention: “It’s a republic, if you can keep it.” He knew that republics, the very few that have been established, that just means they elect representatives. It is not the totally democratic governing that was, for example, in Athens, as a city state. They had a democracy. And what historians have seen, clearly, is that when it is a true democracy, where everybody participates—they had jurors, they would have 501 jurors in just a court case. And what that would lead to, what would be mob action. I mean, people get stirred up, and they end up coming out with a sentence like they did for Socrates, that was far beyond anything appropriate whatsoever. You take an innocent man like that and have him put to death simply because you had too many jurors that got each other worked up.
Well, the saying in Washington is no matter how cynical you get, it is never enough to catch up. But you go by what we have seen.

People in this body often, and it has happened on both sides of the aisle, like to embellish with money, get it extended out as far as possible, way beyond the existence of people for whom it is dedicated, and then when those people eventually pass away, you will see an effort to come in here and say, wow, we had all this money, but we have passed overwhelmingly, and now the people aren’t there that it was originally meant for, so let’s start giving this money to other people, people that we want to curry favor with.

That is not the way it is supposed to go. I voted for it out of respect for our heroes, but for goodness’ sake, 2092, seriously? How could anybody with a straight face say: Oh, if you are not for paying out billions and billions of dollars in the 9/11 fund and will money, get it extended out as far as possible, way beyond the existence of people for whom it is dedicated, and then when those people eventually pass away, you will see an effort to come in here and say, wow, we had all this money, but we have passed overwhelmingly, and now the people aren’t there that it was originally meant for, so let’s start giving this money to other people, people that we want to curry favor with.

That is not the way it is supposed to go. I voted for it out of respect for our heroes, but for goodness’ sake, 2092, seriously? How could anybody with a straight face say: Oh, if you are not for paying out billions and billions of dollars in the 9/11 fund and will money, get it extended out as far as possible, way beyond the existence of people for whom it is dedicated, and then when those people eventually pass away, you will see an effort to come in here and say, wow, we had all this money, but we have passed overwhelmingly, and now the people aren’t there that it was originally meant for, so let’s start giving this money to other people, people that we want to curry favor with.

That is not the way it is supposed to go. I voted for it out of respect for our heroes, but for goodness’ sake, 2092, seriously? How could anybody with a straight face say: Oh, if you are not for paying out billions and billions of dollars in the 9/11 fund and will money, get it extended out as far as possible, way beyond the existence of people for whom it is dedicated, and then when those people eventually pass away, you will see an effort to come in here and say, wow, we had all this money, but we have passed overwhelmingly, and now the people aren’t there that it was originally meant for, so let’s start giving this money to other people, people that we want to curry favor with.

That is not the way it is supposed to go. I voted for it out of respect for our heroes, but for goodness’ sake, 2092, seriously? How could anybody with a straight face say: Oh, if you are not for paying out billions and billions of dollars in the 9/11 fund and will money, get it extended out as far as possible, way beyond the existence of people for whom it is dedicated, and then when those people eventually pass away, you will see an effort to come in here and say, wow, we had all this money, but we have passed overwhelmingly, and now the people aren’t there that it was originally meant for, so let’s start giving this money to other people, people that we want to curry favor with.

That is not the way it is supposed to go. I voted for it out of respect for our heroes, but for goodness’ sake, 2092, seriously? How could anybody with a straight face say: Oh, if you are not for paying out billions and billions of dollars in the 9/11 fund and will money, get it extended out as far as possible, way beyond the existence of people for whom it is dedicated, and then when those people eventually pass away, you will see an effort to come in here and say, wow, we had all this money, but we have passed overwhelmingly, and now the people aren’t there that it was originally meant for, so let’s start giving this money to other people, people that we want to curry favor with.

That is not the way it is supposed to go. I voted for it out of respect for our heroes, but for goodness’ sake, 2092, seriously? How could anybody with a straight face say: Oh, if you are not for paying out billions and billions of dollars in the 9/11 fund and will money, get it extended out as far as possible, way beyond the existence of people for whom it is dedicated, and then when those people eventually pass away, you will see an effort to come in here and say, wow, we had all this money, but we have passed overwhelmingly, and now the people aren’t there that it was originally meant for, so let’s start giving this money to other people, people that we want to curry favor with.

That is not the way it is supposed to go. I voted for it out of respect for our heroes, but for goodness’ sake, 2092, seriously? How could anybody with a straight face say: Oh, if you are not for paying out billions and billions of dollars in the 9/11 fund and will money, get it extended out as far as possible, way beyond the existence of people for whom it is dedicated, and then when those people eventually pass away, you will see an effort to come in here and say, wow, we had all this money, but we have passed overwhelmingly, and now the people aren’t there that it was originally meant for, so let’s start giving this money to other people, people that we want to curry favor with.
and it is a humanitarian crisis on our southern border. And it is no longer just a humanitarian crisis for those who are pouring over our border illegally. They are taking their toll on the border patrolmen. Some have suspected that; Gee, maybe that is a strategy of the Democratic Party.

You keep talking about amnesty, about getting rid of border enforcement, which will encourage more and more people to come in. You keep claiming that people, no matter whether they came in illegally or legally, should be allowed to vote and keep encouraging people in.

You refuse to give a dime for border enforcement. You refuse to give a dime for beds to house people who are pouring in illegally for what they need to be able to detain people that commit criminal acts in coming into the country.

You continue to talk about doing away with any criminality to violating the law and more people come in.

You devastate those officers who have taken an oath to defend our border and our Constitution, and they are already having recruiting problems.

Why would somebody want to come work for you when you have got a major party of the two in the country that castigates you at every turn, says you can’t or won’t protect babies, children, you do not care, you are mean, you are evil, when you are out there doing everything you can, and you are being harassed, being given what you need? And then we had this bill this week in Judiciary talking about it was going to add millions and millions and millions of dollars of requirements for the Border Patrol to have to follow, lest they be pursued with some kind of charge or allegation, and yet not give them a dime to do those jobs, knowing that the result will be more and more people flooding in, more and more humanitarian crisis. Then you blame the human being, and those are the people who are trying to secure our Nation.

Then you get an allowance for all of those people who have poured in illegally, and many of them don’t speak English. They don’t know what is going on. They have never been educated on how you sustain a self-governing country.

All I can figure, the assessment has to have been made, yes, it will have our country in chaos for a little while, and we will have to take away some freedoms because of all the chaos, but, as Democrats have said, that will end the Republican Party nationally, as the Democrats were able to do in California with 2 or 3 million pouring in and voting that had come in illegally after the amnesty in 1986.

Actually, after 1986, when they were given amnesty, now it is legal for them to vote, and they changed California into a very Democratic State.

And there is an assessment: We can do that for the Nation and eliminate the Republican Party as having any kind of viability. And then once we do that, even though it has taken quite a toll on the country, we will get control back. We will get that done. The result will be, that, even Ronald Reagan, historians throughout time have noted, once you have a country that has had great freedom and it loses that freedom, it doesn’t come back. Reagan said not in that generation, but I have trouble finding where it ever came back once a nation of freedom lost it. That is a real potential if we don’t get things under control.

I think God has blessed this country more than any country. I know Solomon’s Israel was just an absolutely amazing place, but there is no place that has ever had our opportunities, our individual freedoms, our individual assets, never in the history of the world.

There is nothing wrong with recognizing the greatness that America has been. It is only in recognizing America’s greatness that you can determine we want to perpetuate that for future generations to have those opportunities, those freedoms, those assets.

But we are in trouble, and there has got to be a change or our time as the greatest country in history will be a self-fulfilling prophesy of those who say: “Ah, it was never that great.” “Nah, it is not a great country.” “No, I have always been embarrassed of America.” That will become a self-fulfilling prophesy. We will lose our greatness, We will lose our freedom.

I said to three individuals from Australia who were here on Capitol Hill a couple years ago: Hey, I have had people up here say when we lose our freedom, I guess we can all come to Australia.

Neither of them even laughed. One of them said: Do you not understand, if you lose your freedom in America, China will take over Australia before you could ever get there?

America is a shining light on a hill. We give people hope. I have heard it and seen it from Africans with tears in their eyes—and, yes, they were Christians. Maybe you would be prejudiced against them. But they said: We need America strong if we are going to have any chance of security and freedom in our own country.

Let’s keep America strong. Let’s support Israel. Let’s support enforcing the law as it is, as it has been, and as we need it to pay for and perpetuate this incredible country.

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

FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. CASE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

General Leave

Mr. CASE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to read and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE. Madam Speaker, I rise as a proud member of the Democratic Blue Dog Coalition.

For a quarter century, the Blue Dogs in Congress have focused on three missions: fiscal responsibility for our country, a strong national defense, and commonsense solutions to practical problems.

We are 27 proud Democrats with democratic values. Our individual views and votes on the broad range of issues that come before this Congress run the gamut from progressive to moderate, centrist, and beyond; but together, we believe that the best way forward for our country on all of these issues is an underlying focus on fiscal responsibility, a strong national defense, and commonsense solutions wherever they may be found to practical problems.

Today, I wish to focus on fiscal responsibility. I do so as co-chair with my colleague from Utah, Mr. McCAIN, of the Blue Dog Task Force on Fiscal Responsibility and Government Reform.

Let me start by saying, unfortunately, and very directly that it is very arguable that at no point in our entire history have we operated our Federal Government in as fiscally irresponsible a manner as we are operating it today.

There are lots of indicia of this out there, but nowhere does this show up more clearly, and more starkly than in the face of our national debt. Let me say what that is.

Our national debt is exactly what it sounds like. It is the amount that our Federal Government—you—owe to everyone who has loaned us money to pay for government.

Why do we have to do that? Because we are not bringing into government the revenues that are sufficient to match and pay for what we are paying for out of expenses.

We are now operating with a chronic and exploding deficit, and we are borrowing with abandon to make up the difference.

This particular chart is taken from the Congressional Budget Office. You will not find a more nonpartisan, objective, and professional group anywhere studying our fiscal responsibilities, our fiscal status, and our budgets than the Congressional Budget Office. I encourage everybody to take a look at their materials at cbo.org. This is just one of their many publications, and it is a wealth of information:
CBO The Budget and Economic Outlook Fiscal Years 2019 to 2049.

They are not only responsible for what has happened today; they are responsible for taking a look at the long-term, as any one of us would want to do with our household finances.

What this chart shows is outlays, or spending, on the top line and revenues on the bottom line. In this particular chart, we are matching outlays over time, and the timeframe here is about 15 years, against gross domestic product, the percentage of gross domestic product.

Why is that important? It is important because one could have outlays and revenues coming in, but the only way to match it up is, how much is the strength of your economy overall? It is kind of like asking yourself: Well, in my own household budget, what is my level of spending, what is my level of borrowing, what is my level of income as opposed to my overall financial situation?

So here we have the percentage of gross domestic product over on the left in the vertical axis, and down here, time.

We can clearly see here that as we look back over a long, long period of time, that if we continued on the way we are today, we would see massive continuing spread of the two lines between expenses on the top and revenues at the bottom.

To have this situation, when we look at where we are currently, 2019, that dotted line right over here, that is about $1 trillion, that gap, $1 trillion in 1 year of a deficit.

So as we can see very obviously, not only are we in a very difficult situation today, but if we do nothing about it, it will spread over time.

Now, what actually finances that difference? Debt. We go out and borrow it. It doesn’t just arrive in the middle of the market like a bag of money. It didn’t just grow on the tree outside. We are operating at a chronic and exploding deficit and borrowing to make up this difference.

I am a returnee to Congress. I served in Congress from 2002 to 2007, so I tend to match up my experiences then versus now. I had a 12-year absence in between, half a generation if you want to think about it.

When I left Congress in early 2007, our national debt stood at $9 trillion. Today, our national debt stands at $22 trillion.

By the way, if you want to have a harrowing view of something, take a look at usdebtclock.org and watch the numbers turn over about as rapidly as anything you can see.

What you can see from studying the debt over time is an incredible increase over here on the right side of this chart. But $22.5 trillion today. Let’s just think about that. That is $68,300 for each and every citizen of this country, $183,000 for each and every taxpayer. Really? 230 years in our country’s history to get to a national debt of $9 trillion, but just 12 years later, increasing by 250 percent to $22.5 trillion?

Again, we can’t just look at the absolute numbers, because they don’t tell the full story. After all, if we had a thriving economy that was producing an increase in both of those, some of these figures wouldn’t make as much sense.

So let’s, again, take the total debt against the total gross domestic product, again, just like any house or business would do here. And if we chart total debt against GDP—again, on the far left side on the vertical axis, we have GDP—as a percent of GDP, and down here, we have a period that starts at the origins of our country and concludes in 2049, from the start of our country to 2049, you can see the peaks right here.

Obviously, our country was in bad shape at the beginning in the Revolutionary War and thereafter. We were just starting out as a country. And you can see, for example, the Civil War, this peak.

Wars are times when we have to borrow money. Wars are times that are very, very difficult for economies, and obviously our expenses are up and people have needs, and during that period, we borrow money. We always try, or have always tried, to pay it back down because we don’t know when the next emergency will come along.

We can see another peak here, World War I. We had the start of the Great Depression right here, the Great Depression and Franklin Roosevelt’s New Deal, which was financed with borrowing. And then, of course, the tragedy of World War II, the absolute peak of our debt versus our gross domestic product, right there.

And why not? Our world was at war. Our economy was in a shambles. We had to finance that war.

Not only did we finance that war, we financed the recovery of the world, the Marshall Plan, in so many ways. We rebuilt our cities. We rebuilt the national highway system. We incurred that largely through debt. This was the highest point of our debt to date.

We see, again, some peaks that were related to great recessions and downturns in our economy where we had to borrow for a little while, then we came back down. And then we came to the last 15 to 20 years.

We see, again, some peaks that were related to great recessions and downturns in our economy where we had to borrow for a little while, then we came back down. And then we came to the last 15 to 20 years.

Why should we care about all of this? The scary thing about this chart, is that we are not the world’s leader. We are the world’s loser, in terms of controlling our national debt.

Why should we care about all of this? Why does debt matter?

I think the first and foremost obvious answer is that debt costs something. It is not free. If we borrow money, we pay interest. That is what everybody who loans us money expects.

They expect to be paid some interest. They expect the interest payments to accelerate rapidly in times of accelerating debt.

We see here a projection, again based on figures from the Congressional Budget Office, of where it is projected to go. And the administration to balance the budget, to get to a national debt of $9 trillion in 1 year of a deficit.

But $22.5 trillion today. Let’s just think about that. That is $68,300 for each and every citizen of this country, $183,000 for each and every taxpayer. Really?
Budget Office, of interest spending over time, the next 10 years, in this particular case. We see that, today, we have interest of somewhere around $400 billion a year but accelerating at a very rapid rate over the next decade, up to close to $1 trillion a year.

The red line is a scenario that is very likely if we do not make some tough decisions. That gets us even higher.

This is the actual trend that we are looking at. That is a lot of money to be paying, just for interest.

To make matters worse, try to compare that level of interest spending against some of our other spending.

In this particular chart, we see this line is our interest spending, kept relatively modest until recently but then accelerating very rapidly, as was indicated in my prior chart, to the levels out to 2029 that are truly scary. That is not the scary part, if that is not scary enough.

This line is our total spending on our children. What do we do to take care of the children of our country? That is our spending line. Interest is just crossing it right now. This is our total defense spending projected out over time with interest crossing over.

What that is that we are about to pay, in a very short period of time, if we don’t do anything, far more money in basic interest on our national debt than we are spending on our children and our defense. That is an inexcusable situation for us to be in.

The first basic problem is that we crowd out spending for other Federal purposes, which forces us, by the way, to borrow more, which forces us to have higher debt, which forces us to pay more interest. Everybody who has been in a business or a personal situation knows this.

The second basic problem with that is why should we care about debt—national security. Where does this money come from? Who is lending us this money?

Two-fifths of our interest payments go overseas, two-fifths of the people in this world who are loaning us money. Other countries because who knows what is going to happen over the next 10 or 20 years or generations.

This is the line that is scary: China, up to 7 percent now and growing. Japan, okay, fine, we welcome Japan loaning money to us. But on balance, I would much rather be the buyer rather than owing the money to other countries because who knows what is going to happen over the next 10 or 20 years or generations.

This is, obviously, not just an issue of our own fiscal stability, but it is a question of our national security.

Another question of national security is that we need this money in case we get into other situations in the world, hopefully not, but prepare for the situation where we may have to have massive increases in defense spending over the next generation.

These are areas where we have traditionally tried to pay down our debt so that we can borrow back up to finance these additional expenditures without destroying our economy. Yet, when we borrow in good times to finance even larger Federal spending, then we have very little safety net to be able to borrow in bad times.

This is what is not just a matter of budgetary stability. That is a matter of national security.

Finally, why should it matter? Economic damage. There is a school out there that is trying to justify more defense, which is largely not agreed to by most economists. Most economists agree that, over time, large levels of debt, large levels of interest payments, drive up basic interest rates. They drive up basic interest rates, and that is bad for the economy. They drive up inflation, and that is bad for the economy.

They lead to a situation where the markets out there—the people who are loaning us money, the people who are relying on the United States for its full faith and credit—start to doubt our basic fiscal solvency. They start to not only loan us money, but they start to charge us more interest, and that causes an economic problem.

Finally, that is not just a tax policy practice to skate too closely on thin ice.

This is why we should care: because our interest payments are crowding out spending; because it is a national security issue; and because, over time, it is an economic issue.

How did we get into this mess? Well, obviously, we are spending more than we are taking in. Our long-term deficit buildup and short-term tax reduction and spending increases are really the issue.

This chart is an illustration, again based on CBO information, of where our deficits are coming from today. When we are talking about the total amount of deficits closing in on $1 trillion, we talk about absent recent legislation—we are talking about just the last 5 years or so—we had a chronic deficit of close to $400 billion a year. That is pretty bad since, if we take $400 billion and times it by 5 years, all of a sudden, we are at $2 trillion of debt.

But, then, we made major mistakes from a fiscal responsibility perspective in the last few years.

First of all, we had tax extenders that were not paid for. We will get into that more when we get into absent recent legislation— we are talking about just the last 5 years or so—we had a chronic deficit of close to $400 billion a year. That is pretty bad since, if we take $400 billion and times it by 5 years, all of a sudden, we are at $2 trillion of debt.

But, then, we made major mistakes from a fiscal responsibility perspective in the last few years.

First of all, we had tax extenders that were not paid for. We will get into that more when we get into absent recent legislation— we are talking about just the last 5 years or so—we had a chronic deficit of close to $400 billion a year. That is pretty bad since, if we take $400 billion and times it by 5 years, all of a sudden, we are at $2 trillion of debt.

By the way, I want to go back to that point about the second debate here whether our government should be bigger or smaller. We are not debating here whether taxes should be higher or lower. We can have that debate. It has been going on, after all, for 250 years and even before that in the Colonies. We have always talked about how big government should or shouldn’t be, how much we should or shouldn’t spend through government. We just had that debate here on this floor today.

We have always talked about the overall level of taxes. Should they be higher? Should they be lower? Should we have high taxes to pay for spending? Should they be lower to generate economic growth? Those are good, solid policy decisions to be made.

The point is not what we are talking about here is the fiscal result when we don’t balance spending and revenues, the result when we don’t balance spending and revenues.

What can we choose to have high spending, but if we don’t generate the revenue for that, then we are going to end up with incredible deficits and debt. We can choose to have lower taxes, but if we don’t adjust the spending at the same time, we are going to end up with high deficits and debt. It just makes perfect sense.

That is all that we are talking about here. We are willing and able to have the debate over the size of government and taxes.

Again, within our Blue Dog Caucus, we have disagreements on that. But where we have centralization of agreement is in managing the consequence of that debate and having it be an honest debate, not a debate that pulls the wool over our fellow citizens eyes on the consequences.

What do we do about it? Well, I think, first of all, we start talking about it again. It is really hard. Twenty years ago, in the great times when we actually did balance the budget in the late 1990s and the early 2000s, public sentiment was high on deficits and debt. People cared about this. People understood the risks, all of a sudden, politicians stopped talking about it. They did, on both sides of the aisle, what many of us do when faced with a major issue: We deny it. We don’t want to acknowledge it. It is too much trouble. We don’t want to say that when we don’t pay taxes and don’t adjust spending, there is a consequence for our deficit and the debt.

We don’t want to say the reverse of that. We want to tell everybody that everything is okay. After all, we can have our cake and eat it, too. I don’t want to go back to my district and say, well, I can’t vote for a tax reduction because it is going to blow our deficit and debt.
Thank you, Representative CASE for organizing this special Order today, and I thank him for his outstanding work as the co-chair of the Blue Dog Task Force on Fiscal Responsibility and Government Reform, to share his views and to outline some of our agenda items.

I yield to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. MCADAMS).

Mr. MCADAMS. Madam Speaker, I thank Representative CASE for organizing this special Order today, and I thank him for his outstanding work as the co-chair of the Blue Dog Task Force on Fiscal Responsibility and Government Reform.

I am lucky to serve alongside him as co-chair, and I also want to thank STEPHANIE MURPHY for her tireless leadership in Congress and with the Blue Dogs.

Madam Speaker, Washington has an addiction problem. It is hooked on deficits, and it is hooked on debt. Our entire Nation, our children, and their children will pay the price for this addiction.

On March 2, 2019, the debt limit was reinstated as $22 trillion as Representative CASE so appropriately outlined. To operate the government at this limit, the Treasury Department deployed extraordinary measures, accounting maneuvers, allowing government operations to continue. But if those measures run out and our cash reserves are depleted, the Federal Government would reach the unprecedented day on which our Federal Government cannot meet all of its obligations in full and on time.

The consequences of defaulting on our obligations are unknown, but could be economically devastating, not only for the United States, but globally.

As Federal Reserve Chairman Jerome Powell said recently about the prospect of not raising the debt limit: "It is beyond even considering that the United States would not honor all of its obligations and pay them when due. It is just something that can’t even be considered."

We know that the costs of barrels towards this fiscal cliff are already mounting. American taxpayers foot the bill for additional borrowing costs that come from delays in extending the debt limit.

In previous years, uncertainty has caused interest rates on some Treasury bills to spike in anticipation of going over the fiscal cliff, resulting in many millions, if not billions of dollars in added interest costs.

As we have done more than 100 times, we are now preparing to vote to raise the debt limit. Raising it does not authorize new spending. It enables the government to pay its bills and avoid the sorry reality of becoming an untrustworthy borrower. What better time to pair that vote with a plan to reform government spending?

It is not as if we woke up this morning to suddenly face this fiscal calamity. It has been building for decades, as we just saw. Both parties in Republican and Democratic administrations have contributed to the problem. The question is: What are we going to do about it? And when will we start to get our borrowing and our spending addiction under control?

The Blue Dog priorities on fiscal responsibility and you will see a comprehensive list of pragmatic steps that we can take, some of which we have already taken.

For example, Blue Dogs support the House paygo rules. It is one of the first things the Blue Dogs fought for when we got sworn in this year. And I was pleased to see the House keep paygo rules.

We don’t want those rules to be waived, but if they are, there should be a vote held on a waiver. Blue Dogs support a constitutional amendment to require a balanced budget every year, except in times of war, in times of national emergency, or recession.

I was proud that my first bill introduced in this Congress is this exact balanced budget amendment that the Blue Dogs have endorsed. We want to return to regular order. Passing a budget every year and on time and avoiding omnibus appropriation packages that do not align with that budget.

As a former mayor myself who had to balance a budget every year and do so in a bipartisan fashion, I was then, as I am now, accountable to the taxpayers. The cost of paying interest on our debt this year alone is $383 billion. This year, $383 billion on interest payments for its debt.

It is important that we fully offset any cuts or revenue increases. We must work together to set priorities, avoid omnibus appropriation packages, and make sure the checkbook balances at the end of each month.

As a former mayor myself who had to balance a budget every year and do so in a bipartisan fashion, I was then, as I am now, accountable to the taxpayers. The cost of paying interest on our debt this year alone is $383 billion. This year, $383 billion on interest payments for its debt.

It is important that we fully offset any cuts or revenue increases. We must work together to set priorities, avoid omnibus appropriation packages, and make sure the checkbook balances at the end of each month.

It is important that we fully offset the cost of all new spending or reductions in fiscal revenues with spending cuts. If not, Congress must make those tough choices. We need strict, enforceable spending caps to ensure a fiscally responsible budget.

The Blue Dogs also support better oversight over our government spending. The Government Accountability Office, or GAO, and the inspectors general are important entities throughout the Federal Government that hold Federal agencies accountable to taxpayers and recommend improved operations.

We believe that Congress should know what it is voting on by having every conference report and bill that comes to the floor of the House accompanied by a cost estimate prepared by the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, and that should be done at least 24 hours in advance of the floor vote. We believe that committees should identify proper and related offsets before the legislation is reported out of committee.

A $22 trillion debt burden is a heavy lift to eliminate, for sure. But at the very least, we should be able to agree not to take on new policies that add to that debt.

We teach our kids that if they want something badly enough, they need to figure out how to pay for it. Tax reform should be deficit neutral. Spending plans should be fully paid for. Even emergency spending, which should be designed quickly to respond to what our communities need it most, should include a plan to pay for it, and we can think ahead and plan ahead for those emergencies.

We should get away from the ad hoc emergency spending and figure out how to establish a rainy-day fund which 45 States currently have. Every man, woman, and child in America owes $188,000 as Representative CASE has highlighted as their share of the national debt. We will all be mortally bankrupt, as well as financially bankrupt, if we don’t stop kicking the can down the road and make future generations liable for our lack of fiscal discipline today.

And so my colleagues often ask me why deficits matter? My answer is because future generations will be forced to bear the burden of our failure if we don’t act today. And the longer it takes for us to act, the more difficult those decisions become.

The cost of paying interest on our debt is the fastest growing part of the budget. We will spend more on interest than on defense by the year 2025. That is 6 years from now. Let that sink in. The government is projected to spend $383 billion on interest payments for its debt this year alone. This year, $383 billion.

So why do I care about the debt and deficits? It is because a strong fiscal house means we have a stronger country. That $383 billion spent on interest payments in our debt is $383 billion we can’t spend on other priorities, such as clean energy and transportation, and affordable healthcare. The interest we pay on the debt is simply going on to our credit card. It is becoming part of the debt.

So if you care about healthcare, if you care about climate change and...
building a 21st century infrastructure system, if you care about affordable housing and any other investment that the government can make, then I urge you, care about the debt, and care about our deficits. Because every dollar spent on paying down the debt and its deficits is interest on that debt is one more dollar that could have been invested in priorities that strengthen our country, that strengthen our national defense, and strengthens the American people.

It is clear that we are on a dangerous and unsustainable course. The decisions will not be easy. But our children and our grandchildren are counting on us to make this right. We were elected to make tough decisions.

I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. CASE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman so much, and I am privileged to be his co-chair.

Would the gentleman engage me in a colloquy on a few of the issues that he touched on?

Mr. MCADAMS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. MCADAMS. I would be happy to.

Mr. CASE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman. Let's talk about his proposed balanced budget amendment, by the way, of which I am a proud co-sponsor.

Some people criticized the balanced budget amendment which would have to be ratified throughout our country, as an overly restrictive mechanism, especially in times of national emergency.

As the gentleman’s balanced budget amendment is crafted, is there flexibility to borrow money and to deficit spend in times of genuine national need?

I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. MCADAMS. Yes, absolutely. We recognize that there may be emergencies that are unforeseen and unplanned for. And in those cases, the language of my proposed amendment would allow for deficit spending to help our communities in times of need, in times of national disasters or other emergencies. And I think that is important.

Mr. CASE. So we always have the ability to override the basic provisions with that balanced budget amendment in Congress, or where we believe that we do have to borrow that money. This is just a mechanism to introduce the same fiscal discipline that a well-run business or household has to follow?

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MCADAMS. That is correct.

Mr. CASE. As, by the way, is the case with 49 out of 50 of our States, who either have a similar balanced budget amendment in their constitution or by statute.

Mr. MCADAMS, Madam Speaker, that is correct. In my own State of Utah that has a balanced budget requirement, and has established a rainy-day fund, as I mentioned, such that when those emergencies arise, they have funds available to account for that.

I would urge us to not only have that flexibility built into the language of the amendment, but to plan ahead. While we don’t know what the next emergency will be or where it will strike, we know that dark days are ahead of us, and that there will be natural disasters and other emergencies and we should plan for those.

Mr. CASE. Madam Speaker, the gentleman made reference to the fact that he was a mayor, and I made the comment to the gentleman once, and I believe it, that all the officials I have ever worked with throughout the country, I think mayors understand fiscal responsibility the best.

The gentleman made reference to the fact that he functioned under a balanced budget. Was there any magic to that? How did the gentleman do that? He had a requirement to do that, so what did he do?

I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. MCADAMS. Well, one thing, I had a council of nine members: five Republicans and four Democrats. And one thing I know from experience is balancing a budget is hard. We have to make really tough choices. There are certain things that may not be meritorious expenses that are easy to say no to, but by and large, we have to make some really tough decisions.

We can’t do it all, even though we might want to do it all. You cannot do it all. And what I told, have a bipartisan relationship where people put their priorities on the table, discuss what they want to accomplish, and how they want to get there.

And then everyone has to continue to work together to refine proposals, to make sure that you cut the fat out of proposals and make sure that they are well refined, and every dollar spent is justified.

Ultimately, we have been able to balance a budget. We have to make tough decisions, but we are able to balance a budget, because there is that expectation, that requirement that we must get there, and so we do get there.

Mr. CASE. Madam Speaker, so to that point, my experience in Hawaii, where we have had a balanced budget for a long time—and I was a State legislator—so I had knock-down, drag-out fights over all this kind of stuff, whether it be to increase spending, or tax reductions, or tax increases. But it was always against the backdrop that it had to balance.

My sense was always that the folks that we represented understood that there was a series of tough choices, and they understood that in the big picture, the tough choices that we had to make as a result of a balanced budget, were for the better, the overall, long-term, big picture fiscal health, economic health and social health of Hawaii.

Did the gentleman have that experience in Utah?
"paygo" around here all the time. Sometimes, people's eyes kind of blank out when we talk about paygo.

Can the gentleman talk a little bit more about the simplistic and basic approach of paygo? What does it mean? What is its effect on the work that we do?

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. MCADAMS. The rules of the House require that any legislation that would have a fiscal impact has to be paid for, so we simply add that on to the tab and put it on the taxpayers' credit card. Every legislation has to be paid for upfront.

Mr. CASE. In other words, not financed by additional debt, which would have the result of driving up the deficit, the debt, and interest payments?

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. MCADAMS. That is exactly right. I describe it as saying that the first thing you find yourself in a hole and are not sure how to get out is to stop digging.

Mr. CASE. Let's take a pretty straightforward example. Let's say that we wanted to reduce taxes. By the way, we can acknowledge there is a debate about whether reducing taxes does, in fact, generate revenue or not. But for these purposes and especially the recent large tax cut, we simply did not see a return on revenues from that.

But let's just stick with the fact that if we reduce taxes, then we have to either increase another tax and/or reduce government spending somewhere to be able to have a budget-neutral, a deficit-neutral outcome.

Is that correct?

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. MCADAMS. That is right. Every activity, whether it is reducing revenues or increasing spending, should be neutral as it relates to the Federal deficit.

Mr. CASE. Conversely, if we want to increase Federal spending, we have to either reduce some other Federal spending or increase taxes, correct?

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. MCADAMS. Exactly. That is correct.

Mr. CASE. The gentleman said that the House rule already provided for paygo. So why are we here so concerned about it?

