



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 165

WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, OCTOBER 18, 2019

No. 165

Senate

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Monday, October 21, 2019, at 3 p.m.

House of Representatives

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 18, 2019

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

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
October 18, 2019.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JOE NEGUSE to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: God our Father, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

As the House comes to the end of an emotional week, we ask that You give all Members Your calming and comforting spirit.

We mourn the loss of a colleague, and implore Your healing presence in this Chamber, in the Cummings family, and in the hearts of all who have labored in these Halls, especially in the Oversight Committee in these most recent years.

We continue to rely upon Your wisdom and understanding, and ask Your favor for us and for our Nation.

May all that is done be for Your greater honor and glory.
Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. WALORSKI) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mrs. WALORSKI led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

UAW STRIKE

(Mrs. DINGELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, for the last month, my brothers and sisters in the UAW have been standing up for their livelihoods, their families, and their future. When home, I have joined them at all hours and all shifts just to listen, to support, and to understand.

Being on a picket line is hard work, but UAW workers are committed workers who are a crucial component of building America's auto industry and driving our Nation's economy.

This strike has been about the collective community and workers across America being treated fairly, with dignity and respect. Many UAW members are newer hires and temporaries, workers who are paid less than their colleagues whom they work side by side with. Many temps work 7 days a week, get no overtime, have no sick pay, and can't take time for a family emergency.

The good news for the country is that a tentative agreement between the UAW and GM is now going for ratification.

All workers need to recognize they benefit from the courage, commitment, and caring of these UAW workers. We need their jobs here; we need manufacturing here in this country; but we need fair pay, fair benefits, and commitment to produce here in the United States of America. Their fight is the fight of all workers.

ABANDONED COAL MINES

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to draw attention to our Nation's abandoned coal mines.

☐ 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.

H8231

Pennsylvania's heritage is rooted in coal. It powered an industrial revolution and won two world wars. However, as more and more coal mines continue to shut their doors, properly closing these mines is incredibly important.

Of Pennsylvania's 67 counties, 43 have abandoned mine lands. My district, Pennsylvania's 15th Congressional District, has the most, nationwide. These sites are a danger to the environment and to Pennsylvania's residents.

To take action on this, I was pleased to join my colleague, Representative MATT CARTWRIGHT from Pennsylvania's Eighth Congressional District, in introducing H.R. 4248, the Abandoned Mine Land Reauthorization Act.

The Abandoned Mine Land trust fund is set to expire in September of 2021. This bill will not only reauthorize the fund for the next 15 years, but helps for economic growth in coal communities impacted by mine closures.

Since 1977, the AML program has eliminated over 46,000 open mine portals, and reauthorizing the AML trust fund is critical to continued progress.

REDUCING PRESCRIPTION DRUG COSTS

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

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, 3 in 10 adults in America today have reported not taking medicine as prescribed because of the cost. Our seniors and families should not have to choose between paying their monthly bills and affording their prescription drugs.

That is why I introduced the Advancing Enrollment and Reducing Drug Costs Act with my friend from New Hampshire, CHRIS PAPPAS, to simplify how low-income seniors get the help they need affording their medications.

That is why I introduced the Star Rating for Biosimilars Act with my friend from Ohio, BOB GIBBS, to drive down costs and provide greater access to generic biosimilar drugs treating cancer, arthritis, and many other conditions.

And that is why the House is moving forward with H.R. 3, the Low Drug Costs Now Act, which will use competitive price negotiation to save Medicare some \$345 billion and save United States households nearly \$160 billion, combined. Private businesses would save some \$46 billion under our bill.

Across America, seniors and families are struggling to afford the prescription drugs that they need to stay healthy and alive. It is time for Congress to act. Let's act now.

HONORING SENATOR RICHARD LUGAR

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

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3152 and to honor the life and legacy of Senator Richard Lugar, who passed away earlier this year.

Senator Lugar was a true statesman, whose unwavering dedication to his community and his country led to a lifetime of service. He worked tirelessly to champion freedom, advance democracy, and build peace and prosperity both at home and abroad. His wisdom, bipartisanship, and commitment to America's ideals made our country stronger and safer.

Though we will miss his spirit and conviction, the values he fought for will endure in those who follow his example of servant leadership. He built a foundation of opportunity and empowerment so future generations of Hoosiers could carry on his life's mission.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 3152 to dedicate the Richard G. Lugar Post Office in Indianapolis and to celebrate a leader who never stopped working to make the world a better place.

SOLIDARITY WITH HONG KONG

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

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in defense of liberal democratic values and in solidarity with the people of Hong Kong. Earlier this week, the House passed legislation in support of these values and of human rights.

A strong nation is one that does not turn to its worst instincts in the face of dissent. A strong nation does not see liberal democratic values as a threat. A strong nation tolerates differences in pursuit of prosperity for itself and prosperity for the world.

To my fellow Americans, I say that we must not turn our backs on our principles in exchange for profit; we must not trade away our freedoms or be indifferent to those who yearn to be free.

To the 2 million courageous young people in Hong Kong who marched, to those who are willing to fight for a prosperous future where their rights will be respected and where their freedoms will be protected: We are with you.

NATIONAL DEBT

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

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Speaker, I am here once again to sound the alarm bell about our country's addiction to spending the hard-earned tax dollars of its citizens and future generations.

It is with great regret that I report, as many are already aware, that our country's national debt has topped \$1 trillion for fiscal year 2019.

Now, we know that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will blame President Trump's Tax Cuts and Jobs Act for this shortfall; but, in fact, the corporations they attempt to hold responsible have paid \$8 billion more in the 11 months of this fiscal year than they did in 2018, according to issuesinsights.com.

No, the increase in the deficit over the past year is due to rampant spending, stemming from right here in this Chamber. Wasteful spending increases have been seen across the board; and, to add insult to injury, the interest owed on this money is now up more than 14 percent.

This is an issue that can go on no more. I promised my constituents when I came to Washington that I would convey their concern about our runaway national debt. It is time for all lawmakers to understand that we cannot afford to use tax dollars as a piggy bank for pet projects. Spending like what we have seen is a threat to our national security and a disservice to the American people.

Since I started speaking 50 seconds ago, our national debt has risen nearly \$2 million. Therefore, we cannot simply encourage leadership in Congress to commit to restoring regular order in the appropriations process, but we must demand that we address this fiscal crisis before it is too late.

PRESCRIPTION DRUG PRICES

(Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about the urgent need to address the high and rising costs of prescription drug prices in this country.

Far too often, I have heard heart-breaking stories from Oklahomans and people in my community who face the unacceptable reality of choosing between putting food on their table and taking the lifesaving medications they need.

Earlier this year, I held a townhall where I heard from many people in Oklahoma, and we released a report about the soaring costs of insulin. In my district alone, more than 22,000 seniors on Medicare and other Oklahomans living with disabilities and diabetes face prescription drug costs of more than \$25 million.

It is time to act and make medicine more affordable and make it possible for people to get the lifesaving prescription drugs they need.

One important solution is limiting the out-of-pocket costs for patients at the pharmacy counter. That is why I introduced the Capping Drug Costs for Seniors Act. This practical solution lowers the cost for patients directly. This bill keeps Medicare part D patients from paying more than \$2,000 out of pocket, which has a real impact for 46 million Americans who rely on this program.

Medication only works if it is taken as prescribed. The high cost of prescription drugs forces too many people to choose between putting food on their table and buying the medicine they need.

We must continue working on this important issue and create pathways to affordable medications and improving health.

□ 0915

HONORING THE MEMORY OF BILL BERKMAN

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

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, the Tri-Cities community recently lost a leader and a friend. I rise today to honor the memory of Bill Berkman, chairman of the Benton County Republicans. Bill became involved with the local Republican Party as a precinct committee officer in 2016, and later that year, as chairman. I got to know him well while encouraging our fellow community members to get out to vote.

As owner of the MenZone franchises in Kennewick and Pasco, Bill was a passionate voice for limited government and policies that supported small business owners. Even with his strong personal beliefs and conservative principles, though, Bill never let partisanship rise above integrity. He was adamant that we could and should do more to bring more respect into our politics.

He will be remembered for his efforts to build bridges, including with his counterparts in the local Democratic Party.

We will all miss Bill's booming voice, his polite fervent candor, and his desire for facts, for truth, and for solutions for the Nation.

Rest in peace, Bill.

FIX MEDICAID FUNDING IN THE INSULAR AREAS

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

Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Speaker, Republicans and Democrats on the House Energy and Commerce Committee agree that now is the time to fix Medicaid funding in the insular areas.

H.R. 2328, reported out of the committee in July, addresses the serious funding shortfall all the insular areas face now that special ObamaCare Medicaid funding for our areas has ended.

In the Marianas, this special funding has kept our only hospital open, and is a significant source of revenue for doctors in private practice, pharmacists, and an array of healthcare providers.

Take this funding away, and not only low-income families that qualify for Medicaid will suffer, but everyone at every income level who depends on

those doctors, pharmacists, and other healthcare providers will lose service.

The insular areas have reached the Medicaid cliff, but we have a solution. Chairman PALLONE, Ranking Member WALDEN, and all of the Members of the Energy and Commerce Committee agree: Let us bring H.R. 2328 to the floor.

Show that the House is united and fix the insular area Medicaid funding cliff.

REMEMBERING THE LIFE OF MARVIN H. "MARK" CHESSER

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember the life of Mr. Marvin H. "Mark" Chesser who passed away at the age of 78 on September 25, the mayor pro tem of Ludowici in Long County in the First Congressional District of Georgia.

His friends and colleagues remember him as a valuable servant to the community who served tirelessly and did a great job. Even before becoming the mayor pro tem, Mr. Chesser spent countless hours dedicated to his local community.

One important example of his work includes his time driving school busses for the district there. In addition, he was very active within his church, both in the men's ministry and driving the church van for Wednesday night activities.

During his time as mayor pro tem, Mr. Chesser worked hard to promote policies that boosted the economy, and increased jobs in Ludowici. I am thankful that we had Mr. Chesser in the First Congressional District where his passion made our area a better place to live.

Mr. Chesser's family and friends will be in my thoughts and prayers during this most difficult time.

OUTSOURCING ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 2019

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 3624, and to insert extraneous material thereon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 629 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 3624.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. NEGUSE) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 0919

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3624) to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to require the disclosure of the total number of domestic and foreign employees of certain public companies, and for other purposes, with Mr. NEGUSE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services.

The gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 3624, the Outsourcing Accountability Act of 2019 crafted by Representative AXNE from Iowa, a new Member to Congress and the Financial Services Committee.

The Outsourcing Accountability Act of 2019 protects American workers by shining a light on companies that are shipping jobs overseas.

Although public companies are required to disclose their total number of employees, there is currently no requirement that they disclose where those employees are geographically based. This allows companies to quietly ship jobs overseas and makes it difficult for investors to know if the companies they are investing in are creating and protecting American jobs.

Moreover, voluntary disclosure of outsourcing data has declined in recent decades. According to the AFL-CIO: ". . . multinational companies have increasingly focused job creation in non-U.S. markets and would prefer not to disclose numbers that could lead to reputational risks."

As a result of the lack of disclosure, some companies that are failing to invest in American workers escape accountability. The limited information the public does have about companies' outsourcing and offshoring usually comes from the news media.

The data that we do have shows that the U.S. is losing jobs to trade. According to the Economic Policy Institute, the United States has lost more than 3 million American jobs to trade with China in the last 20 years. Since 1975, more than 5 million Americans have been certified for Trade Adjustment Assistance after losing wages, hours, or their employment because of trade.

President Trump's 2017 tax scam has also worsened matters by essentially incentivizing certain manufacturers to move entire production lines overseas.

By requiring public companies to disclose the locations of their workforces,

the Outsourcing Accountability Act provides investors with the information they need on which companies are investing in the American economy and will incentivize companies to invest in American workers.

With the passage of this bill into law, public companies would no longer be able to ship jobs overseas under the cover of darkness.

I commend Representative AXNE for introducing this bill that creates transparency and benefits American workers and urge adoption of H.R. 3624.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to H.R. 3624. The Republicans stand ready to work with our colleagues on the other side of the aisle to strengthen our public markets and increase opportunities for everyday investors.

We know that robust capital markets give everyday investors the opportunity to save for a first home, a child's college education, and retirement. But instead of considering a bill that will grow the economy and create jobs, we are using our floor time, a full legislative day, in fact, to talk about where public company employees are located; not foreign companies, but American public companies.

We are considering a bill that really should be part of a larger bill. It shouldn't take up a full legislative day. It is two-and-a-half pages of legislative text and does very little that it purports to do.

But here we are. We must ensure that public companies are properly regulated and supervised to protect our capital markets for all Americans. That is why companies are already required to provide information to investors on risk exposure, material financial data, and the company's financial condition. These reports help investors determine whether they believe the company's value is worthy of investment.

Unfortunately, Democrats are pursuing a partisan agenda of government mandates that jeopardize economic opportunity for millions of middle-income Americans.

H.R. 3624 is just the latest in a series of partisan proposals offered by committee Democrats to add nonfinancial disclosures to an already thorough list of mandatory disclosures, and the effort is really to pursue a political agenda or political interest rather than economic interest.

These mandates add to a company's cost of compliance. And in some cases, they can put lives at risk for people who are employed in countries around the globe. They do not have an impact on the underlying value of the firm, and most certainly will discourage companies from going public.

Why the bill's sponsor wants companies to disclose where employees reside is unclear. I know the title of the bill, but I don't see in the contents of the bill anything related to the title of the

bill. The bill provides no context for this data.

In fact, during the hearing on this legislation, witnesses shared that simply knowing that 1 percent of the company's workforce resides in a particular State or abroad, does not explain whether American workers hold these jobs or have moved between States or overseas for work; whether some expertise or resource is central to that job that cannot be found in the United States or cannot be found in the State or another region of the country; or whether moving jobs overseas results in cheaper products for the American consumer or more jobs here in the United States.

Perhaps they are selling something to a foreign country. We don't have that as a part of information here with this disclosure. The information sought by H.R. 3624 would, at best, tell an incomplete story and, at worst, could be deeply misleading.

The only plausible explanation for this bill is to use the information to try to shame public companies based on incomplete and misleading information. It is unclear to me how shaming a company benefits the everyday investor, or encourages more companies to go public, or brings more vibrant capital markets here in the United States or creates jobs here in the United States.

How does shaming a company encourage more companies to go public? How does shaming create more opportunities to save for retirement? How does it enhance children's savings for college, or parents saving for their children to go to college?

How does it build a brighter, more vibrant future for them economically? In fact, we have yet this Congress to bring a bill to the floor that would accomplish the goal of building retirement savings, savings for a college education, or help with buying a first home.

We have yet to consider one bill that will grow the economy or actually create jobs. We are falling behind China. We are falling behind our economic competitors across the world when it comes to the number of initial public offerings, the number of IPOs.

China has more IPOs than the United States in recent time. We need to right this. I want to hear what my Democrat colleagues' solution is to that issue; not just a messaging bill that we have here today of two-and-a-half pages of legislative text.

□ 0930

I urge my colleagues to listen to the American people. Let's get back to the economic work that they need, given where we are in this economic cycle. I encourage my colleagues to vote "no" on this bill. It does nothing that the title says that it does.

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

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from

Iowa (Mrs. AXNE), who is the sponsor of the bill.

Mrs. AXNE. Mr. Chairman, I thank Mrs. MALONEY, the chair of the Investor Protection, Entrepreneurship, and Capital Markets Subcommittee, for her support on this bill. I also thank Senator PETERS and Representative MCNERNEY for their work on the Outsourcing Accountability Act.

Last December, Wells Fargo in my district laid off 400 workers, claiming it was due to technological advances. But I heard from dozens of laid-off employees who were directed to train their replacements overseas. Across the country, corporations are shipping jobs overseas, leaving American workers high and dry, just to benefit their bottom line.

What is worse is that corporations aren't even required to disclose when they are laying off hardworking Americans by moving jobs overseas. Currently, when corporations submit their annual reports, they are only required to disclose the total number of employees, not where they are located. This makes it far too easy for companies to hide when they are laying off American workers and moving those jobs overseas.

It also makes it easier for corporations to deceive the public about inaccurate job creation. If a company lays off 500 workers in Iowa and then hires 1,000 of them in India, their annual report would show that they added 500 jobs when, in reality, hardworking Iowans are left unemployed, wondering how they are going to pay their bills.

Employees who lose their jobs due to overseas trade are eligible for Trade Adjustment Assistance, or TAA. This program provides laid-off American workers with support and training to find a new job. But workers are only eligible for this assistance if they can certify that their job has been outsourced, which can be very difficult if a company is lying about outsourcing.

Far too often, companies are more concerned with protecting their public image than protecting workers and are reluctant to notify laid-off workers that their job has been outsourced. We have seen this happen time and time again.

My bill, the Outsourcing Accountability Act, would simply require public companies to include in their annual report where their employees are located by State and country. This will disincentivize companies from outsourcing, and it will certainly disincentivize them from lying to employees and the public about it. If a company knows that information will be disclosed, they will think twice about such unpopular actions. Not only will this help disincentivize the practice of outsourcing and protect American jobs, but it will give investors and consumers the information they need to identify companies that are supporting American jobs.

I know some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have said this is

too burdensome for companies. If a corporation isn't already tracking where in the world their employees are located, then for God's sake, they have bigger problems than this legislation.

One of the most difficult things about trying to address outsourcing and offshoring is that it is so hard to get information about how many jobs it affects. This is a commonsense reporting bill that will increase transparency and accountability on a practice that is contributing to unemployment across this country, and it doesn't even cost the taxpayers a dime.

I have heard from dozens of Iowans in my district who are looking at their expenses and wondering how they are going to get through the month. They are wondering this because they have been laid off by their employer that claimed technological advances only to then train employees to replace them overseas.

I urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to go back home to their districts and talk to their constituents who are struggling to pay their bills or put food on the table because their jobs have been shipped overseas. Go back home. Ask them if they elected you to fight for American jobs or for multinational corporations.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a "yes" vote on the bill.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The bill does no such thing as the author just stated, Mr. Chair. It gives a list of the numbers of employees in each State or territory in the United States. It gives the number of employees in a country as a matter of corporate disclosures.

If my friend wants to talk about accountability, a list of names is not accountability, unless this is about the trial bar suing or it is about naming and shaming companies for changing head counts in different States or government intervening to say that you can't move employees between States. It does not do the things that the author states.

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

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY), who is the chairwoman of the Subcommittee on Investor Protection, Entrepreneurship, and Capital Markets.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for her support on this bill and for her leadership on the Financial Services Committee.

I rise in strong support of the bill to protect American workers from outsourcing, H.R. 3624, the Outsourcing Accountability Act of 2019. And I congratulate my new colleague and my new friend from the great State of Iowa, CINDY AXNE, for her hard work on this important bill that will help American workers and save American jobs.

This bill would require companies to disclose in their annual report the

total number of employees they employ in each State and each foreign country. It would also require companies to disclose how those numbers have changed from the previous year, which is critically important because it will allow investors and the public to monitor which companies are sending U.S. jobs overseas and also to see which companies are bringing jobs back to the United States and employing Americans.

When companies outsource more of their jobs to other countries, sometimes that lowers a company's costs, but it also exposes the company to reputational risk and increased operational risk. If more of the company's workforce is located overseas, then the company is more exposed to political unrest or trade disruptions, which we have recently seen around the world.

It also makes it more difficult for companies to train workers who are located halfway across the globe and to oversee their workforce and ensure robust compliance with all the necessary regulatory requirements. It opens the company up to potential scandals and fines, which, at the end of the day, harms investors and harms the companies.

These risks are definitely material to investors, and they need to know about them.

The bill would fix these problems and would hold companies that are outsourcing U.S. jobs accountable for the decisions they are making. This bill helps the American worker. It is just plain common sense, and it does not cost the taxpayer anything. It is a win-win in so many areas.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this worker protection bill.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCNERNEY).

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairwoman WATERS and Representative AXNE for bringing forth this legislation, H.R. 3624.

I have to admit that I don't really understand the ranking member's objection to this legislation. As Americans continue to struggle in an economy where too many corporations value profits over people, this legislation grew out of the idea that consumers should know about the choices their companies are making so they can determine how to use their purchasing power.

H.R. 3624 would require a publicly traded company to disclose the number of employees working in the United States and abroad and to report the differences from year to year.

Too many Americans find themselves out of work because the companies they have put their faith and hope for the future in decided to ship their jobs out of this country without a thought for the workers and communities they leave behind. As these companies look for short-term gains through outsourc-

ing, they neglect the long-term damage that this practice does to our economy and to our country.

This legislation would bring real transparency at a time when consumers are becoming increasingly conscious about where they spend and invest their money.

Mr. Chairman, I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

While I agree with my colleague from New York's sartorial decisions, we diverge here.

What I would say to my colleagues here in the Chamber is that we all care about having more workers here in America. We do. A corporate mandate on disclosing the number of employees does not actually do that.

Having competitive regulations, having a competitive Tax Code, competing around the globe for jobs here in the United States, winning a trade war with the biggest competitor on the globe that we have—a rising China—and having an eye to the competition we face globally is the way we get American jobs here and keep them here.

Simply mandating something more on our companies and holding them back and retraining them does not actually move us forward in the globe. It doesn't. It doesn't actually get at the driving force of this.

What I hear from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle is that it seems like they do support our having a reset with our trade relationship with China and that they do agree that we need to have a new trading relationship with our biggest trading partners so we get more jobs here. The unions support that concept. Republicans support that concept. We should be able to have a bipartisan coalition to support a better agenda on trade so that we have American jobs here.

My district has felt that intensely, with the loss of textile manufacturing jobs. The way we brought them back is by competing: by having better regulation, better tax rates, and more technological innovation here in the United States. Now, we have more jobs than we did 10 years ago in textiles in North Carolina. We have more jobs than we did 10 years ago when it deals with furniture.

We can compete. We can do this smartly, and we can do it well. But more corporate mandates and more expense burdens on public companies does not lead to more public companies and does not lead to better investments for pensioners, whether it is public pensions, union pensions, or individual folks who want to save for their retirement.

What we have to do is think differently than just more mandates, more regulation, and more burden.

No State has felt this type of challenge and dealt with it in a competitive way than the State of Michigan.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr.

HUIZENGA), who is the lead Republican on the Investor Protection, Entrepreneurship, and Capital Markets Subcommittee.

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the ranking member yielding me the time.

As I was hearing my colleagues describe what this bill does and whom it is targeted at, it just struck me, there is an untethering from reality of what our economy is and how our economy functions.

Certainly, along any of the border—and, yes, we have a northern border, while in Michigan it is actually to the east of us. When you look at what happens in the automotive industry, and when you look at what happens in the agricultural industry, that is the most porous border in the world because that is our largest trading partner in the world. In just the State of Michigan alone, Canada is the seventh or eighth largest trading partnership in the entire world.

