



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 165

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 18, 2019

No. 150

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
September 18, 2019.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JOSH GOTTHEIMER to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2019, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties. All time shall be equally allocated between the parties, and in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m. Each Member, other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip, shall be limited to 5 minutes.

CONGRESS MUST PASS USMCA AGREEMENT

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

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, it is time. It is time for Congress to pass the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement, the USMCA. This is not, as many of you know, a new issue. The administration finished its work months ago—292 days ago, to be exact.

That is 292 days that Congress has had to ask questions. That is 292 days

that we have had to assess the benefits of the agreement. That is 292 days we have had to analyze the text of that agreement.

During the August recess, I had conversations with hundreds, maybe thousands, of folks. Their message was clear: USMCA is a clearly better agreement, and Congress needs to do its job for the good of this country.

There are a number of ways in which the President has negotiated a USMCA that is stronger, that is better than NAFTA.

First, USMCA ensures that the digital economy will be more open and that it will be more secure.

Second, the strong language on currency manipulation and on intellectual property provides a model for our way forward with other agreements, especially one with China.

Third, Mr. Speaker, the benefits to the ag community are compelling. My colleagues have heard me speak before about the fact that our ag producers have not had the easiest time of it lately. They need USMCA.

This agreement opens up new access to Canadian markets for wheat, wine, eggs, poultry, and dairy. It increases agricultural exports by \$2 billion a year. That is why 1,000 ag groups from across the country have endorsed USMCA. They know that with fair access to markets, American producers can compete and win.

USMCA is not perfect, but collectively, these improvements would create 176,000 new American jobs and would increase our GDP by \$68 billion. That is real value, and it is value across the agricultural, manufacturing, and service sectors.

The administration has done its job. It has negotiated an agreement that powers economic opportunity and grows American jobs.

So, it is time. It is time for this body to act. It is time for the Speaker to bring this bill to the floor. Mr. Speaker, it is time for us to pass USMCA.

PUT PRINCIPLES ABOVE POLITICS

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

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, and still I rise because I love my country. And I rise today because we are witnessing clear and convincing evidence of a Presidential coverup. We are witnessing this evidence live and in living color on national TV.

Just yesterday, before the Judiciary Committee, two witnesses did not appear pursuant to the coverup, and the one who did appear brought with him the clear and convincing evidence. He brought with him a letter from the President of the United States, by and through his agents, that indicates that he should not give certain testimony—clear and convincing evidence of a coverup.

The President of the United States is engaged in a continuation of obstruction that is creating the coverup. He obstructed. This is why we are having the Judiciary Committee hearings, in part.

He continues his obstruction, which means he is covering up. We cannot allow this to continue.

The President is making a bet. The President's bet is this: The President is betting that we will put politics above principle, that we will not use Article II, section 4 of the Constitution as the radical Republicans did in 1868 to impeach President Johnson for merely speaking ill of Congress.

He is betting we won't use that. He is betting we won't put the principle above the politics. He believes that we will put winning the next election above the Constitution of the United States of America. He believes that we are going to put the politics above the moral imperative to do that which we know should be done when a President has committed impeachable acts.

I believe that we will not be driven by the polls. We will not. Those who

☐ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., ☐ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H7757

crossed the Edmund Pettus Bridge weren't driven by the polls. They were driven by a moral authority that they had to do that which was right, and we must do the right thing, too.

We cannot be driven by polls. We must drive the polls. We must stand on principle. We will not allow the next election to determine what we will do now.

Mr. Speaker, it is a risky thing to make this kind of decision. You don't know what the next election will bring. You have to use this power that the voters have given us, the constituents have given us, the people of this country have given us to do that which is right.

We must impeach this President. If we don't impeach him, Article II, section 4 of the Constitution will become meaningless. There will be no guardrails. There are none now, as he sees it, because he has made a bet.

Well, I am betting that this Congress will do the right thing. I am betting that we are going to put principle above politics and the people of this country above our political parties. I am betting we are not going to try to save a few people at an election at the expense of all the people who are suffering because of the cover up and because of the insidious discrimination this President is perpetrating upon this country and his policies.

I am betting on the American people. I am betting that the American people will stand with us. I am also betting that principle above all is what we must stand with.

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

CONGRATULATING WICK'S PIES ON ITS 75TH ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise with the sweetest news from the Sixth Congressional District of Indiana. On September 25, the famous Wick's Pies will celebrate its 75th anniversary in business.

Hoosier families have come to know Wick's for its delicious pies and baked goods that have been a staple in Randolph County since 1944. Duane "Wick" Wickersham started this business by delivering pies from his 1934 Buick sedan. Within 4 years, he was producing over 300 pies a day.

Wick's is renowned for its sugar cream pie, a Hoosier specialty since that has become the State's official State pie.

To this day, Wick's Pies remains family owned and can produce 10,000 pies in a single 8-hour shift. Wick's distributes to more than 40 States, though you can't beat a fresh slice from Mr. Wick's restaurant on Cherry Street in Winchester, which I have enjoyed.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Wick's Pies.

LACK OF HIGH-SPEED INTERNET ACCESS IMPACTS ALL AMERICANS

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, earlier in the year, I had the privilege of sitting in Ranking Member GRAVES' chair for a portion of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure Members' Day Hearing. Regardless of the diverse backgrounds or districts we represent, my Republican and Democratic colleagues echoed familiar stories of how the lack of high-speed internet access is impacting their constituents.

To address this issue, I worked with my colleague and fellow Hoosier, Congressman VISLOSKY, to introduce the Broadband Interagency Coordination Act, legislation to close the digital divide in rural America. Our bill directs the FCC, USDA, and NTIA to enter into an agreement to coordinate the distribution of Federal funds for broadband deployment.

We are working to make it easier for rural communities to access high-speed internet. We must close the digital divide and ensure Hoosiers and rural Americans are not left behind.

GUN VIOLENCE IS UNACCEPTABLE

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

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address the scourge of mass shootings currently plaguing my community and other communities around the Nation.

The Gun Violence Archive, Mr. Speaker, which is a not-for-profit corporation that tracks and disseminates information on mass shootings, defines mass shootings as incidents where four or more people are injured or killed as a result of gunfire. Using this metric, Mr. Speaker, there have been 33 mass shootings in my district in the past 5 years, and eight so far this year—33 mass shootings in my district in the past 5 years and eight so far this very year.

Mr. Speaker, our national consciousness has been shocked by the tragedies in Ohio and Texas, as it should very well be, but we seem increasingly numb to the everyday violence taking place in cities like Chicago and Baltimore and other places throughout the Nation, especially when that violence impacts people of color.

Mr. Speaker, clearly, the events that took place in Dayton, El Paso, and Odessa deserve our most serious and intense attention. These are despicable acts carried out by despicable actors. I only wish, Mr. Speaker, that every single mass shooting in our Nation received the same intense and undivided attention.

There are men, women, and children being murdered and maimed on an almost daily basis across our Nation. Their names, Mr. Speaker, are easily forgotten and not remembered. Their stories will not be read aloud on the national news. Their families' pain will continue to be ignored.

There are many slow-moving massacres taking place in districts like mine that, unfortunately, do not receive the same widespread attention because the violence is occurring in poorer, minority communities where it is sadly seen as commonplace or par for the course: They deserve to be victims. They deserve to be mass murdered. They deserve to be killed by gunfire. They have earned that. That is how they live. They are subhuman.

Mr. Speaker, as you and I know, this is unacceptable at its core. Throughout my tenure in this Congress, I have introduced and reintroduced legislation that will help reduce the mass shootings taking place today, yesterday, and days gone by in my district and beyond.

□ 1015

In 2007, I first introduced the Blair Holt Firearm Licensing and Record of Sale Act. I have reintroduced this bill in every Congress since; and in 2019, it is more necessary than ever, as it would forbid unlicensed firearm ownership, prohibit the transfer of firearms without a valid license, and require universal background checks.

Additionally, Mr. Speaker, this body has passed two important background check bills that have been passed out of this House, and I was the proud cosponsor of each of these bills. They now, sad to say, are sitting collecting dust over on the Senate side.

WELCOMING AUSTRALIAN PRIME MINISTER SCOTT MORRISON TO THE UNITED STATES

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

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, on Friday this week, September 20, our country will be welcoming the top official of the country of Australia, Prime Minister Scott Morrison, who will be arriving in Washington, D.C.

It is an important event, I think, for both countries, because this alliance between our two countries is so deep and the bond is so strong. The times that we are living in are so critical in terms of, again, just reaffirming all of the work that our two countries do together in so many ways, whether it is in terms of our military alliance, intelligence, trade, our cultures in terms of everything from movies to literature to music. Again, it is a deep and rich bond between our two countries.

Mr. Speaker, during the August break, we had a bipartisan group, a number of us, who actually went to the country of Australia for a joint Members of Parliament/Members of Congress conference that took place in Perth, Australia. There were about a dozen Members, bicameral and bipartisan. I can tell you that the prognosis is very good in terms of the connection between our two countries.

As I said, the integration of our two militaries could not be deeper and

more connected. Again, it is a relationship that goes back to World War I, when U.S. troops, the first group that arrived in the expeditionary force in World War I, actually fought under an Australian general, John Monash. Obviously, that carried through during World War II, particularly in the Asia-Pacific region.

In Vietnam, they were our ally, one of the few that actually fought with our country during that conflict; and, obviously, in the Middle East, Australian troops have been part of, again, operations, to this day, between the two countries in terms of the fight against ISIS and others.

When we were in Australia, again, the situation that I think is most urgent and something I really think all of us need to pay attention to is that the environment in the Indo-Pacific region is changing dramatically.

We now have a leader in the country of China, Xi Jinping, who has declared himself President for life and who has openly and brazenly basically signaled that he is prepared to disregard all international rules-based order, which has really been the foundation of that region since the end of World War II, whether it is maritime law, where, again, they are building islands totally in violation of maritime law, or whether it is a claim of the Nine-Dash Line, which is a territorial claim far out into the South China Sea and the East China Sea.

Again, what is happening there is egregious. It is harmful in terms of safe passage and open lanes of maritime traffic in the region. They obviously are engaged in an unprecedented military buildup, again, developing missile technologies that put surface ships of both countries and others in the region at great risk.

So we have a lot of work to do.

Rare earth minerals, which, again, China dominates. They have a virtual monopoly. Everything from our cellphones to aerospace and maritime equipment require the use of that.

Western Australia, in particular, has deep deposits of rare earth minerals, and it is time for our two countries to work together to create a different supply chain that does not rely totally on the country of China to make that happen.

What we also heard was that the best way that our country can move forward is to really, I think, point to what makes us most attractive in the world today, which is our embrace of democracy, free speech, openness, and generosity.

Again, those are policies which we heard loud and clear from our colleagues in the Australian Parliament that they are looking to America, which has been the leader since the end of World War II, to promote, that type of international rules-based order.

That is really the question of the day for this administration, which is in a go-it-alone trade war with China. Again, they have got the symptom

right, which is that China's behavior is egregious and malign, particularly in terms of the trade practices that they engage in, but the question is: How do you push back? How do you execute a policy that should be multilateral, collaborative with our allies, to make sure that the World Trade Organization actually has real teeth in terms of enforcing egregious violations that China has been engaged in in terms of intellectual property and government involvement in terms of trying to capture different markets like solar panels and many, many others?

So, again, I just want to say to our friends in Australia that they are welcome in this country. We look forward to, again, a very rich and strong alliance moving forward. The coequal branch of our government in Congress is part of that message and part of that policy.

Again, we look forward to many years of productive work together based on common values as well as common interests and, obviously, the embrace of democracy for the region and for the rest of the world.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 21 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

Chaplain Major General Steven Schaick, U.S. Air Force, The Pentagon, Arlington, Virginia, offered the following prayer:

Loving God, we ask forgiveness for all the times we forget things that bear remembering. Sometimes we forget that when Sam Johnson's F-4 was shot down and 7 years of torture ensued, he credits prayer, holy scripture, and Your undeniable presence for his survival, release, and his becoming a U.S. Congressman. And sometimes we forget that when Tech Sergeant Bell was raped by a man she once considered a friend, leaving her with hopelessness and thoughts of suicide, You, O Lord, raised her up to become one of our most amazing noncommissioned officers.

Lord, Your fingerprints are seen on every sortie, every mission, and on the precious lives of every airman, past and present. And so today we can say "happy birthday" with humble gratitude.

We pray Your continued blessing on our United States Air Force, which

today celebrates its 72nd birthday. We pray also Your blessings upon these Halls of Congress and on our United States of America.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

WELCOMING CHAPLAIN MAJOR GENERAL STEVEN SCHAICK

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, today is a great day. It is the birthday of the United States Air Force and for those of us who serve. I rise today to recognize not only that birthday of the Air Force but to have the great and distinct honor of having Chief of Chaplains Steve Schaick, as we have just heard, to be here. I have the privilege of also calling him my boss because I am in the Air Force as well. He is a chaplain, and he is the top of my chain. He is there for a reason. He exemplifies what a chaplain means and how they serve in our Air Force.

Throughout our country's history, men and women have awaited and answered the call of duty, accomplishing each mission with valor. Today, we acknowledge the men and women who have taken to the skies to defend our country as members of the United States Air Force.

As a chaplain in that United States Air Force Reserves, I have had the privilege to minister and work with airmen since 2002. Their courage and integrity both at home and abroad are unmatched, and Chaplain Steven Schaick is a testament to that courage and integrity.

Chaplain Schaick is a native of Oshkosh, Wisconsin. He enlisted in the United States Air Force in 1976, serving for 4 years as an F-15 integrated avionics component specialist. He is endorsed by the Presbyterian Church, U.S.A., and was commissioned in the Air Force Reserves as a chaplain candidate in 1985 and into the Active Duty chaplaincy in 1988.