Mr. MCADAMS. One of my concerns is the willingness with which both sides, both parties, will waive paygo. It takes a simple majority to waive paygo. We have seen that happen from time to time, whether it is exigent circumstances like emergencies, but other things that we can plan ahead and should look ahead for.

Mr. CASE. Essentially, we have a rule that is honored in the breach?

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. MCADAMS. Yes.

Mr. CASE. Of course. One of the elements of our Blue Dog fiscal responsibility blueprint is to tighten up the rules on paygo so that we stop the bleeding on debt and deficit spending.

Mr. MCADAMS. Exactly.

Mr. CASE. Again, I am honored to be the gentleman's co-chair, and I thank the gentleman for adding to our debate today.

Madam Speaker, I want to make one other point before I close on this subject. I want to emphasize one of the points made by my colleague from Utah. He talked about restoring the budget and appropriations process. This starts to be real inside baseball.

Congress goes through a process establishing a budget, which is the overall outline of Federal spending for the next year—because we do everything on a yearly basis, for the most part—and then passing appropriations bills that are consistent with that budget. In other words, we make the big picture deal, and then when we have our appropriations bills that must match that budget.

In what we refer to here as regular order, what we would do is first have a budget resolution that passes the House, and is agreed to by both the House and the Senate so that we know what our roadmap is. Then, we would take each of the areas of government that needs appropriations every year.

The way we do it is, there are 12 separate appropriations bills, and we would individually pass each of those bills consistent with the budget. We would do all of that by October 1, which is when our fiscal year starts.

We would call that regular order. That would be quite regular order for any business and any personal budget.

The last time we followed regular order was 1995. The last time we went through a full budget process, an individual appropriations bill process, was 1995. And that has simply thrown our Federal fiscal house into disarray. We saw that with an incredibly tragic and unnecessary Federal Government shutdown just late last year and earlier this year. That was in part to be laid at the feet of our failure to follow basic budgetary, fiscal, and appropriations procedures.

We have tried, on a bipartisan basis, to fix this. In fact, just last year, we did have bipartisan efforts to do just that introduced by both the House and the Senate as to the budget and the appropriations process.

I want to read a passage from that committee's report. This was the Joint Select Committee on Budget and Appropriations Process Reform, Republicans and Democrats, House and Senate.

Here is a quote from the committee's report in late 2018: "There have been numerous breakdowns in the budget process in recent decades. Fiscal year 1995 was the last time Congress passed a conference report on the budget resolution followed by passage of 13 separate appropriations bills before the beginning of the new fiscal year."

We now do 12.

"Continuing resolutions, CRs, have become the status quo for funding the Federal Government, demonstrating Congress's failure to complete its work on time. CRs create uncertainty for agencies and the American people."

By the way, I stop to describe a CR as a resolution that says: Sorry, we can't figure out what to do in this next fiscal year. So while we are trying to figure it out, all we are going to do is continue the spending the way it was in the last fiscal year, no adjustment of spending levels, no adjustment of priorities, and no update for current situations. Let's just kick this can down the road.

That is a CR.

Back to the report.

"In many years, there has been concern that parts of the government would have to shut down and be unfunded. We have to take the failure to enact even stopgap appropriations, and shutdowns of various durations have actually occurred. In the 115th Congress alone, the most recent Congress, "there have been two government shutdowns. With Federal employees being furloughed, national parks shutting down, adverse effects on defense and law enforcement, shutdowns inflict severe damage and uncertainty on the Nation's fiscal state. Additionally, multiple JSCBAPR members have noted that the lack of legislative tools available for Congress to address national needs or the national debt in a bipartisan manner.

The committee's report was submitted very, very late in the last Congress, so there was really not enough time to debate it fully and to proceed, but the report certainly remains highly relevant together with recommended legislation. Our Blue Dog Caucus believes that reform along those lines is necessary.

Finally—and I don't speak now for the Blue Dogs, but I do speak for myself and, I believe, many individual Blue Dogs and perhaps others—we have another mechanism available to us, a mechanism that we shouldn't have to follow but that sometimes may be the only way to cut through the political dialogue and the fears of people to make tough decisions. That is to develop independent commissions outside Congress of experts, hopefully on a neutral basis and hopefully on a non-partisan or bipartisan basis, who are charged with reviewing and making decisions on revenue and spending matters and reporting their results back to Congress, hopefully for an up-or-down vote. If Congress gets the opportunity to pick at a balanced report once it comes back, then it defeats the purpose of the commission to start with. Simpson-Bowles was one very well-known commission that failed, and there have been others.

It is certainly conceivable that if we can't get our act in order in Congress—
as we should be able to do, and as I believe the American people want and think we should — then we need to resort to some other mechanism to get this House in order.

Finally, we need public support. We need to get people involved again in this issue.

As I said earlier, the late 1990s and early 2000s were the height of public concern over deficits and debt, and it resulted in external pressure to Congress to balance our budget.

A succession of two Presidents with bipartisan Congresses, by the way, got it balanced. The public demanded it; we delivered.

Now, it is almost a forgotten issue. It doesn’t even rank in the top 10 of major issues. We have many, many major issues. But, Madam Speaker, I will tell you one thing, the issues that are in the top 10, our solutions to those issues will be crippled if we don’t get our basic fiscal house in order.

In conclusion, the Blue Dogs believe that we are, in fact, in a national crisis. We stand ready to work with anyone and everyone toward common-sense, mainstream solutions.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CASE. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o’clock and 55 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, July 19, 2019, at 9:30 a.m.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Official Foreign Travel during the second quarter of 2019, pursuant to Public Law 95–384, are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO FRANCE, EXPENDED BETWEEN JUNE 6 AND JUNE 9, 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Member or employee</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arrival</td>
<td>Departure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Gerald Connolly</td>
<td>5/30</td>
<td>G3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Michael Turner</td>
<td>5/30</td>
<td>G3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Brett Guthrie</td>
<td>5/30</td>
<td>G3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Linda Sanchez</td>
<td>5/30</td>
<td>G3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Susan Davis</td>
<td>5/30</td>
<td>G3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Neal Dren</td>
<td>5/30</td>
<td>G3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. James Sensenberger</td>
<td>5/30</td>
<td>G3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Paul Cook</td>
<td>5/30</td>
<td>G3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. James Costa</td>
<td>5/30</td>
<td>G3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Brendan Boyle</td>
<td>5/31</td>
<td>G3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Frank Palladino</td>
<td>5/31</td>
<td>G3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. John Shimkus</td>
<td>5/30</td>
<td>G3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collin English</td>
<td>5/30</td>
<td>G3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam Housley</td>
<td>5/30</td>
<td>G3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonds Rice</td>
<td>5/30</td>
<td>G3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate Koustos</td>
<td>5/30</td>
<td>G3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>2,590.00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Per diem 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other purposes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

1 Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO MEXICO, EXPENDED BETWEEN MAY 30 AND JUNE 3, 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Member or employee</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arrival</td>
<td>Departure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Katherine Moore</td>
<td>6/5</td>
<td>6/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Jaime Lizarraga</td>
<td>6/5</td>
<td>6/8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee total</th>
<th>2,544.00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Per diem 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other purposes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO FRANCE, EXPENDED BETWEEN JUNE 6 AND JUNE 9, 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Member or employee</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arrival</td>
<td>Departure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Nancy Pelosi</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Kevin McCarthy</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Eliot Engel</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Mark Takano</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Dan Lungren</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Anna Eshoo</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Mac Thornberry</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Ron Kind</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. James Langevin</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Stephen Lynch</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Dutch Ruppersberger</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. G.K. Butterfield</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Mike Conaway</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. James Comer</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Jeff Fortenberry</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Susan Gallo</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Kenny Merchant</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Mike McCaul</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Deb Ha Wasserman Schultz</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Ed Perlmutter</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Bob Latta</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Jackie Speier</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>2,590.00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Per diem 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other purposes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

2 If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Member or employee</th>
<th>Arrival</th>
<th>Departure</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Per diem 1</th>
<th>Transportation</th>
<th>Other purposes</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Mike Quigley</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/9</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Larry Bharrton</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/9</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Morgan Griffith</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/9</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Bill Huizenga</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/9</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Bill Johnson</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/9</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. William Noel</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/9</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Julia Brownlow</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/9</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Matt Carmignani</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/9</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Paul Cook</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/9</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Ann Kuster</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/9</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Sean Patrick Maloney</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/9</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Marc Veasey</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/9</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Don Barrasso</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/9</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Brian Bascom</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/9</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Barry Levenson</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/9</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Eliot Stannik</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/9</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Don Bacon</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/9</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Jim Banks</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/9</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Nanette Siemering</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/9</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Salah Carbajal</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/9</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Neal Dunn</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/9</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Royce Marshall</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/9</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Jimmy Pateo</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/9</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Thomas Suozzi</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/9</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Gil Crescenz</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/9</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Jason Crow</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/9</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Chrisy Houlahan</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/9</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. John Joyce</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/9</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Mike Sherl</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/9</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Abigail Spanberger</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/9</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Michael Waltz</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/9</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Sheila Jackson Lee</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/9</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Brian Monahan</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/9</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Irving</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/9</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myriam Parker</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/9</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drew Hamill</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/9</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate Houston Walters</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/9</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily Beret</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/9</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Ross</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/9</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Smith</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/9</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristina Leter</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/9</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie Obscura</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/9</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caleb Smith</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/9</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will Outhwaite</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/9</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brittian Speltz</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/9</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Rucinski</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/9</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt Reel</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/9</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erik Leszynski</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/9</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Adams</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/9</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valerie Roberts</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/9</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Committee Totals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Member or employee</th>
<th>Arrival</th>
<th>Departure</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Per diem 1</th>
<th>Transportation</th>
<th>Other purposes</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Report of Expenditures for Official Foreign Travel, Committee on Ethics, House of Representatives, Expended Between Apr. 1, and June 30, 2019

Report of Expenditures for Official Foreign Travel, Committee on Rules, House of Representatives, Expended Between Apr. 1, and June 30, 2019

Report of Expenditures for Official Foreign Travel, Committee on Natural Resources, House of Representatives, Expended Between Apr. 1, and June 30, 2019

1 Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
2 If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent, if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
3 Military air transportation.
EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker’s table and referred as follows:

1672. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting a report of a violation of the Antidiscrimination Act, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1351; Public Law 97-258; (98 Stat. 926); to the Committee on Appropriations.

1673. A letter from the Under Secretary, Acquisition and Sustainment, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department’s report titled “Fiscal Year 2018 Purchases From Foreign Entities”, pursuant to 41 U.S.C. 8305; Public Law 104-201, Sec. 827 (as amended by Public Law 111-350, Sec. 3); (124 Stat. 3833) and 41 U.S.C. 8304 note; Public Law 115-240, Sec. 820(b); (132 Stat. 3006); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1674. A letter from the Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter authorizing three (3) officers to wear the insignia of the grade of major general, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 777(b)(3)(B); Public Law 104-106, Sec. 500(a)(3) (as added by Public Law 108-136, Sec. 500(a)(3)); (117 Stat. 1458); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1675. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Vice Admiral Raquel C. Bono, United States Navy, and her advancement to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 1370(c)(1); Public Law 96-513, Sec. 112 (as amended by Public Law 104-106, Sec. 502(b)); (119 Stat. 248); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1676. A letter from the Comptroller of the Currency, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, transmitting the 2018 annual report to Congress containing a description of actions taken to carry out section 308 of the Financial Institutions Reform, Recovery, and Enforcement Act of 1989, as amended, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 1639; Public Law 101-73, Sec. 308 (as added by Public Law 111-203, Sec. 121); (124 Stat. 1556); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1677. A letter from the Assistant Administrator, Bureau of Legislative and Public Affairs, U.S. Agency for International Development, transmitting the Agency’s Report to Congress on Global Health Innovations for Fiscal Year 2018, pursuant to Public Law 115-411, Sec. 2(a); to the Committee on Foreign Operations.

1678. A letter from the President and Chief Executive Officer, Federal Home Loan Bank of Indianapolis, transmitting the Federal Home Loan Bank of Indianapolis 2018 management report and financial statements, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9106(a)(1); Public Law 97-258; (98 Stat. 926); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.
Referred, as follows:

By Mr. NEAL: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 3819. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to prohibit discrimination against same-sex couples in the same manner as other couples; with an amendment (Rept. 116–158). Referred to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. CASTRO of Texas (for himself, Mr. PÉREZ, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. FLECAHNT of California, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. CISNEROS, Mr. GONZALEZ of California, and Mr. CAÑADA of Puerto Rico): H.R. 3825. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 401 Main Street in Brawley, California, as the “Helen Fabela Chávez Memorial Post Office Building” to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee (for himself, Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Virginia, Mr. ELLER, Mr. GARRISON of North Carolina, Mr. BASS, and Mr. WEST): H.R. 3827. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy to establish a program for the research, development, and demonstration of commercially viable technologies for the capture of carbon dioxide produced during the generation of natural gas-generated power; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. GARAMENDI (for himself, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. FITZPATRICK of Colorado, Mr. WITTMAN of Virginia, Mr. TONKO): H.R. 3830. A bill to provide taxpayers with an improved understanding of Government programs through the disclosure of cost, performance, and areas of duplication among them, leverage existing data to achieve a functional Federal program inventory, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG: H.R. 3831. A bill to repeal the Act entitled “An Act to confer jurisdiction on the State of North Dakota over offenses committed by or against Indians on the Devils Lake Indian Reservation”; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BEYER (for himself, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, and Ms. SEWELL of California): H.R. 3832. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the deadline for contributions from individual retirement accounts to include rollovers for charitable life-income plans for charitable purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. BONAMICI (for herself, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. MOULTON, and Mr. FITZPATRICK): H.R. 3833. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide for the automatic recertification of income for income-driven repayment plans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.
H.R. 3835. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage of cancer care planning and coordination under the Medicare program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DeSAULNIER (for himself and Mr. PETER DEFazio of Oregon):

H.R. 3836. A bill to amend section 332 of the Communications Act of 1934 to include public safety requirements in terms and conditions States may require of mobile services; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FOSTER:

H.R. 3837. A bill to establish the National Fab Lab Network, a Federally chartered organization consisting of a national network of local digital fabrication facilities providing universal access to advanced manufacturing tools for workforce development, STEM education, developing inventions, creating businesses, producing personalized products, mitigating risks, and other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. ESHOO (for herself, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. HUFFMAN of California, Mr. DAVIS of California, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. ROUDA, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. COX of California, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. PANNETTA, Ms. HILL of California, Mr. CINSEROS, Ms. LEE of California, and Mr. MCMURDO):

H.R. 3838. A bill to direct the Secretary of Labor to recognize employers with a commitment to helping employees balance workplace responsibilities and family obligations; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. HAALAND (for herself, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. BARRAGÁN, Mr. CLARKSON of Indiana, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. RUSH, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Mr. CARIJAL):

H.R. 3839. A bill to provide for the imposition of sanctions against 24 senior officials of the Border Service and Federal Security Service of Russia until the release of certain specified persons and members, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CASTRO (for himself, Mr. WELCH, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. MOORE, and Mr. BASS):

H.R. 3840. A bill to amend titles XIX and XXI of the Social Security Act to require a State child health plan to include certain lead screening and early childhood cancer care programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KEATING (for himself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. COHEN, Mr. ADELHOLT, Mr. JACKSON LEE, Mr. HUDSON, Ms. MOORE, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. SIGUZZI, and Mr. MALNICK):

H.R. 3843. A bill to promote international efforts in combating corruption, kleptocracy, and illicit finance by foreign officials and politicians, including through a new anti-corruption action fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KHANNA (for himself and Mr. POHAN):

H.R. 3844. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to require all persons exercising substantial operational control over a concentrated animal feeding operation to jointly obtain a permit for certain discharges, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. KILMER (for himself, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. MCADAMS, Mr. STIVER, Miss RICE of New York, Ms. PORTER, Mr. HIMES, Ms. TLALI, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. PERLMUTTER, and Mrs. MURPHY):

H.R. 3845. A bill to authorize a grant program that strengthens the capacity of community Colleges, regional centers, and other institutions of higher learning and through alignment with national service participants, to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LUJÁN (for himself, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. COLE, Ms. HAALAND, Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mrs. RADERWIGEN, Mr. COOK, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. CASE, and Mr. LAMALFIA):

H.R. 3846. A bill to enhance protections of Native American cultural heritage and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, and Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. McEACHIN (for himself, Mr. WITTMAN, Mrs. LURIA, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. HUDGELMAN, Mr. CLINE, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. GRIFFITH, Ms. WEXTON, and Mr. CONNOLLY):

H.R. 3847. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Post Office located at 117 West Poythress Street in Hopkinsville, Kentucky, as the "Reverend Curtiss West Harris Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. POCAN (for himself, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. GARCIA of Illinois, Mr. GRIFFEL, Mr. SOTO of California, Ms. PRESSLEY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Ms. TLAIB):

H.R. 3848. A bill to require the Securities and Exchange Commission to require issuers requiring private funds to publicly disclose certain information, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, the Judiciary, and Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD (for herself, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. SOTO, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. MOORE, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, and Ms. HAALAND):

H.R. 3849. A bill to address maternity care shortages and promote optimal maternity outcomes by expanding educational opportunities for midwives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SARBANES:

H.R. 3850. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to exempt assistance provided by political parties to the campaigns of candidates who are affiliated with such parties for secure information communications technology or cybersecurity efforts in combating corruption, and for other purposes; to the Committees on Financial Services, the Judiciary, and Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WELCH (for himself, Mr. BILIRIS, Mr. TRUMKA, and Mr. LONG):

H.R. 3851. A bill to extend funding for Brand USA through fiscal year 2027, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WELCH (for himself, Ms. PINHIE, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. McGOVORNE of New York, and Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire):

H.R. 3852. A bill to provide oversight of the border zone in which Federal agents may conduct vehicle checks and to allow agents to enter private land without a warrant, and to make technical corrections; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. WEXTON (for herself and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 3853. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to increase under the Medicaid program the minimum monthly personal needs allowance for institutionalized individuals and couples, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. McNERNEY (for himself and Ms. KAPTUR):

H.J. Res. 73. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States regarding the permissible use of funding for elections for public office and State ballot measures; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. CASTOR of Florida (for herself, Mr. LAUREN of California, Mr. SCALONI, Ms. HAALAND, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. FRANKEL, and Ms. LAWRENCE):
H. Res. 502. A resolution congratulating the United States Women’s National Team for its win on July 7, 2019, of the 2019 Federation Internationale de Football Association Women’s World Cup, and for becoming the most successful team in international women’s soccer; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Ms. MAST.

H. Res. 503. A resolution recognizing and honoring the 50th anniversary of SEARCH, The National Consortium for Justice Information and Statistics headquartered in Sacramento, California; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. WATERS (for herself, Ms. Lee of California, Ms. Norton, Mr. Drutch, Mr. Rush, Mr. Sean Patrick Maloney of New York, Mr. Payne, Mr. Cox of California, Mr. Nadler, Mr. Hastings, Mr. Cohen, Ms. Kelly of Illinois, Ms. Velázquez, Mr. Carson of Indiana, Ms. Cisneros, Mr. Danny K. Davis of Illinois, Mr. Meeks, Mrs. Axne, Ms. Johnson of Texas, Mr. Johnson of Georgia, Ms. Titus, Mr. Cummings, Mr. Garcia of Illinois, and Mr. Smith of Washington):

H. Res. 504. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Clinicians HIV/AIDS Testing and Awareness Day, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. MENG (for herself and Mr. Johnson of Georgia):

H. Res. 505. A resolution recognizing July 28, 2019, as “World Hepatitis Day”; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Mr. Cicilline introduced a bill (H.R. 3854) to allow the Coast Guard to issue a certificate of documentation with a coastwise endorsement for the vessel Oliver Hazard Perry, and for other purposes; which was referred to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

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 Ms. UNDERWOOD:

H. R. 3819.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. ROUDA:

H. R. 3820.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. McHENRY:

H. R. 3821.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. MAST:

H. R. 3822.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Ms. HOULAHAN:

H. R. 3823.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Ms. UNDERWOOD:

H. R. 3824.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. DOGGETT:

H. R. 3825.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. BOST:

H. R. 3826.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. VARGAS:

H. R. 3827.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. CASTRO of Texas:

H. R. 3828.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. GARAMENDI:

H. R. 3829.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:

H. R. 3830.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 3831.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. BEYER:

H. R. 3832.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Ms. BONAMICI:

H. R. 3833.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 3834.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Ms. ESCH:

H. R. 3835.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Ms. TAYLOR:

H. R. 3836.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. BEYER:

H. R. 3837.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. HAALAND:

H. R. 3838.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Ms. HOULAHAN:

H. R. 3839.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota:

H. R. 3840.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Ms. KAPTUR:

H. R. 3841.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. KATKO:

H. R. 3842.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 3843.
The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. GRASSLEY).

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore 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.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The President pro tempore (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH). Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, with the record rainfalls and the negotiations of Chinese tariffs going on, our farmers are hurting, but we can give them some certainty by passing the U.S.-Mexico-Canada Agreement on trade.

In my home state, 86,500 Iowans in farming depend upon agricultural exports to Canada and Mexico, adding $10.3 billion to our state’s economy. Manufacturing and services are also going to have a big boom out of this agreement being agreed to. Every third row of Iowa soybeans are exported, and this trade deal will ensure that these farmers continue to have duty-free access to our North American neighbors.

The U.S.-Mexico-Canada Agreement also provides new export opportunities for American dairy farmers, poultry, and egg producers.

Let’s give a boost to our farmers and all the jobs related to farming and in cities and also give a boost to the entire country, by passing the U.S.-Mexico-Canada Agreement and do it very soon.

I yield the floor.

Mr. MCDONNELL. Madam President, this week the Senate has attended to one of this body’s unique responsibilities relating to foreign affairs—the ratification of treaties. We have ratified bilateral tax agreements with four trading partners: Spain, Switzerland, Japan, and Luxembourg. Measures like these bring clarity, certainty, and fairness to international commerce. They ensure U.S. citizens and businesses have a level playing field without duplicative tax burdens, and they make the United States a more inviting destination for foreign investment.

These newly ratified treaties will provide immediate and much needed relief to employers in every corner of our country. They will reinforce support for hundreds of thousands of jobs including many in my home State of Kentucky. This is a significant bipartisan accomplishment.

Now, standing in stark contrast to the Senate’s productive, bipartisan week is what the Democratic House of Representatives has chosen to prioritize. We have seen plenty of partisan theatrics and high drama for the television cameras. We have seen the
majority spend plenty of time attacking the President and members of the administration, but virtually nothing in the way of bipartisan legislation to actually make progress for the American people.

The problem seems to be that so many Democrats have moved so far to the extreme left that they literally could not pass commonsense legislation even if they wanted to.

A case in point is the chronic difficulties in consternation that we have seen over in the House when it comes to the seemingly straightforward task of condemning anti-Semitism and efforts to delegitimize the Jewish State of Israel.

Back in March, remember, House Democrats had their hands full dealing with one of their freshman members who had touted out age-old anti-Semitic tropes—dual loyalties, support for Israel being driven by money, the kind of language you would think the House could have condemned pretty easily.

But instead, after days of internal Democratic strife, all the House leadership could drum up was a watered-down resolution that sort of—sort of—touched the problem at its roots while, Senate-passed legislation that would actually do something about anti-Semitism has been languishing over in the House without a vote.

For more than 5 months and counting, we were especially vulnerable when a foreign policy legislation that we were focused on lending a helping hand. When the Obama administration de-

ECONOMIC GROWTH

Mr. McCONNELL, Madam President, earlier this week, I spoke about the economic pain that many Americans felt under the last administration's leftwing policies and all the Trump administration and Republicans in Congress have done to turn the page.

Today in the Senate, taking action on the so-called Clean Power Plan, and re- placed them with policies to support American energy dominance.

For former miners and for the industry, the damage can't be unwound overnight. This very month, we have seen two more major coal producers in Kentucky move toward bankruptcy. Clearly, even now, all is not well. That is why my colleagues and I are focused on lending a helping hand. When healthcare benefits for thousands of retired coal miners and their families were at risk, I led the effort to secure a permanent extension and protect coal miners and their families.

And to do so, my colleagues and I are focused on delivering revenue into our State. So we were especially vulnerable when a Democratic administration came to Washington that didn't even try to hide its hostility toward Kentucky coal. Back in 2009, the industry directly employed more than 23,000 Kentuckians. It provided more than 90 percent of our electricity. It brought billions of dollars in revenue into our State. So we were especially vulnerable when a Democratic administration came to Washington that didn't even try to hide its hostility toward Kentucky coal.

Our friends in the Democratic Party are openly urging their leadership not to make them vote on condemning anti-Semitism a resolution. Let's say that again. The far left in the House wants to defend BDS.

This is where we are elected members of the Democratic Party are openly pressing their leadership to actually make them vote on condemning anti-Semitism a resolution. Let's say that again. Elected members of the Democratic Party are openly pressing their leadership not to make them vote on condemning anti-Semitism a resolution. Let's say that again. }
the Green New Deal that would have made the Obama-era War on Coal look like child’s play. Among all of its other craziness, it sought to end all production of American oil, coal, and natural gas within a decade. How ridiculous. How absurd.

We had a vote on it in the Senate, and lest we think this was just some extreme view that only the fringe subscribes to, only 4 of 47 Democrats could bring themselves to oppose the Green New Deal in the Senate—only 4 of 47 Democrats could bring themselves to oppose the Green New Deal in the Senate. There were 43 of 47 Democrats who couldn’t vote against this thing. Fortunately, Republicans voted it down.

But last week, not to be deterred, a number of Democrats rolled out yet another far-left environmentalist manifesto. This new resolution calls for—here we go again—a managed phaseout of the use of oil, gas, and coal to keep fossil fuels in the ground—a managed phaseout of the use of oil, gas, and coal to keep fossil fuels in the ground. Of course, this means a whole lot more intrusive Big Government.

The bill calls for a “massive-scale federal mobilization of resources”—a “massive-scale federal mobilization of resources.” Just imagine what that would entail. And yet this new manifesto dictates that our Nation model ourselves after Europe, Canada, and liberal enclaves like New York and Los Angeles. You just can’t make this stuff up.

The contrast is clear. Republicans are working overtime to rebuild the conditions for middle-class prosperity, and we are working overtime to help those who were hit hard in the Obama years. But Democrats are working to resurrect the same bad ideas that caused much of that damage and implement them yet again, this time on steroids. The good news is, as long as we have a Senate, we can stop them yet again, this time on steroids.

I could go on, but you get the idea. The internet and mobile internet-enabled devices like our phones and watches have resulted in an explosion of opportunity. Information is more accessible than ever before. We can communicate more swiftly and easily than ever before. We can shop without leaving our house, strike out confidently into the unknown without a map and still find our way back, turn on the air conditioner or heater with a simple voice command, and see who is knocking on our door while we are 600 miles away on vacation.

With the convenience and opportunity of the internet revolution comes serious privacy concerns. Every time we book a hotel, navigate a new town, buy movie tickets, or buy groceries online, we are putting a lot of personal information into the hands of a lot of different companies: banking information, health information, information about our location, our preferences, our habits. All of this information is likely used in some form or fashion by some of the world’s most successful internet businesses to personalize our search results on Google or to deliver the content that we see on Facebook or Instagram.

As a member and former chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee, I have gotten an up-close look at the issue of consumer privacy. I believe that developing bipartisan consumer privacy legislation needs to be a priority in Congress.

Last year, as chairman of the Commerce Committee, I convened hearings into consumer data privacy and the accessing of millions of Facebook users’ personal data by the political intelligence firm Cambridge Analytica. I also led a hearing to discuss the European Union’s General Data Protection Regulation and California’s new privacy-related law. I have continued to focus on consumer privacy this year as chairman of the Commerce Subcommittee on Communications, Technology, and the Internet.

A few weeks ago, I convened a hearing to look at the use of persuasive technology on internet platforms like Facebook and YouTube. Sites like YouTube and Facebook use algorithms and artificial intelligence driven by user-specific data to tailor just about everything you see on their platforms, from ads to the video that plays after the YouTube video you searched for. These algorithms can also be used to track you searched for Paul Simon’s “Diamonds on the Soles of Her Shoes” on YouTube, you probably will not mind hearing “Graceland” next. If you are shopping for a new computer, you might find it useful to see an ad for the latest HP or Apple laptop.

These algorithms can also be deployed in far more troubling ways. For example, in June, the New York Times reported that YouTube’s automated recommendation system was found to be automatically playing a video of children playing in their backyard pool to users who had watched sexually themed content. Algorithms can also be used to limit what news stories and other content people are exposed to.

As we learned from a witness at the hearing on persuasive technology, a former Google employee named Tristan Harris, these algorithms have the potential to be used to influence the thoughts and behaviors of literally billions of people.

For all of these reasons, I believe that transparency needs to be an essential part of the conversation. Americans should be clearly informed about how their personal data is being used and how companies influence and control what Americans see online.

Obviously, users have an obligation to exercise personal responsibility, but companies also need to provide greater transparency about how content is being filtered.

Given the ever-increasing size of our digital footprint and the increased privacy dangers that come along with that, the question isn’t whether we will have Federal privacy legislation; it is what that legislation will look like.

I believe that any final bill should be bipartisan and should set a single national data privacy standard so that companies and consumers don’t have to navigate 50 different sets of rules. We need to make consumer data privacy a priority while also preserving the ability of companies to innovate and deliver the cutting-edge services we rely on.

I also believe, as I mentioned, that any bill should include transparency provisions that give consumers a clear understanding of what is being done with their data. I believe consumers have the option to engage on internet platforms without being manipulated by algorithms powered by their own personal data.

This isn’t the first time Congress has tackled new and emerging privacy concerns. Over the last few decades, Congress has enacted child online, protect sensitive healthcare information, and to modernize how institutions use consumer data.
I believe we can follow in that tradition by developing a new consumer privacy law, and that is why I am committed to working with colleagues from both parties to develop legislation to meet the privacy challenges we are facing. I am confident that we can arrive at a strong consumer privacy bill for the digital age, and I will continue to make Americans’ privacy a priority of mine here in Congress.

I yield the floor.

I support the presence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Recognition of the Minority Leader

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

SENATE LEGISLATIVE AGENDA

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, last night, we saw the President of the United States, who has spent years maligning our elected Member of Congress and a U.S. citizen—one of the oldest and ugliest racist attacks against Americans of color.

The way the President appeals to the worst instincts of people and what was shown last night at the rally last night without the President’s upbarding them was despicable and eerily familiar to what happens in dictatorships.

We all know that the only way President Trump will stop this is for Republicans—his own party—to demand it.

The only way President Trump will stop this is for Republicans on the other side to tell him to stop. All we stop is when Republicans on the other side stand up and say: This is not the America I know and love. Whatever your political affiliation, that applies to a little AI technology to a selfie to make your face look younger or older or add a beard. That seems like benign new social media fun, but it actually may not be benign at all.

Who is the parent company of this app? Wireless Labs. It is based in, of all places, St. Petersburg, Russia. It also came to light that the app not only came to light that the app not only applies a little AI technology to a picture but retains the right to access all your photos, your search history, and gives “perpetual, irrevocable, and worldwide” license to use your photo, your name, and your likeness. This is a breathtaking level of access—all too common in murky apps like these—that raises very substantial privacy concerns.

