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 18, 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 servants here in the House with a healing balm to comfort and renew the souls of all in this assembly.

May Your spirit of wisdom and patience descend upon all, so that any spirit of darkness might have no place in our midst.

Rather, let 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 ayes appeared to have it.

The Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes had it.

Mr. PAPPAS. Mr. Speaker, 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The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.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.

**STAND UP AGAINST BIGOTRY AND HATE**

Mr. GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, and still I rise with love of country in my heart, understanding that, Mr. Speaker, we have gone from “lock her up” to “Jews will not replace us,” to now “send her back.”

“Send her back.”

Mr. Speaker, bigotry, hate is on the rise in the country, and I am so proud of the 95 persons who, yesterday, voted against bigotry and hate. We must not allow this to continue.

We now are marching on; we are marching on until victory is won. We first had 58, then we had 66. Now, we have 95. We are marching on to 212. And, Mr. Speaker, let me close with this: This is an important time in our country. These are dangerous times. Every Member of this House needs additional security. I am going to file a bill asking for more security for the Members of this House.”

Leadership has adequate security. Members do not have adequate security. I want to thwart the efforts of those who might want to harm a Member of this House.

**HONORING NEIL ARMSTRONG**

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

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, on July 20, 1969, Neil Armstrong stepped onto the surface of the moon, becoming the first human to walk on another world.
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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 where he or she was 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 contribution 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 American craftsmanship 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 citizenry who make up this 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 of 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 antirejection 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 of Tennessee asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Valerie Calhoun.

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

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

Through Valerie’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 congratulate Valerie 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, home to the Neil Armstrong Air and Space Museum.

The museum has on display many artifacts from the mission and other
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. 3630, 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’ 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.

RAISE THE WAGE ACT

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 492, I call up the bill (H.R. 582) to provide for increases in the Federal minimum wage, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Speaker pro tempore. The Speaker pro tempore will allow a 5-minute debate on the motion to proceed to H.R. 582. The motion to proceed to H.R. 582 shall be considered as agreed to. The Clerk will read the title and the first paragraph of the bill.

RAISE THE WAGE ACT

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 ‘‘Raise the Wage Act’’.

SEC. 2. MINIMUM WAGE INCREASES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 6(a)(1) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 206(a)(1)) is amended to read as follows:

(1) except as otherwise provided in this section, not less than—

(A) $8.40 an hour, beginning on the effective date under section 7 of the Raise the Wage Act;

(B) $9.50 an hour, beginning 1 year after such effective date;

(C) $10.60 an hour, beginning 2 years after such effective date;

(D) $11.70 an hour, beginning 3 years after such effective date;

(E) $12.80 an hour, beginning 4 years after such effective date;

(F) $13.90 an hour, beginning 5 years after such effective date;

(G) $15.00 an hour, beginning 6 years after such effective date;

(H) beginning on the date that is 7 years after such effective date, and annually there-after, the amount determined by the Secretary under subsection (b) shall be increased by the lesser of—

(aa) $1.50; or

(bb) the amount necessary for the wage in effect under subsection (a)(1) for such period, rounded up to the nearest multiple of $0.05; and

(ii) the cash wage paid such employee, which

SEC. 3. TIPPED EMPLOYEES.

(a) BASE MINIMUM WAGE FOR TIPPED EMPLOYEES AND THE RETENTION OF THE DETERMINATION OF MEDIAN HOURLY WAGE.—Section 3(m)(2)(A)(i) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 203(m)(2)(A)(i)) is amended to read as follows:

‘‘(i) the cash wage paid such employee, which

SEC. 4. SEPARATE MINIMUM WAGES FOR TIPPED EMPLOYEES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 6(a)(1) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 206(a)(1)) is amended by striking ‘‘or in accordance with the median hourly wage determined by the Bureau of Labor Statistics; and

(b) DETERMINATION BASED ON INCREASE IN THE MEDIAN HOURLY WAGE OF ALL EMPLOYEES.—
with subclause (I) or (III) of section 3(m)(2)(A)(i)(I)".

(3) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by paragraphs (1) and (2) shall take effect on the date that is 6 years after the date on which the hourly wage determined under subparagraph (III) of section 3(m)(2)(A)(i)(I) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 206(m)(2)(A)(i)(I)), 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)) is 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; 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 this paragraph to equal the wage in effect under section 6(a)(1) 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)(i), the minimum wage in effect under section 6(a)(1)."

(b) SCHEDULED REPEAL OF SEPARATE MINIMUM WAGE FOR NEWLY HIRED EMPLOYEES WHO ARE LESS THAN 20 YEARS OLD.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 6(g)(6) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 206(g)(6)), as amended by subsection (a), shall be repealed.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Subsection (i) of section 6 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 206), as amended by section 3(c)(2), is further amended by striking "or subparagraph (C) or of subparagraph (G)(1)."

(3) 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 determined under subparagraph (C) of section 6(g)(1) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 206(g)(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 sections, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

"(ii) Not later than 60 days prior to the effective date of any increase in the required wage rate under this subsection, the Secretary shall publish—

"(A) technical assistance and information to employers issued a special certificate under this subsection for the purposes of—

"(i) transitioning the practices of such employers to comply with this subsection, as amended by the Raise the Wage Act; and

"(ii) ensuring continuing 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."

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

(b) 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.—Subsection (i) of section 6 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 206), as amended by subsection (a)(1), takes effect.

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)) is amended to read as follows:

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

"(i) $12.50 an hour, beginning 1 year after the date the wage rate specified in section 6(a)(1)(A) takes effect; or

"(ii) $6.80 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 this paragraph, of the individual for whom the wage rate is being determined under this subparagraph.,"

(b) PROHIBITION ON NEW SPECIAL CERTIFICATES.—

(1) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 214(c)(1)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(6) PROHIBITION ON NEW SPECIAL CERTIFICATES.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1), the Secretary shall not issue a special certificate under this subsection to an employer that was not issued a special certificate under this subsection before the date of enactment of the Raise the Wage Act.

(7) SUNSET.—Beginning on the day after the date on which the wage rate described in paragraph (1)(A)(i)(VI) takes effect, the authority to issue special certificates under paragraph (1) shall expire, and no special certificates issued under paragraph (1) shall have any legal effect.

(8) TRANSITION ASSISTANCE.—Upon request, the Secretary shall provide—

"(A) technical assistance and information to employers issued a special certificate under this subsection for the purposes of—

"(i) transitioning the practices of such employers to comply with this subsection, as amended by the Raise the Wage Act; and

"(ii) ensuring continuing 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."

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

(b) 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.—Subsection (i) of section 6 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 206), 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)(i), or section 14(c)(1)(A) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 214(c)(1)), 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 gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) and the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.
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 an 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 reduction 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, adding 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 wreak havoc on 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 colleague 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 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 not downward mobility. That is not upward mobility. 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 immediate 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 done 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, turning 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, and talk 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), Representatives Robert C. “Bobby” Scott (VA), Mark Pocan (WI), and Pramila Jayapal (WA). If enacted, this legislation would:

Gradually raise the federal minimum wage to $15 an hour in 2025.

At $15 an hour, 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 unless they have a valid state certificate.

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 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 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 55 percent of the workers who would benefit from a $15 minimum wage. The Act would also raise the subminimum wage to $15, making it instrumental in helping to close the gender-wage gap. Raising the minimum wage to $15 would also significantly benefit workers of color. According to the Economic Policy Institute, 33 percent of American workers and 33 percent of Latinos seeing a pay increase once this law goes into effect.

These bills are the right way to 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 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 act quickly to pass this piece of legislation as quickly as possible, and for President Trump to sign it when it comes to his desk.

Sincerely,

RI Coalition of Labor Union Women (CLUW); Raise Minimum Wages; Raise the Wage PA; Raise-Up Housing Cooperative; Refugio Ministries Tampa Bay; Regina Mundie Inc.; Restaurant Opportunities Centers of Michigan; Restaurant Opportunities Center of New York; Restaurant Opportunities Center of Pennsylvania; Restaurant Opportunities Center of Texas; Restaurant Opportunities Center United RESULTS Raleigh; RESULTS-Santa Fe; Rural Coalition; Rural Coalition & Alianza Nacional de Campesinas; Rural Community Action of Southern Nevada Housing Alliance; Sacramento Regional Coalition to End Homelessness; SafeHouse Denver, Inc; San Diego Hunger Coalition; San Gabriel Valley-Whittier NOW; Santa Fe NOW; Sargent Shriver National Center on Poverty Law; Scleros Homeless Preventive Organization Inc.; Seattle Human Services Coalition; King County Coalition on Homelessness; Second Harvest Food Bank of Lehigh Valley and Northeast Pennsylvania; SEIU Healthcare Pennsylvania; Service Employees International Union; Sexuality Information and Education Council of the United States (SIECUS); Sherwood Community Services; SIA Legal Team; Sinhawana Dominican Peace and Justice Office; Sister Reach; Sisters of Charity Federation; Sisters of Mercy in NH; Sisters of Mercy West Midwest Community Justice Team; Smith Center for喜欢; Sisters of St Joseph of Cambray Justice and Peace Committee; Sisters of St. Dominic of Blaualveit, New York; Sisters of St. Francis, Clinton, Iowa; Sisters of the Holy Spirit and Mary immaculate; Sisters of the Most Precious Blood of O’Fallon, MO; Social Action Linking Together (SALT); SocioEnergetics Foundation; south Carolina Christian Action Council, Inc.; South Dakota Chapter of the National Association of Social Workers; Southern HIV/AIDS Strategy Initiative (SASI); Duke University School of Law; Southern Mutual Help Association, Inc.; Southern Poverty Law Center; Southwestern Community Church; Southwest PA National Organization For Women; Southwest Women’s Law Center; Sravasti Abbey; St. James Infirmary; St. Louis CLUW Chapter; St. Louis Gateway District Area Local—APWU 8; St. Louis Gateway District Area Local APWU—POWER Sisters; TASH; Tax Fairness Oregon; Tax March; Tenderloin Neighborhood Development Corporation (TND); Tennessee Citizen Action; Tennessee Justice Center; Texas Education Agency; The ARC; INC; The Commonwealth Institute for Fiscal Analysis; The Farmworker Association of Florida; The Greater Boston Food Bank; The John Harvard Bar Fund; The Public Interest Law Project; The Washington Initiative for Supported Employment; The Welcome Church; TMS Enterprises; Toled Area Jobs with Justice & Interfaith Worker Justice Coalition; Transition Services, Inc.; Transport Workers Union of America Local 87; Tri-Enforcement Action Training Program; Trilium Employment Services; Tzedek DC.

UCSF; UETHDA Head Start; Ultra Violet; United Farm Workers Union for Justice; United for Respect; United for a Fair Economy; United For Respect; United Steelworkers (USW); University Church; University of Delaware; University and Regional Planning Department; Upper East Tennessee Human Development Agency; UVF: United for Reproductive & Gender Equity; Vennmedia: A Nonprofit Media Enterprise; Virginia Employment Lawyers Association; Voices for Peace; Vote-Climate.

Wage Equality; Washington Anti-Hunger & Nutrition Coalition; Washington Lawyers’ Committee for Civil Rights and Urban Affairs; Washington Legal Clinic for the Homeless; Washington State Budget & Policy Center; Washington State Community Action Partnership; Watertown Citizens for Peace, Justice, and the Environment—People—Pennsylvania; Wellstone Democratic Renewal Club; West Valley Neighborhoods Coalition; West Virginia Center on Budget and Policy; Western Center on Poverty; Western NY Chapter Coalition of Labor Union Women; Western Pennsylvania Employment Lawyers Association (WPELA); WHEAT—World Hunger Education, Advocacy & Training; Whitman-Walker Health; Windham Area Interfaith Ministry.

Wisconsin Fair Voice Coalition; Women Employed; Women’s Fund of Rhode Island; Women’s Law Project; Worcester County Food Bank; Worker Justice Center of New York; Working Families’ Parenting Partnerships USA; Workplace Fairness; Young Progressives Demanding Action; Youth Care; YWCA of the University of Illinois; YWCA Seattle King/Snohomish; YWCA USA; YWCA Utah.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 582, the Raise the Wage Act.

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.

urge all my colleagues to vote in support of workers’ rights, by supporting 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 see, 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—Union, Dillon, 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 reform 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, 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.

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.

The Women’s Chamber 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 migration of women from the workforce into business ownership has been one of the great economic achievements of the American dream. As women move from employees to business owners, we have brought a new perspective to America’s business leadership. Women own 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 health care aides and the cashiers—are women. 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 well. 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 gradual increases in the minimum wage for tipped workers until it equals the regular minimum wage as called for in the Raise the Wage Act.

Small businesses know 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 poor wages 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 growing 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, and that makes sense. Small businesses are working together to offer the best goods and services to their customers. My members know they cannot generally compete with big box stores or big chain restaurants that focus 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 are squeezing many small businesses to their price advantage over small and local businesses. Indeed, low-paying big chains count on responsible employers and taxpayers to subsidize their workers—workers who can’t make ends meet on poverty wages.

Raising the minimum wage to a more realistic level helps level the playing field for businesses like my members who believe in treating their workers fairly and investing in their communities.

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 face—and that is weakening the economy a decade after the Great Recession. And economists recognize that until we restore real wage growth for working and middle-class Americans, consumer spending will not be where we need it to be to help businesses thrive and grow into the future.

Too many people forget that workers are also consumers. Consumer spending drives 70 percent of our economy, and we must repower broad-based consumer spending—backed by adequate wages rather than unaffordable debt—if we are to repower our economy, create good jobs and reverse the decline in our middle class. Raising the minimum wage boosts the economy from the bottom up, which is exactly what we need.

That’s why local businesses support raising the minimum wage—because that additional money in the pockets of our 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 spending it at the grocery store, the pharmacy and the auto-repair in their communities.
RAISING THE MINIMUM WAGE HELPS WORKING WOMEN

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 those women who make the superglue. 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 lift women from poverty, it will stimulate small businesses 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 manufacturers 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 good 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 CommerceTM

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 across the chamber to raise the minimum wage for all workers with a cost-of-living raise. Congress realizes that they do not earn enough and, importantly, they realize that people earning $7.25 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 largest city in my district.

This policy would directly lift the wages of at least 30 million workers. That is the largest city in my district. In 2016, Seattle’s minimum wage increased to $13 an hour; in 2019, 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 create even a worse impact on rural America.

I think my colleagues 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 colleagues that his vote against this bill is a vote to deny about 41 percent of the workers in his district in Tennessee an average raise of about $3,700 a year.

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 have a job that 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 for working women; 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? Can you urge your 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 in 1968 (adjusted for inflation). We can afford to pay the lowest-paid workers in America substantially more than what their counterparts were paid a half century ago. Workers produce more today from each hour of work with productivity nearly doubling since the late 1960s. 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 frozen at $5.25 since 1991.

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.

At $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 median. A $15 minimum wage 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 consumer prices, it would ensure that the wage floor keeps up with growth of middle-wage workers going forward.

There is a wealth of rigorous academic research on the effect of minimum wage increases on employment, with the weight of evidence showing that previous increases in the minimum wage had little or no negative effects on the employment of low-wage workers. It is time to support a bolder increase to address the fact that 3.7 million jobs for workers at the low end of the labor market have continued to stagnate.

Even if the growth of aggregate work hours for low-wage workers were to slow somewhat, workers who work less could still break even, or come out ahead, in terms of annual earnings. Since as many as 10 percent of the lowest-wage workers leave or start out of the labor force in a median of Pennsylvania, Pennsylvania. The number of full-time equivalent jobs will mean that some workers will take more time finding a new job, or will work fewer hours. But many of these losses may still be partially offset by annual earnings rise because of their wage increase.

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 a key policy designed specifically 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,

Daron Acemoglu, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Ph.D.; Jacqueline Agasa, Marshall University, Ph.D.; Alan Aja, Brooklyn College, Ph.D.; Randy Albert, University of Massachusetts Boston, Ph.D.; Sylvia A. Allegrito, University of California, Berkeley, Ph.D.; Bernard E. Anderson, University of Illinois, Ph.D.; Robert M. Anderson, University of California, Berkeley, Ph.D.; Eileen Appelbaum, Center for Economic and Policy Research, Ph.D.; Michael Ash, University of Massachusetts Amherst Ph.D.; Algeron Austin, Demos, Ph.D.

Kate Bahn, Washington Center for Equitable Growth, Ph.D.; Dean Baker, Center for Economic and Policy Research, Ph.D.; Erdgan Bakir, Bucknell University, Ph.D.; Stephen Barger, The University of Texas at Austin, Ph.D.; Bjorn Banks, Bucknell University, Ph.D.; James Barron, Yale School of Management, Ph.D.; Lourdes Beneria, Cornell University, Ph.D.; Jared Bernstein, Ph.D.; Josh Bivens, Economic Policy Institute, Ph.D.; Sandra Black, University of Texas at Austin, Ph.D.

Gail Blattenberger, University of Utah, Ph.D.; Robert Blackburn, American University, Ph.D.; Barry Bluestone, Northeastern University, Ph.D.; Barry Bosworth, Brookings Institution, Ph.D.; Heather Boushey, Washington Center for Equitable Growth, Ph.D.; Clair Brown, University of California, Berkeley, Ph.D.; Lawrence Chimerin, Radnor Consulting, Ph.D.; Robert Coen, Northwestern University, Ph.D.; Jennifer Cohen, Miami University, Ph.D.; David Cutler Harvard University, Ph.D.

Sheldon Danziger, University of Michigan, Ph.D.; Angus Deaton, Princeton University, Ph.D.; Gregory DeFretes, Hofstra University, Ph.D.; James Devine, Loyola University Chicago, Ph.D.; Myrka Dihond, University of Massachusetts Amherst, Ph.D.; Peter Diamond, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Ph.D.; Adrienne Eaton, Rutgers University, Ph.D.; Janet Eger, University of Missouri-Kansas City, Ph.D.; John Edgren, Eastern Michigan University, Ph.D.; Gerald Epstein, University of Massachusetts Amherst, Ph.D.; Allan Freyer, NC Justice Center, Ph.D.; Teresa Ghilarducci The New School, Ph.D.; Joelle Grogger, University of Wisconsin, Ph.D.; Jeff Hayes, Institute for Women’s Policy Research, Ph.D.; Adam Hersh Former Chief Economist of the Economic Policy Institute, Ph.D.; Stephen Herzenberg, Keystone Research Center, Ph.D.; Emily Hoffman, Western Michigan University, Ph.D.; David Howell, The New School, Ph.D.

Candace Howes, Connecticut College, Ph.D.; Jennifer Hunt, Rutgers University, Ph.D.; Jeffrey Keefe, Rutgers University, Ph.D.; Rachel Kuhlman, University of North Carolina, Ph.D.; Janet Knoedler, Bucknell University, Ph.D.; Ebru Kongar, Dickinson College, Ph.D.; Brent Kramer, City University New York, Ph.D.; Howard Levenstein, University of California, Davis, Ph.D.; Paul Leigh, University of California, Davis, Ph.D.; Henry Levin, Columbia University, Ph.D.

Oren Levin, Metropolitan College of New York, Ph.D.; Mark Levinson, SIEU, Ph.D.; Frank Levy, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Ph.D.; David B. Lipsey, University of Wisconsin, Evt.; Pamela Loprest, Urban Institute, Ph.D.; Stephanie Luce, School of Labor and Urban Studies/CUNY, Ph.D.; Lisa Lynch, Brandeis University, Ph.D.; Stephanie Mariñas, Universidad Nacional de Colombia, Ph.D.; Juliane Malveaux, Economic Education, Ph.D.; Patr Germany, Florida State University, Ph.D.; Jordan Matsudaira, Columbia University, Ph.D.; Peter Matthews, Middlebury College, Ph.D.; Anne Mayhew, University of Tennessee, Ph.D.; Elaine McCrate, University of Vermont, Ph.D.; John Miller Wheaton College, Ph.D.; Lawrence Mishel, Economic Policy Institute, Ph.D.; Monique Morrissey, University of the District of Columbia, Ph.D.; Paul Morris, University of Massachusetts, Lowell, Ph.D.; Eshragh Motahar Union College, Ph.D.; Tracy Mott, University of Denver, Ph.D.

Richard Murnane, Harvard University, Ph.D.; Robert Murphy, Boston College, Ph.D.; Paulette Olson, Wright State University, Ph.D.; Rudolph Oswald, Retired, Ph.D.; Stanley Malinowitz, Universidad Nacional de Colombia, Ph.D.; Pranassan Parthasarathi, Boston College, Ph.D.; Manuel Pastor University of Southern California, Ph.D.; Michael Pizzello, University of Florida, Ph.D.; Eva Paus, Mount Holyoke College, Ph.D.; Kenneth Peres, Retired Communications Workers of America, Ph.D.; Joseph Peri School of Illinois at Chicago, Ph.D.; Michael Piore, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Ph.D.; Robert Pollin, University of Massachusetts Amherst, Ph.D.; Mark Price, Keystone Research Center, Ph.D.; Michael Reich, University of California, Berkeley, Ph.D.; Rene Rosenbaum, Michigan State University, Ph.D.; Janet Rotstein, University of California, Berkeley, Ph.D.; Daniel Rubinfeld University of California, Berkeley, Ph.D.; Emmanuel Saenz, University of Massachusetts Amherst, Ph.D.; Elizabeth Sawhill, Brookings Institution, Ph.D.; Peter Schaeffer, West Virginia University, Ph.D.; William Schaniel, University of West Virginia, Ph.D.; John Schmitt, Economic Policy Institute, Ph.D.; Geoffrey Schneider, Bucknell University, Ph.D.; Juliet Schor, Boston College, Ph.D.; Robert E Scott Economic Policy Institute, Ph.D.; Heidi Shierholz, Economic Policy Institute, Ph.D.; Rachel Shuhart, American University, Ph.D.; Andna Smythe, Howard University, Ph.D.

Youngwhan Sim, Union College, Ph.D.; Sarah Smathers, Ph.D.; Case Sprenkle, University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign, Ph.D.; William E Spriggs, Howard University and AFL-CIO, Ph.D.; Marshall Steinbaum, Roosevelt Institute, Ph.D.; James Stewart, The Pennsylvania State University, Ph.D.; Frank Stricker, CSU Dominguez Hills, Ph.D.; Jennifer C. Thomas, University of Missouri-St Louis, Ph.D.; Chris Tso, University of California Los Angeles, Ph.D.

Laura Tyson, University of California Berkeley, Ph.D.; Johann Urban, Denison University, Ph.D.; Paula Voos, Rutgers University, Ph.D.; Richard Walker University of California, Berkeley, Ph.D.; Robert Wassen, California State University, Sacramento, Ph.D.; David Weil, Brandeis University, Ph.D.; Joann Weiner, The George Washington University, Ph.D.; Jeannette Wicks-Milardi University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Ph.D.; Charles Wilkins, University of Notre Dame, Ph.D.; Sarah Wilhelm, Ph.D.; Robert Williams, Guilford College, Ph.D.; Valerie Wilson, Economic Policy Institute, Ph.D.; Yavuz Yasar, University of Denver, Ph.D.; Alexandra Zhang, Ph.D.; Ben Zipperer, Economic Policy Institute, Ph.D.

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 8 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 1/4 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG).

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker. I rise today in opposition to H.R. 562, 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 in no time jobs are kept, which they won't be.
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 my 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 1 minute 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 that The Seattle Times called “a crazy restaurant boom”—that is a quote—with new job created every year.

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 a vibrant community. 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.

JULY 16, 2019.

The undersigned organizations enthusiastically support the Raise the Wage Act of 2019, introduced by Senators Bernie Sanders (VT) and Elizabeth Warren (MA), Representatives Robert C. “Bobby” Scott (VA), Mark Pæan (WI) and Stephanie Murphy (FL).

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, which have 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 under the age of 20.

At Vanco, 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, and to ensure that we are 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 earn less than $40,000 a year, which is enough to make a tremendous difference in the life of a pre-school 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. It wakes 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 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 real value 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 when it comes to his desk.