Chaplain Schaick has served three different major commands as a staff

chaplain, followed by a special duty assignment to Arlington National Cemetery. He now serves as the Chief of Chaplains of the United States Air Force.

It is my honor to sponsor him to be the guest chaplain of the United States House of Representatives on this, the Air Force's birthday, September 18, 2019. Again, it is my pleasure to have Chaplain Schaick with us today.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 15 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

HONORING BUFFALO FIRE DEPARTMENT

(Mr. HIGGINS of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Madam Speaker, this week, I was pleased to announce the city of Buffalo Fire Department has been awarded a Federal grant of more than \$8.9 million by the Department of Homeland Security's Staffing for Adequate Fire and Emergency Response program. With this critical support, the Buffalo Fire Department will be able to hire 50 additional firefighters.

The purpose of this grant is to make certain that local fire departments are able to respond quickly to emergencies and at all hours.

Buffalo is home to an incredible team of firefighters who work to protect our community from fires and other emergencies. Just 1 month ago, the department received a separate grant of \$322,000 for equipment and training. This Federal grant funding will go a long way in strengthening the city's fire department and adding more dedicated personnel who work tirelessly to keep our community safe.

TIME IS NOW TO AX WIDOW'S TAX

(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. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the conferees of the National Defense Authorization Act, NDAA, were announced, and I am deeply grateful to serve another year on this committee for fiscal year 2020.

I will continue to promote peace through strength and work to champion repeal of the widow's tax. Our surviving spouses have waited long enough.

As of this week, my bill, the Military Surviving Spouses Equity Act, has 376 cosponsors from both sides of the aisle. In fact, it has the highest number of cosponsors of any bill in the current Congress.

In a time of constant disagreement, I am thankful to come together and for

the bipartisan support this bill has received. I am disappointed it did not receive a standalone vote, but I will fight to keep it in the NDAA. It is now time to ax the widow's tax.

I am dedicated to supporting our servicemembers, veterans, and military families. I look forward to working with the entire NDAA conference committee and President Donald Trump to advance this bipartisan legislation.

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

VAPING IS QUICKLY BECOMING A PUBLIC HEALTH CRISIS

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

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, recently, it was reported that a seventh person has died from a vaping-related illness in the United States.

In response, the CDC recently announced that it has activated its emergency operations center to investigate what is quickly becoming a public health crisis. It is becoming abundantly clear that e-cigarettes are causing harmful health impacts among both teens, approximately 2.4 million students, and adults who use them.

While more research is needed, I believe this public health emergency requires swift action by Congress to prevent the marketing of these products to young people. That is why I have introduced the Stop Vaping Ads Act, which will close the loophole in current law and would ban e-cigarette advertisements on broadcast media.

I invite my colleagues to join me in support of this commonsense bill that will help curb the onslaught of harmful and dangerous e-cigarette ads.

HONORING CONGRESSMAN SEAN DUFFY

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

Mr. BUDD. Mr. Speaker, on September 23, Congress will lose one of its most dedicated Members as SEAN DUFFY retires from the House.

I will miss his unwavering commitment to conservative principles and the way that he never backed down from a fight. In fact, he welcomed them. But he also engaged in a battle of ideas, and he never made it personal.

It is because of this attitude that freedom and liberty will be sustained a little longer, and I wish we had more like him. I also respected his legislative accomplishments, particularly his commitment to protecting our State-based system of insurance regulation, just one of his many passions during his time as chairman and ranking member of the Housing and Insurance Subcommittee.

Mr. Speaker, SEAN will be remembered by me as a friend, a loving father, a dedicated husband, and a humble public servant. I, for one, hope this is not the last we hear or see of Congressman SEAN DUFFY.

HONORING RONNIE LUPE

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

Mr. O'HALLERAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay my respects to Ronnie Lupe, former chairman of the White Mountain Apache Tribe, who passed away last month at the age of 89.

During his time as a public servant, Mr. Lupe fought for Tribal sovereignty and worked extensively on water rights issues. Mr. Lupe's efforts aided the passage of the White Mountain Apache Water Rights Quantification Act of 2009 and established a reservation-wide clean drinking water system.

For his service to his Tribe, he was recognized by former Arizona Governor Jack Williams on the Arizona Commission of Indian Affairs in 1968.

A veteran, Mr. Lupe was a member of the United States Marine Corps during the Korean war.

Arizona lost an awesome voice for Native American advancement. I feel truly humbled to have known him. Pat and I are keeping our thoughts with Ronnie's family and the entire White Mountain Apache Tribe in our prayers as they mourn his passing.

RECOGNIZING SPRING LAKE'S 150TH BIRTHDAY

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

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the village of Spring Lake on its 150th birthday.

This past weekend, friends and residents of the small village in west Michigan gathered together to celebrate and share memories of the community's rich and storied history.

The village of Spring Lake first began as a lumber town in 1838 when Captain Benjamin Hopkins and his family arrived from Canada. Soon after, other settlers arrived and constructed additional sawmills, leading to the village officially incorporating in 1869. As the village developed, railroads, resorts, and telephone lines all helped the village grow into a bustling community.

Today, the village is situated on the beautiful shores of both Spring Lake and the Grand River right next to Lake Michigan, offering endless recreational opportunities and a wide variety of shops and services.

While the village has changed much throughout the last 150 years, one thing has remained constant, the close-knit and welcoming community continues to make the village a special place to live and raise a family.

Mr. Speaker, let us join in celebration and in recognition of all former and current residents of Spring Lake Village as we celebrate its 150th birthday.

STATE OF GUN VIOLENCE IN THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

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

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, every day, 100 Americans are killed with guns and hundreds more are shot and injured. That is 36,500 people a year who lose their lives to gun violence. The effects extend far beyond those casualties and shape the lives of millions of Americans who witness it, know someone who was shot, or live in fear of the next shooting. This senseless loss of life is all too common in the United States and its territories.

As of August 26, we have lost 26 lives to gun violence in the Virgin Islands. In 2018, the United Nations released a report naming the territory as the new murder capital in the Caribbean, with 52.64 murders per 100,000 people.

For the families, friends, and communities of victims in the Virgin Islands, this pain will never pass, just as it will not pass for the loved ones of thousands of other people who have died from gun violence in the U.S.

Time for action is overdue. Earlier this year, the House passed the Bipartisan Background Checks Act of 2019, requiring checks for all gun purchases. We need to push for universal background checks, assistance and increasing funds to border control for the Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico to stop guns coming into the territories, and enhanced treatment and resources for mental health.

I look forward to working with all to come up with some form of sensible gun law legislation.

□ 1215

RECOGNIZING BILL DUNN

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

Mr. BURCHETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in recognition of my good friend, Bill Dunn, a colleague of mine from my time in the Tennessee General Assembly.

Representative Dunn and I served together in the State house starting when we were members of the same freshman class in 1995. Since that time, he has remained a strong champion for fiscal conservatism and the rights of the unborn.

Upon completing his current term, Representative Dunn will retire from his house seat after 26 years. Representative Dunn has been a diligent public servant, an excellent representative for his community, and, most importantly, an honorable family man.

He and his wife, Stacy, have raised a wonderful family of five children; and I have not checked lately to see how many grandchildren there are, but there are a bunch of them, I am sure. I am sure his retirement includes quality time with his family.

I wish Representative Dunn the best of luck in the next chapter of his life and thank him for his commitment to our home State of Tennessee.

Bill Dunn is a good guy.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1423, FORCED ARBITRATION INJUSTICE REPEAL ACT; WAIVING A REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(A) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS REPORTED FROM THE COMMITTEE ON RULES; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 558 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 558

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1423) to amend title 9 of the United States Code with respect to arbitration. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116-32 modified by the amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may de-

mand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommend with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. The requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII for a two-thirds vote to consider a report from the Committee on Rules on the same day it is presented to the House is waived with respect to any resolution reported through the legislative day of September 20, 2019, relating to a measure making or continuing appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020.

SEC. 3. It shall be in order at any time on the legislative day of September 19, 2019, or September 20, 2019, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules as though under clause 1 of rule XV. The Speaker or her designee shall consult with the Minority Leader or his designee on the designation of any matter for consideration pursuant to this section.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CUELLAR). The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 1 hour.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. LESKO), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, the House Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 558, providing for consideration of H.R. 1423, the FAIR Act, under a structured rule.

The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

The rule also provides same day authority for a rule providing for the consideration of a fiscal year 2020 CR and provides blank suspension authority through the legislative day of Friday, September 20, 2019.

Mr. Speaker, 11 years ago, Kevin Ziober joined the United States Navy Reserve. In his own words, he did so to "help protect America's liberties, freedoms, and security."

From 2010 to 2012, Kevin worked diligently for a Federal contractor in my home State of California, helping to grow the company from 18 employees to more than 90.

When he found out that he would be deployed in November of 2012, his employer decorated the office with navy-color balloons and threw a surprise party in his honor.

Unfortunately, the real surprise was delivered to him 30 minutes after his party. Kevin was fired. His employer made it clear that his job would not be waiting for him when he got back from his deployment.

I wonder what my colleagues would do if forced with the same circumstance of choosing country over providing for their own families.

The Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Rights Act protects his rights as a reservist to deploy and keep his job.

When Kevin returned from serving his country in 2014 and tried to enforce this very right, his employer filed a motion to compel arbitration, and it was granted.

Six months into his tenure with the company, Kevin had been required to sign several documents as a condition of keeping his job. Those documents included a forced arbitration clause, which meant that Kevin would have no access to the Federal court system—no access. He would lose his right to a jury trial, to any meaningful appeal, and to a public or speedy proceeding of any kind.

Mr. Speaker, Kevin and the thousands of other Americans who have been forced into arbitration proceedings are why we are here today. We are here to ensure that Americans are not forced to unknowingly agree to surrender their constitutional rights.

Under the present system, when corporations harm workers and consumers, their cases are often funneled into the confidential quasi-legal arbitration system.

When thousands of Californians were charged early termination fees that were illegal under State law, DIRECTV responded by forcing individual customers into arbitration.

What exactly are consumers supposed to do when it costs more to pursue a case through arbitration than it would if they were looking to recover a small amount?

Instead of victims fighting their cases together, big corporations can get away with making millions illegally by harming average Americans. By allowing forced arbitration and preventing class action lawsuits, we incentivize this very bad behavior.

Mandatory arbitration has the potential to affect everyone. One story that haunts me is that of Sister Irene Morissette.

When she was 84 years old, Sister Irene, an elderly Catholic nun, moved to Chateau Vestavia, an assisted living facility outside of Birmingham, Alabama. While living at this facility, she was brutally raped at 84 years of age. The police found blood and semen on her bed and her clothing.

The medical examiner documented bleeding and injuries that indicated a rape had occurred, but after the police failed to bring a criminal case, Irene's family attempted to bring a civil suit against Chateau Vestavia. Instead of being able to pursue her case in court,

she was forced to arbitration. Irene, unknowingly, had signed a forced arbitration clause buried in the documents required to live at the facility.

The arbitrator decided that, despite the physical evidence of rape, besides the blood and the semen on her clothing, the facility that was charged with keeping her safe could not and would not be held responsible.

Unfortunately, forced arbitration is common practice among large chain nursing facilities. Ninety percent of these large facilities require forced arbitration agreements.

Mr. Speaker, can you imagine trusting your loved one, your mom or a grandma, to be cared for at one of these facilities and then finding out that they have been brutally harmed and that you could not seek a fair recourse, no justice?

These facilities argue that if you refuse to sign a forced arbitration clause, you can just take your loved one, take your business somewhere else, go. But that choice isn't a viable choice, because the majority of these large facilities, as I stated, 90 percent of these large facilities require you to sign an arbitration agreement.

□ 1230

Many people don't have another option, at least not one if they want to live close to their loved ones or in their home State. So, seniors must sign away their right and be denied the opportunity to seek justice, just like Sister Irene.

What struck me the most about her story is why the arbitrator did not rule in her favor. The arbitrator said that Sister Irene did not sound upset enough in the audio recording to determine if she was really raped. What does that mean? How many times have men been judge and jury when deciding women didn't seem hurt enough, didn't fight back enough, didn't wear the right clothing, didn't scream loud enough, or didn't wear her own condom? Sister Irene was 84 years old, for God's sake. What does it take to find responsibility in an act of violence against an innocent nun?

I wonder how many other victims, who have been forced into arbitration, have heard similar statements of doubt from private arbitrators. The worst part is that we will never know. And why is that? Because most arbitration proceedings are not public. Nondisclosure agreements and gag orders often accompany mandatory arbitration. The #MeToo movement taught us a valuable lesson about nondisclosure agreements and forced arbitration. Without forced arbitration, we could have stopped Bill O'Reilly or Roger Ailes from assaulting women and spewing their hate on FOX News long ago. Doing away with forced arbitration means more victims can share their stories and prevent abusers from harming others.

What I hope these stories make clear is that arbitration, contrary to claims

of my colleagues, does not work for everyone. In fact, for most Americans, it serves as a barrier to justice and a legal shield for corporations. It is a system that deters defendants from seeking justice and small payouts. It is a system that is fundamentally based on tricking Americans into giving up their rights.

That is why H.R. 1423 is so critically important. This bill would restore the rights of Americans by allowing them to make the choice for themselves about whether arbitration is right for them. Ultimately, that is what this bill is about: freedom to choose for every American.