After everything we learned about Russia’s unrepentant cyber aggression in 2016, the nexus of facial recognition, digital privacy, and a shadowy Russian company based in St. Petersburg, where so much of the Russian interference in our elections and interference with the internet emerged from, what happens with the app from Wireless Labs called FaceApp should set off alarm bells for all Americans.

FACEAPP

Madam President, on another matter, over the past couple of days, millions of Americans have been downloading FaceApp—a viral tool that applies a little AI technology to a selfie to make your face look younger or older or add a beard. That seems like benign new social media fun, but it actually may not be benign at all.

Who is the parent company of this app? Wireless Labs. It is based in, of all places, St. Petersburg, Russia. It also came to light that the app not only takes your picture but retains the right to access all your photos, your search history, and gives “perpetual, irrevocable, and worldwide” license to use your photo, your name, and your likeness. This is a breathtaking level of access—all too common in murky apps like these—that raises very substantial privacy concerns.

After everything we learned about Russia’s unrepentant cyber aggression in 2016, the nexus of facial recognition, digital privacy, and a shadowy Russian company based in St. Petersburg, where so much of the Russian interference in our elections and interference with the internet emerged from, what happens with the app from Wireless Labs called FaceApp should set off alarm bells for all Americans.
At the very least, we need to know more about what the heck is going on here. I have called for the FTC and the FBI to investigate FaceApp to see if private information of millions of Americans could wind up in the wrong hands and be used for deadly purposes. We must also pursue the assurance that the administration is transparent when it comes to immigration. It looks like those raids maybe peremptorily accelerated by the announcement of something like Russian intelligence or the Russian military is really troubling. I have called for the FTC and the FBI to get to the bottom of FaceApp.

\[\text{S4927}\
\text{BORDER SECURITY}\
\text{Madam President, on one more issue, over the last few months, Americans have seen for themselves the awful conditions that migrant children are enduring at the Southern border. Faultless kids—many traveling alone, many very young—are subject to inhumane conditions, without the proper healthcare, nutrition, hygiene, or space. People can have different views on immigration—we know that—but no one should want to see these kids treated so inhumanely. All they are doing is fleeing for a better life.}\
\text{This weekend, I am leading a visit to the border with a number of my Democratic colleagues to investigate, inspect, and evaluate the latest conditions at these facilities. We hope—desperately hope—that the conditions have improved over the last several weeks. We will primarily report to the American people and to the Senate on what we find.}\
\text{I yield the floor.}\
\text{I suggest the absence of a quorum.}\
\text{The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.}\
\text{BORDER SECURITY}\
\text{Mr. KAINES. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.}\
\text{The PRESIDENT PRO Tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.}\
\text{Mr. KAINES. Madam President, I rise today to talk about an experience that I had on Sunday. Sunday was the day, July 14, that President Trump had preannounced that massive deportation and immigration raids were about to begin. It looks like those raids maybe didn’t start on Sunday, but the communities of immigrants in Virginia and elsewhere have been experiencing tremendous fear, had that fear dramatically accelerated by the announcement.}\
\text{On Sunday, my wife and I, who live in Richmond, went to a town called Kilmarock, about an hour and 10 minutes away from us, where my wife’s parents are in a nursing home. They are 95 and 93 years old. We went down to spend the day with my in-laws and to take my mother-in-law to church at the local Episcopal church where she has long been a member.}\
\text{I was struck by the readings. It was a day of fear for many immigrant communities, and the readings that occurred in the Episcopal church, which are readings that are delivered in Catholic and Presbyterian and other churches on a set schedule, struck me as I was thinking about the fear in these communities.}\
\text{For the Old Testament reading, normally, in most churches around the globe, Catholics and Episcopalians read from Deuteronomy, but for some reason, the pastor of this church—it was his goodbye ceremony, and he was leaving and retiring—and I had switched the Old Testament reading and instead put in a reading from the Old Testament Book of Amos, Chapter 7, verses 7 through 9.}\
\text{This is what he showed me: “The Lord was standing by a wall that had been built true to plumb, with a plumbline in his hand. And the Lord asked me, “What do you see, Amos?”}\
\text{“A plumbline,” I replied.}\
\text{Then the Lord said, “Look, I am setting a plumbline among my people Israel: I will spare them no longer.”}\
\text{A plumbline is a device used when you are constructing something. It is just a weight on a string, nonmagnetized, and it will show up and down so that you can build something that is square and that has a solid foundation.}\
\text{It is a reading about principles and values and what is a solid foundation. The Gospel reading that we heard in our tiny church in Kilmarock and around the world was the Good Samaritan story. Jesus is being pestered by a lawyer: What do I do to inherit eternal life? And Jesus said: You know the answer. Tell me the answer. And the lawyer does. He is smart. Love God and love your neighbor as yourself. Jesus says: Fine. You know the answer. Just live that way. But the lawyer, either to trap Jesus or because he was confused or he was trying to figure it out, says: But who is my neighbor? And then Jesus tells the story of a person beaten on the road to Jericho and lying at the side of the road. Some passed by pretending not to notice, though they do notice. Some noticed and sort of half go over to help but don’t do anything. But one person, a Samaritan—and in the Bible, Samaritans were despised minorities because they didn’t worship like other people did—actually is the one who actually goes and helps. As everyone knows, in the story he takes care of the person who is beaten. He takes him to an inn and pays the innkeeper and says: I will even pay you more. I will set up, Make sure that you nurse him back to health. This Samaritan was the one who was the neighbor. When Jesus then goes back to the lawyer and says: Which was the one who was the neighbor to the person who was beaten, the lawyer was so infected by the prejudice of his day that he can’t even say “the Samaritan.” Again, Samaritans were despised people, much like refugees or migrants or migrant kids seem today to be despised people. The lawyer couldn’t even make his lips say the word “Samaritan.” Who is the neighbor to the person who was beaten? He can’t even answer the question—the Samaritan. But he doesn’t know the answer and instead he says: The one who showed him mercy. Those were the readings that we heard—that the Lord will set a plumbline to try to determine whether the nation—in that instance, Israel—was being behaved properly or not, and in terms of what the plumbline is, what is the moral standard. The Lord is encouraging us to be neighbors, and not just to the people like us, not just to the people who are our next-door neighbors but even to people who are down on their luck, beaten, despised, and hurting.}\
\text{Mr. KAINE. Madam President, I rise to talk about an experience that I had on Sunday. Sunday was the day, July 14, that the President announced that the deportation raids would start. Woody Guthrie was listening to the radio. This is a man born on July 14, the day that the President announced that the deportation raids would start. Woody Guthrie was listening to the radio in January of 1948, and he heard a story about a plane that was taking deportees back to Mexico. The plane crashed in Los Gatos Canyon, near L.A., and the pilot and some others were killed, and 32 deportees were killed.}\
\text{And then Woody Guthrie was struck that when the story was told on the radio, they mentioned the names of the pilot and the copilot and the others who were working on the plane, but as for the 32 deportees who were killed, their names weren’t mentioned. They were “just deportees.”}\
\text{Here are the lyrics to the Woody Guthrie song written based on an incident in January 1948, but our history repeats itself.}\
\text{The oranges piled in their creosote dumps; They’re flying ‘em back to the Mexican border.}\
\text{To pay all their money to wade back again Goodbye to my Juan, goodbye, Rosalita, Adios mis amigos, Jesus y Maria; You won’t have your names when you ride the big airplane,}\
\text{All they will call you will be “deportees.” My father’s own father, he waded that river, They took all the money he made in his life; My brothers and sisters come working the fruit trees, And they rode the truck till they took down and died.}\
\text{Some of us are illegal, and some are not wanted,}
Our work contract’s out and we have to move on;
Six hundred miles to that Mexican border.
They chase us like outlaws, like rustlers, like thieves.
We died in your hills, we died in your deserts,
We died in your valleys and died on your plains.
We died ‘neath your trees and we died in your bushes.
Both sides of the river, we died just the same.
The sky plane caught fire over Los Gatos Canyon,
A fireball of lightning, and shook all our hills.
Who are all these friends, all scattered like dry leaves,
The radio says, “They are just deportees…”
Is this the best way we can grow our big orchards?
Is this the best way we can grow our good fruit?
To fall like dry leaves to rot on my topsoil
And be called by no name except “deportees”?

Along with several other colleagues earlier this week, I filed a bill called the Stop Cruelty to Migrant Children Act. It is a bill that has 40-plus cosponsors. It would do a number of things. It would set safety, health, and nutrition standards in these facilities whose pictures we are seeing—pictures that set an embarrassing example of a nation that should want to set a good example.

It would set minimum standards for food, nutrition, and healthcare. It would guarantee that children in these facilities that doesn’t even mean a meal a day and that the meals would be of adequate nutritional value. It would end the practice of family separation, unless ordered by a court, so the presumption would be that families could not be separated. It would provide additional resources for lawyers so that people can follow the rule of law and present evidence and present a case for asylum or refugee status, if there is a case to be made. It would allow the restart of programs like the Family Case Management Program, which was a successful program that enabled people to be placed in community settings, not cages or jails or institutions, and have management to make sure that they then come to court dates on time.

The bill has a number of provisions that I think are worthy, but the thing that is the most important about the bill to me and why I agree to cosponsor it is that I just think it puts our country in a position where we are setting the right example, not the wrong example. It puts our country in a position where if the plumline of right and wrong is applied to us, we are on the right side of that judgment. It puts us in a position where as we are being directed to be good neighbors—including to people who are hurting, including to people who are suffering—we would be able to look ourselves in the mirror and look the world in the eye and say: The United States believes that we are good neighbors, and we are behaving in a neighborly way toward people.
Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to ask my colleagues to support a lawsuit that is proceeding through the court system right now that has succeeded the district court level, that has had a hearing at the appellate court level, and may be speeded toward the Supreme Court. It is a lawsuit brought by 20 Republican attorneys general. It is a lawsuit that is being supported by the Trump administration. It is a lawsuit that many of my colleagues have gone on record saying they support. It is a lawsuit to undo the entirety of the Affordable Care Act, to throw out insurance for 20 million Americans and to end protections for people with preexisting conditions. It is an attempt to do through the court system what this Congress refused to do, which is to repeal the Affordable Care Act and all the insurance it provides for people without any plan for what comes next.

I have served in both the House and the Senate, and I listened for a long time to my Republican colleagues say that while they don’t like the Affordable Care Act, they certainly understand that there has to be something else, and that something else should be just as good as the Affordable Care Act.

In fact, the President himself said that whatever plan he supported in substitute of the Affordable Care Act would have better insurance, cheaper insurance, and would insure more people.

Republicans never came up with that plan. In fact, the replacement they jammed through the House of Representatives in 2017 was much worse than the Affordable Care Act. The Congressional Budget Office said that 24 million people would lose because of that piece of legislation and rates would potentially skyrocket for people with preexisting conditions.

There has never been a replacement for the Affordable Care Act. The only plan from the beginning has been to repeal it. Now that Congress has said it won’t repeal the Affordable Care Act—why? because Americans do not want the Affordable Care Act repealed with nothing to replace it—now that Congress has finally said that Americans people don’t support the repeal of the protections for sick people in the Affordable Care Act, Republicans are trying to get the courts to do it.

We are perhaps 60 days away from the Sixth Circuit invalidating the entirety of the Affordable Care Act. Likely, if that is the case, the judgment will ultimately be rendered by the Supreme Court. But that could come as soon as the beginning of next year. We could still be months away from a lawsuit in which the entirety of the Affordable Care Act is invalidated and what to do about it is put back before Congress.
It would stand to reason that if your plan is to try to get the entire Affordable Care Act thrown out in Congress, you would maybe start thinking about what would replace it. As far as I can tell, Republicans have no plan for what happens if the Affordable Care Act is overturned. I can tell you this: my Republican colleagues have spent no time thinking about what would happen if they actually end up catching the car they have been chasing.

What happens if the lawsuit succeeds? What happens if the Affordable Care Act is struck down? What comes next? We can’t accept—and I don’t think my Republican colleagues would want to accept—millions of people losing coverage overnight or insurance companies being able to discriminate against you because your child has a history of cancer or an insurance company being able to go back to capping the amount of insurance you get on an annual or lifetime basis.

It is far easier to think that we can reproduce the protections in the Affordable Care Act if we are not talking about it ahead of time. I am coming back on the floor today, as I have several times in the last few months, to ask my Republican colleagues to either withdraw your support for this lawsuit, stop the administration from being able to pursue it in court, or start a serious discussion about how you are going to protect care for everyone who has it today—not just a handful of people who have it today but all the people who have it today—while this lawsuit is moving through the system.

My Republican colleagues have been queried as to whether they support this lawsuit. The answers are all over the map, which tells you once again that nobody on the Republican side has really thought this one through.

One Republican Senator says: I actually think that the courts are eventually going to strike it down. Another says: I am ready for the lawsuit to succeed. I would love to go back in and actually deal with healthcare again.

Another one says: Do I hope the lawsuit succeeds? I do.

Another says: I can’t say I hope it succeeds. I think the strategy from here on that I have adopted in my own mind is repair.

Another one says: My hope and belief is we won’t strike the law down.

The answers are all over the map. That is fine. The Republicans can have a varied set of opinions on whether the lawsuit should succeed, but none of those individuals who are quoted giving various opinions as to whether they would like the lawsuit to succeed have a concrete plan for what comes next.

Let’s just be honest. It is mere fantasy to think that a divided Congress is going to be able to, in an emergency, come up with plans to keep 20 million people insured and keep preexisting conditions protections for the 133 million Americans who depend on them.

We can’t pass a budget through Congress. We have trouble passing a Higher Education Act reauthorization or the Violence Against Women Act. How on Earth are we going to pass a reordering of the American healthcare system when it is blown to bits by a Supreme Court? How are you going to prepare for what comes next?

That is why I am down on the floor today. I am going to keep on bringing this up because I just can’t accept this world in which we live today in which half of this Chamber is just sort of boxing the thing, just sort of eyes to this legal strategy. If it succeeds, as many Republicans hope it does, all we are going to be talking about here is healthcare. Overnight, we will be consumed by this topic, and we will not be able to come up with a solution that involves the same amount of protections that exist today.

Why repeal it? Why not continue to work on making the system better without holding hostage all of the Americans on it today? That is a much better path of action. Keep the Affordable Care Act in place. Work together on ways that we can fix the existing healthcare system. Don’t create a chaotic situation with the wholesale repeal of the entire act, putting lives in jeopardy.

There is no plan on behalf of the Republicans as to what to do if the ACA is overturned. I feel that we need to remind the country of that over and over again.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

REMEMBERING CORPORAL BENJAMIN KOPP

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, 10 years ago today, CPL Benjamin Kopp’s spirit departed from this world, but he remains with us in far more than memory.

Ben was raised in Minnesota, where his mother described him as a boy’s boy. He loved cars, trucks and revered his great-grandfather, a decorated veteran from World War II.

Then came 9/11, which changed Ben’s life forever, just as it changed the lives of so many Americans. Ben was only 13—little more than a boy—but on that day of tragedy, he felt the call of duty to his country. Moreover, he sensed a rendezvous with destiny. Remembering his great-grandfather, the heroic veteran of the U.S. Army at the age of 18, shipping off for basic training at Fort Benning not long after his high school graduation. There, he grew into a man and an Army Ranger. He assigned to fight with the Army’s famed 75th Ranger Regiment.

He served two deployments in Iraq and then went to Afghanistan in 2009. There, Ben and his buddies were exposed to heavy combat, as Rangers usually are. On June 10, 2009, they were engaged in an hours-long, intense firefight with Taliban insurgents in Helmand Province. Ben was leading a machine gun crew, providing suppressive fire for a group of Rangers amid enemy onslaught. Ben exposed himself and was shot behind the knee right in an artery. He was evacuated from the battlefield and placed in an induced coma.

Despite the surgeon’s best efforts, Ben never recovered from the loss of his leg. CPL Benjamin Kopp died with honor. Eight days later, on July 18, 2009, at the age of only 21, at Walter Reed Medical Center, Ben Kopp returned home to the Lord. Yet Ben is with us still. The heart of this Ranger beats on every day for those who knew him.

Before deploying, Ben did a lot of paperwork, as all soldiers do. On one form, he checked the box to be an organ donor. Where it asked which organs he wished to donate, he simply wrote “any that are needed.” In death, as in life, Ben lived up to the Ranger creed. He shouldered more than his share of the task, “one-hundred-percent and then some.” So just 2 days after Ben’s heart stopped beating, it beat anew in the chest of Judy Melkie, a Chicago woman who waited 7 months just to get on the organ donation list. “How can you have a better heart,” Judy said as she recovered. “I have the heart of a 21-year-old Army Ranger war hero beating in me.”

Ultimately, scores of people came to benefit from the sacrifice of this young soldier in Minnesota from his very blood and bones. Four lives were saved, all told, because Ben gave his all, his very body, for their sake. Ben departed 10 years ago, but his legacy lives on in the patients whose lives he touched and through the brave work of his mother, Jill, who has devoted her life to veterans’ causes. This year, she organized the second annual Freedom Walk to the Wall and challenged America to walk 1 million miles in honor of our fallen heroes.

The tragedy of Ben’s loss has touched Jill in unexpected ways as well. She has remained close with the Army Rangers who served alongside Ben and even with those who had never met him. Just recently, two freshly minted Rangers from Minnesota reached out to speak with Jill. You could say that she lost her son but gained a family of Rangers.

In Genesis, it is written that the Lord God created Eve in the rib of Adam. The first man. When God brought her to Adam, He said, “This is now bone of my bones and flesh of my flesh.” That mystical passage takes on new meaning when we reflect on stories like Ben’s.

Thanks to his willing sacrifice, Ben connected with scores of his countrymen in one of the most intimate ways imaginable. For all time, they will remain bone of his bones and flesh of his flesh. Rangers lead the way. That is what new Rangers learn at Fort Benning. In life and in death, Ben Kopp led the way, and his story will inspire us for many years to come, for, indeed, he is with us still.

I yield the floor.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Corker nomination?

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 55, nays 40, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 217 Ex.]

The nomination was confirmed.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the next nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Lynda Blan- chard, of Alabama, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Slovenia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Blanchard nomination?

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from Nevada (Ms. COTZES MASTO), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. MURPHY). The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from California.

The bill clerk called the roll.

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 54, nays 40, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 216 Ex.]

The nomination was confirmed.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the next nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Donald R. Tapia, of Arizona, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Jamaica.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BLUNT. Madam President, something I want to talk about today is something that you and I both care a lot about, and that is farming families and trade. For those of us who grew up on or near farming families, we know that there are a lot of things that are beyond the control of families who farm. For farming and ranching families, the only real certainty is uncertainty.

The only thing you know for sure, if your mom or dad is a dairy farmer, like my mom and dad were, is that you don’t know anything for sure. You don’t know about the weather. You don’t know absolutely for sure that all of your equipment is going to work exactly like you need it to and at exactly the time you need it to.

In some farming situations, you don’t know whether the help you need is going to be available the day you need it. The watermelons can’t wait. The strawberries can’t wait. The tomatoes can’t wait. But you can’t have a staff on all the time, ready to pick the watermelon the 2 weeks they need to be picked, or whatever those farmers have to deal with.

Uncertainty is part of farming. That is why trade agreements with other countries are so important to America’s agriculture. Trade is an essential part of our economy that not only feeds our country but goes so far toward feeding the whole world. Trade agreements can provide a little bit of certainty about markets and the opportunities people have to sell the products they are able to grow.

In Missouri, agriculture is an $88 billion industry. It employs nearly 400,000 people in our State. Missouri farmers and ranchers export more than $4 billion worth of products every year.

Trade deals that lower tariffs that are paid by Missouri farming and ranching families are a good deal now. I could go a long way beyond this, too, because not only does the agricultural sector impact people who make agricultural products but seeds and chemicals that we need fewer and fewer of all the time because people who make and repair machinery get more effective all the time. So both in the seed and chemical area but also people in transportation, people in insurance, people who run the local coffee shop, people whom the school district depends on for those property taxes are all benefited by a strong agricultural sector.

We make lots of other things in our State too. We make airplanes. We make pickup trucks. We make cars. We make beer cans. We make all kinds of things that are impacted by trade, but I say to the Presiding Officer, particularly when you and I are out talking in our neighboring States with the communities we deal with in agriculture, trade is a top-of-the-line issue.

It is just an important part of the economy of most of our States, frankly. Because of our location where we live, infrastructure is critical. We are also the hub for products that go all over North America. Integrating that infrastructure—water, rail, cars, and
trucks—makes a difference in how we compete.

Canada and Mexico are our two biggest trading partners in, I am sure, our State and in the country. In recent months, Mexico has become the biggest trading partner. Canada and the next biggest trading partner we have. These are not inconsequential relationships.

When the United States signed the North America Free Trade Agreement 25 years ago, it did a lot to open those markets for our products and to not only strengthen our economy but to strengthen the neighborhood. Our exports of food and agricultural products to Canada and Mexico quadrupled under the NAFTA agreement. The treaty also helped to strengthen ties among our countries.

You know, a strong Mexico is actually good for us. We have these problems at the border right now that Mexico is working to help solve. Nobody is coming from the northern border that we would be able to do at the southern tip of Mexico more secure that much narrower border where they are helping our neighbors that want to work with us.

It is time that we begin to build on the NAFTA agreement. The three of our countries agree on that. Democrats and Republicans agree on that. Members of the House and Senate agree on that. Now what we need to agree on is how to have a time to vote and approve this deal. Let's give our neighborhood the strength we have seen develop over the last 25 years. We hope our friends in the House bring this to the floor. It will be a bipartisan vote. It will be a comfortably passed vote. But you have to decide to have a vote for that to happen, and I hope we are close to that moment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

BROWSER ACT

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam President, today I rise and seek my colleagues' support for the BROWSER Act, which is a bipartisan piece of legislation that will protect consumers' data privacy and offer tech companies the freedom they need to innovate.

This is something we are hearing so much about. How do you protect your privacy online, or do you have privacy online? The BROWSER Act is the bipartisan solution to that.

Innovation really puts the words and the wisdom of the world at our fingertips. Think about it. A click of a mouse, a touch of the screen, and everything you want to know appears right there in front of you. Now that we have all downloaded a myriad of apps and we are using search engines every single day, it is commonplace. But what we have learned and what people are more than ever is that in the process of doing this, they have given away something vitally important and precious; that is, their privacy and their information. I call it your “virtual you” because it is you, your presence, that is right there online.

As your transactional life has grown online—you pay your bills, you do your shopping, you order your groceries, you order dinner to be delivered—every time you do that, you are giving these apps a peek into your privacy, into your habits, and there is really quite a battle going on. Who owns the “virtual you”? Is it you or the bank or the insurance company or the app that is profiting off you?

Data is the bedrock of most tech companies’ revenue streams. The higher the quality of that data, the more money they are going to get for the ad space they sell. The more money they get for the ad space they sell, the more profit they are going to put into their pocket.

When you look at all these apps—Facebook, YouTube, Instagram, Google, Snapchat—all of these apps are taking your information. They mine your information, and it gets sold—sold for those that are placing ads on your screen.

There is a reason companies provide convoluted, pages-long disclosure, full disclosure and privacy policies in tiny print so small you can’t read it. It is the same reason that watchdogs warn consumers that if the service is free, you are the product. If the service is free, then you are selling yourself. You are the product. You are because it is your information that they want.

Now, I will tell you this: We have come to a season in our society where we are having a different story just about every single day of some type of bad behavior from one of these companies. The current story today is about FaceApp, and I think that if I went around the room and asked those who are younger if they have used any of these face-altering apps, they would probably say: Yeah, we downloaded one. They are really a lot of fun to play with.

Here is the danger: That app—these face-altering apps and FaceApp—is not limited to just bits of personal information that are going to be appended to a data set. It could be your image used publicly—with your consent, of course, if you agreed to the fine print by clicking “download” or “get.” With that, you give your privacy away.

Consumers have really grown accustomed to clicking the “get” button. They say: I don’t have time to read all about it, but it would take too long. I don’t understand what it means. I just want to use this app. It is convenient.

A quick scroll through an average Instagram feed this morning revealed post after post of artificially-aged faces, all thanks to FaceApp, which now owns those images and can do whatever it wants with those images because you unintentionally, when you clicked “get,” gave them the permission to use them.

This is one of those things where you have to say: Buyer beware and know what you are getting into. Ask anybody who downloaded that app last night, and I bet you they have a little bit of buyer’s remorse going on, and they probably wish they hadn’t done it and opened those photos to being used by people they will never ever know.

Over the past few years, we have watched tech companies lose control of their own narratives, and customers are demanding a more satisfying response to the current parade of controversy—something more than just “Oh, we are going to do better in the future.” It is clear that the real company can no longer regulate itself. Big Tech does not have the appetite for self-regulation.

That is why I welcome my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to sign on to the BROWSER Act. This bill finally has been years in the making. I first introduced it in the House of Representatives during the 115th Congress, but my
work on the issue began long before that, as I chaired the Privacy Working Group in the House.

What this legislation, the BROWSER Act, would do is it would set up a Federal compliance framework that tech companies use as a guide. It would require companies to secure a clear opt-in from you, the consumer, before collecting sensitive information about your health, your finances, or your Social Security numbers—things that are important and personal to you. You have to get your explicit permission in order to use those. For less sensitive information, like an IP address or your browsing history or your search and your purchase history, companies would have to give customers the opportunity to opt-out so that they would not have the permission to share that.

Companies won’t be able to deny service to anyone refusing to waive their privacy, but the Federal Trade Commission will keep the playing field level by applying the rules equally across the entire internet ecosystem.

To recap that, you would have opt-in for sensitive information and opt-out for nonsensitive information and one set of rules, with one regulator, for the entire internet ecosystem and a tech platform that would not be able to throw you off because you said: Hey, I want to protect myself and my family. I think it is important, too, to realize that the BROWSER Act does not over-regulate the industry, but what this does is it says: Let’s have guidelines. Let’s have some guardrails up here. Let’s have a light-touch regulation that is going to protect the consumer and allow the consumer to protect their “virtual you,” their presence online.

Lately, what we have seen is some blowback from some very public mistakes that have chased some of these big companies into the arms of the regulators, making them all too happy to accept government-mandated rules in lieu of internal standards. You have heard it. You have heard some people like Facebook saying: Oh, my goodness. We will accept regulation now. We want the Federal Government more involved. What they are trying to do is block out innovation and competition and new startups because they control the marketplace.

Google—ninety percent of search is done by Google.

Recently, Facebook got a $5 billion fine from the Federal Trade Commission. I said that actually wasn’t enough. It should have been more like $50 billion when you look at the business Facebook has built and the valuation they have built. They are a big advertising company. They have this platform. They get you on that platform. They build their valuation off the number of eyeballs they capture to that, the more and, remember what I said earlier, the high quality of the data. That is money in their revenue stream, and it is profit in their pockets. Their bad behavior will not change unless we change the way they are going to be able to do business.

Understanding the business of Big Tech is half the battle. I have been at this for years, going back to my days on the House Armed Services Committee, we looked at film and entertainment and music and moving from analog to digital in the economy, coming to Congress, working in the House on this issue.

I will state that the ins and outs of this industry is not something that can be learned in a day or something you can be briefed on and then all of a sudden you are an expert in that area. If you think you know it all—what I have learned in tech is, the more you learn the less you know, and you have to keep working on it if you are going to properly regulate the industry.

I thank my colleague Senate Judiciary Chairman LINDSEY GRAHAM for recognizing the need for institutional knowledge for knowing why I am asking you to lead the committee’s new technology task force. This is a bipartisan group. We will meet regularly with leaders in the tech industry, and we will talk a good bit about data, privacy and granularization, censorship, and other issues that will arise. Our first meeting is actually going to be later today. I would encourage my friends in the Senate to use this time and use this task force as a resource. None of these issues are not going to go away. It is time for us to do something on the issues of privacy, data security, censorship, and prioritization.

To my colleagues who are really very knowledgeable, that we can use a tighter touch in regulating Big Tech. I want to say this: Washington is historically very bad at culture change. They are very bad at it. What we do know is, when looking at the technology that goes through the industrial sector in this country, that technology goes through a life cycle, if you will, in about 18 months. We know there cannot be heavy-handed regulation. We know we cannot regulate to a technology. We know that the guidelines need to be put in place, and the guardrails need to be laid down.

We need to make certain businesses are looking at their consumers, and they are saying: You can trust us to be a good steward of your information. Consumers, citizens—Tennesseans, in my case—need to know I have asked the tech companies to work to restore the trust and confidence that is needed by the online consumer and to move away from having it understood by people—understood in the negative, that if the service is free, you are the product.

Let’s join together, in a bipartisan fashion, and give the American online consumer the ability to control and to own their virtual “you,” which is them and their presence online.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNT). The clerk will call the roll. The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ONE SMALL STEP TO PROTECT HUMAN HERITAGE IN SPACE ACT

Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, 50 years ago, more than 650 million men, women, and children from nearly every corner of the Earth gathered around radios and televisions with wide eyes and quickly beating hearts. They gathered to witness one of the greatest triumphs of ingenuity and cooperation in human history. Scrawled across television screens were the words never spoken before: “Live from the Moon.”

I remember that moment vividly. I was 10 years old, and I was in France with my mother and my French family, my grandma and grandpa, and we huddled around a little black and white TV to watch my grandma, Betty, July 20, 1969. It was evening in France when the landing occurred. Our eyes were glued to the screen and we saw this grainy video, and there was little prickly audio broadcast of Neil Armstrong and Buzz Aldrin as they were attempting to do what no human had ever attempted to do before.

Almost 2 hours after the landing, as we held our breath and saw the landing, Commander Armstrong created the first human boot print not on planet Earth. In that moment, I remember thinking that the astronauts on the Moon didn’t just represent America at that moment. They also represented my family who lived in France and their excitement. They really represented everybody around the world. They were representing humanity and what is achievable when you dream big.

I have come to the floor today to honor the incredible achievement of Neil Armstrong, Buzz Aldrin, and Michael Collins, as well as the 400,000 people around the world who made the Apollo 11 landing possible. Among those were NASA’s now-famous “Hidden Figures”—African-American women pioneers including Katherine Johnson, Mary Jackson, and Dorothy Vaughan, who were responsible for calculating trajectories to get Apollo astronauts to and from the Moon.

Ultimately, this achievement was the result of the perseverance of countless individuals and, of course, the American taxpayers who, after numerous high-profile failures, including the loss of the very first Apollo crew, continued to support the Apollo Program.

Over the last few months there have been celebrations of this anniversary around the world because the achievements of Apollo were achievements for humanity. Here in the Senate I was
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proud to introduce legislation with Senator TED CRUZ that would establish the first of its kind of Federal protections for the Apollo landing sites. Our One Small Step to Protect Human Heritage in Space Act would permanently protect the Apollo landing sites from intentional and unintentional disruptions by future Moon missions. It would ensure that any activities destined for the Moon and licensed by the U.S. Government would have to follow NASA’s preservation guidelines for the Apollo sites.

In recent years, a number of countries and private companies have announced plans to send spacecraft to the Moon. For example, India just recently delayed a launch of a spacecraft that is destined for the Moon, and China has announced plans to establish a permanent presence on the Moon.

Our legislation will set an example for other countries to protect these sites for their historical, archaeological, scientific, and engineering value and to help ensure that future lunar activities do not disturb these sites.

I am pleased that last week we were able to pass the One Small Step to Protect Human Heritage in Space Act out of the Senate Commerce Committee, thanks to the leadership of Chairman ROGER WICKER and Ranking Member MARIA CANTWELL and their staffs.

Today I ask the Senate to take one small step forward in passing this legislation—a first of its kind conservation measure to honor and preserve human heritage in space.