Sincerely,

Jackson State University: Jewish Women International; Jobs with Justice; Just Harvest; Kentucky Center for the Performance of Social Justice and Advocacy Committee of the Lehigh Conference of Churches; Justice for Migrant Women; Kalamazoo Leavés & Fishes; Kansas Association of Community Action Programs; Kentucky Equal Justice Center; Kentucky State AFL-CIO; Keystone Progress; Kentucky Research Center; Kings Local Food Pantry; Korea United Community 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; Lamonille Family Center; Law Foundation of Silicon Valley; Law Students in Court; Lawyers’ Committee for Civil Rights Under Law; Leadership Conference of Women Religious; The Legal Aid Society; Civil and Human Rights; Leadership Team, Sisters of the Presentations; Legal Aid at Work; Legal Aid Service of Broward County; Legal Momentum: The Coalition for Women’s Reproductive Justice and Education Fund; Legal Voice; Let Justice Roll: Living Wage Campaign; Lincoln Hills Development Corporation; Louisiana Alliance of Mental Health Providers; 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 Center on Economic and Housing Solutions; Maryland National Organization for Women; Massachusetts Law Reform Institute; Maternal and Child Health Access; MCCA/MSCA; Men of All Colors Together (MFACT) (CT); Mercyhaven 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 Aid Lawyers Association Chapter; Michigan League for Public Policy; Michigan’s Children; Middlesex Coalition for Children; Milwaukee Area Service & Hospitality Workers Organizing Campaign; Mississippi Homeless; Mississippi Law Reform Initiative; Missouri CLUW Chapter; MomeRising; Mountain State Justice; MWC, AFL-CIO; NAACP; NARAL Pro-Choice North Carolina; Nashua Soup Kitchen and Shelter; National Advo-cates for Change; National Association of Community Organizers for Reform and Empowerment; National Association of Community Organizers for Reform and Empowerment of the Southwest; 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; National Association of Social Workers—PA; National Council of Jewish Women—Texas; National Council of Jewish Women—Florida; National Disability Rights Network; National Domestic Workers Alliance; National Education Association; National Employment Law Project; National Employment Lawyers Association; National Employment Lawyers Association—Eastern Pennsylvania; National Employment Lawyers Association—AF-Affiliate National Employment Lawyers Association—New York; National Equality Action Team (NEAT); National Health Care for the Homeless Council; National Immigration Services Assembly; National Immigration Law Center; National Korean American Service & Education Consortium (NAKASEC) National LGBTQ Task Force Action Fund; National Low Income Housing Coalition; National Partnership for Women & Families; National Resource Center on Domestic Violence; National Rural Social Work Caucus; National Urban League.

National Women’s Law Center; National Women’s Law Center, Positive Change for Women; National Workrights Institute; NC Justice Center; NC State AFL-CIO; Nebraska Appleseed; Nebraska Chapter of the National Association of Social Workers; Nebraska Women Action Network; Nevada Women’s Political Action Committee; New Jersey Women’s Economic Success Fund; New Jersey Women’s Political Action Committee; New Mexico Center on Law and Poverty; New Orleans 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 of Communities; North Dakota Coalition Against Domestic Violence; North Carolina Council of Churches; North Dakota Chapter of the National Association of Social Workers; North Dakota Economic Security and Prosperity Alliance.

Northwest Indiana Community Action; Northwest Pilot Project; 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 Demanding 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; Popular Coalition of Hispanic Americans; Positive Women’s Network-USA; PowHer New York; Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.); Pridle at Work; Princeton Community Housing; Professional Child Care Provider Network; Public Investment in Virginia; Public Justice Center; Public Action for Children; Public Advocacy for Children; Provincial Council Clerics of St. Vincent de Paul; 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 gentlewoman 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 minimalists. 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 he is not the chair? In December 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 have 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 that is 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 hardworking 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 I would just want to 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 workers who have not been employed 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 workers in his district who have effectively received a 17 percent 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 with me, we are going to help. We think what you do is valuable to our community and to our society.

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. You must be on board with this. It is not a Republican tide; it is a rising tide does. It is not a Democrat tide; it is a rising tide for the American people.

We say we want to raise people’s wages, we want to create jobs, we want to have a minimum wage that goes far enough to lift everyone. And we're going to help. We think what you do is valuable to our community and to our society.

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. 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 People of Maryland, started his career as a nonunion day laborer barely making a living. Now he has a union construction job, and the increasing wages he now has.

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 minimalists. 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 he is not the chair? In December 2017 to lift all boats?

Why would we turn our back on workers who have 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 that is 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 hardworking 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 I would just want to 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 workers who have not been employed 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 with me, we are going to help. We think what you do is valuable to our community and to our society.
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 States 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 bipartisan 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 33 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 our country stronger.

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 Democrat 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 all this 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 33 million 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 the great work our State has done to grow jobs and the economy.

And I am telling you, we are not 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 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 lost jobs, cut hours, and make our country less competitive. What I suggest is, well, it is good for our economy.

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 33 million 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 the great work our State has done to grow jobs and the economy.

And I am telling you, we are not 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 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 lost jobs, cut hours, and make our country less competitive. What I suggest is, well, it is good for our economy.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I remind my colleagues 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. Scott for yielding.

I do find it interesting to sit and listen to a debate today where people who make $174,000 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 reason we are here today: to try to raise the wage for 33 million people, a quarter of our workforce.

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 workers 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 businesswoman. 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 multibillion-dollar water plant, they can afford to pay their workers $15 an hour instead of holding down wages for the entire community.

Congress recently set a new record for the longest stretch in U.S. history with no hike in the minimum wage: 10 years. It is long past due that we show workers respect by putting more money in their pockets and support this bill.

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 (UFCW) which represents more than 1.3 million 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) and vote against any amendments that would weaken the bill. UFCW will be scoring this vote.

The Raise the Wage Act will raise the federal minimum wage from $7.25 to $15 by 2024 and gradually increase it over the next five years until it reaches $15 an hour in 2024. After 2024, the minimum wage will be indexed so that it continues to rise along with a typical workers wage. The Raise the Wage Act will also end unfair exclusions 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 growth, 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 grocery 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—26.6 percent of the U.S. workforce. A $15 minimum wage would begin to reverse decades of pay inequality between 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.

Across the country, there is an 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. California, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania and New York are all raising their minimum wage to $15 an hour.

Representative members of Congress: We ask that you join us in raising the minimum wage to $15 an hour and help seize an opportunity to strengthen the American Dream.
UCFJ opposes a regional minimum wage. Regional minimum wages bake-in low wages to already low-wage places. Rural counties and Southern cities where wages have been depressed 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,
ADEMOLA 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).

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 582. The Raise the Wage Act would cause the most harm to the very families it purports to help. H.R. 582 and President Trump's focus on eliminating wasteful regulations.

The Republican Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, the rise thanks to a booming economy, and President Trump's focus on eliminating wasteful regulations.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. SCOTT for making sure that we finally, after 11 years, will have a vote to raise the minimum wage. This is America. You play by the rules, you work hard, you are supposed to be able to make it, but that is not the way it is.

Less than 2 years ago, our colleagues on the other side of the aisle made sure that the top 1 percent got their raise, as they are stepping on the American worker.

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 their 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.

Re United Steelworkers support H.R. 582, the Raise the Wage Act.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the 890,000 members of the United Steelworkers (USW), I urge you and 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 clear that this stagnation has resulted in a cut in real wages for those workers who can least afford it.

While 29 states and the District of Columbia have taken action to raise their wage floors, the failure of federal action on the minimum wage means roughly 40 percent of Americans and their communities have seen continued wage stagnation.

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. 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.

In Alabama an average wage of about $9 an hour.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SMUCKER).

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

Mr. Speaker, we are in opposition to theRaise the Wage Act (H.R. 582).

Significantly, CBO has also found that only 1.3 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. America's workers and small businesses to make, and I especially don't think we should ask our young workers to make it.

Significantly, CBO has also found there would be a reduction in real family income by $2025 of $9 billion, effectively reducing pay for many American families.

Remember, wages are currently on the rise thanks to a booming economy, the Republican Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, and President Trump's focus on eliminating wasteful regulations.

With 7.3 million unfilled jobs nationwide, job creators know they must offer competitive wages and benefits to attract and retain workers, and 29 States already have a minimum wage higher than the Federal Floor. Instead of providing tangible benefits to working class Americans, H.R. 582 would cause the most harm to the very people its supporters claim to help.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose an increase in the minimum wage.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I remind my colleagues that his vote against this bill is a vote to deny about 37 percent of the workers in his district in Alabama an average wage of about $3,700 a year.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. NORCROSS), a distinguished member of the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. NORCROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. SCOTT for making sure that we finally, after 11 years, will have a vote to raise the minimum wage. This is America. You play by the rules, you work hard, you are supposed to be able to make it, but that is not the way it is.

Less than 2 years ago, our colleagues on the other side of the aisle made sure that the top 1 percent got their raise, as they are stepping on the American worker.

Today is the day that we set the record straight and give opportunities to those who need it the most.

Wage increases don't think we should ask our workers to pay their 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 their 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.

Re United Steelworkers support H.R. 582, the Raise the Wage Act.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the 890,000 members of the United Steelworkers (USW), I urge you to stand with workers and support the Raise the Wage Act (H.R. 582).

According to the Congressional Budget Office, raising the nation's wage floor to $15.00 an hour would boost the earnings of 27 million workers and their families, lifting some of America's poorest families 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 increase job creation by 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.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, our colleagues say all the time that we need to help the people at the bottom of the ladder.

Those are exactly the people who are being helped by the Republican policies that were enacted in the first 2 years of this administration. We are seeing people moving out of poverty, their purchasing power increased by 4 percent.

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

When I was a teenager, at 14 years old, one of my first jobs was serving as a dishwasher at Smoketown family restaurant. I had no previous work experience, but the owner took a chance on me. I certainly didn't receive a great wage, but it was a starting point, and the lessons that I learned in that job were life lessons that I used during my entire career.

I went on after high school to buy a small construction company, operated it for 23 years, creating family-sustaining jobs for hundreds of individuals.

Today, my 16-year-old son serves food in a skilled nursing center after school at a wage of $9 an hour. He is very thrilled with that; again, learning the skills, the people skills, needed, learning to show up for work on time, learning to work hard.

In fact, one of the best indicators of success in a career is whether or not you had a job during high school.

This bill, unfortunately, would rob many of the opportunity to hold that first job. CBO actually said 3.7 million jobs will be lost as a result of this bill.

Our friends on the other side of the aisle are not talking about that aspect of the bill.

There is no question here about our desire to see every individual that we represent have the opportunity to live the American Dream: the idea that the previous speaker just said, the idea that
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 opened more opportunities 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 104,800 people would get a raise under the bill.

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 sensibly.

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 while worker productivity has increased the median 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 include in the RECORD a letter to all Members of the House from the AFL-CIO.

AFL-CIO. July 12, 2019.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the AFL-CIO, I am writing to urge you to vote for the “Raise the Wage Act of 2019” (H.R. 582) scheduled for floor consideration this week. This legislation would gradually raise the federal minimum wage to $15 an hour by the year 2024. In addition to indexing future increases to the growth in the median wage, the bill would gradually eliminate the subminimum wage for tipped workers, which has been since 1991.

Because Congress has not raised the minimum wage in more than 10 years, millions of our Nation’s full-time workers live in poverty. The wage in their wage had risen at the same pace as productivity growth since 1969, it would be over $20 an hour today.

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 $12,300 ($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 to 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 social cost of the Raise the Wage Act. Mr. Speaker, I urge you to vote yes.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM SAMUEL,
Government Affairs Department.

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker,

I would like to thank the gentlewoman 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 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 gentlewoman 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 151st 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 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 otherwise as well—this has been 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 front of living wage 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 equalit—this is about women. It is about the 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

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to support this historic legislation.
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 tonight? 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 hard work deserves a decent wage.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a strong, bipartisan 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 who had been a really important part of the Senate action on raising the minimum wage. Included is Representative Jim McGovern, Chair of the House Agriculture Committee, Representative Linda T. Sánchez, Chair of the House Committee on Education and Labor, and many others.

Ms. MENG of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to make an addition to the record.

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

Ms. MENG. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter signed by over 1,000 businesses who had been a really important part of the Senate action on raising the minimum wage. Included is Representative Jim McGovern, Chair of the House Agriculture Committee, Representative Linda T. Sánchez, Chair of the House Committee on Education and Labor, and many others.

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

Ms. MENG. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter signed by over 1,000 businesses who had been a really important part of the Senate action on raising the minimum wage. Included is Representative Jim McGovern, Chair of the House Agriculture Committee, Representative Linda T. Sánchez, Chair of the House Committee on Education and Labor, and many others.

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

Ms. MENG. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter signed by over 1,000 businesses who had been a really important part of the Senate action on raising the minimum wage. Included is Representative Jim McGovern, Chair of the House Agriculture Committee, Representative Linda T. Sánchez, Chair of the House Committee on Education and Labor, and many others.

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

Ms. MENG. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter signed by over 1,000 businesses who had been a really important part of the Senate action on raising the minimum wage. Included is Representative Jim McGovern, Chair of the House Agriculture Committee, Representative Linda T. Sánchez, Chair of the House Committee on Education and Labor, and many others.
but I didn't have any skills. Things were happening at the house, I needed to get out of the house, as some reasons for seeking employment. I was a young man. People have different like many folks did, working when I was a young man. People have different lives and different skills.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, I started, like many folks did, working when I was a young man. People have different lives and different skills. But I didn't have any skills.

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 is what is going to get you a job.

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 to hire 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 we are trying to help are not going to have that opportunity. That is what this is really about in America, having opportunity.

A minimum wage requirement from the Federal level doesn't draw any distinctions between Los Angeles and Gratz, Pennsylvania, a great little town that I am privileged to represent. It doesn't draw a distinction between Chicago or Shiremanstown. It says they all have to do the same thing. Dover or New York, all the same wage, really.

I don't have tall skyscrapers in central Pennsylvania like they do in New York City, Chicago, and L.A., but I have hardworking people who want the opportunity that is provided by the market.

There are 7.5 million jobs open right now. The market is providing the wages to incentivize people to come to them, and they have an opportunity to go to another job and make even more under the free market.

The Federal Government is going to stifle that with this $15 an hour minimum wage.

Mr. Speaker, I urge us not to vote for this bill.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I remind my colleague that his vote against this bill is a vote to deny about 35 percent of the workers in his district in Pennsylvania an average raise of about $3,200 a year.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute 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 10% minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from North Carolina has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I remind my colleague 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 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, 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. Women working full time, year round 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 31 cents, and Latinas only 53 cents for every dollar paid to their white, non-Hispanic male counterparts. While Asian American and Pacific Islander (AAPI) women make 78 cents to every dollar paid to their white male counterparts, many AAPI communities experience drastically wider pay gaps.

Women’s overrepresentation in low-wage jobs is a direct force behind this 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 two-thirds of the jobs that pay the minimum wage to non-Hispanic men, many AAPI communities experience.

Women’s lack of economic power in these workplaces perpetuates the already pervasive culture of sexual harassment and inappropriate behavior from customers so as to not jeopardize their income and employers are often unwilling to speak up or act for fear of upsetting a paying customer.

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 dignity, and safety. There is no more-promising way to address economic security for women and families than by making real, concrete progress in ensuring all women receive adequate pay.

We urge you to prioritize the Raise the Wage Act and advance the legislation as a top priority of 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, APL-CIO; APT Local 1766 (Union of Rutgers Administrators); American Medical Student Association; American Psychological Association; American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees (AFSCME); MS Black Women’s Roundtable; Arizona Coalition to End Sexual & Domestic Violence; Asian Pacific American Labor Alliance, AFL-CIO; Black Women’s Roundtable; Black Women’s Rundouts; MS Black Women’s Roundtable; California Child Care Resource & Referral Network; Cambridge Committee to Raise the Minimum Wage; Center for Democracy & Domestic Action (ADA); Arizona Coalition to End Sexual & Domestic Violence; Asian Pacific American Labor Alliance, AFL-CIO; Black Women's Roundtable; smack; Black Women’s Roundtable; Center for American Progress; Center for Child Care Resource & Referral Network; Cambridge Committee to Raise the Minimum Wage; Center for Democracy & Domestic Action; Center for American Progress; Center for Frontline Retail; Center for Law and Social Policy (CLASP); Center for Popular Democracy; Chicago Women 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 Area Chapter, CLUW; Columbus Area Chapter, CLUW; Denver Metro Area Chapter, CLUW; Denver Area Chapter, CLUW; Detroit Area Chapter, CLUW; Greater Cleveland Chapter, CLUW; Greater Cincinnati Area Chapter, CLUW; Greater Kansas City Area Chapter, CLUW; Greater Los Angeles Area Chapter, CLUW; Houston Area Chapter, CLUW; Jakarta Area Chapter, CLUW; King County Chapter, CLUW; Lorain County Chapter, CLUW; Los Angeles Area Chapter, CLUW; Metro-Detroit Area Chapter, CLUW; Metropolitan District of Columbia Chapter, CLUW; Missouri Area Chapter, CLUW; New Jersey Area Chapter, CLUW; Greater Philadelphia Area Chapter, CLUW; Philadelphia Area Chapter, CLUW; San Diego Area Chapter, CLUW; San Francisco Area Chapter, CLUW; Southwestern Pennsylvania Chapter, CLUW; St. Louis Area Chapter, CLUW; Western New York Area Chapter, CLUW; Western Virginia Chapter, CLUW; Coalition on Human Needs; Color of Change; Connecticut Women’s Education and Legal Fund (CWELF); Connecticut Women’s Education and Legal Fund (CWELF); Poverty Project at the Institute for Policy Studies; Day One; Domestic Violence Legal Empowerment & Appeals Project; Economic Opportunity Institute; Center for Law and Social Policy; Equal Rights Advocates; Equality North Carolina; Equality Ohio: Fair World Project; Federal Employees Women; Feminist Majority Foundation; Food Chain Workers Alliance; Forward Together; Found Objects Transformed; Friends Committee on National Legislation; Futures Without Violence; Gender Justice; Health Care for America Now; If/When/How: Reckoning for Reproductive Justice; 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; Justice with Justice, Jobs With Justice, St Joseph Valley Project; Justice for Migrant Women; Kentucky Equal Justice Center; Labor Council for a Democratic White Working Class; Las Hermanas USA; Laundry Workers Center; Legal Momentum, The Women’s Legal Defense and Education Fund; Maine Women’s Lobby; Massachusetts Women’s Health and 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 American Women’s Forum (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, Greater Cleveland 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 Task Force Action Fund; National Network of Abortion Funds; National Organization for Women (NOW);
NOW, Louisiana; NOW, North Carolina; NOW, Raleigh; NOW, Southwest Pennsylvania; NOW, Triad North Carolina.

National Partnership for Women & Families: National Women’s Law Center; America’s 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 Working Women’s Union.

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; Pathways PA; Pennsylvania NOW; People for the American Way.

PHENOM (Public Higher Education Network of Massachusetts); Physicians for Reproductive Health; PL-USA: Paid Leave for the United States; Powder New York; Project IRENE; Public Justice Center; PWN-USA; Racial and Ethnic Health Disparities Coalition; Reclaiming Economic Opportunities Centers United; Restaurant Opportunities Centers Pennsylvania.

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

United Democratic Women of MD, Inc.; URGE: Unite for Reproductive & Gender Equity; V.I. Domestic Violence & Sexual Assault Council; Valerie Fund, Pennsylvania; WomenRising, Rights and Empowerment Network; Women’s Health Center of Virginia; Western Sexual Violence; Voices for Progress; Washington Food Bank; Women & Girls Foundation of Southwest Pennsylvania; Women’s Center on Law and Poverty.

Women & Girls Foundation of Southwest Pennsylvania; Women Employed; Women's Action Network; Women Lawyers of Sacramento; Women of Reform Judaism; Women’s Law Project; Women’s Right to a Fair Wage; Women’s Medical Fund, Pennsylvania; WomenRising, Inc.; Working Washington/Fair Work Center; Working Women.

WV FREE; Yellowhammer Fund: YWCA USA; YWCA, Dayton; ZERO TO THREE.

I want to commend Chairman Scott and his staff for their outstanding work to get us to this point.

The current Federal minimum wage rate hasn’t budged in a decade, but basic costs have, and they have dramatically. It is an affront to basic fairness and an intolerable conditions for families working hard yet falling further and further behind.

They live on a razor’s edge facing impossible choices:

Paying the rent or the car;
Buying diapers and formula for their children or medication for themselves;
Cutting a check for a student loan debt payment or a doctor’s visit.

Today, a single mother with two children working full-time at $7.25 an hour is living well below the Federal poverty line. We can fix that by voting to give her a raise.

Let’s do the same for the rest of America by passing the Raise the Wage Act. It is this moment.

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.

A poll after poll shows that small business owners support raising the minimum wage. This is because doing 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.

BUSINESS FOR A FAIR MINIMUM WAGE FEDERAL $15 SIGN ON STATEMENT

As business owners, 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 costs, lower error rates, national increased productivity and better customer service. Employees often make the difference between repeat customers or lost customers.

Raising the minimum wage is smart policy. It will reduce the strain on the safety net caused by wages that people can’t live on. It will help level the playing field for big businesses and the consumers and the companies and businesses and the consumers spending businesses depend on to thrive.

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

Holly Sklar, CEO, Business for a Fair Minimum Wage; Jennifer Donnelly, Oregon Coalition for Biomedical Health, Gustavus, AK; Phillip Austin, Owner, DJ Cabihotel Tuscaloosa, AL; Eddie Babies, Owner, Eddie B’s Barber Shop, Montgomery, AL; Varis Berry, Owner, New Beginning Barber & Style Montgomery, AL; Larry Bethune, Owner, Brenda’s BBQ, Montgomery, AL; Joseph Bower, Sidekicks Sneaker Shop, Birmingham, AL; Tahara Broadnax, Owner, The Hair Day Birmingham, AL; David Brown, Owner, Manitou Bistro, Birmingham, AL; Brown, Owner, Hue Studio, Montgomery, AL; Dawn Cassizzle, Owner, Beacon Yoga, Birmingham, AL; Michael Crayton, Owner, ManIfE Suites, Montgomery, AL; Robert Dean, Owner, Momma Goldberg’s Deli, Homewood, AL; Adriane Dunson, Owner, Tara Bell, Owner, Newman Evans, Owner, Newman’s Classic Cuts, Birmingham, AL; Dan Hall, Owner, Queen City Cycles, Tuscaloosa, AL; Benita Harley, Owner, Shaheen Lingerie, Montgomery, AL; Carla Hamilton, Owner, Four Comers Gallery, Birmingham, AL; James Harris, President, Harvest Midwest, Birmingham, AL; Tim Hicks, Owner, Veteran Cuts Barber Shop, Montgomery, AL; Ashraf Hijaz, Owner, Beauty & Beyond, Montgomery, AL; Justin Holt, Owner, Detox’s Scrapbook, Tuscaloosa, AL; Joseph Kasson, Owner, TechniGO, Tuscaloosa, AL; Nate Johnson, Owner, Teamwork Barber Shop, Selma, AL; Walter L. Law, Owner, Village East Shoe Center, Montgomery, AL; Raymond Josof, Owner, Five Points Hotdogs, Birmingham, AL; Melissa Kendrick, CEO, Southside Children’s Health, Montgomery, AL; Skyler Khrosanov, Owner, Prof Alterations, Tuscaloosa, AL; Dr. Jerry Kirby, Owner, Kirby Chiropractic Clinic, Montgomery, AL; Lakethia Knox, Owner, The Doctor, Tuscaloosa, AL; Nicholas Lewis, Owner, Tha Cutting Zone, Tuscaloosa, AL; Brandon MacDonald, Owner, MacDonald Insurance Group, Birmingham, AL; Alcollin Lemon, Owner, Lex Couture Boutique, Selma, AL; Charli Matthews, CEO, Empowering Brains, Tuscaloosa, AL; Marissa Mitchell, Owner, Swaddle, Birmingham, AL; Kenya Mitchell, Owner, SKT Hair Salon, Selma, AL; Byoung Moon, Owner, Tuny Custom T-shirts, Montgomery, AL; Nahoo O. Obied, Owner, Makano’s Kabob Express, Birmingham, AL; Derrick Paolatto, Owner, The Record Stop, Montgomery, AL; Salisha Parker, Owner, This & That LLC; Sasa Perovic, Owner, Bridal P & Prom, Selma, AL; Brittney Powell, Owner, Kay Couture, Montgomery, AL; Jim Reed, Owner, Reed’s Book Store, Birmingham, AL; Allangrangers, 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; Casey Snipes, Owner, 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; Tarrell 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, Dress Sands, Owner, Kut N Go, Montgomery, AL; Trix Vintage, Birmingham, AL; Mark Snyder, Owner, Mark’s Joint Restaurant, Homewood, AL; Robby Spaelth, Owner, Capital City Tire & Sales, Chelsea, AL; Stephanie Brown, Co-owner, Train & Burn, Birmingham, AL; Cheri Stewart, Owner, Trim Tab Brewing, Birmingham, AL; Deon Trone, Owner, Deon’s Styling Tuscaloosa, AL; Deon Trone, Owner, Deon’s Automotive, Tuscaloosa, AL; Teresa VICKREY,
Owner, Natural Healing, Montgomery, AL; Johnny Weatherspoon, Owner, Style Connection Barber Shop, Tuscaloosa, AL; LaTesha Wells, Owner, Salon Ambience, Tuscaloosa, AL; Amanda West, Owner, High End Hair Designs, Birmingham, AL; TIm Williamson, Owner, Carter Drug, Selma, AL; Kandice Wright, Owner, Moon Hair Spa, Tuscaloosa, AL; Bradley Wyatt, Owner, Copper Top, Tuscaloosa, AL; Blake Ralston, Owner, Ralston Agency, Fort Smith, AR; Steve Svendsen, Owner, SVendys Hair Design, Fort Smith, AR; Darla Aguilera, Owner, 480 Barber Shop, Chandler, AZ; Janice Brian, Owner, Alley Cats Haircutting Salon, Flagstaff, AZ; Malcom Bates, Owner, Ft. Antiques Retro and Vintage, Flagstaff, AZ.