As we have been piling on regulation upon regulation over the last number of decades, Mr. Chairman, you saw companies leaving the United States. Sometimes, though, they were for different reasons. It is the supply chain. It didn't have anything to do with lower labor markets in Canada. The UAW strike also was the Canadian workers' strike. This is all linked together.

In the bill itself, there is a disclosure requirement that we have to desegregate by State, the District of Columbia, Commonwealth, territory, and possession, and compare a percentage. So, Mr. Chairman, as you are shifting from Ohio to Detroit, Indiana, or Wisconsin, you are going to have to track all of those things as you are going through—by the way, not by numbers but by percentages of the total number of employees who physically work in and domicile in another country outside of the United States.

Again, you are going to have to do that same thing as you are shifting automotive parts production between subsidiaries. That happens all the time, whether it is going from Troy, Michigan, or to Windsor, Ontario.

□ 0945

That is a free flow that goes back and forth all the time. That has nothing to do with some nefarious shipping of jobs overseas. That is called supply chain.

So this bill is flawed because it paints an incomplete company picture. Simply knowing one percentage of a company's workforce residing abroad—which obviously means everywhere and on anything—just really does not give you any kind of picture or flavor or test of what is happening within that.

And, yes, it is duplicative. In fact, I will have an amendment on this bill a little bit later. We already have conflict mineral reporting. We have all kinds of other reporting that had happened because of Dodd-Frank.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Chair, I yield the gentleman from Michigan an additional 1 minute.

Mr. HUIZENGA. I can tell you that the lack of competitiveness in the United States and one of the challenges that we have on our committee that we constantly talk about is how do we make sure that the United States is an area for growth, innovation, entrepreneurship.

Because these companies that are now public, none of them started out public. They became public companies. And we have seen a plunge in the number of publicly traded companies. That is why I supported regulatory reform. That is why I supported tax reform, because we had to make the United States more competitive.

This bill does nothing to help the United States become more competitive. It becomes less competitive and more burdensome, and all with the goal of shaming companies, not actually getting aggregate information that helps anybody.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The Outsourcing Accountability Act of 2019 is a commonsense bill that is supported by consumer advocacy organizations, like Public Citizen, the labor representatives from the AFL-CIO, Communications Workers of America, the United Automobile Workers, and the United Steelworkers.

According to the Communications Workers of America: "This key piece of legislation would greatly help working families and CWA fully supports the bill's passage. This is a vital effort to guarantee that companies are required, by law, to disclose the magnitude to which they outsource American jobs and exploit low-cost foreign labor."

According to the AFL-CIO, the offshoring disclosure required by H.R. 3624 would "help investors analyze companies' strategic plans, exposures to geopolitical risk and risk from extreme weather events. From a public policy perspective, such disclosure will also allow the public to see the effect of the corporate tax cut on encouraging offshoring."

Mr. Chairman, I include in the RECORD a letter from the Communications Workers of America in support of H.R. 3624.

COMMUNICATIONS WORKERS OF
AMERICA, LEGISLATIVE DEPARTMENT,
October 15, 2019.

Hon. CINDY AXNE,
Member of Congress,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE AXNE: On behalf of the officers and 700,000 members of the Communications Workers of America (CWA), I am writing to thank you for introducing H.R. 3624, the Outsourcing Accountability Act of 2019. This key piece of legislation would greatly help working families and CWA fully supports the bill's passage. This is a vital effort to guarantee that companies are required, by law, to disclose the magnitude to which they outsource American jobs and exploit low-cost, foreign labor.

As you know, under existing law, publicly traded corporations are not required to pub-

licly list where their employees are located. This lack of disclosure makes it much more difficult to hold corporations that move jobs overseas accountable. The Outsourcing Accountability Act remedies this problem by requiring companies to disclose the total number of employees that they have by state and country, and the percentage change from the previous year.

Without this accountability mechanism, corporations will continue to attempt to deceive workers and the American public when they outsource jobs. A prime example of this problem occurred when Wells Fargo announced a massive layoff of over 26,500 employees in 2018. While the company proclaimed the layoff was due to changes in customer preferences and publicly denied that work was being offshored, several investigations by the Department of Labor revealed that many people lost their jobs because Wells Fargo chose to expand their operations overseas. In fact, the company is opening a call center in the Philippines where they will employ over 7,000 workers. This same dynamic occurs frequently across industries.

CWA believes this bill adds imperative transparency that will disincentive the practice of corporations outsourcing jobs. Furthermore, it will help ensure that workers affected by outsourcing are able to access their Trade Adjustment Assistance benefits by demonstrating more clearly that offshoring played a role in their job loss.

We are very grateful for your efforts on this bill and thank you for your commitment to standing up for American workers with the introduction of H.R. 3624. We look forward to working with you on this and other issues of importance to working people in the future.

Sincerely,

SHANE LARSON,
Senior Director, Gov-
ernment Affairs and
Policy, Communica-
tions Workers of
America (CWA).

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Chair, I am ready to close, if I may inquire if the gentleman from California has any further speakers.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to close.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let us be clear: The bill we are considering right now has nothing to do with outsourcing. This is a political talking point, not a piece of legislation. It will not bring jobs back to the United States. The bill is simply designed to create more opportunities for corporate activists and the trial bar to name and shame companies.

What does this do for the American people? Nothing.

In contrast, the Republican Tax Cut and Jobs Act has brought more jobs and greater payback to the United States.

Mr. Chair, our unemployment rate is at a 50-year low, so all this economic gloom about outsourcing, we have been talking about insourcing, bringing jobs back to the United States from overseas.

We have a President who has an aggressive trade agenda to make sure that we have more jobs here in the United States instead of outsourcing

jobs through bad trade deals that we agree in a bipartisan way.

Bad trade deals have cost us jobs over the years, led by both Republican and Democratic Presidents, unfortunately. So there is bipartisan support here for better trade legislation, better trading relationships. Let's focus on that.

The labor force participation rate is way up and continues to rise. More people in the United States are entering the workforce than leaving the workforce. The American people are reaping the benefits of a strong economy.

If Democrats are serious about continuing to grow our economy and create high-paying jobs, let's start passing bills that unleash companies, not constrain them.

Let's help businesses grow, not discourage them from going public. American businesses need resources, not mandates, to compete with our biggest economic threat—China.

If my Democratic colleagues are not interested in growing our economy, let's find other areas of common ground. We should pass bills that help everyday Americans save for their retirement, for their children's college education, or to buy their first home.

Let's help those workers who are putting together a couple of jobs get full-time jobs.

Let's pass bipartisan legislation to help seniors access prescription drugs.

Let's authorize the Defense Department and have a stronger national defense by passing a bipartisan National Defense Authorization Act.

Unfortunately, this bill we are discussing today would do none of those things; and we have spent the large majority of our week discussing two small, tidy, but very vacuous, extraordinarily vacuous, pieces of legislation that have consumed our week, legislatively.

We have a 2½ page bill that is the full bit of our business here on a Friday, on a legislative day. We had a really meaningless, vacuous, poorly designed bill yesterday that consumed a whole legislative day as well. This is not the way we should be running Congress.

I would like to reiterate: The Republicans stand ready to work with our colleagues across the aisle on meaningful legislation that will help the American people.

So let's vote this bill down. Let's not just agree with the political talking point that is put into legislative text for political reasons. Let's vote this down. Let's get to serious legislating and get done with these empty bills and on with the work of the American people.

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

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chair, may I inquire how much time I have remaining.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from California has 17 minutes remaining.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I have sat here and listened to my colleagues on the opposite side of the aisle attempt to explain why it is they are opposed to this bill and what this bill is attempting to do to create transparency in American companies by simply asking them to disclose the number of jobs that they are exporting overseas. I don't understand what their argument is.

I have heard from both sides of the aisle, for years, that one of our number one priorities is jobs: job creation and job retention. I have heard from both sides of the aisle that we must do everything that we can to stop American corporations from exporting our jobs offshore.

I have heard Members from both sides of the aisle take to the floor of the House of Representatives and talk about how we must stop, how we must do everything that we possibly can to ensure that we are in no way supporting or incentivizing our companies to export our jobs overseas.

We heard the gentlewoman from Iowa (Mrs. AXNE), author of this bill, who talked about what happened in her district with Wells Fargo. We heard her explain how these people, these employees are hurting, and many of them just feel it is absolutely unfair for our companies who got big tax breaks to be able to export our jobs overseas in search of cheap labor, undermining the labor force here in America.

I don't know how they justify that.

And I heard the ranking member of this committee keep talking about shaming the companies. I don't know who he is trying to protect. I don't know where he gets this language from, "shaming the companies."

But if that is what he wants to use, if that is what he wants to accuse me of—I am sure he is not accusing the author of this bill of shaming American companies. But if you want to accuse me of that, you might be able to do so.

And let me just say this: You might be able to say that I am throwing a little shade on you also, because if, in fact, you are defending the actions of American companies that are taking your constituents' jobs out of your district, offshore, and you can defend that, then there is something wrong with your reasoning.

And I don't know if it is shaming or shading or whatever it is, I am opposed to it. Most of the Members of this House of Representatives are opposed to it.

And this legislator, a new legislator, who came to the Congress of the United States probably wondered why we hadn't done something about this sooner. I am so pleased that she had the courage, the wisdom, and the insight to challenge us all and to say this has got to stop.

And you are saying this bill does nothing? Are you saying that information is no good? Are you saying that somehow knowing this, understanding this, we wouldn't be able to do something about it?

Well, let me just tell you, I think you are wrong. I think you are absolutely wrong.

When this information is revealed, when this information is unfolded, when it is made evident that these companies are doing this, then I think we have more than a few Members who will rise to the occasion to do everything possible to stop shipping American jobs from our districts to foreign countries for cheap labor.

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

The CHAIR. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Financial Services, printed in the bill. That committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read.

The text of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 3624

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Outsourcing Accountability Act of 2019".

SEC. 2. REQUIRED DISCLOSURE OF NUMBER OF DOMESTIC AND FOREIGN EMPLOYEES.

Section 13 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78m) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(s) DISCLOSURE OF NUMBER OF DOMESTIC AND FOREIGN EMPLOYEES.—

"(1) DEFINITION.—In this subsection, the term 'covered subsidiary' means, with respect to an issuer, any subsidiary of such issuer that is—

"(A) a consolidated subsidiary; or

"(B) a subsidiary with respect to which the issuer accounts for the investment of the issuer in the subsidiary using the equity method of accounting.

"(2) DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENT.—Except with respect to an emerging growth company, beginning in the first full fiscal year that begins after the date of the enactment of this subsection, each issuer that is required to file a report with the Commission pursuant to subsection (a) shall disclose in such report—

"(A) the total number of employees of the issuer and any covered subsidiary of the issuer who are domiciled in the United States—

"(i) disaggregated by State, District of Columbia, commonwealth, territory, or possession of the United States; and

"(ii) compared using a percentage change calculation to any such total reported by the issuer in the most recent annual report of the issuer;

"(B) the total number of employees of the issuer who physically work in and are domiciled in any country other than the United States—

"(i) disaggregated by country; and

"(ii) compared using a percentage change calculation to any such total reported by the issuer in the most recent annual report of the issuer; and

"(C) the total number of employees of any covered subsidiary of the issuer who physically work in and are domiciled in any country other than the United States—

“(i) disaggregated by country; and
 “(ii) compared using a percentage change calculation to any such total reported by the issuer in the most recent annual report of the issuer.
 “(3) RULEMAKING.—The Commission may issue such rules as the Commission considers necessary to implement this subsection.”.

The CHAIR. No amendment to that committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part C of House Report 116-237. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. HUIZENGA

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part C of House Report 116-237.

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 3, line 21, insert after “emerging growth company” the following: “and except as provided in paragraph (3)”.

Page 5, after line 2, insert the following:
 “(3) EXCEPTION.—An issuer is not required to disclose information pursuant to paragraph (2) if such issuer is required to make disclosures pursuant to—

“(A) subsection 13(p); or

“(B) section 229.402 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulation, relating to chief executive officer pay ratios.”.

Page 5, line 3, strike “(3)” and insert “(4)”.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 629, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

□ 1000

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Chair, what we just heard a little while ago from the other side of the aisle can be easily explained. They don't understand the power of the Federal Government fully on how it can deter growth in our economy.

It is not one big, giant thing. It is death by a thousand cuts. It is creating the atmosphere or destroying the atmosphere that allows innovation, allows growth, and allows the entrepreneurial spirit that has set America apart from the rest of the world. It is putting it on the chopping block.

That is why I oppose this bill. Once again, we are using the massive power of the Federal Government to bully companies around.

I am kind of curious, if this is all about foreign jobs, why in the world, under section (A)(i), we are going to need all this information disaggregated by State—by State.

This has nothing to do with whether a job is going to Mexico or China or Vietnam or Canada. It has to do with

whether it is going from Michigan to Ohio or from Indiana to Iowa.

Yet, you are going to force the companies to continue to do all of this work for zero benefit, no benefit—not a benefit to an investor, not a benefit to the employee, certainly, unless, apparently, you have something against Michigan or against Ohio. I have got something against their university, not the State.

But why we continue to just pile this on is why I believe this is deeply flawed and it paints incomplete pictures of what is going on.

So, today, my amendment is this: I am offering a simple amendment that would exempt issuers from making these disclosures if they are already required to make a CEO pay ratio disclosure and disclosures relating to conflict minerals.

I cannot describe to you fully in these 5 minutes the damage that has been done with conflict minerals alone in a wide swath of industries, including the automotive industry.

People would think: Why in the world would that have anything to do with it? It has been hundreds and hundreds of man-hours to try to track something down that is untrackable. We still have no idea where all this is.

So, my amendment today—and, if this is really about foreign jobs and all those kinds of things, which we know it is really not because we need to disaggregate it by State; but, if it is about that, then it is time for the authors to step up and support this amendment.

We need to stop mandating frivolous disclosures for public companies. Well, we already have two with the CEO pay ratio and the conflict minerals.

I believe this is reasonable to say, that if you already are doing those, you no longer have to do these additional disclosures.

We should be looking at ways to lower costs, reducing barriers on those seeking to become the next Ford, the next Amazon, the next Microsoft. Instead, we are just putting up speed bump after speed bump after speed bump. What happens, Mr. Chair, is those speed bumps eventually turn into a wall, and that stops all progress.

So, I encourage my colleagues to vote “yes” on this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chair, I strongly oppose Representative HUIZENGA's amendment, which would effectively gut H.R. 3624 by exempting the vast majority of public companies from the outsourcing disclosure.

The amendment does this indirectly by exempting companies that have to comply with SEC rules requiring disclosure of the pay ratio between the CEO's compensation and that of its median employee or rules requiring disclosures relating to conflict minerals.

However, all public companies must comply with those rules, with some narrow exemptions.

The CEO pay ratio and conflict minerals disclosures have nothing to do with the new requirement to disclose how many jobs are being outsourced.

Taken together with the limited exemption for newly public companies already in H.R. 3624, the amendment would limit the bill's outsourcing disclosures to small reporting companies, foreign private issuers, and certain registered investment companies.

What my Republican colleagues do not seem to understand is that investors do care about all of these types of disclosures. They know that when a CEO makes significant multiples of the median employee, the performance of the company is hurt. Investors also know that, if a company sources its minerals to conflict zones, it faces a much higher risk than a company with a stable source of resources.

Likewise, investors also want to know whether a company is creating jobs in the United States or overseas.

By proposing a huge expansion of exemptions, Representative HUIZENGA's amendment would effectively negate the bill and allow companies to continue to, quietly and secretly, ship American jobs overseas.

Let me just add to these comments, in particular for all of the new Members of Congress: Anytime any company is shipping jobs out of your district, no matter where they are going, you raise questions. You ask why they are doing that. Don't be ashamed to do that. Don't think that something is wrong with doing that.

You were elected to represent the people in your district, and Mr. HUIZENGA would have you believe that, if jobs are being taken from your State to another State, you are supposed to be quiet because something is wrong with that.

I don't care whether it is from State to State or overseas or what have you. Representatives who were sent here to speak for their constituents should be concerned about that, they should raise the questions, and they should be involved with everything they can do to preserve those jobs.

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

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Chair, may I inquire how much time I have remaining.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Michigan has 45 seconds remaining.

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Chair, I will make it quick, because this is pretty easy.

What you just heard isn't true, Mr. Chairman, because if, truly, the other side cared about anytime there was a job getting shipped overseas, they would not have, under the (B)(2) disclosure requirement, an exemption with respect to an emerging growth company.

If they actually put their money where their mouth is, they wouldn't have that exclusion in there because,

apparently, an automotive job isn't as valuable as an emerging growth company job.

So, I am confused. If that is really what it is all about, then we ought to make sure that the rules apply to everybody and that there should not be an exemption.

And I am confused as to why the author of this bill would allow that to happen, would allow those technology companies to ship those jobs overseas, without any respect of having to report that.

Obviously, Mr. Chairman, I am being a little sarcastic, but it just goes to show why this is a flawed bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chair, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Iowa (Mrs. AXNE), the sponsor of this important legislation.

Mrs. AXNE. Mr. Chair, as a new Member of Congress, there is a lot of learning to be done. But what I can tell you from listening to this debate this morning is that I am always astounded at how we can't come together to find common ground to help people in this country, and that is simply what this bill does.

This amendment proposed by my colleague is, quite simply, designed to exempt the vast majority of companies from the Outsourcing Accountability Act and leave the disclosures exactly as they are now, and I fail to see any logic behind saying that companies that disclose their CEO pay ratio or whether they are using conflict minerals should be exempt from the disclosures in this bill. It has nothing to do with it.

The disclosures in my bill are meant to show if a corporation is truly supporting American jobs or if they are shipping them overseas.

If my colleague doesn't want to know where that information is and how many companies are shipping jobs overseas in the companies that he is investing in, then he should just simply say so.

I know some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have brought up that there could be good reasons to add jobs overseas. Nothing in this bill prevents companies from explaining that. If a company is opening new retail stores abroad, they can simply say that. The same goes for any other reason.

This bill is very simple. It simply requires the companies to disclose to the public information that they already have about what in country their employees are located. This amendment would remove that requirement, leaving companies free to continue to hide that information.

A vote for this amendment is really a vote against the bill itself.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to reject this unproductive amendment.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. HILL OF ARKANSAS

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part C of House Report 116-237.

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 3, line 21, insert after "emerging growth company" the following: "and except as provided in paragraph (3)".

Page 5, after line 2, insert the following: "(3) EXCEPTION.—An issuer is not required to disclose information pursuant to paragraph (2) if such information is not material."

Page 5, line 3, strike "(3)" and insert "(4)".

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 629, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HILL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Mr. Chair, I want to thank the ranking member on our side for offering me time to explain my amendment. I commend my friend from Iowa for her work in this legislation.

Let me make a couple of comments initially about the bill, generally. First of all, I don't think this bill is going to be a disincentive, as she described it, to companies who are recruiting to another State or considering moving to another country, potentially, for supply chain reasons, because, look, they are doing what they think is in the best, long-run interest of building their product.

And, don't forget, our States recruit our companies, countries recruit our companies. We look at supply chains. These are frequently very public matters about Governors bragging how many employees they have from each State and each company.

And the WARN Act, which is already on the statute books, certainly takes care of this issue of notice on layoffs and disclosure of employees.

In my own State recently we had Kimberly-Clark, a publicly traded company, decide to move jobs to Wisconsin. Those jobs were well known in my district and in Mr. GALLAGHER's district in Wisconsin. There was nothing secret about it. It is just part of business realigning inside our beautiful, largest economy in the world.

And I do have concerns about this disclosure internationally that my friend is requiring, because what if you are proposing to enter a country and you want to keep that private, for competition purposes, from international

competition or from your competitors in the United States? You are now forced, as a public company, to disclose, oh, I have one employee in a country.

I find that concerning. You may even put that employee at a safety risk, depending on what country is a target for Americans.

So, in my view, that brings up the topic of overall burden, and we know of the old expression "the straw that broke the camel's back."

And regulatory burdens are cumulative. Any one burden doesn't seem large, but, when piled up on all the other burdens, you see it in total.

I was talking to a chief accounting officer the other day of a \$2 billion market cap company. She spends \$250,000 a year, for example, to comply with the conflict mineral rule. If you have a 10-time multiple on that, that is a lot of money annualized impacting their business to try to comply with something they say is not physically possible to comply with.

So, I look at this as an additional burden. I urge that it not be adopted.

And my amendment does something simple. It just simply says, if this employment disclosure, domestically or internationally, is material to the business, in keeping with the tradition of the securities laws, then okay. So, if it is a material statement to describe where these employees are located to the business, then that might be something useful.

Mr. Chair, I urge adoption of my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1015

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, let me say to my colleague from Arkansas on the opposite side of the aisle that the need to be concerned about regulations relative to companies that are shipping jobs overseas is something I don't understand. I don't understand why the Members on the opposite side of the aisle could take this precious time to come here in defense of companies that would ship our American jobs overseas for cheap labor.

There is no excuse. There is no reason. There is no reason why our colleagues who come here to represent constituents, many of whom are still looking for jobs, and those who get laid off because their companies have taken their jobs and shipped them overseas, would come here and defend some company because they believe that we are being too tough on them, that we are overregulating them.

Well, I don't understand it, and there is nothing they could say or do to help me understand that.

I strongly oppose Representative HILL's amendment because it would effectively negate the purpose of H.R. 3624 by allowing companies to opt out of this disclosure if they believe that

the information is not “material” information for investors.

As we all know, in practice, companies have interpreted “material” only to include information on issues that have a current and easily quantifiable impact. This is exactly what the multinational companies that have been shipping American jobs overseas want, to hide what they are doing.

As the AFL-CIO noted before an Investor Protection, Entrepreneurship, and Capital Markets Subcommittee hearing in May, multinational companies “have increasingly focused job creation in non-U.S. markets and would prefer not to disclose numbers that would lead to reputational risks.”

We must stand with American workers and address this informational barrier to help investors, the public, and policymakers understand the true magnitude of the problem. So I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on this amendment.

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

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Mr. Chair, how much time do I have?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Arkansas has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Mr. Chair, my friend from California, I think, is making the case that this bill is confusing and a burden because we don't even know internationally if these are American jobs that were moved or not.

You are just counting the people in foreign countries. I don't know that that is really relevant. And it weakens your argument, in my view, as well, that we are disclosing in the States, as my friend, the ranking member, made so eloquently. So I think it is a burden.

It is not about shipping jobs. We have the WARN Act, which directly deals with jobs that are shipped overseas, or moved, and makes sure that people are retrained and compensated in the right way.

Instead, this is another burden on our public companies, our public companies. We want more public companies.

I just formed the Entrepreneur Caucus with my friends Mr. FOSTER, Mr. VEASEY, STEPHANIE MURPHY, and STEVE CHABOT. We have asked GAO why we are not having more public companies at smaller sizes.