If arbitration is the amazing system that my colleagues claim it is, then Americans will flock to pursue their claims through it. But if arbitration is, in fact, the barrier to justice that it appears to be for so many Americans, then this bill will allow them to choose for themselves how they want to pursue that justice. Voting for this rule is a step towards fighting the special interests that oppress our constituents.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would advise Members to not traffic the well while another Member is under recognition.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative TORRES for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we all want to protect innocent people, we all want to protect the little guy, and we all want to protect the elderly. That is why I would remind my colleague that courts can and have overturned unfair arbitration clauses, and, certainly, if criminal acts have been done, criminal charges should be pursued.

Today, we consider a bill that disregards private contracts and enriches the wealthiest trial attorneys. We consider a bill that my Democrat colleagues intended to protect the American people, but really it specifically carves out an application to labor unions. And why would it do that? Because the labor unions and trial lawyers are the Democrats' most ardent supporters and donors. We consider a bill that will hurt businesses and the very consumers and employees it seeks to protect.

The bill's proponents advance the idea that arbitration is unfair, coercive, and harmful, but that is far from the truth. In fact, I would like to read some of the things that the U.S. Supreme Court has said about arbitration agreements in various cases. They have said: The advantages of arbitration are many; it is usually cheaper and faster than litigation, it can have simpler procedural and evidentiary rules; it normally minimizes hostility and is less disruptive of ongoing and future business dealings among the parties; it is often more flexible in regard to scheduling of time and places of hearings and discovery devices; and the

U.S. Supreme Court in multiple rulings also further recognized that the informality of arbitral proceedings is itself desirable, reducing the cost and increasing the speed of dispute and resolution. And in other studies it has proven, over and over again in multiple studies, that arbitration actually has better results for the small guy, for the employee.

The bill's proponents advance the idea that arbitration is unfair, coercive, and harmful. But again, I repeat, that is far from the truth. Arbitration is an important option in our legal system. It allows us to resolve disputes without costly litigation. It is easier, faster, and cheaper.

Arbitration is well accepted and available to those who wish not to bring their disputes before Federal or State courts. It is a way to avoid the inflexibility, delays, and expenses of litigation. In fact, an employee can often set times better with arbitration than they do with a court hearing. It is especially useful in consumer disputes, which typically involve smaller claims.

Aside from benefits in cost and time, studies show that the results of arbitration are as good, or often better results than one would get in court.

To be fair, I don't believe that arbitration is always appropriate. For example, I, personally, do not agree with mandatory binding arbitration in situations involving sexual assault. I would be willing to work across the aisle with my Democratic colleagues on a tailored bill addressing the issue of sexual assault, but this bill is way too wide and targets arbitration across the board.

This bill would shut some Americans out of the justice system. Eliminating arbitration means that Americans, who can't afford courtroom lawyers' fees, may never receive justice. Allowing only those who can afford attorneys to obtain justice is not justice.

While shutting out some Americans from the justice system, this bill gives a massive handout to trial lawyers, who will greatly benefit from the huge increase in litigation costs. Money-hungry trial lawyers benefit from this bill, not everyday consumers and employees.

In fact, an amendment that was offered in Rules last night by Congressman SENSENBRENNER, who has been here for years and studied this topic, would have said, okay, arbitration stays in place, the status quo. But there is an option. If the trial lawyer can tell the consumer, the client, how much money it is going to cost to take it to court—and that is reasonable, and he had different ways that you would determine if the trial attorney fees were reasonable—then you can go ahead. My Democrat colleagues in the Rules committee rejected that amendment, a reasonable amendment.

I believe if this bill passes, we will see a rise in class action lawsuits and the abuse that comes from it. The rampant abuse in class action lawsuits

is why companies have chosen mandatory binding arbitrations in the first place. If mandatory binding agreements are invalidated, there will be substantially more class action abuses.

Mr. Speaker, arbitration is beneficial. It saves time and money for both parties, and achieves just as good, if not better, outcomes for those involved.

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

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CARTWRIGHT).

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I want to talk a little bit today about accountability. Accountability is something we teach our children. Let me burden you with a short story.

About 20 years ago, I am sitting in my kitchen. I think it was a Saturday morning. My son, Mattie, who is 4 years old, was in the middle of the kitchen floor and dropped a plate. It landed at his feet. He was wearing shoes. He looked up at me, I looked at him, and he said to me, Dad, I didn't do it.

Well, it is a funny story and it is cute, but the point is that you teach your children about accountability. You teach them to accept responsibility, to make things right that they have done wrong, and to move on with their lives.

My wife, Marion, and I have two boys, and we like to say we have done a marvelous job teaching them about accountability and taking proper responsibility.

But there is a poison in this country. There is a pestilence that has been occurring for at least a couple of generations. I want to say it started with the Watergate era back in the seventies, when people didn't want to take accountability and they didn't want to take responsibility. You heard phrases come up like "plausible deniability."

And then we went on into the corporate world and we had the Enron scandal. Rather than taking accountability and responsibility, standing up and admitting what they did and making it right, no, what did they do? They were shredding the documents as fast as they could shred them.

It is routine in this country now for people in positions of power and responsibility to say, "mistakes were made," not "I messed up." "Mistakes were made." It is a pestilence in this country to deny accountability and responsibility. It is unacceptable.

The question is: What do we do to bring back accountability to the American culture? Well, the FAIR Act makes a big step in that direction. It invalidates forced arbitration clauses: the ones that show up in the boiler plate of the contracts that consumers sign with every agreement we have with a big corporation. It shows up in the fine print. And if you take the time to read it, it is not debatable, it is not

negotiable. You have to sign it or else you have to not get the contract, not get the account.

□ 1245

Mr. Speaker, if you look at those contracts, it makes you waive your constitutional right, as Congresswoman TORRES just said.

We have a constitutional right to go to court to settle our disputes. Our Founding Fathers and people in the American Revolution fought and died for that constitutional right.

Mr. Speaker, with the stroke of a pen, you are allowed to give this away, even though it is in the fine print. Instead, you have to go to a rigged and secret arbitration process that the corporations control and usually win. It also means you can't band together with other claimants.

Think of what that means, Mr. Speaker. It means if you have an account with a big corporation and they decided to charge an extra \$500 for the year, even though that is in violation of the contract, and it may be in violation of State law, who is going to bring a case for \$500? A lawyer won't take that case. These clauses prohibit banding together in class actions and doing the cases together.

What does the upshot of that mean? It means that these corporations that do it act with impunity. They are immunized from accountability. They can do anything that they want without having to account for it in court.

This is a license to steal. It is wrong, and it goes against the American ideal of responsibility and accountability, what we try to teach our children. This is not something that really applies to small businesses. It applies to big corporations.

Eighty-one out of the Fortune 100 corporations use these forced arbitration clauses, and almost nobody goes to arbitration under them. Take Amazon Prime, for example. They have 101 million subscribers to Amazon Prime. In the last 5 years, there have been only 15 arbitrations. That is because it just doesn't make sense. The economics don't work. If you can't band together and do it as a class action, then it doesn't work.

Class actions keep American corporations accountable and responsible. That is why we don't want to shut them down.

My friend from across the aisle, the gentlewoman from Arizona, just said that this bill shuts some people out of the justice system and that it is an important option. It is not an option. That is the point of this bill. It is mandatory. It is forced. They don't have a choice. They go into a secret and rigged system.

Vote for the FAIR Act. I thank the gentlewoman, Mrs. TORRES, for yielding.

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

I would also like to expand on several studies that have been done on this

issue throughout the years. One is the Searle study, another one done by the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, and another one done by the U.S. Chamber Institute for Legal Reform. In all of these studies with different cases, it was found that employees were three times more likely to win in arbitration than in court. Employees, on average, won twice the amount of money through arbitration. In this U.S. Chamber Institute for Legal Reform report, it specifically said the employee won in arbitration an average of \$520,630 versus in court, where the average was \$269,885.

It also said arbitration disputes were resolved faster, on average: 569 days for arbitration; litigation, 665 days. Both seem long to me.

Mr. Speaker, 79 percent of arbitration cases were filed by employees who made less than \$100,000.

What I am saying is, let's not throw out the baby with the bathwater. Arbitration has worked. It has worked for years. It has proven repeatedly that it is more cost-effective. In the cases of these studies, the employees actually got awarded more than they did, on average, when they went to court.

Let's not forget all of those people who have used trial attorneys. Mr. Speaker, you hear it over and over again, where the attorneys got all the money and the victims got hardly anything.

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

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

When Wells Fargo opened up 3.5 million fake accounts, including 178,972 from Arizona, Wells Fargo tried, since 2013, to use forced arbitration to block lawsuits, including a class-action case. These people were charged excess overdraft fees when their accounts were not overdrawn.

As it relates to labor, there are 60.1 million workers who make up a majority of nonunion private-sector employees who are subject to forced arbitration clauses. These employees are told that if they want the job or want to keep their current job, they must sign away their right to their day in court and submit to forced arbitration agreements.

In contrast, the collective bargaining process includes protections that are unavailable to many nonunion workers, such as rejecting unfair employment terms. In collective bargaining, both the company and the union are represented by counsel and can agree on arbitration before the dispute arises to an informed and transparent basis.

The collective bargaining process can also involve agreement over other important protections, such as truly neutral arbitrators, better procedures, and transparent decisionmaking.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN), a distinguished member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, have our colleagues across the aisle forgotten that the right to a jury trial was as essential a cause of the American Revolution as was representative democracy and the denial of voting rights itself?

John Adams said: "Representative government and trial by jury are the heart and the lungs of liberty. Without them, we have no other fortification against being ridden like horses, fleeced like sheep, worked like cattle, and fed and clothed like swine and hounds."

The massive suppression of trial by jury rights by British authorities was a critical cause of our Revolution. One of the charges that Thomas Jefferson leveled against the British in the Declaration of Independence was "depriving us in many cases of the benefits of trial by jury."

Now, today, we have not a foreign king and government trying to impose a closed Star Chamber on the American people but certain large corporations chartered by the States that seek to divest consumers and employees of their sacred trial by jury and due process rights by conditioning their employment or their market agreements on relegating them to closed-door binding arbitration sessions where all of their rights are vanquished and the whole process, from start to finish, is skewed in favor of the corporations that control and design the proceedings.

This legislation, the FAIR Act, vindicates the most essential rights of the American people.

Amazingly, the GOP floor leader admits that forcing victims of sexual harassment into compulsory arbitration proceedings is unfair and agrees with us that they should not be forced into compulsory arbitration. She would like us to strip everything else out of the bill and boil it down to that.

If it is not fair for victims of sexual harassment to be forced into forced arbitration, why is it fair for victims of racial harassment, consumer fraud, wrongful termination, or any of the other causes of action that she would exclude from the legislation?

I am glad that the gentlewoman agrees with us on the importance of not subjecting victims of sexual harassment to closed-door Star Chamber proceedings, but this concession from the minority gives away the whole game. If it is unfair to coerce them, it is unfair to coerce everyone else, too.

The key to understanding this legislation is that any consumer or employee who wants to enter into binding arbitration with a corporation can do so and is perfectly free to do so after a conflict has arisen, but it should not be compelled as a condition of employment, purchase, or rental, essentially elevating the power of corporations that have been chartered by the government over the essential constitutional rights of the people.

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

Mr. Speaker, sometimes I don't understand why my Democratic colleagues put forward certain bills and not other bills, and this is not a bill that—I don't know about my colleagues, but I haven't had a lot of constituents talk to me about this bill and the need for it.

In fact, I have in front of me a recent poll that was done. It was conducted in March 2019. There were 1,000 registered voters who were polled. In that poll, it asked: "Is arbitration viewed much more favorably than both class-action and individual lawsuits?"

On this, it said in all cases that arbitration was viewed more favorably by our constituents than individual lawsuits.

It goes on to break this down among Republicans, independents, and Democrats. In this case, Republicans thought that arbitration was a better format by 47 percent; independents, 36 percent; and half and half, another 36 percent. Democrats thought arbitration was better than going to court, 44 percent, and then another 34 percent added to 10 percent. Our constituents—and I may not be reading this right because it is in black and white instead of color. I will show it to the gentlewoman later.

If you add the two together, it clearly shows that Republicans, independents, and Democrats favor arbitration over going to court, and it is probably because of cases like this.

In fact, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau found numerous problems in its study to be associated with reliance on class-action lawsuits for recovery on consumer claims. In addition, class-action lawsuits also have presented other problems, including scandal involving fabricated testimony bought and sold to support false claims.

For example, multiple renowned class-action lawyers have been exposed and convicted of such behavior. One of them, William Lerach of Milberg Weiss, told *The Wall Street Journal* that illegal kickbacks to people recruited to file class-action lawsuits is an industry practice. He and fellow trial lawyer Melvyn Weiss engineered a \$250 million criminal scheme to pay people to sue companies, lied about it in court, and became Federal prisoners.

Another of American's most prominent trial lawyers, Richard Scruggs of Mississippi, pled guilty in March 2018 to bribing a State judge to obtain more legal fees.

I have already talked about how the U.S. Supreme Court, through multiple cases, has said that arbitration is a good practice, better in many cases than going to court. I have already talked about multiple studies that have studied the analysis between arbitration and court; that employees, on average, get awarded more money through arbitration than going to court; and that it helps employees and employers with flexibility of scheduling of time instead of going to court.

This has been a practice that has worked successfully for many years, and this is such a broad stroke that my Democratic colleagues are doing.

I continue to oppose it, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1300

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire first from my colleague if she is prepared to close.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, I am.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to ensure that, if you like your contract, you can keep your contract. My amendment would make this bill apply only prospectively, because in this bill it is retroactive unless the consumer chooses otherwise.