Mr. President, as if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 155, S. 1694.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1694) to require any Federal agency that issues licenses to conduct activities in outer space to include in the requirements for such licenses an agreement relating to the preservation and protection of the Apollo 11 landing sites and other historic sites, and for purposes related thereto.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

S1694
CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

SEC. 1. SHORT TITLE.
This Act may be cited as the “One Small Step to Protect Human Heritage in Space Act”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS; SENSE OF CONGRESS.
(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:
(2) On July 20, 1969, will mark the 50th anniversary of the date on which the Apollo 11 spacecraft landed on the lunar surface and Neil Armstrong and Buzz Aldrin became the first humans to set foot on a celestial body off the Earth.
(3) The landing of the Apollo 11 spacecraft and Neil Armstrong's first footprints on the lunar surface are achievements unparalleled in history, a direct product of the work and perseverance of the more than 400,000 individuals who contributed to the development of the Apollo missions on the shoulders of centuries of science and engineering pioneers from all corners of the world.
(4) Among those thousands of individuals who have contributed to the achievements of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (in this section referred to as “NASA”) are African-American women such as Katherine Johnson, Dorothy Vaughn, Mary Jackson, and Dr. Christine Darden, who made critical contributions to NASA space programs. Katherine Johnson worked at NASA for 35 years and calculated the trajectory of the Apollo 11 landing and the trajectories for the spaceflights of astronauts Alan Shepard and John Glenn. Katherine Johnson, together with individuals whose work of whom often went unacknowledged, helped broaden the scope of space travel and charted new frontiers for humanity’s exploration of space.
(5) The landing of the Apollo 11 spacecraft was made on behalf of all humankind, and Neil Armstrong and Buzz Aldrin were accompanied by messages of peace from the leaders of more than 70 countries.
(6) The lunar landing sites of the Apollo 11 spacecraft, the robotic spacecraft that preceded the Apollo 11 mission, and the creased and robotic spacecraft that followed, are outstanding universal value to humanity.
(7) Such landing sites are an essential part of our national and human exploration activities that remain a potential source of cultural, historical, archaeological, anthropological, and scientific value.
(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—
(1) as commercial enterprises and more countries acquire the ability to land on the Moon, it is necessary to ensure the recognition and protection of the Apollo 11 landing site and other historic landing sites in the United States; and
(2) the President should work with other countries to develop best practices to ensure the protection of historic lunar landing sites and artifacts.

The committee-reported amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 927) was agreed to as follows:

(Purpose: To modify the sense of Congress with respect to collaboration with other countries)

In section 2(b), strike paragraph (3) and insert the following:
(3) The President should work with other countries to develop best practices to ensure the protection of historic lunar landing sites and artifacts.

The committee-reported amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

Mr. PETERS. I know of no further debate on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate on the bill?

Hearing none, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (S. 1694), as amended, was passed.
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 “One Small Step to Protect Human Heritage in Space Act”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS; SENSE OF CONGRESS.

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


(2) July 20, 2019, will mark the 50th anniversary of the date on which the Apollo 11 spacecraft landed on the Moon and Neil Armstrong and Buzz Aldrin became the first humans to set foot on a celestial body off the Earth.

(3) The landing of the Apollo 11 spacecraft and humanity’s first off-world footprints are achievements unparalleled in history, a direct product of the work and perseverance of the more than 400,000 individuals who contributed to the development of the Apollo missions on the shoulders of centuries of science and engineering pioneers from all corners of the world.

(4) Among the thousands of individuals who helped to achieve the goals of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (in this section referred to as “NASA”) are African-American women such as Katherine Johnson, Dorothy Vaughan, Mary Jackson, and Dr. Christine Darden, who made critical contributions to NASA space programs. Katherine Johnson worked at NASA for 35 years and calculated the trajectory of the Apollo 11 landing and the trajectories for the spaceflights of astronauts Alan Shepard and John Glenn. Katherine Johnson, together with many other individuals, the work of whom often went unacknowledged, helped broaden the scope of space travel and charted new frontiers for humanity’s exploration of space.

(5) The landing of the Apollo 11 spacecraft was made on behalf of all humankind, and Neil Armstrong and Buzz Aldrin were accompanied by messages of peace from the leaders of more than 70 countries.

(6) The lunar landing sites of the Apollo 11 spacecraft, the robotic spacecraft that preceded it, and the human and robotic spacecraft that followed, are of outstanding universal value to humanity.

(7) Such landing sites:

(A) win the first archaeological sites with human activity that are not on Earth;

(B) provide evidence of the first achievements of humankind in the realm of space travel and exploration; and

(C) contain artifacts and other evidence of human exploration activities that remain a potential source of cultural, historical, archaeological, anthropological, scientific, and engineering knowledge.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) as commercial enterprises and more countries acquire the ability to land on the Moon, it is necessary to recognize and protect the Apollo 11 landing site and other historic landing sites in acknowledgment of the human effort and innovation the sites represent;

(2) the Apollo 11 landing site, other similar historic landing sites, lunar artifacts, and the environment surrounding such sites and artifacts merit protection from disturbance to prevent irremediable loss of sites and artifacts that are of archeological, anthropological, historical, scientific, and engineering significance and value; and

(3) the President should work with other countries to develop best practices to ensure the protection of historic lunar landing sites and artifacts.

SEC. 3. LICENSING REQUIREMENTS CONCERNING PRESERVATION OF HISTORIC LUNAR ARTIFACTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, any Federal agency that issues a license to conduct a lunar activity shall require each applicant for such a license to—

(1) agree to abide by the recommendations described in subsection (b); or

(2) in the case of a license that requires a license from more than one Federal agency, to certify under penalty of perjury as provided in paragraph (1) or (2), as applicable, of section 1796 of title 28, United States Code, that the applicant has submitted an application for a license for such activity to another Federal agency that satisfies paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 1796.

(b) RECOMMENDATIONS DESCRIBED.—The recommendations described in this subsection are—

(1) “NASA’s Recommendations to Space-Faring Entities: How to Protect and Preserve the Historic and Scientific Value of U.S. Government Lunar Artifacts” issued by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration on July 20, 2011, and updated on October 28, 2011; and

(2) any successor heritage preservation recommendations, guidelines, or principles relating to the protection and preservation of Government lunar artifacts issued by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

(c) EXEMPTIONS.—A Federal agency issuing a license described in subsection (a) may, in consultation with the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, exempt specific lunar activities of an applicant from the requirements for such licenses an agreement between the agency and the applicant was agreed to, as follows:

(1) as commercial enterprises and more countries acquire the ability to land on the Moon, it is necessary to recognize and protect the Apollo 11 landing site and other historic landing sites in acknowledgment of the human effort and innovation the sites represent;

(2) the Apollo 11 landing site, other similar historic landing sites, lunar artifacts, and the environment surrounding such sites and artifacts merit protection from disturbance to prevent irremediable loss of sites and artifacts that are of archeological, anthropological, historical, scientific, and engineering significance and value; and

(3) the President should work with other countries to develop best practices to ensure the protection of historic lunar landing sites and artifacts.

SEC. 4. AUTHORITY TO ASSESS PENALTY FEES.

(a) AUTHORITY TO ASSESS PENALTY FEES.—A Federal agency issuing a license described in subsection (a) may, in consultation with the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, exempt specific lunar activities of an applicant from the historic preservation requirements for such licenses an agreement between the agency and the applicant was agreed to, as follows:

(1) as commercial enterprises and more countries acquire the ability to land on the Moon, it is necessary to recognize and protect the Apollo 11 landing site and other historic landing sites in acknowledgment of the human effort and innovation the sites represent;

(2) the Apollo 11 landing site, other similar historic landing sites, lunar artifacts, and the environment surrounding such sites and artifacts merit protection from disturbance to prevent irremediable loss of sites and artifacts that are of archeological, anthropological, historical, scientific, and engineering significance and value; and

(3) the President should work with other countries to develop best practices to ensure the protection of historic lunar landing sites and artifacts.

(2) has a greater likelihood than not of becoming lunar in nature, including unintentional orbit and impact.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, I further ask that the committee-reported amendment to the title be agreed to and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

Mr. PETERS. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PETERS. The committee-reported title amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to. The bill (S. 1694), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. PETERS. The committee-reported title amendment was agreed to, as follows:

Amend the title so as to read: “A bill to require any Federal agency that issues licenses to conduct lunar activities to include in the requirements for such licenses an agreement relating to the preservation and protection of the Apollo 11 landing site, and for other purposes.”

Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, I want to thank my colleague Senator Cruz for helping me develop and advance this legislation.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, I want to thank my colleagues on the House Science Committee, Chairwoman Johnson and Ranking Members Horn, Lucas, and Babin for their leadership and support in the House of Representatives.

Fifty years ago, Neil Armstrong and Buzz Aldrin left a plaque on the lunar surface. On that plaque is a map of Earth and the following words:

Here men from the planet Earth first set foot upon the Moon, July 1969 A.D. We came in peace for all mankind.

Our grandchildren’s grandchildren should have an opportunity to observe this plaque.

I thank my colleagues for taking this small step with me to ensure that the opportunity will generationally come and that the spirit of Apollo—of ingenuity, of cooperation, and of peace—will inspire generations to come.

Thank you.

Mr. PETERS. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, this week marks an extraordinary milestone in the history of humanity.

Fifty years ago, on July 16, 1969, the entire world watched in awe as the Apollo 11 mission took off from Cape Canaveral. Four days later, on July 20, again the entire world held its breath as the lunar lander made its descent and as Neil Armstrong and then Buzz Aldrin both stepped onto the surface of the Moon. As Neil Armstrong famously said, “It’s one small step for man, one giant leap for mankind.”

On Saturday, 50 years will have passed since man first stepped onto the Moon. We are celebrating that as a nation, and we are celebrating that across the world—the 50 years that have passed since. We are also looking...
forward, with hope and optimism, to the next 50 years of space exploration and America’s continued strong leadership in space.

I thank my friend Senator Peters for his leadership on this legislation that we have just passed through the Senate. It is legislation that ensures that those artifacts, those footprints, made by those historic pioneers for humanity will not be disturbed, will not be violated, will not be destroyed but, rather, will be preserved for future generations so that decades and centuries from now those shrines to the incredible imagination and the unstoppable potential of the human spirit will be preserved for all of history.

This is a time of partisan division on many, many issues. Yet I am encouraged when it comes to space and America’s leadership in space that we continually see the bipartisan cooperation of Democrats and Republicans working hand in hand.

I also commend NASA, in particular, for announcing the Artemis Project. Artemis, as you know, is the twin sister to Apollo in Greek mythology, and Artemis will be the next journey to the Moon that the United States will be undertaking.

I am particularly grateful that the Administrator of NASA has committed that when we, once again, land on the surface of the Moon in the coming years, among those astronauts to land on the Moon will be the first woman ever to set foot on the surface of the Moon. As the father of two young daughters, after 50 years, I say it is about time that we land a woman on the Moon. As the father of two young daughters, after 50 years, I say it is about time that we land a woman on the Moon.

I am particularly grateful that the Administrator of NASA has committed that when we, once again, land on the Moon in the coming years, among those astronauts to land on the Moon will be the first woman ever to set foot on the surface of the Moon. As the father of two young daughters, after 50 years, I say it is about time that we land a woman on the Moon.

I am particularly grateful that the Administrator of NASA has committed that when we, once again, land on the Moon in the coming years, among those astronauts to land on the Moon will be the first woman ever to set foot on the surface of the Moon. As the father of two young daughters, after 50 years, I say it is about time that we land a woman on the Moon.

I am particularly grateful that the Administrator of NASA has committed that when we, once again, land on the Moon in the coming years, among those astronauts to land on the Moon will be the first woman ever to set foot on the surface of the Moon. As the father of two young daughters, after 50 years, I say it is about time that we land a woman on the Moon.

I am particularly grateful that the Administrator of NASA has committed that when we, once again, land on the Moon in the coming years, among those astronauts to land on the Moon will be the first woman ever to set foot on the surface of the Moon. As the father of two young daughters, after 50 years, I say it is about time that we land a woman on the Moon.

I am particularly grateful that the Administrator of NASA has committed that when we, once again, land on the Moon in the coming years, among those astronauts to land on the Moon will be the first woman ever to set foot on the surface of the Moon. As the father of two young daughters, after 50 years, I say it is about time that we land a woman on the Moon.

I am particularly grateful that the Administrator of NASA has committed that when we, once again, land on the Moon in the coming years, among those astronauts to land on the Moon will be the first woman ever to set foot on the surface of the Moon. As the father of two young daughters, after 50 years, I say it is about time that we land a woman on the Moon.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Mark T. Esper, of Virginia, to be Secretary of Defense.

The following Senators from the Senate, according to the vote schedule for 1:45 p.m., make up the cloture motion to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Mark T. Esper, of Virginia, to be Secretary of Defense.

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Mark T. Esper, of Virginia, to be Secretary of Defense.

The Senate is in session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 66, nays 26, as follows:

(Rollcall Vote No. 218 Ex.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEA</th>
<th>NAY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alexander</td>
<td>Fischer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barasso</td>
<td>Gardner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackburn</td>
<td>Graham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blunt</td>
<td>Grassley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boozman</td>
<td>Hasean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burr</td>
<td>Hawley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capito</td>
<td>Hoeven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlin</td>
<td>Hyde-Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carper</td>
<td>Inhofe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassidy</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collins</td>
<td>Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coons</td>
<td>Kennedy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornyn</td>
<td>King</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cramer</td>
<td>Lankford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crapo</td>
<td>Leach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daines</td>
<td>Latta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duckworth</td>
<td>McSally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ernst</td>
<td>Menendez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ernst</td>
<td>Mirkowski</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ernst</td>
<td>Murphy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminine</td>
<td>McSally</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOT VOTING—8

Booker | Cortez Masto | Stabenow |
| Harris | Isakson | Warren |

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion was carried.

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate’s action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order to move to proceed to nominations reported out of the Armed Services Committee today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion was agreed to.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Mark T. Esper, of Virginia, to be Secretary of Defense.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 371.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion was agreed to.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion was agreed to.

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Brian C. Buescher, of Nebraska, to be United States District Judge for the District of Nebraska.

Motions be waived.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Brian C. Buescher, of Nebraska, to be United States District Judge for the District of Nebraska.

The motion was agreed to.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the motion of Brian C. Buescher, of Nebraska, to be United States District Judge for the District of Nebraska.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk read the nomination of Brian C. Buescher, of Nebraska, to be United States District Judge for the District of Nebraska.

The motion was agreed to.

I, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Wendy Williams Berger, of Florida, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Florida.

Motions be waived.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion will call the roll.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, the men and women who responded to the horrific events of September 11, 2001, are among the great heroes of American history. Whether fighting the deadly flames, rescuing people who were injured or dying, or removing the destructive debris from the 9/11 attack sites, the 9/11 volunteers and rescue workers displayed the courage and the sacrificial service that has earned them universal respect and admiration.

Tragically, the men and women who responded to the 9/11 attack sites, the 9/11 victims fund has now paid out $5.2 billion to compensate both the survivors and responders who lived near the site. It was authorized for 2 years, and it paid out about $7 billion in benefits and then closed.

In 2011, Congress established the September 11th Victim Compensation Fund to compensate both the survivors of the attacks and also the residents who lived near the site. It was authorized for 2 years, and it paid out about $7 billion in benefits and then closed.

In 2011, Congress revived and expanded the program to cover a larger universe of victims and responders, and it authorized that fund to spend $2.7 billion over 5 years.

In 2015, citing a growing need, Congress reauthorized the fund for another 5 years and an additional $4.6 billion. Of that $7.4 billion authorized since 2011, the fund has now paid out $5.2 billion.

With money getting tight, in February of this year, the fund began temporarily reducing the claimants’ benefits until Congress reauthorized and replenished it until such time as we can make those beneficiaries whole.

In Washington, this is a recipe for trouble. As we all know, finite authorizations are how Congress ensures that taxpayer money actually gets to its intended beneficiaries and not simply lost through government bureaucracies somewhere. It is how we make sure this is about protecting those who are supposed to benefit rather than government bureaucrats themselves.

Since 2011, the 9/11 victims fund has always had finite authorizations, and, by all accounts, it has had an excellent record of avoiding waste and abuse. These two things are not coincidental. They go together, and 9/11 survivors and first responders deserve no less moving forward. They deserve no less than to make sure the program created in their honor for their benefit, in fact, benefits them. This is why I would like to offer a simple amendment to this bill that would authorize $10.2 billion in additional funding for the 9/11 victims fund over the next 10 years. That is the amount the Congressional Budget Office has estimated is necessary for covering all valid claims between now and 2029.

My amendment would further authorize an additional $10 billion beyond that time. My amendment would not block or delay the bill’s consideration, let alone its passage.

This is something we could vote on in a matter of minutes, 15 minutes or so, and then move on to final passage. We could, in fact, accomplish this today before we adjourn for the weekend.

This is, in fact, what I prefer. I think finishing our work on this bill to protect victims and first responders is worth 15, 20, 30 minutes of our time. That is what I prefer.

I have had conversations with my colleagues, including colleagues across the aisle. In order to accommodate requests from some of my colleagues, I have agreed, with their mutual assent, to negotiate a different arrangement—one that would make some way to finish passage on this bill and that we consider my amendment and that of Senator Paul’s within the next few days.
Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President,-reserving the right to object.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I will not object. First, I just want to thank both my colleagues from New York and Utah for working out this agreement with the leader and me.

What this does is it paves the way, finally, for what we have been waiting on for a very, very long time—an up-or-down vote on H.R. 1327. There will be two amendments offered. We will oppose them. I don’t think they have much of a chance of winning, but there is a right to offer them.

I want to thank my colleague from Utah for moving forward here, as well as, of course, my colleague from New York for the great work. Right now, for the first time, we can not only see the light at the end of the tunnel, we are getting very close to getting out of the tunnel. I expect that by Wednesday, we will be out of that tunnel, the bill will head to the President’s desk, having already passed the House, he will sign it, and our first responders can go do the job they have been intending to do all along, which is to take care of themselves and their loved ones, and take care of their brothers and sisters who have these injuries or who will get these injuries.

It has been a long, long and hard struggle for over a decade, but now, finally, it looks quite certain that this bill will pass the Senate, go to the President’s desk, and at long last become law, and those first responders who made this happen more than anybody else will not—will not have to come back again.

I do not object to the offer by my colleague from Utah.

I yield the floor.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I am grateful to the Democratic leader and to both Senators from New York for working with me on this and for getting this, along with my amendment and Senator Paul’s amendment, set up for a vote.

To be very clear—I want there to be no ambiguity—I will be willing to vote on this right now. There is no reason, finally, finally—it looks quite certain that this bill will pass the Senate, go to the President’s desk, and at long last become law, and those first responders who made this happen more than anybody else will not—will not have to come back again.

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I am grateful to the Democratic leader and to both Senators from New York for working with me on this and for getting this, along with my amendment and Senator Paul’s amendment, set up for a vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 153, H.R. 1327; that the only amendments in order be Lee amendment No. 928 and Paul amendment No. 929 to be offered; that there be up to 2 hours of concurrent debate equally divided between the leaders or designees; that just prior to the vote in relation to the amendments in the order listed, with no second-degree amendments in order prior to the votes; that there be 2 minutes equally divided prior to each vote; and that each amendment be subject to an affirmative 60-vote threshold, notwithstanding rule XXII.

Mr. SCHUMER. With the Democratic leader and to the Democratic leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 153, H.R. 1327; that all amendments be in order; that each amendment be subject to an affirmative 60-vote threshold; and that each amendment be subject to an affirmative 60-vote threshold for delay.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 153, H.R. 1327; that all amendments be in order; that each amendment be subject to an affirmative 60-vote threshold; that the only amendments be Lee amendment No. 928 and Paul amendment No. 929 to be offered; that there be up to 2 hours of concurrent debate equally divided between the leaders or designees; that just prior to the vote in relation to the amendments in the order listed, with no second-degree amendments in order prior to the votes; that there be 2 minutes equally divided prior to each vote; and that each amendment be subject to an affirmative 60-vote threshold, notwithstanding rule XXII.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I will not object. First, I just want to thank both my colleagues from New York and Utah for working out this agreement with the leader and me.

What this does is it paves the way, fi

THE ECONOMY

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, just another day on Wall Street and just another news story. The New York Times’ headline today was “Big Banks Are Earning Billions of Dollars. Trump’s Tax Cuts Are A Big Reason.’’

So Congress can continue to do tax cuts for Wall Street. Congress can continue to weaken rules on Wall Street. Congress has forgotten. They have this collective amnesia about what happened 10 years ago when this country’s economy almost imploded because of Wall Street greed. So now Congress—because of the tax cut and because of continued relaxation of Wall Street financial stability safety rules, Wall Street is doing really well again.

However, Congress can’t pass an overtime bill—I mean, sorry. Congress can’t pass a minimum wage bill. The last minimum wage increase in this Congress was signed by President Bush in 2007. President Obama never did it, and President Trump continues to oppose a minimum wage increase.

President Trump has rolled back an overtime rule, which in the State of Indiana—the Presiding Officer’s State—almost 100,000 workers were going to get a raise because of the overtime rule we passed a couple years ago. So people, if they work more than 40 hours, they ought to get paid for more than 40 hours. We passed a bill that said that back—and 130,000 workers in my State alone would have gotten a big bump in their wages because they were working 45, 50, or 60 hours a week.

This Congress will not pass an infrastructure bill. Look at the conditions of the roads in Cleveland, Toledo, Mansfield, Findlay, Akron, Youngstown, Gallipolis, Chillicothe, and Portsmouth, in my State, and all kinds of communities in Indiana, which the Presiding Officer represents. Congress can’t even find a way to fund it can always find the money to help the richest 1 percent and help the big banks, but we can’t turn around and do what
we ought to do on the minimum wage, what we ought to do on the overtime rule, and what we ought to do to expand the earned income tax credit. I do appreciate the Presiding Officer’s interest, especially in the earned income tax credit, what he has tried to do there. We just simply can’t find the time to do that.

We always help the people who have much in this society, and we just never get around, in this Congress, to helping the people who need a break.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BRAUN). The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I am proud of the fact that 1 out of every 10 persons who wears the uniform of the U.S. military calls Texas home. It is no surprise that with more than a dozen military installations in the State, many servicemembers choose to live in Texas when they return to civilian life. We had a historic dentist’surn population of all of the States, with an estimated 1.6 million veterans living in Texas.

As you might suppose, in having the honor of representing these 1.6 million veterans, I have quite a few people who hear from them often. I hear about the challenges they face when they transition back to civilian life. Whether the challenges are the big ones or the little ones, whether the challenges are of navigating complicated trails of paperwork, getting the timely healthcare they need, or finding employment when they return to civilian life, I am eager to help them identify solutions.

Over the last few years, we have made some major progress. In the last Congress, for example, we passed the historic VA MISSION Act, which modernized the veterans’ appeals process and the electronic health records system. The bill reformed GI benefits, improved accountability within the VA Administration, and provided the largest funding increase in history for veterans’ care and services.

We have also passed other bills to help veterans transition from military service. For example, our Jobs for Our Heroes Act made it easy for veterans to get commercial driver’s licenses. Believe it or not, it is hard for the private sector to find the truckdrivers it needs. After somebody has driven a large vehicle in the military as part of his daily duties, you can imagine that his transitioning to a commercial driver’s license would be a relatively simple thing. Given the paperwork and the bureaucracy and the challenges of one’s applying for a commercial driver’s license, we were able to pass legislation to facilitate that transition.

We also passed the American Law Enforcement Heroes Act, which ensures that veterans get hired by local law enforcement agencies. If you think about that, it is a skill set that many learn in the military, whether they served in the military police or otherwise. If you talk to one of your local police departments, one of the things the department is short on is the number of people who work for local law enforcement. That is also true for Federal law enforcement agencies, particularly for the Border Patrol. Many military servicemembers come out of the military with the very skills that are needed most by the police agencies that work to keep our communities safe.

To improve the educational opportunities that are available to these men and women, in the last Congress, we passed a bipartisan bill called the Harry W. Colmery Veterans Educational Assistance Act, also known as the Forever GI Bill. President Trump signed it into law in August of 2017. With a stroke of a pen, he enhanced and expanded education benefits for veterans, servicemembers, and their families.

The Forever GI Bill made much needed updates for veterans who face school closures while they are enrolled. It expanded work study activities. It also created a scholarship program for students who receive degrees in science, technology, engineering, and math, the so-called STEM fields. It established the Edith Nourse Rogers STEM Scholarship, which provides student veterans with an additional 9 months of GI bill eligibility in order to ensure they have the time and the financial assistance they need in order to complete their studies in some of our most needed fields. We later learned that there is an issue, though, that prevents many student veterans from full advantage of that program. The current law mandates that students must be enrolled in a STEM program for more than 128 credit hours, but the Department of Veterans Affairs found that there are only three States in which the average STEM degree exceeds that minimum. That places many students in an unfair position of either picking from a limited list of schools or forgiving the scholarship money, which can provide them in financial assistance. That is a Hobson’s choice for our veterans, and it is time for Congress to fix that error.

To ensure that all veterans who want to take advantage of the Nourse scholarship are able to, on a bipartisan basis with several of my colleagues, I recently introduced legislation called the Veteran STEM Scholarship Improvement Act, which would lower the 128 credit hour threshold to the more common 120 credit hour requirement. Now, changing a number from an eight to a zero may not seem like a big deal, but for the veterans who have been frustrated by this impediment that prevented them from using the benefits they were promised, it can be life-changing. This would ensure that Texas’s veterans who are interested in pursuing STEM programs that are offered in their communities are able to do so while they receive their GI benefits.

I just want to say a word about the GI bill because it is personal to me and my family. My dad, who was a B–17 pilot in the Army Air Corps and was stationed at Molesworth Air Force base in England, flew a total of 26 bombing missions over the English Channel into the industrial heartland of Germany to try to end that terrible, terrible war. Unfortunately, he and another of my mother’s brothers was captured as a prisoner of war on his 26th mission, and he served the last 4 months of World War II as a prisoner of war. Thankfully, he survived that experience.

To my point here, when he came back to Corpus Christi, TX, he took advantage of the GI bill so he could continue his education. He received a 2-year associate of arts degree from, as it was called then, the Del Mar Community College. He also met my mother at about that time, and they married. Lo and behold, he ended up deciding, I think I want to go to dental school. So, after he had been shot out of the sky by German anti-aircraft guns, maybe a tooth or two is OK. It sounds pretty good, and that is what he chose.

It was thanks to the GI bill that the whole generation of that so-called ‘greatest generation’ was able to come back from the war and get the tools and the education they needed in order to contribute to our country and help make our economy and our country as strong as we inherited it and welcome it today.

Even for this next greatest generation of veterans who fought in Iraq and Afghanistan and for those who still serve today, it is important for us to keep this opportunity of the modern GI bill benefits when they take off the uniform as Active-Duty servicemembers and transition to civilian life.

I thank my colleagues—particularly Senators RUBIO, CRUZ, MANCHIN, and SINEMA—for supporting the STEM bill I described a little earlier. The House passed the legislation this last month, and now the Senate seems to be moving forward to get it to the President’s desk for his signature.

In addition to this legislation, I am eager to vote on the final passage of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2020. Last month, the Senate passed our version of the bill with broad, bipartisan support. As a matter of fact, only eight Senators voted against it. It is hard to find many things that are that bipartisan in the Senate or in Washington, DC, today.

In addition to investing in military modernization and in providing the largest pay raise in a decade for our troops, this legislation also included other provisions to support our veterans.

A bill I introduced with Senator BALDWIN, of Wisconsin, called the HAVEN Act, was included as a proviso of the NDAA. This bill would shield VA and Department of Defense disability benefits in bankruptcy proceedings in the same way Social Security disability is exempted. Veterans shouldn’t be penalized for receiving
disability compensation that they are rightly due.
I hope this provision will be included in the final version, which will follow the conference committee on the national defense authorization bill. The House passed its version of the NDAA last week, and I hope the conference committee will quickly iron out the differences between the two bills so we can approve this legislation.
Like all of my colleagues, I am grateful for the dedicated service and sacrifice of millions of men and women across our country who defend our freedoms. I want to make sure, as we all do, that their transitioning to civilian life after their military service is as smooth as possible.
By improving access to healthcare, employment, and education, the Senate is working hard to support America’s veterans, and we are demonstrating in a country that has an all-volunteer military that we will keep our promises to our military members while they wear the uniform and keep our commitments to our veterans when they transition to civilian life. This is an important part of our continuing to recruit and retain the best and brightest to serve in the U.S. military.
I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.
Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BORDER SECURITY
Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I start this afternoon with a topic we are all talking about—the horror that we saw and heard last night at a rally when there was a chant over and over again—we have seen the footage of it—of ‘‘send her back.’’
I speak at this time—as I did earlier today—in the strongest possible terms, and I want to reiterate my condemnation of that chant. I know that condemnation is widely shared on both sides of the aisle. I hope folks in both Chambers and both parties will condemn and reiterate the condemnation of that kind of chant but also what is underneath it. It is racist, for sure, and it is not who we are. That is not America.
I am glad the President said that if it happens again, he will try to stop it. I wish he had done that in real time last night, but let’s see what happens at the next rally.
There is no excuse for any public official to do anything other than condemn that kind of language. Representative OMAR is a Representative in the Congress of the United States who came here as a child, and for anyone to utter those kinds of words against her or anyone else, of course, should be condemned.
Fortunately, I think most Americans agree with me, and we have to be very clear when we have that kind of sentiment expressed, especially when it is repeated across the country, as we saw last night.
I want to talk about our asylum system, a legal asylum system that was established in the wake of the horrors at the beginning of World War II. The United States of America—vowed after that conflict to do better, to be better, to serve as a refuge for those fleeing violence and persecution in their home countries.
Today, many families from Central America are arriving at our southern border, hoping to avail themselves of this system because of the violence in their home countries. The three we have heard so much about—Honduras, Guatemala, and El Salvador—rank in the top 10 countries in the world for homicide. According to a report issued by Doctors Without Borders in 2017, Northern Triangle countries, these three countries, are experiencing—and this is a direct quote from the Doctors Without Borders report, 2017—‘‘violent displacement, persecution, sexual violence, and forced repatriation akin to the conditions found in the deadliest armed conflicts in the world today.’’ So said Doctors Without Borders.
In the face of violence and other such circumstances, the choice to move in search of opportunity and safety is one that the vast majority of families would make, even when that journey can further subject them to violence and danger.
Late last month, the Nation was horrified—and indeed, the world was horrified—by a photograph of a 2-year-old girl and her father, her small arm clinging to her father as they lay face down in a river, dead.
That is not the picture I am showing here. We all know that picture. I don’t need to show it again. So many Americans, so many people around the world remember that picture.
But the picture I put up is a picture of that little girl and her father as they lived, a picture of the two of them that appeared in the Washington Post in an article dated Thursday, June 27, 2019, on page 3.
Here is the article that the picture was taken from. The headline reads, ‘‘Pair who died at border were desperate for a better life’’—desperate for a better life.
The true story of so many of these families—desperate for a better life, free from violence or the threat of violence, free from or at least distant from death threats, and free from poverty, grinding poverty, the likes of which so many of us here never had to experience. That is what they are desperate for when they say ‘‘desperate for a better life.’’
Rather than simply focus on this father and his daughter and how they died and the picture of them facedown in a river, we all knew that we saw their faces, to celebrate their lives but to remind us of our obligation, our enduring obligation, to make sure that we at least—-at least—take steps to reduce the likelihood that we will ever see again a horrific picture like the one of the two of them dead in a river, facedown.
Here is what part of the story is of this little girl and her father. The little girl’s name was Valeria. Quoting from the Washington Post story:
Valeria was a cherriy child. Not even 2 years old, she loved to dance, play with her stuffed animals and brush her family members’ hair. Her father, Eric Alberto Martinez Ramirez, was stalwart. Nearly always working, he sold his motorcycle and borrowed money to move his family from El Salvador to the United States and his wife, Tania Vanessa Ávalos, wanted to save up for a home there. They wanted safety, opportunity.
‘‘They wanted a better future for their girl,’’ Maria Estela Ávalos, Vanessa’s mother, told The Washington Post.
They traveled more than 1,000 miles seeking it. Once in the United States, they planned to ask for asylum, for refuge from the violence that drives many Central American migrants from their home countries every day. But the feariest the family got was an international bridge. . . . On Sunday—
This would be the Sunday before June 27.
On Sunday, they were told that the bridge was closed and that they should return Monday. Aid workers told The Post the line to get across the bridge was hundreds long.
Then we know what happened next to this father and his daughter.
There was also a New York Times story in the New York Times the day before, June 26. The headline read ‘‘Girl was Safe but Tried to Follow Father Back.’’
I will not go through all of it, but here is what they were facing in terms of their own economic circumstances. At the end of the New York Times story it reads as follows:
Mr. Martinez quit his job at Papa Johns, where he had earned about $50 a month. By then, his wife had already left her job as a cashier at a Chinese restaurant to take care of their daughter.
The couple lived with Mr. Martinez’s mother in the community of Altavista, a massive housing complex of tiny concrete houses east of San Salvador, according to [someone referred to earlier in the story].
Though Altavista is under the control of gangs, the couple was not fleeing from violence. [Ms. Ramirez] told him. Rather, the grind of surviving as a family on $10 a day had become unmanageable.
So we have a lot of families fleeing for reasons based on violence and death threats and that horror, and then we also have families fleeing because they, in this case, had $10 a day to live on. So these families risk danger as they cross through—what could only be said by way of understatement—treacherous terrain. They risk that danger because the graver risk is not to make that journey.
The administration has not sought, in my judgment, to address the root causes of migration, such as what we can call the root causes of poverty, and corruption. Rather, the administration has repeatedly attempted to walk back our Nation’s solemn vow
and close the door on refugees and asylum seekers.