I submit to you, my friends from California and Iowa, it is because we have raised the cost of being public too high. This is another burden, and I think we should think long and hard before we add burdens.

Materiality is the way to bring balance back.

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

The CHAIR. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I would ask, does the gentleman have any more speakers?

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, I don't, but I have time that I will use, so I will use that time to close.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Mr. Chair, let me close by simply saying that we want more public companies. We want to lower the cost of being public. We want to remove barriers from being public. We do that by carefully balancing the regulatory burden to be public.

This bill, which does not enhance any knowledge for investors or do anything important or material, weakens that effort to reduce barriers to being public.

I believe we should have a materiality standard. I urge adoption of my amendment.

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

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman from Arkansas to use your time to deal with the burden that you claim multinationals have just for doing this reporting. We will use our time to support the workers and the people of this country.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from Iowa (Mrs. AXNE), the sponsor of this important legislation.

Mrs. AXNE. Mr. Chairman, as written, my colleague's amendment would severely limit the Outsourcing Accountability Act and continue to leave companies in charge of whether or not they tell the public about outsourcing.

Corporations are already going to great lengths to cover it up, and if they are moving jobs overseas, why would they voluntarily disclose it in their annual report?

My colleague mentioned that this is the straw that broke the camel's back. I can tell you that these companies are already tracking this information. We have to pay workers; therefore, they know exactly where they are located.

I have done this work in my past. I have been involved with human resources and organizational development for my entire career. I have tracked this kind of information. All it takes is programming and a push of the button to make sure that that information comes out.

I would like to also talk about the WARN Act because the WARN Act does not require disclosure of whether layoffs are due to outsourcing. That is exactly why we need this information, so workers can get that Trade Adjustment Assistance they need to put food on the table to feed their children and keep their lights on.

These disclosures are intended to find out if a corporation is truly creating American jobs or if, instead, they are just moving them overseas. This amendment, just like the last one, would leave things just as they are now, with corporations able to share that information only if they decide to do so.

That situation has left us with, frankly, insufficient data about outsourcing as a general practice and minimal transparency about which corporations are creating American jobs.

I urge my colleagues to reject this unproductive amendment.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this moment to thank my colleague, a new Member of the Congress of the United States who serves on the Financial Services Committee, for introducing, supporting, and working for this legislation.

I urge all of my colleagues to vote “no” on this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HILL).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part C of House Report 116-237 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. HILL of Arkansas.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. HUIZENGA

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 184, noes 229, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 565]

AYES—184

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

Griffith Marshall
 Grothman Massie
 Guest Mast
 Guthrie McCarthy
 Hagedorn McCaul
 Harris McClintock
 Hartzler McHenry
 Hern, Kevin McKinley
 Herrera Beutler Meadows
 Hice (GA) Meuser
 Higgins (LA) Miller
 Hill (AR) Mitchell
 Holding Moolenaar
 Hollingsworth Mooney (WV)
 Hudson Mullin
 Huizenga Murphy (NC)
 Hunter Newhouse
 Hurd (TX) Norman
 Johnson (LA) Nunes
 Johnson (OH) Olson
 Johnson (SD) Palazzo
 Jordan Palmer
 Joyce (OH) Pence
 Joyce (PA) Perry
 Katko Posey
 Keller Ratcliffe
 Kelly (MS) Reed
 Kelly (PA) Reschenthaler
 King (IA) Riggleman
 King (NY) Roby
 Kinzinger Rodgers (WA)
 Kustoff (TN) Roe, David P.
 LaHood Rogers (AL)
 LaMalfa Rogers (KY)
 Lamborn Rooney (FL)
 Latta Rose, John W.
 Lesko Rouzer
 Long Roy
 Lucas Rutherford
 Luetkemeyer Scalise

NOES—229

Adams DeSaulnier
 Aguilar Deutch
 Allred Dingell
 Amash Doggett
 Axne Doyle, Michael
 Barragán F.
 Bass Engel
 Bera Escobar
 Beyer Espallat
 Bishop (GA) Evans
 Blumenauer Finkenauer
 Blunt Rochester Fletcher
 Bonamici Fortenberry
 Boyle, Brendan Foster
 F. Frankel
 Brindisi Gallego
 Brown (MD) Garamendi
 Brownley (CA) Garcia (IL)
 Bustos Garcia (TX)
 Butterfield Golden
 Carbajal Gonzalez (TX)
 Cárdenas Gottheimer
 Carson (IN) Green, Al (TX)
 Cartwright Grijalva
 Case Haaland
 Casten (IL) Harder (CA)
 Castor (FL) Hastings
 Castro (TX) Hayes
 Chu, Judy Heck
 Cicilline Higgins (NY)
 Cisneros Hill (CA)
 Clark (MA) Himes
 Clarke (NY) Horn, Kendra S.
 Clay Horsford
 Cleaver Houlihan
 Cohen Hoyer
 Connolly Huffman
 Cooper Jackson Lee
 Correa Jayapal
 Costa Jeffries
 Courtney Johnson (GA)
 Cox (CA) Johnson (TX)
 Craig Kaptur
 Crist Keating
 Crow Kelly (IL)
 Cuellar Kennedy
 Cunningham Khanna
 Davids (KS) Kildee
 Davis (CA) Kilmer
 Davis, Danny K. Kim
 Dean Kind
 DeFazio Kirkpatrick
 DeGette Krishnamoorthi
 DeLauro Kuster (NH)
 DelBene Lamb
 Delgado Langevin
 Demings Larsen (WA)

Schweikert
 Scott, Austin
 Sensenbrenner
 Shimkus
 McCaul
 Simpson
 Smith (MO)
 Smith (NE)
 Smucker
 Spano
 Stauber
 Ryan
 Sánchez
 Sarbanes
 Scanlon
 Schiff
 Stivers
 Taylor
 Thompson (PA)
 Thornberry
 Timmons
 Tipton
 Turner
 Upton
 Wagner
 Walberg
 Walden
 Walker
 Walorski
 Clyburn
 Eshoo
 Fudge
 Gabbard
 Gomez

Quigley
 Raskin
 Rice (NY)
 Rice (SC)
 Rose (NY)
 Rouda
 Roybal-Allard
 Ruiz
 Ruppersberger
 Rush
 Ryan
 Sánchez
 Sarbanes
 Scanlon
 Schiff
 Schneider
 Schrader
 Schrier
 Scott (VA)
 Scott, David
 Serrano

Babin
 Beatty
 Bishop (NC)
 Carter (TX)
 Elyburn
 Marchant
 Fudge
 Gabbard
 Gomez

Larson (CT)
 Lawrence
 Lee (CA)
 Lee (NV)
 Levin (CA)
 Levin (MI)
 Lewis
 Lieu, Ted
 Lipinski
 Loebsack
 Lofgren
 Lowenthal
 Lowey
 Lujan
 Luria
 Lynch
 Malinowski
 Maloney,
 Carolyn B.
 Maloney, Sean

So the amendment was rejected.
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:
 Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Chair, had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 565.

Mr. GOMEZ. Mr. Chair, I inadvertently missed one vote today. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 565.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. HILL OF ARKANSAS

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HILL) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 187, noes 224, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 566]

AYES—187

Abraham
 Aderholt
 Allen
 Amash
 Lamb
 Armstrong
 Arrington
 Bacon
 Baird
 Balderson
 Banks
 Barr
 Bergman
 Biggs
 Bilirakis
 Bishop (UT)
 Bost
 Brady
 Brooks (AL)
 Brooks (IN)
 Buchanan

Buck
 Bucshon
 Budd
 Burchett
 Burgess
 Byrne
 Calvert
 Carter (GA)
 Chabot
 Cheney
 Cline
 Cloud
 Cole
 Collins (GA)
 Comer
 Conaway
 Cook
 Crawford
 Crenshaw
 Curtis
 Davidson (OH)
 Davis, Rodney
 DesJarlais
 Diaz-Balart
 Duncan
 Dunn
 Emmer
 Estes
 Ferguson
 Fitzpatrick
 Fleischmann
 Flores
 Fortenberry
 Foy
 Fulcher
 Gaetz
 Gallagher
 Gianforte
 Gibbs
 Gohmert
 Gonzalez (OH)
 Gooden
 Graves (GA)
 Graves (LA)
 Graves (MO)
 Green (TN)
 Griffith
 Grothman
 Guest
 Guthrie
 Hagedorn
 Harris
 Hartzler
 Hern, Kevin
 Herrera Beutler
 Hice (GA)

Higgins (LA)
 Hill (AR)
 Holding
 Hollingsworth
 Hudson
 Huizenga
 Hunter
 Hurd (TX)
 Johnson (LA)
 Johnson (OH)
 Johnson (SD)
 Jordan
 Joyce (OH)
 Joyce (PA)
 Katko
 Keller
 Kelly (MS)
 Kelly (PA)
 King (IA)
 King (NY)
 Kinzinger
 Kustoff (TN)
 LaHood
 LaMalfa
 Lamborn
 Latta
 Lesko
 Long
 Lucas
 Luetkemeyer
 Marshall
 Massie
 Mast
 McCarthy
 McCaul
 McClintock
 McHenry
 McKinley
 Meadows
 Meuser
 Miller
 Mitchell
 Moolenaar
 Mooney (WV)
 Mullin
 Murphy (NC)
 Newhouse
 Norman
 Nunes
 Olson
 Palazzo
 Palmer
 Pence
 Perry
 Posey
 Ratcliffe

NOES—224

Adams
 Aguilar
 Allred
 Axne
 Barragán
 Bass
 Bera
 Beyer
 Bishop (GA)
 Blunt Rochester
 Bonamici
 Boyle, Brendan
 F.
 Brindisi
 Brown (MD)
 Brownley (CA)
 Bustos
 Butterfield
 Carbajal
 Cárdenas
 Carson (IN)
 Cartwright
 Case
 Casten (IL)
 Castor (FL)
 Castro (TX)
 Chu, Judy
 Cicilline
 Cisneros
 Clark (MA)
 Clarke (NY)
 Clay
 Cleaver
 Cohen
 Connolly
 Cooper
 Correa
 Costa
 Courtney
 Cox (CA)
 Craig
 Crist
 Crow
 Cuellar
 Cunningham
 Davids (KS)
 Davis (CA)
 Davis, Danny K.
 Dean
 DeFazio
 DeGette
 DeLauro
 DelBene
 Demings
 Heck
 Higgins (NY)
 Hill (CA)
 Himes
 Horn, Kendra S.
 Horsford
 Houlihan
 Hoyer
 Huffman
 Jackson Lee
 Jayapal
 Jeffries
 Johnson (GA)
 Johnson (TX)
 Keating
 Kelly (IL)
 Kennedy
 Khanna
 Kildee
 Kilmer
 Kim
 Kind
 Kirkpatrick
 Krishnamoorthi
 Kuster (NH)
 Lamb
 Langevin
 Larsen (WA)
 Larson (CT)
 Lawrence
 Lee (CA)
 Lee (NV)
 Levin (CA)
 Levin (MI)
 Lewis
 Lieu, Ted
 Lipinski
 Loebsack
 Lofgren
 Lowenthal
 Lowey

Luján Peterson
Luria Phillips
Lynch Pingree
Malinowski Plaskett
Maloney, Pocan
Carolyn B. Porter
Maloney, Sean Pressley
Matsui Price (NC)
McAdams Quigley
McBath Raskin
McCollum Rice (NY)
McGovern Rose (NY)
McNerney Rouda
Meeks Roybal-Allard
Meng Ruiz
Moore Ruppertsberger
Morelle Rush
Moulton Ryan
Mucarsel-Powell Sánchez
Murphy (FL) Sarbanes
Nadler Scanlon
Napolitano Schakowsky
Neal Schiff
Neguse Schneider
Norcross Schrader
Norton Schrier
O'Halleran Scott (VA)
Ocasio-Cortez Scott, David
Omar Serrano
Pallone Sewell (AL)
Panetta Shalala
Pappas Sherman
Pascrell Sherrill
Payne Sires
Perlmutter Slotkin
Peters Smith (WA)

NOT VOTING—26

Babin González-Colón
Beatty (PR)
Bishop (NC) Gosar
Blumenauer Granger
Carter (TX) Grijalva
Clyburn Kaptur
Eshoo Lawson (FL)
Fudge Loudermilk
Gabbard Marchant

□ 1059

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. MCNERNEY). The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. NEGUSE) having assumed the chair, Mr. MCNERNEY, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3624) to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to require the disclosure of the total number of domestic and foreign employees of certain public companies, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 629, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

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

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

Ms. WATERS. 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 226, nays 184, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 567]

YEAS—226

Adams Gottheimer
Aguilar Green, Al (TX)
Allred Grijalva
Axne Haaland
Blumenauer Harder (CA)
Barragán Hastings
Bass Hayes
Bera Heck
Beyer Bishop (GA)
Blumauer Hill (CA)
Blunt Rochester Himes
Bonamici Horn, Kendra S.
Boyle, Brendan Horsford
F. Houlihan
Brindisi Hoyer
Brown (MD) Huffman
Brownley (CA) Jackson Lee
Bustos Jayapal
Butterfield Jeffries
Carbajal Johnson (GA)
Cárdenas Johnson (TX)
Carson (IN) Ruiz
Cartwright Keating
Case Kelly (IL)
Casten (IL) Kennedy
Castor (FL) Khanna
Castro (TX) Kildee
Chu, Judy Kilmer
Cicilline Kim
Cisneros Kind
Clark (MA) Kirkpatrick
Clarke (NY) Krishnamoorthi
Clay Kuster (NH)
Cleaver Lamb
Cohen Langevin
Connolly Larsen (WA)
Cooper Larson (CT)
Correa Lawrence
Costa Lee (CA)
Courtney Lee (NV)
Cox (CA) Levin (CA)
Craig Levin (MI)
Crist Lewis
Crow Lieu, Ted
Cuellar Lipinski
Cunningham Loebbeck
Davids (KS) Lofgren
Davis (CA) Lowenthal
Davis, Danny K. Lowey
Dean Luján
DeFazio Luria
DeGette Lynch
DeLauro Malinowski
DelBene Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Delgado Maloney, Sean
Demings Matsui
DeSaulnier McAdams
Deutch McBath
Dingell McBath
Doggett McCollum
Doyle, Michael McGovern
F. McKinley
Engel McNerney
Escobar Meeks
Españat Meng
Evans Moore
Finkenaue Morelle
Fletcher Moulton
Foster Mucarsel-Powell
Frankel Murphy (FL)
Gallego Nadler
Garamendi Napolitano
Garcia (IL) Neal
Garcia (TX) Neguse
Golden Norcross
Gomez O'Halleran
Gonzalez (TX) Ocasio-Cortez

NAYS—184

Abraham Gooden
Aderholt Graves (GA)
Allen Graves (LA)
Amash Graves (MO)
Amodel Green (TN)
Armstrong Griffith
Arrington Grothman
Bacon Guest
Baird Guthrie
Balderson Hagedorn
Banks Harris
Barr Hartzler
Bergman Hern, Kevin
Biggs Herrera Beutler
Bilirakis Hice (GA)
Bishop (UT) Higgins (LA)
Bost Hill (AR)
Brady Holding
Brooks (AL) Hollingsworth
Brooks (IN) Hudson
Buchanan Huizenga
Hunter Hunter
Bucshon Hurd (TX)
Budd Johnson (LA)
Burchett Johnson (OH)
Burgess Johnson (SD)
Byrne Jordan
Calvert Joyce (OH)
Carter (GA) Joyce (PA)
Chabot Katko
Cheney Keller
Cline Kelly (MS)
Cloud Kelly (PA)
Cole King (IA)
Collins (GA) King (NY)
Comer Kinzinger
Conaway Kustoff (TN)
Cook LaHood
Crawford LaMalfa
Crenshaw Lamborn
Curtis Latta
Davidson (OH) Lesko
Davis, Rodney Long
DesJarlais Lucas
Diaz-Balart Luetkemeyer
Duncan Marshall
Dunn Mast
Emmer McCarthy
Estes McCaul
Ferguson McClintock
Fitzpatrick McHenry
Fleischmann Meadows
Flores Meuser
Fortenberry Miller
Foxy (NC) Mitchell
Fulcher Moolenaar
Gaetz Mooney (WV)
Gallagher Mullin
Gianforte Murphy (NC)
Gibbs Newhouse
Gohmert Norman
Gonzalez (OH) Nunes

NOT VOTING—21

Babin Gabbard
Beatty Gosar
Bishop (NC) Granger
Carter (TX) Lawson (FL)
Clyburn Loudermilk
Eshoo Marchant
Fudge Massie

□ 1108

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 4603

Mr. CARBAJAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Congresswoman SHEILA JACKSON LEE be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 4603.

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

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER
AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 860

Mr. VAN DREW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove my name as a cosponsor of H.R. 860, the Social Security 2100 Act.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1115

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), our distinguished majority leader, for the purpose of inquiring about the schedule for the week to come.

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

On Monday, the House will meet at 12 p.m. for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business with votes postponed until 6:30.

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

On Thursday, the House expects to meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business. Last votes of the week will be expected no later than 3 p.m.

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

In addition, Madam Speaker, the House will consider H.R. 2513, the Corporate Transparency Act. This bill is part of a package of legislation coming to the floor to crack down on money laundering and shine a light on the corrosive impact of dark money from Russia and other authoritarian governments on our democracy, a serious national security threat that must be addressed.

Lastly, the House will consider H.R. 4617, Stopping Harmful Interference in Elections for a Lasting Democracy, otherwise known as the SHIELD Act. Clearly, we believe that it is extraordinarily dangerous to be having foreign governments, particularly those who are hostile to the interests of democracy and the United States, to be participating in any financial way or any other way in our elections. This bill will prevent foreign interference in our elections and safeguard our democracy.

There also may be additional items that are possible to be brought forward, and we will notify the House and the minority as soon as we have made such decisions.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I know we all continue to mourn the loss of our colleague, Elijah Cummings. We still see the flowers sitting in the spot where Elijah used to sit.

Yesterday, I thought we had a very appropriate remembrance of our col-

league in a special way, remembering who he was, the special person he was, the giant that he was, the leader—sometimes in a very boisterous way, sometimes in a gentle way.

But Maya, his wife, and his three children are in our prayers, and will continue to be as we remember that great loss that we experienced and will continue to remember.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding. I was going to mention Elijah at the end of our colloquy, but it was an extraordinarily sad day to hear of the loss yesterday, in the very early morning, of a colleague who was gentle, decent, honest, of high intellect, and high integrity.

The minority leader, Mr. MCCARTHY, spoke beautifully, I thought, about sentiments from both sides of the aisle, about Elijah Cummings. He was respected as a man, not only of intellect, but of great civility and kindness. And, yes, he could be tough. He was tough. He was the son of sharecroppers and became a Member of the Congress of the United States.

What a wonderful American story, and what a wonderful, decent, good human being Elijah Cummings was. And he will be remembered as such.

I thank the minority leader and I thank the minority, so many Members, who have served with Elijah on the minority, and, obviously, on a committee as the minority leader, Mr. MCCARTHY, pointed out, it can be pretty contentious from time to time.

But notwithstanding, Trey Gowdy and others who had served with him, served as either ranking member or chairman, spoke so highly of him. He was a very dear friend of mine for over four decades. He was the first African American speaker pro tem of the Maryland House of Delegates; president of the student government at Howard University, Phi Beta Kappa; and served with such distinction for 23 years in this House, and we will miss him. I thank the Republican whip for mentioning his passing, and how sad all of us are at that passing.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, as we all remember him, it is that style. It shows the example for all of us that you can be tough, you can fight for the things you believe in—we ought to all come here to fight for the things we believe in—and that means we are not always going to agree.

But he always treated people fairly, and the fact that even as he had some of those tough confrontations with people like Chairman Gowdy and JIM JORDAN, that those people who went toe to toe with him respected him, and mourn his loss equally as we all do, I think it says a lot about his character and that he is able to leave a strong legacy as a champion for the things he believed in. But even his adversaries that he fought with on the other side hold deep regard for the kind of person he was. Again, he was a great example for all of us to,

hopefully, try to emulate as we move forward with some of the other challenges that we are facing.

I do want to ask the gentleman about the latest efforts to try to get some kind of fair process in where we are with this impeachment inquiry. There are hearings going on behind closed doors. Many of my colleagues have tried to attend some of those hearings and have been turned away if they are not on the committees of jurisdiction. Colleagues that have tried to go and read things like the Volker testimony have been turned away, denied the ability to do that.

So there is a real concern that there is an attempt to impeach a President of the United States, remove a President who is duly elected, using a process of secrecy, behind closed doors, where one person is setting the rules, breaking with the tradition that we have always had with the only three other times in our country's history where an impeachment inquiry began in the House.

In all of those cases, they laid out rules of fairness, where people were able to ask questions on both sides. People were able to call witnesses on both sides. Even the President would be able to have an opportunity to have somebody there to also question people. That has always been the case, and, yet, it is not the case here.

Very serious questions of fairness have been raised, and I would ask the gentleman: Are we going to finally get beyond this secret, closed-door, Star Chamber process of impeachment and go to something that is ruled in fairness? I yield to the gentleman.

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

Madam Speaker, I reject wholly and fully the premise underlying the whip's representation. There is no unfairness in this process.

The Republicans are like the lawyer who does not have the facts, because if he has the facts, he pounds on the facts; or if he has the law on his side, he pounds on the law. But if he neither has facts nor the law on his side, he pounds on the table, Madam Speaker. He makes noise.

The Republicans talk about process, not the substance. And the process, quite interestingly enough, is much of what the Republicans put in the rules that we included in our rules when we adopted them.

And as the whip clearly knows, one of the strongest advocates and defenders of the President of the United States sits there in the hearing, asks questions, can review documents, and could go right back to the White House and to all of your Members and say: This is what happened.

There is no unfairness in this, and no requirement that we have a vote. The committee is doing its job of fact-finding. Frankly, the White House counsel wrote a letter filled with eight pages that clearly misconstrues the status of this process; treats it as if it were the

trial. We do not conduct the trial, Madam Speaker. The Senate conducts the trial.

And just as in our legal due process system, when that occurs, the President will have all of that due process, I am sure, extended to him by the House of Representatives. That is not what this proceeding is.

This proceeding is to decide whether there is probable cause to think that the President of the United States has committed high crimes and misdemeanors. We have not made that conclusion yet, and we may not make it if the facts do not lead us there.

As Mr. SCHIFF pointed out in his letter to all of the Members, there is a very definite reason why grand juries and this committee are doing its process with full participation by the Republican Members of the Select Committee on Intelligence; full participation.

It is because witnesses ought not to be forewarned of what somebody else has said. Why? So that they don't parrot the other witness but tell the truth as they know it to be.

And I will tell the gentleman, the other reason grand juries are in secret is to protect the innocent, so that if there is no probable cause, there will be no assertion that somebody alleged that somebody did something wrong.