Americans enter into agreements with one another with the assumption that the law will not change the deal they made. This amendment would ensure that, if you like your contract and you are the small guy, you can keep your contract.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, in closing, this bill will impose costly litigation on employees and consumers since arbitration offers a faster, cheaper, and easier way to resolve disputes. It also freezes out Americans who can't afford expensive lawyer fees from our justice system.

We should not be considering a bill that promotes injustice and inequality in our system. This bill is nothing but a giveaway to wealthy trial lawyers.

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

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Before I conclude, I would like to start by thanking Mr. JOHNSON and Mr. NADLER for bringing this critical piece of legislation to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues have repeatedly argued that this legislation is for trial lawyers. Let me tell you about Allen.

Allen tried to hold American Express accountable for high swipe fees in a class action lawsuit with other small businesses. Instead, he was forced to go at it alone in arbitration, where he quickly found out that, even if he won his case, he would lose because it would cost much more to bring his claim than he could hope to ever recover. Allen

lost his case after appealing all the way to the Supreme Court.

Recently, some very large companies like Walgreens, CVS, and Safeway have taken American Express to trial over the very same issue. The difference here is that they are large enough to have been able to negotiate contracts without forced arbitration clauses.

I have heard it said that the FAIR Act is bad for small businesses. It is quite the opposite. Corporate America claims the FAIR Act outlaws all arbitration clauses. That is simply not true. The FAIR Act does not apply to business-to-business arbitrations.

The bill protects workers, consumers, and small businesses with antitrust cases. Companies like Walmart or Exxon are not protected from forced arbitration under the FAIR Act.

I could share many more of these stories, but our time here is limited.

It shocks me that my colleague is so opposed to fair representation when our Founding Fathers recognized the importance of access to legal counsel, and every day on this very floor we pledge "with liberty and justice for all"—for all.

I do agree with my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, that the biggest special interest at play here is the corporations that want to protect their top executives who sexually assault their employees; the cable companies who charge illegal fees, making millions in profits; the credit card companies that charge exorbitant fees, crippling small businesses; and many others that use forced arbitration to escape justice.

There are plenty of special interests that are fighting to keep using this broken system, and my colleague has tried to flip that narrative to make it seem as if the underdog will be hurt by this legislation—the underdog of billionaires. Nothing could be further from the truth.

Let's not forget whom this bill is for. This bill is about fighting for veterans like Kevin, for our loved ones in nursing homes like Sister Irene, for small businessowners and every other victim of forced arbitration.

Mr. Speaker, we have tossed around a lot of legal terms in this debate, but at its core, this bill is about justice.

In conclusion, I would like to tell about a horrific experience suffered by a customer of Massage Envy in L.A. County.

Lilly was sexually assaulted by a therapist, and after the assault, Lilly tried and tried to cancel her membership to this service, but the company repeatedly put roadblocks in her way. A year and a half later, she downloaded the Massage Envy app on her phone to cancel her membership. Hidden in the fine print of the app was a forced arbitration clause. Lilly filed a lawsuit.

Like hundreds of other women who have been assaulted, now Massage Envy is using forced arbitration to prevent Lilly from getting justice, attempting to force her and other women into arbitration to keep it a secret.

Years later, she still has not seen an outcome.

By isolating survivors of sexual assault, wage theft, and discrimination and denying them the leverage of class action suits, we discourage other victims from coming forward. While the victims wait in limbo, navigating a potentially rigged arbitration system, their perpetrators are free to continue to rape, to continue to steal, and to continue their bad behavior.

Forced arbitration is bad for workers, small businesses, and consumers, and this bill is about giving Americans a chance to fight against powerful special interests.

Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues consider this legislation, I ask you: Will we continue to silence victims, or will we give them the freedom to make their own choice to fight against the injustice that they have suffered?

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

The material previously referred to by Mrs. LESKO is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 558

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 4. Notwithstanding any other provision of this resolution, the amendment printed in section 5 shall be in order as though printed as the last amendment in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution if offered by Representative Lesko of Arizona or a designee. That amendment shall be debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent.

SEC. 5. The amendment referred to in section 4 is as follows:

At the end of section 401 of chapter 4 of title 9 of the United States Code, as added by section 3 of the bill, add the following:

"(7) the term 'solicited party' means a contracting party asked to agree to a predispute arbitration agreement or to a predispute joint-action waiver; and

"(8) the term 'soliciting party' means a contracting party who asked a solicited party to agree to a predispute arbitration agreement or to a predispute joint-action waiver."

In section 402(a) of chapter 4 of title 9 of the United States Code, as added by section 3 of the bill, insert

"unless the solicited party seeks to enforce such agreement, or such waiver, against the soliciting party and the agreement or waiver was agreed to before the date of enactment of this Act" before the period at the end.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess for a period of less than 15 minutes.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 9 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1315

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CUELLAR) at 1 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed. Votes will be taken in the following order:

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 558;

Adoption of House Resolution 558, if ordered; and

Suspending the rules and passing H.R. 4285.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1423, FORCED ARBITRATION INJUSTICE REPEAL ACT; WAIVING A REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(A) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS REPORTED FROM THE COMMITTEE ON RULES; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 558) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1423) to amend title 9 of the United States Code with respect to arbitration; waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules; and providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 228, nays 195, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 533]

YEAS—228

Adams	Barragán	Bishop (GA)
Aguilar	Beatty	Blumenauer
Allred	Bera	Blunt Rochester
Axne	Beyer	Bonamici

Boyle, Brendan F.	Hayes	Pappas
Brindisi	Heck	Pascarell
Brown (MD)	Higgins (NY)	Payne
Brownley (CA)	Hill (CA)	Perlmutter
Bustos	Himes	Peters
Butterfield	Horn, Kendra S.	Peterson
Carbajal	Horsford	Phillips
Cárdenas	Houlahan	Pingree
Carson (IN)	Hoyer	Pocan
Cartwright	Huffman	Porter
Case	Jackson Lee	Pressley
Casten (IL)	Jayapal	Price (NC)
Castor (FL)	Jeffries	Quigley
Castro (TX)	Johnson (GA)	Raskin
Chu, Judy	Johnson (TX)	Rice (NY)
Cicilline	Kaptur	Richmond
Cisneros	Keating	Rose (NY)
Clark (MA)	Kelly (IL)	Rouda
Clarke (NY)	Kennedy	Roybal-Allard
Clay	Khanna	Ruiz
Cleaver	Kildee	Ruppersberger
Cohen	Kilmer	Rush
Connolly	Kim	Sánchez
Cooper	Kind	Sarbanes
Correa	Kirkpatrick	Scanlon
Costa	Krishnamoorthi	Schaff
Courtney	Kuster (NH)	Schneider
Cox (CA)	Lamb	Schrader
Craig	Langevin	Schrier
Crist	Larsen (WA)	Scott (VA)
Crow	Larson (CT)	Scott, David
Cuellar	Lawrence	Serrano
Cunningham	Lawson (FL)	Sewell (AL)
Dauids (KS)	Lee (CA)	Shalala
Davis (CA)	Lee (NV)	Sherman
Davis, Danny K.	Levin (CA)	Sherrill
Dean	Levin (MI)	Sires
DeFazio	Lewis	Slotkin
DeGette	Lieu, Ted	Smith (WA)
DeLauro	Lipinski	Soto
DelBene	Loeb	Spanberger
Delgado	Loeb	Speier
Demings	Lofgren	Stanton
DeSaulnier	Lowenthal	Stevens
Deutch	Lowe	Suozzi
Dingell	Luján	Swalwell (CA)
Doggett	Luria	Takano
Doyle, Michael F.	Lynch	Thompson (CA)
Engel	Malinowski	Titus
Escobar	Maloney	Tlaib
Eshoo	Maloney, Sean	Tonko
Espallat	Matsui	Torres
Evans	McAdams	Torres (CA)
Finkenauer	McBath	Torres Small (NM)
Fletcher	McCollum	Trahan
Foster	McGovern	Trone
Frankel	McNerney	Underwood
Fudge	Meeks	Van Drew
Gabbard	Meng	Vargas
Gaetz	Moore	Veasey
Gallego	Morelle	Vela
García (IL)	Moulton	Velázquez
García (TX)	Mucarsel-Powell	Visclosky
Golden	Murphy (FL)	Wasserman
Gomez	Nadler	Schultz
Gonzalez (TX)	Napolitano	Waters
Gottheimer	Neal	Watson Coleman
Green, Al (TX)	Neguse	Welch
Grijalva	Norcross	Weston
Haaaland	O'Halleran	Wild
Harder (CA)	Ocasio-Cortez	Wilson (FL)
Hastings	Omar	Yarmuth
	Pallone	
	Panetta	

NAYS—195

Aderholt	Bucshon	Diaz-Balart
Allen	Budd	Duffy
Amash	Burchett	Duncan
Amodei	Burgess	Dunn
Armstrong	Byrne	Emmer
Arrington	Calvert	Estes
Babin	Carter (GA)	Ferguson
Bacon	Carter (TX)	Fitzpatrick
Baird	Chabot	Fleischmann
Balderson	Cheney	Flores
Banks	Cline	Fortenberry
Barr	Cloud	Foxx (NC)
Bergman	Cole	Fulcher
Biggs	Collins (GA)	Gallagher
Bilirakis	Collins (NY)	Gianforte
Bishop (NC)	Comer	Gibbs
Bishop (UT)	Conaway	Gohmert
Bost	Cook	Gonzalez (OH)
Brady	Crenshaw	Gooden
Brooks (AL)	Curtis	Gosar
Brooks (IN)	Davidson (OH)	Granger
Buchanan	Davis, Rodney	Graves (GA)
Buck	DesJarlais	Graves (LA)

Graves (MO)	Luetkemeyer	Schweikert
Green (TN)	Marchant	Scott, Austin
Griffith	Marshall	Sensenbrenner
Grothman	Massie	Shimkus
Guest	McCarthy	Simpson
Guthrie	McClintock	Smith (MO)
Hagedorn	McClintock	Smith (NE)
Harris	McHenry	Smith (NJ)
Hartzler	McKinley	Smucker
Hern, Kevin	Meadows	Spano
Herrera Beutler	Meuser	Staubert
Hice (GA)	Miller	Stefanik
Higgins (LA)	Mitchell	Steil
Hill (AR)	Moolenaar	Steube
Holding	Mooney (WV)	Stewart
Hollingsworth	Mullin	Stivers
Hudson	Murphy (NC)	Taylor
Huizenga	Newhouse	Thompson (PA)
Hunter	Norman	Thornberry
Hurd (TX)	Nunes	Timmons
Johnson (LA)	Olson	Tipton
Johnson (OH)	Palazzo	Turner
Johnson (SD)	Palmer	Upton
Jordan	Pence	Wagner
Joyce (OH)	Perry	Walberg
Joyce (PA)	Posey	Walden
Katko	Ratcliffe	Walker
Keller	Reed	Walorski
Kelly (MS)	Reschenthaler	Waltz
Kelly (PA)	Rice (SC)	Watkins
King (IA)	Riggleman	Weber (TX)
King (NY)	Roby	Wenstrup
Kinzinger	Rodgers (WA)	Westerman
Kustoff (TN)	Roe, David P.	Williams
LaHood	Rogers (AL)	Wilson (SC)
LaMalfa	Rogers (KY)	Wittman
Lamborn	Rooney (FL)	Womack
Latta	Rose, John W.	Woodall
Lesko	Rouzer	Wright
Long	Roy	Yoho
Loudermilk	Rutherford	Young
Lucas	Scalise	Zeldin

NOT VOTING—11

Abraham	Cummings	Ryan
Bass	Garamendi	Thompson (MS)
Clyburn	Mast	Webster (FL)
Crawford	McEachin	

□ 1343

Messrs. GALLAGHER, COLE, FLORES, CRENSHAW, MURPHY of North Carolina, SMITH of New Jersey, and BILIRAKIS changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. RUSH changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 228, nays 196, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 534]

YEAS—228

Adams	Brown (MD)	Clarke (NY)
Aguilar	Brownley (CA)	Clay
Allred	Bustos	Cleaver
Axne	Butterfield	Cohen
Barragán	Carbajal	Connolly
Bass	Cárdenas	Cooper
Beatty	Carson (IN)	Correa
Bera	Cartwright	Costa
Beyer	Case	Courtney
Bishop (GA)	Casten (IL)	Cox (CA)
Blumenauer	Castor (FL)	Craig
Blunt Rochester	Castro (TX)	Crist
Bonamici	Chu, Judy	Crow
Boyle, Brendan F.	Cicilline	Cuellar
Brindisi	Cisneros	Cunningham
	Clark (MA)	Dauids (KS)

Davis (CA) Kirkpatrick
 Davis, Danny K. Krishnamoorthi
 Dean Kuster (NH)
 DeFazio Lamb
 DeGette Langevin
 DeLauro Larsen (WA)
 DelBene Larson (CT)
 Delgado Lawrence
 Demings Lawson (FL)
 DeSaulnier Lee (CA)
 Deutch Lee (NV)
 Dingell Levin (CA)
 Doggett Levin (MI)
 Doyle, Michael Lewis
 F. Lieu, Ted
 Engel Lipinski
 Escobar Loeb sack
 Eshoo Lofgren
 Espallat Lowenthal
 Evans Lowey
 Finkenauer Luján
 Fletcher Luria
 Foster Lynch
 Frankel Malinowski
 Fudge Maloney, Sean
 Gabbard Carolyn B.
 Gallego Maloney, Sean
 Garcia (IL) Matsui
 Garcia (TX) McAdams
 Golden Mc Bath
 Gomez Mc Collum
 Gonzalez (TX) McGovern
 Gottheimer McNerney
 Green, Al (TX) Meeks
 Grijalva Meng
 Haaland Moore
 Harder (CA) Morelle
 Hastings Moulton
 Hayes Mucarsel-Powell
 Heck Murphy (FL)
 Higgins (NY) Nadler
 Hill (CA) Napolitano
 Himes Neal
 Horn, Kendra S. Neguse
 Horsford Norcross
 Houlihan O'Halleran
 Hoyer Ocasio-Cortez
 Huffman Omar
 Jackson Lee Pallone
 Jayapal Panetta
 Jeffries Pappas
 Johnson (GA) Pascrell
 Johnson (TX) Payne
 Kaptur Perlmutter
 Keating Peters
 Kelly (IL) Peterson
 Kennedy Phillips
 Khanna Pingree
 Kildee Pocan
 Kilmer Porter
 Kim Pressley
 Kind Price (NC)