Paula Beltran, Owner, V.I. Alternations & Tailoring, San Antonio, TX; Hilda Betancourt, Make-U-Mobile, Mesa, AZ; Eric Cady, Co-owner, Chucapacabra Taproom, Mesa, AZ; Francisco Carlo, Owner, Cabinets by Design, Phoenix, AZ; Caryn Carter, Owner, 24K Hair Spa, Phoenix, AZ; Jorge Castillo, Co-owner, The Gaming Zone, Tempe, AZ; Alison Chinn, Co-Owner, Noble Beast Pet Market, Phoenix, AZ; Abel Chavez, Owner, Chavez Barber Shop, Tempe, AZ; Shang Syun Chiu, Owner, Dealer Electronics, Mesa, AZ; Natalia Cibrian-Chacon, Chico, CA; Katherine O'Neill, Owner, AZ; Kimberly Clarke, Owner, Solstice Intimates, Tempe, AZ; Mark Cosmas, Owner, iRun, Phoenix, AZ; Joe Cook, Co-Owner, Unique Planes, Phoenix, AZ; Lauren Danuser, Owner, Local Nomad, Phoenix, AZ; Daniel De Hoyos, Owner, De Hoyos Carpet, Mesa, AZ; Max Fishman, Owner, FISHER, Scottsdale, AZ; Alfredo Flores, Owner, Watch & Jewelry Repair, Tempe, AZ; Farrel Fried, President, Professional Affiliates of Arizona, LLC, Scottsdale, AZ; Jason Fultz, Owner, Let Us Floor You, Inc. Chandler, AZ; Brian Galaz, Co-Owner, Make a T Factory, Flagstaff, AZ; Kristin Garcia, Owner, Purge Love Peace Rage Room, Chandler, AZ; Brenda Hackman, Co-owner, EmbroidMe, Phoenix, AZ; Tim Hackman, Co-owner, EmbroidMe, Phoenix, AZ; Billy Halton, Co-owner, Casa Grande Dry Cleaning, Casa Grande, AZ.

Eddie Harris, Owner, Hummus Express, Tempe, AZ; Lamar Harris, Co-owner, Get Sassy Beauty Supply, Chandler, AZ; Richo’s UPGames, Mesquite, NV; Faheema Hassan, Owner, Khyber Halal, Phoenix, AZ; Dione Hauke, Owner, Ziggie’s Hair & Beauty, Chandler, AZ; Jimmy Hash, Owner, Kozan Salon, Chandler, AZ; Natasha Winnik, Owner, Originate Natural Building Materials Showroom, Tucson, AZ; Carolyn Young, Owner, West of the Moon Jewelry & Art, Tucson, AZ; Alfredo Zedda, Co-owner, Hair Deco, Phoenix, AZ; Feliciano Zizzo, Owner, Zillo Tailoring, Scottsdale, AZ; Rafa Zuniga, Owner, Customer Service, Rogue Antiques Retro and Salvage Cuts & Design, Mesa, AZ; Paul William Zucher, Owner, Smoke Dem Bones BBQ, Phoenix, AZ.

Maury Williamson, Owner, The Country Clipper Barber Shop, Alhambra, CA; Natasha Winnik, Owner, Originate Natural Building Materials Showroom, Tucson, AZ; Carolyn Young, Owner, West of the Moon Jewelry & Art, Tucson, AZ; Michelle Zarazua, Owner, Wig Designer, Ziggie’s, Chandler, AZ; Neil Biqmquist, Managing Director, Natural Habitats USA Inc., Richmond, CA; Neil Biqmquist, Owner, Sustainable Solutions Consulting, Sonoma, CA; Nate Clark, Owner, Ekef Incorporated, Redwood Valley, CA; Eric Cohen, Owner, Justice Grace Vineyards, Sonoma, CA; Bryan Cook, Attorney, Thomas Cook Intellectual Property Attorney, Sausalito, CA; Fred Dew, Professional Engineer, Dew Consulting, Aliso Viejo, CA; Chad Donkor, President, Dimitrova Agency, San Dimas, CA; Jerome Dodson, President, Pammass Investments, Los Angeles, CA; Eric Edelson, CEO, Frieday Tile, San Francisco, CA; Mikael Eno, Operations Manager, Mafia Bags, San Francisco, CA; Malla Everett, CEO, Everett, CA; Jennifer Faber, Owner, Spa Petaluma, CA; David Bronner, CEO, Dr. Bronner’s, Vista, CA; Rinaldo Brutoco, Founding President & CEO, World Business Academy, Santa Barbara, CA; Carrie Clark, Owner, Eleck Incorporated, Redwood Valley, CA; Eric Cohen, Owner, Justice Grace Vineyards, Sonoma, CA; Thomas Cook, Attorney, Thomas Cook Intellectual Property Attorney, Sausalito, CA; Fred Dew, Professional Engineer, Dew Consulting, Aliso Viejo, CA; Chad Donkor, President, Dimitrova Agency, San Dimas, CA; Jerome Dodson, President, Pammass Investments, Los Angeles, CA; Eric Edelson, CEO, Frieday Tile, San Francisco, CA; Mikael Eno, Operations Manager, Mafia Bags, San Francisco, CA; Malla Everett, CEO, Everett, CA; Jennifer Faber, Owner, Spa Petaluma, CA; David Bronner, CEO, Dr. Bronner’s, Vista, CA; Rinaldo Brutoco, Founding President & CEO, World Business Academy, Santa Barbara, CA; Carrie Clark, Owner, Eleck Incorporated, Redwood Valley, CA; Eric Cohen, Owner, Justice Grace Vineyards, Sonoma, CA;...
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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 earned 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 34 million Americans. They don’t respect the dignity of the work that these folks do.

As your gentlewoman colleague, Ms. DE LAURO, from Connecticut has said, the Democrats want to increase the Federal minimum wage, injecting new life into our Main Street and our economy.

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 AFT, 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 co-sponsoring the Raise the Wage Act of 2019 (H.R. 582).

By raising the federal minimum wage from $7.25 to $15 per hour by 2024, H.R. 582 would empower millions of struggling Americans to make ends meet and support their families.

The federal minimum wage was last raised to $7.25 per hour 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 because a raise would lift millions out of poverty, help close the racial and gender wage gaps, 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 3 in 10 working women a raise, including 43 percent of African American working women, 38 percent of workingLatinas, 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. Moreover, a raise not limited to preschool teachers, who on average earn $13.84 per hour; substitute teachers,
who average $13.47 per hour; child care workers, who earn an average of $10.18 per hour; and home healthcare workers, who on average receive $10.87 per hour. With higher wages, individuals would be better able to afford food, clothing, housing and other necessities, which, in turn, would support local businesses and economic growth.

Two million families in the United States are being forced to depend on poverty-level wages. Congress can help strengthen our economy and lift families out of poverty by raising the federal minimum wage.

Thank you for your introduction of H.R. 582.

Sincerely,
RANDI WINGERTEN,
President,
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 gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, let me first thank Chairman SCOTT for yielding back. And thank you, Mr. Speaker, for your tireless, incredible, and brilliant leadership.

I include in the RECORD a letter from The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights expressing their strong support for H.R. 582.

THE LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE ON CIVIL AND HUMAN RIGHTS,

VOTE RECOMMENDATION: SUPPORT THE RAISE THE WAGE ACT OF 2019

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, a coalition charged by its diverse membership of more than 200 national organizations to promote and protect the civil and human rights of all persons in the United States, we write to express our strong support for the Raise the Wage Act of 2019 (H.R. 582). This important legislation would gradually raise the federal minimum wage to $15 an hour by 2025, index it to median federal wages, and ensure that all tipped workers, working people with disabilities, and young people at least the federal minimum wage. Passage of the Raise the Wage Act is a top legislative priority of our coalition and is strongly outweighed by its potential effects of increasing the federal minimum wage to $15 an hour incrementally through 2025.

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. The CBO report predicted that this gradual increase would decrease the number of individuals living in poverty by 12 percent and disproportionately 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 2019, a full-time worker without 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 colleagues, and for the children, food, transportation, childcare, health care, and other necessities. We urge you to vote for clean passage of the Raise the Wage Act of 2019. We respectfully request that you reconsider any MOTR that is offered to address the economic security concerns of working families. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

VANTA GUPTA,
President and CEO,
Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this bill, the Raise the Wage Act. This critical bill would increase the minimum wage to $15 an hour and give 33 million workers a raise, including 16 million people of color who are disproportionately paid poverty wages.

Once more, it would lift 1.3 million Americans out of poverty.

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 picket lines, in rallies, and in 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 an 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 4½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from North Carolina has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman 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 the RECORD a letter signed by many youth organizations in support of this legislation.

DEAR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS: The under-signed organizations are writing to express our strong support for the Raise the Wage Act of 2019, which would incrementally increase the federal minimum wage from $7.25 to $15.00 over the next 6 years. Beyond raising the wage, the bill’s important provisions include phasing out the subminimum wages for tipped workers, people with disabilities, and youth. As organizations committed to the wellbeing 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.
Mr. Speaker, I include in the Record statistics relating to the 18th Congressional District of Texas.

Texas 18th District
Share of workers affected: 41.3%
Total workers affected: 155,800
Total wage increase for all affected workers (2018): $1,100
Change in avg. annual earnings among all $4,100 year-round affected workers (2018): $1,100
Percent change in avg. annual earnings among all year-round affected workers: 18.6%
Ages 16 to 24—Total workers affected: 41,400
Ages 16 to 24—Share affected: 81.8%
Ages 25 to 39—Total workers affected: 63,900
Ages 25 to 39—Share affected: 41.0%
Ages 40 to 54—Total workers affected: 33,100
Ages 40 to 54—Share affected: 29.4%
Ages 55 or older—Total workers affected: 17,400
Ages 55 or older—Share affected: 29.8%
Men—Total workers affected: 72,000
Men—Share affected: 35.1%
Women—Total workers affected: 83,900
Women—Share affected: 48.5%
Asian or other—Total workers affected: 7,600
Asian or other—Share affected: 29.2%
Black—Total workers affected: 49,100
Black—Share affected: 48.8
White—Total workers affected: 10,000
White—Share affected: 15.7%
Hispanic—Total workers affected: 89,100
Hispanic—Share affected: 55.2%
Ms. JACKSON LEE. 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 CYLBERN, 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.
What a difference an election makes. 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, earn the minimum wage and would gross just $15,000, which is $6,100 below the $25,100 needed to lift a family of three out of poverty.

In 2018, the average CEO was paid 1,140 times more than a minimum wage earner. The raise the minimum wage will benefit working families: These low-wage workers to make a little better $4,100 a year to meet critical needs such as child care, health care, and food and shelter.

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 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 falling 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 states.

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 current 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’ well-being, since the wages of a worker bring 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, 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 have only 31 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 support for 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 most need the money, 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 the Americans we represent a long-over due 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.”

Ms. FOX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I do take offense at anyone who characterizes Republicans as not caring about children, not caring about women, not caring about people of color, and not caring about the poor. We care for all people, too, Mr. Speaker, and I want to make that very clear. We will disregard philosophically, but we care about people, and we love our fellow Americans.

Democrats continue to point to figures of potential wage increases in our congressional districts, but not once have they acknowledged that CBO estimates that as many as three jobs could
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 satisfy a far left, socialist political commitment.

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 Employment Lawyers Association, and a recent article in Politico by Reverend William Barber.

NATIONAL EMPLOYMENT LAW PROJECT, July 15, 2019.

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. NELP urges you to vote Yes on the bill and No on any Motion to Recommit when the measure comes up for a vote 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 inexorable in a country with the collective wealth we enjoy and with an economy that is booming for those who work and do not.

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 eliminate the index the 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 systematically 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.

There are two basic premises the minimum wage will claim that it will result in job loss, these prophesies 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 $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 authors found the 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. A national poll showing 65% for a $15 federal minimum wage even in battleground Congressional districts.

The Raise the Wage Act provides a 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 of our growing economy.

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

Sincerely, CHRISTINE L. OWENS, Executive Director.


HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, Washington, DC.

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 tipped, disabled and youth workers making wages at or near the federal minimum wage of at least $10 per hour facing 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 77 cents of a dollar to white, non-Hispanic male counterparts making $1.28; Latino women make 60 cents; Native women make only 56 cents. Women of color face even larger wage gaps.

The Paycheck Fairness Act will address the pay discrimination, often cloaked by employer-imposed pay secrecy policies, that is one factor driving these persistent wage gaps. But women’s overrepresentation in low-wage jobs is another key factor: women are close to two-thirds of the workforce in jobs that pay the minimum wage or just a few dollars above it, and more than two-thirds of workers in tipped jobs. Women of color are particularly overrepresented in tipped workers and low-wage workers. And they are particularly harmed by a $7.25 federal minimum wage that has not gone up in a decade—and by a $2.13 tipped wage that has been frozen for an astonishing 28 years.

The Raise the Wage Act will raise the federal minimum wage from $7.25 an hour to $15 by 2025, then index the minimum wage so that it continues to rise along with wages overall. It will also end unfair exclusions for women tipped workers, people with disabilities, and youth so that they, too, can benefit from a decent minimum wage. The Economic Policy Institute (EPI) estimates that the bill (as introduced) 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, NPLC research shows that women workers are 26 percent more likely to have 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 those with a wage gap above $7.25. The Raise the Wage Act is essential to advance equal pay for women and economic security for their families.

Today, women across the country—especially women of color—continue to experience a gender wage gap and a poverty gap than men. Women working full time, year round typically make only 80 percent of what 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 77 cents of a dollar to white, non-Hispanic male counterparts making $1.28; Latino women make 60 cents; Native women make only 56 cents. Women of color face even larger wage gaps.

The Paycheck Fairness Act will address the pay discrimination, often cloaked by employer-imposed pay secrecy policies, that is one factor driving these persistent wage gaps. But women’s overrepresentation in low-wage jobs is another key factor: women are close to two-thirds of the workforce in jobs that pay the minimum wage or just a few dollars above it, and more than two-thirds of workers in tipped jobs. Women of color are particularly overrepresented in tipped workers and low-wage workers. And they are particularly harmed by a $7.25 federal minimum wage that has not gone up in a decade—and by a $2.13 tipped wage that has been frozen for an astonishing 28 years.

The Raise the Wage Act will raise the federal minimum wage from $7.25 an hour to $15 by 2025, then index the minimum wage so that it continues to rise along with wages overall. It will also end unfair exclusions for women tipped workers, people with disabilities, and youth so that they, too, can benefit from a decent minimum wage. The Economic Policy Institute (EPI) estimates that the bill (as introduced) 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, NPLC research shows that women workers are 26 percent more likely to have 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 those with a wage gap above $7.25. The Raise the Wage Act is essential to advance equal pay for women and economic security for their families.
than in states that follow the $2.13 federal standard. One Fair Wage also ensures that women in tipped jobs have a paycheck they can count on, making them less vulnerable to the mistreatment, from the outset, that women can feel forced to tolerate when they have to rely on tips for nearly all of their income.

A $15 minimum wage will make a meaningful difference for millions across the country who are struggling to put food on the table, access the health care they need, and support themselves and their families. But it is still a modest wage relative to the expenses that women and their families face every day, no matter where they live in the United States. According to EPI, by 2025, a single worker without children will need at least full-time earnings at $15 an hour ($31,200 annually) to meet basic needs, and women in costlier areas and those supporting families will need more. 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.

We strongly 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 exacerbate the pay gap.

The Raise the Wage Act is critically needed to end the trend of pay inequality that disproportionately affects African American, Hispanic, and other people of color. The problem is not that the poor work too little to benefit from better wages. Workers of color are more likely to be among the working poor, with African American and Hispanic women respectively making up 4.4% and 4.6% of the working poor, compared to 2.9% of white women. Additionally, people of color disproportionately live in poverty, with 20% of African Americans and 16% of Hispanics living in poverty compared to 12% of white Americans. 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 they can work with 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.

Respectfully submitted,

Kristen Clark,  
President & Executive Director.

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), 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
- After 2025, adjust the minimum wage each year to keep pace with growth in the typical worker’s pay
- 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.
- 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 cycle and raise pay broadly across the bottom of the workforce. According to the Economic Policy Institute, this Act will deliver 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.

26 percent are working parents with children, and half have family incomes of less than $40,000 per year. Women make up nearly 50 percent of the workforce and 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 address the color line, with 38 percent of African American workers and 33 percent of Latinos seeing a pay increase once this law goes into effect.

These are the frontline workers who make America run—yet despite 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 in Congress to enact this important piece of legislation as quickly as possible, and for President Trump to sign it when it comes to his desk.

Sincerely,

Emily J. Martin,  
Vice President for Education & Workplace Justice.

LAWSYER’S COMMITTEE FOR CIVIL RIGHTS UNDER LAW.

July 12, 2019.
This week, the House of Representatives will have a chance to end a pernicious legacy of slavery. Lawmakers will vote on the Raise the Wage Act, which would hike the national minimum wage across the country to $15 an hour by 2024. This would be a crucial step toward the first federal minimum wage increase in more than a decade.

A just-released Congressional Budget Office report finds that a $15 minimum wage would help to lift millions of low-wage workers of all races and ethnicities. Yet the stakes are particularly high for black workers. The share who would benefit from the Raise the Wage Act is far larger than the share of white workers who would benefit—38 percent compared with 23 percent.

There’s another provision in the legislation—eliminating the subminimum tipped wage—that corrects a wrong that goes much further back than the previous federal minimum wage. In the early 1900s, often in recognition of its immorality or an acknowledgment of inferiority, “the relation of a man giving a tip and a man accepting it is as against American ideals. “The relation of a customer and employer to earn anything at all. The practice spread throughout the country earlier. The immorality of paying an insufficient tipped wage still exacerbates the inequalities passed down from that time. Workers in the restaurant industry are far more likely to be poor or near-poor than the general population. 86 percent of restaurant workers are women. One of the most notorious examples comes from the Pullman Company, which hired newly freed African American men as porters. Railroad employers literally in the hospitality sector, looked for ways to avoid paying formerly enslaved workers.

One of the most notorious examples comes from the Pullman Company, which hired newly freed African American men as porters. Railroad employers literally in the hospitality sector, looked for ways to avoid paying formerly enslaved workers. You might not think of tipping as a legacy of slavery, but it has a far more racialized history than most Americans realize. Tipping originated in feudal Europe and was imported back to the United States by American travelers eager to seem sophisticated. The practice spread throughout the country after the Civil War as U.S. employers, largely in the hospitality sector, looked for ways to avoid paying formerly enslaved workers.

One of the most notorious examples comes from the Pullman Company, which hired newly freed African American men as porters. Railroad employers literally in the hospitality sector, looked for ways to avoid paying formerly enslaved workers. One of the most notorious examples comes from the Pullman Company, which hired newly freed African American men as porters. Railroad employers literally in the hospitality sector, looked for ways to avoid paying formerly enslaved workers. Luckily, two journalists and a labor lawyer are fighting to overturn voter-approved local bans on tipping. And tipped workers are few and far between—one would benefit from the Raise the Wage Act, but it’s a relic of slavery.

That’s why national action to finally reverse this particular vestige of slavery is so vital. No one can live on $2.13 an hour—a poverty wage.

We may live in a very different society from 130 years ago, but the subminimum tipped wage still exacerbates the inequalities passed down from that time. Workers in the restaurant industry are far more likely to be poor or near-poor than the general population. 86 percent of restaurant workers are women. One of the most notorious examples comes from the Pullman Company, which hired newly freed African American men as porters. Railroad employers literally in the hospitality sector, looked for ways to avoid paying formerly enslaved workers. That’s why national action to finally reverse this particular vestige of slavery is so vital. No one can live on $2.13 an hour—a poverty wage.
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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 increase 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.

Proposals 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 executive pocket or, as President Roosevelt said in a fireside chat way back in 1938: “Do not let any calamity-howling executive . . . 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. CUÉLLAR. 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 $6,400,000.

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. What I acknowledge is that every day 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 2025, the employment rate in the United States is a mere 3.7 percent. It is critical that policies we pass through this House do not interrupt or deter this economic prosperity.

Furthermore, while I support this important legislation, we must consider how it will affect small business and their economic futures. Therefore, I have negotiated with the Committee a provision to lengthen the phase in period to $15 minimum wage until the year 2026.

Additionally, I am a co-sponsor of the O’Halleran Amendment. This amendment will require a comprehensive GAO report on national and regional economic impacts of the minimum wage increases in this bill. The report will have a special focus on small business and agricultural sectors. It will facilitate 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 business exporters, 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 24.3 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 there 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 work 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 Offered by Mr. Cuellar of Texas

Strike section 3 and insert the following new section:

SEC. 3. MINIMUM WAGE FOR SMALL BUSINESS EMPLOYERS.

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

(1) SMALL BUSINESS MINIMUM WAGE RATE.—With respect to an employer that is a small business concern (as defined in section 3 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632)), except as otherwise provided in this section, the wage in effect under subsection (a)(1) shall be—

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Add at the end the following new section:

SECTION 4. MINIMUM WAGE EMPLOYEES CREDIT FOR SMALL EMPLOYERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subpart D of part IV of chapter A of chapter 1 of such Code is amended by striking “plus” at the end of paragraphs (3), (4), (5), (6), and (7) of section 38, and by adding at the end the following:

‘‘(8) $12.50 an hour during the calendar year 2020, and $13.00 an hour during the calendar years 2021 and each year thereafter.’’.­

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall be—

(1) applicable to taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

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

Add at the end the following:

SEC. 6. AGRICULTURE EXEMPTION.

Nothing in this Act, or the amendments made under this Act, shall apply to any farm business concern (as defined in section 503 of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 (7 U.S.C. 603)) or to any small farm (as defined in section 606 of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 (7 U.S.C. 606)).
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, “see to it” that those with disabilities have an equal voice. 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 that they deserve "a fair day’s pay that they deserve." Men and women throughout the nation work full-time yet remain trapped in poverty by their low-wages. According to the American Association of University Women, 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. Raising the minimum wage also will reduce child poverty. According to the Economic Policy Institute, the increased minimum wage will give raises to 41 million women, 28 percent of whom have children.

As many may know, helping low-income workers is a primary legislative priority for me. In my District, almost 31 percent of children live in poverty and half of those children live in extreme poverty. Further, 25 percent of the tax filers in my district are low-income working parents. I see the challenges that these children face firsthand. They are hard-working and incredible people trying to better themselves.