But the Republicans have been pounding on process and the reason for that, Madam Speaker, is they don't even want to discuss the substance. Of course, the Acting Chief of Staff did discuss substance. It is on the front page of The Washington Post. Of course we do this.

So I will tell my friend, this process is fair. It is consistent with the rules. It is consistent with the Constitution of the United States. It is consistent with the laws of this country. It is about one of the most serious matters we can deal with, and we don't want to make it a circus.

Yes, the committee is doing its work in camera, so to speak, adducing the facts. And your Members, and, particularly, one of the President's strongest supporters, defenders, and collaborators is sitting in the room every time the hearing occurs—unless he absences himself—and the Members of that committee, which you have appointed—not you personally, but your conference has appointed—are sitting in the room, equal time asking questions.

□ 1130

This hearing is fair, judicious, and thoughtful. And the attempt to besmirch the chairman of the committee is shameful. He is a fair and experienced Member of this body who has conducted himself as he should.

It is our constitutional responsibility, Madam Speaker, to see the facts behind conduct that may rise to the level of a high crime and misdemeanor. We don't know that to be the case, but if it is, we will meet our duty to the Constitution, to the laws of this Nation, and to the American public.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, with all due respect, this process is rotten to the core. The gentleman can talk about process, and he can talk about facts. The facts point out that this process is shrouded in secrecy.

Madam Speaker, you literally have a chairman who was running around for 2 years during the whole Mueller investigation saying that he had "more than circumstantial evidence" that there was collusion between the President and Russia. And then the Mueller Report comes out, and there were no charges. There was no collusion. In fact, the chairman never showed his secret evidence. If he had evidence "more than circumstantial"—his quotes—then he should have shown it to the American people. But he didn't because there was no evidence.

Those were the facts. If the facts were there, Madam Speaker, you know he would have shown that evidence. It didn't exist.

Instead of moving on and taking care of the work of the people of this country, it is another witch hunt. It is another fishing expedition in secret.

The gentleman talks about fairness, why is it that voting Members of Congress are being denied access to the room?

The press doesn't have access to these hearings that the gentleman calls fair. He calls them fair. There was never even a vote of this House to start an impeachment inquiry. It was a decree from the Speaker in The Washington Post in September: "Therefore, today, I am announcing"—the Speaker of the House—"I am announcing the House of Representatives is moving forward with an official impeachment inquiry."

That is a decree by the Speaker of the House. That has never happened before. The other three times when there was an impeachment inquiry, it was started with a vote of the full House. Everybody was accountable—no Star Chamber, no one or two people in this country who think they can run the entire process and deny the people the right of a duly elected President to serve because they just don't agree with the results of the 2016 election.

They never showed high crimes and misdemeanors. The majority has never shown high crimes and misdemeanors. They are just looking around for something.

The majority calls witnesses. They talk about fairness and who is in the room. Our side cannot call witnesses. Do you think that is fair?

Our side, the President's own counsel—

Mr. HOYER. That is your rule.

Mr. SCALISE. The gentleman will have an opportunity—

Mr. HOYER. That is your rule.

Mr. SCALISE. The gentleman made a lot—

Mr. HOYER. That is your rule, Mr. SCALISE.

Mr. SCALISE. This is your rule. You are in charge of the House.

Mr. HOYER. That is your rule in the Republican rule that we adopted.

Mr. SCALISE. This is your rule. You are in charge of the House.

Mr. HOYER. That is your rule in the Republican rule that we adopted.

Mr. SCALISE. You are the one who made the official decree.

This is my time. I will yield time to the gentleman in a moment.

If he wants to talk about fairness, let's lay out the facts because these are the facts: Our side cannot call witnesses. The majority could change that rule today.

I would ask the gentleman: Would you be willing to change the rule to let our side call witnesses and to let the President's counsel be able to question witnesses who are, in secret, making charges against him to try to literally undo the results of a duly elected President? Would the gentleman be willing to change the rules to do that?

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Fine. We are going under your rules.

Mr. SCALISE. These are your rules. You are the majority party.

Mr. HOYER. When we were in the minority, we were not allowed to do what you are requesting to do. We were not allowed to do it—

Mr. SCALISE. We never tried to impeach a President—

Mr. HOYER.—in any of the hearings.

Mr. SCALISE.—with all due respect.

Mr. HOYER. These are your rules, Mr. SCALISE.

Mr. SCALISE. And in all three cases where there was an impeachment—

Mr. HOYER. Ask your counsel.

Mr. SCALISE.—the rules allow for both sides to have fairness.

Mr. HOYER. Ask your counsel if those are your rules.

Mr. SCALISE. You think fairness is you being able to control everything and not letting the other side—

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, apparently, he does not want to answer—

Mr. SCALISE.—participate.

Madam Speaker, I reclaim the time.

Mr. HOYER.—about it being his rule.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. GARCIA of Texas). Gentlemen, gentlemen, please. Let's have some order.

Mr. SCALISE. I appreciate it, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. You can proceed.

Mr. SCALISE. So let's look at the process. Let's look at the facts.

Yes, if you think it is fair that you can control everything and deny the ability for Members of Congress to go in and see what is happening behind closed doors in that room, if you think it is fair to deny the ability for both sides to call witnesses—hey, you get to call your witnesses and you think that is fair, and you don't want anything to be disclosed.

You talk about innocence. Everybody is innocent until proven guilty. You think the President should have to go prove his innocence time and time

again, with anonymous sources in many cases citing things that are inaccurate, that have been disproven. But you can lay false claims out, and the chairman can lay false claims out, and then the President has to go prove his innocence.

Time and time again, we see that even with these selective leaks that are coming out of your committee—which shouldn't happen—many of those are disproven too, but the damage is done.

Just like when the chairman opened up the committee hearing with a parody, stating things that were false that were not part of the phone call between President Trump and President Zelensky, giving his own version of it that was false while the public was watching on TV thinking that was the transcript, that is disingenuous. That is not a fair process, but that is what happened.

Just today and yesterday and every day, we have had of members of our party—I don't know if any members of your party have tried—but members of our party who wanted to try to go down there and read the Volker testimony or sit in the hearings were turned away because the process is going on in secret.

This is not fairness. This is not how it has always been done. If you really think it is unfair, and you think the rules should be changed, you do get the control over that. I will write the rule with you, and we will vote for it together. We could pass that rule today.

In fact, I filed a rule change with Ranking Member COLE of the Rules Committee to allow Members access to these hearings.

Madam Speaker, I would ask the gentleman: Would you be willing to schedule this rule for the floor so we could have more fairness in this process?

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Does the gentleman not trust Mr. NUNES?

Apparently, there is no answer to that question.

Mr. NUNES is the ranking Republican and very close friend, associate, and defender of the President of the United States. He is there to hear every word. My presumption is he also can tell every word to his colleagues.

Mr. SCALISE. Well, let me ask the gentleman: Would he allow—

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker—

Mr. SCALISE.—Mr. NUNES to call witnesses?

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, he yielded to me. Is he reclaiming his time and shutting me up?

Mr. SCALISE. Well, you asked a question. Could I answer the question?

Mr. HOYER. You didn't answer it. But if you want to answer—

Mr. SCALISE. I am trying to answer it.

Mr. HOYER. Do you trust Mr. NUNES?

Mr. SCALISE. I would trust Mr. NUNES to have equal access to call in witnesses, just like Chairman SCHIFF does, to subpoena people. Chairman SCHIFF can do that, and Mr. NUNES cannot.

Why is Mr. NUNES denied those same rights that the chairman has?

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. He hasn't answered my question yet, but I will assert again—

Mr. SCALISE. I would trust him to run that same fair process.

Mr. HOYER. I assert, again, to anyone who is listening, we are operating—

Mr. SCALISE. But he is denied that.

Mr. HOYER.—with respect to that under the rules that the Republicans adopted in their rules package and applied to our side when we were in the minority, Madam Speaker.

The same rules that they imposed upon us they are now complaining about because they don't think they were fair. Apparently, they thought they were fair when they were applied to the Democratic minority. But, apparently, now those same rules—their rules they adopted and voted for—are not fair because they are in the minority.

Very frankly, what is good for the goose is good for the gander. What is fair to the goose is fair to the gander.

They are your rules, Mr. SCALISE. You ask your counsel. We adopted your rules on the issuing of subpoenas—your rules.

Mr. SCALISE. With all due respect, the goose is being cooked behind closed doors because you started an impeachment inquiry by decree. You could change the rules today.

If this is an impeachment inquiry, if it is—and I would ask the question: Are we in an impeachment inquiry right now?

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. We are in an exercise of our constitutional responsibility—

Mr. SCALISE. Of an impeachment? Is it? Yes or no? Is it an impeachment inquiry?

Mr. HOYER. Is the gentleman going to let me answer?

Mr. SCALISE. I would ask him. It is a yes or no question, but I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. The answer is that we are involved in exercising our constitutional responsibility to oversee, to make sure that the laws of this Nation and the Constitution of this Nation are honored in practice and in spirit but particularly in practice.

Let me ask the gentleman a question. Do you think it is okay to ask foreign leaders to interfere in our elections?

Mr. SCALISE. Is the gentleman yielding?

Mr. HOYER. Certainly. It is your time, you yielded to me, and I am asking a question.

Mr. SCALISE. So as the so-called whistleblower—

Mr. HOYER. You want to talk about process. That is substance.

Mr. SCALISE. As the so-called whistleblower complaint started with leaks

to the press, where they said there were quid pro quos in the phone call with Zelensky, that is where this all started—

Mr. HOYER. Do you want me to read you the transcript?

Mr. SCALISE. So a phone call, this was before the transcript was released, there were all of these insinuations.

And this is a pattern, by the way, we have seen even going back to the Mueller investigation. And again, I cited the chairman running around, saying he had more than circumstantial evidence—

Mr. HOYER. Who appointed Mr. Mueller?

Mr. SCALISE.—of collusion, and there was no collusion.

So now we move on to this claim of quid pro quo. Well, first of all, you can name all the whistleblowers you want—you won't. You won't even allow the whistleblower to be interviewed, someone who is trying to take down—someone who was deemed to have a political bias is trying to take down a President of the United States in secret—

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCALISE.—behind closed doors with innuendos.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCALISE. Absolutely. I would absolutely yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. When he is talking about the whistleblower, is that the person that the President of the United States said ought to be treated as if he had done treason?

And we know what we do to those who commit treason.

Is that the whistleblower you want outed? Is that the whistleblower you want to expose to that kind of danger? Is that what you are talking about?

Mr. SCALISE. First of all—

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I would ask the whip—

Mr. SCALISE. If you would yield, if you are talking about the whistleblower, we are talking about a whistleblower, again, who is deemed to have a political bias who got all of their information secondhand.

And oh, by the way, the standard for being a whistleblower used to be firsthand information and, secretly, days before the whistleblower complaint was filed, after going to Chairman SCHIFF's staff and working with partisans to develop the whistleblower complaint, they changed the rules for even designating what is a whistleblower so it could allow secondhand information.

Who changed that rule? Boy, we would sure be curious to find out. But you don't want us to find all that out because you are holding all of this in secret.

Shouldn't we know what is really going on and what is behind this so-called whistleblower complaint that has been debunked?

So many of those claims were debunked. There was no quid pro quo. In

fact, the two people who were on the phone call, the ones who are really in question here, both said there was nothing wrong, both of them.

In fact, Zelensky said there was no pressure. He wasn't even aware that any funds were being held up. He praised the President for selling Javelin missiles to Ukraine, which, by the way, Barack Obama would not sell when he was President of the United States. He withheld the Javelin missiles that Ukraine was asking for to defend themselves against Russia.

Again, we talk about Russia. Who stood up to Russia? President Trump stood up to Russia by allowing Ukraine to buy the Javelin missiles to bust the tanks. Barack Obama wouldn't sell those. I don't know why he wouldn't allow Ukraine to stand up to Russia. I don't know why Barack Obama allowed Russia to interfere with our elections and didn't do more to stop it.

But we should be getting to the bottom of that, yet we are not because it is all a focus of secrecy, drib-drib, selective leaks to try to give a false narrative. Our Members can't go talk to our other colleagues about some of the things that happened in these hearings. It is all secret.

We want it to be opened up. In fact, that is why I filed a rule change.

Again, I would ask the gentleman: Would he support a rule change that would allow all Members to participate and be involved in at least sitting in on these hearings to see what is really going on if you are going to ask people to impeach the President of the United States?

Again, it has always been done with a vote of the House. Now it is being done by a decree from the Speaker. And you won't answer the question of whether or not, yes or no, it is an impeachment inquiry.

The Speaker said it is an impeachment inquiry, but we have never voted on it. Why don't we ever vote like we did all other times to set real rules of fairness?

They always set rules of fairness where both sides got to participate. Real due process, which is part of our Constitutional duty, is being denied in secret. That is what is happening in that room right now.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, there is no such rule. None.

Mr. SCALISE. There is.

Mr. HOYER. But Mr. SCALISE believes, Madam Speaker, the more he repeats it, somebody will believe it.

Mr. SCALISE. Well, why are Members being denied entrance to the room?

Mr. HOYER. Have you yielded to me?

Mr. SCALISE. They are being turned away today.

Mr. HOYER. Have you yielded to me?

Mr. SCALISE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. There is no such rule. There are no requirements for any

committee to undertake any investigation that you have to have a rule passed by this House.

And the gentleman apparently thinks that, by having an investigation and an inquiry, somehow that is an impeachment; it is not. He is absolutely right.

To impeach would have to have a vote of this House. Clearly, that is correct. That is consistent with the Constitution and the laws of this country. There is nothing that says—other than the Republicans who repeat it ad nauseam because they are hopeful that some people will believe what they say, that somehow it is unfair that Democrats and Republicans are sitting together as the constituted Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence looking at this matter.

Everybody has a right to ask a question in that room. All Members have a right to review the materials.

What he doesn't like is the rule that they put in place, Madam Speaker, about who can call witnesses.

□ 1145

They said the minority could not call witnesses unless the chairman and the committee approved of it. That is their rule, not our rule. We adopted our rule. We kept that rule in.

I asked the gentleman, Madam Speaker, a question. Does he believe it is right for a President of the United States to seek foreign interference in our elections? He has not answered that question.

Here is the—it is not a transcript. It is a report of the conversation, which came from the White House. I would hope we could count on its accuracy.

President: "I would like you to do us a favor, though."

What do you think "though" means? Yes, I know you want something, but I would like to you do a favor, "though."

Mulvaney: Aid withheld to press Ukraine.

Now, he doesn't say what it was for. I get that. But you don't think President Zelensky had any doubt: I would like you to do a favor.

Now, the whip, Madam Speaker, has not answered my question whether he thinks it is appropriate for a President to ask a foreign leader for help in the elections, whether it was the 2016 or the 2020 elections. I happen to believe it was the 2020 elections.

He talks about Hunter Biden; he talks about Joe Biden all the time. So it would not be an unreasonable conclusion that that is what he was talking about.

Let me ask you another question.

Mr. SCALISE. Would the gentleman yield on that specific accusation he just threw out?

Mr. HOYER. Before I do that, let me say, collusion, by the way, my friend, is not a crime. What, however, Mr. Mueller did find is that there was reason to believe that there was obstruction of justice, which is a crime. He said, however, that, under Justice De-

partment's rulings, he could not indict the sitting President, so he referred it to us.

Now, he is not a special prosecutor, as Mr. SCHIFF pointed out. The special prosecutors who precluded the two most recent impeachment proceedings, by the way, did their work in secret. They did their work as a grand jury does their work.

And, by the way, I don't think the gentleman is a lawyer, but in the grand jury, people under investigation do not have the right either to question, present evidence, or have counsel present in a grand jury. That is the prosecutors trying to find out whether there is probable cause that a crime has been committed by A, B, or C. And at that point in time, if the grand jury agrees, an indictment is laid down, and then all the due process rights to which Mr. Cipollone talked about in his letter—he did go to law school, and I don't know how he wrote that letter. It has been panned by almost every legal scholar that has reviewed it.

But I will tell my friend, do you believe it is appropriate to need a favor—clearly about the elections, whatever election. Do you believe it is appropriate for us to ask a foreign leader to involve themselves in our elections?

Mr. SCALISE. I thank the gentleman for yielding because there were many things that were thrown out there that need to be addressed.

First of all, the Department of Justice disagreed with Mueller's assessment that he didn't have the ability to bring charges. He had full authority to bring any charges, and he brought zero charges.

Mueller had full authority to bring charges and brought zero because he found nothing, and Justice even said he didn't have—

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCALISE. I am going to yield in a moment after I go through the different claims the gentleman made.

It is real interesting that the majority leader read selectively from that conversation between President Trump and Zelensky on: Will you do me a favor?

So let me read you the full sentence, because you are trying to take one context and shift it somewhere else, which has been done over and over by Chairman SCHIFF and others.

So let's start. This is President Trump:

I would like you to find out what happened with this whole situation with Ukraine. They say CrowdStrike.

That is the sentence where he said: I would like you to do us a favor.

Not "me," "us."

Please read the transcript. That is what he said.

And when he said, "I would like you to do 'us' a favor, though, because our country has been through a lot and Ukraine knows a lot about it," the corruption was going on in Ukraine. The interference from Russia, much of it

was emanating from Ukraine in 2016. We know that. Don't deny it. Don't try to hide that.

"I would like you to find out what happened with this whole situation with Ukraine. They say CrowdStrike."

He is not talking about Biden. He is not talking about some future election. He is talking about the company that was looking into the corruption and the interference by Russia in the 2016 election. We still haven't gotten to the bottom of that. This is part of it. This absolutely went through Ukraine.

And, by the way, in the NDAA, a law that is on the books today that the gentleman voted for and I voted for, the law requires that, when the United States of America is giving money to a foreign country, they have to make sure that they are looking into whether or not there is corruption. And so he is absolutely looking into the corruption, because we are sending hundreds of millions of dollars over there.

And before they sent the hundreds of millions, the law—not his personal preference, the law—says he has to look to make sure there is no corruption. That is in the NDAA law that we passed last year. That is current law.

And so the President is complying with the law asking him "do us a favor"—us, not him. Please make that note accurately. And then he asks about CrowdStrike. Not Biden, CrowdStrike.

We all know what CrowdStrike was involved in. They were involved in looking into some of the illegal activity that Russia was participating in to try to interfere with the 2016 election.

We still haven't gotten the answer to that. I wish your committee would be spending more time on that so that we can stop it from happening again.

And so that is what he was talking about. That is the context. It is not accurate, it is not fair to try to read it out of context and then go attribute it to something else, because many have done that.

"I would like you to do us a favor."

And then he says, all of this stuff that was happening in Ukraine, "they say CrowdStrike." That is what he asked about.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I know he is very interested in reading the whole thing, so let me read him some more of the report we got from the White House.

The other thing: "There's a lot of talk about Biden's son, that Biden stopped the prosecution and a lot of people want to find out about that." So: "Biden went around bragging that he stopped the prosecution, so if you can look into it"—that doesn't sound to me like the 2016 election—"if you can look into it, it sounds horrible to me."

What do you mean he doesn't mention Biden? I will give you a copy of this, if you would like, if you want to

read the whole—I have read the whole thing.

What do you think Giuliani was talking about? 2016? No.

Two of his compatriots, of course, million-dollar bail; the Ambassador, fired. Why? Because she wouldn't cooperate with making a foreign leader complicit in the elections of the United States of America. She had the courage to come testify, as did the security adviser for Russia from the White House in this administration.

Now, frankly, Madam Speaker, I don't think this is the time to argue the case. The time continues to be finding out the facts, finding out the facts. And those facts, every day, are more instructive, whether it is Mr. Giuliani, the President's lawyer, who was substituted, Madam Speaker, for the State Department—a private State department.

The gentleman still hasn't answered my question: Is it appropriate? I want a favor. And oh, by the way, the Bidens, you know, that Hunter Biden and Joe Biden, you really ought to look at them.

Everybody who has looked at this has said, including the present prosecutor—or the recently present. I don't think he still is the prosecutor, but the subsequent prosecutor said: We looked at this. Nothing there. Nothing there.

That wasn't acceptable, of course, to the President of the United States, so he kept beating on it. And he had \$391 million needed by our Ukrainian friends to defend themselves against the Russians, otherwise known as Putin.

Maybe Putin didn't want that money to go to Russia, to go to Ukraine, Madam Speaker.

We just did a resolution for which Mr. SCALISE voted, and that resolution essentially said that the actions taken the other day by the President in a phone call with the authoritarian leader of Ukraine helped Russia, helped Iran, helped Syria—

Mr. SCALISE. With all due respect, the resolution does not say that.

Mr. HOYER.—and hurt our allies in the fight against ISIS, and has now reached an agreement that the President claimed some victory on where the Turks got everything they wanted and our allies are going to be pushed out.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I would hope the gentleman is not trying to conflate Ukraine with Turkey and Syria and the Kurds.

Mr. HOYER. No, sir.

Mr. SCALISE. Because you just made that assertion, and that is not—

Mr. HOYER. No, I did not make that assertion.

Mr. SCALISE. The gentleman did.

Mr. HOYER. What I said was that we are going to obviously have, and the committee is having, a hearing on that very matter without a vote of this committee, because it is their responsibility. And your minority member, Mr. MCCAUL, is for that resolution that is

going to come out on the Turkish sanctions.

My point to you is there was no vote of this body that they should do that. They are doing their responsibility as the Select Committee on Intelligence, as the Committee on the Judiciary, as the Committee on Foreign Affairs, as the Committee on Oversight and Reform. They are doing their duty.

When they reach a conclusion, they will come and report to us. And they will report, perhaps, no finding, or maybe they will report they have findings and, as a result, this body will vote.

But the gentleman has still not answered my basic question: Do you think it is correct for a President of the United States—clearly, if you read this—you wanted to read the whole thing; you read the whole thing. Clearly, almost everybody who has read it—almost everybody who has read it, even some of Mr. Trump's friends whom he is now mad at have read it and said: Look, this was not proper.

I am asking, Madam Speaker, whether the whip thinks it is proper to ask a foreign leader to interfere in our elections.

Mr. SCALISE. Well, first of all, there were no foreign leaders being asked to interfere with elections. Russia was trying to interfere with our elections when Barack Obama was President.

President Trump is in this phone call and in other actions trying to get to the bottom of how the Russians interfered to make sure it doesn't happen again. And he also has legal authority in the NDAA to focus on decreasing corruption as it involves taxpayer money, and that was what they were discussing on that phone call as well.

But getting back to the issue of the hearings, because the gentleman keeps talking about the hearings and what this committee might produce, as if they are having hearings on a bill to lower drug prices—which, by the way, we could be focusing on lowering drug prices. There was a unanimous bill that came out of committee to lower drug prices.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, we did that yesterday, as you know.

Mr. SCALISE. But the gentleman won't bring that bill to the floor that would pass and be signed into law today, and families across America would be paying lower prices for drug costs. But we don't get that opportunity because they are focused on an impeachment inquiry.