NAYS—196

Aderholt Cole
 Allen Collins (GA)
 Amash Collins (NY)
 Amodei Comer
 Armstrong Conaway
 Arrington Cook
 Babin Crenshaw
 Bacon Curtis
 Baird Davidson (OH)
 Balderson Davis, Rodney
 Banks DesJarlais
 Barr Diaz-Balart
 Bergman Duffy
 Biggs Duncan
 Bilirakis Dunn
 Bishop (NC) Emmer
 Bishop (UT) Estes
 Bost Ferguson
 Brady Fitzpatrick
 Brooks (AL) Fleischmann
 Brooks (IN) Flores
 Buchanan Fortenberry
 Buck Foxx (NC)
 Bueshon Fulcher
 Budd Gaetz
 Burchett Gallagher
 Burgess Gianforte
 Byrne Gibbs
 Calvert Gohmert
 Carter (GA) Gonzalez (OH)
 Carter (TX) Gooden
 Chabot Gosar
 Cheney Granger
 Cline Graves (GA)
 Cloud Graves (LA)

Quigley LaMalfa
 Raskin Lamborn
 Rice (NY) Latta
 Richmond Lesko
 Rose (NY) Long
 Rouda Loudermilk
 Roybal-Allard Lucas
 Ruiz Luetkemeyer
 Ruppertsberger Marchant
 Lee (CA) Marshall
 Sánchez Massie
 Sarbanes McCarthy
 Scanlon McCaul
 Schakowsky McClintock
 Schiff McHenry
 Schneider McKinley
 Schrader Meadows
 Schrier Meuser
 Scott (VA) Miller
 Scott, David Mitchell
 Serrano Moolenaar
 Sewell (AL) Mooney (WV)
 Shalala Mullin
 Sherman Murphy (NC)
 Sherrill Newhouse
 Sires Norman
 Slotkin Nunes
 Smith (WA) Olson
 Soto Palazzo
 Spanberger Palmer
 Speier Pence

Abraham
 Clyburn
 Crawford
 Cummings

NOT VOTING—10

Garamendi
 Mast
 McEachin
 Ryan

□ 1350

So the resolution was agreed to.
 The result of the vote was announced
 as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on
 the table.

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS EXPIRING AUTHORITIES ACT OF 2019

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4285) to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend and modify certain authorities and requirements relating to the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.
 The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.
 The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 417, nays 1, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 535]

YEAS—417

Adams
 Aderholt
 Aguilar
 Allen
 Allred
 Amash
 Amodei
 Armstrong
 Arrington
 Axne
 Babin
 Bacon
 Baird
 Balderson
 Banks
 Barr

Byrne
 Calvert
 Carbajal
 Cárdenas
 Carson (IN)
 Carter (GA)
 Carter (TX)
 Cartwright
 Case
 Casten (IL)
 Castor (FL)
 Castro (TX)
 Chabot
 Cheney
 Chu, Judy
 Cicilline
 Cisneros
 Clark (MA)
 Clarke (NY)
 Clay
 Cleaver
 Cline
 Cloud
 Cohen
 Cole
 Collins (GA)
 Collins (NY)
 Comer
 Conaway
 Connolly
 Cook
 Cooper
 Correa
 Courtney
 Cox (CA)
 Craig
 Crenshaw
 Hunter
 Crow
 Cuellar
 Cunningham
 Curtis
 Davids (KS)
 Davidson (OH)
 Davis (CA)
 Davis, Danny K.
 Davis, Rodney
 Dean
 DeFazio
 DeGette
 DeLauro
 DelBene
 Delgado
 Demings
 DeSaulnier
 DesJarlais
 Deutch
 Diaz-Balart
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Doyle, Michael
 F.
 Duffy
 Duncan
 Dunn
 Emmer
 Engel
 Escobar
 Eshoo
 Espallat
 Estes
 Evans
 Ferguson
 Finkenauer
 Fitzpatrick
 Fleischmann
 Fletcher
 Flores
 Fortenberry
 Foster
 Foxx (NC)
 Frankel
 Fudge
 Fulcher
 Gabbard
 Gaetz
 Gallagher
 Gallego
 Garcia (IL)
 Garcia (TX)
 Gianforte
 Gibbs
 Gohmert
 Gonzalez (OH)
 Gonzalez (TX)
 Gooden

Boyle, Brendan
 F.
 Brady
 Brindisi
 Brooks (AL)
 Brooks (IN)
 Brown (MD)
 Brownley (CA)
 Buchanan
 Buck
 Bueshon
 Budd
 Burchett
 Burgess
 Bustos
 Butterfield

Steube
 Stewart
 Stivers
 Taylor
 Thompson (PA)
 Thornberry
 Timmons
 Tipton
 Turner
 Upton
 Wagner
 Walberg
 Walden
 Walker
 Walorski
 Walt
 Watkins
 Weber (TX)
 Wenstrup
 Westerman
 Williams
 Wilson (SC)
 Wittman
 Womack
 Woodall
 Wright
 Yoho
 Young
 Zeldin

Thompson (MS)
 Webster (FL)

Gosar
 Gottheimer
 Granger
 Graves (GA)
 Graves (LA)
 Graves (MO)
 Green (TN)
 Green, Al (TX)
 Griffith
 Grijalva
 Grothman
 Guest
 Guthrie
 Haaland
 Hagedorn
 Harder (CA)
 Harris
 Hartzler
 Hastings
 Hayes
 Heck
 Hern, Kevin
 Herrera Beutler
 Hice (GA)
 Higgins (LA)
 Higgins (NY)
 Hill (AR)
 Hill (CA)
 Himes
 Holding
 Hollingsworth
 Horn, Kendra S.
 Horsford
 Houlihan
 Hoyer
 Hudson
 Huffman
 Huizenga
 Hunter
 Hurd (TX)
 Jackson Lee
 Jayapal
 Jeffries
 Johnson (GA)
 Johnson (LA)
 Johnson (OH)
 Johnson (SD)
 Johnson (TX)
 Jordan
 Joyce (OH)
 Joyce (PA)
 Kaptur
 Katko
 Keating
 Keller
 Kelly (IL)
 Kelly (MS)
 Kelly (PA)
 Kennedy
 Khanna
 Kildee
 Kilmer
 Kim
 Kind
 King (IA)
 King (NY)
 Kinzinger
 Kirkpatrick
 Krishnamoorthi
 Kuster (NH)
 Kustoff (TN)
 LaHood
 LaMalfa
 Lamb
 Lamborn
 Langevin
 Larsen (WA)
 Larson (CT)
 Latta
 Lawrence
 Lawson (FL)
 Lee (CA)
 Lee (NV)
 Lesko
 Levin (CA)
 Levin (MI)
 Lewis
 Lieu, Ted
 Lipinski
 Loeb sack
 Lofgren
 Long
 Loudermilk
 Lowenthal
 Lowey
 Lucas
 Luetkemeyer
 Luján
 Luria

Lynch
 Malinowski
 Maloney, Sean
 Marchant
 Marshall
 Massie
 Matsui
 McAdams
 McBath
 McCarthy
 McCaul
 McClintock
 McCollum
 McGovern
 McHenry
 McKinley
 McNerney
 Meadows
 Meeks
 Meng
 Meuser
 Miller
 Mitchell
 Moolenaar
 Moore
 Morelle
 Moulton
 Mucarsel-Powell
 Mullin
 Murphy (FL)
 Murphy (NC)
 Nadler
 Napolitano
 Neal
 Neguse
 Newhouse
 Norcross
 Norman
 Nunes
 O'Halleran
 Ocasio-Cortez
 Olson
 Omar
 Palazzo
 Pallone
 Palmer
 Panetta
 Pappas
 Pascrell
 Payne
 Perlmutter
 Perry
 Peters
 Peterson
 Phillips
 Pingree
 Pocan
 Porter
 Posey
 Pressley
 Price (NC)
 Quigley
 Raskin
 Reed
 Reschenthaler
 Rice (NY)
 Rice (SC)
 Richmond
 Riggleman
 Roby
 Rodgers (WA)
 Roe, David P.
 Rogers (AL)
 Rogers (KY)
 Rose (NY)
 Rose, John W.
 Rouda
 Rouzer
 Roy
 Roybal-Allard
 Ruiz
 Ruppertsberger
 Rush
 Rutherford
 Sánchez
 Sarbanes
 Scallise
 Scanlon
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Schneider
 Schrader
 Schrier
 Schweikert
 Scott (VA)
 Scott, Austin
 Scott, David
 Sensenbrenner

Serrano	Swalwell (CA)	Walden
Sewell (AL)	Takano	Walker
Shalala	Taylor	Walorski
Sherman	Thompson (CA)	Waltz
Sherrill	Thompson (PA)	Wasserman
Shimkus	Thornberry	Schultz
Simpson	Timmons	Waters
Sires	Tipton	Watkins
Slotkin	Titus	Watson Coleman
Smith (MO)	Tlaib	Weber (TX)
Smith (NE)	Tonko	Welch
Smith (NJ)	Torres (CA)	Wenstrup
Smith (WA)	Torres Small	Westerman
Smucker	(NM)	Wild
Soto	Trahan	Williams
Spanberger	Trone	Wilson (FL)
Spano	Underwood	Wilson (SC)
Speier	Upton	Wittman
Stanton	Van Drew	Womack
Stauber	Vargas	Woodall
Stefanik	Veasey	Wright
Stell	Vela	Yarmuth
Steube	Velázquez	Yoho
Stevens	Visclosky	Young
Stewart	Wagner	Zeldin
Suozzi	Walberg	

NAYS—1

Mooney (WV)

NOT VOTING—16

Abraham	Maloney,	Ryan
Clyburn	Carolyn B.	Stivers
Crawford	Mast	Thompson (MS)
Cummings	McEachin	Turner
Garamendi	Ratchliffe	Webster (FL)
	Rooney (FL)	Wexton

□ 1401

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on September 18, on rollcall No. 535 for passage of H.R. 4285, the Department of Veterans Affairs Expiring Authorities Act of 2019, I mistakenly voted "nay" when I meant to vote "aye" in support of the bill.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 3632

Mr. DEFAZIO. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove Representative COHEN of Tennessee as a cosponsor of H.R. 3632.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. OMAR). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

HONORING PRISCILLA GARDNER

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

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, I want to take a moment to honor a distinguished member of my district. Priscilla Gardner has been a staple of the Jersey City community during her 50-year career at the Jersey City Free Public Library. Priscilla is known for many successes during her time there.

She created the library's first computer learning center when the internet was in its infancy.

Ms. Gardner established the Jersey City Free Public Library Foundation to raise desperately needed funds to

improve and expand the library when necessary, a successful venture that still exists today.

Ms. Gardner was project director when they built the first new library since 1962, a gorgeous new facility with community and children's areas that opened in 2004.

Ms. Gardner drove fundraising efforts for the library to have a bookmobile, one that provided residents with 2,000 books, computer terminals, and other media stations.

Most importantly, Ms. Gardner has been instrumental in the renovation and restoration of Jersey City's historic 120-year-old main library.

Ms. Gardner leaves the library and her city a much better place. Ms. Gardner will be sorely missed, and I wish her all the best in her retirement.

CELEBRATING 72ND BIRTHDAY OF UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

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

Mr. SPANO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to bring attention to and celebrate the birthday of the United States Air Force.

Today's Air Force traces its lineage to the U.S. Signal Corps in 1907 but officially became its own branch as part of the National Security Act of 1947.

During this period, the Air Force has been on the front lines of racial integration, helped keep the city of Berlin fed for 11 months, placed the first artificial communications satellite into orbit, and continually maintained round-the-clock flights of an airborne command post for three decades.

More significantly, their vigilance and reach have deterred aggression while their speed, power, and sacrifice of life have restored peace.

Today, on the 72nd birthday of the Air Force, the branch has grown into a staple of the United States defense community. With over 600,000 Active Duty, Reserve, and civilian personnel, thousands of whom serve at MacDill Air Force base in Tampa, it is imperative we give these American heroes, past and present, the respect that they deserve.

Please join me in wishing the United States Air Force a happy birthday and honoring the lives of all who have served.

AMERICANS MUST NOT FAIL TO CONFRONT CLIMATE CHANGE

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

Mr. COSTA. Madam Speaker, this morning, I heard moving testimony from some of the young people leading the fight against climate change, including Greta Thunberg. It was inspiring to see the faces leading the next generation.

We must work together across the aisle to confront these challenges that will be faced now and by the next generations, and our time is running out.

In the San Joaquin Valley of California, which I represent, I have witnessed the devastating effects of climate change for too long, the droughts, the fires.

As a farmer, I know firsthand the struggle that our agricultural communities go through, and I know that climate change isn't making them any easier.

As I have said before and I will say again, mitigating and adapting to the effects of climate change will require a multipronged, commonsense approach. We must not fail to confront these challenges.

As today's testimony reminded us, the most devastating effects of climate change will be the impact not only today but of the young and future generations to come. I refuse to sit by and do nothing.