I reject opponents’ arguments that increasing the federal minimum wage will eviscerate jobs. I know firsthand the benefits of an increase minimum wage because the minimum wage in the City of Chicago is $13 an hour, much higher than the federal wage of $7.25. According to the Illinois Economic Policy Institute, the transition to this wage had no impact on the employment rate nor did it negatively affect private businesses. Rather, the higher minimum wage was a higher demand to lower-income households for employment. Given the positive outcomes from raising the minimum wage in Chicago and given state-wide economic needs, Governor J.B. Pritzker and our state legislators just raised the state minimum wage to $15—making Illinois, D.C., and five other states national leaders in providing livable wages for their workers. Our new law will help almost 1.4 million Illinoisans currently making less than $15 an hour, lifting thousands out of poverty and growing our economy at the same time.

Now today as a Congressman, I proudly cast my vote in support of raising the federal minimum wage to strengthen workers, families, and our economy.

Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 582. This bill is yet another overreach of power-grab from Washington. Missouri voters already decided to raise their minimum wage last year. However, now the federal government believes it knows better than the states and wants to force a one-size-fits-all policy on all Americans. Unfortunately, this policy will cost 3.7 million jobs nationwide, and would cause nearly half of families with a minimum wage earner to see a reduction in household income.

Even worse, this bill 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 dignified 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 acclimate 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 the “deaf or otherwise 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 acclimate 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 the “deaf or otherwise 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 acclimate 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.

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support 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. BISHOP of Georgia, 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.

Nationwide polls show that Americans support raising the minimum wage across geographic and party lines.

Georgia’s Second Congressional District, which I represent, is one of many that would be most impacted. 43 percent of workers would receive a wage increase here. Of these workers are women and people of color, who are disproportionately affected by poverty. The largest age group that would benefit are those between the ages of 25 and 39.

Nationally, raising the minimum wage to $15 would lift 1.3 million Americans out of poverty, including 600,000 children. Poverty has devastating effects on families, and studies have shown children born into poverty have greater difficulties succeeding in the future. Americans work hard and should be able to support themselves and their families. This bill is modest and gradual, giving businesses plenty of time to adjust. 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

Mr. O’HALLERAN. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

SEC. 2. GA REPORT ON WAGE INCREASE IMPACT.
(a) In General.—Not later than 90 days before the date of the third wage increase to first take effect after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General, in consultation with the Secretary of Labor, shall submit a report to Congress.
verately impact communities nationwide. I strongly support the Raise to ensure that once this legislation is commonsense amendment is necessary.

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 that the minimum 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 require the Gov- ernment 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 and experts when developing its report. These would include small business owners, labor econo- mists, agricultural workers, the food service industry, and State and local governments.

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

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

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

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.

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.

The SPEAKER pro tem. The gen- tlewoman is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

Mr. Speaker, a hot economy is lead- ing to higher wages. There are 7.3 million unfilled jobs which puts all workers in a good position to receive higher 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.
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 the Education and 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 who already support a $15 per hour hike 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 their Democrat Members who are justifiably trying to ensure the $15 wage hike as the appropriate benchmark.

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 want to point out that the discussion in Mr. Scott’s comments were not about this bill. They were about another bill.

To identify that the Members of this Congress do not need data on which to Congress do not need data on which to make further decisions, I hope we don’t get to that point in time in Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve 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 I get to that point in time in Congress.

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

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).

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 gentleman from Arizona has 1 1/2 minutes remaining.

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

To identify that the Members of this Congress do not need data on which to make further decisions, I hope we don’t get to that point in time in Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve 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 the other side does so.

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

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.
Mr. MEUSER. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit. 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 motion, if adopted, would send H.R. 582 to the Committee on Education and Labor so that it may conduct an appropriate hearing on the bill. As the sponsor of H.R. 582, the Speaker may request that a motion to reconsider be filed at a later time.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this modest amendment to H.R. 582. It would make sure that any increase in the Federal minimum wage did not disproportionately burden 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 annual sales 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 10 employees will account for 57 percent of jobs lost due to this bill, and businesses with fewer than 100 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 the 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 business owners 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 mandate. A recent 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 city’s low-wage workers by $120 million per year in that one city alone.

The National Federation of Independent Business shows, 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 National Federation of Independent Business shows, 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.

We know the results: job losses.小企业 owners and employers would be punished.

Congress should not force our Nation’s smallest and most vital job creators to make those kinds of decisions.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this modest amendment to H.R. 582. It would make sure that any increase in the Federal minimum wage did not disproportionately burden 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 annual sales 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 10 employees will account for 57 percent of jobs lost due to this bill, and businesses with fewer than 100 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 the 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 business owners and their families will also take a significant hit. The nonpartisan CBO backs up this reality, reporting that mandating a $15 minimum wage law 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 mandate. A recent 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 city’s low-wage workers by $120 million per year in that one city alone.

The National Federation of Independent Business shows, 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.

We know the results: job losses.
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 love of country. It is also about striving to make this country even stronger. It is about trying to make life a little bit easier for Americans who work hard and play by the rules, folks who make my parents and like so many of my constituents, and 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 $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 at the earliest. 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 oppose it because 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.

What 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 capitals across this country.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The contrast is clear: Our Republican colleagues 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 capitals across this country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit. The question has been taken, and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.
**ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 231, noes 199, not voting 3, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ayes</th>
<th>Noes</th>
<th>Not Voting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aden</td>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>Amen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armstrong</td>
<td>Auster</td>
<td>Avello</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babin</td>
<td>Bacon</td>
<td>Bard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank</td>
<td>Barfield</td>
<td>Biggs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishop</td>
<td>Boucheron</td>
<td>Burgess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cafer</td>
<td>Calvert</td>
<td>Chambers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cline</td>
<td>Cole</td>
<td>Collins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conway</td>
<td>Cook</td>
<td>Crawford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cunningham</td>
<td>Curtis</td>
<td>Davey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeLauro</td>
<td>Dingell</td>
<td>Dooley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doyle</td>
<td>Echols</td>
<td>Espaillat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evans</td>
<td>Espy</td>
<td>Evans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eshoo</td>
<td>Esty</td>
<td>Estes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finkenauer</td>
<td>Finkenauer</td>
<td>Finkenauer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finkenauer</td>
<td>Finkenauer</td>
<td>Finkenauer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster</td>
<td>Fries</td>
<td>Gabbard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frankel</td>
<td>Fugate</td>
<td>Fugate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fugate</td>
<td>Fuller</td>
<td>Fugate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster</td>
<td>Fuller</td>
<td>Fugate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fugate</td>
<td>Fuller</td>
<td>Fugate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOES—199**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ayes</th>
<th>Noes</th>
<th>Not Voting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aden</td>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>Amen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armstrong</td>
<td>Auster</td>
<td>Avello</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babin</td>
<td>Bacon</td>
<td>Bard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank</td>
<td>Barfield</td>
<td>Biggs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishop</td>
<td>Boucheron</td>
<td>Burgess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cafer</td>
<td>Calvert</td>
<td>Chambers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cline</td>
<td>Cole</td>
<td>Collins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conway</td>
<td>Cook</td>
<td>Crawford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cunningham</td>
<td>Curtis</td>
<td>Davey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeLauro</td>
<td>Dingell</td>
<td>Dooley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doyle</td>
<td>Echols</td>
<td>Espaillat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evans</td>
<td>Espy</td>
<td>Evans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eshoo</td>
<td>Esty</td>
<td>Estes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finkenauer</td>
<td>Finkenauer</td>
<td>Finkenauer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finkenauer</td>
<td>Finkenauer</td>
<td>Finkenauer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster</td>
<td>Fries</td>
<td>Gabbard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frankel</td>
<td>Fries</td>
<td>Fries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fugate</td>
<td>Fuller</td>
<td>Fugate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster</td>
<td>Fuller</td>
<td>Fugate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frankel</td>
<td>Fugate</td>
<td>Fugate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOT VOTING—3**

Abraham Fortenberry Gabbard

**ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. So the bill was passed. A reconsideration request was made above recorded. A motion to reconsider was made and the request was announced above recorded.

**COMMUNICATION FROM CHIEF OF STAFF, THE HONORABLE STEVE SCALISE, MEMBER OF CONGRESS**

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Jennifer Megan Bel Miller, Chief of Staff, the Honorable Steve Scalise, Member of Congress:
CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. SCALISE. 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 Wednesday would 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 that 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 move.

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 years. We would like to see that progress continue.

A lot of our tools, many of our tools, 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 in the past have been 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?

Mr. SCALISE. 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, 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. 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 support 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 of money 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 T.A.A.G., which was defeated in a 77–23 vote. It doesn’t mean that the Senate has the best 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 of this type 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 nothing 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 or not, and we had a resolution on the President’s tweet. There was a resolution filed to impeach the President of the United States. There was a resolution to hold Trump officials in contempt of Congress with no basis for that contempt. There were multiple just this week, target and harass different policies of the administration—there is so much legislation we ought to be on this floor debating to do things that would actually help real families.

There is a crisis at our border, and there has been no bipartisan legislation. The bills that are going to be coming to the floor next week, that the gentleman mentioned, 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 an attempt to work in a 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 acknowledgment, there is no indication that it is going to move out of committee any time soon. It ought to be a part of 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.
don’t believe that Members on your side of the aisle want to tolerate rac-
ism any more than we want to tolerate rac-
ism. 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 re-
sponse to a tweet. It was not the tweet, it was the what the tweet said, what it im-
plied, what it diminished in terms of America’s sense of decency and equal-
ity and tolerance and inclusion for our people.

Now, let me go to legislation. As the gentleman knows, we have passed sub-
stantial 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 trans-
parency in the financing of campaigns.

It made sure that our redistricting was fair to our citizens and that we politi-
cians were not drawing the dis-
tricts, but that the districts are drawn in fairness to the American people.

It also demanded ethics performance. But the Republicans passed an anti-hate reso-
lution. It was just words, but it said no
to hate: 173 Republicans voted for that.

It overwhelming passed bipartisan.

We passed a Land and Water Con-
servation 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 retire-
ment security. That was supported by
187 Republicans.

We passed the violence against
women reauthorization. Unfortunately, it did not pass because the voting was
not fair to our citizens and that we politi-
cians were not drawing the dis-
tricts, but that the districts are drawn in fairness to the American people.

We passed a provision that said we want to protect preexisting condi-
tions in the Affordable Care Act. We got 8
Republicans. I would have wished we
gotten more.

We passed disaster relief. The gen-
eral knowledge of which I am
very proud of the 6 months that we
have had more.

We passed disability relief. The gen-

tleman knows a lot about disaster rel-
ief, important to his State. Unfortu-
nately, we only got 34 Republicans, but it was good to have a minimum wage increase in that bill, in the
Labor-Health bill to the floor. I can only con-
clude that they are not for increasing the
minimum wage.
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Do we have more work to do? We do. Madam Speaker, we 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, 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 world, 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.

Before the committee abruptly and prematurely terminated the accommodation process, 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 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. We believe 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 it 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 is necessary for our community and 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 need to do their part so 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 subjected, 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 very 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 the reason people come 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 having to come to Washington to get an amount or come to union bosses to get the amount that they can earn. They can actually go do it on their own.

It is playing out in reality, not just 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 billionaire because they saw 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 out of parts of 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 and had remeasured 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 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 telling them that they had to do it well 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.
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 we 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, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjoins today, it adjourn to meet at 9:30 a.m. tomorrow; and, further, when the House adjoins on that day, it adjourn to meet on Tuesday, July 22, 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, pensions 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.

Congress should improve our constituents’ lives. It is with great anticipation that next week we offer a glimmer of hope for those retirees.

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. I wish them the very best in their adventures.

IN RECOGNITION OF MAJOR GENERAL MARK BERRY

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

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Major General Mark Berry, commander of the Arkansas National Guard. After a long career of dedicated service, Major General Berry retired on August 10, 2019.

He first assumed duties as the adjutant general of the Arkansas National Guard on January 13, 2015. Prior to this post, Major General Berry was the A-4 assistant to the director of the Air National Guard in Arlington, Virginia.

In addition to his highly decorated career, Major General Berry is a man who goes out of his way to protect and to serve his fellow countrymen. Most recently, Major General Berry provided critical immediate assistance when flooding devastated many parts of Arkansas.

I had the opportunity to work side by side with him during flood relief efforts and saw how he worked around the clock to save lives and to protect homes and businesses. He is a great leader, a great friend, and, above all, a great American.

I thank Major General Berry for his service and wish him all the best in retirement.

IN SOLEMN MEMORY OF THE LIVES LOST IN THE AURORA THEATER SHOOTING

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

Mr. CROW. Madam Speaker, I rise today to offer a solemn memory of the 12 lives lost and the many lives changed for-ever 7 years ago in the Aurora theater shooting.

Since then, I have come to know many of the victims' families, and I stand in their courage and strength. Many have become stewards in our community, and their example is an inspiration to us all, people like State Representative Tom Sullivan, who honors his son's life by serving in the Colorado State Legislature and fighting every day for commonsense gun violence prevention, or Sandy and Lonnie Phillips, who lost their daughter and have spent their days since advocating for survivors around the country.

Today, my only wish is to tell them that we haven't forgotten.

Looking at this Chamber, it may seem as if we have moved on. In the 7 years since, little has changed. Our country is no safer. We disagree about how to solve the problem, but we do agree that there is a problem. There is a public health crisis in our country, and it doesn't matter if you live in a red or blue district.

I stand here today, committed to making a change, committed to Genow-ing families in our community that just because time has passed, our ur-}
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 always 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, I want 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 Military Surviving Spouses Equity Act from being a standalone bill. I am proud that 86 percent of Congress, 371 Members, have cosponsored this legislation, who were recruited by determined widows in the veterans service organizations.

As Minority Whip Steve Scalise pointed out on the floor last week:

Here is a bill that can quickly get to the President’s desk, and it gets included in other pieces of legislation that might come months away. But here is a bill where a Member worked in good faith under the rules that were created and it was unfortunate that the rule to bring the NDAA bill to the floor turned off the Consensus Calendar specifically for that bill, that one bill, which happened to be the first bill that met that requirement.

We should work together, bipartisan, to bring the Military Surviving Spouses Equity Act up for a standalone to eliminate the widow’s tax.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September 11th in the global war on terrorism.

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 OF 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 Admiral 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, internal 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 remember 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 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 remember 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 what all of those Texans did. 

And with due deference to my friend from Tennessee, MARSHA BLACKBURN—something worth dying for. That is what all of those Texans did.

And here it is 163 years later, and we still remember, and we are still inspired. Liberty comes at great cost, 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 help accommodate and protect those who can’t help themselves. That is why some of us are pro-life. 

But it has been shocking how for years and years, after 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 who were 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 own foreign policy, the 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., now 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 minorities.

And it has been a long time since I read his quote, but in essence it was—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 big bulk 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 fo-mented by a military campaign led by 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 geno-ocide 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 actu-ally 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 noted that in the future along with security improve-ments have returned to religious mi-nority communities devastated by ISIS, courtesy of the Trump administra-tion efforts.

“My 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 govern-ment 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 minor-ity 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 ef-forts, coupled with”—and let me make myself clear on that, I’m talking about helping others build their nations—for those who claimed that America is trying to do something—is not a real success.

“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 actu-ally corrupted.

And this is what Father Youssef had to say:

“I wish to give thanks to the govern-ment 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 minor-ity communities in Iraq.”

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 any-thing 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 res-o-lution? 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 sup-port, 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

There 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 imperialist 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 Chris-tians and home to the largest con-centration 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 by his enemies. He was not having anywhere near what he wanted. But he turned it all down.

If he had accepted it, it would have been basically impossible for Israel to defend itself under anything but nuclear means; no conventional way to defend Israel if Arafat had accepted that, what I would consider, outrageously. And fortunately, he didn’t accept it, and so Israel has been able to defend itself since then.

But the attacks are daily. They are ongoing. There is an ongoing effort by enemies of Israel that are being promoted by some Democrats, some in Congress, some outside of Congress. That is who they are supporting, people that are, every single day, smuggling rockets into Gaza, smuggling weapons, trying to smuggle weapons into Israel, and continuing to teach hatred, blind bigotry against the Jewish people, against Israel.

So why wouldn’t I think if that resolution did not get filed; but that is up to individuals in Congress. Everybody has a right to file whatever bill they think will be most helpful.

But I have looked for Scripture in the Bible that says those who curse or seek to harm Israel will be blessed. And I just—it is just not there. So it causes me, grave concern to think that we may have people in leadership positions in the United States, again, who really want to harm Israel. They want to divide it.

I know we have a growing group that don’t believe anything in the Bible. But for those of us who do, when we are told that any nation that divides or attempts to divide Israel will bring down judgment on itself, that causes me, grave concern for the country for which I have taken an oath to defend repeatedly; as a member of the United States Army, as an Assistant District Attorney, as a District Judge, as a Chief Justice, and as a Member of Congress.

That oath means so much to me that I think it would be a good idea to be supportive of the Nation of Israel, and I am thrilled we have a President that is doing that.

Even though, reports I have heard from people that were there, he had Cabinet officials telling him he was going to start World War III if he recognized Jerusalem as the capital. A bit like some of the stories of Lincoln being told that says, member of the Cabinet it would be a disaster if he finalized the Emancipation Proclamation.

Lincoln knew it was right in his heart, and with every Cabinet member reportedly against him and arguing against it. He, in essence, said, every Jews have it. He was the only one.

Here you had not all, but most of the Cabinet really hammering 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, but then, I say that is a despicable 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 of the maps 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 talking about things, like bombing and killing 100 or more in Iran. But what we are seeing in Iran is amazing, because their economy is suffering dramatically, so much so you see them lashing out and trying to, whether it is by attacking ships, trying to show whatever power they can. The pressure is intensifying.

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 full 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 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 comments 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 contest case. And what that would mean 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 is a problem. It is 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 Rome figured out, we need a representative form of government; so it has parts of it that are democracies, and in part it is a representative government, so it is a republic. And until Caesar crossed the Rubicon and made it into a virtual dictatorship—if course, that didn’t last long because as, Mark Antony said:

But Brutus says he was ambitious, and Brutus is an honorable man. So are they all, all honorable men.

There was trouble in the Roman empire. But they began to have a flood of people that were not Romans citizens. They lost their power. They had begun bread and circuses; gave away way too much in what was considered welfare of that day, bread and circuses.

And, as I recall, it was even Caesar that decided maybe we are corrupting people by providing this form of welfare and entertainment. But by that point, it was 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 U.S. military.

But when people begin not to appreciate the good things that their nation does and is doing, has done, and they build up hatred toward their own nation, you really are on the downhill slide and you are moving closer to the dustbin of history. Eventually every country is going to get there.

But our goal in this body should be to perpetuate this little experiment in self-government, the best ever conceived. Keep it going as long as possible. Don’t let it die on our watch. But it is in trouble.

And as we have bills, I don’t know anybody on this entire House floor, either party, who is against standing behind and helping those incredible American heroes of 9/11 and the days following. We are all for that.
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 think of themselves as men who will not give 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. And 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 like this, you are not for the 9/11 fund says it is supposed to be for. The 9/11 fund says it is supposed to be for.

We are loading up future generations with so much debt. That alone could be enough to bring down our country. It is time to become responsible.

And I know across the aisle we have had these hearings on the bills, the Equality Act, for example, and I understand the sentiment behind it is to try to avoid any type of discomfort, uncomfortable feelings by anybody because of their chosen gender.

But as we brought out at our hearings before the Equality Act was passed in committee and here on the floor, there is a danger, and it is not about making people a little uncomfortable because they are biologically male but they want to go to a women’s restroom.

As a former felony judge, I have heard the testimony about the trauma. I have seen the effects of sexual assault on women. I have read and understand that women who are victims of sexual assault have three to four times more occurrence of PTSD.

There are different explanations as to why they have so much higher rate of PTSD than even our soldiers in combat, but also that a trigger for reliving the horrors, the awful crime against them and their person is to be in a small, confined area and have someone of the opposite sex come in. We were laughed at and belittled when we brought up that concern.

The story was contained in another story. It was about a British leader who was in a transgender bathroom. It is now under criminal investigation or charges. But this was a story I missed back in February. “A trans ‘woman’”—meaning biological man but considered himself, herself, whatever you want to say, to be a woman—“was allowed to walk free from Kirkcaldy Sheriff Court in Scotland after being convicted of sexually assaulting a 10-year-old girl in a supermarket restroom.”

“The attacker, whose name is given as Katie Dolatowski, waited for the young victim to come out of a toilet cubicle at Morrisons supermarket . . . then grabbed her by the face and forced her back inside the cubicle. . . . Dolatowski told the girl to remove her trousers and warned that a man outside would kill her mother . . . but she fought back, striking the pedophile in the face, belly, and crotch and tearing away to her father and siblings outside.”

“Dolatowski had attempted to photograph a 12-year-old as she urinated at another supermarket a month prior but the victim had decided not to send the sexual offender to prison, instead handing down a tagging order and community service order. . . . The girl’s mother was horrified, saying she felt ‘very, very let down’ by the court.”

And despite what some of our colleagues across the aisle have said, these are sympathetic border patrolmen, not one dime for detention beds, not one dime to help the Border Patrol do their job to help the border, not one dime to help build a wall barrier where we need it, when we basically, because of liberals who may mean well, but they basically turned over our southern border to drug cartels.

As a former felony judge, I have seen the effects of sexual assault on women. I have read and understand that women who are victims of sexual assault have three to four times more occurrence of PTSD.

But this was a story I missed back in February. “A trans ‘woman’”—meaning biological man but considered himself, herself, whatever you want to say, to be a woman—“was allowed to walk free from Kirkcaldy Sheriff Court in Scotland after being convicted of sexually assaulting a 10-year-old girl in a supermarket restroom.”

“The attacker, whose name is given as Katie Dolatowski, waited for the young victim to come out of a toilet cubicle at Morrisons supermarket . . . then grabbed her by the face and forced her back inside the cubicle. . . . Dolatowski told the girl to remove her trousers and warned that a man outside would kill her mother . . . but she fought back, striking the pedophile in the face, belly, and crotch and tearing away to her father and siblings outside.”

“Dolatowski had attempted to photograph a 12-year-old as she urinated at another supermarket a month prior but the victim had decided not to send the sexual offender to prison, instead handing down a tagging order and community service order. . . . The girl’s mother was horrified, saying she felt ‘very, very let down’ by the court.”

And despite what some of our colleagues across the aisle have said, these are sympathetic border patrolmen, not one dime for detention beds, not one dime to help the Border Patrol do their job to help the border, not one dime to help build a wall barrier where we need it, when we basically, because of liberals who may mean well, but they basically turned over our southern border to drug cartels.

Some of the most evil people in the world, these drug cartels, and we are not going to enforce our border. That message from the majority has gone out over and over again, and what it does, the Border Patrol know when they send a group in the middle of the night, one of their guys will tell you if you go down there as often as I have: Every time one of you guys in Congress talk about amnesty, legalization, not enforcing the border, any of those things, we get surges.

And they also want to see us spend billions of dollars on detention beds, detention centers, get rid of any enforcement of our border and refusing, in the $4.6 billion that was passed out of this House, not one dime for detention beds, not one dime to help the Border Patrol do their job to help the border, not one dime to help build a wall barrier where we need it, when we basically, because of liberals who may mean well, but they basically turned over our southern border to drug cartels.

Some of the most evil people in the world, these drug cartels, and we are not going to enforce our border. That message from the majority has gone out over and over again, and what it does, the Border Patrol know when they send a group in the middle of the night, one of their guys will tell you if you go down there as often as I have: Every time one of you guys in Congress talk about amnesty, legalization, not enforcing the border, any of those things, we get surges.

And they also want to see us spend billions of dollars on detention beds, detention centers, get rid of any enforcement of our border and refusing, in the $4.6 billion that was passed out of this House, not one dime for detention beds, not one dime to help the Border Patrol do their job to help the border, not one dime to help build a wall barrier where we need it, when we basically, because of liberals who may mean well, but they basically turned over our southern border to drug cartels.

Some of the most evil people in the world, these drug cartels, and we are not going to enforce our border. That message from the majority has gone out over and over again, and what it does, the Border Patrol know when they send a group in the middle of the night, one of their guys will tell you if you go down there as often as I have: Every time one of you guys in Congress talk about amnesty, legalization, not enforcing the border, any of those things, we get surges.