And, again, it was the Speaker's own words. She said this is an impeachment inquiry.

And so you are trying to play it both ways. You are trying to say, oh, it is just the committee doing a normal hearing.

It is not a normal hearing. Every time there has been an impeachment inquiry, there were rules laid out by the House through a vote of all Members of the House—all three times. Even going back to Andrew Johnson,

they voted in the House; for Clinton, they voted in the House; for Nixon, they voted in the House, and both sides had fairness, both sides could call witnesses. That is not the case today. Only Chairman SCHIFF gets to call witnesses.

Oh, gee-whiz, other people can question Schiff's witnesses, but why can't everybody question DEVIN NUNES' witnesses or JIM JORDAN's witnesses? Because they are not allowed to come forward under your rules.

And, again, we have a rule, 103(a)(2).

You cannot say that Members are not being denied entrance. The rules of the House, which you are in the majority, you can change, we can change. But every time there has been an impeachment inquiry, all three times, this House established those rules.

And so you want to deem an impeachment inquiry by the Speaker's decree, not a vote of the House. Well, if you are going to do it, then do it the fair way that it has always been done, where both sides can call witnesses, both sides can issue subpoenas, the White House can actually have counsel to ask questions to witnesses.

Some who have made statements that have been deemed inaccurate, you won't allow the people who were there who can deem it inaccurate to come testify because you don't want both sides of the story. You want to be able to present some one-sided report and say: Here, this shows us what we wanted.

Because if a prosecutor wants to go and find somebody guilty, they can meander around and look, but that is not the way it is supposed to work. It is supposed to work where the prosecutor sees something wrong, then they go out and, in a fair process, find it.

□ 1200

That is the Justice Department, by the way, the judicial branch, that does it. ADAM SCHIFF is not a prosecutor in this case. He might have been a prosecutor in his previous life, but he is a chairman of a committee in Congress now. He is not a prosecutor, but he is acting like one, and he is doing it in secret, without fair rules.

I can't go into that hearing, and you can't go into that hearing. Rank-and-file Members can't go into that hearing. They are being denied, today, the ability to do it.

And you could change that rule. If it is truly an impeachment inquiry—and, again, you won't answer the question yes or no, but the Speaker said it is. If it is, then treat it like every other impeachment inquiry where there is fair due process on both sides, not just your side.

You might like the fact that only you can call witnesses, but you know that is not fair. You know that is not a fair process. And it is not how it has been done in all other cases.

Mr. HOYER. It is your rule.

Mr. SCALISE. So I would just ask the gentleman, would he be willing to

treat this impeachment inquiry, as the Speaker designated it, like all of the other impeachment inquiries in the history of this Congress that have been held, in a fair process?

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, Mr. SCALISE ought to know this is not like any other one.

I am not sure about Johnson. There was a special prosecutor in the Nixon case. Nixon fired the first one, Mr. Cox, you will recall. Mr. Jaworski succeeded him.

There was a special prosecutor in the Clinton case. All of them did—not exactly, because all the Republicans are in the room that are on the committee, members of the committee.

It is a Select Committee on Intelligence. The Intelligence Committee operates that way, consistent with their rules and with your rule. You continue to say we ought to change the rule. It is your rule that we adopted in our own rules. You didn't like it. You liked it when it was applied to us, but you don't like it when it is applied to you.

Mr. SCALISE. We never had an impeachment inquiry. We are talking about an impeachment inquiry, which has been done before—there is precedent—three times, and it has always been done the same way.

You are now having an impeachment inquiry, but you are treating it as if it is a secret, closed-door hearing, which it is not.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, the whip continues to ignore the fact that there were very different circumstances. There were two special prosecutors with respect to Nixon and one special prosecutor with respect to Mr. Clinton. That was a radically different position than we find ourselves in today.

Mueller, by the way, was appointed by the Deputy Attorney General of the United States, a Republican appointed by the President of the United States, Mr. Trump—not our guy. He appointed him.

Now, he dismisses that the special—he is not a special prosecutor, but I forget exactly what his title was. In any event, he wasn't a special prosecutor, but he did, in fact, find that there was reason to believe that there was obstruction of justice.

Mr. SCALISE. He filed no charges. He had authority. He filed no charges. He found nothing that rose to the level of filing charges that he had the full authority to do.

Mr. HOYER. That is inaccurate, Madam Speaker. That is inaccurate.

Mr. SCALISE. That is accurate. Did he file a single charge? Please name it, because I haven't seen the charge because it doesn't exist.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Why didn't he file a charge? And if you read the report, as I am sure you did—

Mr. SCALISE. So you are acknowledging he didn't.

Mr. HOYER. He said: I didn't file a charge because I cannot file a charge against the President of the United States under Justice Department rules.

Mr. SCALISE. And the Department of Justice disagreed with that, but he had the authority.

Mr. HOYER. He was an employee and working for the Justice Department. He was under the aegis of the Deputy Attorney General of the United States. He was not an independent actor, a special prosecutor. He was an employee of the Justice Department.

And the rules that Mueller followed under the Justice Department are that you cannot indict a President. He said, however, the Congress can take action. He said that. He said we were the proper authority to take action in a case like this.

We are doing that.

He puts a lot of emphasis on "inquiry." Investigation, inquiry, hearing—it is a fact-finding process in the pursuit of our constitutional duties to find out whether high crimes and misdemeanors have been committed by the President of the United States.

It is a hearing. It is an investigation. Call it an inquiry. The Speaker said "inquiry." I adopt that language—investigation, hearing, whatever the language is.

Mr. SCALISE. But an impeachment inquiry is different.

Mr. HOYER. But the substance of these charges—and I asked him about one. He hasn't answered the question of whether he thinks it is appropriate to ask a foreign leader for a favor. He says, no, he didn't ask for a favor.

Mr. SCALISE. He asked for a favor to look into CrowdStrike. Again, read the sentence.

Mr. HOYER. Why did he mention the Bidens?

Mr. SCALISE. A lot of people are asking about the Bidens, by the way.

Mr. HOYER. That is reaching.

Mr. SCALISE. I don't think that is anything new.

Mr. HOYER. Because that was the subject of the discussion, Madam Speaker.

Mr. SCALISE. CrowdStrike was the subject of the favor for us, for our country, to find out how Russia interfered with the elections.

By the way, all nine Republicans of the House Intelligence Committee sent a letter to Chairman SCHIFF accusing him of "withholding the existence of documents from the minority."

So, you want to talk about fairness. Maybe it is fair for you to withhold information from the minority members of a committee during an impeachment inquiry—withholding information, hiding it, keeping it in secret, turning away other Members of Congress from even walking into the room. And you are going to defend that?

We would join with you today to establish rules of fairness. You don't have to make them up. You don't have

to reinvent the wheel because, in all other three impeachment inquiries, they did it the same way where both sides had true fairness.

If you think fairness—just because you have the might doesn't make it right. You have the majority, so you can call your witnesses and shut everybody else out and "withholding the existence of documents from the minority;" that is not the way to conduct an impeachment inquiry. And those are your rules.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, we adopted the rules adopted by the Republican majority in the last Congress dealing with this subject.

Mr. SCALISE. With all due respect, we never adopted impeachment inquiry rules. We never did.

Mr. HOYER. Of course not. You are talking about subpoenas and right to documents.

Mr. SCALISE. The last time it was done was during Bill Clinton's time in office. That was the last time it was done.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, he is talking about subpoenas; he is talking about the right to see documents.

Mr. SCALISE. I am talking about fairness, both sides having equal access to call witnesses, to counter things that are said that are inaccurate, which are, right now, not being allowed to happen.

Again, it is in secret. Nobody can see. You can make claims or statements about fairness. The minority members of the committee have just said it is not fair.

So, you can make it fair. You can bring a rule up that we would support that would actually allow both sides to have the same access to information and witnesses. You could do that right now. And I would ask the gentleman, would he be willing to do that?

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. I am willing to follow the rules that you imposed upon us.

Mr. SCALISE. On impeachment inquiries?

Mr. HOYER. We didn't have an impeachment inquiry.

Mr. SCALISE. This is an impeachment inquiry. You just admitted it is.

Mr. HOYER. No, the rules of the committee in terms of subpoenas and witnesses. We are following that rule. He complains about it.

Madam Speaker, he hasn't answered the substantive question. They don't have an answer to the substantive question.

Clearly, the testimony that was given yesterday by the Acting Chief of Staff clearly indicated putting leverage on Ukraine to get something we want, and, clearly, the President mentions the election of 2020.

Mr. SCALISE. And the Chief of Staff talked about corruption, which is the law, by the way. The law says we have to root out corruption.

Mr. HOYER. Are you reclaiming your time?

Mr. SCALISE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. The gentleman mentioned the Justice Department. Mr. Barr is essentially Mr. Trump's lawyer. Mr. Trump mentioned him in the transcript, too—it is not a transcript; it is a report of the call—and said: Talk to Barr, and he'll come over there with you and talk about this corruption, i.e., Hunter Biden and Joe Biden, not CrowdStrike.

Mr. SCALISE. They did.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, the Justice Department refused to investigate this case, notwithstanding the waterfall of facts and information that raise questions.

We haven't resolved the answers to those questions, but we are investigating them because it is our constitutional responsibility.

And I would say to my friend: We could go on for the next 5 hours talking about this. We would not agree. You would continue to talk about process. My perspective is we are pounding on the table because the facts don't want to be discussed.

The only reason I brought up Turkey is because, by a vote of 354-60, we said the actions of the President of the United States were inappropriate and dangerous and helped our enemies, not our allies. That is what we said in that resolution, and, very frankly, two-thirds of the Republicans voted for that because they were concerned about our national security interests.

We are concerned about our national security interests when a President of the United States is talking to a foreign leader, talking about elections, past, present, or future—inappropriate, in our opinion, and, we think, inappropriate in the minds of the American people. But we will see, and we will have a vote on that at some point in time.

But, first, we are going to find out what the facts are, and we have witnesses coming forward to give us those facts, with every Republican member of the committee able to be there, able to question witnesses, with equal time because we believe that is fair.

And, very frankly, he says: Well, they don't have a right to call witnesses. They do have the right to suggest calling a witness, and the committee can vote on it, under the Republican rules that we adopted.

So, Madam Speaker, I would hope that perhaps we could go on, perhaps, to something else because we are not going to reach agreement on this.

We are going to continue to have what we believe are fair, proper, consistent with the rules, consistent with the Constitution of the United States, consistent with the laws of the United States of America, to find out whether this President has committed high crimes and misdemeanors.

And then, when we conclude an answer to that question, every Member of

this House will have availability of all the information. And, very frankly, Mr. SCHIFF says in his letter to all of us, that once the witnesses have been concluded that we can see that. What he doesn't want is to have the witnesses reading one another's testimony and parroting it. That is a fair thing, to make sure that we don't have one witness just simply adopting the testimony of another witness. We want the truth, not parroting of other information.

So, I would hope we can move on. I am prepared to continue to speak about this, but I don't think we are going to reach any conclusion beyond what we have already stated on both sides.

Mr. SCALISE. Well, if both sides wanted the truth, they would let all witnesses be able to come forward. You shouldn't be so insecure in your claim that you won't even let somebody come and give an alternative view of some of the secondhand and, in many cases, thirdhand information, by people who have a political bias.

Madam Speaker, the gentleman hasn't answered the fundamental question of the precedent that you are trashing and rolling over and running backward over is that there have been three—only three in the history of our country—impeachment inquiries.

All of them started with a full vote of the House, and all of them had rules of fairness where both sides could participate.

That is not the case here. That is not fairness. It is surely not how it has been done all the other times. Maybe you think the other three times it was done wrong and you have got a better way, but the public doesn't buy it. That is not fair when you only let one side tell their version.

Mr. HOYER. The polls reflect that the public believes we ought to be doing what we are doing.

Mr. SCALISE. The polls reflect that there is going to be an election next year, and they want to decide the next President. They don't want the Speaker and Chairman SCHIFF to be deciding, behind closed doors, who the next President will be. That is not how we should be conducting business.

We should be moving on to other issues, like those bills that would lower drug prices, like bills that will address so many other problems that families are facing, where there is actual work, bipartisan work, that is being done by relevant committees. And they are moving bills out, and none of them are moving through this House in a bipartisan way that could become law.

So, we sit here, just days away from a potential government shutdown, and what is the focus? The focus is on a one-sided, closed-door impeachment inquiry instead of those issues.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, we have moved over 250 bills to the Senate. A number of those are very important bills in the sense that they affect a large number of people.

We passed making permanent the Land and Water Conservation Fund, and 133 Republicans voted for that bill. It sits, languishing, in the United States Senate, led by a Republican leader.

We passed that anti-hate resolution, and 173 Republicans voted for that.

We passed comprehensive background checks, and only 2 Republicans voted for that. And 90 percent of America—90 percent of America—supports that bill. It sits, languishing, in the United States Senate, unattended.

We have passed 96 percent of the funding of government prior to June 30—96 percent. It hasn't been done before. It sits.

Not a single bill has passed the Republican-led United States Senate—not a single appropriation bill.

We passed a number of bills to make sure that the ACA was stable and preserving existing conditions—Republicans didn't vote for that. Well, actually, eight did. It sits, languishing, in the United States Senate.

□ 1215

We passed a bill on climate action, what the Joint Chiefs of Staff say is one of the major challenges to our security. Three Republicans voted for that. It sits languishing in the United States Senate.

We passed disaster relief. That did pass.

We passed a lot of health legislation and prescription drug legislation. We said that prescription drug companies can't pay generics not to bring their product to the market. It is called "pay to delay." We passed that. It sits languishing in the United States Senate.

Now, it either sits languishing in the United States Senate because MITCH MCCONNELL is against all of those or it sits languishing so the Republicans can say: You haven't done anything. All you are doing is impeachment.

That is baloney.

Madam Speaker, we had a markup yesterday on a major bill that is going to save \$345 billion, according to CBO, and bring prescription drug costs down for every American. It was marked up yesterday. We are going to bring it to the floor before we leave here this work period, and we are going to pass it.

I don't predict how many Republicans are going to vote for it, but I predict this: It will sit languishing in the United States Senate.

We passed the Equality Act so that every American would be treated consistent with our declaration that all are created equal, not just some. It sits languishing in the United States Senate.

So don't say we haven't done anything. Don't say impeachment is taking all of our time. It is not. We have one committee right now—other committees also—one committee now that is giving attention, as it should. But the Energy and Commerce Committee, the Ways and Means Committee, the

Education and Labor Committee, and so many other committees are dealing with substantive issues to make sure the lives of our people are better for the people.

I could read another 30 bills like that languishing in the Republican-led United States Senate.

We are doing our work. The government was shut down when we took over, the first time in history the government was shut down when a new Congress was sworn in—the first time. We spent 30 days just opening up the people's government.

We passed appropriations bills. But not one has passed the United States Senate, led by the Republican leadership in the United States Senate. So sad.

We ought to be doing our business. We are doing our business. We are doing the people's business. We are making their lives better, and we are going to continue to do it. And we can do the same as well in dealing with the constitutional protections and the protections of our national security dealing with the President of the United States.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, on so many of those bills that the gentleman mentioned, the gentleman failed to point out the poison pills that were attached to those bills to ensure that they went out in a partisan way.

Case in point is the bill the gentleman mentioned last night. I was there in the Energy and Commerce Committee. Again, you take a package of bills—here are two different alternatives. People wonder why Congress can't get things done.

You had a package of bills to lower drug prices that every Republican and every Democrat on the committee voted for, worked for months to put together—good work, sincere, dedicated work by the people on the committee of jurisdiction—passed out of committee unanimously to lower drug prices.

Then, last night, you saw a package of bills on drug prices that resulted, ultimately, in socialist-style price-setting, and it went out on a party-line vote. Not one Republican voted for it.

If you can imagine, in divided government—which we are, Democratic House, Republican Senate with a 60-vote requirement, and a Republican President. If you want to pound on a table and make statements, you can send out party-line vote after party-line vote and say they are over there in the Senate, because you know, just as well as everyone else knows, those bills won't become law.

But if you look at the bills that came out unanimously, why is it that you send out the party-line vote to the Senate instead of taking the bill that came out of committee unanimously that actually would get signed into law by the President?

Months ago, that bill would be signed into law, and families would be paying lower prices for drugs today. But you

won't send out the unanimous bill. You send out the party-line bill.

That is what happens over and over. People see it.

You talk about government funding. We are 16 days away from a shutdown, and you haven't even gotten an agreement with the Senate on a 302(b) number—in other words, how much we are going to spend.

You are going to have to have some give and take. You are going to have to work with the other side. But that work is not happening because you are focused on a secret, behind-closed-doors impeachment inquiry.

It would be helpful if we had that 302(b) number and you went and got the agreement, so go over there and talk to them.

But don't just send them party-line bills. Send them bills that are serious and have a chance to get signed into law. You know which bills those are.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. HOYER. You know how this process works. Let them pass whatever bill they want; we will go to conference. We have our position; they have their position. It is led by your party. They haven't passed a single bill.

You talk about getting a 302(b). We sent them an offer 30 days ago. We haven't heard any response. Your party runs that.

You want to pass those bills? You think they are wonderful bills? Tell MITCH MCCONNELL: Pass those bills and send them over here. Let's see what we do with them.

We have a two-House legislature. Madam Speaker, the Republicans control the Senate. Let them pass a bill.

You say everybody is for it? Then it ought to pass. But don't say Democrats aren't passing. We passed appropriations bills. We have passed substantive bills on prescription drugs. We have passed substantive bills on healthcare. We have passed substantive bills on education. We have passed a substantive bill on the environment. We have passed climate change protection. We have passed lots of bills.

Now, if they don't like those bills, pass their own bills and send them over here, Madam Speaker. We will have a conference, and we will try to resolve it. That is how the legislative process works.

Don't say that we have to do your work and our work. We have a perspective, exactly as you did when you were in the majority, and you jammed us over and over again.

We are not trying to jam you. You had a perspective; we had a perspective. You passed your perspective. You knew the President of the United States, when it was President Obama, that he wasn't going to sign those. You knew the Senate wasn't going to pass them. Your position was, however: No, that is our position. We have a right to do that.

You were right. You had a right to do that.

But you want to deny us that right, like you want to deny us following your rules that you say are unfair.

Madam Speaker, I don't get it. We have done our work. We will continue to do our work. We will continue to do our work on both sides of the ledger, doing our constitutional duty and doing our legislative duty, which may be one and the same.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, hopefully, we can get that 302(b) number. Hopefully, Madam Speaker, if we want to talk about some of these bills, I would love if the majority leader would bring the package of bills that came out of committee unanimously, where every Republican and Democrat came together, not with poison pills, but to show that we can actually govern in a way that a bill can get signed into law, not party-line games.

We all know the issues with the Senate. We can both agree on the differences we have with how the Senate operates, where they require 60 votes, which means, in order to do anything, both sides—not one side, but both sides—have to come together.

NDAA, first time in over 40 years where an NDAA bill came out that sets the rules for our Department of Defense funding in a partisan way, it should have never been that way. It has never happened that way before.

Hopefully, we can find a way to come together and address some of these real problems and have real fairness.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, it is a two-House legislature. One is led by Republicans; one is led by Democrats.

The reason we don't have 302(b) is because the Senate couldn't agree with itself on 302(b)s.

I talked to MITCH MCCONNELL in January of this year. MITCH MCCONNELL comes out of the Appropriations Committee; I come out of the Appropriations Committee. Both of us said that we need to get 302(a)s, which is the big number. You then subdivide it into 12 different committees. He agreed that we ought to do that, but he said that we have to have the President agree.

Very frankly, the Acting Chief of Staff, who served in this body, did not want to do that. The leadership of the Republicans had as much trouble with him as we had with him. Just ask Mr. Boehner and Mr. Ryan. He didn't want to have a deal. He wanted a CR. Actually, he wanted less than a CR because he wanted to go back to the sequester numbers.

That is why we don't have a 302(b), because neither the White House, Madam Speaker, nor the Acting Chief of Staff would agree.

Mr. MCCONNELL said: I am not going to do anything the President of the United States won't do.

Unlike being the independent, Article I body that we ought to be, acting independently and then sending it down to the President, and he makes a decision as to whether he wants to sign it or not, we are simply saying, in the United States Senate: If he won't agree with it, we won't put it on the floor. He doesn't have to veto it.

The public has to be so extraordinarily confused and angry about our unwillingness and inability to get our work done.

Madam Speaker, we have done our work. The Senate hasn't sent us anything. It is not like they have sent us something that we have rejected in a partisan way. They haven't sent us anything. They are too busy appointing judges that they think will reflect their ideological point of view.

So I am frustrated, along with the citizens of this country.

Everybody here who wants to do a 1-minute or a 5-minute is really frustrated. I get that. I am hopeful we can end this because we are not going anywhere.

But we are going to continue to do our job. We are going to continue to pass legislation that we think is for the people, to make their lives better, to focus on them, not us. We are going to focus on the Constitution and the laws of this country, to make sure that they are faithfully executed and carried out.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Maybe we would both agree that it might be helpful if the four leaders—the Speaker, the minority leader, the Senate majority leader, and Senate minority leader—got in a room and agreed not to leave until they come up with an agreement so we can actually do our business and not wait that 60 days.

The Secretary of Defense has made clear how damaging it is to our defense if we don't have a DOD appropriations bill passed and signed into law by the time this funding expires, how it hurts our men and women in uniform.

Hopefully, they would all agree to go and have that conversation and, ultimately, get that resolved. Then, we can take care of more of the people's work.

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

ADJOURNMENT FROM FRIDAY, OCTOBER 18, 2019, TO MONDAY, OCTOBER 21, 2019

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

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

There was no objection.

CALLING ON VIETNAMESE GOVERNMENT TO RELEASE MICHAEL NGUYEN

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

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Madam Speaker, today, I am here again, once more, to speak about an American citizen, Michael Nguyen, who is currently in prison in Vietnam on vague allegations and charges.

I thank my colleague, Representative KATIE PORTER, for her tireless advocacy on this matter, and the men and women at the State Department, including Ambassador Dan Kritenbrink, for their work and continued support.

It has been over a year since Michael was arbitrarily detained, hastily tried, and harshly imprisoned on claims that he plotted to overthrow the Government of Vietnam, which no one—and I repeat, no one—has seen any evidence of.

Earlier this year, Michael was convicted, along with two Vietnamese men, after a half-day trial. Michael was sentenced to 12 years in prison, which is longer than the two Vietnamese men received for the same charges.

Michael's family has struggled emotionally and financially with his imprisonment. His wife and four daughters only want him to come home.

He is currently appealing the length of his sentence.

As a co-chair of the Congressional Caucus on Vietnam, I call upon the Vietnamese Government to do the right thing: quickly close this case and return Michael back to the United States and to his family.