Over the past couple of weeks, reports have surfaced of children held in squalid conditions without adequate medical attention, sanitation, or even food and water.

A law professor who spoke with children at a Texas CBP facility was quoted in the Washington Post as saying, “It’s the worst conditions I have ever witnessed in several years of doing these inspections.”

That is a law professor, not a casual observer but someone who has experience and training, recognizing what is happening in these facilities.

In May, the Department of Homeland Security Office of Inspector General issued a report stating that the El Paso Del Norte Processing Center, a facility with a maximum of 125 detainees, was holding 900—capacity 125, holding 900 detainees.

Some migrants were held in standing-room-only conditions for days and weeks with limited access to showers and clean clothing. These conditions were dangerous and posed an immediate risk to both migrants and personnel.

The administration has sought to use inhumane policies like separating families, just one example, as a deterrent—or as a deterrent?

They recently canceled English classes, recreational programs, and legal aid for unaccompanied minors at shelters across the country, and an attorney for the Department of Justice argued that the government should not be required to give detained migrant children toothbrushes, soap, towels, or showers.

Does that make any sense at all? Is that consistent with our values?

The administration is seeking to relax standards for holding children, when, according to the American Academy of Pediatrics—also not casual observers—such a facility is not just a temporary shelter but the beginning of a child’s journey to try to make their case. We need to have people choosing a different system to try to make sure that that child and that father have a shot to come here.

One of the problems we are having now at the border is that when you tell the world that you want to push people away, by way of rhetoric or by way of extreme policies at the border—inhuman policies, which might be an understatement—and by telling the world, or at least sending the message to the world, that you want to greatly restrict immigration, you are going to have people choosing a different system to try to make their case. We need to fix both. We have a broken immigration system, and this body dealt with it in 2013—88 votes in the Senate—to fix the system and to deal with all the tough issues. We can’t get 68 votes around here to adjourn for lunch or to move on to the next part of the day sometime, a very good reason to get us started.

What happened? Because there are extreme voices in this town that told the House of Representatives, “Don’t even vote on it; just end it right here.”

The best attempt in maybe decades to set up the Department of Homeland Security, to deal with the guest worker program, to deal with all the difficult issues with immigration, and with 68 votes here, died in the House. It didn’t even get a vote in the House, and this Chamber and the House have done basically nothing since then, at least the way I see it—nothing in terms of dealing with this system, trying to fix this broken system so you have rules and order and certainty, but also based upon and founded upon our values.

Some people say: You can’t deal with the world that you want to push people away, by way of rhetoric or by way of extreme policies at the border—inhuman policies, which might be an understatement—and reflects our values as a Nation. When we think of not just what our immigration system must be about but what our asylum system must be about, about let us think of those families who put themselves at risk because of what they are fleeing, who simply want to make their case.

Let’s also remember two people whose faces we didn’t see much of except in this one picture—a father and a daughter, little Valeria and her father, Oscar Martinez Ramirez—and remember what they were trying to do. I realize some will debate this: What happens when someone presents themselves at our border based upon poverty? I understand that will be the argument against it, but we are a big enough country and a great enough country to be able to develop a system to make sure that child and that father have a shot to come here.

One of the problems we are having now at the border is that when you tell the world that you want to push people away, by way of rhetoric or by way of extreme policies at the border—inhuman policies, which might be an understatement—and by telling the world, or at least sending the message to the world, that you want to greatly restrict immigration, you are going to have people choosing a different system to try to make their case. We need to fix both. We have a broken immigration system, and this body dealt with it in 2013—88 votes in the Senate—to fix the system and to deal with all the tough issues. We can’t get 68 votes around here to adjourn for lunch or to move on to the next part of the day sometime, a very good reason to get us started.

What happened? Because there are extreme voices in this town that told the House of Representatives, “Don’t even vote on it; just end it right here.”

The best attempt in maybe decades to set up the Department of Homeland Security, to deal with the guest worker program, to deal with all the difficult issues with immigration, and with 68 votes here, died in the House. It didn’t even get a vote in the House, and this Chamber and the House have done basically nothing since then, at least the way I see it—nothing in terms of dealing with this system, trying to fix this broken system so you have rules and order and certainty, but also based upon and founded upon our values.

Some people say: You can’t deal with the world that you want to push people away, by way of rhetoric or by way of extreme policies at the border—inhuman policies, which might be an understatement—and reflects our values as a Nation.

When we think of not just what our immigration system must be about but what our asylum system must be about, about let us think of those families who put themselves at risk because of what they are fleeing, who simply want to make their case.

Let’s also remember two people whose faces we didn’t see much of except in this one picture—a father and a daughter, little Valeria and her father, Oscar Martinez Ramirez—and remember what they were trying to do. I realize some will debate this: What happens when someone presents themselves at our border based upon poverty? I understand that will be the argument against it, but we are a big enough country and a great enough country to be able to develop a system to make sure that child and that father have a shot to come here.

One of the problems we are having now at the border is that when you tell the world that you want to push people away, by way of rhetoric or by way of extreme policies at the border—inhuman policies, which might be an understatement—and by telling the world, or at least sending the message to the world, that you want to greatly restrict immigration, you are going to have people choosing a different system to try to make their case. We need to fix both. We have a broken immigration system, and this body dealt with it in 2013—88 votes in the Senate—to fix the system and to deal with all the tough issues. We can’t get 68 votes around here to adjourn for lunch or to move on to the next part of the day sometime, a very good reason to get us started.

What happened? Because there are extreme voices in this town that told the House of Representatives, “Don’t even vote on it; just end it right here.”

The best attempt in maybe decades to set up the Department of Homeland Security, to deal with the guest worker program, to deal with all the difficult issues with immigration, and with 68 votes here, died in the House. It didn’t even get a vote in the House, and this Chamber and the House have done basically nothing since then, at least the way I see it—nothing in terms of dealing with this system, trying to fix this broken system so you have rules and order and certainty, but also based upon and founded upon our values.

Some people say: You can’t deal with the world that you want to push people away, by way of rhetoric or by way of extreme policies at the border—inhuman policies, which might be an understatement—and reflects our values as a Nation.

When we think of not just what our immigration system must be about but what our asylum system must be about, about let us think of those families who put themselves at risk because of what they are fleeing, who simply want to make their case.

Let’s also remember two people whose faces we didn’t see much of except in this one picture—a father and a daughter, little Valeria and her father, Oscar Martinez Ramirez—and remember what they were trying to do. I realize some will debate this: What happens when someone presents themselves at our border based upon poverty? I understand that will be the argument against it, but we are a big enough country and a great enough country to be able to develop a system to make sure that child and that father have a shot to come here.

One of the problems we are having now at the border is that when you tell the world that you want to push people away, by way of rhetoric or by way of extreme policies at the border—inhuman policies, which might be an understatement—and by telling the world, or at least sending the message to the world, that you want to greatly restrict immigration, you are going to have people choosing a different system to try to make their case. We need to fix both. We have a broken immigration system, and this body dealt with it in 2013—88 votes in the Senate—to fix the system and to deal with all the tough issues. We can’t get 68 votes around here to adjourn for lunch or to move on to the next part of the day sometime, a very good reason to get us started.

What happened? Because there are extreme voices in this town that told the House of Representatives, “Don’t even vote on it; just end it right here.”
Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, this week America celebrates the fiftieth anniversary of a monumental achievement for our country and all of humankind, and as the Apollo 11 mission that landed the first human beings on the Moon.

Like families across America and across the world, our family gathered in front of the television in our living room that Sunday night of July 20, 1969, to watch this historic event. I was a law student by day and a law enforcement officer by night. His legacy and sacrifice will be remembered.

Mr. CHISUM. Mr. President, on August 10, Fulton County Sheriff Deputy Troy Chisum should be turning 40 years old. He should be spending the day watching his daughters play softball, or he should be playing football with his friends and excitedly discussing the upcoming Minnesota Vikings football season.

But, sadly, he won’t be doing these things. Deputy Chisum was killed in the line of duty on June 25. I want to honor him today.

Deputy Chisum was answering a call about a domestic disturbance in Avon, IL. He was 4 minutes closer than any other deputy. When he arrived at the scene, he saw the suspect on the porch. As he moved back for safety, he was shot in the back and killed. The suspect barricaded himself in the house for the next 19 hours before the standoff ended.

Deputy Chisum was the fifth law enforcement officer in America in an 8-day period to be shot and killed while on duty. Another police officer has been shot and killed since then. Their deaths are a heartbreaking reminder of the dangers officers face every day.

Troy Chisum loved his community. He always answered the call to help. He worked as a paramedic with the Fulton County EMA and as a firefighter with Northern Tazewell County. He also was a member of the West Central Illinois Special Response Team and the Illinois Law Enforcement Alarm System Weapon of Mass Destruction/Special Response Team, Region Six. He had formerly worked for Lewiston Police Department. He was a consummate public servant.

His family was always his No. 1 priority. He loved any activity with his wife Amanda and his time with his three daughters. He helped inspire his daughter Kyleigh to pursue a medical career. He made his girls so proud.

Deputy Chisum’s wife Amanda, their three daughters Kyleigh, Abigail, and Gracie, his father, Phil Chisum, his mother and stepfather, Debra and Mike Wheeler and too many relatives, colleagues and friends to name; they were all proud of Troy.

Deputy Chisum was one of the good ones. His colleagues knew him as the first one in every morning and the last one out every night. His legacy and sacrifice will be remembered.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, on August 10, Fulton County Sheriff Deputy Troy Chisum should be turning 40 years old. He should be spending the day watching his daughters play softball, or he should be playing football with his friends and excitedly discussing the upcoming Minnesota Vikings football season.

But, sadly, he won’t be doing these things. Deputy Chisum was killed in the line of duty on June 25. I want to honor him today.

Deputy Chisum was answering a call about a domestic disturbance in Avon, IL. He was 4 minutes closer than any other deputy. When he arrived at the scene, he saw the suspect on the porch. As he moved back for safety, he was shot in the back and killed. The suspect barricaded himself in the house for the next 19 hours before the standoff ended.

Deputy Chisum was the fifth law enforcement officer in America in an 8-day period to be shot and killed while on duty. Another police officer has been shot and killed since then. Their deaths are a heartbreaking reminder of the dangers officers face every day.

HONORING TROY CHISUM

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, on August 10, Fulton County Sheriff Deputy Troy Chisum should be turning 40 years old. He should be spending the day watching his daughters play softball, or he should be playing football with his friends and excitedly discussing the upcoming Minnesota Vikings football season.

But, sadly, he won’t be doing these things. Deputy Chisum was killed in the line of duty on June 25. I want to honor him today.

Deputy Chisum was answering a call about a domestic disturbance in Avon, IL. He was 4 minutes closer than any other deputy. When he arrived at the scene, he saw the suspect on the porch. As he moved back for safety, he was shot in the back and killed. The suspect barricaded himself in the house for the next 19 hours before the standoff ended.

Deputy Chisum was the fifth law enforcement officer in America in an 8-day period to be shot and killed while on duty. Another police officer has been shot and killed since then. Their deaths are a heartbreaking reminder of the dangers officers face every day.

As Neil Armstrong so famously said, his one small step was a giant leap for all of humanity.

As he and other astronauts often noted, that leap was made possible not just by his step, but by the small steps of thousands of women across America who participated in the space program, including some from the town of Vergennes, VT.

Today, 50 years ago, the Apollo 11 mission was hurtling toward the moon, but getting to the Moon is not a matter of just pointing the nose of a craft and igniting the powerful engines. First, the command module had to dock with the lunar expeditionary module, then leave Earth’s orbit, then navigate to get into lunar orbit, and finally return. Throughout the process, Michael Collins needed to use the craft’s engines, known as a burn, to adjust the heading.

But with no option to refuel, these burns had to be precise and effective, and any deviation from the planned fuel usage had to be worked into future plans. Otherwise, there would be no return for America’s heroes. This is where Vergennes came in.

Vergennes, Vermont’s role in the Apollo mission was crucial. It was gutsy, St. Pierre, now 74, remembers.

A thrilling, disruptive American decade Simmonds, subsequently bought by Goodrich and then United Technologies, went on to design and build fuel sensors for Boeing and Airbus, among other customers. St. Pierre stayed with the company until he retired in 2019.

But the fast-paced years leading up to the successful moon landing on July 20, 1969—landing, the crew’s safe return—remain vivid for St. Pierre.

The space program offered a welcome, uplifting message forpered by the Chicago riots of 1968, as well as the assassinations of Martin Luther King, Jr. and Robert F. Kennedy in that year, St. Pierre said.

“We had a schedule to meet.” Engineers at NASA kept the Simmonds crew very busy and focused, he added: “We worked long, long days. Come rain or high water, we had a schedule to meet.”

St. Pierre remembers the dust-free workplace in Vergennes, bustling with technicians in white smocks and surgical caps.

But, despite America’s global, cold-war rivalry with the Soviet Union that extended into those countries’ space programs, there was little secrecy at Simmonds—beyond the safekeeping of papers that documented test results, St. Pierre said.

Excitement built when NASA flew him to Cape Kennedy (now Cape Canaveral), where he joined hundreds of other engineers in fitting together thousands of pre-assembled pieces of a never-before-assembled puzzle.

“To this day, 50 years later,” St. Pierre said, “it’s still viewed as the greatest technological achievement ever.

(At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)
casting Naturally," which aptly distils the organization’s mantra in simple, clever terms. Arkansas’ radio and television broadcast outlets provide vital information and quality programming to communities across the state. They educate, inform, entertain, and communicate with Arkansans in a variety of ways. When we turn on our televisions or radios and perhaps just as much these days by opening our smartphones and tablets or powering on our computers, we have come to expect the content we are looking for will be readily available and accessible.

We are able to find what we are looking for on TV or radio or their technology-enabled apps and online platforms because of the hard work that broadcasters do to ensure their product is meeting the demands and desires of consumers. I believe these broadcasters will be the first people to tell you that the Arkansas Broadcasters Association has played an integral role in their ability to provide that service, adapt to changing technology, and better understand the market they operate in.

On the confirmation of Mr. Donald R. Tapia to be Ambassador to Jamaica. Had I been able to attend, I would have opposed his nomination.

At the request of Mr. Schumer, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the Record:

VOTE EXPLANATION
Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Mr. President, I had expected to vote on the confirmations of Mr. Clifton Corker to the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Tennessee, Ms. Lynda Blanchard to be Ambassador to the Republic of Slovenia, and Mr. Donald R. Tapia to be Ambassador to Jamaica. Instead, I am in Nevada for a funeral.

On the question of the confirmation of Mr. Clifton Corker to the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Tennessee, I would have voted no.

On the question of the confirmation of Mr. Lynda Blanchard to be Ambassador to the Republic of Slovenia, and Mr. Donald R. Tapia to be Ambassador to Jamaica. Had I been able to attend the rollcall vote on these confirmations, I would have voted no.

At the request of Mr. Schumee, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the Record:

VOTE EXPLANATION
Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Mr. President, I had expected to vote on the confirmations of Mr. Clifton Corker to the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Tennessee, Ms. Lynda Blanchard to be United States Ambassador to the Republic of Slovenia, and Mr. Donald R. Tapia to be United States Ambassador to Jamaica. Had I been able to attend, I would have opposed her nomination.

Mr. President, unfortunately I was unable to attend the rollcall vote on the nomination of Donald R. Tapia to be United States Ambassador to Jamaica. Had I been able to attend, I would have opposed her nomination.

Mr. President, unfortunately I was unable to attend the rollcall vote on the nomination of Lynda Blanchard to be United States Ambassador to the Republic of Slovenia. Had I been able to attend, I would have opposed her nomination.

Mr. President, unfortunately I was unable to attend the rollcall vote on the nomination of Mr. Clifton Corker to the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Tennessee. Today, the ABA highlights its credentials as a vigorous advocate for the 88,000 members, representing roughly 1,000 radio and television广播 outlets across the state. Today, the ABA highlights its mission to help members in “Broad-...
Italian Republic of certain defense articles and services.

S.J. Res. 37. Joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed export to the United Arab Emirates of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the Republic of France of certain defense articles and services.

S.J. Res. 38. Joint resolution 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.

The message also announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 736. An act 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.

H.R. 748. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on high-cost employer-sponsored health coverage.

H.R. 1250. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 11138 Highway 146 North in Hardin, Texas, as the "Lucas Lowe Memorial Post Office".

H.R. 1526. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 100 Israel Road Southeast in Tumwater, Washington, as the "Eva G. Hewitt Post Office".

H.R. 1844. An act to require the Select Committee on Intelligence to require congressional notification for certain changes in status of inspectors general, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2235. An act 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"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 3095. An act 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".

H.R. 3871. An act to require congressional notification for certain changes in status of inspectors general, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3949. An act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes; to the Select Committee on Intelligence.

**MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR**

The following bill was read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 736. An act 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.

**MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME**

The following bills were read the first time:

H.R. 582. An act to provide for increases in the Federal minimum wage, and for other purposes.

H.R. 748. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on high-cost employer-sponsored health coverage.

**EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS**

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC—2023. A communication from the Director of the Office of the President of the Senate on July 16, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC—2032. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Streamlining Electric Program Procedures" (RIN0575–AD60) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2019; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC—2027. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel, General Law, Ethics, and Regulation, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, three (3) reports relative to vacancies in the Department of the Treasury, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2019; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

**MEASURES REFERRED**

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 1250. An act 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"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 1258. An act 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"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 1526. An act 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"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 1844. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 190 Colón in the District of San Juan, Puerto Rico, as the "65th Infantry Regiment Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 3095. An act 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"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 3949. An act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes; to the Select Committee on Intelligence.

**EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS**

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC—2023. A communication from the Director of the Office of the President of the Senate on July 16, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC—2030. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Indian Country: Air Quality Planning and Management; Federal Implementation Plans; Colorado; Revisions to Regulation Number 4, New Wood Stoves and the Use of Certain Woodburning Appliances During High Pollution Days" (FRL No. 9995–93–Region 8) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 16, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC—2031. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Massachusetts Coastal and Estuarine Land Protection Program, Final Program Document: Final Program" (RIN0375–A943) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC—2032. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Massachusetts Coastal and Estuarine Land Protection Program, Final Program Document: Final Program" (RIN0375–A943) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.
EC–2338. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel, General Law, Ethics, and Regulation, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Under Secretary (International Affairs), Department of the Treasury, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2019; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–2338. A communication from the Director of the Office of Textiles and Apparel, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Imports of Certain Worsted Wool Fabric: Implementation of a Final Determination Under Title V of the Trade and Development Act of 2000: Removal of Regulations” (RIN0625–AB13) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2019; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–2338. A communication from the Assistant Director of the Office of Policy, Executive Office for Immigration Review, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Board of Immigration Appeals: Affirmation Without Opinion, Deferred for Panel Review, and Public Notice” (RIN1125–AA58) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 16, 2019; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–2338. A communication from the Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Affairs, Office of the Secretary, U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled “Report to Congress on Global Health Innovations for Maternal, Newborn, and Child Health” (RIN1200–AA91) to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–2338. A communication from the Acting Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Affairs, Office of the Secretary, U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to seven (7) vacancies in the agency, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 16, 2019; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–2338. A communication from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative and Public Affairs, U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled “Re-Applications Coordinator, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Medicare and Medicaid Programs; Revision of Requirements for Long Term Care Facilities: Arbitration Agreements” (RIN0938–AT18) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2019; to the Committee on Finance.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred to or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM–118. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of New Jersey urging the United States Congress to enact the Military Hunger Prevention Act; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 73

Whereas, The Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), formerly known as the Food Stamp Program, provides assistance to eligible low-income individuals and families to buy healthy, nutritious food at a network of participating stores and farmer’s markets, and is one of the most important anti-hunger program; and

Whereas, The federal government pays for 80% of SNAP benefits, and the program’s eligibility rules are primarily set at the federal level, while the costs of administering the program are shared between the federal government and the states; and

Whereas, In a typical month in 2017, the SNAP program helped more than 40 million low-income Americans afford a nutritionally adequate diet; and

Whereas, Most recipients of SNAP who are able to work are working while receiving benefits, which demonstrates the need of increasing family income; and

Whereas, In 2015, more than $80 million in SNAP benefits were used to buy food at military commissaries; and

Whereas, The Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), formerly known as the Food Stamp Program, provides assistance to eligible low-income individuals and families to buy healthy, nutritious food at a network of participating stores and farmer’s markets, and is one of the most important anti-hunger program; and

Whereas, The federal government pays for 80% of SNAP benefits, and the program’s eligibility rules are primarily set at the federal level, while the costs of administering the program are shared between the federal government and the states; and

Whereas, In a typical month in 2017, the SNAP program helped more than 40 million low-income Americans afford a nutritionally adequate diet; and

Whereas, Most recipients of SNAP who are able to work are working while receiving benefits, which demonstrates the need of increasing family income; and

Whereas, In 2015, more than $80 million in SNAP benefits were used to buy food at military commissaries; and

Whereas, According to the U.S. Census Bureau’s American Community Survey, two percent of active duty military families, or approximately 23,000 families, received SNAP benefits from 2009 to 2012, and six percent of respondents of the Blue Star Family
Whereas, Military families that do not reside on a military base or installation receive the Basic Housing Allotment (BAH) which is meant to offset the cost of civilian housing for those who do not reside in government-provided housing, and the rate of the BAH calculation, pays based on the number of dependents of the service member; and

Whereas, Although the BAH is intended to offset the cost of civilian housing for service members and women who do not live on a military base, the amount of the BAH is currently determined for purposes of determining eligibility for SNAP; and certain other benefits, pursuant to federal law; and

Whereas, The ‘‘Military Hunger Prevention Act,’’ currently pending in Congress as H.R. 1078 and S. 2488, would amend federal law to exclude the BAH when determining eligibility for certain federal benefits, including SNAP; and

Whereas, Among the many economic challenges faced by members of the military are: relatively low pay compared to non-military occupations; infrequent and insufficient pay raises; frequent transfers or deployments, particularly when the transfer is to a region of the country making upwardly and downwardly mobile and the difficulty of spouses to find well-paying, long-term employment due to transfers and deployments; and

Whereas, As an example that members of the armed services and their families, who make considerable personal sacrifices to protect and serve the United States, have sufficient and nutritious food on their tables, it is fitting and proper that the law be amended to exclude the BHA from income for purposes of determining SNAP eligibility, and other federal programs; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the Senate and General Assembly of the State of New Jersey:

1. The Legislature and Governor of New Jersey respectfully urge the Congress of the United States to introduce and enact the ‘‘Military Hunger Prevention Act,’’ currently pending in both houses of Congress, so that those members of the armed forces who make considerable sacrifices in order to serve our country, yet face hunger or require assistance, are able to benefit from the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program and other benefits, notwithstanding their receipt of a Basic Housing Allowance.

2. Resolution, as transmitted with the Secretary of Senate, shall be transmitted by the Clerk of the General Assembly or the Secretary of the Senate to the Majority and Minority Leaders of the United States Senate, the Speaker and Minority Leader of the United States House of Representatives, and every member of Congress from this State.

3. This joint resolution shall take effect immediately.

POM-119. A resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of Illinois urging the United States Congress to enact legislation making United States policy not to start a nuclear war and to prohibit the funding of further development and production of additional nuclear weapons; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

HOUSE RESOLUTION NO. 61

Whereas, The use of even a small number of nuclear weapons could have catastrophic human, environmental, health, and economic consequences globally; and

Whereas, Approximately 14,000 nuclear weapons still exist in the world and pose an intolerable risk to humanity; and

Whereas, The United States has over 6,000 nuclear weapons, which combined are more than 100 times more powerful than all the weapons used during World War II; and

Whereas, The United States is currently planning to spend nearly $2 trillion over the next 30 years on maintaining and modernizing its nuclear weapons arsenal; this is a gross misuse of funds that could instead be devoted to improving security, health, and education; and

Whereas, The United States currently maintains nearly 1,000 nuclear weapons on high alert so they are ready for launch within minutes of a presidential decision, which simultaneously increases the risk of accidental use, cyber attacks, and miscalculations, thereby increasing the risk of nuclear use; and

Whereas, The United States currently reserves the right to use nuclear weapons in response to non-nuclear attacks by Russia, China, or North Korea; nations that could respond by using their own nuclear weapons, resulting in a nuclear war that could have devastating consequences; and

Whereas, Americans and all people on the planet should have the right to live a life free from the threat of nuclear weapons; and

Whereas, The United States should immediately change its nuclear policies, as well as actively pursue verifiable agreements with other nuclear-armed nations to reduce the number of nuclear weapons and eliminate them from the planet; therefore, be it

Resolved, by the House of Representatives of the One Hundred First General Assembly of the State of Illinois, that, as an important first step, we call on the President of the United States to make it the policy of the United States that it will not start a nuclear war and therefore will not use nuclear weapons first, and we call on the United States Congress to pass legislation supporting this policy; and be it further

Resolved, That we call on Congress to not fund the development and production of additional U.S. nuclear weapons that can produce a relatively small nuclear explosion, making them unstable for rogue nuclear war fighters and potentially lowering the threshold to using nuclear weapons first; and be it further

Resolved, That suitable copies of this resolution be delivered to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the U.S. Senator, Majority Leader, the U.S. Senate Minority Leader, the U.S. Speaker of the House, the U.S. House of Representatives Minority Leader, and all members of the Illinois Congressional Delegation.

POM-120. A resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania urging the United States Congress to reauthorize and fully fund the September 11th Victim Compensation Fund; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE RESOLUTION NO. 343

Whereas, The September 11th Victim Compensation Fund was created in 2001 to compensate for illnesses and deaths due to exposure to toxins at the September 11th attack sites; and

Whereas, the fund was reauthorized in 2011 and then again in 2015, allowing individuals to submit claims until December 18, 2020; and

Whereas, The World Trade Center Health Program was established to diagnose and treat medical issues of September 11th responders and victims; and

Whereas, The $7.3 billion fund has already paid out approximately $5 billion to claimants and still has approximately 19,000 additional claims; and

Whereas, Insufficient money exists to pay current and projected claims at the same levels under current procedures, and claimants that are unpaid will see a drastic cut in payments; and

Whereas, More than 90,000 Americans, including approximately 1,500 residents of this Commonwealth, struggle with illnesses related to the September 11th attacks as of 2019; and

Whereas, The fund should be reauthorized and fully funded through 2090, which will make it last until the 2090 expiration date of the World Trade Center Health Program; now, therefore be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania urge the Congress of the United States to reauthorize and fully fund the September 11th Victim Compensation Fund; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the president of each house of Congress and to each member of Congress from Pennsylvania.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. LEE, from the Joint Economic Committee:


By Mr. RISCH, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 727. A bill to combat international extremism by addressing global fragility and violence and stabilizing conflict-affected areas, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. ROUNDS for Mr. INHOFFE for the Committee on Armed Services.

*Mark T. Esper, of Virginia, to be Secretary of Defense.

*Army nomination of Gen. Mark A. Milley, to be General.


Army nomination of Maj. Gen. Ronald J. Place, to be Lieutenant General.

Army nomination of Col. Robert T. Woolridge II, to be Brigadier General.


Mr. ROUNDS for Mr. INHOFFE, for the Committee on Armed Services I report favorably the following nomination lists which were printed in the RECORDS on the dates indicated, and ask unanimous consent, to save expenses, for printing the Executive Calendar that these nominations lie at the Secretary’s desk for the inspection of Senators.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Air Force nominations beginning with Mark C. Alderman and ending with Denean V. E. Zooto, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 29, 2019.

Air Force nomination of Robert K. Rankin, Jr., to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Air Force nominations beginning with Gaylan A. Gray and ending with Anna Yoo, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 8, 2019.

Air Force nomination of John W. Poulter, to be Colonel.

Air Force nomination of Thomas D. Asherman, to be Colonel.

Air Force nominations beginning with Edward J. Brennan and ending with Kenneth A. Stremmel, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 8, 2019.

Air Force nominations beginning with Lauren A. Baker and ending with Jesse W. Johnathan, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 8, 2019.

Air Force nominations beginning with Jonathan P. Sexton, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 18, 2019.

Air Force nomination of Roger M. Lewis, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nominations beginning with Theima D. Cummings and ending with Kyungkun Lee, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 29, 2019.

Army nomination of Matthew Walden McFarland, of Ohio, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nominations beginning with Jason B. Babcock and ending with Mark A. Patterson, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 18, 2019.

Army nomination of Roger M. Lewis, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nominations beginning with Theima D. Cummings and ending with Kyungkun Lee, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 29, 2019.