For years, in California and Washington, I have worked for meaningful solutions to address climate change, and that will continue.

HONORING CAROL SMOLENSKI

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

Mr. OLSON. Madam Speaker, I rise to honor an extraordinary leader on her retirement, Carol Smolenski.

She has been involved in ECPAT for 20 years as the executive director, a renowned organization with a single mission: end child exploitation and trafficking.

Two decades ago, Carol noticed that America did not have an ECPAT-like organization like some other nations had, and so she took charge. ECPAT-USA was born.

Carol's mission has been pure and simple: raise awareness of modern-day slavery in America and end human trafficking in our world.

As Carol moves on, I would like to let her hear some Texas wisdom. Carol may not be in a class by herself, but whatever class she is in, it don't take long to call the roll. I thank Carol. She has saved lives.

HONORING PURPLE HEART RECIPIENTS

(Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of my bill, the National Purple Heart Hall of Honor Commemorative Coin Act, which is scheduled for a vote on the House floor tomorrow.

George Washington himself created the Purple Heart in the closing days of the Revolutionary War. Since it was

revived to honor veterans of World War I, it has been awarded to nearly 2 million brave service men and women, yet there is no comprehensive list of Purple Heart recipients.

The National Purple Heart Hall of Honor located in my district in New Windsor, New York, was created to collect and preserve the names and stories of the men and women wounded or killed in service of our Nation. The proceeds of this coin, which will be produced nearby at the West Point Mint, will support the hall in its critical mission, along with other programs that help veterans and their families.

Today, I am thinking of two men who inspired our work on this bill. One was my dad, who was a Navy vet who was hurt on the USS *Manchester* and who taught me the reverence we must have for our service men and women. The other was Republican Senator Bill Larkin, a New York State Senator, a dear friend who passed away just days ago. He and I worked closely to advance the mission of the hall.

I also thank the Military Order of the Purple Heart and volunteers like Stephanie Keegan, who helped round up 300 of our colleagues in support of this important legislation and who will make tomorrow's vote a reality.

SUPPORTING WITHDRAWAL OF THE WOTUS RULE

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to commend Andrew Wheeler, Administrator at EPA, and R.D. James, administrator at the Army Corps of Engineers, for withdrawing the very devastating WOTUS rule, the waters of the United States rule that was put in about 4 years ago under the Obama administration which went way beyond the bounds of what the Clean Water Act passed and was intended by this Congress in 1972.

It has been devastating to farmers, ranchers, and others outside that do things with the management of water seeming to be not just in what is called navigable waterways but every mud puddle across the United States.

This was a massive overreach by the previous administration on that, and we can put this back on a better path so that we have the type of management that actually does help keep our water clean in this country but also not onerous regulations that make it impossible to farm and ranch in this country.

We have seen farmers receive million-dollar fines because of merely re-engaging crops have been fallow for a while or changing a crop, which is way beyond the scope of what the Clean Water Act intended and had provisions for exemptions for agriculture.

It is a great step. Thank you, EPA and Army Corps, for the repeal of this measure.

IMPORTANCE OF TEACHING CLIMATE CHANGE IN SCHOOLS

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

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the importance of teaching climate change in schools.

This Friday, on September 20, students from around the world will be protesting the need to combat climate change. Led by Greta Thunberg, a climate activist from Sweden who boldly skipped school to protest the need for more climate action, her act of defiance has evolved into a movement and set precedent for a generation of climate activism. More than 25 percent of America's students are taking action to urge us to address climate change.

In order to meaningfully act upon our climate change and eliminate climate change, young people need education on its causes, consequences, and possible solutions. That is why I am introducing a resolution to support climate change education in American schools.

It is a fact that American students do not learn enough about climate change. We need to teach every young person the human impacts of climate change and how to address our warming planet before it is too late. I urge my colleagues to support this important resolution and to hear the voices of the students protesting in Friday's climate strikes.

□ 1415

HONORING THE MEMORY OF SERGEANT FIRST CLASS BARRETO-ORTIZ

(Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico. Madam Speaker, I rise to honor Sergeant First Class Elis Barreto Ortiz, fallen in Afghanistan on September 5.

When Sergeant Barreto enlisted 10 years ago, he followed the tradition of many Puerto Ricans, including his father, in answering the call to defend America.

He served with distinction, earning many awards and the praise of his comrades. Now he joins those who also made the ultimate sacrifice for freedom.

The people of Puerto Rico share the pain that fills this hero's family in his small hometown of Morovis and his unit's base at Fort Bragg.

Nothing can fill the void for his parents or his wife and children, but we must resolve that his sacrifice will be remembered and honored, and his memory will always endure.

May you rest in peace, Sergeant Barreto, a hero and a proud Puerto Rican.

STEPHANIE TIMOTEO'S 100TH BIRTHDAY

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

Mr. VAN DREW. Madam Speaker, Stephanie Timoteo, a resident of Bridgeton in South Jersey, turned 100 years old on August 25.

Stephanie has always been an incredibly active person in her community. She values faith, family, and heritage as the most important aspects of her life.

She was born into a family of Polish immigrants, and in her midtwenties, she became a seamstress and she made uniforms for soldiers during World War II.

After the war, Stephanie spent most of her time with her children, but she continued to work at home as a seamstress and a dressmaker.

Over the years, Stephanie has given her time as a den mother, a Girl Scout leader, a Christ Child volunteer, a coordinator for the Polish American Club, and many, many, many other roles. They are actually countless.

Now she loves to crochet, read, and spend time with her seven grandchildren and nine great-grandchildren.

Happy birthday to Stephanie. We are incredibly lucky to have her. May God bless her. South Jersey is proud of her; New Jersey is proud of her; and America is proud of her.

HONORING GENERAL ROBERT P. CARSON, THE CITADEL MASCOT

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

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of General Robert P. Carson, the beloved bulldog mascot of The Citadel, who passed away this Friday.

The General came from a distinguished lineage, and his relatives include former mascots of the University of Georgia, the United States Marine Corps, and Mississippi State University.

The General's caretaker, Dr. John Bradford, reported that on game days, he would often find the bulldog waiting in the corner of his backyard, facing the stadium. He just couldn't wait to fire those cannons, and his spirit helped his fellow Bulldogs pull off an incredible upset this past Saturday.

The General was with his fellow mascot, Boo X, when he passed away. The two were the pride of The Citadel campus and cherished members of the institution.

Anyone with a pet knows how deeply they impact our lives, and I offer my sincere condolences to the entire Citadel community.

Go 'Dogs.

REAUTHORIZING SECTION 215 OF
THE PATRIOT ACT

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, today in our Judiciary Committee was quite interesting. For some people, it was quite a role reversal.

We had a hearing on the potential reauthorization of the FISA courts and discussion about powers of our DOJ, FBI, and NSA under what is often referred to as section 215.

It was interesting in the way of role reversals because, for years, we have been told that Democrats are the real civil libertarians. They are the ones who are trying to defend privacy rights, rights of Americans to think what they want, do what they want, and without being interrupted or spied upon by the Federal Government.

Yet, today, over and over, we heard apologies basically from our Democratic friends to the representative of the Department of Justice, the FBI, and National Security Administration for comments of some Republicans.

There really was no need to apologize. We weren't attacking these three individual witnesses, but there are issues that are still unresolved that many of my friends across the aisle used to be concerned about, privacy and Fourth Amendment rights that are supposed to protect us from improper search and seizure or spying, or surveillance being one of the more important. So we had these witnesses.

It was interesting, and if I were our friend Israel, I would be very concerned, because I asked these representatives, first of all, does the Department of Justice, the FBI, or the NSA consider Russia to be a known terrorist organization under section 215. Each of the representatives indicated, in turn, that they could not answer that question.

Well, the silence seemed to speak volumes to me. It should have been an easy question to answer.

I asked about Israel. Does the DOJ, FBI, or NSA consider the Ambassador from Israel to be a representative of a terrorist organization, and they couldn't answer that question.

That is quite interesting.

But my concern arose out of reading and hearing, in prior years, about how apparently Jeff Sessions was surveilled because he was speaking to a Russian Ambassador, and there were reports that the Ambassador from Israel had been surveilled.

So, under 215, they are supposed to be part of either a known terrorist or an ally, someone who identifies with a known terrorist organization.

So it is interesting that things have evolved the way they have so that our own intelligence can't tell us whether Russia or Israel is considered a terrorist organization. It is quite alarming.

But ever since I first got here, my first term, when we took up reauthorization of the PATRIOT Act—and I understood when the PATRIOT Act was passed, it was just days after, maybe a week or so after 9/11, and we didn't know who had hit us, were they about to hit us again, were 3,000 or more people going to be dying any day again and again.

So I wasn't here, but Congress passed this overarching bill that gave way too much power to the government, but I understand the atmosphere here at the time.

Then section 215 came up for reauthorization, as has the FISA courts in recent years. It is important that we continue to take a look at those. I think it is extremely important that we have sunsets; otherwise, if there is not the chance that these powers will go away, then we always have trouble, no matter whether it is a Democrat or a Republican administration, always have trouble getting people to come up and speak frankly or get records so we know what may have occurred, whether it was abused or not.

But I go to section 215, and I have been concerned about some of this language since I first got here.

As a former litigator, prosecutor, judge, chief justice, I know words mean things. This section says that, basically, the FBI can make an application for an order requiring production of tangible things for an investigation to obtain foreign intelligence information not concerning a U.S. person or to protect against international terrorism or clandestine intelligence activity.

Now, I asked this several years ago when this was being pushed for reauthorization: What does "clandestine intelligence activity" mean? What does that mean? Because, to me, if I am the judge, you come to me and you want a warrant and you say, "We have caught somebody engaged in clandestine intelligence activities," wow, that is so broad.

So the question I asked today I asked years ago: Could that mean that, if my neighbor is peering, watching my yard from behind his or her curtain—well, that is clandestine. They are hiding behind a curtain. They are trying to see what is going on. That is gathering intelligence. So would that justify a warrant from the FISA court?

Well, they couldn't answer that question, and they never have. They never have attempted to answer that question.

In fact, years ago, when it was reauthorized, the representatives of DOJ, CIA, NSA, they were all saying:

"Look, that really doesn't come into play, particularly."

"Oh, well, good. Then let's eliminate it."

"Well, no. We don't want to eliminate our ability to get a warrant based on clandestine intelligence activities."

"Well, what does that mean? How has it been used?"

Couldn't get an answer, but they sure wanted to keep it in there.

What does that mean? It doesn't say "foreign clandestine intelligence." It doesn't say "terrorist clandestine intelligence."

So words mean things. Why do they keep wanting that language in there?

It used to be not as big of a concern until we find out that the FISA courts, basically—we might call them the RS courts instead of the FISA courts. The FISA courts are basically RS courts, rubberstamp courts because, basically, when the Federal Government comes in, they get what they want.

I was one, having, again, been a judge, I had law officers come before me many times. Sometimes they would come to my house at 2 or 3 in the morning. They would need a warrant quickly, and the requirements of the Constitution are very clear.

I just happen to have a copy of the Constitution. Amendment IV says: "The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized."

That particular description, those words, are very important, as are the two words, "probable cause."

□ 1430

We were taught, and as a judge I applied it, that if a law officer wants a warrant—sometimes there were FBI who would come and sometimes they would come with other law officers—but they knew, under the Constitution—they normally did a very good job—you have to have an affidavit that establishes there is probable cause to believe a crime was committed and probable cause to believe the person whose records were sought to be seized had probably committed the crime. It is not enough to just allege we have probable cause to believe a crime was committed and this person committed it. That is not enough. The affidavit must describe facts—not conclusions, but facts—that establish that, yeah, probably a crime was committed and probably this person did it and that is why we need this record, that is why we need this search warrant, and that is why we need to be able to go look for those specific records, specific things.

Imagine my surprise when a FISA court order was leaked—and it was an order by the FISA court here in Washington—and it says, it orders, it was ordered:

The custodian of records shall produce to the NSA on service of this order and continue production on an ongoing daily basis thereafter for the duration of this order, unless otherwise ordered by the court, all call detail records or telephoning metadata created by Verizon for communications 1) between the United States and abroad, or 2) wholly within the United States, including local telephone calls. This order does not require Verizon to produce telephone and metadata for communications wholly originating and terminating in foreign countries.

That was interesting to me because, first of all, what this order is going after, supposedly, under section 215, trying to monitor terrorist activity, it only wanted calls by Americans. Whereas, if you are an American in the United States, you have constitutional rights, including the Fourth Amendment, that this certainly appears to violate. There is no allegation of probable cause a crime is committed, no allegation that Verizon or the records of the people being sought had committed a crime, the application apparently said “must have” because that is the way the order reads: We want everybody’s records that Verizon has if they are protected by the Fourth Amendment, but we don’t want anybody’s records, foreign records, even though they are not protected by the Constitution and Fourth Amendment rights against unfair search and seizure.

That is really an interesting role reversal right here. You are protecting the people who have no protection and going after the people who are protected by the Fourth Amendment.

It has caused a lot of concerns about, well, what else does the FISA court rubber stamp? It seems kind of silly, but we have been told that section 215—that I have read from here—was reformed and that the NSA ended their program of gathering records. But the thing is, as long as there is a FISA court and as long as there is a section 215 that is even half as broad as it currently is, any of our law enforcement can go back into the FISA court and get a warrant rubber stamped, which is basically what happened, it appears, in the FISA orders regarding the Trump campaign.

The thing, as a former judge, that really grieves me most about the FISA court is that we have not had a FISA judge who had sufficient righteous indignation to demand Comey, Rosenstein, or McCabe—if he participated—any of those participants, to come in before them and show cause as to why they should not go to jail for committing a fraud upon the court, which it sure appears they did.