□ 1230

RECOGNIZING THE IMPORTANCE OF SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAMS IN OUR NATION

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

Mr. COMER. Madam Speaker, this week is National School Lunch Week. I rise today to recognize the importance of school lunch programs in our Nation, which provide low-cost or free lunches to more than 29 million children in nearly 100,000 public and residential child care institutions across the country. I have great appreciation for all the hard work the school nutrition service industry provides to ensure our children are fed nutritious meals.

As the former commissioner of agriculture in Kentucky, I understand the importance of child nutrition programs. Quality food service at school should be the least of a child's worries as they are navigating the school environment and engaging in new learning opportunities. The health and well-being of our Nation's children is something all congressional Members can

adamantly support. This is a main priority of mine as the representative of several rural, underserved communities in Kentucky's First Congressional District.

As a member of the House Committee on Education and Labor, finding solutions to better serve our Nation's children is a goal we are constantly striving to build upon. I look forward to continuing to support important programs proven to serve and aid our Nation's children.

HONORING THE LIFE OF LIEUTENANT SANDEEP SINGH DHALIWAL

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

Mrs. FLETCHER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Lieutenant Sandeep Singh Dhaliwal of the Harris County Sheriff's Office, who was shot and killed in the line of duty 3 weeks ago today on September 27.

As the first observant Sikh to serve in the Harris County Sheriff's Office and one of the first in Texas to receive a policy accommodation to practice his religion while serving as a police officer, Deputy Dhaliwal was a role model for Americans of all faiths who want to serve others.

Deputy Dhaliwal sold his successful business to join the sheriff's office out of a sense of duty and a desire to build a bridge between the department and the Houston area Sikh community. He was known for his energy, his optimism, and his giving heart, coordinating relief efforts for our community after Hurricane Harvey and traveling to Puerto Rico to do the same after Hurricane Maria.

Deputy Dhaliwal's service to our community and to our country is an example to us all. The people of Houston, Harris County, the Harris County Sheriff's Office and the Sikh community across the country celebrate the life and mourn the loss of this remarkable man, a selfless hero who represented the very best of our country's ideals.

IT'S TIME TO STOP THE MADNESS

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

Mr. KELLER. Madam Speaker, the impeachment inquiry being led by the House Democrats is a sham process. Over the last 3 weeks, we have seen a stunning lack of transparency, the failure to provide basic due process rights to the President, the selective leaking of testimony and information, and Members of Congress being refused entry to the closed-door hearings.

I was even denied this week the opportunity to review the Volker testimony, despite being on one of the committees responsible for fact finding in this nontransparent inquiry.

Since day one, Democrats in this Chamber have been attempting to over-

turn the results of the 2016 election by any means necessary. They have been so focused on impeachment, that recently it seems like this Chamber, Democrats' friends in the news, and pundits cannot focus on anything else.

As Democrats continue to focus on keeping the curtain closed on these proceedings to the public, the minority and the President, the American people are left to suffer without passage of the USMCA, bipartisan prescription drug reform, and border security measures.

The people in my district, both Republicans and Democrats, have repeatedly told me they are sick and tired of this nontransparent inquiry, and the fact that Congress fails to do anything other than focus on tearing down the duly-elected President.

It is time to stop this nonsense. It is time to stop the madness. It is time to stop the opaque inquiry for the benefit of the American people.

AMERICA IS BETTER THAN THIS

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

Ms. DEAN. Mr. Speaker, by abandoning our Kurdish allies in Syria, President Trump has allowed ISIS fighters to escape prison, strengthen Russia, Iran and Syria, and damaged our reputation around the world. He has also betrayed an ally that fought valiantly alongside American forces against ISIS and who lost 11,000 soldiers doing so.

The Washington Post reports that American soldiers are sickened by this betrayal. One retired four-star general described the President's decision as, "unsound, morally indefensible, and a disgrace." Our allies around the world are also disturbed. They watched America leave its friends vulnerable to attack. They took note as a predictable humanitarian crisis ensued. As The New York Times reports, many now see the United States as an unreliable, untrustworthy partner.

The President's decision cost many lives, including the lives of children, and it will have painful consequences for generations to come.

As our dear colleague, Representative ELIJAH CUMMINGS, so often said to us, we are better than this, America is better than this.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. VAN DREW). Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

THE AMERICAN PEOPLE DESERVE FOR THIS CONGRESS TO GO TO WORK

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

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to Speaker PELOSI's radical partisan prescription drug pricing plan.

Let's not forget the last time that Speaker PELOSI brought healthcare legislation it was rushed through this House, and it doubled our premiums and our deductibles skyrocketed.

There is no guarantee that H.R. 3 would lower the prices of drugs, but rather, it could mandate a one-size-fits-all government takeover of healthcare. It could pose a grave threat to innovation, research and development, and ultimately patient access to life-changing prescriptions.

The bill could have far-reaching economic consequences that would negatively affect jobs, the economy, and trade. The pharmaceutical industry employs over 800,000 workers and supports an estimated four million jobs in this country. I know this firsthand. Right in my district healthcare researchers are transforming patient care and creating local jobs at the same time.

This week the House Committee on Education and Labor marked up this legislation, and, unfortunately, my amendment was not adopted. My amendment would have prevented innovation and American manufacturing from moving out of the United States to China.

The American people deserve for this Congress to go to work and pass legislation that is bipartisan and has a chance to become law to lower drug prices.

AMERICANS SHOULD NOT HAVE TO DECIDE BETWEEN LIFE AND DEATH BECAUSE THEY CAN'T AFFORD PRESCRIPTION DRUGS

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

Ms. GARCIA of Texas. Mr. Speaker, we all continue to mourn the passing of our dear friend ELIJAH CUMMINGS. He was an honorable man with a deep commitment to our Nation. He inspired many of us to always do what is right and to seek the truth. It is, therefore, fitting that H.R. 3 will be renamed in his Honor.

It is wrong and immoral that Americans spend more money per person on prescription drug prices than any other country in the world. No American should have to decide between life or death because they can't afford their prescription drugs.

This is personal to me. Many of my family members suffer from diabetes, as do many of my constituents. This is why I support H.R. 3. Let us honor the legacy of our dear colleague with action. Let's deliver lower prescription drug prices for the American people on his behalf and in his Honor.

Rest in power, Mr. CUMMINGS.

CONGRATULATING THE FLORIDA AIR NATIONAL GUARD'S 125TH FIGHTER WING

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

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

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Florida Air National Guard's 125th Fighter Wing on their return home after a 4-month deployment in support of Operation Spartan Shield.

During their deployment, the 125th Fighter Wing served as an essential and direct combat support component of that mission that provided intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance in southwest Asia and contributed to a successful mission. I thank these brave Air Force men and women who are willing to go abroad and risk their lives for our freedom.

We are incredibly proud of the more than 1,600 Air Force men and women who make up the 125th Fighter Wing to provide 24/7, 365 air homeland defense to combatant commanders worldwide, while simultaneously protecting the life and property of Floridians during times of crisis.

I especially want to thank their families and the northeast Florida community for supporting these brave men and women before, during, and after they are sent into harm's way.

Also, Mr. Speaker, as a 41-year law enforcement officer, I know what due process is and I know what fairness is when I see it. This impeachment process provides no due process, nor fairness.

CONGRATULATING MARILYN MIGUEL

(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, Marilyn Miguel is 18 years old. She graduated from Vineland High School with a 4.0 this year, and she received a full-ride scholarship to Harvard University. She also has coordinated with Harvard for their new community outreach program, Service Starts with Summer, which encourages incoming freshmen to create service projects for their various communities.

As a first-generation college student and a second-generation Mexican American, Marilyn knew the importance of implementing a college preparation course for incoming seniors at her high school. Her free program ran from August 13 to 15, and Marilyn made sure to create an accessible, comprehensive college prep course for the people of south Jersey.

Marilyn says the goal of her program was to help people discover their own potential. Nothing could be more important. Programs like these are essential for the success of young people, and I commend Marilyn for bringing it to our community in south Jersey.

I wish Marilyn the best of luck at Harvard and to have a wonderful year. You are truly a star, and south Jersey is proud of you.

DEMOCRATS ARE TRYING TO IMPEACH THE PRESIDENT FOR FOLLOWING A LAW THAT THEY VOTED FOR

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

Mr. BARR. Madam Speaker, we know the Democrats' hyperpartisan closed-door impeachment process lacks any semblance of fundamental fairness. We know from the transcript between President Trump and President Zelensky that there was no quid pro quo.

But what many people don't know is this: In 2014, this House unanimously passed the Ukraine Freedom Support Act, which tasks the executive branch to use U.S. assistance to bolster democratic institutions of Ukraine and counter corruption and improve transparency and accountability of the Ukrainian Government. Every Democrat voted for this measure.

In 2017, this House overwhelmingly passed the National Defense Authorization Act, which required the administration to certify as a condition of providing assistance that the Government of Ukraine has taken substantial actions to counter corruption and increase accountability. 145 Democrats voted for that.

In 2019, the NDAA that passed this House required that certification requirement again, and 139 Democrats voted for that.

So here is the bottom line: Given recent elections, President Trump not only had the authority to address the issue of corruption in the call with President Zelensky, he had a legal duty to speak and secure assurances from the new Ukrainian Government that those anticorruption measures would be carried forward. The Democrats are trying to impeach the President for following a law that they voted for.

□ 1245

REVIEW IMPEACHMENT PROCESS

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

Mr. MEUSER. Madam Speaker, let's review some facts surrounding this unfair, partisan impeachment process.

To begin with, a whistleblower claims to have secondhand information on the President's call with the Ukrainian President. The White House released the transcript of the call, making the whistleblower irrelevant.

The Ukrainian President, the most important witness, emphasized publicly that there was no quid pro quo and no pressure. Prior to having any of this information, or maybe they did, the Speaker announces an impeachment inquiry, and over 200 Democratic Members of the House agree, evidence be damned.

Since then, we have discovered that the chairman's staff met with the whis-

tleblower earlier than originally stated, yet stated that they didn't.

All hearings were held in secrecy, and there has been no due process.

Madam Speaker, a petty thief is provided more legal rights than the President of the United States. There is no transparency of testimony to Members of Congress or to the general public, and there has been no vote for an impeachment inquiry.

It appears these impeachment proceedings are not about whether the President did right or wrong or broke any laws. It is only about scoring political points while undermining the will of the electorate.

LET'S GET BACK TO WORK

(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 because I would sure like for Congress to get back to work doing what the American people really need.

It has been more than a year since the USMCA, a trade agreement with Canada and Mexico, was agreed to. We still haven't voted on it here in the House, despite bipartisan support. Why? Because a new and improved trade deal with our closest neighbors looks like it might be too much of a win for the President for the Democratic leadership to allow.

Since the Democrats have been in control of the House, what do we have to show for it, other than investigation after investigation? What have we accomplished in this Chamber for the American people? Not what we should be.

Hyperpartisan language has been injected into bills that both parties would otherwise support. Good, bipartisan legislation on lowering prescription drug prices that could pass committee unanimously languished because of hyperpartisan activity, undoing the good work of our committees and hurting Americans who are paying too much for prescription drugs.

As my Democratic colleagues dive headfirst into finding any excuse to impeach this President, they are leaving the American people hung out to dry.

Let's get to work. There are countless things other than this witch hunt.

ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. GARCIA of Texas). 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, at this time, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HURD), my friend.

Mr. HURD of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2420, the National Museum of the American Latino Act.

As the lead Republican on this bill, I believe it is my solemn obligation to champion the gospel of the American Latino, not only in Texas, not only in Congress, but across the globe.

When you walk down the historic National Mall, a sense of patriotism overwhelms every American spirit. We proudly celebrate our history, our ingenuity. We proudly celebrate the arts and sciences. We acknowledge our sins against our fellow man. We honor centuries' worth of heroic acts to bring peace to the world.

But for nearly 60 million Americans, there is a void when they visit The National Mall, a hole in the quilt of America's fabric. That is why we need a National Museum of the American Latino.

For it is the Latino who has joined fellow Americans in taking up arms against oppression in defense of democracy in every war since the American Revolution; it is the Latino who has contributed extensively to our Nation's history and culture; and it is the American Latino, through innovation and a thirst for knowledge, who will help propel the United States into realms never imagined by our forefathers.

Madam Speaker, I remind my colleagues present that the America we cherish in our hearts would be a shell of what she is today if it were not for the selfless contributions of the American Latino.

This week, the Natural Resources Committee has taken a critical step toward the eternal immortalization of the American Latino. This committee has recognized that the American image was painted by the broad strokes of patriotic Latinos. This committee has acknowledged the need to champion the accolades of American Latinos past, present, and future.

Madam Speaker, I hope every Member of this body will stand alongside Congressman SERRANO, Congressman CÁRDENAS, and I as we work to establish a foundation for the National Museum of the American Latino.

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, first, I want to pay tribute to a colleague, Congressman Elijah Cummings.

We had political disagreements, but in working together to help an Army sergeant who was unfairly, inappropriately prosecuted while serving and being heroic in Afghanistan, I developed a great appreciation for Elijah Cummings' desire to see justice done.

It was an honor to work with him in successfully helping Sergeant Derrick Miller. I am proud to have Sergeant Derrick Miller now working with me and those of us that have started a caucus, the Congressional Justice for Warriors Caucus.

That arose out of sincere, worthy, and quite able efforts by Elijah Cummings. I had not been on a committee with him, but it gave me an opportunity to see the heart of the man. He will be sorely missed here in Congress, and I am grateful to have had the chance to have worked with him.

Madam Speaker, I also felt it was important to pay tribute to one of our fallen soldiers. That is Master Sergeant Mark Allen.

This is Master Sergeant Mark Allen, his wife, and child.

I think this article from David Aaro is very helpful in reminding people who Master Sergeant Mark Allen was.

First of all, to become a master sergeant, with all the stripes above and below, it takes many, many, many years of devoted service.

Just for a little background, when I was finishing college at Texas A&M with a 4-year obligation of Active Duty coming up in the Army, I was told by an officer: Look, Louie, the best thing you can do when you get to your post is find a master sergeant that you like and feel comfortable with, and make him your confidant, because if he is a master sergeant, he has been around and has seen everything. You can trust him, and he is one of the best we have in the military.

It was very wise advice. That is the kind of guy Mark Allen was.

This article says: "Retired Army Master Sergeant Mark Allen died . . . 10 years after he was shot while looking for a missing soldier in Afghanistan back in 2009." He has died at the age of 46.

Master Sergeant "Allen was unable to walk or speak since being shot in the head by a sniper in July 2009 during his attempted search for Army Sergeant Bowe Bergdahl, who walked off his base in Afghanistan."

The article doesn't say it, but basically, Bowe Bergdahl was a deserter. He betrayed his country. Even worse than betraying his country, he betrayed his fellow soldiers who have to rely on each other in a combat theater. He simply walked away and went over to the enemy.

This heroic master sergeant, Mark Allen, dutifully went out into harm's way, looking for what they hoped was not a deserter. They hoped that something happened, that the enemy may have gotten him. They went looking. He was leading, looking for what turns out to have been a deserter.

In his service to his country, and in his service to what he was afraid was a fellow warrior who had befallen an enemy's tactics, he got shot in the head by an enemy sniper.

Master Sergeant Allen died 10 years after he was shot while looking for Bowe Bergdahl, the article says, who went missing in Afghanistan. He deserted.

"Bergdahl later pled guilty and was dishonorably discharged, reduced in rank from sergeant to private and fined \$1,000 per month over a 10-month period for deserting his post and endangering the lives of fellow soldiers, including Allen."

In other words, we can thank Bowe Bergdahl's desertion for getting this man maimed, paralyzed for 10 years, and killed.

"When Bergdahl was traded for five Taliban prisoners"—those are the en-

emies. Those are people who were killing Americans, and the Obama administration thought it wise to give five people who had killed Americans, who were enemies of America, give those back so that they could go on killing other Americans so that we could get our deserter back from our enemy.

"When Bergdahl was traded for five Taliban prisoners and brought home, Shannon Allen, Mark's wife, didn't hold back her feelings for how he changed their family forever.

"Meet my husband," she wrote on Facebook, "injuries directly brought to you by the actions of this traitor."

Our President, Donald Trump, "also expressed his disdain toward the prisoner transfer of Bergdahl, calling the decision 'a complete' and 'total disgrace to our country and our military.'

"During the trial of Bergdahl, Shannon testified that it took 90 minutes to get her husband out of bed, showered, and dressed each morning. She had to use a pulley system, which was attached to the ceiling to move him, according to Task & Purpose."

Master Sergeant Allen's "young daughter also enjoyed climbing into his wheelchair and sitting on his lap, Shannon told the outlet.

"U.S. Veterans' Network posted a tribute, calling Allen 'a true American hero.'

"Master Sergeant Mark Allen, a true American hero. Thank you for your service, brother."

"His service will be held in Loganville, Georgia."

□ 1300

May he rest in peace and may something that we do here give comfort to the family of this American hero that was betrayed by a man who the Obama administration traded five of our enemies to get back. That is a hero. If we were going to trade enemies for anybody, it would have been a guy like this.

We thank Mark Allen for his service and his incredible wife and daughter for standing by our hero for the last 10 years.

I was here in the Chamber the last couple of hours and heard the exchanges during the colloquy between STEVE SCALISE and Leader HOYER. I heard the comment that ADAM SCHIFF is fair and judicious. And I hope the Parliamentarian won't get nervous, because I am going to adeptly avoid violating the rules.

Congressman ADAM SCHIFF, back in 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, we were on the Judiciary Committee together, and we had two Federal judges who needed to be impeached. They needed to be eliminated from their official positions as Federal judges. One had committed a sexual assault, and the other had trouble understanding that bribes were not appropriate for judges.

Congressman SCHIFF was put in charge, basically, of a temporary committee to deal with the impeachment of those two judges, and during those

efforts, it was quite bipartisan. Republicans had just gone into the minority for the first time in many years. We were in the minority, and Democrats were in the majority.

I found ADAM SCHIFF very easy to work with. I found that when he gave his word on something, it could be trusted. I found that he was a person who was a pleasure to work together with.

I have had trouble melding those experiences with what I am seeing in the effort to eliminate a duly elected President from his position.

I heard our majority leader say he is fair. So I would ask a hypothetical question, not pointed directly at an individual, but just hypothetically: Is it fair if someone lies for 2 years saying they have overwhelming evidence that a President is guilty of being a traitor to his country and that there is no question, the evidence is just overwhelming and it is not just circumstantial, and it turns out there was never such evidence?

Hypothetically speaking, I would think that such a person's fairness would come into issue.

Hypothetically, is it fair to conspire and collude with gossipmongers loyal to President Obama, people like Clapper and Brennan who use potentially third-, fourth-, fifth-, sixthhand hearsay, to try to convict a President in public opinion while remaining anonymous?

By the way, I heard reference to a whistleblower who had no direct information—he is a gossipmonger—that there was fear for his safety. As an old history major who has never stopped studying history, I think we can take a look at history.

If you look at this President's time as President, and even before being President, people who have spoken out against President Trump or candidate Trump or businessman Trump, they seem to still be around and talking.

I read about an Italian individual who may have colluded with the Democratic National Committee or the Hillary Clinton campaign in helping try to set up candidate Trump so that our intelligence, with the cooperation, potentially, of Britain, maybe Australia, corruption in Ukraine, corruption in Russia, trying to set President Trump up. He was concerned for his life in Italy and was asking security.

That is what brought the question to my mind: Well, gee, who is he afraid of? The people who have things to say—even complete lies—about President Trump are still alive and well and kicking and lying, and they are out there just spreading more gossip and lies. They seem to be plenty healthy.

So the question arises: Who the heck are they—people like the person who was involved in the conspiracy to bring down Donald Trump, who is he afraid of? It shouldn't be Donald Trump, because the people against him are still out there.

Could it be that fear of safety could be from those whom such a witness

could identify as conspiring to bring down Donald Trump?

There are plenty of people who are no longer alive who had been potential witnesses against others in the Democratic Party, but it doesn't seem that there are potential witnesses against Donald Trump who are dead.

So who would this gossip-mongering, so-called whistleblower—he is not a whistleblower. He is a gossipmonger. He didn't have any direct evidence. He just wanted to create a problem for President Trump.

People with whom he colluded knew that President Trump, if they said: Oh, he conspired in this phone conversation. He threatened Ukraine's President. He did a quid pro quo in that conversation, it is very clear—we even had a chairman represent from the chairman's position that a number of times in that conversation that President Trump made clear that he was threatening the Ukrainian President to either get dirt on Vice President Biden or else you are not going to get help.

Well, we know Joe Biden did that. He is on video. The President doesn't want to talk about that, at least not the mainstream.

Anyway, they knew that President Trump could not afford to release a transcript of the conversation, so they knew whatever they were going to say about what was in the conversation, that would be the mantra. But it turns out President Trump did release the transcript of the conversation, so it kind of messed up the strategy there.

They were already talking about the President doing a cover-up because that was the strategy: Look, first, we will have this gossipmonger call him a whistleblower. We will change the rules by other Obama loyalists still in the intelligence arena in our government. We will change the rules because it has always been a rule, and a good one, you couldn't be a whistleblower unless you had direct evidence. So they had to change the rule.

The inspector general, the new one—not the one who was there previously; he was a very honorable person—the new one, not so honorable. And that is why he dishonestly changed the rule for whistleblowers so that you could be a whistleblower and not have any direct information at all. And he backdated that so that it would go back to the time that this gossipmonger was actually coordinating and colluding with the majority staff on the Intelligence Committee.

We still don't know if the Intelligence Committee staff helped prepare this so-called whistleblowing complaint.

So when we hear the so-called whistleblower, the gossipmonger is concerned for his safety, well, it sure couldn't be from President Trump, because none of his enemies have been harmed.

So who is he afraid of? Is he afraid of the people that he colluded with to try to bring down President Trump? He has no basis being afraid of Trump.

As a former judge, sometimes you have to sign protective orders. If somebody came in with the facts that we know so far about this gossipmonger, my question would be: Who is he afraid of? He shouldn't be afraid of President Trump in this situation. So who is he afraid of? And that is a really good question, I think.

So we have this Star Chamber proceeding attempting to remove a properly elected President.

We never had proceedings like this trying to take out a President—never. Since the Judiciary Committee was formed, any time there was any effort toward impeachment, it went through the Judiciary Committee, which I am a part of.

Apparently, the powers that be have not been pleased with the Democratic performance in the Judiciary Committee, so somebody figured out we are better off politically—no matter the damage it may do to our country, we are better off politically having a Star Chamber proceeding where we are the only ones who go out and leak what we want to be out. That way all of the exculpatory evidence, evidence that shows the President didn't do anything wrong, that doesn't get to come out, because, if it does, then we will demand prosecution. So we will be the only ones that leak information.

And we can legally make things available to the press, so we will only make those things available that are taken out of context that help us accomplish our goal of trying to make President Trump look bad.

I heard the Speaker on television say that she was tasking six committees with investigating President Trump, and one of those, the Judiciary Committee, I am on.