And they also want to see us spend billions of dollars on detention beds, detention centers, get rid of any enforcement of our border and refusing, in the $4.6 billion that was passed out of this House, not one dime for detention beds, not one dime to help the Border Patrol do their job to help the border, not one dime to help build a wall barrier where we need it, when we basically, because of liberals who may mean well, but they basically turned over our southern border to drug cartels.

Some of the most evil people in the world, these drug cartels, and we are not going to enforce our border. That message from the majority has gone out over and over again, and what it does, the Border Patrol know when they send a group in the middle of the night, one of their guys will tell you if you go down there as often as I have: Every time one of you guys in Congress talk about amnesty, legalization, not enforcing the border, any of those things, we get surges.

And they also want to see us spend billions of dollars on detention beds, detention centers, get rid of any enforcement of our border and refusing, in the $4.6 billion that was passed out of this House, not one dime for detention beds, not one dime to help the Border Patrol do their job to help the border, not one dime to help build a wall barrier where we need it, when we basically, because of liberals who may mean well, but they basically turned over our southern border to drug cartels.
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 where 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 for 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 humane society, which is those 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 again. We will rein in the chaos, and the Republicans will be gone and we will have our country.

Somebody must have made that kind of assessment to be pushing the kind of bills that they are.

We cannot allow that chaos to occur and to build because it wasn’t just Ronald Reagan, but 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 become a self-fulfilling prophecy. 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, apostate 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 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.

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. BISHOP, 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 directly and bluntly in the face than 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.

That 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 without regrets.

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 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 my situation, when we take a 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 marketplace, like a magic bag. 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 and increasing the wealth of more, 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 we would see here that 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 have that 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.
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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.
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Up until this point, we operated fairly responsibly. By 15 to 20 years, we abandoned our own budgets. We can see fiscal responsibility and started down a road of accelerating debt, for the most part unrelated to wars, other than for Iraq and Afghanistan, which definitely had a consequence for our national debt, but mostly, as a result of a failure in this body and the inability of members to balance budgets as we went along.

Here we are in 2017, 2018, and 2019. What is scarier than anything else is the CBO’s projection of where it is going over time: out the roof, straight up.

We can see that this is not a partisan issue. In this particular graph, the percent of GDP is over on the left axis, and the bottom, whereas the one we were over time. In more recent history, the post-war period by Presidencies, we have Democrats in blue and Republicans in red.

We see over here President Truman in the late 1940s had a high threshold of debt-to-GDP, a little over 100 percent. Then, of course, it came down after that as we recovered. It went up in the era of some of our Great Recessions, and, of course, our wars.

Then, we had the period when we did the best, which was an evolution from President Clinton into President Bush, which was the last time we balanced our budget.

Then, there is that spike starting with President Bush through the last Presidency and, especially, the current Presidency into an ascending column, which is a projection from the Congressional Budget Office.

These are scary projections because the CBO projects that if we do nothing, we are about to run a deficit of 1414 percent of GDP within a couple of decades.

Where does that rank us in the world? After all, we have had other governments that have had high debt. We have had other governments that have collapsed. We have had other governments for which their budget problems have caught up with them. Let’s take a look at that.

This chart shows the period projected from the current year out only 5 years. It asks the question: What is the growth in our debt-to-GDP as compared to the rest of the world? How fast are we growing in our debt versus the rest of the world?

Unfortunately, the line on the right is us. We project that our debt-to-GDP will grow 11 percent over the next couple of years.

The next line is Italy. We have Korea and Japan, but the rest of the world seems to be getting their growth under control. Some of these countries are recovering from recessions, but some of these countries just have sound economic practices.

The embarrassing thing about this chart, 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? One of the questions asked sometimes is, 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. Things get interest payments accelerate rapidly in times of accelerating debt.

We see here a projection, again based on figures from the Congressional
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 one 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.

We see that 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. Two-fifths of our total debt is loaned to us, basically, by other countries. Other countries, 26 percent.

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 borrower 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 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 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 debt, 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, if we have too much tax expenditure 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 problem.

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 need to be very aware of how this is happening in the market.

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 great detail, but we had tax extenders, tax reductions, and tax rates that were extended without accounting on the other side for the spending.

We had a major tax bill, which is still debated in this Chamber as to whether it was the right idea or not. What is indisputable about that tax bill was that it drove incredibly increasing deficits and incredibly and rapidly increasing debt.

Then, finally, we had a budget agreement, last year, to raise the amount of spending. There is nothing wrong with raising the amount of spending, per se, if it is a public judgment and a policy judgment that that is the best thing for our country. What is wrong is to pretend that there is no consequence to our deficit, debt, and national fiscal policy.

What do we do about it? By the way, I want to go back to that point. We are second round debating 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. 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.

That is not what we are talking about here. 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 if 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 risk. 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 cut 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.
This is an insidious situation. The consequences of deficits and debt are not apparent right up front. They don’t catch up with us for a long time. But I think we all know, deep down, that we have a problem and that is not true.

And the second thing we have to do, at some point, is simply make a plan and implement it. And that is what our Democratic Blue Dog Coalition has done and will try to do going forward.

We have tried to come up with a blueprint for fiscal responsibility, which today, we endorsed and released. And these are a series of points that we believe need to be pursued in order to have some chance at fiscal responsibility and sustainability over time.

From that perspective, I am very pleased that I am joined today by my colleague from Utah (Mr. McADAMS), my 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 barreling 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 Coalition, of which I am a proud member, has a well-deserved reputation for talking the talk and walking the walk when it comes to fiscal responsibility.

Look at 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 was 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, clear with taxpayers for every dollar we spent. Do elected officials face tough tradeoffs? Yes, absolutely. That comes with the job. Just as hardworking families and small business owners must do, you must work together, and we, in Congress, must work together to set priorities 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 reductions. If not, we must not 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 improvements.

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 paid for quickly to respond when 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 $68,000 as Representative CASE has highlighted as their share of the national debt. We will all be morally 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 an 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 of all the offi-cials 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 as a mayor. 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 meritori-ous 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 when it all is over, 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 make 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 re-ductions, 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 were 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?
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.

Mr. CASE. 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 budget, and then 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 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 had an independent commission set up to reform the rules of 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—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 because of 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 800,000 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 and staff expressed frustration regarding 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 the Congress of experts, hopefully on a neutral basis and hopefully on a nonpartisan 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 do—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 want to 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 commonsense, 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 SLOVAKIA, EXPENDED BETWEEN MAY 30 AND JUNE 3, 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Member or employee</th>
<th>Arrival</th>
<th>Departure</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Per diem 1 Foreign currency U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency 2</th>
<th>Transportation</th>
<th>Other purposes</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Gerald Connolly</td>
<td>5/30</td>
<td>6/3</td>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>1,222.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Michael Turner</td>
<td>5/30</td>
<td>6/3</td>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>1,222.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Brett Guthrie</td>
<td>5/30</td>
<td>6/3</td>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>1,222.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Linda Sanchez</td>
<td>5/30</td>
<td>6/3</td>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>1,222.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Susan Davis</td>
<td>5/30</td>
<td>6/3</td>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>1,222.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Neal Dunn</td>
<td>5/30</td>
<td>6/3</td>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>1,222.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. James Sensenberger</td>
<td>5/30</td>
<td>6/3</td>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>1,222.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Paul Cook</td>
<td>5/30</td>
<td>6/3</td>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>1,222.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. James Costa</td>
<td>5/30</td>
<td>6/3</td>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>1,222.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Brendan Boyce</td>
<td>5/31</td>
<td>6/3</td>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>917.10, 3,382.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Frank Vela</td>
<td>5/31</td>
<td>6/3</td>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>917.10, 3,382.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. John Shimkus</td>
<td>5/30</td>
<td>6/3</td>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>1,222.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collin E. Gentle</td>
<td>5/30</td>
<td>6/3</td>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>1,222.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam H. K.3</td>
<td>5/30</td>
<td>6/3</td>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>1,222.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmond Rice</td>
<td>5/30</td>
<td>6/3</td>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>1,222.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate Kroushus</td>
<td>5/30</td>
<td>6/3</td>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>1,222.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17,119.20</td>
<td>3,382.20</td>
<td>226.02</td>
<td>20,727.42</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.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO MEXICO, EXPENDED BETWEEN JUNE 5 AND JUNE 8, 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Member or employee</th>
<th>Arrival</th>
<th>Departure</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Per diem 1 Foreign currency U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency 2</th>
<th>Transportation</th>
<th>Other purposes</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Katherine L. Mengoth</td>
<td>6/5</td>
<td>6/8</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>1,272.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Jaime L. Marois</td>
<td>6/5</td>
<td>6/8</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>1,272.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,544.00</td>
<td>863.63</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,407.63</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.

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>Arrival</th>
<th>Departure</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Per diem 1 Foreign currency U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency 2</th>
<th>Transportation</th>
<th>Other purposes</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Nancy Pelosi</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/9</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Kevin McCarthy</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/9</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Ewart Engle</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/9</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Mark Takano</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/9</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Don Young</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/9</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Anna Eshoo</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/9</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Max Thurnberry</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/9</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Ron Kind</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/9</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. James Langevin</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/9</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Stephen Lynch</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/9</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Oddie Amstutz-Bergner</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/9</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. D.K. Butterfield</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/9</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Mike Cinnery</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/9</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. James Smith</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/9</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Jeff Fienberg</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/9</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Louis Goh</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/9</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Penny Marchant</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/9</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Mike McGee</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/9</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Debra Wasserman Schultz</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/9</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Ed Perlmutter</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/9</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Bob Land</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/9</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Jackie Speer</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/9</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>2,590.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></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.

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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Member or employee</th>
<th>Arrival</th>
<th>Departure</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Per diem</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 Bucshon</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 Hurd</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 Brownly</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 Cartwright</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 Ruster</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 Walenz</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. Donald Norcross</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 Babin</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 Loudermilk</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. Elise Stefanik</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 Hamrung</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 Pachetti</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 Suozzo</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 Cisneros</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 Sherill</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>Hon. Lee Zeldin</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>Myrden 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 Berett</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>Patti 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>Kerney 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>Bill Doughtam</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>Brittan Specht</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 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>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 Leinweber</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>Valeria 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

|                         | 188,561.00 | 1,947.63 | 190,508.63 |

1 Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

2 If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent, if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

3 Military air transportation.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ETHICS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1, AND JUNE 30, 2019

- **Please Note:** If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return.

HON. NANCY PELOSI, July 8, 2019.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2019

- **Please Note:** If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return.

HON. THEODORE E. DEUTCH, July 9, 2019.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON RULES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2019

- **Please Note:** If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return.


1 Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

2 If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent, if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
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 pursuant to the Antideficiency Act, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1331; Public Law 97-258; 96 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 111-203, Sec. 308 (as amended by Public Law 101-73, Sec. 308 (as amended by Public Law 101-576, Sec. 306(a)); (104 Stat. 2854); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1681. A letter from the Attorney, CG-LRA, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drainbridge Operation Regulation; Shrewsbury River, Monmouth County Highway Bridge, Sea Bright, New Jersey [Docket No.: USCG-2017-0460] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 15, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1682. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Fireworks Display, Denver, CO [Docket Number: USCG-2019-0698] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 15, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1683. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Independence Day Fireworks Display; Port of Redwood City, Redwood City, CA [Docket No.: USCG-2019-0649] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 15, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1684. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Independence Day Fireworks Display; Port of Redwood City, Redwood City, CA [Docket No.: USCG-2019-0637] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 15, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1685. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Independence Day Fireworks Display; Port of Redwood City, Redwood City, CA [Docket No.: USCG-2019-0630] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 15, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.
Drug Control Policy to publish a list of drug control grant programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MCHENRY:
H.R. 3821. A bill to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act to make improvements to the regulation of consumer reporting agencies and protect consumers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. DOGGETT (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. GARCIA of Illinois, and Mr. TONKO):
H.R. 3822. A bill to amend titles 23 and 49, United States Code, to require metropolitan planning organizations to consider greenhouse gas emissions in long-range transportation plans and transportation improvement programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BOST (for himself, Mr. CLAY, Mr. SHIMKUS, and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois):
H.R. 3823. A bill to ensure that health professions opportunity demonstration projects train project participants to earn a recognized postsecondary credential, and to clarify that community colleges are eligible to conduct such a demonstration project; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VARGAS (for himself, Mr. PAINTER, Mr. COOK, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. CARDEÑAS, Mr. TAKANO, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mr. KNANNA, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. CINNARROS, Mr. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. CABRAL, Mr. PETERS, Ms. SPIERL, Mr. CORREA, Mr. COX of California, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. DELAUNOY, Ms. PADEL, Mr. COSTA, and Mrs. DAVIS of California):
H.R. 3824. 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. PETTENKER, Mr. BOST, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. BANKS, and Mr. BILIRAKIS):
H.R. 3826. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to prohibit the Secretary of Veterans Affairs from transmitting certain information to the Department of Justice for use by the national instant criminal background check system; to the Committee on Veteran’s Affairs.

By Mr. CASTRO of Texas (for himself, Mr. CUÉLLAR, Mr. GALLEGO, Ms. PAINE, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. MILLER, Mr. BARRAGÁN, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. HALAND, Mr. SOTO, Mr. LUJÁN, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. PORTER, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. GARCIA of California, Mr. CABRAL, Mr. SINGH, Mr. SERRAS, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. MENG, Ms. MUCCASREL-POWELL, Mr. HSDAHL, Mr. CINNARROS, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. ENGLIS, Ms. OCASIO-CORTÉZ, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. Sánchez, Mr. VERAAY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. HURD of Texas, Mr. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLON of Puerto Rico, Ms. HILL of California, Ms. MORENTHAL, and Mr. PALACIOS):
H.R. 3827. A bill to promote and support collaboration between Hispanic-serving institutions and Hispanic-serving school districts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CRENSHAW (for himself, Mr. CUÉLLAR, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. FLORES, Mr. LAMB, and Mr. WALBERGER):
H.R. 3828. 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, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. POCAN, Mr. HUNTER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. KING of New York, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. CARSON of Washington, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. GOLDEN, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. NOBREGA, and Mrs. LURIA):
H.R. 3829. 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 Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on 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. WALBERG (for himself and Mr. COOPER):
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 land owned 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 Alabama):
H.R. 3832. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for deductions 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. 3841. 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 individuals, 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. KOCHAKO (for himself, Mr. WELCH, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. MOORE, and Mr. BALLS)

H.R. 3842. 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 testing requirements; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KEATING (for himself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. COHEN, Mr. ADERHOLT, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. HUDSON, Ms. MOORE, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. SUGOZZI, and Mr. MALONEY)

H.R. 3843. A bill to promote international efforts in combating corruption, kleptocracy, and illicit finance by foreign officials and businesses, 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 Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. KHANNA (for himself and Mr. POE)

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, Mr. PORTER, Mr. HINES, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. SCHEFFER, Mr. PERLMUTTER, and Mrs. MURPHY)

H.R. 3845. A bill to authorize a grant program that strengthens the capacity of community organizations described through alignment with national service programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LUJÁN (for himself, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. COLE, Ms. HAAJ, Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico, Mr. O’HALLERAN, Mrs. RADENWALD, Mr. COOK, Ms. McCOLOM, Mr. CASE, and Mr. LA MALFA)

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. HODGSON, Mr. CLINE, Ms. GOTTLEIB, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. GRIFFITH, Ms. WEXTON, and Mr. CONNOLLY)

H.R. 3847. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Courthouse located at 117 West Poythress Street in Hopewell, Virginia, as the “Reverend Curtis West Harris Post Office Building”; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. POCAN (for himself, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. GARCIA of Illinois, Mr. GRAVEN, 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 broker-dealers to ensure when soliciting 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. HERRERA, Ms. HUNDELEY 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 assisted maternity care services from contributions limits and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WELCH (for himself, Mr. BILLIiken, Mr. TIBURON, Ms. PRESSLEY, 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. PINHURST, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. JAYAPAL, 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 at points of entry 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. NORТОN)

H.R. 3853. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to increase under the Medicare program the monthly minimum 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. KAPITUR)

H.R. 3854. A bill to direct the Secretary of Labor to recognize employers with a commitment to helping employees balance work and family responsibilities and family obligations; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. ALVAREZ (for herself and Mr. BAIRDSON)

H.R. 3855. A bill to improve commercialization activities in the SBIR and STTR programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business, and in addition to the Committees on Science, Space, and Technology, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota

H.R. 3860. A bill to establish a consortium of universities to advise the Secretary in the event of a cybersecurity incident requiring the deployment of forces for active defense on cybersecurity matters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. KAPTUR (for herself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Mr. HARRIS)
H. Res. 502. A resolution congratulating the United States Women’s National Team for its win on July 7, 2019, of the 2019 Fédération 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 Mr. MASTEFY:


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. CINNERS, 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 I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. ROUDA:

H.R. 3820.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, 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:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the explicit power of Congress to regulate commerce as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 3. Additionally, Article I, Section 8, Clause 2 allows for every bill passed by the House of Representatives and the Senate and signed by the President to be made law, and therefore implicitly allows Congress to amend any legislation that has been passed by both chambers and signed into law by the President.

By Mr. DOGGETT:

H.R. 3822.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. BOST:

H.R. 3823.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. VARGAS:

H.R. 3824.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

(1) To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution;

(2) To establish post offices and post roads as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 7 of the U.S. Constitution; and

(3) To make all laws necessary and proper for executing powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CASTRO of Texas:

H.R. 3825.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, which states “[t]he Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States”.

By Mr. CRAGH of Texas:

H.R. 3826.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, which states “[t]he Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States”.

By Mr. CASTRO of Texas:

H.R. 3827.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution—Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. I, Sec. 8, Clause 18)

The U.S. CONSTITUTION

ARTICLE I, SECTION 8: POWERS OF CONGRESS

CLAUSE 18

The Congress shall have power . . . To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

By Mr. CRENSHAW:

H.R. 3828.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clauses 1, 3, & 18

By Mr. GARAMENDI:

H.R. 3829.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. WALBERG:

H.R. 3830.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7—No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:

H.R. 3831.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. BEYER:

H.R. 3832.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8: The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Ms. BONAMICI:

H.R. 3833.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 8, Section 1 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 3834.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution—General Welfare Clause.

By Mr. DeSaulnier:

H.R. 3835.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution, which gives Congress the power “to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.”

By Mr. FOSTER:

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, Clauses 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:

Article I, Section 8, of the U.S. Constitution

By Ms. HOULAHAN:

H.R. 3839.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota:

H.R. 3840.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, of the U.S. Constitution

By Ms. KAPTUR:

H.R. 3841.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. KATKO:

H.R. 3842.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8: The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. KEATING:

H.R. 3843.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. KHAAN:

H.R. 3545.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. KILMER:

H.R. 3545.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. LIJAN:

H.R. 3546.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendment, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. McEACHIN:

H.R. 3547.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution

By Mr. POCAN:

H.R. 3548.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have Power To . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. WELCH:

H.R. 3549.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have Power To . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. WEXTON:

H.R. 3551.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have Power To . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. WEXTON:

H.R. 3553.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. MCDERMOT:

H.R. 3554.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. MCDERMOT:

H.R. 3555.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution

By Mr. MCDERMOT:

H.R. 3556.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendment, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. MCDERMOT:

H.R. 3557.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have Power To . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. MCDERMOT:

H.R. 3558.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution

By Mr. MCDERMOT:

H.R. 3559.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have Power To . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. WEXTON:

H.R. 3561.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have Power To . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. WEXTON:

H.R. 3562.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have Power To . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. WEXTON:

H.R. 3563.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. CICILLINE:

H.R. 3564.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution

By Mr. MCDERMOT:

H.R. 3565.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have Power To . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. WEXTON:

H.R. 3567.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have Power To . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. WEXTON:

H.R. 3568.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution

By Mr. MCDERMOT:

H.R. 3569.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have Power To . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. MCDERMOT:

H.R. 3570.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. MCDERMOT:

H.R. 3571.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have Power To . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. WEXTON:

H.R. 3572.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have Power To . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. WEXTON:

H.R. 3573.
BEYER, Mrs. McCATH, and Mrs. Davis of California.
H.R. 3290: Mr. Garamendi.
H.R. 3303: Mr. Panetta and Mr. Fitzpatrick.
H.R. 3366: Mr. Cline and Mr. Norman.
H.R. 3319: Mr. Baird.
H.R. 3349: Mr. Wright.
H.R. 3356: Mr. Riggs.
H.R. 3362: Mr. Young.
H.R. 3369: Mr. Lawson of Florida and Mr. Rush.
H.R. 3375: Mr. Cline, Mr. Cunningham, Mr. Rutherford, Mr. Larson of Connecticut, Mr. Pappas, Mr. Johnson of Georgia, Ms. Speier, Mr. Lawson of Florida, Ms. Blunt Rochester, Mr. Carson of Indiana, Mr. Costello, Mr. Morelle, Ms. Bonamici, Ms. Cheney, Mr. Burchett, Mr. Stewart, Mr. Riddle, Mr. Stager, and Mr. David P. Roe of Tennessee.
H.R. 3394: Ms. Judy Chu of California and Mrs. Watson Coleman.
H.R. 3396: Mr. Perlmutter.
H.R. 3425: Mr. Gallagher.
H.R. 3437: Ms. Garcia of Texas.
H.R. 3452: Mr. Aguilar.
H.R. 3497: Mr. Balderson.
H.R. 3502: Mr. Holding, Mr. Posey, Mr. Meuser, Ms. Johnson of Texas, Mr. Cox of California, Mrs. Hartlzheimer, Mrs. McCathy, Mr. Allen, Mr. Hagedorn, Mr. Norman, Mr. Basin, Mr. Abraham, and Mrs. Fletcher.
H.R. 3512: Ms. Brownley of California.
H.R. 3515: Mr. Riddleman, Mr. Cramer, and Mr. Kevin Hirt of Oklahoma.
H.R. 3524: Mr. Liu.Img
H.R. 3576: Mr. Grijalva, Mr. Lawson of Florida, Mr. Lamb, Mr. Porter, Mr. Slottkin, Mr. Cox of California, and Mrs. Napelitano.
H.R. 3580: Mr. Watkins, Mr. Gianforte, Mr. Bacon, and Mr. Timmons.
H.R. 3582: Mr. Grijalva and Mr. Costa.
H.R. 3586: Mr. Morelle, Mr. Shires, Mr. Bishop of Georgia, Ms. Wexton, Mr. Lipinski, Ms. Kendra S. Horn of Oklahoma, Mr. Foster, Ms. Porter, Mr. Meeks, Ms. Haaland, Mr. Pappas, Ms. Moore, Ms. Johnson of Texas, Mr. McAdams, Mr. Cummings, Mr. Lanevin, Mr. Johnson of Georgia, Mr. Van Drew, Mr. McCaskill, Ms. Plaskett, Mr. Smith of Missouri, Mrs. Watson Coleman, Mr. Stanton, Ms. Hill of California, Ms. Torres Small of New Mexico, Ms. Kelly of Illinois, Mrs. Lawrence, Mr. Larsen of Washington, Mr. Curtis, and Mr. Brindisi.
H.R. 3598: Mr. Moulton, Miss Rice of New York, and Mrs. Lee of Nevada.
H.R. 3607: Mr. Fitzpatrick.
H.R. 3609: Mr. Grijalva.
H.R. 3655: Mr. Balderson.
H.R. 3667: Mr. Garcia of Illinois.
H.R. 3670: Ms. Sherrill and Ms. Spanberger.
H.R. 3691: Mr. Taylor.
H.R. 3697: Mr. Pallone.
H.R. 3702: Mr. Cleaveland.
H.R. 3722: Mr. Taylor and Mr. Meadows.
H.R. 3739: Mrs. Lenkoff.
H.R. 3745: Mr. Levin of Michigan and Ms. Clarke of New York.
H.R. 3776: Mr. Ruppersberger and Mrs. Kirkpatrick.
H.R. 3778: Ms. Wasserman Schultz, Ms. Royal-Allard, and Mr. Aguilar.
H.R. 3782: Mr. Fitzpatrick.
H.R. 3794: Mr. Case, Ms. Matsui, and Mr. Thompson of California.
H.R. 3808: Ms. DeLauro, Mr. Pressley, Mr. Nadler, Mr. Grijalva, Mr. Lee of California, Mr. Kilmer, Ms. Judy Chu of California, Mr. Swalwell of California, and Mr. Cucelar.
H.R. 3816: Mr. Guest and Mr. Baird.
H.J. Res. 72: Miss Rice of New York, Mr. Raskin, and Mrs. Luria.
H. Con. Res. 27: Mr. Estes.
H. Con. Res. 52: Mr. Panetta and Mr. Doggett.
H. Res. 54: Mr. Castro of Texas.
H. Res. 60: Mr. Griffith.
H. Res. 189: Mr. Taylor, Mr. DeFazio, Mr. Stewart, and Mr. Butterfield.
H. Res. 246: Ms. Blunt Rochester, Mr. Graves of Louisiana, and Mr. Timmons.
H. Res. 358: Ms. Eshoo.
H. Res. 374: Mrs. Rodgers of Washington.
H. Res. 396: Mr. Quigley.
H. Res. 419: Mr. Hill of Arkansas.
H. Res. 484: Ms. McCollum and Mr. Kind.
H. Res. 486: Mr. Gonzalez of Ohio.
H. Res. 487: Mr. Costa, Mr. Quigley, Mr. Cicilline, Mr. Shires, and Mr. Trone.
H. Res. 493: Mr. Duncan and Mr. Riggleman.
H. Res. 495: Mr. Thompson of California and Mr. Garcia of Illinois.
H. Res. 501: Mr. Smith of Washington, Ms. Sewell of Alabama, Ms. Wild, Mrs. Lawrence, Mr. Trone, and Mr. Horsford.
The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. GRASSLEY).