They were not truthful about the Russia hoax, about the so-called Russian dossier that a discredited, dishonest former MI6 agent in England put together based on representations by Russian agents, that he now admits they could have worked for Putin, I don’t know. And that were being purchased, paid for, by the DNC and the Clinton campaign through Fusion GPS, which included Nellie Ohr, who is married to Bruce Ohr, who kept bringing material from them that had been purchased by the FBI to the DOJ.

This, more than anything else, causes me to think maybe we need to do away with the FISA court and go back to the way that things were, because we didn’t have a FISA judge involved in this with enough morality, enough righteousness, and enough honesty, to recognize that a fraud against

their court was committed and to be offended by it.

If somebody came in and got a warrant from me and they did not provide me the true facts, and they knew their source could not be verified and they swore that this was verified, somebody would be going to jail. That is so dishonest. People in those kinds of positions that we trust with so much power, they need to be honest, and especially before a judge.

But, apparently, we have one or more FISA judges who are not offended to be lied to. Maybe it is because they saw it was going for a good cause to try to stop the Donald Trump campaign or get him thrown out as President, that is a worthy cause. Even though it was a dishonest application affidavit and warrant, that is okay with the FISA judge.

I would really like to have the FISA judges come before our committee and testify about their lack of morality, their lack of integrity, and their not caring that people would come in and submit lies and verify something they knew, and intentionally deceived about, being unverifiable.

We have some work to do. I am very grateful to Congresswoman ZOE LOFGREN. I believe she was sincere today in a hearing when she looked down the dais at me and my Republican friends and said, we know there are reforms that need to be made, we know that there are amendments that need to occur regarding the system, and we look forward to working with our friends on the other side of the aisle.

I hope that is true because this little experiment in a constitutional Democratic Republic is in jeopardy. I know people want to talk about climate change, but 12 years from now when we are told the world may end if we don’t do something about climate change, this little constitutional Democratic Republic will have ceased to be based on the Constitution, which has already set a record for being the longest basis for a country in the history of the world. So we have work to do, and I hope that we can do it in a bipartisan manner.

Even if you read in the Bible about King David, what you learn is that even the finest people in the world, if they are not held accountable, if there is not some accountability, can do some really egregious things. That is our obligation here in Congress. Let’s have some accountability.

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

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 2 o’clock and 39 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1830

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CARSON of Indiana) at 6 o’clock and 30 minutes p.m.

ADJOURNMENT

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o’clock and 31 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, September 19, 2019, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker’s table and referred as follows:

2170. A letter from the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Administration’s proposed rule — Implementation of the Current Expected Credit Losses Methodology for Allowances, Related Adjustments to the Tier 1/ Tier 2 Capital Rule, and Conforming Amendments (RIN: 3052-AD36) received September 5, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2171. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Rear Admiral William F. Moran, United States Navy, and his advancement to the grade of admiral on the retired list, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 1370(c)(1); Public Law 96-513, Sec. 112 (as amended by Public Law 104-106, Sec. 502(b)); (110 Stat. 293); to the Committee on Armed Services.

2172. A letter from the President and Chairman, Export-Import Bank, transmitting the Bank’s statement with respect to transactions involving exports to Mozambique, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 635(b)(3); July 31, 1945, ch. 341, Sec. 2 (as added by Public Law 102-266, Sec. 102); (106 Stat. 95); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2173. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the 2018 National Healthcare Quality and Disparities Report, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 299b-2(b)(2); Public Law 106-129, Sec. 2(a); (113 Stat. 1658); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2174. A letter from the Deputy Chief, Public Safety and Homeland Security Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission’s final rule — Implementing Kari’s Law and Section 506 of RAY BAUM’S Act [PS Docket No.: 18-261]; Inquiry Concerning 911 Access, Routing, and Location in Enterprise Communications Systems [PS Docket No.: 17-239]; Amending the Definition of Interconnected VoIP Service in Section 9.3 of the Commission’s Rules [GN Docket No.: 11-117] received September 10, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2175. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting notification that all state, territory Governors, and the Mayor of the District of Columbia, received letters outlining their individual REAL ID program implementation status and offering guidance to help ensure a smooth transition to full REAL ID enforcement. A copy of that letter is attached, pursuant to 8 U.S.C. 1778(b); Public Law 109-13,

div. B, title III, Sec. 301(b); (119 Stat. 316); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

2176. A letter from the Attorney, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Special Local Regulations; Upper Mississippi River, 839.5 to 840.5 St. Paul, MN [Docket Number: USCG-2019-0437] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received September 10, 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.

2177. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Fireworks Display, Delaware River, Chester, PA [Docket No.: USCG-2019-0690] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 10, 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.

2178. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Sabine River, Orange, TX [Docket No.: USCG-2019-0376] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 10, 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.

2179. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Bahia De San Juan, San Juan PR [Docket No.: USCG-2019-0653] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 10, 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.

2180. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Illinois River, Mile Marker 162 to 166, Peoria, IL [Docket No.: USCG-2019-0729] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 10, 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.

2181. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a Declaration of a Public Health Emergency and Waiver and/or Modification of Certain HIPAA, and Medicare, Medicaid, and Children's Health Insurance Program Requirements (consequences of Hurricane Dorian on the State of Georgia), pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 247d(a); July 1, 1944, ch. 373, title III, Sec. 319(a) (as amended by Public Law 107-188, Sec. 144(a)); (116 Stat. 630) and 42 U.S.C. 1320b-5(d); Aug. 14, 1935, ch. 531, title XI, Sec. 1135(d) (as added by Public Law 107-188, Sec. 143(a)); (116 Stat. 628); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

2182. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a Declaration of a Public Health Emergency and Waiver and/or Modification of Certain HIPAA, and Medicare, Medicaid, and Children's Health Insurance Program Requirements (consequences of Hurricane Dorian on the State of South Carolina), pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 247d(a); July 1, 1944, ch. 373, title III, Sec. 319(a) (as amended by Public Law 107-188, Sec. 144(a)); (116 Stat. 630) and 42 U.S.C. 1320b-5(d); Aug. 14, 1935, ch. 531, title XI, Sec. 1135(d) (as added by Public Law 107-188, Sec. 143(a)); (116 Stat. 628); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

2183. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a Declaration of a Public Health

Emergency and Waiver and/or Modification of Certain HIPAA, and Medicare, Medicaid, and Children's Health Insurance Program Requirements (consequences of Hurricane Dorian on the State of Florida), pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 247d(a); July 1, 1944, ch. 373, title III, Sec. 319(a) (as amended by Public Law 107-188, Sec. 144(a)); (116 Stat. 630) and 42 U.S.C. 1320b-5(d); Aug. 14, 1935, ch. 531, title XI, Sec. 1135(d) (as added by Public Law 107-188, Sec. 143(a)); (116 Stat. 628); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

2184. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a Declaration of a Public Health Emergency and Waiver and/or Modification of Certain HIPAA, and Medicare, Medicaid, and Children's Health Insurance Program Requirements (consequences of Hurricane Dorian on the State of North Carolina), pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 247d(a); July 1, 1944, ch. 373, title III, Sec. 319(a) (as amended by Public Law 107-188, Sec. 144(a)); (116 Stat. 630) and 42 U.S.C. 1320b-5(d); Aug. 14, 1935, ch. 531, title XI, Sec. 1135(d) (as added by Public Law 107-188, Sec. 143(a)); (116 Stat. 628); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 3525. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to direct the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection to establish uniform processes for medical screening of individuals interdicted between ports of entry, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 116-211). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. ARMSTRONG, and Mr. HUNTER):

H.R. 4370. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to furnish hyperbaric oxygen therapy to veterans with traumatic brain injury or post-traumatic stress disorder; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. TRAHAN (for herself, Mr. PAPPAS, Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma, and Ms. FINKENAUER):

H.R. 4371. A bill to authorize funding to strengthen investments in the Nation's post-secondary career and technical education (CTE) programs and build connections across the entire education and workforce development system; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. JOHNSON of Texas (for herself and Mr. WALTZ):

H.R. 4372. A bill to direct Federal science agencies and the Office of Science and Technology Policy to undertake activities to improve the quality of undergraduate STEM education and enhance the research capacity at the Nation's HBCUs, TCUs, and MSIs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Ms. JOHNSON of Texas (for herself, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. LUCAS):

H.R. 4373. A bill to provide for a coordinated Federal research initiative to ensure continued United States leadership in engineering biology; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. GARAMENDI (for himself, Mr. ZELDIN, and Mr. CISNEROS):

H.R. 4374. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to require air carriers to disclose information on aircraft maintenance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. ROUDA (for himself and Mr. GARAMENDI):

H.R. 4375. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to enter into an agreement with the National Academy of Engineering to conduct a study on seismicity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DUNN:

H.R. 4376. A bill to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to require Federal agencies impacted by a major disaster to submit to Congress a report on the estimated cost of the impact, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, 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. MCKINLEY (for himself and Mr. TONKO):

H.R. 4377. A bill to extend the authorization for the Wheeling National Heritage Area; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. LOWEY:

H.R. 4378. A bill making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2020, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. AXNE (for herself, Ms. STEVENS, Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, Mrs. LEE of Nevada, Ms. WILD, Ms. FINKENAUER, Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico, and Ms. HOULAHAN):

H.R. 4379. A bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to require qualified health plans to have in place a process to remove from publicly accessible provider directories of such plans providers that are no longer within the network of such plans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CASTRO of Texas (for himself and Mr. MARCHANT):

H.R. 4380. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to clarify requirements for disclosure of transfer of credit policies; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts:

H.R. 4381. A bill to effectively staff the public elementary schools and secondary schools of the United States with school-based mental health services providers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CONNOLLY (for himself, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mr. MEADOWS):

H.R. 4382. A bill to amend the Inspector General Act of 1978 to require the Council of Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency to include additional information in requests and reports to Congress, to make information available to Congress regarding allegations closed without referral, to expand the membership of the Council, and for

other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

H.R. 4383. A bill to ensure that unclaimed money recovered at airport security checkpoints is transferred to a fund for certain border security activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. CRIST (for himself and Mr. HILL of Arkansas):

H.R. 4384. A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to ensure that certain custodial deposits of a well capitalized insured depository institution are not considered to be funds obtained by or through a deposit broker, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois (for himself, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. BOST, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. KINZINGER, Mr. CASTEN of Illinois, Mr. COMER, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. BACON, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, and Mr. WATKINS):

H.R. 4385. A bill to amend section 211(o) of the Clean Air Act to adjust the renewable fuel obligation to account for the full volume of gasoline and diesel produced by small refineries that are exempt under paragraph (9), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DOGGETT (for himself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. DEAN, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. EVANS, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. SANCHEZ, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. THOMPSON of California, and Mr. TRONE):

H.R. 4386. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the Medicare and disability insurance benefits waiting periods for disabled individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and Transportation and Infrastructure, 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. ESPAILLAT (for himself and Mr. BALDERSON):

H.R. 4387. A bill to establish Growth Accelerator Fund Competition within the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. HASTINGS (for himself, Mr. BUCHANAN, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Mr. STEUBE):

H.R. 4388. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the implementation of curricula for training students, teachers, and school personnel to understand, recognize, prevent, and respond to signs of human trafficking and exploitation in children and youth, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LANGEVIN (for himself, Mr. ESPAILLAT, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 4389. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide additional amounts of loan forgiveness to teachers of English learners, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LUJAN (for himself, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mrs.

WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. CORREA, Mr. GARCIA of Illinois, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. SOTO, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. GALLEGGO, Ms. TITUS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. POCAN, Mr. HUFFMAN, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ):

H.R. 4390. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act by striking marijuana use, possession, and distribution as grounds of inadmissibility and removal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PANETTA (for himself, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. CISNEROS, Mrs. MCBATH, and Mr. COX of California):

H.R. 4391. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to modernize and improve the public service loan forgiveness program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SHERMAN (for himself and Mrs. WAGNER):

H.R. 4392. A bill to direct the President to withdraw the application of the duty-free treatment with respect to Burma under the Generalized System of Preferences program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SWALWELL of California (for himself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. GALLEGGO, Mr. ROUDA, and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 4393. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide for a State option under the State Medicaid plan to provide DNA sequencing clinical services for certain children, provide for a study by the National Academy of Medicine on the use of genetic and genomic testing to improve health care, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. TAKANO (for himself, Mr. SUOZZI, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. NORTON, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. CORREA, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. GARCIA of Illinois, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. SANCHEZ, and Mr. SOTO):

H.R. 4394. A bill to prohibit Federal funds from being used to violate the terms of the Flores settlement agreement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENGEL:

H. Con. Res. 63. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services should take action to ensure that home infusion therapy services are accessible to all Medicare beneficiaries; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. MATSUI (for herself, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. SLOTKIN, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. COLE, and Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico):

H. Con. Res. 64. Concurrent resolution recognizing the 25th anniversary of AmeriCorps; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CÁRDENAS (for himself, Mr. AGUILAR, Ms. BASS, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. CAR-

SON of Indiana, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. CISNEROS, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CORREA, Mr. COSTA, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. DEAN, Ms. DEGETTE, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. ESCOBAR, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. EVANS, Ms. FRANKEL, Mr. GALLEGGO, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. HARDER of California, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. HIMES, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KILMER, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEVIN of California, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. MALINOWSKI, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MENG, Ms. MOORE, Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, Mr. MOULTON, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NEAL, Ms. NORTON, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Ms. OMAR, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. PETERS, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. POCAN, Ms. PORTER, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. LUJÁN, Miss RICE of New York, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. SABLON, Mr. SAN NICOLAS, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SCANLON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. SIRES, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. SOTO, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. TITUS, Mrs. TORRES of California, Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. VELA, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. WATERS, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. HOULAHAN, and Mr. HASTINGS):

H. Res. 561. A resolution recognizing Hispanic Heritage Month and celebrating the heritage and culture of Latinos in the United States and the immense contributions of Latinos to the United States; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Ms. LEE of California (for herself, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, Mr. SIRES, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. WATERS, Mr. COX of California, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. NADLER, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. SHALALA, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. SOTO, Ms. PLASKETT, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia):

H. Res. 562. A resolution expressing condolences and long-term support to the people of

the Bahamas in the aftermath of the devastating Hurricane Dorian; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. LOFGREN (for herself and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois):

H. Res. 563. A resolution recognizing the Office of the Legislative Counsel of the House of Representatives on the occasion of the 100th anniversary of the Office; to the Committee on House Administration.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. BIGGS:

H.R. 4370.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8

By Mrs. TRAHAN:

H.R. 4371.