□ 1315

Sometimes we have things that are so important to keep secret that they are handled only by the Intelligence Committee only in a SCIF, so it is secured. But even then, as a member of the Judiciary Committee, many times I have gone to the SCIF to review classified information.

I remember on one occasion back when the Democrats were in the majority previously, I think it was the first closed session we ever had here at Congress, because it was desired to discuss something that was classified, and I came down here, was speaking right here, and I was stopped by the majority leader.

And he said: Wait a minute. We are authorized to have this classified discussion, but the gentleman from Texas is getting into areas that are above the classified area. He is authorized to have information that everybody here is not allowed to have. So I was not allowed to continue talking on that subject.

The point being, as a member of the Judiciary Committee, we get into things that are of a more secret nature, classified information, that a majority

of our body here is authorized to know and discuss and learn about.

So it has been quite surprising to be locked out of hearings. And we know that they are not so sensitive that only the Intelligence Committee could hear them, because they lumped in two other committees, Foreign Affairs and Oversight and Reform, so it is not about just keeping it confined to the Intelligence Committee.

But I specifically heard the Speaker say that six committees would be investigating, and I am on one of those, and, yet, I go into the SCIF, into the hallway outside of the secure area, and I am not allowed to go in.

I wanted to know who gave the order, and the Democratic staff said: Well, you know, that is the order.

Who gave the order?

Well, our boss told us.

So an unelected staffer tells two other staffers that you are to prevent a duly elected Member of Congress from doing their job.

I wanted to know who gave that order. Is it in writing somewhere? Who gave that order? Who is it that is undermining the election of over half of the Members of Congress to prevent them from being able to do their job? Who gave that order?

They couldn't say. They send out more staff; not a Member of Congress. It seemed a little cowardly to me. Nobody would come out. I was there with friends like ANDY HARRIS, ANDY BIGGS, and others. I went ahead and went through the first door—there is another door there—and they went apologetic.

I am authorized to hear classified information. I am authorized to hear the classified information that they were supposedly listening to. But the truth is, it is not classified. There is no reason for it to be classified.

This is all a political show. That is why there is no written order. That is why there has been no vote in here to proceed with impeachment, and it is just wrong.

I don't remember who said it, but there was some historian that noted there are many different—not many, but there are a number of different phases of a civil war, and only the last phase involves guns.

But this sure feels like this coup attempt is setting this country up for civil war. I won't participate in a civil war, but our job here, our oath here is to protect and defend the Constitution of the United States.

I took that oath as a prosecutor. I took that oath in the United States Army—Active Duty for 4 years, inactive Reserve for 2 more years. I took that oath as a judge, as a felony judge. I took that oath as a chief justice, and I take that oath every 2 years, right here.

And that is what a lot of us are trying to do. But what is going on around here is not fair. It is not just. It is against the House rules. The House rules are very clear: If there was not a

specific rule in “Jefferson’s Manual and Rules of the House of Representatives,” as adopted every 2 years, then the precedence is what is the rule in that case.

And the precedence on impeachment, it goes through the Judiciary Committee, and it doesn't happen anything like what is happening now. It is true. The majority could come in here and have a vote and amend the rules so they could defy all precedent on impeachment. But for some reason, they prefer to break the rules rather than simply come in and do what they can as majority. They can change the rule any time they get ready. They have got enough votes to do that.

They won't do that. For some reason, they prefer to break the rules. This is not good. Kids across America see what is going on.

They are not taught history like they once were. Why? Because since we have the Department of Education and it mandates the Federal test—oh, yeah, you can come up with your own test, but here is what has to be on there. And if a child fails that, then you don't get any of your money back for that child's year in school. So everybody is scared. Many schools drop history, drop civics.

That is why a survey in recent years indicated college students could name The Three Stooges in greater numbers than they could name the three branches of government.

So they don't know as much as they used to about what goes on here. But when they see that if you are in the majority, you can break the rules any time you want, if you dislike some other elected official—like a President—and just try to eliminate him from office, then it is okay.

In other words, the new Constitution for America, apparently, based on what we are seeing going on here on Capitol Hill, is that if you are in the majority, then the ends justify the means.

Since I have been here, there were times we were in the majority when there were Republicans—thank God they were in a small number—but they thought the ends justified the means. It didn't for them, and it doesn't for anybody else.

This little experiment in self-government, we know won't last forever. Anybody that studied history at all knows, no country, no government lasts forever. And we are on borrowed time right now, because we are setting records every day as the Nation that has functioned the longest under one founding document, our Constitution. The Romans didn't make it that long as a republic. We are setting records every day.

We know it won't last forever, but my commitment is to do everything I can to perpetuate our freedom, and what was given to us, as the greatest country in the history of the world, more opportunity, more individual assets than any country, even more than Solomon's Israel. We are an anomaly.

And we have broken the record on how long we can exist with the freedoms we have.

It is time we come together and stop playing political games so that years from now, future generations will not be rising up and cursing our names. We need to come together and abide by the rules and the Constitution so that we have a shot some day of our children rising up and calling us blessed.

That ought to be our goal. I yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 24 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, October 21, 2019, at noon 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:

2665. A letter from the Deputy Bureau Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — The Uniendo a Puerto Rico Fund and the Connect USVI Fund [WC Docket No.: 18-143]; Connect America Fund [WC Docket No.: 10-90]; ETC Annual Reports and Certifications [WC Docket No.: 14-58] received October 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.

2666. A letter from the Chief, Pricing Policy Division, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Updating the Intercarrier Compensation Regime to Eliminate Access Arbitrage [WC Docket No.: 18-155] received October 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.

2667. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's report detailing the progress and the status of compliance with privatization requirements, pursuant to Public Law 105-33, Sec. 11201(c)(2)(B); (111 Stat. 734); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2668. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting a signed agreement between the United States of America and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland on Access to Electronic Data for the Purpose of Countering Serious Crime; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2669. A letter from the Acting Administrator, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a report advising that the cost of response and recovery efforts for FEMA-3416-EM in the State of Louisiana has exceeded the limit for a single emergency declaration, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 5193(b)(3); Public Law 93-288, Sec. 503(b)(3) (as amended by Public Law 100-707, Sec. 107(a)); (102 Stat. 4707); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2670. A letter from the Acting Administrator, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a report advising that

the cost of response and recovery efforts for FEMA-3417-EM in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico has exceeded the limit for a single emergency declaration, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 5193(b)(3); Public Law 93-288, Sec. 503(b)(3) (as amended by Public Law 100-707, Sec. 107(a)); (102 Stat. 4707); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2671. A letter from the Administrator, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a report advising that the cost of response and recovery efforts for FEMA-3419-EM in the State of Florida has exceeded the limit for a single emergency declaration, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 5193(b)(3); Public Law 93-288, Sec. 503(b)(3) (as amended by Public Law 100-707, Sec. 107(a)); (102 Stat. 4707); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2672. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone, Wilmington River, Savannah, GA [Docket Number: USCG-2019-0756] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received October 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.

2673. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Special Local Regulation; Battle of the Bridges, Intracoastal Waterway, Venice, FL [Docket No.: USCG-2019-0508] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received October 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.

2674. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Columbia River, Bonneville, OR [Docket No.: USCG-2019-0781] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received October 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.

2675. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; San Juan Harbor, San Juan, PR [Docket No.: USCG-2019-0686] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received October 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.

2676. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Neches River, Beaumont, TX [Docket No.: USCG-2019-0614] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received October 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.

2677. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Delaware Bay and River, PA [Docket No.: USCG-2019-0782] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received October 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.

2678. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Special

Local Regulation; North Atlantic Ocean, Ocean City, MD [Docket No.: USCG-2019-0634] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received October 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.

2679. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone, Delaware River, Philadelphia, PA [Docket No.: USCG-2019-0784] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received October 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.

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. GRIJALVA: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 2819. A bill to extend the authority for the establishment of a commemorative work in honor of Gold Star Families, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 116-243). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GRIJALVA: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 1568. A bill to assist in the conservation of the North Atlantic right whale by supporting and providing financial resources for North Atlantic right whale conservation programs and projects of persons with expertise required for the conservation of North Atlantic right whales, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 116-244, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on the Budget discharged from further consideration. H.R. 1568 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. POSEY (for himself, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. WEBER of Texas, and Mr. BABIN):

H.R. 4733. A bill to amend the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to provide for a low-dose radiation basic research program; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. BUCSHON (for himself, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. BANKS, Mr. BAIRD, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. PENCE, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH):

H.R. 4734. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 171 South Maple Street in Dana, Indiana, as the "Ernest 'Ernie' T. Pyle Post Office"; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. MEUSER (for himself and Mr. CARTWRIGHT):

H.R. 4735. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit for certain facilities that remediate and reclaim coal refuse sites in the United States by producing electricity from coal refuse; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois (for himself, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Miss

GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico, Mr. BACON, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. POSEY, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. WALKER, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. STAUBER, and Mr. STEUBE):

H.R. 4736. A bill to amend the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938 to clarify the coverage of political activities directed within the United States by agents of foreign principals outside of the United States, to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to clarify the application of disclaimer rules for political advertisements which are disseminated online and to reduce the incidence of illicit foreign money in elections, to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to prohibit the collection and transmission of ballots by third parties in elections for Federal office and to prohibit the availability of funds under such Act to States which permit non-citizens to vote in elections for public office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. CLARKE of New York (for herself and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi):

H.R. 4737. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to require the Under Secretary for Science and Technology of the Department of Homeland Security to research and evaluate existing Federal research regarding approaches to mitigate climate change on homeland security to identify areas for further research within the Department, research and develop approaches to mitigate the consequences of climate change on homeland security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. WALBERG (for himself, Mrs. WAGNER, Ms. STEFANIK, and Mrs. WALORSKI):

H.R. 4738. A bill to amend the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to provide protections against pregnancy discrimination in the workplace, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. CLARKE of New York (for herself, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. ROSE of New York, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. KATKO, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Ms. SLOTKIN, and Mr. ROGERS of Alabama):

H.R. 4739. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to protect U.S. Customs and Border Protection officers, agents, other personnel, and canines against potential synthetic opioid exposure, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security, 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 Mr. RUSH:

H.R. 4740. A bill to direct the Consumer Product Safety Commission, in consultation with the Director of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives, the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and the Director of the National Institutes of Health, to conduct a study on the safety and efficacy of tasers and firearms, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. OLSON:

H.R. 4741. A bill to provide that the Federal Communications Commission and communications service providers regulated by the Commission under the Communications Act of 1934 shall not be subject to certain provisions of the National Environmental Policy

Act of 1969 and the National Historic Preservation Act with respect to the construction, rebuilding, or hardening of communications facilities following a major disaster or an emergency declared by the President, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, 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. SUOZZI (for himself and Mr. KING of New York):

H.R. 4742. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to impose a tax on nicotine used in vaping, etc; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SABLAN (for himself and Mrs. RADEWAGEN):

H.R. 4743. A bill to amend the Wagner-Peyser Act to include the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands and American Samoa, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. FRANKEL (for herself, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi):

H.R. 4744. A bill to prohibit the obligation or expenditure of Federal funds for certain agreements relating to the 46th G7 Summit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER (for himself, Mrs. WAGNER, and Mr. COSTA):

H.R. 4745. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow refunds of Federal motor fuel excise taxes on fuels used in mobile mammography vehicles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROWN of Maryland (for himself, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mr. PAPPAS, and Mr. TED LIEU of California):

H.R. 4746. A bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to submit to Congress a report on service waivers for transgender individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CICILLINE (for himself, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SERRANO, and Ms. JACKSON LEE):

H.R. 4747. A bill to carry out an income-contingent repayment program for Federal Interest Free Education Loans for undergraduate students, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CISNEROS (for himself and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H.R. 4748. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend increased dependency and indemnity compensation paid to surviving spouses of veterans who die from amyotrophic lateral sclerosis, regardless of how long the veterans had such disease prior to death; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CLAY:

H.R. 4749. A bill to provide temporary authority to the Secretary of Education to re-issue certain student loans to reduce interest rates paid by borrowers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CLAY:

H.R. 4750. A bill to amend title 11 of the United States Code to make student loans dischargeable; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. TLAI, and Mr. CARSON of Indiana):

H.R. 4751. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of the Treasury to regulate tax return preparers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. CRAIG (for herself, Mr. HAGEDORN, and Ms. MCCOLLUM):

H.R. 4752. A bill to accept land into trust for the benefit of the Prairie Island Indian Community as compensation to the Tribe for Tribal lands that have been rendered dangerous by the use and storage of highly toxic nuclear materials, some of which also have been inundated by flood waters, to release the United States from related claims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CRENSHAW (for himself, Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico, and Mr. ROGERS of Alabama):

H.R. 4753. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of Homeland Security from operating or procuring foreign-made unmanned aircraft systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. CURTIS (for himself, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. SIRES, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, and Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas):

H.R. 4754. A bill to express United States support for Taiwan's diplomatic alliances around the world; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, 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. DELAURO (for herself and Ms. MENG):

H.R. 4755. A bill to establish the Food Safety Administration to protect the public health by preventing foodborne illness, ensuring the safety of food, improving research on contaminants leading to foodborne illness and the chronic health outcomes associated with foodborne illnesses, improving the surveillance of foodborne pathogens (including foodborne pathogens identified as antibiotic resistant), and improving security of food from intentional contamination, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DESAULNIER:

H.R. 4756. A bill to establish an Office of Housing Innovation in the Department of Housing and Urban Development to assist in exploring and developing new approaches for increasing and diversifying the supply of housing and for meeting the challenges of housing shortages, housing affordability, and traffic congestion, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. FOSTER (for himself, Mr. RYAN, Mr. RUSH, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. UNDERWOOD, and Mr. SWALWELL of California):

H.R. 4757. A bill to prioritize funding for an expanded and sustained national investment in basic science research; to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committees on Science, Space, and Technology, and Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GRIFFITH:

H.R. 4758. A bill to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to establish a national sexual assault care and treatment task force; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and the Judiciary, for a period to be

subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma:

H.R. 4759. A bill to increase emergency and disaster relief response, build safer communities, strengthen Second Amendment rights, streamline administrative reviews, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma:

H.R. 4760. A bill to bolster the domestic workforce by encouraging communication between career and technical education institutions and emphasizing potential employment opportunities, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to treat certain costs relating to career and technical education as qualified higher education expenses for purposes of section 529 programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Education and Labor, Transportation and Infrastructure, Armed Services, and Small Business, 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. HIGGINS of Louisiana (for himself, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. KATKO, Mr. ROSE of New York, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania, and Mr. MCCAUL):

H.R. 4761. A bill to ensure U.S. Customs and Border Protection officers, agents, and other personnel have adequate synthetic opioid detection equipment, that the Department of Homeland Security has a process to update synthetic opioid detection capability, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security, 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 Mr. HILL of Arkansas (for himself and Mr. SCHWEIKERT):

H.R. 4762. A bill to amend the Securities Act of 1933 to codify certain qualifications of individuals as accredited investors for purposes of the securities laws; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. KAPTUR (for herself, Mr. RYAN, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio, and Mr. JOYCE of Ohio):

H.R. 4763. A bill to extend the limited wraparound coverage pilot program for an additional 5 years, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. MATSUI (for herself, Mr. BLIRAKIS, and Ms. PINGREE):

H.R. 4764. A bill to reauthorize the Stem Cell Therapeutic and Research Act of 2005, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MEADOWS:

H.R. 4765. A bill to amend the Food Security Act of 1985 to provide for certain payment limitations with respect to commodity programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H.R. 4766. A bill to amend title 46, United States Code, to exclude certain aquaculture workers from treatment as seamen for the purpose of liability in the event of injury or death, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SCALISE (for himself and Mr. COLE):

H. Res. 639. A resolution requiring that all Members have non-participatory access to committee proceedings related to matters referred to by the Speaker in her announcement of September 24, 2019; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PALMER (for himself, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. HICE of Georgia, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. BUCK, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. FULCHER, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. BILLIRAKIS, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. HILL of Arkansas, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. BUDD, Mr. ROY, Mr. CLOUD, Mr. BABIN, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. GIANFORTE, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. SPANO, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. WALKER, Mr. BIGGS, Mrs. MILLER, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. MULLIN, Mrs. RODGERS of Washington, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. WESTERMAN, and Ms. FOXX of North Carolina):

H. Res. 640. A resolution condemning the global persecution of Christians; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GRIJALVA (for himself, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico, Mr. SAN NICOLAS, Mr. SABLAN, and Ms. PLASKETT):

H. Res. 641. A resolution acknowledging that the decisions rendered by the United States Supreme Court in the so-called Insular Cases rest on the same racist and ethnocentric assumptions leading to Plessy v. Ferguson's infamous "separate but equal" doctrine, that the legal doctrine emanating from the Insular Cases has no place in United States Constitutional law, and that the Insular Cases must be rejected in their entirety; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, 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. BLUMENAUER (for himself and Mr. ZELDIN):

H. Res. 642. A resolution recognizing the contributions of American Viticultural Areas and winegrowing regions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER (for herself and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD):

H. Res. 643. A resolution recognizing women's cardiovascular health as a critical health care priority that affects every State and contributes to increased health care costs, and promoting the necessity of increased awareness of and education on the symptoms for heart disease among women, gender-specific cardiovascular disease research, and policy action to alleviate the risks of heart disease among women; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PAPPAS (for himself, Mr. BILLIRAKIS, and Mr. SARBANES):

H. Res. 644. A resolution expressing support for the designation of October 28 as "Oxi Day" to commemorate the anniversary of Greek Prime Minister Ioannis Metaxas' answer of "Oxi!" or "No!" to surrender to the Axis forces, inflicting a fatal wound that helped save democracy for the world; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. TRONE (for himself, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. FUDGE, Mrs. LEE of Nevada, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Ms. HOULAHAN):

H. Res. 645. A resolution expressing support for the designation of October 11, 2019, as the Day of the Girl Child in the United States, and celebrating the International Day of the Girl Child in the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

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. POSEY:

H.R. 4733.

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

U.S. Constitution, Article I, Section 8, Clause 18:

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

By Mr. BUCSHON:

H.R. 4734.

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

Article I, Section 8, clause 7 of the United States Constitution provides Congress with the power to establish post offices and post roads.

By Mr. MEUSER:

H.R. 4735.

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

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

By Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 4736.

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

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

By Ms. CLARKE of New York:

H.R. 4737.

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

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. WALBERG:

H.R. 4738.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution of the United States; the power to regulate commerce among the several states.

The purpose of the bill is to amend the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to provide protections against pregnancy discrimination in the workplace, and for other purposes.

By Ms. CLARKE of New York:

H.R. 4739.

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

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. RUSH:

H.R. 4740.

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

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. OLSON:

H.R. 4741.

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

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. SUOZZI:

H.R. 4742.

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. SABLAN:

H.R. 4743.

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

Under Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Ms. FRANKEL:

H.R. 4744.

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

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER:

H.R. 4745.

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 lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises to pay the debts and provide for the common Defense and general welfare of the United States, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 1. Thus, Congress has the authority not only to increase taxes, but also, to reduce taxes to promote the general welfare of the United States of America and her citizens. Additionally, Congress has the Constitutional authority to regulate commerce among the States and with Indian Tribes, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mr. BROWN of Maryland:

H.R. 4746.

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

Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. 1, Sec. 8, Cl. 18)

By Mr. CICILLINE:

H.R. 4747.

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. CISNEROS:

H.R. 4748.

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

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

By Mr. CLAY:

H.R. 4749.

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

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. CLAY:

H.R. 4750.

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

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 4751.

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

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the United States Constitution and Amendment XVI of the United States Constitution

By Ms. CRAIG:

H.R. 4752.

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

Article I Section 8

By Mr. CRENSHAW:

H.R. 4753.

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

Article One, Section 8 (Clause 18): "To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers"

Article One, Section 8 (Clause 1): "provide for the common Defense"

Article One, Section 8 (Clause 3): "to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations"

By Mr. CURTIS:

H.R. 4754.

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

Article 1 Section 8 Clause 3

By Ms. DeLAURO:

H.R. 4755.

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

Article 1 Section 8, U.S. Constitution

By Mr. DESAULNIER:

H.R. 4756.

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

Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. FOSTER:

H.R. 4767.

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

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GRIFFITH:

H.R. 4758.

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 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma:

H.R. 4759.

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

Article I Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma:

H.R. 4760.

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

Article I Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana:

H.R. 4761.

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

U.S.C. Art. I Sec. 8 cl 18.

By Mr. HILL of Arkansas:

H.R. 4762.

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

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

By Ms. KAPTUR:

H.R. 4763.

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

The Commerce Clause.

By Ms. MATSUI:

H.R. 4764.

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

Article 1, Section 8 of the US Constitution

By Mr. MEADOWS:

H.R. 4765.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 states “The Congress shall have Power To . . . regulate Commerce . . . among the several States . . .” And Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 states “The Congress shall have Power to . . . provide for the . . . general Welfare of the United States . . .”

By Mr. YOUNG:

H.R. 4766.

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

Under Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 which deals with interstate commerce.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

- H.R. 24: Mr. MARSHALL.
- H.R. 141: Mr. LUCAS and Mr. CUNNINGHAM.
- H.R. 307: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
- H.R. 587: Mr. HARDER of California.
- H.R. 589: Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BABIN, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. PALMER, Mr. HOLDING, and Mr. MEUSER.