PRAYER
The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:
Let us pray.
O Lord, our God, You soar on the wings of the wind. May our lives delight You. As our lawmakers seek to fulfill Your purposes, impart to them Your wisdom. Lord, pursue and overtake their enemies so that Your will may be accomplished on Earth. Show our Senators Your loving kindness, enabling them to serve You faithfully. Sustain us all with Your love, for we find our joy in You. Show mercy to the merciful, purity to the pure, and justice to the upright.
We pray in Your great Name. Amen.

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 PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH). Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.
The Senator from Iowa.
Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for 1 minute.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNITED STATES-MEXICO-CANADA TRADE AGREEMENT
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.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. 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 MAJORITY LEADER
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

MCCREARY COUNTY AND DEPUTY SHERIFF DUSTIN WATKINS
Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, first, this morning I would like to join Kentuckians in McCreary County in breathing a sigh of relief. Deputy Sheriff Dustin Watkins was responding to a routine call on Tuesday evening when he was shot and needed to be airlifted to a hospital. Fortunately, we heard yesterday afternoon that Deputy Watkins is in stable condition. I understand that last night he was able to sit up for the first time—all good news.

With Sheriff Randy Waters, I wish to extend sincere thanks to the doctors, nurses, and hospital staff who are caring for this brave Kentuckian and will support his recovery. My best wishes go out to Deputy Watkins, his family, and his colleagues. We thank them for their service to our Commonwealth as we are reminded once again of the sacrifices they make every day to keep us safe.

TREATIES AND HOUSE LEGISLATIVE AGENDA
Mr. McCONNELL. 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 좌의 우익도 텔레비전 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 trotted 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 on the trouble, but made the problem worse. The 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, the House has refused to act on S. 1, the foreign policy legislation that we here in the Senate passed back in February. This bipartisan bill included a provision to take on the Boycott, Divestment, and Sanctions movement, an economic form of anti-Semitism that targets Israel.

Here in the Senate, taking action against BDS was a bipartisan goal. I am a passionate opponent of the BDS movement. I know my friend the Democratic leader opposes BDS as well, and S. 1 earned 77 votes here in the Senate back then.

But apparently it is a bridge too far for this Democratic House. Even a milder resolution simply condemning BDS—not doing anything about it, but condemning it—has become a lightning rod for the far left this very week.

Reports indicate that “senior progressive Democrats are organizing House leaders to walk away from the resolution that opposes BDS—a resolution, not the thing that we passed, which is much stronger. So the House will not take action against it, and now it seems they can’t even merely condemn it. They can’t even condemn it. In fact, the far left wants to defend BDS.

I guess this is where we are. Elected members of the Democratic Party are openly urging their leadership not to make them vote on condemning anti-Semitism. Let’s say that again. The far left in the House wants to defend BDS.

I urge the Speaker of the House to do the right thing. Don’t let these far-left voices run the show. At long last, bring S. 1 up for a vote—the comprehensive legislation that sailed through the Senate with 77 votes. Bring it up for a vote, Madam Speaker. Let them vote. I bet they will get out and show and condemn anti-Semitism the door.

ECONOMIC GROWTH

Mr. McCONNEL, Madam President, earlier this week, I spoke about the economic pain that many Americans felt under the last administration’s leftist policies and all the Trump administration and Republicans in Congress have done to turn the page.

Today in Kentucky, 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 helping dislocated miners and their families. And then these mass layoffs overnight. This very month, we have seen two more major coal producers in Kentucky move toward bankruptcy.

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.

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 on the trouble, but made the problem worse. The 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, the House has refused to act on S. 1, the foreign policy legislation that we here in the Senate passed back in February. This bipartisan bill included a provision to take on the Boycott, Divestment, and Sanctions movement, an economic form of anti-Semitism that targets Israel.

But apparently it is a bridge too far for this Democratic House. Even a milder resolution simply condemning BDS—not doing anything about it, but condemning it—has become a lightning rod for the far left this very week.

Reports indicate that “senior progressive Democrats are organizing House leaders to walk away from the resolution that opposes BDS—a resolution, not the thing that we passed, which is much stronger. So the House will not take action against it, and now it seems they can’t even merely condemn it. They can’t even condemn it. In fact, the far left wants to defend BDS.

I guess this is where we are. Elected members of the Democratic Party are openly urging their leadership not to make them vote on condemning anti-Semitism. Let’s say that again. The far left in the House wants to defend BDS.

I urge the Speaker of the House to do the right thing. Don’t let these far-left voices run the show. At long last, bring S. 1 up for a vote—the comprehensive legislation that sailed through the Senate with 77 votes. Bring it up for a vote, Madam Speaker. Let them vote. I bet they will get out and show and condemn anti-Semitism the door.
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 intrusions on the 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 this Republican Senate has anything to do, we’ll be able to stop these ideas in their tracks.

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 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 passed laws that protect children 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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

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.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, last night, we saw the President of the United States, who has spent years maligning women, continue to malign Americans. The President once again whipped up a toxic brew of racism, xenophobia, and nativism, with his crowd chanting “send her back” about a duly 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 shouted at the rally last night without the President’s upbraid- ing 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.
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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 used for very bad purposes. We need to make sure that the assurances we have received are true. For the sake of our futures we need the facts. The potential for our facial data and the data from all of our friends and families contained in our photos to fall into the hands of something like Russian intelligence or the Russian military is really troubling. I strongly urge the FTC and the FBI to get to the bottom of FaceApp.

**BORDER SECURITY**

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 inhuman conditions, without the proper healthcare, nutrition, hygiene, or space. People 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.

This weekend, I am leading a visit to the border with my delegation of 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 briefly report to the American people and to the Senate on what we find.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore OF THE SENATE. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KAINES. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

**BORDER SECURITY**

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.

On Sunday, my wife and I, who live in Richmond, went to a town called Kilmarnock, 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.

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.

For the first 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—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.

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?”

“A plumbline,” I replied.

Then the Lord said, “Look, I am setting a plumbline among my people Israel: I will spare them no longer. 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.

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 Kilmarnock 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 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 settle 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 in fact 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 behaving 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.

Sunday was also another day. It was Woody Guthrie’s birthday. Woody Guthrie was a great American songwriter known for “This Land Is Your Land” and so many other songs that are part of who we are as a people. Woody Guthrie wrote a song in 1948 called “Plane Wreck at Los Gatos,” and the song is more commonly known by the name “Deportee.” We lived this history before.

In 1948 in California, there was an effort to deport so many people. There are times when we desperately want immigrants here to do the work, and then there are phases where they get deported.

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.

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.”

Here are the lyrics to the Woody Guthrie song written based on an incident in January 1948, but our history repeats itself.

The crops are all in and the peaches are rotting.
The oranges piled in their creosote dumps;
They’re flying ‘em back to the Mexican border.
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,
All they will call you will be “deportees”
My father’s own father, he waded that river,
All they will call you will be “deportees.”
They took all the money he made in his life;
My brothers and sisters came working the fruit trees,
And they rode the truck till they took down and died.
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 face 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 would receive three meals 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 presented. 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 plumber of right and wrong is applied to us, we are on the right side. It puts us in a position where 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 in being to people who are suffering—we want the plumbline that separates those that are morally strong versus those that are not, and I think that is the most important about the bill.

How make a child of tender years make that choice? The young girl's name was Sofia. Many of us know the Virginia Apgar, author of "Sophie's Choice," and his book "Sophie's Choice." Sophie is forced to make an existential choice between her children in a concentration camp in Poland during World War II. That is the choice. That is the existential choice in the heart of that novel.

When tiny Sofia is being told: We are separating your mother and father, and you have to choose between them, should a child have to do that? None of us would tolerate that for our own family members, we wouldn't tolerate that for a member of our community. So is it fair to do that to a child of tender years because she happens to be somebody who has come from Central America? These issues are of immense importance to those involved, to the Sophies, to the father and daughter who tried to get across a river a few weeks ago and drowned as they were trying to do it. They had come thousands of miles, and they were so close. All they wanted to do was apply for asylum legally: Can you accept my application? We are not trying to sneak across. We want to apply legally and have the laws of your country apply to us if we can justify that we should come. Please do that.

When they reached the border, we are taking so few applications now that they waited and they waited and they waited, and they eventually tried to cross a river and were drowned in the process—that heartbreaking picture of them having come so far and being so close that they could touch the bank. They almost got to touch the bank of this nation they had dreamed might offer them a better life.

Their case, had they been able to apply, may or may not have been accepted. There is no guarantee they would have met the standards, but all they wanted was the opportunity to apply to enter this greatest Nation on Earth. So I will just conclude and say I hope, in the days ahead—and I know there are discussions going on between Members of this body and between Members of this body and the White House about what we might do. I just want us to do something that we can look in the mirror and be proud of. I want us to do something that we can use as an example for ourselves and for others.

We have an enormous debt left over after World War II. That was the triggering mechanism for them. Throughout the Korean war, for instance, they didn't raise the debt ceiling. They found ways to find fiscal restraint because they had so much debt. They even seem to be the conversation anymore. Now debt ceiling conversations are about what bill will we get into to make sure it passes so we can just keep going. That moment of determining how we can deal with fiscal restraint seems to be gone.

Let me state just how severe this has become. Right now, our current debt to GDP—that is, gross national product—our debt compared to our gross national product is at 78 percent. That is an enormous number. That means, if you take all of the American economy, every single person in the entire country, group it all together, what they receive in pay, what they make, and put it all together, it would take 78 percent of every single person in the country to pay off our debt for an entire year.

If we were to maintain that debt-to-GDP ratio at 78 percent, just not get worse than where we are at $22 trillion right now. We asked the Congressional Budget Office how much we would either have to raise in taxes or cut in spending each year to not make it worse. The answer that came back from the Congressional Budget Office was $400 billion, but the hard part about that—not that $400 billion is not bad enough—we would have to cut or raise in taxes $400 billion every single year for 30 years in a row. That is not the original $400 billion but a new $400 billion every year for 30 years in a row. That is going to happen. There is not the will in this Congress to reduce
$400 billion this year much less do it every single year for 30 years in a row.

So my simple push is this. We have to get to a real conversation about what we are going to do about our debt and how we are going to respond to this.

I have committed, around any kind of debt ceiling conversation, that the conversation should not be about just raising it and going on; it should be about how we are going to address our debt. We cannot support a debt ceiling that just raises the debt ceiling without any consideration about what we are going to do to actually pay off that debt or how we are going to get on top of it.

We have a broken process. We are not dealing with debt when we talk about debt ceilings anymore, and we are facing a September 30 deadline. There is already an ongoing rumor and conversation around the hallways about could we have another government shutdown.

In the last 40 years, we have had 21 government shutdowns—21—under Republican and Democratic Presidents and under Republican and Democratic Congresses. The one that happened earlier this year was the longest one in history, but that doesn’t mean it is the longest one that will ever happen. There may be a longer one coming. The challenge is, how do we solve this issue about debt?

How do we deal with some of the simple processes like government shutdowns and how do we stop these?

Government shutdowns actually cause more spending to happen because it costs so much to prepare for it. When it happens, there is a greater cost, and when restarting it, there is greater cost again. All of that is lost money. It is just a waste.

So Senator MAGGIE HASSAN, the Democrat from New Hampshire, and I have worked together to put a simple proposal together to stop government shutdowns. This is not rocket science. Most Americans can’t leave their work and walk away, especially if they are small business owners. They can’t walk away from their jobs unless the job is done. That is just the nature of it. So our simple idea is this: Federal workers should be held harmless, and Members of Congress and Senate, our staff, and to members of the Office of Management and Budget is the same precious commodity every American has. It is time—time.

If we lose the time so we can’t do all of the other things we need to do until we get the budget work done, we will get the budget work done because there are a lot of things on our schedule, but our first priority should be the budget work that needs to be done.

This puts us in a position to basically do what my mom did to my brother and me. When my brother and I had an argument, my mom would lock the two of us in a room and say: You guys work this out. When you are done, you can come out of the room, but you guys keep talking until you settle it. Quite frankly, my mom would be a pretty good role model for this Congress. Lock us in the room, keep us debating until we solve it.

We had the longest shutdown in American history this past time, and it started right before Christmas. What did the Members of Congress do? They left. They may say: So what, they went home for Christmas. They went away. While Federal workers did not have their paychecks coming in, Members of Congress, our staff, and the Senate, would all be here in Washington, DC, with no travel.

It is as simple and straightforward as this: Federal workers should be held harmless, and Members of Congress should be kept to stay and work it out.

Senator HASSAN and I continue to work through this. We gained wide bipartisan support. It went through the first of two committees—10 to 2 as it passed the committee. Now it has a second committee to go through before it comes here. We want to build bipartisan support to say: We will have disagreements on budget. We will have disagreements on many other things, but we should keep debating until we solve it. But do not loop the Federal workers and their families into this, and certainly don’t harm the taxpayers in the process.

We look forward to trying to get some things resolved in this place and to keeping the debate going until we do.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to ask my colleagues a simple question. We are facing 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 speeding 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 said it won’t do it because the American 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 humane protection for the American people 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 that 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 mere fantasy 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 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 don't think the courts are eventually ever 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 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 a plan to keep 20 million people insured and keep preexisting condition 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 decision? How many Americans are ready for that?

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 box checking the result of 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 in this country? 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. The love of his life was his truck, and his dream was to join the Army's famed 75th Ranger Regiment, which tells you once again that the lives of these men—soldiers like Ben—changed the lives of those who knew them.

Ben was a young man who never met his mother, Jill, who has devoted her life to the service of veterans. 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 mysterious 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. SCOTT of South Carolina. The nomination was confirmed.

The nomination was confirmed.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR
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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 was 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 but that Mexico is doing to help solve nobody is compounding from Mexico: they are coming through Mexico. Where they are working to make our cars, they are coming through Mexico. Why aren’t they coming from Mexico like we have? The President is trying to help us solve. Almost everybody good for us. We have these problems among our countries.

Trade increases our economic security, but it also increases our national security. Living in a good neighborhood is what we all want to do, and that is the value we have seen out of this agreement for the last 25 years. The agreement could have been better, and the President has made it better. The USMCA is going to be better than NAFTA. No NAFTA would be a bad thing; NAFTA replaced by USMCA would be a good thing.

It is time that we begin to stand on what we have learned in those 25 years and move into this century with a new agreement that works for farming families, for ranching families, for workers, for people who make automobiles, airplanes, and other things. This leads to more American jobs, and it leads to great benefit for us economically.

But, again, let me repeat, the national security impact of having two neighbors to work with, that we just saw the President negotiate with Mexico, where they are helping secure that much narrower border at the southern tip of Mexico more than we would be able to do at the much bigger northern border, that is helpful. They are not helping to help people stay there where their cases are being heard, that is helpful to our country. It is easier to keep people there and have their cases heard than let them disperse throughout the entire United States.

Certainly, we hope to gain from the new USMCA treaty, but we hope our neighbors also benefit from that treaty and know they will. The three countries all signed this agreement in November. Mexico has ratified it already. The Prime Minister of Canada says they stand ready to call their Parliament back into session to ratify it. As soon as it is clear, they are going to.

Trade is essential. All three of our countries agree on that. Democrats and Republicans agree on that. Members of the House and Senate agree on that.

What we just saw the President negotiate is a great benefit for us economically. It is time that we begin to build on the strong Canada is good for us. The daily trade over that Canadian-U.S. border—things passing back and forth—is incredible and has been for a long time, but it is also much stronger than it used to be. Keeping these connections strong is essential.

Trade increases our economic security, but it also increases our national security. Living in a good neighborhood is what we all want to do, and that is the value we have seen out of this agreement for the last 25 years. The agreement could have been better, and the President has made it better. The USMCA is going to be better than NAFTA. No NAFTA would be a bad thing; NAFTA replaced by USMCA would be a good thing.

It is time that we begin to stand on what we have learned in those 25 years and move into this century with a new agreement that works for farming families, for ranching families, for workers, for people who make automobiles, airplanes, and other things. This leads to more American jobs, and it leads to great benefit for us economically.

But, again, let me repeat, the national security impact of having two neighbors to work with, that we just saw the President negotiate with Mexico, where they are helping secure that much narrower border at the southern tip of Mexico more than we would be able to do at the much bigger northern border, that is helpful. They are not helping to help people stay there where their cases are being heard, that is helpful to our country. It is easier to keep people there and have their cases heard than let them disperse throughout the entire United States.

Certainly, we hope to gain from the new USMCA treaty, but we hope our neighbors also benefit from that treaty and know they will. The three countries all signed this agreement in November. Mexico has ratified it already. The Prime Minister of Canada says they stand ready to call their Parliament back into session to ratify it. As soon as it is clear, they are going to.

Trade is essential. All three of our countries agree on that. Democrats and Republicans agree on that. Members of the House and Senate agree on that.

Now, I will tell you this: We have come to a season in our society where we have 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 the 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 that. 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 the consumer narrative for their products. It is clear that the tech companies 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 the BROWSER Act. This bill really 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 may 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 give 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 be able to develop 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 in the original BROWSERAct 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 open the door to regulating Big Tech at the federal level, 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 want to do whatever it takes to be compliant. I think that is the right attitude because we need to have this tech platform that is being used to 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.

Gov’t—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 value 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. They have 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 until 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 in the Senate as 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 and for asking me 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 data security, prioritization, 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. We know 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 skeptical that we can use a lighter 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 we have in 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—people, 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 seen 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 television as my grandmother, 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 pilots, including Katherine Johnson, Mary Jackson, and Dorothy Vaughn, 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
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 Small Step to Protect Human Heritage in Space Act would permanently protect the Apollo landing sites from intentional and unintentional disturbances 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, archeological, 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 WICHER and Ranking Member MARIA CANTWELL and their staff.

Today I ask the Senate to take one small step in saving 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 is 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 for other purposes.

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:

First of its kind conservation measure to honor and preserve human heritage in space.

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, the first landing on the Moon by humans was made. The Command Module, Columbia, remained in orbit and impacted.

(3) The landing of the Apollo 11 spacecraft and the first human footprint on the Moon 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.

(b) RECOMMENDATIONS DESCRIBED.—The recommendations described in this subsection are NASA’s Recommendations to Space-Faring Entities: How to Protect and Preserve the Historic and Scientific Value of U.S. Government Lunar Artifacts.

(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 from an applicant for a license relating to the agreement under subsection (a)(1).

(d) AUTHORITY TO ASSIGN PENalty FEES.—(1) IN GENERAL.—A Federal agency issuing a license described in subsection (a) may assign a penalty fee amount as follows:

(A) is intended to be lunar in nature, including lunar orbit, landing, and impact.

(B) is associated with the property relating to the agreement under subsection (a)(1).

(C) is intended to be lunar in nature, including lunar orbit, landing, and impact.

(2) AMOUNTS.—The penalty fee amount assessed under paragraph (1) shall be—

(A) of the environmental, cultural, and archaeological significance and value of the property described in paragraph (1).

(B) sufficient to deter future violations.

(e) LUNAR ACTIVITY DEFINED.—In this section, the term “lunar activity” means an action or activity that is intended to be lunar in nature, including lunar orbit, landing, and impact.

Mr. PETE. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that the President’s amendment to the committee-reported substitute amendment be considered and agreed to, and the bill, as amended, be considered read a 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 read the third time.

Mr. PETE. 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 Representa-
tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

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) July 20, 2019, will mark the 50th anniversary of the day 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 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 many other individuals, was 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 exploration of the moon and robotic spacecraft that followed, are of outstanding universal value to humanity.

(7) Such landing sites:

(A) are 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.

(8) On July 20, 2011, NASA published the voluntary guidance entitled "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

(9) The landing site, other similar historic landing sites, and lunar artifacts, and the environment surrounding such sites and artifacts merit protection from disturbance to prevent irreparable loss of sites and artifacts that are of archeological, anthropological, historical, scientific, and engineering significance and value; and

(10) 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 irreparable loss of sites and artifacts that are of archeological, anthropological, historical, scientific, and engineering significance and value; and

(11) The licensing requirements under this Act are designed to protect the historic and scientific value of U.S. government-based lunar activities and therefore have limited efficacy for protecting the Apollo 11 landing site, other similar historic sites, and lunar artifacts from disturbances caused by space-faring entities based outside the United States.

(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 becomes necessary to strengthen the recognition and protection of 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 irreparable 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 LANDING SITES.

(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 lunar activities to include in the license terms the requirement that the applicant from the historic preservation perspective of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration has reviewed the proposed license under subsection (a)(1).

(1) to agree to abide by the recommendations described in subsection (b) in the case of a lunar activity 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 paragraph (1) or (2), as applicable;

(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 consultations with the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, exempt specific lunar activities of an applicant from the historic preservation or certification requirements under subsection (a) if such bona fide activities are determined to have legitimate and significant historical, archeological, anthropological, scientific, or engineering value.

(d) Authority to Assess Penalty Fees.—(1) In General.—A Federal agency issuing a license described in subsection (a) may assess a penalty fee on the holder of such license for conduct that violates one or more terms of the license relating to the agreement under subsection (a)(1).

(2) Amount.—The penalty fee amount assessed under paragraph (1) shall be—

(A) commensurate with the nature and extent of the violation; and

(B) sufficient to deter future violations.

(e) Lunar Activity Defined.—In this section, the term “lunar activity” means an activity to conduct lunar activities to include—

(1) is intended to be lunar in nature, including lunar orbit, landing, and impact; or

(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 out of order and laid upon the table without intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee-reported title amendment in the nature of a substitute 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.

Thanks, as well, to 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 remain for generations to come and that the spirit of Apollo—of ingenuity, of cooperation, and of peace—will inspire generations to come.

Thank you.

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 they will be preserved for future generations so that decades and centuries from now those shoes 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 can continue to 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. I am particularly proud that it will be an American astronaut whose boots will return to the Moon and that we will continue to make history together.

This is a moment to celebrate American leadership, but this is a moment, even more fundamentally, to celebrate what mankind can do—the frontier spirit of discovery and exploration. It is a spirit that should unite us all.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the rollocall vote scheduled for 1:45 p.m. start at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Tapia nomination?

Ms. COLLINS. 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.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Georgia (Mr. Isakson) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. Moran).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. Booker), the Senator from Nevada (Ms. Cortez Masto), the Senator from California (Ms. Harris), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. Sanders), the Senator from Michigan (Ms. Stabenow), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. Warren) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are 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.)