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

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 4372.

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

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Ms. JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 4373.

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. GARAMENDI:

H.R. 4374.

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. 4375.

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

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. DUNN:

H.R. 4376.

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

Article I Section 8

By Mr. MCKINLEY:

H.R. 4377.

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

Article I Section 8

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

By Mrs. LOWEY:

H.R. 4378.

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

The principal constitutional authority for this legislation is clause 7 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution of the United States (the appropriation power), which states:

“No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law”

In addition, clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution (the spending power) provides:

“The Congress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States”

Together, these specific constitutional provisions establish the congressional power of the purse, granting Congress the authority to appropriate funds, to determine their purpose, amount, and period of availability, and to set forth terms and conditions governing their use.

By Mrs. AXNE:

H.R. 4379.

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

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CASTRO of Texas:

H.R. 4380.

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

Constitutional Authority—Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. I, Sec. 8, Clause 18)

THE U.S. CONSTITUTION

ARTICLE I, SECTION 8: POWERS OF CONGRESS

CLAUSE 18

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

By Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts:

H.R. 4381.

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

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 14 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CONNOLLY:

H.R. 4382.

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

Article I, Section 8, clause 18

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

H.R. 4383.

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

Article I of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. CRIST:

H.R. 4384.

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

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 4385.

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

Article I, Section 8, clause 18 (Necessary and Proper Clause)

By Mr. DOGGETT:

H.R. 4386.

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

Pursuant to Clause I of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution and Amendment XVI of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 1 (relating to providing for the general welfare of the United States) and clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress)

By Mr. ESPAILLAT:

H.R. 4387.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

“The Congress shall have Power to . . . provide for the . . . general Welfare of the United States; . . .”

By Mr. HASTINGS:

H.R. 4388.

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

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. LANGEVIN:

H.R. 4389.

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

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. LUJAN:

H.R. 4390.

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 amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. PANETTA:

H.R. 4391.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18.

By Mr. SHERMAN:

H.R. 4392.

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

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

By Mr. SWALWELL of California:

H.R. 4393.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. TAKANO:

H.R. 4394.

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

The Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. I, Sec. 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.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 40: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 51: Mrs. AXNE.
H.R. 77: Mr. MEADOWS.
H.R. 94: Mr. MEEKS.
H.R. 123: Mr. CLEAVER.
H.R. 216: Mr. CLINE.
H.R. 218: Mr. STEIL.
H.R. 435: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 444: Mr. PERLMUTTER.
H.R. 485: Mr. GALLAGHER.
H.R. 585: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 594: Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 616: Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. BAIRD, and Mr. ADERHOLT.
H.R. 683: Mr. DEUTCH.
H.R. 712: Mr. COLLINS of New York and Ms. PRESSLEY.
H.R. 744: Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana.
H.R. 836: Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 838: Mr. CORREA and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
H.R. 877: Mr. CUNNINGHAM.
H.R. 886: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H.R. 912: Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma.

- H.R. 945: Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. KING of Iowa, and Ms. PRESSLEY.
- H.R. 1034: Mr. KING of New York and Mr. GIBBS.
- H.R. 1171: Ms. SLOTKIN.
- H.R. 1173: Mr. ALLRED.
- H.R. 1179: Mr. BALDERSON.
- H.R. 1186: Mr. RUIZ and Mr. PAPPAS.
- H.R. 1225: Mr. DELGADO.
- H.R. 1314: Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico.
- H.R. 1379: Mrs. RODGERS of Washington, Ms. LOFGREN, and Ms. TITUS.
- H.R. 1380: Mr. CICILLINE.
- H.R. 1396: Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. MCHENRY, and Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma.
- H.R. 1425: Mrs. LURIA.
- H.R. 1450: Mr. COURTNEY.
- H.R. 1479: Mr. PAPPAS.
- H.R. 1516: Mr. SERRANO.
- H.R. 1570: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
- H.R. 1599: Mr. CUNNINGHAM.
- H.R. 1705: Ms. TITUS and Mr. COURTNEY.
- H.R. 1706: Mr. CHABOT.
- H.R. 1739: Mr. WRIGHT.
- H.R. 1749: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.
- H.R. 1767: Mr. HAGEDORN.
- H.R. 1777: Mr. TAKANO.
- H.R. 1858: Mr. CRAWFORD and Mr. BYRNE.
- H.R. 1869: Mr. VISCLOSKEY.
- H.R. 1903: Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. KATKO, Ms. TITUS, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. TLAIB, Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. LAMB, Ms. SHERRILL, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. SIREs, Ms. PORTER, Mrs. LURIA, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. ALLRED, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. SCHRIER, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. DEAN, Mr. CRIST, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. PRESSLEY, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. HILL of California, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. ESPAILLAT, and Mr. PANNETTA.
- H.R. 1954: Mr. WESTERMAN.
- H.R. 1982: Ms. SCANLON and Ms. JOHNSON of Texas.
- H.R. 2117: Mr. BRINDISI.
- H.R. 2161: Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.
- H.R. 2222: Mr. POCAN, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mrs. LESKO, and Mrs. LEE of Nevada.
- H.R. 2245: Mr. MCGOVERN.
- H.R. 2256: Mr. HORSFORD, Ms. TITUS, and Ms. HILL of California.
- H.R. 2271: Mr. LYNCH.
- H.R. 2293: Mr. LEVIN of California.
- H.R. 2319: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mrs. HARTZLER, and Mrs. WAGNER.
- H.R. 2376: Mr. POCAN.
- H.R. 2382: Mr. WALTZ.
- H.R. 2387: Mr. WELCH.
- H.R. 2426: Mrs. HAYES and Mr. LOUDERMILK.
- H.R. 2435: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.
- H.R. 2453: Mr. RIGGLEMAN.
- H.R. 2467: Mr. CASTEN of Illinois.
- H.R. 2482: Mr. GOLDEN.
- H.R. 2496: Mrs. TORRES of California.
- H.R. 2513: Mr. SHERMAN.
- H.R. 2577: Mr. KEATING.
- H.R. 2585: Mr. CASTEN of Illinois.
- H.R. 2602: Mr. SOTO and Mr. RUIZ.
- H.R. 2628: Mr. WALTZ.
- H.R. 2645: Mr. COLLINS of New York.
- H.R. 2693: Ms. NORTON, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, and Mr. POSEY.
- H.R. 2698: Mr. STANTON.
- H.R. 2708: Mr. BERA and Mr. CUELLAR.
- H.R. 2711: Mrs. HAYES.
- H.R. 2739: Mr. COHEN.
- H.R. 2749: Mr. VARGAS.
- H.R. 2764: Ms. HILL of California.
- H.R. 2772: Mr. MCGOVERN.
- H.R. 2782: Mr. MARCHANT.
- H.R. 2829: Mr. CLEAVER.
- H.R. 2846: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania and Mr. CRIST.
- H.R. 2882: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
- H.R. 2897: Mr. CALVERT, Mr. KIM, and Mr. COLLINS of New York.
- H.R. 2988: Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma.
- H.R. 3006: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia and Mr. MOOLENAAR.
- H.R. 3035: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
- H.R. 3036: Mr. COLLINS of New York.
- H.R. 3043: Mr. SIMPSON.
- H.R. 3047: Mr. CHABOT.
- H.R. 3048: Mr. HUFFMAN.
- H.R. 3062: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.
- H.R. 3094: Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico.
- H.R. 3103: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
- H.R. 3116: Mr. RASKIN, Mr. GALLEGRO, Mr. SOTO, Ms. SPEIER, and Mr. POCAN.
- H.R. 3129: Mr. POCAN.
- H.R. 3190: Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL and Ms. LOFGREN.
- H.R. 3193: Ms. BASS, Mr. SAN NICOLAS, Mr. KILDEE, and Mrs. LURIA.
- H.R. 3197: Mr. LEWIS, Ms. HILL of California, Mr. GALLEGRO, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, and Ms. JUDY CHU of California.
- H.R. 3287: Mr. TIMMONS, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. BARR, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. STEWART, Mr. BUDD, Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio, Mr. WALSON, Mr. BOST, and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.
- H.R. 3289: Mr. WEBER of Texas.
- H.R. 3332: Mr. KIND.
- H.R. 3362: Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. DELGADO, and Mr. CLEAVER.
- H.R. 3373: Mr. MCGOVERN.
- H.R. 3404: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
- H.R. 3412: Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico.
- H.R. 3442: Mrs. HARTZLER.
- H.R. 3463: Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. CASTEN of Illinois, and Mr. CLEAVER.
- H.R. 3548: Mr. PAPPAS.
- H.R. 3590: Mr. RASKIN.
- H.R. 3607: Mr. MCKINLEY.
- H.R. 3632: Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. ALLRED, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Ms. SPANBERGER, Ms. FINKENAUER, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. VELA, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mrs. FLETCHER, Mr. KATKO, Ms. CRAIG, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, and Mr. ROSE of New York.
- H.R. 3739: Mr. BIGGS.
- H.R. 3764: Ms. HAALAND, Ms. PORTER, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. ROSE of New York, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. WILD, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. EVANS, and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.
- H.R. 3779: Mr. GARAMENDI.
- H.R. 3820: Ms. SCANLON.
- H.R. 3846: Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma.
- H.R. 3851: Mr. CASE, Ms. PINGREE, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico, Mr. WESTERMAN, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. PETERS, and Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma.
- H.R. 3864: Mr. BABIN, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. BUDD, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, and Mr. STAUBER.
- H.R. 3956: Mr. RUTHERFORD.
- H.R. 3964: Mr. POSEY and Mr. WALBERG.
- H.R. 3971: Mr. BURCHETT.
- H.R. 4009: Mr. HUIZENGA.
- H.R. 4029: Mrs. AXNE.
- H.R. 4032: Ms. STEVENS.
- H.R. 4044: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. MAST, Mr. KIM, and Ms. BLUNT ROCH-ESTER.
- H.R. 4056: Mr. PAPPAS and Ms. JUDY CHU of California.
- H.R. 4100: Mr. PETERS.
- H.R. 4174: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
- H.R. 4175: Ms. HAALAND.
- H.R. 4194: Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Ms. HOULAHAN, and Mr. DELGADO.
- H.R. 4206: Mrs. MCBATH and Mr. DESAULNIER.
- H.R. 4211: Mr. KIM.
- H.R. 4228: Mrs. BEATTY and Ms. JOHNSON of Texas.
- H.R. 4236: Mr. PAPPAS.
- H.R. 4249: Mr. DESAULNIER.
- H.R. 4265: Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. GALLEGRO, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Ms. MOORE.
- H.R. 4272: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.
- H.R. 4276: Mr. MOOLENAAR.
- H.R. 4294: Mr. PENCE.
- H.R. 4295: Mr. POCAN.
- H.R. 4297: Ms. SPEIER and Mr. LEWIS.
- H.R. 4300: Mr. CÁRDENAS.
- H.R. 4301: Ms. NORTON, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Ms. UNDERWOOD, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mrs. LEE of Nevada, Ms. OMAR, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. CUELLAR, and Mr. SOTO.
- H.R. 4339: Mr. PAYNE and Mr. MCGOVERN.
- H.R. 4347: Mr. HICE of Georgia.
- H.R. 4358: Mr. RICE of South Carolina.
- H.J. Res. 66: Mr. MCGOVERN.
- H. Con. Res. 60: Mr. COSTA, Mr. RASKIN, and Mr. JOYCE of Ohio.
- H. Res. 49: Mr. TIPTON.
- H. Res. 107: Mr. KHANNA.
- H. Res. 114: Ms. BONAMICI.
- H. Res. 146: Mr. DEFazio, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. COLE, and Mr. TIMMONS.
- H. Res. 296: Mr. LYNCH.
- H. Res. 323: Mr. POCAN.
- H. Res. 326: Mr. O'HALLERAN.
- H. Res. 390: Mr. BYRNE.
- H. Res. 419: Mrs. LEE of Nevada.
- H. Res. 493: Mr. LATTA.
- H. Res. 517: Ms. SPANBERGER, Mr. FLORES, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, and Ms. MENG.
- H. Res. 551: Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. MARSHALL, and Mr. BALDERSON.
- H. Res. 555: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.
- H. Res. 556: Mr. PETERS, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. CASTEN of Illinois, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, and Mr. KILDEE.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MR. YARMUTH

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on the Budget in H.R. 4378 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MRS. LOWEY

H.R. 4378, making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2020, and for other purposes, does not contain any congressional earmark, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

DELETION OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 3632: Mr. COHEN.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

42. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Mayor and City Commission of Sweetwater, FL, relative to Resolution No. 4554, urging the United States Citizenship and Immigration Services (“USCIS”) to reevaluate and grant Ramon Saul Sanchez’s application for permanent resident status; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.