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. THUNE (for himself, Mr. CARIN, and Mr. ROBERTS):

S. 2156. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 with respect to corporation tax reform, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CASEY:

S. 2157. A bill to extend title XI of the Social Security Act to expand the use of global payments to hospitals in rural areas; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. HASSEIN (for herself and Mr. GARDNER):

S. 2158. A bill to improve certain programs of the Department of Health and Human Services with respect to heritable disorders; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. HOEVEN (for himself and Mr. CRAMER):

S. 2159. A bill to repeal the Act entitled "An Act to confer jurisdiction over the State of North Dakota over offenses committed by or against Indians on the Devils Lake Indian Reservation"; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina (for himself and Mr. MENENDEZ):

S. 2160. A bill to require carbon monoxide alarms in certain Federally assisted housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. CRUZ (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON, and Mr. LEE):

S. 2161. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to provide for reciprocal marketing agreements and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

S. 2162. A bill to require the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection to annually hire at least 600 new Border Patrol agents, to report quarterly to Congress on the status of the Border Patrol workforce, and to conduct a comprehensive staffing analysis; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Ms. HARRIS, and Mr. BOOZMAN):

S. 2163. A bill to establish the Commission on the Social Status of Black Men and Boys, to study and make recommendations to address social problems affecting Black men and boys, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mr. BOOZMAN):

S. 2164. A bill to amend the Water Resources Research Act of 1984 to reauthorize grants for and require applied water supply research regarding the water resources research and technology institutes established under that Act; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. HEINRICH (for himself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. BALDWIN, Mr. DAINES, Ms. SCATZ, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. UdALL, and Mr. LANKFORD):

S. 2165. A bill to enhance protections of Native American tangible cultural heritage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. WICKER (for himself, Mr. JONES, Mr. CARSON, Ms. COLLINS, and Ms. CANTWELL):

S. 2166. A bill to designate Regional Ocean Partnerships of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. WINEGARD:

S. 2167. A bill to require a certain percentage of natural gas and crude oil exports be...
transported on United States-built and United States-flag vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. MCCORMICK (for himself and Mr. UDALL): S. 2188. A bill to establish a student loan forgiveness program for certain borrowers who are employed at a qualified farm or ranch; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. LANKFORD (for himself, Mr. PETERS, and Ms. SINEMA): S. 2169. A bill to amend section 3116 of title 5, United States Code, to clarify the applicability of permanent employment limitations for students appointed under the expedited hiring authority for post-secondary students; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. WICKER: S. 2170. A bill to amend the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012 to make reforms to flood mapping programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. WICKER: S. 2171. A bill to amend the Running-Bereuter-Blumenauer Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2004 to require insurance agents who sell flood insurance under the National Flood Insurance Program to take certain continuing education courses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Ms. SINEMA, and Mr. YOUNG): S. 2173. A bill to amend title I, United States Code, to enhance the land-based unmanned aircraft system program of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Ms. SINEMA, and Mr. YOUNG): S. 2174. A bill to expand the grants authorized under Jennifer’s Law and Kristen’s Act to include processing of unidentified remains, resolving missing persons cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. HASAN (for herself and Mr. PAUL): S. 2175. A bill to address recommendations made to Congress by the Government Accountability Office and detailed in the annual duplication report, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. RUBIO: S. 2176. A bill to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to designate Haiti for temporary protected status; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANKFORD (for himself, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. ENZI, Mr. PAUL, Mr. CORNYN, and Mr. TESTER): S. 2177. A bill to provide taxpayers with an improved understanding of Government programs through the disclosure of cost, performance, and areas of duplication among them; to require the data to be subject to a functional Federal program inventory, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mr. CORNYN): S. 2178. A bill to impose requirements on certain Federal law enforcement infringement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. CRUMER, and Ms. ROSEN): S. 2179. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to provide social service agencies with ability to provide services to meet the urgent needs of Holocaust survivors to age in dignity, comfort, and security; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself and Mrs. Murray): S. 2180. A bill to provide oversight of the border zone in which Federal agents may conduct vehicle checkpoints and stops and enter private land without a warrant, and to make technical corrections; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARKS (for himself and Mr. SMITH): S. 2181. A bill to require the disclosure of information relating to cyberattacks on aircraft systems and maintenance and ground support systems for aircraft, to identify and address cybersecurity vulnerabilities to the United States commercial aviation system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. MARKS and Mr. BLUMENTHAL: S. 2182. A bill to protect consumers from security and privacy threats to their motor vehicles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. PAUL (for himself, Ms. HASAN, and Mr. LANKFORD): S. 2183. A bill to require the Comptroller General of the United States to analyze certain legislation in order to prevent duplication of and overlap with existing Federal programs, offices, and initiatives; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. REED, Mr. BERNSTEIN, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. BALDWIN, and Ms. SMITH): S. 2184. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act and the Higher Education Act of 1965 to require certain creditors to obtain certifications from institutions of higher education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. SMITH, Mr. HARRIS, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. BROWN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. SCHATZ, and Mr. BENNET): S. 2185. A bill to provide labor standards for certain energy jobs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MERKLEY: S. 2186. A bill to require entities to provide consumers with the opportunity to prohibit the entity from collecting or using certain data concerning the consumer and to request deletion of such data; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. RUBIO: S. 2187. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to waive the guarantee fee for veterans and spouses of veterans for the Export-Import Bank, International Trade, and Export-Import Bank Express programs; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Ms. HIRONO: S. 2190. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to require that the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands is eligible for certain Small Business Administration programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. MENENDEZ): S. 2191. A bill to amend the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 to allow the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to provide capitalization grants to States to establish revolving funds to provide funding assistance to reduce flood risks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. PERDUE: S. 2192. A bill to require the Administrator of General Services to issue guidance to clarify that Federal agencies may pay by charge card for the charging of Federal electric motor vehicles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. SCOTT of Florida (for himself and Mr. YOUNG): S. Res. 278. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding Turkey’s purchase of the S-400 air and missile defense system from the Russian Federation and its membership in NATO, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. CASSIDY (for himself and Mr. CRUZ): S. Res. 279. A resolution calling for the designation of Antifa as a domestic terrorist organization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 133

At the request of Mr. Murkowski, the names of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) and the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 133, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the United States merchant mariners of World War II, in recognition of their dedicated and vital service during World War II.

S. 178

At the request of Mr. Menendez, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 178, a bill to condemn gross human rights violations of ethnic Turkic Muslims in Xinjiang, and calling for an end to arbitrary detention,
At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 286, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the coverage of marriage and family therapist services and mental health counselor services under part B of the Medicare program, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 286, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the coverage of marriage and family therapist services and mental health counselor services under part B of the Medicare program, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 286, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the coverage of marriage and family therapist services and mental health counselor services under part B of the Medicare program, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 286, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the coverage of marriage and family therapist services and mental health counselor services under part B of the Medicare program, and for other purposes.

S. 360
At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 360, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require pharmacy-negotiated price concessions to be included in negotiated prices at the point-of-sale under part D of the Medicare program, and for other purposes.

S. 362
At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 362, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reform taxation of alcoholic beverages.

At the request of Mrs. GILLIAND, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 373, a bill to provide for the retention and service of transgender individuals in the Armed Forces.

At the request of Mrs. GILLIAND, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 373, a bill to provide for the retention and service of transgender individuals in the Armed Forces.

At the request of Mrs. GILLIAND, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 373, a bill to provide for the retention and service of transgender individuals in the Armed Forces.

At the request of Mrs. GILLIAND, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 373, a bill to provide for the retention and service of transgender individuals in the Armed Forces.

S. 433
At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 433, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve home health payment reforms under the Medicare program.

S. 546
At the request of Mrs. GILLIAND, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 546, a bill to extend authorization for the September 11th Victim Compensation Fund of 2001 through fiscal year 2090, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mrs. GILLIAND, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 546, a bill to extend authorization for the September 11th Victim Compensation Fund of 2001 through fiscal year 2090, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mrs. GILLIAND, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 546, a bill to extend authorization for the September 11th Victim Compensation Fund of 2001 through fiscal year 2090, and for other purposes.

S. 638
At the request of Mr. CARPER, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 638, a bill to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to designate per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances as hazardous substances under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, Liability Act of 1986, and for other purposes.

S. 639
At the request of Mr. CARPER, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 638, a bill to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to designate per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances as hazardous substances under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, Liability Act of 1986, and for other purposes.

S. 639
At the request of Mr. CARPER, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 638, a bill to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to designate per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances as hazardous substances under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, Liability Act of 1986, and for other purposes.

S. 639
At the request of Mr. CARPER, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 638, a bill to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to designate per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances as hazardous substances under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, Liability Act of 1986, and for other purposes.

S. 639
At the request of Mr. CARPER, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 638, a bill to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to designate per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances as hazardous substances under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, Liability Act of 1986, and for other purposes.

S. 640
At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 640, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require pharmacy-negotiated price concessions to be included in negotiated prices at the point-of-sale under part D of the Medicare program, and for other purposes.

S. 952
At the request of Mr. COTTON, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. ROSS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 952, a bill to provide that the Federal Communications Commission may not prevent a State or Federal correctional facility from utilizing jamming equipment, and for other purposes.

S. 1081
At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1081, a bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to provide permanent, dedicated funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund, and for other purposes.

S. 1116
At the request of Mrs. BLACKBURN, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1116, a bill to require providers of broadband internet access service and edge services to clearly and conspicuously notify users of the privacy policies of those providers, to give users opt-in or opt-out approval rights with respect to the use of, disclosure of, and access to user information collected by those providers based on the level of sensitivity of the information, and for other purposes.

S. 1188
At the request of Mr. CARPER, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRANO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1188, a bill to promote United States-Mongolia trade by authorizing duty-free treatment for certain imports from Mongolia, and for other purposes.

S. 1273
At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the names of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) were added as cosponsors of S. 1273, a bill to amend title 17, United States Code, to establish an alternative dispute resolution program for copyright small claims, and for other purposes.

S. 1340
At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1340, a bill to authorize activities to combat the Ebola outbreak in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, and for other purposes.

S. 1437
At the request of Mr. CARPER, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1437, a bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to require that direct-to-consumer advertisements for prescription drugs and biological products include truthful and non-misleading pricing information.

S. 1447
At the request of Mr. BENNET, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1447, a bill to allow the financing by United States persons of sales of agricultural commodities to Cuba.

S. 1539
At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1539, a bill to increase the minimum age for sale of tobacco products to 21.

S. 1541
At the request of Mr. MCCONNELL, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) and the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) were added as cosponsors of S. 1541, a bill to increase the minimum age for sale of tobacco products to 21.

S. 1641
At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1641, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income interest received on certain loans secured by agricultural real property.

S. 1728
At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the names of the Senator from Colorado (Ms. PANETTA) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1728, a bill to require the United States Postal Service to sell the Alzheimer’s semipostal stamp for 6 additional years.

S. 1764
At the request of Mr. DUCKWORTH, the name of the Senator from Texas (Ms. DUCKWORTH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1764, a bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to require the Federal Communications Commission to ensure just and reasonable charges for telephone and advanced communications services in the correctional and detention facilities.
At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1792, a bill to require the Secretary of Labor to maintain a publicly available list of all employers that relocate a call center or contract call center work overseas, to make such companies ineligible for Federal grants or guaranteed loans, and to require disclosure of the physical location of business agents engaging in customer service communications, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1850, a bill to direct the Federal Trade Commission to prescribe rules to protect consumers from unfair and deceptive acts and practices in connection with primary and secondary ticket sales, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1956, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the qualified contract exception to the extended low-income housing commitment rules for purposes of the low-income housing credit, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1963, a bill to require the purchase of domestically made flags of the United States of America for use by the Federal Government.

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Ms. HYDE-SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2028, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for new markets tax credit investments in the Rural Jobs Zone.

At the request of Mr. MARKET, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2054, a bill to posthumously award the Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to Glen Doherty, Tyrone Woods, J. Christopher Stevens, and Sean Smith, in recognition of their contributions to the Nation.

At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, the names of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) and the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2062, a bill to prohibit the use of funds for the 2026 World Cup unless the United States Soccer Federation provides equitable pay to the members of the United States Women’s National Team and the United States Men’s National Team.

At the request of Mr. RISCH, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2066, a bill to review United States Saudi Arabia Policy, and for other purposes.

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2075, a bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to require issuers to disclose certain activities relating to climate change, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2093, a bill to amend chapter 2205 of title 36, United States Code, to ensure pay equity for amateur athletes, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2097, a bill to amend section 287 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to limit immigration enforcement actions at sensitive locations, to clarify the powers of immigration officers at such locations, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2121, a bill to amend the Animal Welfare Act to restrict the use of exotic and wild animals in traveling performances.

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2129, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the rules relating to inverted corporations.

At the request of Mr. DUR bin, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRANO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2140, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the rules relating to inverted corporations.

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the names of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) and the Senator from Wyoming (Ms. HARRIS) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 252, a resolution designating September 2019 as National Democracy Month as a time to reflect on the contributions of the system of government of the United States to a more free and stable world.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. THUNE (for himself, Mr. CARDIN and Mr. ROBERTS):

S. 2156. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for S corporation reform, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. THUNE Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; REFERENCE.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the “S Corporation Modernization Act of 2019”.

(b) AMENDMENT OF 1986 CODE.—Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

SEC. 2. MODIFICATIONS TO S CORPORATION PASSIVE INVESTMENT INCOME RULES.

(a) INCREASED PERCENTAGE LIMIT.—Section 1375(a)(2) is amended by striking “25 percent” and inserting “60 percent”.

(b) REPEAL OF EXCESSIVE PASSIVE INCOME AS A TERMINATION EVENT.—Section 1362(d) is amended by striking paragraph (3).

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 1375(b) is amended by striking paragraphs (3) and (4) and inserting the following new paragraph:

“(3) PASSIVE INVESTMENT INCOME DEFINED.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this paragraph, the term ‘passive investment income’ means gross receipts derived from royalties, rents, dividends, interest, and annuities.

“(B) EXCEPTION FOR INTEREST ON NOTES FROM SALES OF INVENTORY.—The term ‘passive investment income’ shall not include interest on any obligation at any time acquired in the ordinary course of the corporation’s trade or business from its sale of property described in section 1221(a)(1).

“(C) TREATMENT OF CERTAIN LENDING OR FINANCE COMPANIES.—If the S corporation meets the requirements of section 542(c)(6) for the taxable year, the term ‘passive investment income’ shall not include gross receipts for the taxable year which are derived directly from the active and regular conduct of a lending or finance business (as defined in section 542(d)(1)).

“(D) TREATMENT OF CERTAIN DIVIDENDS.—If an S corporation holds stock in a C corporation meeting the requirements of section 1362, the term ‘passive investment income’ shall not include dividends from such corporation to the extent such dividends are attributable to the earnings and profits of such C corporation derived from the active conduct of a trade or business.

“(E) EXCEPTION FOR BANKS, ETC.—In the case of a bank (as defined in section 581) or other similar institution (as defined in section 3(w)(1) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1813(w)(1))), the term ‘passive investment income’ shall not include—

“(i) interest income earned by such bank or company, or

“(ii) dividends on assets required to be held by the bank or company, including stock in the Federal Reserve Bank, the Federal Home Loan Bank, or the Federal Agricultural Mortgage Bank or participation certificates issued by a Federal Intermediate Credit Bank.

“(F) GROSS RECEIPTS FROM THE SALES OF CERTAIN ASSETS.—For purposes of this paragraph—

“(i) CAPITAL ASSETS OTHER THAN STOCK AND SECURITIES.—In the case of dispositions of

capital assets (other than stock and securities), gross receipts from such dispositions shall be taken into account only to the extent of capital gain net income therefrom.

"(II) EFFECTIVE DATE.—In the case of sales or exchanges of stock or securities, gross receipts shall be taken into account only to the extent of the gain therefrom.

"(G) ALTERNATIVE AMORTIZATION.—(1) The term 'S corporation built-in gain amount' means the amount of passive investment income of an electing S corporation with respect to any taxable year in the recognition period. Terms used in the preceding sentence shall have the same respective meanings as when used in section 1374.

"(2) The item relating to section 1375 in the table of sections for part III of subchapter S of chapter 1 is amended by striking '25 percent' and inserting '60 percent'.

"(C) The heading for section 1375 is amended by striking '25 percent' and inserting '60 percent'.

"(D) The item relating to section 1375 in the table of sections for part III of subchapter S of chapter 1 is amended by striking '25 percent' and inserting '60 percent'.

"(E) The following new subsection is added—

"(1) stock of an S corporation with respect to any taxable year over the 15-year period beginning with the month which includes the date of such disposition, or

"(2) property which was taken into account under subsection (b)(2) with respect to which stock was disposed of at a gain (determined without regard to whether or not such gain is recognized and reduced by any amount of gain which is treated as ordinary income under any other provision of this title), the amount of such stock (hereafter in this section referred to as the 'shareholder') shall be allowed a deduction with respect to the S corporation built-in gain amount over the 15-year period beginning with the date on which such stock is taken into account which includes the applicable valuation date.

"(b) S CORPORATION BUILT-IN GAIN AMOUNT.—For purposes of this section, the term 'S corporation built-in gain amount' means the lesser of—

"(1) the excess (if any) of—

"(A) the basis of the stock referred to in subsection (a) as determined under section 1014(a), over

"(B) the adjusted basis of such stock immediately before the death of the decedent, or

"(2) the pro rata share (determined as of the applicable valuation date) of—

"(A) the aggregate fair market value of all property held by the S corporation which is of a character subject to depreciation or amortization, over

"(B) the aggregate adjusted basis of all such property held by the S corporation as of such date.

"(c) ELECTION OF S CORPORATION.—For purposes of this section, the term 'electing S corporation' means, with respect to any shareholder, any S corporation which elects the application of section 1375 with respect to such shareholder at such time and in such form and manner as the Secretary may prescribe.

"(d) APPLICABLE VALUATION DATE.—For purposes of this section, the term 'applicable valuation date' means—

"(1) in the case of a decedent with respect to which the executor of the decedent's estate elects the application of section 1375, the date 6 months after the decedent's death, and

"(2) in the case of any other decedent, the date of the decedent's death.

"(e) ACQUISITION IN CASE OF DISPOSITION OF S CORPORATION PROPERTY.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—If—

"(A) the pro rata share of the gain recognized on the disposition of such property determined for all prior taxable years exceeds the S corporation built-in gain amount for such property;

"(B) the amount determined under subsection (b)(2) by only taking into account subsection (a) with respect to any stock, for the taxable year of the S corporation which includes the date of such disposition ends, shall (except as otherwise provided in this section) not be less than the lesser of—

"(i) the excess (if any) of—

"(1) the aggregate fair market value of all property held by the S corporation which is of a character subject to depreciation or amortization, over

"(2) the aggregate adjusted basis of all such property held by the S corporation as of such date.

"(ii) the aggregate fair market value of all property held by the S corporation which is of a character subject to depreciation or amortization, over

"(2) the aggregate adjusted basis of all such property held by the S corporation as of such date.

"(f) RECHARACTERIZATION OF GAINS AS ORDINARY.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—If—

"(A) the pro rata share of the gain recognized on the disposition of such property determined for all prior taxable years exceeds the S corporation built-in gain amount for such property;

"(B) the amount determined under subsection (b)(2) by only taking into account subsection (a) with respect to any stock, for the taxable year of the S corporation which includes the date of such disposition ends, shall (except as otherwise provided in this section) not be less than the lesser of—

"(i) the aggregate fair market value of all property held by the S corporation which is of a character subject to depreciation or amortization, over

"(ii) the aggregate adjusted basis of all such property held by the S corporation as of such date.

"(2) PROPERTY WHICH WAS NOT TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT.—No deduction shall be allowed under subsection (a) with respect to any stock for any taxable year to the extent that such deduction (when added to the deductions so allowed for all prior taxable years) exceeds the S corporation built-in gain amount with respect to such stock.

"(d) Amending section 4975(d)(16) is amended—

"(1) by striking subparagraphs (A) and (B) and by redesignating subparagraphs (C), (D), and (E) as subparagraphs (A), (B), (C), and (D), respectively, and

"(2) by striking 'such bank or company' in subparagraph (D) and inserting 'such bank or company or its affiliate'.

"(E) AUTHORITY TO TREAT LATE RECOGNITION AS TIMELY.—If—

"(1) the date on which the corporation's election under section 1362 terminates, or

"(2) the date on which the shareholder transfers such stock to any other person.

"(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to recognition of such gain beginning with the date on which the provisions of this Act, in taxable years ending after such date.

"(3) TREATMENT OF CERTAIN TRANSFERS.—

"(1) DISTRIBUTIONS FROM ESTATES OR TRUSTS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, any distribution of stock from an estate or trust to a beneficiary, the beneficiary (and not the estate or trust) shall be treated as the shareholder to which such section applies with respect to periods after such transfer.

"(2) CERTAIN TRANSFERS INVOLVING SPOUSES.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, in the case of a transfer described in section 1041, the transferor (and not the transferee) shall be treated as the shareholder to which this section applies with respect to periods after such transfer.

"(3) TREATMENT OF INCOME IN RESPECT OF THE DECEDENT.—

"(1) ADJUSTMENT TO BUILT-IN GAIN OF PROPER- TIES HELD BY A CORPORATION.—For purposes of subsection (b)(2), the fair market value of any property taken into account under subparagraph (A) thereof shall be decreased by any amount of income in respect of the decedent with respect to such property to which such section applies with respect to periods after such transfer.

"(2) ADJUSTMENT TO BASIS OF S CORPORATION STOCK.—For adjustment to basis of S corporation stock, see section 1367(a)(1)(B).

"(3) REPORTING.—Except as otherwise provided by the Secretary, for purposes of section 6015, the amounts determined under subsections (b)(2), (e)(1), and (f)(1) shall be treated as items of the corporation and the pro rata share determined under such subsection shall be furnished to the shareholder under section 6037(b).''.

"(b) ADJUSTMENT TO BASIS OF STOCK.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1367(a)(2) is amended by striking 'and' at the end of subparagraph (D), by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (E) and inserting '.', and by inserting after subparagraph (E) the following new subparagraph:

"(F) the amount of the shareholder's deduction allowable under section 1369.'''.

"(2) ADJUSTMENT NOT TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT IN DETERMINING TREATMENT OF DISTRIBUTIONS.—Section 1368 is amended—

"(A) in subsection (d)(1), by inserting 'other than subparagraph (a)(2)(F) thereof' after 'section 1367', and

"(B) in subsection (e)(1)(A)—

"(i) by striking 'this title and the phrase' and inserting 'title and phrase', and

"(ii) by inserting 'and', and no adjustment shall be made under section 1367(a)(2)(F)' after 'section 1367(a)(2)'.

"(c) General Amendment.—The table of sections for part II of subchapter S of chapter 1 is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

"Sec. 1369. Amortization of built-in gain amount upon death of shareholder.'''.

"(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to any taxable year beginning after the enactment of this Act, in taxable years ending after such date.

"(3) SEC. 5. RECOGNITIONS OF S CORPORATION ELECT- IONS.—

"(a) Revocations.—(1) Paragraph (1) of section 1362(d) is amended—

"(i) by striking 'subparagraph (D)' in subparagraph (C) and inserting 'subparagraphs (D) and (E)', and

"(2) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

"(E) AUTHORITY TO TREAT LATE RECOVA- RATIONS AS TIMELY.—If—

"(1) the date on which the corporation's election under section 1362 terminates, or

"(2) the date on which the shareholder transfers such stock to any other person.

"(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to elections described in section 1362, in taxable years ending after such date.
"(i) a revocation under subparagraph (A) is made for any taxable year after the date prescribed by this section shall apply to revocation made for any taxable year, and
"(ii) the Secretary determines that there was a reasonable cause for failure to timely make such revocation, the Secretary may make such a revocation as timely made for such taxable year.".

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to revocations after December 31, 2019.

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself and Mr. MURRAY):
S. 2184 would provide oversight of the border zone in which Federal agents may conduct vehicle checkpoints and stops and enter private land without a warrant, and to make technical corrections; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, "Show me your papers." Those are words that you should never hear once inside the United States. Unless a government agent is a security agent. When you say those words to me, and search you—a reasonable suspicion or probable cause—Americans should not be subject to questioning and detention for merely going about their daily lives. This is a fundamental tenet of the Fourth Amendment. Victims and Border Protection (CBP) operations are effectively immune from the Fourth Amendment within a broadly defined "border zone." And this so-called border zone need not border at all: Seventy-year-old regulations define it as up to 100 miles from any border, land or sea. According to the CBP, southern Vermont is in the border zone, as is the entire State of Florida, and even Richmond, Virginia. In fact two-thirds of the entire U.S. population is in the border zone.

In Vermont, under the Trump administration, the border zone has resulted in highway checkpoints and bus boarding by the Department of Homeland Security, and Border Patrol agents set up the first highway checkpoint in a decade. The checkpoint was set up miles from the Canadian border in South Hero, Vermont. It was in operation for hours. We do not know how many hundreds of cars were stopped, but we do know that it did not lead to a single arrest or seizure. Last month, the CBP established a second checkpoint in the same location. This time nearly 900 cars were stopped, and only one individual was detained—for a traffic violation. Today, Border Patrol agents have also boarded Amtrak trains in White River Junction and boarded a Greyhound bus at the Burlington airport, demanding to know whether passengers were citizens.

Today, at the behest of Senator MURRAY in reintroducing the Border Zone Reasonableness Restoration Act of 2019. Our legislation would establish critical privacy protections by reducing the unjustifiably large border zone from hundreds of miles to 25 miles. I find it difficult to believe that these checkpoints are an effective use of law enforcement resources. Border Patrol stations in Vermont are already stretched thin. And just last month the Senate passed a bipartisan $4.6 billion emergency supplemental appropriations bill to address the humanitarian crisis on the southern border. The Department of Homeland Security's limited resources should be focused on improving conditions of detention and providing food, appropriate shelter, and medical care to families fleeing violence and dire poverty, not conducting pointless vehicle checkpoints miles from the northern border in Vermont.

The Border Zone Reasonableness Restoration Act is based on an amendment that Senator MURRAY and I successfully attached to comprehensive immigration reform legislation in 2013. The Act of 1953 to require certain creditors to obtain certifications from institutions of higher education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

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 "Know Before You Owe Private Education Loan Act of 2019".

SEC. 2. AMENDMENTS TO THE TRUTH IN LENDING ACT.
(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 128(e) of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1688(e)) is amended—
(1) by striking paragraph (3) and inserting the following:
"(3) INSTITUTIONAL CERTIFICATION REQUIRED.—
"(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), before a creditor may issue any funds with respect to an extension of credit described in this subsection, the creditor shall obtain from the relevant institution of higher education where such loan is to be used for a student, to borrowers of such credit, the information necessary to determine whether such credit is a private education loan or a private education loan that is made in connection with an institution's certification under part F of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965;
"(ii) the student's cost of attendance at the institution as determined by the institution under part F of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965; and
"(iii) the difference between—
"(I) such cost of attendance; and
"(II) the student's fiscal aid Receives financial assistance, including such assistance received under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070 et seq.) and other financial assistance known to the institution, as applicable.
"(B) EXCEPTION.—Notwithstanding subparagraph (A), a creditor may issue funds with respect to an extension of credit described in subsection (B), such credit the issuance of such funds in a manner determined by the Director of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau.
"(B) DEFINITION OF PRIVATE EDUCATION LOAN.—There is added after paragraph (9) the following:
"(10) DEFINITION OF PRIVATE EDUCATION LOAN.—Section 140(a)(8)(A) of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 166(a)(8)(A)) is amended—
(1) by redesignating clause (ii) as clause (iii);
(2) in clause (i), by striking "and" after the semicolon; and
(3) by adding after clause (i) the following:
"(ii) is not made, insured, or guaranteed under title VII or title VIII of the Public
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Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 292 et seq. and 296 et seq.); and’’.

(c) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 365 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Financial Protection Bureau shall issue regulations in final form to implement paragraphs (3) and (9) of section 128(e) of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1638(e)), as amended by subsection (a), and paragraphs (28) and (29) and inserting the following:

‘‘(28)(A) Upon the request of a private educational lender, acting in connection with an application initiated by a borrower for a private education loan in accordance with section 128(e)(3) of the Truth in Lending Act, the institution shall within 15 days of receipt of the request—

‘‘(i) provide certification to such private educational lender—

‘‘(I) that the student who initiated the application for the private education loan, or on whose behalf the application was initiated, is enrolled or is scheduled to enroll at the institution;

‘‘(II) of such student’s cost of attendance at the institution as determined under part F of this title; and

‘‘(III) of the difference between—

‘‘(aa) the cost of attendance at the institution; and

‘‘(bb) the student’s estimated financial assistance received under this title and other assistance known to the institution, as applicable;

‘‘(ii) notify the creditor that the institution has received the request for certification and will need additional time to comply with the certification request; or

‘‘(iii) provide notice to the private educational lender of the institution’s refusal to certify the private education loan pursuant to subparagraph (D).

‘‘(B) With respect to a certification request described in paragraph (A), the institution shall—

‘‘(i) determine whether the student who initiated the application for the private education loan, or on whose behalf the application was initiated, has applied for and exhausted the Federal financial assistance available to such student under this title and inform the student accordingly; and

‘‘(ii) provide the borrower whose loan application has prompted the certification request by a private educational lender, as described in subparagraph (A)(i), with the following information and disclosures:

‘‘(I) The amount of additional Federal student assistance for which the borrower is eligible and the advantages of Federal loans under this title, including disclosure of the fixed interest rates, deferments, flexible repayment options, loan forgiveness programs, and additional protections, and the higher student loan limits for dependent students whose parents are not eligible for a Federal Direct PLUS Loan.

‘‘(II) The borrower’s ability to select a private educational lender of the borrower’s choice.

‘‘(III) The impact of a proposed private education loan on the borrower’s potential eligibility for Federal student assistance, including Federal financial assistance under this title.

‘‘(IV) The borrower’s right to accept or reject a private education loan within the 30-day period following a private educational lender’s approval of a borrower’s application and about a borrower’s 3-day right to cancel period.

‘‘(C) For purposes of this paragraph, the terms ‘private educational lender’ and ‘private education loan’ have the meanings given such terms in section 146 of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1650).’’.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the effective date of the regulations described in section 2(c).


SEC. 4. REPORT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 24 months after the issuance of regulations under section 2(c), the Director of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau shall submit to Congress a report on the compliance of—

(1) private educational lenders with section 128(e)(3) of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1638(e)(3)), as amended by section 2; and


(b) CONTENTS.—The contents of the report described in subsection (a) shall include information about the degree to which specific institutions utilize certifications in effectively—

(1) encouraging the exhaustion of Federal student loan eligibility by borrowers prior to taking on private education loan debt; and

(2) lowering private education loan debt by borrowers.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. MENENDEZ).

S. 2192. A bill to amend the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 to allow the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to provide capitalization grants to States to establish revolving funds to provide supplemental flood mitigation funds, to provide capitalization grants to States for flood risk mitigation, and for other purposes; to the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to establish revolving funds to provide capitalization grants to States to establish revolving funds to provide supplemental flood mitigation funds, to the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to provide capitalization grants to States to establish revolving funds to provide supplemental flood mitigation funds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, today I am reintroducing the State Flood Mitigation Revolving Fund Act of 2019 along with Senators KENNEDY and MENENDEZ.

The purpose of our bill is to reduce flood risk and the costs associated with flooding by establishing a State revolving loan program to fund mitigation projects for property owners and communities that participate in the National Flood Insurance Program. By funding projects that reduce risk, such as home elevations, flood proofing, acquisitions, and environmental restoration, the bill provides an avenue to help middle-income and low-income property owners reduce their flood insurance premiums. It is a proposal that has been endorsed by over 200 local and national organizations, including the Pew Charitable Trusts, Association of State Floodplain Managers, National Association of Mutual Insurance Companies, the Property Casualty Insurance Association of America, the National Science Foundation, the Federal Emergency Management Agency, the American Society of Civil Engineers, and the National Flood Insurance Program.

The bill requires States to provide matching funds and gives them the ability to further leverage Federal dollars, as many already do under the drinking water and clean water SRF programs.