**YEAS—66**

- Alexander
- Barraso
- Blackburn
- Blackburn
- Blunt
- Boozman
- Brown
- Burr
- Capito
- Cardin
- Carder
- Cassidy
- Collins
- Coons
- Cornyn
- Crapo
- Cruz
- Daines
- Duckworth
- Enzi
- Ernst
- Ernst
- Baldwin
- Bennet
- Blumenthal
- Brown
- Cantwell
- Casey
- Durbin
- Feinstein
- Gillibrand
- Booker
- Cortez Masto
- Harris
- Harris
- Sanders

**NAYS—26**

- Paul
- Gardner
- Graham
- Grassley
- Hassan
- Hawley
- Hoeven
- Hyde-Smith
- Inhofe
- Johnson
- Jones
- Kennedy
- King
- Lankford
- Leahy
- Lee
- Machin
- McCain
- McSally
- Menendez
- Murkowski
- Murphy
- Heinrich
- Hirono
- Kaine
- Klobuchar
- Markley
- Murray
- Peters
- Reed
- Isakson
- Moran
- Sanders

**NOT VOTING—8**

- Schatz
- Schumer
- Smith
- Tester
- Udall
- Van Hollen
- Warner
- Wyden
- Stabenow
- Warren

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The 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.

**EXECUTIVE SESSION**

**EXECUTIVE CALENDAR**

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 374.

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.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Mark T. Esper, of Virginia, to be Secretary of Defense.

**CLOTURE MOTION**

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 hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Mark T. Esper, of Virginia, to be Secretary of Defense.


**LEGISLATIVE SESSION**

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.

**EXECUTIVE SESSION**

**EXECUTIVE CALENDAR**

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 clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Stephen M. Dickson, of Georgia, to be Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration for the term of five years.

**CLOTURE MOTION**

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
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.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 53.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 45. 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 send a cloture motion to the desk. The PREIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I 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.

CLOTURE MOTION

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.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum calls for the cloture motions be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Wendy Williams Berger, of Florida, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Florida.

CLOTURE MOTION

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 Wendy Williams Berger, of Florida, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Florida.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 53.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 53.
Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I will not object. First, I just want to thank those of us from New York and Utah for working out this agreement with the leader and me.

What this does is pave 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 in the 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 I am certain that this bill will pass the Senate, go to the President’s desk, and at 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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

With no objection, it is so ordered.

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 would be willing to vote on this right now. There is no reason not to vote. Finally—it looks quite certain that this bill will pass the Senate, go to the President’s desk, and at 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 respectfully but strongly disagree with my colleagues on the merits of some of the issues we have been discussing. We will debate those more in the coming days.

I would reiterate that it is not unreasonable to suggest that a program that takes the unprecedented step of authorizing funding until 2092—that, coupled with language authorizing the expenditure of such sums as may be necessary, creates problems. It is one of the reasons we opt to vote on this amendment and one of the reasons I believe in this amendment.

In any event, this is the kind of thing that ought not to be difficult. When any Member of any political background sees a potential weakness or defect in a piece of legislation, the rules of our body are such that we are supposed to be able to offer that up and cast an amendment. In this circumstance, I am pleased that it worked out the way it did, and we will be able to get votes on these amendments.

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 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 President’s home 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. If they work 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 President refers to in his speech, in which he 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 have the highest military population of all 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 and their families, we 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 the complicated maze 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 their 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 Education 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 pursue 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 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 students from fully taking 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 forgoing the scholarship money, which can provide much needed 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 hours down 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 means realizing 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 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 little bit later, he decided he was 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 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 I hope the Senate does the same soon so we can get this bill 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 vets.

A bill I introduced with Senator BALDWIN, of Wisconsin, called the HAVEN Act, was included as a provision of the NDAA. This bill would shield VA and Department of Defense disability beneficiaries in bankruptcy proceedings in the same way Social Security disability is exempted. Veterans shouldn’t be penalized for receiving
I want to talk about our asylum system, a legal asylum system that was established in the wake of the horrors 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, 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—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—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 this image.

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.

This is the 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 have never had to experience. This 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 face down in a river, I want to see their faces, to celebrate their lives but to remind us of our obligation, our enduring obligation, to make sure that we at least—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, face down.

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 cheery child. Not even 2 years old, she loved to dance, play with her stuffed animals and brush her family’s hair. Her father, Oscar 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 farthest 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 an important 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 $350 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 massing housing complex of more than 200 homes, 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 call violence, 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—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—but a set of experts on what a child needs to survive and thrive—Department of Homeland Security facilities already do not meet the basic standards for the care of children in residential settings.

Earlier this week, the administration issued an interim final rule that essentially bars Central American migrants from claiming asylum by making them ineligible for asylum, including unaccompanied children who enter the United States after crossing the southern border after passing through another country. This is just the latest in many attempts to restrict our asylum system and bar those fleeing violence, persecution—and for other reasons—from exercising their legal right, a legal right that is not just grounded in United States law but international law, the right to petition the U.S. Government for protection consistent with what we did after World War II because of the horrors we saw in World War II. This was a commitment to the world that we are going to make sure that if someone is fleeing violence and persecution, they will at least have a shot to make their case, to have due process to make their case. Most don’t make the case; we know that. Most end up not being successful. But we should let them make the case, because every day, a nation of laws. We are also, of course, a nation of immigrants, and both of these principles are intertwined and undervalued.

President Kennedy said it pretty well:

Immigration policy should be generous; it should be fair; it should be flexible. With such a policy, we can turn to the world and to our own past with clean hands and a clear conscience.

It is entirely possible to create an immigration system that reflects not just President Kennedy’s vision but our values as Americans—a system that respects the rule of law, that treats all individuals with dignity, 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, let us think of those families who put their lives 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 in this body with 65 votes in the Senate—to fix the system and to deal with all the tough issues. We can’t get 65 votes anywhere around here to adjourn for lunch or to move on to the next part of the day sometimes. We only have a slight exaggeration—but 68 votes.

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 make sure that this bill dealt with citizenship, 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 the undervalued and undervalued.
VERGENNES, VERMONT'S, ROLE IN THE APOLLO 11 MOON LANDING

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, this week America celebrates the fiftieth anniversary of a monumental achievement for our country and all of humankind, the landing of the Apollo 11 mission at the Sea of Serenity. Apollo 11 launched 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. The State’s attorney then, and we lived in a duplex in Burlington.

Our 5-year-old son Kevin asked if he could stay up late to watch, and of course, Marcelle and I agreed. He stretched out on the floor in his P.J.s. He had nodded off by the time the images from the Moon started to come across, and we roused our little fellow. We knew this was a night we would always remember.

The next day, I went to court for an arraignment. Then I met with police officers about several matters, and we all had a hard time concentrating as we excitedly discussed what we had seen the night before.

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 then rendezvous with 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.

Vermont has a long tradition of building basic tools and machinery, and NASA turned to Simmonds Precision of Vergennes, VT, to ensure that the Apollo 11 crew and Mission Control knew exactly how much fuel they had. The fuel probes and valves had to be as nearly perfect as possible, and they had to perform perfectly in varying levels of microgravity. It was an immense technological challenge, which the engineers and workers in Vergennes met.

Fifty years later, the company is still there. Not operating under the name Collins Aerospace, they still make fuel probes, along with other aerospace technology that seems to be able to do the impossible. When you enter the factory, along their wall of history, the Apollo Program commands a special place of pride. It is a reminder of how the small steps taken by Americans everywhere, when working together, can accomplish tremendous leaps.

I ask unanimous consent that a recent article about one of the engineers from Vergennes, published by the Burlington Free Press, be printed into the RECORD.

Thank you. Without objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Burlington Free Press, July 17, 2019]

VERMONT COMPANY PLAYED KEY ROLE IN APOLLO MOON MISSION

(By Joel Banner Baird, Free Press Staff Writer)

A FORMER ENGINEER WITH VERGENNES-BASED SIMMONDS PRECISION DESCRIBES THE COMPANY’S ROLE IN THE APOLLO SPACE PROGRAM

Something clicked when Dominique St. Pierre heard President John F. Kennedy declare, in 1962, that the U.S. would land men on the moon. St. Pierre was a Vermont High School student.

“It was gutsy,” St. Pierre, now 74, remembers. “I was a 14-year-old kid.”

Then came the U.S. moon shot for America’s heroes. This is where Vergennes in 1965 and help design and build a fuel system for the Apollo moon mission.

Three years later, the first-ever astronauts to orbit the moon were measuring their crew’s precious propellant with Vermont-made gauges, valves and meters.

His collaboration with more than 200 employees at Simmonds yielded a tool that performed flawlessly throughout the Apollo program, St. Pierre said.

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—when America’s crew’s safe return—remain vivid for St. Pierre.

The space program offered a welcome, uplifting message for people reeling from 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 hell 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 pieces of a never-before assembled puzzle.

“That day, 50 years later,” St. Pierre said, “it’s still viewed as the greatest technological achievement of mankind.”

(At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)
VOTE EXPLANATION

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, unfortunately I was unable to attend the rollover 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 his nomination.

Mr. President, unfortunately I was unable to attend the rollover 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.

(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 Ms. Lynda Blanchard to be Ambassador to the Republic of Slovenia, I would have voted no.

On the question of the confirmation of Mr. Donald R. Tapia to be Ambassador to Jamaica, I would have voted yes.

Thank you.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

70TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ARKANSAS BROADCASTERS ASSOCIATION

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, today I wish to congratulate the Arkansas Broadcasters Association, ABA, on its 70th anniversary and celebrate the organization’s decades of service to radio and television broadcasters in my State.

Established in 1949, the Arkansas Broadcasters formed to help broadcast regulatory expertise, and advocacy coordination. The trade association’s support and the services associated with it have doubt been a tremendous asset to broadcasters across the State. Today, the ABA highlights its mission to help members in “Broadcasting Naturally,” which aptly distills the organization’s mantra in simple, clever terms.

Arkansas’ radio and television broadcast outlets provide vital information and quality programming to communities throughout the state, educate, inform, entertain, and communicate with Arkansans in a variety of ways. We believe our broadcasters and radio stations do to ensure their product is for multiple purposes and desires of consumers. We believe these radio stations and the Arkansas Broadcasters Association have a role in the market they operate in.

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 content is widely available and accessible. We can 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 content is widely 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 content is widely available and accessible.

As commander of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Kansas City District, Colonel Guttormsen has overseen many military and civil works projects throughout the district. From directing construction projects at the region’s military installations to ensuring the levees and dams are structurally sound, Colonel Guttormsen has demonstrated able and consistent leadership.

TRIBUTE TO COLONEL DOUGLAS B. GUTTORMSEN

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, today, I would like to recognize COL Douglas B. Guttormsen on the occasion of his retirement from the Kansas City District Commander for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. He has diligently served in this role for 3 years.

After earning degrees from the U.S. Military Academy at West Point, the University of Missouri at Rolla, the National Defense University, and the U.S. Army Command and General Staff College, Colonel Guttormsen went on to lead engineering battalions across the United States and around the world. In addition to these assignments, he served in combat operations in Iraq and the Republic of Korea.

As commander of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Kansas City District, Colonel Guttormsen has overseen many military and civil works projects throughout the district. From directing construction projects at the region’s military installations to ensuring the levees and dams are structurally sound, Colonel Guttormsen has demonstrated able and consistent leadership.

Although his resume boasts many accomplishments, Colonel Guttormsen’s work leading the emergency operations center, which plays a vital role in responding to natural disasters whenever and wherever they may occur, is most impressive.

This spring, when facing extensive rainfall and severe flooding, he and the entire Kansas City District staff worked around the clock to respond to levee breaches and assist affected communities. Colonel Guttormsen also participated in the Missouri River Flood Forum that Congressman STEVE WATKINS and I hosted in March, where we saw the extensive flooding at the 4-State Lookout Point in Kansas and then spoke alongside the Department of Agriculture and answered questions from community members.

Colonel Guttormsen is a true professional and has exhibited remarkable leadership during his time as the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Kansas City District commander. I trust my fellow members will join me in congratulating him and wishing him well in the days to come.

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 12:25 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. NUNNALLY, one of the House clerks, announced that the House has passed the following joint resolutions, without amendment:

S.J. Res. 36. Joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed treaty to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Kingdom of Spain, and the
Italian Republic of certain defense articles and services.

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. 39. 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 11158 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 Calle Alondra in San Juan, Puerto Rico, as the “65th Infantry Regiment Post Office Building”.

H.R. 1844. 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”.

H.R. 3005. 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. 3094. 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.

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 17, 2019; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–2025. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition and Sustainment), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled “Reports to Congress on Distribution of Department of Defense Fiscal Year 2018 Purchases From Foreign Entities”: to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–2026. A communication from the Acting Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report 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; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–2027. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel, General Legal Counsel, 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.

EC–2028. A communication from the Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Prohibitions and Restrictions on Proprietary Trading and Certain Interests In, and Relationships With, Hedge Funds and Private Equity Firms” (RIN 3235-A013), received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 16, 2019; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–2029. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Improvement and Evaluation of 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–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 Certain Interests In, and Relationships With, Hedge Funds and Private Equity Firms” (RIN 3235-A013), received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 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: Final Approval of State Underground Storage Tank Program Revisions, Codification, and Incorporation by Reference” (FRL No. 9996–67–Region 10) received in 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 “New Mexico: Final Approval of State Underground Storage Tank Program Revisions, Codification, and Incorporation by Reference” (FRL No. 9997–67–Region 3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 16, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and 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 Tunwater, Washington, as the “Eva G. Hewitt 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 Colonne Drive in Alondra, Puerto Rico, as the “65th Infantry Regiment Post Office Building”; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 3055. 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”.

H.R. 3394. 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 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.

Rural Development, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Streamlining Electric Program Procedures” (RIN0575–AC40) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2019; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition and Sustainment), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled “Report to Congress on Distribution of Department of Defense Fiscal Year 2018 Purchases From Foreign Entities”: to the Committee on Armed Services.

A communication from the Acting Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report 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; to the Committee on Armed Services.

A communication from the Assistant General Counsel, General Legal Counsel, 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.

A communication from the Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Prohibitions and Restrictions on Proprietary Trading and Certain Interests In, and Relationships With, Hedge Funds and Private Equity Firms” (RIN 3235–A013), received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 16, 2019; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

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 Certain Interests In, and Relationships With, Hedge Funds and Private Equity Firms” (RIN 3235–A013), received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Massachusetts: Final Approval of State Underground Storage Tank Program Revisions, Codification, and Incorporation by Reference” (FRL No. 9996–67–Region 10) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 16, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “New Mexico: Final Approval of State Underground Storage Tank Program Revisions, Codification, and Incorporation by Reference” (FRL No. 9997–67–Region 3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 16, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.
EC–2033. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel, General Law, Ethics, and Regulation, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to 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–2034. 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 the Agreement Under Title V of the Trade and Development Act of 2000: Removal of Regulations” (RIN0938–AT16) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2019; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–2035. A communication from the Regulations 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–AT16) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2019; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–2036. A communication from the Assistant Administrator, Bureau of Legislative and Public Affairs, U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled “Report to Congress on Global Health Innovations and the USAID Innovation Lab”, to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–2037. A communication from the Acting Executive Director, U.S. Agency for International Development, 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–2038. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaties Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Case-Zablocki Act, U.S.C. 112b, as amended, the report of the texts and background statements on treaties other than treaties (List 2019–0048 - 2019–0059) to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–2039. A communication from the Associate Secretary (International Affairs), Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Under Secretary (International Affairs), Department of Homeland Security, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2019; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–2040. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled “Report to Congress on the Physicians’ Comparability Allowance Program”; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.


EC–2042. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Office of Inspector General’s Semiannual Report and the Management Response for the period of October 1, 2018 to March 31, 2019; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–2043. A communication from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS) Annual Report to Congress on the Rafael Ramos and Wenjian Lu National Blue Alert Act of 2015; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–2044. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, two (2) reports relative to a vacancy in the position of Assistant Secretary/Director, Immigration and Customs Enforcement, Department of Homeland Security, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2019; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–2045. 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, Referral 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–2046. A communication from the Acting Deputy Director, Executive Office for Immigration Review, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Probationary Period for Assistant Deputy Attorneys General” (RIN1125–AA78) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 16, 2019; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred 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, has afforded 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 the cost of SNAP benefits; and

Whereas, The SNAP “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 continued SNAP benefits in line with a member in the armed forces, for assistance, particularly during economic downturns; and

Whereas, In 2015, more than $80 million in SNAP benefits were used by 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 nearly 120,000 families, received SNAP benefits from 2009 to 2012, and six percent of respondents of the Blue Star Family
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Lifestyle Survey reported using emergency food relief in 2017; and

Whereas, Military families that do not reside on a military base or installation receive the Basic Housing Allowance (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 Basic Housing Allowance, paid to the number of dependents of the service member; and

Whereas, Although the BAH is intended to offset the cost of civilian housing for service men and women who do not live on a military base, the amount of the BAH is currently determined on a per-household income 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 with a comparatively high cost of living; and the difficulty of spouses to find well-paying, long-term employment due to frequent transfers and deployments; and

Whereas, Military families 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 eligibility for SNAP 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 reduced food quality, are able to benefit from the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program and other benefits, notwithstanding their receipt of a Basic Housing Allowance.

2. Resolution, as authorized by the Secretary of the 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 elected 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 humanitarian, health, and economic consequences globally; and

Whereas, Approximately 14,000 nuclear weapons still exist in the world and pose an intolerable quantity; and

Whereas, The United States has over 6,000 nuclear weapons, which combined are more than 10 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 to maintain 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 approximately 21,000 nuclear weapons on high alert so they are ready for launch within minutes of a presidential order; so making them vulnerable to accidents, unauthorized 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; that nations that could respond by using their own nuclear weapons, resulting in a nuclear war that could have devastating consequences; and

Whereas, Americans and other U.S. nuclear weapons should be deter a nuclear attack on the United States, its forces, and its allies; there is no reason for the United States to ever use nuclear weapons in any circumstances; and

Whereas, The U.S. President has sole authority to order a nuclear attack without any consultation or input; and the decision to one individual increases the chance of a nuclear weapon being used; and

Whereas, A policy renouncing the first use of nuclear weapons would greatly constrain the ability of the President to order a nuclear attack, allowing attacks only in response to a nuclear attack; 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 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 last until the 2090 expiration date of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

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 essentially established to diagnose and treat medical issues of September 11th responders and victims; and

Whereas, The $7.3 billion fund has already committed to paying over $5 billion to essentially pay the claims of September 11th responders and victims 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 not paid 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 2018; and

Whereas, the fund should be reauthorized and fully funded through 2050, 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 urges 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 presiding officers 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. INHOFE 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. INHOFE. Mr. President, 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 the expense of reprinting on the Executive Calendar that these nominations lie at the Secretary’s desk for the information of Senators.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Air Force nominations beginning with Mark C. Alderman and ending with Denise V. E. Zozo, 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 Jeremiah D. Barnes, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 18, 2019.

Air Force nominations beginning with Hans A. Ankney-Dee and ending with Brian Douglas Zullo, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 18, 2019.

Air Force nominations beginning with Jonathan P. Sexton, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 8, 2019.

Air Force nominations beginning with Jason B. Barden and ending with Kristin B. Whitehouse, 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 Theilma D. Cummings and ending with Kyungkun Lee, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 18, 2019.

Army nominations beginning with Joseph P. Blakney, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nominations beginning with Patrick D. Clary, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nominations beginning with Marie P. Corpuz, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nominations beginning with Ernest M. Dorema, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Simone M. Edwards, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Luciano G. Mizerani, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Rochelle S. Pressley, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Howard G. Rice, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Virginia L. Egli, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Darren K. Purcell, to be Colonel.

Army nominations beginning with Joseph R. Allred and ending with Liang Zhou, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 8, 2019.

Army nominations beginning with Keith J. Andrews and ending with Jeffrey T. Whorton, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 8, 2019.

Army nominations beginning with Timothy K. Gallagher, Jr., to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nominations beginning with Sean M. Williams, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nominations beginning with Christopher D. McLin, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Navy nominations beginning with Rochelle S. Pressley, to be Commander.

Navy nominations beginning with Alex- ander Aldana and ending with Robert J. Wishnevsky, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 29, 2019.

Navy nominations beginning with Timothy G. Boyle and ending with Delicia G. Zimmerman, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 8, 2019.

Navy nominations beginning with Ricardo M. Ahakak and ending with Yu Zheng, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 8, 2019.

Navy nominations beginning with Alexander Aldana and ending with Robert J. Wishnevsky, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 29, 2019.

Navy nominations beginning with Ryan B. Bareng and ending with Timothy A. Spring- er, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 8, 2019.

Navy nominations beginning with Kevin L. Albert and ending with James H. Young, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 8, 2019.

Navy nominations beginning with Arturo Alvarado, Jr. and ending with Elizabeth M. Zuloaga Carri?o, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 8, 2019.

By Mr. GRAHAM for the Committee on the Judiciary:

1. **S. 2166.** A bill to designate Regional Ocean Protection, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON: S. 2163. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to expand the use of global payments to hospitals in rural areas; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CASEY: S. 2157. A bill to extend title XI of the So- cial Security Act to expand the use of global payments to hospitals in rural areas; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. HASAN (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 on 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 alarm certification, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. CRUZ (for himself, Mr. JOHN- son, and Mr. LEE): S. 2161. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to provide for reciproc- ical marketing approval of certain drugs, biological products, and devices that are au- thorized to be lawfully marketed abroad, 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 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 Se- curity and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Ms. Har- ris, and Mr. BOOZMAN): S. 2164. A bill to amend the Water Resources Research Act of 1984 to authorize grants for and require applied water research and educational grants to the water resources research and technology institutes established under that Act; to the Committee on Envi- ronment and Public Works.

By Mr. HEINRICH (for himself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. BALDWIN, Ms. DAINES, Mr. SCHATZ, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. UDALL, and Mr. LANKFORD): S. 2165. A bill to enhance protections of Na- tive American tangible cultural heritage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. WICKER (for himself, Mr. JONES, Mr. CASSIDY, Ms. COLLINS, and Ms. CANTWELL): S. 2166. A bill to designate Regional Ocean Partnerships of the National Oceanic and At- mospheric Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.
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. MORPHY (for himself and Mr. UDALL):
S. 2186. 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, Ms. PETERS, and Ms. SINEMA):
S. 2169. A bill to amend section 3116 of title 5, United States Code, to clarify the applicability of appointment 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.

S. 2171. A bill to amend the Running-Bereuter-Blumenauer Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2004 to require insurance agents who sell flood insurance policies 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. HARIS, Mr. TILLS, and Mr. UDALL):
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. HASSAN (for herself and Mr. PAUL):
S. 2178. A bill to impose requirements in the nuclear posture review of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 2179. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to provide social service agencies with services to meet the urgent needs of Holocaust survivors to age in place with dignity, comfort, and security; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself and Mrs. MURR MAN):
S. 2180. A bill to provide oversight of the border zone in which Federal agents may conduct vehicle checkpoints and stops and enter private property without a warrant, and to make technical corrections; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARKY (for himself and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):
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 assess cybersecurity vulnerabilities to the United States commercial aviation system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. MARKY (for himself 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. HASSAN, 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. BERNAL, 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. GILLBRAND, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. SMITH, Ms. 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 Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

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. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. HYDE SMITH, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. GILLBRAND, Mr. KENE DY, Mr. REED, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):
S. 2187. A bill to reauthorize the National Flood Insurance Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. HAWLEY (for himself and Mr. COONS):
S. 2188. A bill to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 to improve the licensing application process for small business investment companies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Ms. HIRONO (for herself and Mr. ROUNDS):
S. 2189. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to waive the guarantee fee for veterans and spouses of veterans for the Export Working Capital, International Trade, and Export Express programs; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Ms. HIRONO:
S. 2190. A bill to amend the Small Business Administration Act to ensure that 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. RUBIO (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. MENENDEZ):
S. 2191. A bill to amend the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 to allow the Administration 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. PETERS:
S. 2193. 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 Ms. 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.
torture, and harassment of these communities inside and outside China.

At the request of Ms. Ernst, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. Rounds) was added as a cosponsor of S. 285, a bill to require U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement to take into custody certain aliens who have been charged in the United States with a crime that resulted in the death or serious bodily injury of another person, 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 familial therapist services and mental health counselor services under part B of the Medicare program, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. Wyden, the name of the Senator from Florida (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 Mr. Gillibrand, 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 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.

At the request of Mrs. Gillibrand, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. Braun) 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 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 1980, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. Cotton, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. Wyden) was added as a cosponsor of S. 639, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the centennial of the establishment of the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier.

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.

At the request of Mr. Cotton, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. Hyde-Smith) 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.

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 5, United States Code, to provide permanent, dedicated funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund, and for other purposes.

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.

At the request of Mr. Carper, the name 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.

At the request of Mr. Menendez, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. Inhoffe) 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.

At the request of Ms. Duckworth, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. Cardin) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1403, a bill to amend the Child Care Access Means Parents in School Program under the Higher Education Act of 1965.

At the request of Mr. Durbin, the names of the Senator from Iowa (Ms. Ernst) and the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. Baldwin) were added as cosponsors 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.

At the request of Mr. Bennet, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. Peters) 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.

At the request of Mr. Portman, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. Rubio) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1539, a bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to provide funding to secure nonprofit facilities from terrorist attacks, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. McConnell, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. Portman) and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. Cardin) were added as cosponsors of S. 1541, a bill to increase the minimum age for sale of tobacco products to 21.

At the request of Mr. Merkley, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. Blumenthal) and the Senator from Illinois (Ms. Duckworth) were added as cosponsors of S. 1590, a bill to amend the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 to authorize rewards for thwarting wildlife trafficking linked to transnational organized crime, and for other purposes.

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.

At the request of Mr. Markey, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. Blumenthal) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1728, a bill to require the United States Postal Service to sell the Alzheimer’s semipostal stamp for 6 additional years.

At the request of Ms. Duckworth, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. Blackburn) 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 contact 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.

S. 1792

At the request of Mr. MURPHY, 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.

S. 1850

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2062, 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.

S. 2062

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2033, a bill to amend chapter 2265 of title 36, United States Code, to ensure pay equity for amateur athletes, and for other purposes.

S. 2033

At the request of Mr. UDALL, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mrs. MURRAY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2075, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require issuers to disclose certain activities relating to climate change, and for other purposes.

S. 2075

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH) was added as a co-sponsor of S. 2140, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for new markets tax credit investments in the Rural Jobs Zone.

S. 2140

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, 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.

S. 2054

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 co-sponsors 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.

S. 2062

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.

S. 2066

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.

S. 2075

At the request of Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2033, a bill to amend chapter 2265 of title 36, United States Code, to ensure pay equity for amateur athletes, and for other purposes.

S. 2033

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.

S. 2097

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, 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.

S. 2121

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, 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.

S. RES. 252

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the names of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) and the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. CASSIDY) 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:

S. 2156

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

SEC. 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 (5).

(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 of the corporation acquired in the ordinary course of the corporation’s trade or business from its sale or 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 1551, the term ‘passive investment income’ shall not include dividends from such S 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 any other institution (as defined in section 542(d)(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 such 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 Sale of Certain Assets.—For purposes of this paragraph—

“(1) 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) ARCHIVES AND RECORDS.—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.

"(D) UNIFORMITY WITH SECTION 1375.—The amount of passive investment income shall be determined by not taking into account any recognized built-in gain or loss of the S corporation for 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) Effective date.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2019.

SEC. 3. EXPANSION OF S CORPORATION ELIGIBLE SHAREHOLDERS TO INCLUDE S PENSIONS.

(a) In general.—Section 1361(c)(2)(A)(vi) of title 26 is amended to read as follows:

"(vi) A trust which constitutes an individual retirement account under section 408(a), including one designated as a Roth individual retirement account under section 408(u).

(b) Sale of stock in IRA relating to S corporation election exempt from prohibited transaction rules.—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 subsection (d)(2) and inserting "section 1367(a)(2)".

(c) Effective date.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2019.

SEC. 4. TREATMENT OF S CORPORATION BUILT-IN GAIN AMOUNT UPON DEATH OF SHAREHOLDER.

(a) In general.—Part II of subchapter S of chapter 1 is amended by adding at the end the following:

"SEC. 1309. AMORTIZATION OF BUILT-IN GAIN AMOUNT UPON DEATH OF SHAREHOLDER.

"(a) In general.—A person holding stock in an electing S corporation the basis of which is determined under section 1014(a) (hereafter in this section referred to as the 'shareholder') shall be allowed a deduction with respect to the S corporation built-in gain amount of such stock, for the taxable year in which the death of the shareholder occurred, in the case of a transfer of such stock, or in the case of a transfer of such stock, for the taxable year in which the death of the shareholder occurred, in the case of a transfer of such stock, or

"(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.

"(b) Effective date.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2019.

"(1) Distributions from estates or trusts.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, any distributions 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 this section applies with respect to periods after such distribution.

"(2) Certain transfers involving spouses.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, in the case of a transfer described in section 1041, the transferee (and not the transferor) shall be treated as the shareholder to which this section applies with respect to periods after such transfer.

"(c) Treatment of income in respect of the decedent.—

"(1) Adjustment to built-in gain of property held by a corporation.—For purposes of subsection (b)(1), 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 section 691 applies. For purposes of subsection (e)(1)(A), the gain recognized on the disposition of such property shall be reduced by such amount.

"(2) Adjustment to basis of S corporation stock.—For adjustment to basis of S corporation stock, see section 1377.

"(j) Reporting.—Except as otherwise provided by the Secretary, for purposes of section 691, the amounts determined under subsections (b)(2), (e)(1), and (f)(2) shall be treated as items of the corporation and the property described in section 1041, the transferee (and not the transferor) shall be treated as the shareholder to which this section applies with respect to periods after such transfer.

"(d) Effective date.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2019.

"(1) In general.—The electing S corporation terminates, or

"(2) the date on which the corporation's election under section 1362 terminates, or

"(3) by striking ''such bank or company'' in subsection (d)(2) and inserting "section 1367(a)(2)".

"(i) by striking ''this title and the phrase'"
"(i) a revocation under subparagraph (A) is made for any taxable year after the date prescribed by this paragraph for making such revocation for such taxable year or no such revocation is made for any taxable year, and

(ii) the Secretary determines that there was reasonable cause for the failure to timely make such revocation,

the Secretary may treat 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 Mrs. MURRAY): S. 2184—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.

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 has a valid reason to stop you 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. Yet Customs and Border Protection (CBP) enforcement operations are effectively immune from the Fourth Amendment within a broadly defined “border zone.”

And this so-called border zone need not bother you 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 boardings by the New York State police 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 violation, again by Border Patrol agents who 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 with 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 100 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 105 requires 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. 1638(e)) is amended—

(i) 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, such institution’s certification of—

(I) the enrollment status of the student; and

(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

(ii) the difference between—

(I) such cost of attendance; and

(II) the student’s income and non-aided educational and 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 this subsection without obtaining from the relevant institution of higher education such institution’s certification if such institution fails to provide within 30 business days the creditor’s request for such certification—

(i) notification of the institution’s refusal to certify the request; or

(ii) notification that the institution has received the request for certification and will need additional time to comply with the certification request.

(C) LOANS DISBURSED WITHOUT CERTIFICATION.—If a creditor issues funds without obtaining a certification, as described in subparagraph (A), such creditor shall report the issuance of such funds in a manner determined by the Director of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau.

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (9), (10), and (11) as paragraphs (10), (11), and (12), respectively; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (8) the following:

“(D) PROVISION OF INFORMATION.—

(A) PROVISION OF INFORMATION TO STUDENTS.—

(I) LOAN STATEMENT.—A creditor that issues any funds with respect to an extension of credit described in this subsection shall send loan statements, where such loan is to be used for a student, such funds not less than once every 3 months during the time that such student is enrolled at an institution of higher education.

(II) CONTENTS OF LOAN STATEMENT.—Each statement described in clause (i) shall—

(I) report the borrower’s total remaining debt to the creditor, including accrued but unpaid interest and capitalized interest;

(II) report any debt increases since the last statement; and

(III) list the current interest rate for each loan.

(B) NOTIFICATION OF LOANS DISBURSED WITHOUT CERTIFICATION.—On or before the date a creditor issues any funds with respect to an extension of credit described in this subsection, the creditor shall notify the relevant institution of higher education, in writing, of the amount of the extension of credit and the student on whose behalf credit is extended. The form of such written notification shall be subject to the regulations of the Bureau.

(3) by adding a new section (d) to section 140(a)(8)(A) of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1630(a)(8)(A))—

(A) DEFINITION OF PRIVATE EDUCATION LOAN.—Section 140(a)(8)(A) of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1630(a)(8)(A)) is amended—

(i) by redesignating clause (ii) as clause (iii); and

(ii) 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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ACT OF 1965.—Section 487(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1094(a)) is amended by striking paragraph (28) 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 126(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; and

"(II) of such student's cost of attendance at the institution as determined under part F of this title; and

"(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 subparagraph (A)(i), in providing such certification under subparagraph (A)(i) or providing notice of the refusal to provide certification under subparagraph (A)(ii), the institution shall—

"(i) determine whether the student who initiated the application for the private education loan, or on whose behalf the application was received, 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 disclosure:

"(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 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 in section 487(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1094(a)(i)) and are amended by inserting certifying' after "promoting"

SEC. 3. AMENDMENT TO THE HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965.

(a) AMENDMENT TO THE HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965.—Section 487(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1094(a)) is amended by striking paragraph (28) 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 126(e)(3) of the Truth in Lending Act, the institution shall—

"(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; and

"(II) of such student's cost of attendance at the institution as determined under part F of this title; and

"(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 subparagraph (A)(i), in providing such certification under subparagraph (A)(i) or providing notice of the refusal to provide certification under subparagraph (A)(ii), the institution shall—

"(i) determine whether the student who initiated the application for the private education loan, or on whose behalf the application was received, 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 disclosure:

"(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 assistance, including Federal financial assistance under this title.
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 278—EX- PRESSING MATURE 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; and

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"; and

Whereas NATO Member States "seek to promote stability and well-being in the North Atlantic area"; and

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; and

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; and

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; and

Whereas the Government of the Russian Federation has maintained and strengthened its ties with the repressive and corrupt regime of Nicolás Maduro in Venezuela in an effort to prop him up in his illegitimate hold over the state; and

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 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 with the meaning of section 231 of the Countering America's Adversaries Through Sanctions Act (CAATSA) of 2017 (22 U.S.C. 9525);

(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 affecting 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.

**SENATE RESOLUTION 279—CALLING FOR THE DESIGNATION OF ANTIFA AS A DOMESTIC TERRORIST ORGANIZATION**

Mr. Cassidy (for himself and Mr. Cruz) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. Res. 279

Whereas members of Antifa, because they believe that free speech is equivalent to violence, have used threats of violence in the pursuit of suppressing opposing political ideologies; and

Whereas Antifa represents opposition to the democratic ideals of peaceful assembly and free speech for all; and

Whereas members of Antifa have physically assaulted journalists and other individuals during protests and riots in Berkeley, California; and

Whereas in February of 2018, journalist Andy Ngo was intimidated and threatened with violence by protestors affiliated with Antifa; and

Whereas on June 29, 2019, while covering demonstrations in Portland, Oregon, journalist Andy Ngo was physically attacked by protestors affiliated with Antifa; and

Whereas employees of the U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (referred to in this preamble as "ICE") were subjected to doxxing and violent threats after their social media profiles, phone numbers, and home addresses were posted on the Internet by left wing activists; and

Whereas according to the Wall Street Journal, an ICE officer was followed by left wing activists and confronted when he went to pick up his daughter from summer camp; and

Whereas the ICE office in southwest Portland, Oregon, was shut down for days due to threats and occupation by Antifa members; and

Whereas Rose City Antifa, an Antifa group founded in 2007 in Portland, Oregon, explicitly rejects the authority of law enforcement agencies, including the Portland Police, and professes to stifle free speech and stop acts of violence; and

Whereas Rose City Antifa rejects the civil treatment of individuals the group labels as fascists, stating: "We can't just argue against them; we have to prevent them from coming by any means necessary;" and

Whereas there is no place for violence in the discourse between people in the United States, or in any civil society, because the United States is a place on this earth rich in a diversity of ideas and opinions; Now, therefore, be it

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; and

(2) unequivocally condemns the violent actions of Antifa groups as unacceptable acts for anyone in the United States; and

(3) expresses the need for the peaceful communication of varied ideas in the United States; and

(4) urges any group or organizations in the United States to work on 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 redundize its efforts, using all available and appropriate tools, to combat the spread of all forms of domestic terrorism, including White supremacist terrorism.

**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 shipments of weapons lawyers 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.

SA 928. Mr. Lee submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1327, to extend authorization for the September 11th Victim Compensation Fund of 2001 through fiscal year 2092, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 929. Mr. Paul submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1327, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

**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 protection of historic lunar landing sites and artifacts.

SA 928. Mr. Lee submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1327, to extend authorization for the September 11th Victim Compensation Fund of 2001 through fiscal year 2092, and for other purposes; as follows:

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.
(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 2019 through 2029, and $10,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2030 through 2092, to remain available until expended"; and

SA 929. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1327, to extend authorization of the September 11th Victim Compensation Fund of 2001 through fiscal year 2021, to remain available until expended.

SEC. 5. SEQUESTRATION.
(a) Definitions.—In this section—
(1) the terms "direct spending" and "sequestration" have the meanings given such terms in section 250(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 authorization of the September 11th Victim Compensation Fund of 2001 through fiscal year 2021, to remain available until expended.

(b) Implementing direct spending for the child nutrition program (as defined in section 25(b) of the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1766(b));

SEC. 5. SEQUESTRATION.
(a) Definitions.—In this section—
(1) the terms "direct spending" and "sequestration" have the meanings given such terms in section 250(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 906(c)); and

(b) Direct spending for the Medicare program under title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395 et seq.);

(c) Direct spending for net interest (all of major functional category 900);

(d) Direct spending for any program administered by the Department of Veterans Affairs;

(e) Direct spending for Special Benefits for Certain World War II Veterans (26 U.S.C. 41 et seq.);

(f) Direct spending for the child nutrition program (as defined in section 25(b) of the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1766(b)).

(b) Sequestration Orders.—
(1) In 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. 935) 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

(a) shall follow the procedures specified in section 6 of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (2 U.S.C. 935) 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

(b) shall not follow the exemptions specified in section 255 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 906).

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET
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 Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY
The Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, July 18, 2019, at 10:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
The Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, July 18, 2019, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing pending military nominations.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS
The Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, July 18, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY
The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, July 18, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on the following nominations: 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 Whetzel Riggs, to be United States District Judge for the District of New Mexico.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE
The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, July 18, 2019, at 2 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON WATER AND POWER
The Subcommittee on Water and Power of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, July 18, 2019, at 10:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR
Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Tristan Brown, a member of my staff, be granted temporary floor privileges.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME—H.R. 582 AND H.R. 748
Mr. MCONNELL. I now ask for a second reading, and I object to my own request, all en bloc.

Mr. MCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be discharged from further consideration and the Senate now proceed to S. Con. Res. 19.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the concurrent resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CELEBRATING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE "APOLLO 11" MOON LANDING
Mr. MCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 19) was agreed to.

ORDER FOR MONDAY, JULY 22, 2019
Mr. MCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 3 p.m., Monday, July 22, further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, morning business be closed, and the Senate proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the Esper nomination; finally, notwithstanding the provisions of rule XXII, the cloture motions filed during today's session of the Senate ripen at 5:30 p.m. on Monday, July 22.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, JULY 22, 2019, AT 3 P.M.
Mr. MCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.
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. CORKER, 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 MONEYSMAKER
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 Indian 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 recognition for its innovative educational opportunities.

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 a wide variety of interests—comics, movie studios—but it never stopped being about fans coming together to share their interests. Comic-Con has included 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 comic credits.

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 GLENDRA GUUNDERMANN 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.

MS. HAALAND. Madam Speaker, on July 17, 2019, 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.

This “bullet” symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.
IN HONOR OF SERGEANT FREDERICK JOHN HORNE, II FOR HIS DISTINGUISHED SERVICE

HON. DEBBIE DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 16, 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 servicemembers 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.

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 Pomona.

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.
RIDGEVIEW CHARTER MIDDLE SCHOOL COMMENDATION HONORING PRINCIPAL OPIE BLACKWELL

HON. LUCY McBATH OF GEORGIA IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 18, 2019

Mrs. McBATH. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor my constituent and Ridgeview Charter Middle School Principal Opie Blackwell. A good principal knows that his or her students need a robust support system along with a strong education to guarantee success in the classroom and in life. This philosophy is the basis upon which Mr. Blackwell has structured his school.

Principal Blackwell demonstrates exceptional dedication to ensuring that the students at Ridgeview Charter Middle School receive the quality education that they deserve. He is actively involved in the daily life at Ridgeview, taking on the role of a teacher, mentor, and advisor to his students. His passion for education and his commitment to the well-being of the faculty and students has earned him recognition as a National Forum staff member.

Principals are the backbone of any school, and Mr. Blackwell is no exception. He is a role model for his students and is actively engaged in the classroom and extracurricular activities. His commitment to Ridgeview Charter Middle School is evident in the way he inspires his students to achieve their goals and to be the best they can be.

In addition to his work in the classroom, Mr. Blackwell is committed to promoting a positive school culture. He understands the importance of a supportive community and works tirelessly to create an environment where students feel valued and respected.

Mr. Blackwell is a true leader and a valuable asset to Ridgeview Charter Middle School. He is dedicated to the success of his students and to fostering a learning environment that prepares them for future success.

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 Enroll 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.

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.

Introducing the Sailors Act

HON. MARCY KAPTUR OF OHIO IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 18, 2019

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, I rise with my fellow co-chairs of the bipartisan Congressional Ukraine Caucus to introduce the SAILORS ACT, or the “Standing 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 uncompromised Russia brazenly fired upon and took hostage 24 Ukrainians sailors in international waters. The sailors now languish in Russian prisons 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 barrier 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 idly by as Russia increases its aggression in 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 message to the Russian 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 1 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 Univer-
sity, 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 re-
covered to win the second game and tie the
match. This did not let the initial setback dis-
courage 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 in-
credible focus and skill to clinch the National
Championship.

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 Delicatessen in Saint Paul, Minnesota.
Cecil 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 deli-
catessens. 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 1969, initially composed of five employees and
old and have been served delicious Jewish delicacies
and family creations by the Glickmans and
Leventhal.
In fact, there used to be a saying in Highland Park that a baby’s first three
words were ‘mama, papa, and Cecil’s.’
Walking through the front door at Cecil’s
transports customers back to an earlier time.
With its black and white parquet floors, diner
style red chairs, and deli counter piled high with branches of
potato salad, and a plethora of
delicacies, Cecil’s serves up delicious food
with a perfect-sized side of nostalgia. While
the menu has expanded to more than 150
items, one thing that has remained the same
is the attention to detail, great food and serv-
ice.
All of these ingredients come together to
make Cecil’s one of Saint Paul’s most beloved places to relax and get a bite to eat with friends and neighbors. Madam Speaker, please join me in celebrating the 70th anniver-
sary 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, Mis-
souri. 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 des-
ignated 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 to-
gether hundreds of people to see history come to
life each night. Scholar-Actors have talked
tales of the Founding Fathers; great authors
and showmen; and heroes, history and out-
laws 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
Greninger, the entire event is organized,
planned and led by volunteers. That includes
the Chautauqua Singers who set each char-
acter in their time of life by singing the songs
of the era they lived. And all the entertainment
is free.
The Community Spirit is the foundation of Chau-
tauqua 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 Represent-
aves.

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 indispen-
sable 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 pro-
gram in 1978, and it has not stopped thinking
green since. Its innovative Closed Loop pro-
gram allows partnering companies to reduce
their carbon footprint and avoid needless plas-
tic 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 Re-
source Center of Northern Michigan, and take
part in multiple other charity events and
found.

Day after day, Petoskey Plastics con-
siderate in their time of life by singing the songs
of the era they lived. And all the entertainment
is free.
The Community Spirit is the foundation of Chau-
tauqua 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 Represent-
aves.
dedicated citizens. On behalf of my constituents, I wish Petoskey Plastics all the best in its future endeavors.

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 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 fair was attended by a total of eighty-four people over three days.

Over time, the fair has grown at a steady rate, acquiring land and building facilities for the fairgrounds. Today, the fair is one of the largest fairs in the state and draws thousands of visitors each year.

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 mourn 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 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 Stroud Sr. and Ida Mae Rowell 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 yearly birthday bash and attending the Family Reunions over the years.

Willie plans to attend the family picnic and banquet at the Loachapoka Enrichment Center, and church service at Mt Pelia Missionary Baptist Church in Camp Hill, Alabama. The Webb, Rowell, Fielder and Lockhart Family will also attend the U.S. Air Force Museum in Montgomery during the reunion at the end of the month.

Madam Speaker, please join me in recognizing the life of Willie Stroud, Jr.
Harry Watkins of Wrightsville Beach, North Carolina, who passed away late 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**

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 on 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.

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 on 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.

**CELEBRATING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY SAINT PAUL’S STERLING CLUB**

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, 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.
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 dispatchers 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 of Kansas City provides tools to build self-reliance and lightens the burdens many homeowners face. Through these programs, they create opportunities for families to invest in their future and thrive.

John and Mary Pritchard founded Habitat for Humanity of Kansas City in March of 1979, now the seventh oldest branch of Habitat for Humanity International. In their first year, the Pritchards, with the aid of board members, local churches, and community groups, purchased seven properties which they turned over to build. The Middlebrooks, Habitat’s first homeowners, moved to the corner of Linwood and Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard and were able to pay zero-percent interest on their mortgage for twenty years. The hard work of volunteers, families, and community members helped Habitat of Kansas City to continue building, and renewing the homes in their forty years in the area.

Building on their success in constructing homes, Habitat for Humanity of Kansas City created ReStore, a retail store which sells donated home furnishings and construction material to families trying to renovate their homes at an affordable price. Additionally, they built their House of Abraham in 2003, an interfaith endeavor between the Christian, Jewish, and Muslim communities in the Greater Kansas City area. It seeks to promote understanding between faiths by having adherents work together to build and restore homes. Habitat for Humanity of Kansas City also established the HOPE financial literacy program which assists Habitat homeowners with long-term credit and budgeting.

Habitat for Humanity of Kansas City is just one branch of an international organization, which aids people across all 50 states and 70 countries. Habitat International was founded in 1976 and has helped more than 22 million people due to their core belief that housing should be accessible to all. 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 champion for 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 19, 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, Mr. S.E. 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 Wooden Chapel, 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 1976, the 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 which 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 provided 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. R.W. Lindsay, began serving First Baptist on September 20, 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 WAVELEY 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 Seely, 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 a proud 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 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 the Approval of the Speaker’s Journal, 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. RODNEY 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.
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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 S4934
- 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. Page S4955

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 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 notwithstanding Rule XXII. Pages S4937–38

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. Page S4941

Esper Nomination—Cloture: Senate began consideration of the nomination of Mark T. Esper, of Virginia, to be Secretary of Defense. Page S4936

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. Page S4936

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. Page S4936
- Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Legislative Session.
Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Executive Session to consider the nomination. Page S4936

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. Page S4955

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. Page S4936

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Executive Session to consider the nomination. Page S4936

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. Page S4937

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Executive Session to consider the nomination. Page S4937

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. Page S4937

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Executive Session to consider the nomination. Page S4937

Nominations Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nominations:

By 55 yeas to 39 nays (Vote No. EX. 216), Cliff- ton 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.

Pages S4925–31

Messages from the House:

Pages S4943–44

Measures Referred:

Page S4944

Measures Placed on the Calendar:

Page S4944

Measures Read the First Time:

Page S4944

Executive Communications:

Pages S4944–45

Petitions and Memorials:

Pages S4945–46

Executive Reports of Committees:

Pages S4946–47

Additional Cosponsors:

Pages S4848–50

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions:

Pages S4950–54

Additional Statements:

Page S4943

Amendments Submitted:

Pages S4954–55

Authorities for Committees to Meet:

Page S4955

Privileges of the Floor:

Page S4955

Record Votes: Three record votes were taken today. (Total—218) Pages S4331, S4936

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 WateReuse; 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
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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.

Additional Cosponsors:

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).

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein she appointed Representative Malinowski to act as Speaker pro tempore for today.

Journal: The House agreed to the Speaker’s approval of the Journal by voice vote.

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.

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.

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.

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).

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.

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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