For example, the bill ensures mitigation assistance is focused on where the flood risk is greatest and where people are most vulnerable. The bill requires states to prioritize mitigation assistance for low-income homeowners and geographic areas, pre-FIRM buildings, and severe repetitive loss areas, repetitive loss buildings. Finally, it gives states the option of providing additional capitalization grants to low-income homeowners, and simply do not have the wherewithal to access additional Federal dollars, as many already do under the drinking water and clean water SRF programs.

Mr. President, as we talk about appropriate investments in infrastructure, mitigation is one place where we
should be investing. I invite the rest of our colleagues to join me, Senator KENNEDY, and Senator MENENDEZ in supporting this bipartisan legislation.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 276—EX-PRESSING MADURO SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING TURKEY’S PURCHASE OF THE S-400 AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEM FROM THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION AND ITS MEMBERSHIP IN NATO, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. SCOTT of Florida (for himself and Mr. YOUNG) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. Res. 278

Whereas the United States and the Republic of Turkey have been North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) allies since 1952;

Whereas NATO exists for democratic nation states to band together to “safeguard the freedom, common heritage and civilization of their peoples, founded on the principles of democracy, individual liberty and the rule of law”;

Whereas NATO Member States “seek to promote stability and well-being in the North Atlantic area”;

Whereas the primary threat posed by the Soviet Union that precipitated the formation of NATO continues today, and recent actions by the Government of the Russian Federation have reaffirmed the importance of this alliance to the security of the Member States;

Whereas the Government of the Russian Federation has threatened the peace and security of the North Atlantic area, invading and occupying the territory of its non-NATO neighbors and menacing NATO Member States since 2008;

Whereas the Government of the Russian Federation has interfered and attempted to wreak havoc in the election processes of NATO Member States and continues to do so;

Whereas the Government of the Russian Federation has maintained and strengthened its ties with the repressive and corrupt regime of President Nicolás Maduro in Venezuela in an effort to prop him up in his illegitimate hold over the state;

Whereas the Government of the Russian Federation is strengthening its ties with the Government of Cuba, including a recent port call in Havana with its most powerful warship;

Whereas the government of President Recep Tayyip Erdoğan has taken the Republic of Turkey down a path of authoritarianism and human rights abuses, aligns itself with radical Islamic terror groups, and agitates against regional allies of the United States, such as Israel;

Whereas the Government of the Republic of Turkey has cooperated with the Governments of the Russian Federation and Iran against the strategic interests of the NATO Member States, continues to occupy northern Cyprus and continues to unjustly detain United States citizens;

Whereas the Government of the Republic of Turkey has supported the Maduro regime with illicit financial transactions;

Whereas the Government of the Republic of Turkey has acquired the S-400 air and missile defense system from the Russian Federation, which constitutes a direct and dire threat to the security interests of the United States and NATO; and

Whereas the foregoing demonstrates that the Republic of Turkey is consistently contradicting the standards and purposes of the NATO treaty; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) declares that the Republic of Turkey’s receipt of the Russian S-400 air and missile defense system is a significant transaction within the meaning of section 231 of the Countering America’s Adversaries Through Sanctions Act (CAATSA) of 2017 (22 U.S.C. 9532);

(2) calls for full implementation of sanctions under CAATSA;

(3) calls upon the President to consult with NATO Member States, pursuant to Article 4 of the North Atlantic Treaty, signed at Washington April 4, 1949, based upon threats to the political independence and security of the Parties by the Russian actions described in the preamble; and

(4) calls upon the President, during such consultation with NATO Member States, to review the Treaty with regard to the factors ‘‘effecting peace and security in the North Atlantic area’’ described in the preamble, and to consider the continued inclusion of the Republic of Turkey in NATO.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 927. Mr. PETERS (for himself and Mr. CRUZ) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1694, to require any Federal agency that issues licenses to conduct lunar activities to include in the requirements for such licenses an agreement relating to the preservation and protection of the Apollo 11 landing site, for other purposes.

Amendments Submitted and Proposed

SA 927. Mr. PETERS (for himself and Mr. CRUZ) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1694, to require any Federal agency that issues licenses to conduct lunar activities to include in the requirements for such licenses an agreement relating to the preservation and protection of the Apollo 11 landing site, for other purposes.

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) calls for the groups and organizations across the country who act under the banner of Antifa to be designated as domestic terrorist organizations;

(2) unequivocally condemns the violent actions of Antifa groups as unacceptable acts for anyone in the United States;

(3) expresses the need for the peaceful communication of varied ideas in the United States;

(4) urges any group or organizations in the United States to revoice its opinions without using violence or threatening the health, safety, or well-being of any other persons, groups, or law enforcement officers in the United States; and

(5) calls upon the Federal Government to redouble its efforts, using all available and appropriate tools, to combat the spread of all forms of domestic terrorism, including White supremacist terrorism.
(1) in subsection (c), by striking "$4,600,000,000" and all that follows through "expended" and inserting "$10,180,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2021 through 2025, pursuant to section 254(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 906(c)); and

SA 929. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1327, to extend authority for the September 11th Victim Compensation Fund of 2001 through fiscal year 2029, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:  

SEC. 5. SEQUESTRATION.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) the terms "direct spending" and "sequestration" have the meanings given such terms in section 256(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 906(c)); and

(b) SEQUESTRATION ORDERS.—

(1) I N GENERAL.—For fiscal year 2020, as soon as is practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, and on the dates the Office of Management and Budget issues its sequestration preview reports for each of fiscal years 2021 through 2025, pursuant to section 254(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 906(c)), the President shall order a sequestration, effective on issuance, that reduces all nonexempt direct spending by the uniform percentage necessary to reduce the total amount of nonexempt direct spending for such fiscal year by $2,036,000,000.

(2) IMPLEMENTATION.—When implementing the sequestration of nonexempt direct spending under paragraph (1), the Office of Management and Budget shall follow the procedures specified in section 6 of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (2 U.S.C. 933) and the special rules specified in section 256 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 906); and

(3) SEQUESTRATION ORDERS.—

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I have 6 requests for committees to meet during today’s session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to Rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Sen-
There being no objection, the Senate, at 5:09 p.m., adjourned until Monday, July 22, 2019, at 3 p.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 18, 2019:

THE JUDICIARY

CLIFTON L. CORREY, OF TENNESSEE, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

LYNDA BLANCHARD, OF ALABAMA, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF SLOVENIA.

DONALD R. TAPIA, OF ARIZONA, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO JAMAICA.
HONORING LOU MONEYMAKER

HON. SUSAN W. BROOKS  
OF INDIANA  
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Thursday, July 18, 2019

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Lou Moneymaker on the occasion of his retirement as President and Chief Executive Officer of Bosma Enterprises. Throughout his impressive career, Lou proved to be an innovative leader in the Indianapolis nonprofit community. Over the past 17 years, Lou served as the President and CEO of Bosma Enterprises, working tirelessly to improve the quality of life of blind and visually impaired Hoosiers. The people of Indiana’s Fifth Congressional District are forever grateful for Lou’s dedication to transforming lives in Indiana.

A lifelong Hoosier, Lou graduated from George Washington High School in Indianapolis before joining the U.S. Army in 1967. After completing his service in the Army in 1973, Lou attended Indiana University where he earned a bachelor's degree in education. Following that, Lou earned a master's degree in school administration from Butler University. Lou transitioned these achievements into an extraordinary 32-year career with the Indiana School for the Blind and Visually Impaired (ISBVI), one of the largest PreK-12 schools for visually impaired students in the country. ISBVI has earned an excellent national reputation for its commitment to the Indianapolis community, in part, because of Lou's strong leadership and charisma. As a track and field and wrestling coach, Lou inspired many students to succeed. This coaching, combined with his work as the Dean of Students at ISBVI, helped the institution gain national recognition for its innovative educational opportunities.

After leaving the ISBVI and joining Bosma Enterprises in 2001, Lou immediately set about driving the nonprofit to a new level of exceptional growth and success. Under his guidance as President and CEO, Bosma’s revenues grew from two million dollars to over seventy million dollars per year. This growth allowed Bosma Enterprises to expand its training and employment facilities to serve nearly 800 blind or visually impaired individuals per year, helping to drive down the nearly 70 percent unemployment rate among such individuals. Bosma Enterprises employs more than 100 blind and visually impaired Hoosiers, making them the largest such employer in the state.

Today, Bosma offers programs to help those living with blindness and visual impairment maintain a positive lifestyle, especially by giving them tools to live independently. Through their new Center for Visionary Solutions for the Blind, Bosma provides programs to help people of all ages succeed in higher education and find work. Their innovative BosmaForce program utilizes modern education tools to give students around the country access to high skilled job training, in particular, computer and technical jobs. Bosma’s Orientation and Mobility Trail gives visually impaired individuals an opportunity to practice navigation in a real-world environment on a variety of surfaces and around many types of obstacles. Together, programs of this type serve to benefit many of the 160,000 Hoosiers who are blind or visually impaired. These programs would not have been able to reach such a level of success without Lou’s guidance and the commitment of Bosma’s team of more than 220 employees, along with hundreds of volunteers, to fulfill his plan for the future.

Lou’s passion for helping Indiana’s visually impaired community extends far beyond his role at Bosma. A leading founder of the United States Association of Blind Athletes (USABA), Lou helped to transform the lives of many athletes all around the world. His involvement with both Ability Indiana and the Association for the Employment of People who are Blind demonstrates his commitment to the mission to empower visually impaired athletes. Additionally, his work on the 1996 Paralympic Organizing Committee helped to expand the reach of Paralympic organizations throughout the United States.

On behalf of Indiana’s Fifth Congressional District, I congratulate Lou on his extraordinary career of leadership and service. I extend my gratitude for all the contributions he has made to our community. While I know Lou will be missed at Bosma Enterprises, I wish the very best to him and his family as he enjoys a well-deserved retirement.

CHANGE OVER THE YEARS

HON. SUSAN A. DAVIS  
OF CALIFORNIA  
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Thursday, July 18, 2019

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Madam Speaker, I’m very “animated” to announce that this year is the 50th anniversary of San Diego Comic-Con.

This event began with a heavy focus on independent artists and cultivating a community of folks with similar interests—comics. Comic-Con has always been about supporting creative communities and celebrating what makes us special.

Today, Comic-Con has grown to include industry legends, independent artists, TV stars, and movie studios—but it never stopped being about fans coming together to share their interests.

This new era has expanded the levels of interest to a wider audience and brought in more fans of all different kinds.

In an industry that was once dismissed and disparaged as not serious art, celebrating inclusion is an important staple of our community.

I am excited for the next 50 years of panels, whether in the traditional comic book or celebrity style, to flourish in Comic-Con of San Diego.

THANKING GLENDA GUNDERMANN FOR HER 35 YEARS OF SERVICE TO SUGAR LAND

HON. PETE OLSON  
OF TEXAS  
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Thursday, July 18, 2019

Mr. OLSON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Glenda Gundermann for her 35 years of service to our community.

Gundermann has been an important leader within our Sugar Land community over the past three and a half decades. Glenda has worked with five mayors and city managers, managing the annexations of Sugar Creek, First Colony and numerous other cities. Her work has encouraged more participation in local government and has led to Sugar Land being named one of our nation’s top cities for transparency and engagement. During Tropical Storm Allison, she was instrumental in delivering emergency resources to those impacted.

On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again to Glenda Gundermann. Her service to this country will be remembered, and we wish her all the best in her future endeavors.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. DEBRA A. HAALAND  
OF NEW MEXICO  
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Thursday, July 18, 2019

Ms. HAALAND. Madam Speaker, on July 17, I was inadvertently not recorded for Roll Call vote 493. I had intended to vote “Aye.” As a cosponsor of the bill, H.R. 748, the Middle Class Health Benefits Tax Repeal Act of 2019, I strongly support this important legislation that will help reduce the cost of healthcare for the over 181 million Americans who depend on employer-sponsored health insurance. To avoid the 40 percent excise tax, many employers have been making changes in plan design that are driving up deductibles and out-of-pocket costs, yet one in five employers are expected to hit the taxable threshold in 2022. As a result, this tax is placing a disproportionate burden on working families, which was not the intent of Congress when it enacted the Affordable Care Act, and I intended to vote “Aye” on this legislation to repeal it.
IN HONOR OF SERGEANT FREDERICK JOHN HORNE, II FOR HIS DISTINGUISHED SERVICE

HON. DEBBIE DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 18, 2019

Mrs. DINGELL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Sergeant Frederick John Horne, II for his dedicated service. His commitment to country and community is worthy of commendation.

Sergeant Horne entered the Armed Forces on September 7, 1967 and was stationed at Fort Knox in Kentucky. He served in Vietnam where he was wounded in combat twice and received two Purple Hearts. Sergeant Horne was honorably discharged for his dedicated service on September 1, 1973. He returned to Michigan after a year at Valley Forge Hospital in Pennsylvania and worked for General Motors until his eventual retirement. Today we celebrate the fiftieth anniversary of Sergeant Horne receiving his Purple Heart for his sacrifice. He has shown tremendous bravery and selflessness throughout his decorated service.

Sergeant Horne has shown a tremendous love for his country and community. His years as a member of the United States Military exemplify the selflessness of public service and stand as a testament to duty, honor, and country. We thank Sergeant Horne for his commitment to protecting the American people. His service underscores the significant price of freedom, and the dedication and sacrifice of our servicemen in the Armed Forces and their families.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Sergeant Frederick John Horne, II for his exemplary service. He has effectively served Michigan and our nation through his selflessness and leadership.

HONORING THE LIFE OF FIRE CHIEF ROBERT B. ELWELL, JR. OF POMONA

HON. NORMA J. TORRES
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 18, 2019

Mrs. TORRES of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Robert B. Elwell, Jr. of the City of Pomona, and his tireless dedication to serving the Inland Empire community.

Robert Elwell graduated from the Crafton Hills College Paramedic Program and proceeded to work as a paramedic for a local ambulance company. He was then hired by the Ontario Fire Department in October 1985, where he worked for over 34 years in a variety of assignments including Fire Captain and Battalion Chief. In this role, he also helped develop the department’s active shooter response program and assisted several Southern California cities with creating similar programs.

Former Chief Elwell graduated from several fire service state and federal programs and was both a state certified Fire Officer and Chief Officer. He also served on a number of fire service committees and advisory boards that focused on leadership, mentoring and training. In April 2016, he was promoted to Fire Chief, a position he held until his retirement in December 2018.

Chief Elwell was a dedicated husband, loyal friend, and patriotic public servant. He enjoyed RVing with his wife Anne, off-roading, recreational shooting, and spending time with his close friends. He was fondly remembered by his loved ones, friends, colleagues, and extended family.

For his remarkable accomplishments, it is my honor to recognize Chief Robert B. Elwell, Jr. today. His decades of commitment and contribution to public safety and the community is worthy of admiration, and his memory will live on through the countless lives he has impacted. May he rest in peace.

WALNUT BEND ELEMENTARY ODYSSEY OF THE MIND TEAM WINS WORLD CHAMPIONSHIP

HON. PETE OLSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 18, 2019

Mr. OLSON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Walnut Bend Elementary School Odyssey of the Mind team for placing first in their division at the world finals. Nearly 800 teams ranging from elementary to college levels from across the United States and the world participated in the problem-solving competition at Michigan State University in May. The Walnut Bend team has made it to the finals several times, but this year they finally took first place, defeating a team from China to win. Their months of hard work certainly paid off.

On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again to the Walnut Bend Elementary School Odyssey of the Mind team for placing first in the world finals. We look forward to seeing them win again next year.

RECOGNIZING THE MARQUETTE COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

HON. JACK BERGMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 18, 2019

Mr. BERGMAN. Madam Speaker, it is my honor to recognize the Marquette County Department of Veterans Affairs Committee (MCDVAC) for its service to Veterans and their families. Through its tireless work, exceptional leadership, and steadfast devotion to its community, the MCDVAC has become an indispensable part of the Upper Peninsula of Michigan.

The Marquette County Veterans Affairs Committee consists of five Veteran volunteers appointed by the Marquette County Board of Commissioners to four-year terms. They work to provide the Veterans of Marquette County with the benefits and services they have earned through their service, including burial benefits, emergency financial relief, and disability compensation. They work with programs like the Disabled American Veterans Transportation Network, which provides transportation from the Jacobetti Home for Veterans and other areas in the county to the Oscar G Johnson VA Medical Center in Iron Mountain. The organization also aids in the administration of the Soldier Sailor Relief Fund, which provides financial help for Veterans who are unable to provide for the basic necessities of life without causing hardship, and works to help Veterans and their families in applying for a broad range of benefits provided by the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs.

Day after day, the Marquette County Veterans Affairs Committee continues to set an example of how public service can be achieved when the people of a community work together for the common good.

Madam Speaker, it is my honor to recognize the Marquette County Veteran’s Affairs Committee for decades of success and service to the Veterans of the Upper Peninsula. Michiganders can take great pride in knowing the First District is home to such dedicated citizens. On behalf of my constituents, I wish them all the best in their future endeavors.

IN RECOGNITION OF CHRIST CATHEDRAL

HON. J. LUIS CORREA
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 18, 2019

Mr. CORREA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Diocese of Orange Christ Cathedral on the completion of its renovations. The Christ Cathedral, formerly known as the “Crystal Cathedral,” has been a recognizable architectural marvel landmark in Garden Grove since 1955. The 34-acre land has been a beacon to the community and continues to be a space for community members to practice their faith.

In 1955, protestant mega-church leader Dr. Robert Schuller began preaching at the Orange Drive-in Theater. By 1975, his congregation outgrew the first church and Dr. Schuller began searching for architects to build a creative and beautiful space for worship. He worked with Philip Johnson and John Burgee to create a plan for an all glass church. In 2012, the campus and its buildings were sold to the Roman Catholic Diocese of Orange and have since become the new spiritual center of the division.

Starting in 2015, the campus began major renovations including extensive restorations to the grounds and buildings. These renovations included the restoration of 11,000 glass panes, the construction of scaffolding inside the cathedral, and the design of sacred art. Construction workers involved in the project logged over 100,000 hours of work without a single accident. The renovations are now complete, and today the refurbished cathedral is ready to serve as a spiritual home to Orange County’s more than 1.3 million Catholics, and the local community at-large through services and programs available to everyone including weddings, conferences, concerts, and family-friendly events.

It is my distinct honor to ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the new building design of the Christ Cathedral.
The student-first culture is evident at Ridgeview Charter Middle School. Student work is clearly displayed in the hallways, and the faculty and staff are familiar faces at music concerts and the annual musical. Mr. Blackwell recorded the finale of this year’s musical, Alice in Wonderland, and posted it to social media with encouraging words about the performance and the work done by students, faculty, and parents.

In addition to the environment created by teachers and staff, school administrators have worked to ensure that the school is one that is clean and comfortable. Music is played in the hallways during class change to create a calming and pleasant atmosphere. Inspirational messages painted on the walls add a culture of positivity, and those messages convey the high expectations the school has for students.

Ridgeview Charter Middle School stands out as a success story in public education. In his principal’s message on the school’s website, Principal Blackwell made his formal title “Proud Principal.” With such an exceptional review by the National Forum, he and the entire Ridgeview Charter Middle School family certainly should feel proud of the school, its faculty and staff, and most of all, the outstanding student body.

CHRISTINA VARGAS RECEIVES THE CHANCELLOR’S EXCELLENCE AWARD

HON. PETE OLSON OF TEXAS IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES Thursday, July 18, 2019

Mr. OLSON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Christina Vargas for receiving the Chancellor’s Excellence Award from Texas State Technical College in Fort Bend County. A Rosenberg native, Christina has been at TSTC for two years and currently serves as the Assistant Director of Enrollment Management. The Chancellor’s Excellence Award is given to employees who are recommended by their peers and exhibit TSTC’s core values of Excellence, Accountability, Service and Integrity. Christina was one of only 35 recipients from across the state to earn this award. Through her time at TSTC, Christina has helped and inspired her coworkers and students alike.

On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again to Christina Vargas on receiving the Chancellor’s Excellence Award. I thank her for her dedication to our students.

IN RECOGNITION OF RICHMOND BELL, RECIPIENT OF THE FRENCH LEGION OF HONOR

HON. WILLIAM R. KEATING OF MASSACHUSETTS IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES Thursday, July 18, 2019

Mr. KEATING. Madam Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Richmond Bell as he is awarded the French Legion of Honor, 75 years after bravely serving in the United States Army at the Battle of Normandy.

At only 18 years old, Mr. Bell enlisted in the 29th Infantry in 1943. After many members of his regiment lost their lives on D-Day, Mr. Bell, along with 14 other soldiers, were sent to France in an essential support effort of the remaining American Troops.

While serving on the frontlines each day for more than six weeks, Mr. Bell fought with courage and dedication to his country. He continuously risked his life for the war effort and the safety of his fellow soldiers.

In December of 1945, Mr. Bell returned to his hometown of Wellfleet, Massachusetts, honorably discharged with three Purple Hearts. A lifetime resident of the town, Mr. Bell is a beloved and respected member of the Wellfleet community. He is the son of the town doctor and a former paperboy for the Cape Cod Standard. Mr. Bell, now “semi-retired,” lives with his wife Gail. He has 5 children, four step-children and 26 grandchildren.

Madam Speaker, I am proud to honor Richmond Bell for his dedication to his country. I ask that my colleagues join me in thanking him for his immense bravery and valiant efforts through a critical time in our nation’s history.

INTRODUCTION OF SAILORS ACT

HON. MARCY KAPRIT OF OHIO IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES Thursday, July 18, 2019

Ms. KAPRIT. Madam Speaker, I rise with my fellow co-chairs of the bipartisan Congressional Ukraine Caucus to introduce the SAILORS ACT, or the “Stopping Aggressive Incursions on Liberty by Ordering Russian Sanctions Act.”

This bill would direct the Administration to sanction 24 senior officers of the Russian Federal Security Service and its border patrol until it releases all 24 Ukrainian sailors and the three vessels it illegally seized in the Kerch Strait on November 25, 2018.

On that day, an unprompted Russia brazenly fired upon and took hostage 24 Ukrainian sailors in international waters. The sailors now languish in Russian prisons in Moscow under dire conditions.

Tragically, this is just the latest in a series of dangerous and malicious steps Russia has taken to undermine Ukraine’s democratic progress and the international rules-based order.

Since illegally invading Crimea in 2014, Russia now seeks to tighten the noose around Ukrainian coastal waters including building a barbed fence in the Kerch Strait to starve Ukraine of vital naval commerce.

To date, Russia’s illegal war in Eastern Ukraine has led to the death of over 10,000 innocents and the displacement of millions.

The international community must not stand idle in the face of these Russian aggression. Europe and its efforts to undermine democracies globally—including in the United States. The United States and the free world must continue to raise the costs of Russian aggression to protect those at the edge of liberty.

This bill sends a clear message to the Ukrainian sailors and their families that the American people have not forgotten their immense sacrifice and heroic struggle to protect their nation’s democratic future. We call on Russia to
immediately release the Ukrainian sailors and safely return them back to Ukraine. I urge my colleagues to join in this important effort and call for the bill’s swift passage.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ANDY BIGGS
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 18, 2019

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, I took care of family business and was in transit back to D.C. when the vote occurred. Had I been present, I would have voted NAY on Roll Call No. 482.

HONORING THE STEPHEN F. AUSTIN UNIVERSITY WOMEN’S BOWLING TEAM 2019 NCAA DIVISION I NATIONAL COLLEGIATE WOMEN’S BOWLING CHAMPIONS

HON. LOUIE GOHMERT
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 18, 2019

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, it is a great honor to celebrate with my fellow east Texans the outstanding accomplishment of the Stephen F. Austin University bowling team on winning the NCAA National Collegiate Women’s Bowling Championship this year.

Entering the NCAA tournament ranked sixth, the Ladyjacks demonstrated their hard work and determination to oust teams from Sam Houston State University, McKendree University, and University of Maryland Eastern Shore before facing off with the No. 1-ranked team, Vanderbilt University, in the final.

The final began looking like it would end in the Vanderbilt Commodores’ favor. The Ladyjacks lost the first game but quickly recovered to win the second game and tie the match. This did not let the initial setback discourage their performance. Instead, it pushed them to play with more determination and skill. They went on to win each consecutive game, finishing the match with a 4–1 victory over Vanderbilt. These Ladyjacks demonstrated incredible focus and skill to clinch the National Championship.


This is not just a feat for the bowling team but for the entire university. It is the second national championship in the school’s history as a NCAA Division I contender. Furthermore, both national championships were clinched within the past four years. This speaks highly of the hard work and dedication of the men and women and the excellent coaching staff at Stephen F. Austin University.

It is with great pride that I join with all of east Texas in congratulating the Ladyjacks bowling team on their NCAA Division I National Championship. May God continue to bless these consummate first class competitors, along with their families, friends and neighbors in east Texas. This outstanding accomplishment is now preserved in the Record which will endure as long as there is a United States of America.

CELEBRATING THE 70TH ANNIVERSARY OF CECIL’S DELICATESSEN

HON. BETTY MCCOLLUM
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 18, 2019

Ms. McCOLLUM. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 70th anniversary of Cecil’s Delicatesen in Saint Paul, Minnesota. On July 1, 1949, Cecil and Faye Glickman opened the doors for the first time to hungry Saint Paul customers. Seven decades later, Cecil’s is a landmark destination for Highland Park neighbors and international visitors alike.

In the early days, Cecil and Faye Glickman were among a large number of Saint Paul Jewish families operating restaurants and delicatessens. Today, Cecil’s remains as the only traditional deli in the city. This long record of success is due to its loyal customers’ love of Cecil’s made-from-scratch dishes, baked goods and high-quality imported products served up each day by friendly, hardworking and dedicated staff.

Family has always been the key ingredient to success for four generations. In 1980, Cecil and Faye’s daughter Sheila and her husband David Leventhall bought the deli from her parents when they decided to retire. Sheila still takes orders and David balances the books. In addition, Sheila and David’s children and even grandchildren work around the deli, alongside many other employees.

Cecil’s made-from-scratch dishes, baked goods and high-quality imported products served up each day by hardworking and dedicated staff. It is with great pride that I join with all of Saint Paul in congratulating the 70th anniversary of Cecil’s Delicatessen.

RECOGNIZING BIG RIVER CHAUTAUQUA

HON. JASON SMITH
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 18, 2019

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Big River Chautauqua, celebrating its 25th year in Bonne Terre, Missouri. It’s the longest-running privately-funded Chautauqua west of the Mississippi River. Named for Chautauqua Lake where the first event was held in New York in the mid-1920’s, the Big River Chautauqua has been designated by the Missouri Humanities Council as an outstanding example of interactive learning.

It’s held in a big white tent outside city hall and since 1995, Chautauqua has brought together hundreds of people to see history come to life each night. Scholar-Actors have told tales of the Founding Fathers; great authors and showmen; and heroes, heroes and outlaws of the Old West. Appreciative audiences have seen Civil War generals and Anything-But-Civil Politicians who told their life stories in the first person.

Founded by Joe Layden and Sherry Greminger, the entire event is organized, planned and led by volunteers. That includes the Chautauqua Singers who set each character in their time of life by singing the songs of the era they lived. And all the entertainment is free.

Chautauqua’s Community Spirit is the foundation of Chautauqua and the secret to its success. It is my great pleasure to celebrate the Big River Chautauqua of Bonne Terre, Missouri today before the United States House of Representatives.

CELEBRATING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF PETOSKEY PLASTICS

HON. JACK BERGMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 18, 2019

Mr. BERGMAN. Madam Speaker, it is my honor to recognize the 50th anniversary of Petoskey Plastics. Through its trusted service, innovation, and commitment to environmental sustainability and community investment, Petoskey Plastics has become an indispensable part of Northern Michigan.

Petoskey Plastics, Inc. was founded in 1969, initially composed of five employees and a single machine converting film into plastic bags. Over the following 50 years, it would grow to become the successful local institution it is today. With more than 400 associates, 500,000 square feet of manufacturing space, and 47 countries served, Petoskey Plastics is a prime example of the entrepreneurial spirit found in the state of Michigan.

The company first began its recycling program in 1978, and it has not stopped thinking green since. Its innovative Closed Loop program allows partnering companies to reduce their carbon footprint and avoid needless plastic waste, resulting in more than 30 million pounds of plastic film recycled annually. Each year its associates participate in regular Toys for Tots drives, donate to the Women’s Resource Center of Northern Michigan, and take part in multiple other charity events and fundraisers.

Day after day, Petoskey Plastics continues to set a positive example of what can be achieved when the people of a company work together for the common good.

Mr. Speaker, it’s my honor to congratulate Petoskey Plastics for its associates for 50 years of success, service, and community investment. Michiganders can take great pride in knowing the First District is home to such
CONGRATULATING CAPTAIN ANDY FEINBERG ON HIS RETIREMENT

HON. PETE OLSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 18, 2019

Mr. OLSON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Captain Andy Feinberg on his distinguished retirement from the U.S. Navy.

Captain Feinberg recently completed 30 years of honorable service to the U.S. Navy. Throughout his military career, he has earned many awards and held many titles, too many to list here, but here are a few that set him apart. Captain Feinberg was awarded a Defense Superior Service Medal, Meritorious Service Medals (4 awards), the Navy and Marine Corps Commendation Medal (4 awards), the Navy and Marine Corps Achievement Medal, and various unit awards. His life-long service to our great nation has helped keep America safe and free, and we thank him.

On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, I again want to thank Captain Andy Feinberg for his dedicated service to our great country. This former Navy pilot and all of America wish him fair winds and following seas in his retirement. Not for self but country (Non Sibi Sed Patriae).

COMMEMORATING THE ONE HUNDRED SEVENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ALLEGANY COUNTY FAIR

HON. TOM REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 18, 2019

Mr. REED. Madam Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the one hundred seventy-fifth anniversary of the Allegany County Fair.

We are proud of our farmers in Allegany County and the hard work they do. The Allegany County Fair is a celebration of that hard work and an opportunity for friends and neighbors to come together in the festivities. The very first Allegany County Fair was held on October 4, 1844. In its humble beginnings, the first exhibits were limited to livestock, crops, canned goods, and sewing crafts. Until 1855 all exhibits were displayed under one tent. Over time, the fair has grown at a steady rate, acquiring land and building facilities for the fairgrounds. Not even a natural disaster could stand in the way of the fair’s success. In the late 1880’s a cyclone destroyed and damaged multiple fairground buildings, but the fair continued on, re-construting what was broken and adding new amenities to the growing attraction. As the Fair has grown in size, it has also grown in popularity; making it a vital part of our communities and their economies.

Every year the Allegany County Fair is dedicated to someone who goes above and beyond to ensure the success of the fair. This year the fair is recognizing all the volunteers, past and present, who have made the fair a success. Many volunteers involved with the fair use their vacation days to make sure the fair is ready each year. That is why the one hundred seventy-fifth Allegany County Fair is dedicated to “the face in the mirror”.

One hundred and seventy-five years of community tradition is certainly a cause for celebration. I congratulate the Allegany County Fair on this impressive milestone and look forward to many more fairs in the years to come. Given the above, I ask that this Legislative Body pause in its deliberations and join me to celebrate the one hundred seventy-fifth anniversary of the Allegany County Fair.

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE OF BILLY JACKSON THAMES, JR.

HON. TRENT KELLY
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 18, 2019

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the life of Billy Jackson Thames, Jr., who passed away on Friday, July 12th at the age of 66.

Jack, a lifelong resident of Newton, Mississippi, served six years in the National Guard Unit of Newton. He attended the University of Mississippi and later acquired his law degree from the Mississippi College of Law. Jack returned to Newton to open a private law practice and later served as Assistant District Attorney until his retirement in 2017.

Jack and his wife, Wanda, attended Newton United Methodist Church. Left to cherish his memory is his wife, Wanda Thames of Newton; his sons—Amos, Zachary, Samuel, and Benjamin; his brother Kirk Thames; and his grandchildren Knox Thames and Harper Thames, as well as many more extended family members.

Jack’s life was one of service, grace, love for his family, and community. He will be greatly missed by all whom he encountered.

HONORING STAFF SERGEANT PAUL EUGENE CALKIN

HON. ERIC A. “RICK” CRAWFORD
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 18, 2019

Mr. CRAWFORD. Madam Speaker, today I rise to commemorate the passing of Staff Sergeant Paul Eugene Calkin, a World War Two Army Air Corps veteran who passed away on June 12 at the age of 95.

Staff Sergeant Calkin flew with the 349th Bomb Squadron, 100th Bomb Group, 8th Air Force, and the 15th Air Force during the war, based at airfields in Italy and the United Kingdom. He fought in bombardments at Po Valley, the Rhineland, Apennines, and the Battle of the Bulge.

He was never hesitant to share the lessons he learned fighting for freedom with younger generations, even sharing how he was shot down during a visit with students from Valley View Junior High. After his plane ditched in the English Channel in February, Calkin waited in the freezing water for 40 minutes before he was rescued.

In his time in the Army, Calkin was awarded the Distinguished Flying Cross, the Air Medal with four oak leaf clusters, the Good Conduct Medal, the European African Middle Eastern Campaign Medal with four bronze battle stars, the World War II Victory Medal, the American Campaign Medal, the American Defense Medal, and the RAF Gold Fish Medal. In 2000, the Department of Defense awarded Calkin the Purple Heart for injuries he sustained in combat half a century earlier, and in 2013 the French Republic awarded him the French Legion of Honor for his role in liberating France from tyranny.

I invite Congress to join me in extending condolences to Paul Eugene Calkin’s family and recognizing his service to the United States and the world.

IN RECOGNITION OF WILLIE STROUD

HON. MIKE ROGERS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 18, 2019

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Madam Speaker, I rise to recognize Willie Stroud, Jr., Willie, a 96-year-old World War II Veteran, plans to attend his Webb, Rowell, Fielder and Lockhart Family Reunion at the end of July. He was born in Auburn, Alabama, in 1922 to Will and Macon Stroud. Willie was inducted in the U.S. Army in 1943 and served until 1946. While in the 25th Infantry, he was a truck driver and Rifle Specialist. He received the American Theater Service and the World War II Victory Medals. With an honorable discharge, Willie, his siblings and his Mother migrated to Roseville, Michigan, and settled there after the Army.

Willie worked as a truck driver for Roadway, making deliveries of freight throughout the United States and later worked in a steel mill in Detroit, Michigan. Later in life, he decided to become a business owner, buying a truck to become the beloved “Vegetable Man” in the blue truck on the east side of Detroit. He also owned and operated several fish markets on the eastside of Detroit and even has a secret batter for frying fish.

Willie married several times and was blessed with several children: Arabelle (deceased), Rodger (deceased), Roscoe, Lany, Brenda (deceased) and Deborah Stroud. He currently resides with his daughter in Southfield, Michigan. He enjoys church, traveling, shopping, spending time with family during his 96 years of honorable service to the United States and the world.
PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. NORMA J. TORRES
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 18, 2019

Mrs. TORRES of California. Madam Speaker, on July 12, 2019, my vote for Roll Call No. 462, Turner of Ohio Part B Amendment No. 386, was recorded incorrectly. I intended to vote NO on Roll Call No. 462, but I was recorded as voting AYE.

RECOGNIZING THE ONTONAGON COUNTY VETERANS ASSOCIATION

HON. JACK BERGMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 18, 2019

Mr. BERGMAN. Madam Speaker, it is my honor to recognize the Ontonagon County Veterans Association (OCVA) for over sixteen years of service to Veterans and their families. Through their dedicated service, exceptional leadership, and steadfast devotion to its community, the OCVA has become an indispensable part of the Upper Peninsula of Michigan. First formed in 2003, the OCVA represents all eight VFWs and American Legions in Ontonagon County. The organization was first brought together to provide full military honors at all military burials in the county—an endeavor that requires significant coordination and participation from local Veterans. Today, the OCVA Honor Guard leads dozens of burials for Ontonagon Veterans each year. The group also schedules and operates the DAV Van, taking Veterans from throughout the county to the VA Facility in Iron Mountain. This work is made even more difficult by the extreme geographic size and low population density of Ontonagon County. Despite these challenges, the OCVA consistently rises to the challenge in service of our local Veterans.

In addition to their regular work, efforts from the OCVA were crucial in returning L552 Lowell Valley, a sailor on the USS Oklahoma killed during the attacks on Pearl Harbor, home for final burial in 2018. Its members are also highly involved in community activities, churches, government, and local businesses. Day after day, the OCVA continues to set a positive example of what can be achieved when the people of a community work together for the common good.

Madam Speaker, it’s my honor to recognize the Ontonagon County Veterans Association for decades of success and service to the Veterans of the Upper Peninsula. Michiganders can take great pride in knowing the First District is home to such dedicated citizens. On behalf of my constituents, I wish the OCVA all the best in its future endeavors.

IN HONOR OF MR. HARRY WATKINS

HON. DAVID ROUZER
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 18, 2019

Mr. ROUZER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor the life of the late Mr. Harry Watkins of Wrightsville Beach, North Carolina, who passed away last year at the age of 72.

Harry Watkins got his start in architecture after studying at North Carolina State University. After a 40-year-long career, Harry has left a lasting imprint on Wrightsville Beach, Bald Head Island, Figure 8 Island and many other surrounding communities where he designed many of the homes that still stand there today. He always held a special place in his heart for Bald Head Island.

Harry also helped to grow Wrightsville Beach true to his vision: “The architect must understand the community, the environment, and especially the characteristics of the specific site,” Harry said of his design philosophy. He described his idea of what a good home can be as “a joy when things were going well, and a comfort when they were not.”

Harry left a legacy of architectural vision and excellence that is visible in each and every community he touched. He is survived by his wife Vicki, his daughter Brooke, and an entire community of friends, neighbors and clients who are forever grateful for his love and influence in their life.

Madam Speaker, Harry Watkins was a great American who has left an enduring and exceptional legacy for which we are all proud.

RECOGNIZING MICHAEL LANE HARVEY ON HIS ELECTION AS VICE PRESIDENT OF THE 2019 ILLINOIS FUTURE FARMERS OF AMERICA

HON. JOHN SHIMKUS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 18, 2019

Mr. SHIMKUS. Madam Speaker, I rise to recognize Michael Lane Harvey on his election as vice president of the 2019 Illinois FFA. Mr. Lane’s background should serve him well in his new position. He served the past few years as his school’s FFA representative and more recently as president of Illinois FFA Section 23. In that post, he served the farming interests of thirteen area schools as a state officer. After being voted in by over 400 delegates and over 5,000 members from across Illinois at the 91st Illinois FFA State Convention held in Springfield, Mr. Lane will be taking on even greater responsibilities as he represents over 20,000 FFA members and advisors.

Madam Speaker, I congratulate Michael Lane Harvey on his election as vice president of the 2019 Illinois FFA. I have always enjoyed working with our agricultural leaders, especially those in the blue jacket. I would like to extend my well wishes to Mr. Lane, the entire State Officer Team, and all members of the Illinois FFA.

HON. BETTY MCCOLLUM
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 18, 2019

Ms. McCOLLUM. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the centennial anniversary of Saint Paul’s Sterling Club, the oldest African American men’s club in the nation. Founded at a time when racism and segregation were the norm, and African Americans could not access the same accommodations as white community members, the Sterling Club provided a strong community to allow neighbors to come together and to host and celebrate visiting African American dignitaries.

On a bright and cold New Year’s Day in 1919, men from Saint Paul’s Rondo neighborhood chartered a bus to spread the word of a new club created for African Americans. The Sterling Club, and later the Women’s Auxiliary, would quickly become a cornerstone of the social and civic strength of Saint Paul’s African American community. During its first hundred years, the Sterling Club has hosted countless events, balls and social gatherings. Above all, the organization’s principal purpose was “the proper entertainment of persons of note who may visit.”

Officially incorporated on August 28, 1919, the Sterling Club was not a social club in the same vein as others, which typically catered to community elites and the professional class. Among its ranks one could find lawyers, architects, government employees and decorated war veterans. Officers and members also included railroad workers, janitors, meat packers, elevator operators and postal workers. Then as now, the egalitarian ethos speaks to the community-building and organizing principles of the Sterling Club.

In 1900s Saint Paul, African American community members were eager to hear from leaders speaking about overcoming the adversity and racism that was commonplace throughout our nation. To address this desire, the Sterling Club began hosting notable and national leaders including Booker T. Washington, William Monroe Trotter and W.E.B. Du Bois. The club remains actively focused on civic engagement and has hosted forums for generations of candidates seeking elected office in Saint Paul. The development of the Sterling Club Charitable Fund has also contributed greatly to the community, sponsoring student scholarships and honoring volunteers who give back to our community.

Despite being a men’s group, the longevity and success of the club would not have been possible without the women of the Auxiliary. Spouses of club members long played a significant role in fundraising, planning and organizing. Without shrewd and savvy women of the Auxiliary scraping together enough funding, the club likely would not have been able to survive past the Great Depression and World War II to flourish in the post-war years.

The Sterling Club has always relied on the collective experience and abilities of members to organize, resist, thrive and give back to the community. Founded in a time and place where the color of your skin could mean the difference between a comfortable life or a life at the margins, the Sterling Club stands tall as an example of how a community coming together can claim the American Dream in the face of adversity of prejudice and discrimination and forge a new and better future for everyone. Madam Speaker please join me in celebrating 100 years of Saint Paul Sterling Club.
ERIKA STROUD NAMED TEXAS’S BEST TRAINER

HON. PETE OLSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 18, 2019

Mr. OLSON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Sugar Land Public Safety Dispatcher Erika Stroud for being named Texas’s best trainer by the Texas Association of Public Safety Communications Officials and the Texas National Emergency Number Association.

As a public safety dispatcher, Erika’s quick decisions can make the difference between life and death in emergency situations. When training Sugar Land’s public safety dispatchers and answering emergency calls, Erika holds herself and her team to the highest standards and ensures that recruits are ready to help folks in need no matter the time, day or night. She is also a member of the Critical Incident Stress Management Team, which ensures that our dedicated first responders have access to critical mental health resources.

On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again to Erika Stroud for this award. I thank her for her commitment to keeping our Sugar Land community safe.

CELEBRATION OF THE FORTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF HABITAT FOR HUMANITY OF KANSAS CITY

HON. EMANUEL CLEAVER
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 18, 2019

Mr. CLEAVER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the Fortieth Anniversary of Habitat for Humanity of Kansas City. As a leader in nonprofit homebuilding, Habitat for Humanity is dedicated to ensuring suitable and affordable housing for all. Since its creation, Habitat for Humanity of Kansas City has improved hundreds of lives in six counties of the Greater Kansas City area and the Fifth Congressional District of Missouri. Wholly devoted to establishing stability and security in the community via improved housing, Habitat for Humanity constructs and restores homes, and then counsels families on investments and finances to help them keep their homes. When a family can afford a safe and stable home, they can then invest in other needs such as health care or the education of their children. Habitat for Humanity creates a ripple effect throughout communities, not only providing a safe shelter, but also a prosperous and strong future for families. They help families become one of the core values of our country—opportunity for all, regardless of income or background.

Madam Speaker, please join me, Missouri’s Fifth Congressional District, and those around the nation in honoring the Fortieth Anniversary of Habitat for Humanity of Kansas City. Their commitment to bettering the community through building and restoring houses for families in the region is admirable and worthy of our recognition.

CELEBRATING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF FIRST BAPTIST CHURCH OF HULL, TEXAS

HON. BRIAN BABIN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 18, 2019

Mr. BABIN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 100th Anniversary of the First Baptist Church of Hull located in east Liberty County, Texas. On July 18, 2019, a group of dedicated Christians met in a home for the purpose of organizing the First Baptist Church of Hull, Texas. On July 24 of the same year, M.R. Beavers donated two lots of land for a church site. Mr. Beavers was later elected as a Trustee of the church, and his widow was the last surviving of the fourteen charter members. The original church building was built from lumber salvaged from the neighboring abandoned sawmill community of Budconner. On January 4, 1956, the church voted to construct the present building, which was completed in 1957 and dedicated on August 31, 1958. The original frame of the church building was used for several Sunday school classrooms until the current education building was completed on December 13, 1969. In January 1957, First Baptist voted to build a Family Life Center.

Over the years, the church’s resiliency has been tested through several natural disasters: the flood of 1994, Hurricane Ike in 2008, and Hurricane Harvey in 2017 each caused considerable damage to First Baptist’s property. Hurricane Harvey inundated it with several feet of water, wiped out nearby Hull-Daisetta Elementary School, and caused considerable damage to much of the surrounding community.

During the aftermath of Harvey, the damaged Family Life Center at First Baptist served as a distribution center for supplies and provided meals for first responders, disaster relief crews, and local residents. Each time the church was damaged, church members, aided by groups like the Texas Baptist Men’s (TBM) Builders, have rebuilt. To date, the parsonage has been restored and work on the sanctuary and education building is ongoing.

In addition to being on the receiving end of mission efforts following natural disasters, individuals and groups from First Baptist Church, Hull have been missionaries at home and abroad. The church has made several trips to bring the Gospel to the people of Mexico, Guatemala, and Honduras. They have also aided in many construction mission projects, conducted numerous Vacation Bible Schools for children and young adults residing in the surrounding community, and have been active at the East Texas Baptist Encampment in Newton, Texas.

Throughout the past century, the First Baptist Church of Hull has had twenty-seven pastors. Although most have been “full-time,” some have been bi-vocational. On October 19, 1919, Rev. R.L. Nash was called to be the first pastor on a part-time basis. The first full-time Pastor, Rev. W.R. Lindsay, began serving First Baptist on September 26, 1920. The first deacons were elected on May 29, 1921. The church is actively seeking a pastor at this time.

On July 20, 2019, my brothers and sisters in Christ at the First Baptist Church of Hull will celebrate 100 years of delivering God’s word to the people of Hull, Daisetta, and the surrounding communities. The Lord has used this historic church as an amazing witness for a century, and I am privileged to have such a place of worship in my district.

COMMEMORATING THE ONE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE WAWERLY ROTARY CLUB

HON. TOM REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 18, 2019

Mr. REED. Madam Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the one hundredth anniversary of the Waverly Rotary Club. In 1919, the Waverly Rotary Club was established under the sponsorship of the club in Elmira, New York. As they elected their first President, Hart Seeley, this newly founded branch of Rotary International made a commitment to service in their community.

The Rotary International motto is “Service Above Self,” and Waverly Rotary has embodied that principle over one hundred years of supporting community service projects. The Waverly Rotary Club is also a sponsor of a strong Student Exchange Program that was established in 1951. For decades they have fostered positive international relationships for
young people in the community. Waverly Rotary was also one of the first in New York State to adopt a highway when the program began in the 1990’s. Their beautification program has ensured the maintenance of Exit 61 and provided welcome signs to greet those entering the Town of Waverly.

Waverly Rotary has helped to ensure that the spirit of service is alive and well in the city of Waverly. Rotarians are active volunteers and serve as leaders in the community.

One hundred years of service in the community is certainly a cause for celebration. I congratulate the Waverly Rotary Club on this impressive milestone and look forward to their continued success in the years to come.

Given the above, I ask that this Legislative Body pause in its deliberations and join me to celebrate the one hundredth anniversary of the Waverly Rotary Club.

HONORING NATIONAL FRAGILE X AWARENESS DAY

HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 18, 2019

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I rise today in recognition of National Fragile X Awareness Day, happening on Monday, July 22. As the Co-Chair of the Fragile X Caucus with Congressman CHRIS SMITH, I would like to take a moment to raise awareness about this condition, which affects an estimated 100,000 Americans.

Fragile X is a genetic disorder caused by mutations in the gene known as FMR1. These genetic changes can result in behavioral, developmental, cognitive, reproductive and potentially fatal neurodegenerative conditions. Over 1,000,000 Americans have a variation of the Fragile X mutation, meaning they either have, or at risk, of developing one of the conditions associated with Fragile X. This means that each Member of this House, on average, represents 230 constituents living with Fragile X syndrome.

This past March, I led a bipartisan appropriations letter with Congressman CHRIS SMITH urging the NIH to continue investment in Fragile X research and maintaining federal support for the Fragile X awareness and research programs at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, where they fund the FORWARD project, which collects and provides Fragile X data across the lifespan and generations to help improve research towards treatments and a cure. A group of 16 bipartisan Members joined us in this effort.

On National Fragile X Awareness Day, I urge all my colleagues to take time to learn the impact of this disease and how we can pass legislation that improves the lives of Americans living with Fragile X.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, JR.
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 18, 2019

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, due to previously scheduled travel, I was physically absent from the House of Representatives on June 27, 2019. On that day, I missed 5 recorded votes.

On Roll Call No. 426 on the Adoption of H. Res. 466, had I been present, I would have voted “Yea.”

On Roll Call No. 427 on the Republican Motion to Recommit, had I been present, I would have voted “Yea.”

On Roll Call No. 428 on the Passage of H.R. 2722, had I been present, I would have voted “Nay.”

On Roll Call No. 429 on Concursing to the Senate Amendment to H.R. 3401, had I been present, I would have voted “Yea.”

HONORING ZECHARIAH CARTLEDGE

HON. RODNEY DAVIS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 18, 2019

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor a truly special hero for our country, Zechariah Cartledge, a 10-year-old boy from Florida, who has decided he will run a mile for each time a law enforcement officer is killed in the line of duty.

Earlier this year, Zechariah went to New York City to run the “Tunnel to Towers 5K” with police officers, firefighters and military personnel to honor our nation’s heroes. He has continued to raise money for police officers and military personnel with every single mile he has run.

This weekend, Zechariah will be in Springfield, Illinois to participate in a 1-Mile Honorary Run for all Illinois Law Enforcement Officers Killed in the Line of Duty that is being put on by The Peacekeepers, a local organization who have raised an impressive amount of money for our military members and police officers.

This year, in Springfield, Zechariah will be helping The Peacekeepers honor fallen Illinois State Police Trooper Brian McMillen and Petty Officer 2nd Class Logan Palmer. Zechariah is a wonderful hero who is an example of what we all should strive to be: men and women with appreciation and respect for our first responders.

Thank you, Zechariah for everything you have done to honor our heroes. The money you have raised will go a long way for families of our fallen. God bless you and the work you have done.
Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S4923–S4956

Measures Introduced: Thirty-eight bills and two resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 2156–2193, and S. Res. 278–279. Pages S4947–48

Measures Reported:

- S. 727, to combat international extremism by addressing global fragility and violence and stabilizing conflict-affected areas, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. Page S4946

Measures Passed:

One Small Step to Protect Human Heritage in Space Act: Senate passed S. 1694, to require any Federal agency that issues licenses to conduct lunar activities to include in the requirements for such licenses an agreement relating to the preservation and protection of the Apollo 11 landing site, after agreeing to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, the committee-reported title amendment, and the following amendment proposed there-to:

Peters/Cruz Amendment No. 927, to modify the sense of Congress with respect to collaboration with other countries. Page S4933–36

50th Anniversary of the Apollo 11 Moon Landing: Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation was discharged from further consideration of S. Con. Res. 19, celebrating the 50th anniversary of the Apollo 11 Moon landing, and the resolution was then agreed to.

Never Forget the Heroes: James Zadroga, Ray Pfeifer, and Luis Alvarez Permanent Authorization of the September 11th Victim Compensation Fund Act—Agreement: A unanimous-consent-time agreement was reached providing that at a time to be determined by the Majority Leader, in consultation with the Democratic Leader, on or before Wednesday, July 24, 2019, Senate begin consideration of H.R. 1327, to extend authorization for the September 11th Victim Compensation Fund of 2001 through fiscal year 2092, and that the only amendments in order be Lee Amendment No. 928, and Paul Amendment No. 929, to be offered, and that there be up to two hours of concurrent debate equally divided between the two Leaders, or designees, and Senate then vote on or in relation to the amendments in the order listed, with no second-degree amendments in order prior to the votes, and that there be two minutes equally divided prior to each vote, and that each amendment be subject to an affirmative 60 vote threshold; and that upon disposition of the amendments, Senate vote on passage of the bill, as amended, if amended, all with no intervening action or debate and notwithstanding Rule XXII.

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that following Leader remarks on Tuesday, July 23, 2019, Senate begin consideration of the bill, as under the previous order; that notwithstanding Rule XXII, at 12 noon, if cloture is invoked on the nomination of Mark T. Esper, of Virginia, to be Secretary of Defense, all post-cloture time be considered expired; and that following the vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the nomination of Stephen M. Dickson, of Georgia, to be Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration, Senate continue consideration of the bill with all debate time considered expired at 2:30 p.m.

Esper Nomination—Cloture: Senate began consideration of the nomination of Mark T. Esper, of Virginia, to be Secretary of Defense.

A motion was entered to close further debate on the nomination, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, and pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement of Thursday, July 18, 2019, a vote on cloture will occur at 5:30 p.m., on Monday, July 22, 2019.

Prior to the consideration of this nomination, Senate took the following action:

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to nominations reported out of the Committee on Armed Services on Thursday, July 18, 2019.

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Legislative Session.
Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Executive Session to consider the nomination.  

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that at approximately 3 p.m., on Monday, July 22, 2019, Senate resume consideration of the nomination; and that notwithstanding the provisions of Rule XXII, the motions to invoke cloture filed on Thursday, July 18, 2019, ripen at 5:30 p.m., on Monday, July 22, 2019.  

Dickson Nomination—Cloture: Senate began consideration of the nomination of Stephen M. Dickson, of Georgia, to be Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration.  

A motion was entered to close further debate on the nomination, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur upon disposition of the nomination of Mark T. Esper, of Virginia, to be Secretary of Defense.  

Prior to the consideration of this nomination, Senate took the following action:  

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Legislative Session.  

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Executive Session to consider the nomination.  

Berger Nomination—Cloture: Senate began consideration of the nomination of Wendy Williams Berger, of Florida, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Florida.  

A motion was entered to close further debate on the nomination, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur upon disposition of the nomination of Stephen M. Dickson, of Georgia, to be Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration.  

Prior to the consideration of this nomination, Senate took the following action:  

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Legislative Session.  

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Executive Session to consider the nomination.  

Buescher Nomination—Cloture: Senate began consideration of the nomination of Brian C. Buescher, of Nebraska, to be United States District Judge for the District of Nebraska.  

A motion was entered to close further debate on the nomination, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur upon disposition of the nomination of Wendy Williams Berger, of Florida, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Florida.  

Prior to the consideration of this nomination, Senate took the following action:  

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Legislative Session.  

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Executive Session to consider the nomination.  

Nominations Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nominations:  

By 55 yeas to 39 nays (Vote No. EX. 216), Clifton L. Corker, of Tennessee, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Tennessee.  

By 54 yeas to 40 nays (Vote No. EX. 217), Lynda Blanchard, of Alabama, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Slovenia.  

By 66 yeas to 26 nays (Vote No. EX. 218), Donald R. Tapia, of Arizona, to be Ambassador to Jamaica.  

Messages from the House:  

Measures Referred:  

Measures Placed on the Calendar:  

Measures Read the First Time:  

Executive Communications:  

Petitions and Memorials:  

Executive Reports of Committees:  

Additional Cosponsors:  

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions:  

Additional Statements:  

Amendments Submitted:  

Authorities for Committees to Meet:  

Privileges of the Floor:  

Record Votes: Three record votes were taken today. (Total—218)  

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 5:09 p.m., until 3 p.m. on Monday, July 22, 2019. (For Senate’s program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today’s Record on page S4955.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

2018 FARM BILL

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry: Committee concluded a hearing to examine agricultural research and 2018 farm bill implementation, after receiving testimony from Scott Hutchins, Deputy Under Secretary of Agriculture for Research, Education, and Economics.
BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Armed Services: Committee ordered favorably reported the nomination of Mark T. Esper, of Virginia, to be Secretary of Defense, and 1,231 nominations in the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps.

EXPORT CONTROL REFORM IMPLEMENTATION

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine export control reform implementation, focusing on outside perspectives, including S. 1060, to deter foreign interference in United States election, after receiving testimony from Eric L. Hirschhorn, former Under Secretary of Commerce for Industry and Security; Nova J. Daly, former Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Treasury for Investment Security; and Ben Buchanan, Georgetown University Center for Security and Emerging Technology, Washington, D.C.

WATER SUPPLY INFRASTRUCTURE

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Water and Power concluded a hearing to examine opportunities to increase water storage and conservation through rehabilitation and development of water supply infrastructure, including S. 1570, to provide flexibility to allow greater aquifer recharge, S. 1932, to support water infrastructure in Reclamation States, and S. 2044, to amend the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 to establish an Aging Infrastructure Account, to amend the Reclamation Safety of Dams Act of 1978 to provide additional funds under that Act, to establish a review of flood control rule curves pilot project within the Bureau of Reclamation, after receiving testimony from Brenda Burman, Commissioner, Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior; Wesley Hipke, Idaho Managed Recharge Program Manager, Boise, on behalf of the Idaho Water Resource Board; Wade Noble, Welton-Mohawk Irrigation and Drainage District, Yuma, Arizona; Marshall P. Brown, Aurora Water, Aurora, Colorado, on behalf of WaterUse; and Melinda Kassen, Theodore Roosevelt Conservation Partnership, Boulder, Colorado.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

- S. 1273, to amend title 17, United States Code, to establish an alternative dispute resolution program for copyright small claims;
- S. 1883, to improve the prohibitions on money laundering, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute; and
- The nominations of Douglas Russell Cole, and Matthew Walden McFarland, both to be a United States District Judge for the Southern District of Ohio, Robert Anthony Molloy, to be Judge for the District Court of the Virgin Islands, and Kea Whetzal Riggs, to be United States District Judge for the District of New Mexico.

INTELLIGENCE

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee held closed hearings on intelligence matters, receiving testimony from officials of the intelligence community.

Committee recessed subject to the call.
House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 35 public bills, H.R. 3819–3853; 1 private bill, H.R. 3854; and 5 resolutions, H.J. Res. 73; and H. Res. 502–505, were introduced. Pages H7149–51

Additional Cosponsors: Pages H7152–53

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

H.R. 2943, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to make all fact sheets of the Department of Veterans Affairs in English and Spanish, with amendments (H. Rept. 116–158);

H.R. 397, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to create a Pension Rehabilitation Trust Fund, to establish a Pension Rehabilitation Administration within the Department of the Treasury to make loans to multiemployer defined benefit plans, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 116–159, Part 1);

H.R. 3298, to increase entitlement funding for child care, with amendments (H. Rept. 116–160); and

H.R. 3299, to permit legally married same-sex couples to amend their filing status for income tax returns outside the statute of limitations, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify that all provisions shall apply to legally married same-sex couples in the same manner as other married couples, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 116–161). Page H7149

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein she appointed Representative Malinowski to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. Page H7093

Journal: The House agreed to the Speaker’s approval of the Journal by voice vote. Pages H7093, H7128

Raise the Wage Act: The House passed H.R. 582, to provide for increases in the Federal minimum wage, by a recorded vote of 231 ayes to 199 noes, Roll No. 496. Pages H7095–7128

Rejected the Meuser motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Education and Labor with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with an amendment, by a recorded vote of 210 ayes to 218 noes, Roll No. 495. Pages H7126–28

Pursuant to the Rule, 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 H. Rept. 116–155, shall be considered as adopted. Page H7095

Agreed to: O’Halleran amendment (No. 1 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–155) that requires the Government Accountability Office, in consultation with specified experts, to submit a report to Congress on the economic and employment impacts (nationally, regionally, and locally) of the four minimum wage increases in the bill (standard, tipped minimum, youth, and 14(C)) with the report to be prepared after the second wage increase and before the third wage increase; requires Congress to assess the report’s findings and to take any appropriate legislative action, including action to delay or otherwise modify the next scheduled wage increases (by a recorded vote of 248 ayes to 181 noes, Roll No. 494). Page H7123

H. Res. 492, the rule providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 582) was agreed to yesterday, July 17th.

Meeting Hour: Agreed by unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9:30 a.m. tomorrow, July 19th, and further when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet at 12 noon on Tuesday, July 23rd for Morning Hour debate. Page H7134

Quorum Calls—Votes: Three recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H7125–26, H7127, and H7128. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 9 a.m. and adjourned at 2:55 p.m.

Committee Meetings

COUNTERFEITS AND CLUTTERING: EMERGING THREATS TO THE INTEGRITY OF THE TRADEMARK SYSTEM AND THE IMPACT ON AMERICAN CONSUMERS AND BUSINESSES

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Courts, Intellectual Property, and the Internet held a hearing entitled “Counterfeits and Cluttering: Emerging Threats to the Integrity of the Trademark System and the Impact on American Consumers and Businesses”. Testimony was heard from Mary Boney Denison, Commissioner for Trademarks, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; and public witnesses.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURE

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Water, Oceans, and Wildlife held a hearing on H.R. 2245, the “CECIL Act”. Testimony was heard from Chairman Grijalva; and public witnesses.
LEGISLATIVE MEASURES

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests, and Public Lands held a hearing on H.R. 401, the “Lowell Observatory Conveyance Act”; H.R. 1492, the “Yucca House National Monument Boundary Revision Act”; H.R. 1572, the “Botanical Sciences and Native Plant Materials Research, Restoration, and Promotion Act”; and H.R. 2819, the “Gold Star Families National Monument Extension Act”. Testimony was heard from Representatives Tipton, Kim, and Quigley; William Shaddox, Chief, Land Resources Division, National Park Service, Department of the Interior; Frank Beum, Acting Associated Deputy Chief, National Forest System, U.S. Forest Service, Department of Agriculture; and public witnesses.

HEARING WITH ACTING SECRETARY OF HOMELAND SECURITY KEVIN K. MCALEENAN

Committee on Oversight and Reform: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Hearing with Acting Secretary of Homeland Security Kevin K. McAleenan”. Testimony was heard from Kevin K. McAleenan, Acting Secretary, Department of Homeland Security.

Joint Meetings

A UNIFIED FUTURE

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe: Commission received a briefing to examine truth, reconciliation, and healing toward a unified future from Gail C. Christopher, Ntianu Center, Forest Heights, Maryland, on behalf of the Trust for America’s Health; Stuart Eizenstat, Imperfect Justice: Looted Assets, Slave Labor, and Diane Orentlicher, American University, both of Washington, D.C.; Don Ceder, City of Amsterdam Municipal Councilor, Amsterdam, the Netherlands; and Tracy Tansia Bibo, former City Councilor, Liedekerke, Belgium.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR FRIDAY, JULY 19, 2019

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate
No meetings/hearings scheduled.

House
No hearings are scheduled.
Next Meeting of the Senate
3 p.m., Monday, July 22

Senate Chamber

Program for Monday: Senate will resume consideration of the nomination of Mark T. Esper, of Virginia, to be Secretary of Defense, and vote on the motion to invoke cloture thereon at 5:30 p.m.

Next Meeting of the House of Representatives
9:30 a.m., Friday, July 19

House Chamber

Program for Friday: House will meet in Pro Forma session at 9:30 a.m.
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