- H.R. 649: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
- H.R. 724: Mr. BALDERSON, Mrs. RODGERS of Washington, and Mr. LUJAN.
- H.R. 730: Ms. SCHRIER.
- H.R. 737: Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. DOGGETT, and Ms. HOULAHAN.
- H.R. 830: Mr. STEUBE.
- H.R. 877: Mr. PALAZZO.
- H.R. 879: Mr. DESAULNIER.
- H.R. 934: Mr. LEVIN of Michigan.
- H.R. 935: Mr. GALLEGO.
- H.R. 948: Mr. FLEISCHMANN.
- H.R. 960: Mr. MITCHELL.
- H.R. 961: Mr. NADLER, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, and Mr. COURTNEY.
- H.R. 976: Mr. RUIZ and Mr. CASE.
- H.R. 1002: Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. SLOTKIN, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. PHILLIPS, Mr. NADLER, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. WEXTON, and Mrs. DEMINGS.
- H.R. 1024: Mr. GOLDEN.
- H.R. 1034: Mrs. HARTZLER.
- H.R. 1035: Mrs. LESKO.
- H.R. 1042: Mr. NADLER, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. WEXTON, and Mrs. DEMINGS.
- H.R. 1043: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
- H.R. 1055: Ms. ESCOBAR.
- H.R. 1109: Ms. SLOTKIN.
- H.R. 1133: Mr. RYAN.
- H.R. 1139: Mr. KILDEE.
- H.R. 1154: Ms. CLARKE of New York.
- H.R. 1155: Mrs. DINGELL.
- H.R. 1185: Mr. LIPINSKI.
- H.R. 1194: Ms. JACKSON LEE and Mr. HASTINGS.
- H.R. 1195: Mr. KATKO.
- H.R. 1220: Mr. POCAN and Ms. JACKSON LEE.
- H.R. 1225: Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. VISCLOSKY, and Ms. GABBARD.
- H.R. 1230: Mr. LIPINSKI.
- H.R. 1254: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.
- H.R. 1256: Mr. SOTO.
- H.R. 1305: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia and Mr. ROONEY of Florida.
- H.R. 1342: Mr. SMITH of Washington.
- H.R. 1367: Mr. SOTO, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. BEYER, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. DESAULNIER, and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
- H.R. 1379: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.
- H.R. 1380: Mr. NADLER.
- H.R. 1393: Mr. PAYNE, Mr. SABLAN, Mrs. TRAHAN, and Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois.
- H.R. 1434: Mr. WATKINS.
- H.R. 1450: Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. EVANS, and Mr. MCNERNEY.
- H.R. 1488: Ms. FINKENAUER.
- H.R. 1530: Mr. RICHMOND and Mr. PALAZZO.
- H.R. 1545: Mr. SMUCKER.
- H.R. 1549: Mr. MORELLE.
- H.R. 1553: Mr. PERLMUTTER.
- H.R. 1588: Mr. VELA.
- H.R. 1622: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
- H.R. 1652: Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. ENGEL.
- H.R. 1673: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama and Mr. GUEST.
- H.R. 1692: Ms. STEVENS.
- H.R. 1711: Mr. MCEACHIN and Mr. COOPER.
- H.R. 1748: Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. MCADAMS, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, and Ms. ADAMS.
- H.R. 1754: Mrs. HAYES, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. COURTNEY, and Ms. WEXTON.
- H.R. 1766: Mrs. LESKO, Mr. BERA, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. ROUDA, Mr. ROSE of New York, Mr. STANTON, and Mr. GALLAGHER.
- H.R. 1767: Mr. PAYNE.
- H.R. 1777: Mr. POCAN.
- H.R. 1804: Mr. ALLRED.
- H.R. 1824: Miss RICE of New York.
- H.R. 1857: Mr. SIRES.
- H.R. 1865: Mr. HURD of Texas, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Mrs. LAWRENCE.

- H.R. 1868: Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL.
- H.R. 1873: Mr. PALAZZO and Mr. CICCILLINE.
- H.R. 1880: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD and Ms. MENG.
- H.R. 1882: Mr. SUOZZI, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. DELBENE, and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
- H.R. 1923: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Mr. FOSTER.
- H.R. 1945: Ms. CRAIG.
- H.R. 1973: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut and Mr. HOLDING.
- H.R. 1975: Mr. RESCHENTHALER.
- H.R. 2102: Mr. COX of California.
- H.R. 2147: Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Ms. WEXTON, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. BAIRD.
- H.R. 2161: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana and Mrs. WALORSKI.
- H.R. 2166: Mr. CASE.
- H.R. 2178: Mr. SWALWELL of California.
- H.R. 2191: Mr. MAST and Mr. DIAZ-BALART.
- H.R. 2222: Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee, Mr. HARDER of California, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
- H.R. 2245: Ms. SPANBERGER.
- H.R. 2258: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.
- H.R. 2268: Ms. NORTON, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. MOORE, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. DELBENE, Mrs. DINGELL, and Ms. GARCIA of Texas.
- H.R. 2315: Ms. FINKENAUER.
- H.R. 2321: Mrs. DEMINGS.
- H.R. 2350: Mr. MAST.
- H.R. 2382: Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. SHIMKUS, and Mr. MCADAMS.
- H.R. 2423: Mr. GRIFFITH, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. WALKER, Mrs. MILLER, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. FULLER, and Ms. MENG.
- H.R. 2426: Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Ms. SPANBERGER, Mr. ALLRED, and Miss RICE of New York.
- H.R. 2431: Mr. BERA, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. RUTHERFORD.
- H.R. 2435: Mr. HURD of Texas.
- H.R. 2442: Mr. QUIGLEY.
- H.R. 2471: Ms. HAALAND and Ms. ESHOO.
- H.R. 2474: Mr. FITZPATRICK and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
- H.R. 2491: Mr. THOMPSON of California.
- H.R. 2501: Mr. CASE.
- H.R. 2521: Mr. DEUTCH and Mr. MCGOVERN.
- H.R. 2573: Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. CRAIG, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. TONKO, Mr. SPANO, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, and Mr. GOHMERT.
- H.R. 2579: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
- H.R. 2594: Mr. SOTO, Mr. PETERSON, and Mr. HUFFMAN.
- H.R. 2622: Mr. BUCK.
- H.R. 2629: Mr. CASE.
- H.R. 2645: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, and Mr. JOYCE of Ohio.
- H.R. 2651: Mr. MCKINLEY and Ms. CRAIG.
- H.R. 2680: Mr. RUIZ.
- H.R. 2689: Mr. SMITH of Washington.
- H.R. 2694: Ms. PRESSLEY and Mrs. LEE of Nevada.
- H.R. 2699: Mr. BURGESS.
- H.R. 2708: Mrs. LURIA.
- H.R. 2739: Ms. CHENEY.
- H.R. 2746: Mr. BERA.
- H.R. 2771: Mr. GOODEN.
- H.R. 2775: Mr. CORREA and Mr. EVANS.
- H.R. 2788: Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee.
- H.R. 2825: Mr. HUDSON and Mr. PASCARELL.
- H.R. 2846: Mr. BAIRD and Mr. JOYCE of Ohio.
- H.R. 2887: Mr. BRINDISI.
- H.R. 2895: Mr. BERA.
- H.R. 2903: Ms. CHENEY.
- H.R. 2913: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.
- H.R. 2929: Mr. PHILLIPS.
- H.R. 2970: Ms. WEXTON.

- H.R. 2985: Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mrs. WALORSKI, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. LAMBORN, and Mr. PANETTA.
H.R. 3006: Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY and Mr. CASTEN of Illinois.
H.R. 3048: Mr. POCAN and Mr. MCKINLEY.
H.R. 3080: Mr. DEUTCH.
H.R. 3086: Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 3107: Mr. SCHWEIKERT and Ms. FINKENAUER.
H.R. 3113: Mr. TAKANO, Ms. BLUNT ROCH-ESTER, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. FRANKEL, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. GUTHRIE, Ms. FINKENAUER, Ms. STEVENS, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. SOTO, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mrs. WAGNER, and Mr. BILIRAKIS.
H.R. 3115: Mr. LEVIN of California.
H.R. 3129: Mr. TRONE and Mr. TED LIEU of California.
H.R. 3138: Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas.
H.R. 3211: Ms. CRAIG.
H.R. 3225: Ms. BARRAGÁN.
H.R. 3243: Mr. BABIN.
H.R. 3275: Mr. WENSTRUP.
H.R. 3330: Mr. PHILLIPS.
H.R. 3350: Mr. KIM.
H.R. 3398: Mr. CLAY and Mr. KHANNA.
H.R. 3435: Mr. EVANS.
H.R. 3451: Mrs. TORRES of California and Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 3458: Mr. PAPPAS.
H.R. 3463: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 3466: Mr. ARRINGTON and Mr. PHILLIPS.
H.R. 3489: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.
H.R. 3495: Mr. SCHNEIDER.
H.R. 3497: Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. RUIZ, and Mrs. DINGELL.
H.R. 3530: Mr. PALMER.
H.R. 3562: Mr. CASE.
H.R. 3565: Mr. BERA.
H.R. 3570: Mr. KEATING and Ms. FUDGE.
H.R. 3591: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.
H.R. 3598: Mr. ALLRED and Mr. EVANS.
H.R. 3632: Mr. MCKINLEY and Mr. RUIZ.
H.R. 3647: Mr. KIM.
H.R. 3681: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 3698: Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 3716: Mr. TIPTON.
H.R. 3717: Mr. PALMER.
H.R. 3742: Mr. KELLER, Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. LAMB, Mr. HECK, and Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 3760: Mr. GRIJALVA and Mr. SOTO.
H.R. 3778: Ms. JAYAPAL and Mr. HARDER of California.
H.R. 3846: Ms. BASS.
H.R. 3851: Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mrs. LURIA, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. POCAN, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BUCSHON, and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H.R. 3937: Ms. SCHRIER.
H.R. 3942: Mr. BURGESS, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 3971: Mr. JORDAN.
H.R. 3980: Mr. RESCHENTHALER and Mr. TIPTON.
H.R. 4022: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 4031: Mr. STEIL.
H.R. 4044: Mr. POSEY.
H.R. 4056: Mr. SMUCKER and Mr. RESCHENTHALER.
H.R. 4100: Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 4101: Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 4116: Mr. EVANS.
H.R. 4162: Mr. MAST and Mrs. RODGERS of Washington.
H.R. 4189: Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma, Mr. GAETZ, and Miss RICE of New York.
H.R. 4193: Mr. RYAN.
H.R. 4194: Ms. SLOTKIN.
H.R. 4195: Ms. SLOTKIN.
H.R. 4257: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H.R. 4266: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 4283: Mr. CLINE.
H.R. 4294: Mr. CLINE.
H.R. 4305: Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. BRADY, Mr. BRINDISI, Mr. BARR, Mr. BUDD, Mr. HAGEDORN, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. LATTA, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. BOST, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. MAST, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania, Mr. GREEN of Tennessee, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, and Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio.
H.R. 4334: Mr. SMUCKER and Mr. MEUSER.
H.R. 4346: Mr. RYAN and Mr. GALLEGRO.
H.R. 4348: Mr. KIM and Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 4349: Mr. COOK.
H.R. 4369: Mrs. MILLER.
H.R. 4371: Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 4391: Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 4393: Mr. MORELLE.
H.R. 4428: Mr. HASTINGS.
H.R. 4429: Mr. KIM, Ms. DEAN, and Mr. UPTON.
H.R. 4438: Mr. BRINDISI.
H.R. 4456: Mr. HASTINGS.
H.R. 4481: Mr. CUELLAR.
H.R. 4496: Mr. BYRNE and Mr. CARTER of Georgia.
H.R. 4508: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 4550: Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois and Ms. DELBENE.
H.R. 4555: Mr. WELCH and Mr. STIVERS.
H.R. 4556: Mr. PAPPAS and Mr. ESPAILLAT.
H.R. 4586: Ms. CHENEY.
H.R. 4615: Mr. KENNEDY.
H.R. 4617: Mr. CORREA, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. GOLDEN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. VAN DREW, Ms. PINGREE, Mrs. DEMINGS, Ms. WEXTON, Mrs. FLETCHER, Ms. STEVENS, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. SOTO.
H.R. 4640: Mr. DOGGETT.
H.R. 4645: Mr. O'HALLERAN.
H.R. 4680: Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL.
H.R. 4681: Mr. MAST and Mr. PASCHELL.
H.R. 4691: Ms. NORTON, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. RYAN, and Mr. HASTINGS.
H.R. 4692: Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico, Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, and Ms. SPANBERGER.
H.R. 4694: Mr. PALLONE and Ms. CHENEY.
H.R. 4695: Mr. COSTA, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. YOHO, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. CISNEROS, Mr. ALLRED, Mr. SIRES, Mr. BUDD, Mr. LATTA, Mr. HILL of Arkansas, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. GREEN of Tennessee, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. OLSON, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. BALDERSON, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. HURD of Texas, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. BURCHETT, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. WALTZ, Mr. KINZINGER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. BACON, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. KEATING, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. JOHN W. ROSE of Tennessee, Mr. GALLAGHER, and Mr. CRIST.
H.R. 4698: Mrs. DEMINGS.
H.R. 4701: Mr. VARGAS and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.
H.R. 4705: Ms. CRAIG.
H.R. 4708: Mr. MORELLE, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. SUOZZI.
H.R. 4709: Mr. MORELLE, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. SUOZZI.
H.R. 4715: Mr. KHANNA.
H.R. 4732: Mr. ROUDA.
H.J. Res. 38: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.
H.J. Res. 76: Mr. SMITH of Washington.
H. Con. Res. 25: Mr. DEFAZIO.
H. Con. Res. 27: Mr. LATTA.
H. Con. Res. 64: Mr. POCAN.
H. Con. Res. 65: Mr. KILDEE.
H. Con. Res. 68: Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. KELLER, Mrs. LESKO, Mr. STEIL, and Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma.
H. Res. 49: Mr. KINZINGER, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, and Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H. Res. 60: Ms. SPANBERGER.
H. Res. 133: Mr. EVANS.
H. Res. 146: Mr. LATTA.
H. Res. 230: Mr. TRONE.
H. Res. 255: Mr. ROSE of New York.
H. Res. 277: Mrs. TORRES of California, Ms. MENG, and Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER.
H. Res. 399: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H. Res. 467: Mrs. TORRES of California and Ms. MENG.
H. Res. 483: Mr. STEIL.
H. Res. 517: Ms. WEXTON, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Mr. RUIZ.
H. Res. 538: Mr. PENCE.
H. Res. 546: Mr. MOULTON and Mr. SHIMKUS.
H. Res. 574: Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. HUFFMAN, and Ms. SCHRIER.
H. Res. 602: Mr. BAIRD.
H. Res. 604: Mr. MASSIE, Mr. WITTMAN, and Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH.
H. Res. 627: Mr. STANTON.
H. Res. 628: Mr. KILDEE.
H. Res. 630: Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. STEIL, and Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.
H. Res. 631: Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina and Mr. GROTHMAN.
H. Res. 633: Mr. JOHN W. ROSE of Tennessee, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, and Mr. WALKER.
H. Res. 636: Mr. MCGOVERN.

DELETIONS 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. 860: Mr. VAN DREW.
H.R. 4603: Ms. JACKSON LEE.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

CONGRATULATING THE 2019 HONOREES OF THE POLISH AMERICAN CONGRESS ILLINOIS DIVISION

HON. DANIEL LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 18, 2019

Mr. LIPINSKI. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate 10 individuals who are being recognized as the 2019 Polish American Congress, Illinois Division, Honorees. These Polish-Americans will be honored on Sunday, October 20th, at the 50th Annual Polish American Heritage Award Banquets.

Each year, the Illinois Division of the Polish American Congress presents awards to recognize notable work in public service, philanthropy, heritage, community service, the arts, and other notable accomplishments. This year's honorees are The Most Reverend Thomas John Paprocki, Bishop of the Diocese of Springfield in Illinois, Richard Owsiany, Lucie Bucki, Dominic A. Pacyga, Ph.D., Jacek Niemczyk, Tom Startek, Martin Obrecki, Maria Roszek-Kucharski, Ewa Milde, and Bogdan Lanko. The Polish American Congress, and its mission to unite the Polish-American community and to aid its members to become better informed American citizens, have benefitted from the contributions of these individuals.

The Illinois Division is one of 25 state divisions under the national Polish American Congress, and it represents 39 Polish-American organizations and over one million Americans of Polish heritage from across the state. In Chicagoland, and Illinois as a whole, we are blessed to have the most robust Polish-American community in our nation. The Illinois Division works to bring community members together, and it is a privilege to represent and work closely with so many members of this organization.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the award recipients on this tremendous honor. They deserve praise for the energy and time they have dedicated to strengthening Polonia and our nation. I wish them the best in their future endeavors where they will surely continue their success.

EMPLOYMENT SERVICES AND
JOBS PARITY ACT

**HON. GREGORIO KILILI CAMACHO
SABLAN**

OF THE NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 18, 2019

Mr. SABLAN. Madam Speaker, today, I introduce the Employment Services and Jobs Parity Act. This legislation would make long overdue amendments to the Wagner-Peyser Act to include the Northern Mariana Islands and American Samoa.

Presently, the Marianas and American Samoa are not eligible for the employment

services formula grant that is currently awarded to all other states and insular areas. Congressional action is needed to ensure all Americans can get the help they need to develop the skills necessary to enter in-demand jobs and career paths. Special Representatives of the Marianas and the President recommend in 2017 that the Department of Interior work cooperatively with DOL to extend the Wagner-Peyser Act to the Marianas.

At a time when our island economies continue to recover from major natural disasters, the annual Wagner-Peyser grant would provide timely support to the Marianas and American Samoan workforce through skills assessment, career guidance, and referrals to training for job seekers.

Now is the time to make things right and ensure parity for all Americans. The gentleman from American Samoa, Mrs. Radewagen is an original co-sponsor. This bill is important to the workers in the Marianas and American Samoa. I urge all my colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation.

RECOGNIZING THE SERVICE OF
CITY COUNCILMAN DR. JOE LEE
SMITH

HON. BILL POSEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 18, 2019

Mr. POSEY. Madam Speaker, today I would like to recognize and celebrate the service of Councilman Dr. Joe Lee Smith, who after 36 years of faithful service to our Rockledge City Council, will enter retirement this November.

Having been elected to the city council twelve consecutive terms, serving 3 years as council chairman and as deputy mayor, the city of Rockledge owes much to Dr. Smith for his unmatched dedication and service to its residents.

A life-long Brevard County resident, Dr. Smith began his career as an educator, having earned his doctoral degree in education from University of Florida and serving as the President Emeritus of Brevard Community College (BCC) until 2000. He then came out of retirement to become provost of the Palm Bay Campus location and served as BCC's college ambassador until 2017.

In both his personal and professional life, he was viewed as a mentor for students in the community and his coworkers. He was a founder of the Brevard Recreation Association and served on the board of directors for many community organizations such as the Salvation Army, Circles of Care, Rolling Readers, and the Boys and Girls Club.

Mayor Tom Price of Rockledge says of Councilman Smith, "He's the definition of a true statesman, someone that you rarely see in politics anymore. He's done 36 years of great work on the board and will be greatly missed by the City Council."

In recognition of his work to advance higher education in the community, Dr. Smith has

had several educational facilities named in his honor such as the Joe Lee Smith Recreational Center in Cocoa and the Dr. Joe Lee Smith Teaching Center on the Brevard Community College Melbourne Campus.

A revered and distinguished member of the community, he has been the recipient of multiple awards including the Brevard Community College Distinguished Servant Award, Onyx Magazine's Humanitarian Award, and the United Third Bridge Puerto Rican Taino Award for his work advancing the Hispanic community in Brevard.

Aside from his distinguished role as an educator for the community, Dr. Smith has also been honored as an athlete, having been inducted into Florida A & M University's Sports Hall of Fame for his accomplishments as a talented baseball player in addition to the Space Coast Sports Hall of Fame for his contributions in sports program development.

On November 20th, the Rockledge City Council will recognize Dr. Smith's long and accomplished tenure. His contributions to the community are immeasurable and will surely be felt and appreciated by generations of Floridians to come.

I ask my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives along with the residents of Rockledge to join me in saluting his work.

RECOGNIZING BETTY WIECHERT
AS SHE CELEBRATES HER 100TH
BIRTHDAY

HON. TROY BALDERSON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 18, 2019

Mr. BALDERSON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to offer my heartfelt congratulations to Betty Wiechert, a resident of Muskingum County, who is celebrating her 100th birthday this Saturday, October 19, 2019.

Betty has lived a life characterized by devotion and an unyielding selflessness, making her a pillar of this congregation. A woman of family, community, and faith, Betty was a Sunday School teacher and taught my very first Sunday School class. Her devotion and unwavering loyalty for the Coburn Church community is still evident today as she attends each and every Sunday service, even if that requires taking a taxi to mass. Betty is an incredible inspiration and role model to us all and I am sure turning 100 will not slow Betty down in the slightest.

I join Betty's friends and family in extending my best and warmest wishes to her on this special day, and in celebrating her life and contributions to our congregation and community. Happy 100th Birthday to Betty; it is an honor celebrating with her.

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

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

IN RECOGNITION OF ANN
RUDISILL

HON. DEBBIE DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 18, 2019

Mrs. DINGELL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Ann Rudisill and congratulate her on being a Southern Wayne County Regional Chamber (SWCRC) Women of Achievement Award Honoree. Her commitment to our Downriver community makes her a deserving recipient of SWCRC's Inspiring Achievement Award.

Ann Rudisill is a veteran of the United States Air Force. After serving in Colorado Springs for four years during the Vietnam Era, Ann returned home with an unrelenting commitment to the men and women who served in the United States Armed Forces alongside her. She endeavored to find new ways to support our nation's veterans, especially those in her local community, and has been passionately pursuing this mission ever since.

On April 7, 2017, Ann Rudisill founded Downriver for Veterans. Recognizing many veterans in our community lack reliable assistance and transportation options, Ann established Downriver for Veterans to help them meet their needs and navigate throughout the Downriver region. Since the organization's inception, Downriver for Veterans has provided food, shelter, paperwork, and transportation to over 350 veterans in our Downriver community. The organization continues to rapidly grow and was officially recognized as a non-profit organization in February of this year. Downriver for Veterans has a real impact on the veterans of our community, and Ann's meaningful efforts truly serve as an inspiration to all.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Ann Rudisill as she receives SWCRC's Leadership Award. Her commitment to veterans by ensuring all their basic needs are met is worthy of commendation. Ann wholeheartedly deserves the SWCRC Leadership Award, and, above all, we thank her for her service to our great nation.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY
OF LARRY SIMMONS

HON. MARK E. GREEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 18, 2019

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and service of a great American hero, Larry Simmons.

Mr. Simmons joined the United States Army in 1960 after finishing high school. After several assignments throughout the United States and in Berlin, Mr. Simmons received orders to deploy to Vietnam. Over the course of his two tours in Vietnam, he received two Purple Hearts and three Bronze Stars for his heroic actions on the battlefield, including his rescue of two small children during a firefight.

Following Mr. Simmons' retirement from the military in 1980, after 20 years of service, he spent 14 years as a correctional officer at San Quentin prison. After his retirement, Mr. Simmons and his wife, Karen, moved to Kentucky

Lake to enjoy life as a grandfather and great grandfather.

I ask my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives to join me in congratulating Mr. Simmons on his induction into the Signature Healthcare Hall of Fame.

IN RECOGNITION OF MIDDLESEX
COUNTY FREEHOLDER
BLANQUITA B. VALENTI

HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 18, 2019

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Honorable Blanquita B. Valenti on her retirement as a Middlesex County Freeholder. As a freeholder, city council member and educator, Freeholder Valenti has distinguished herself as a dedicated public servant whose contributions and achievements are truly deserving of this body's recognition.

A long-time resident of New Brunswick, New Jersey, Freeholder Valenti devoted many years to representing her community as a council member and freeholder. She is well-respected by her colleagues as well as the residents she serves. Her professionalism and vision for the community earned her elections to leadership positions on the City Council and Board of Chosen Freeholders, including council vice president, council president and freeholder deputy director.

Although retiring from elected office, Freeholder Valenti remains an active community leader and advocate for individuals and families in Middlesex County. She has served on numerous boards of social services agencies, educational organizations and others, including the Middlesex County Board of Social Services, PRAB, Middlesex County Hispanic Affairs Commission, ASPIRA New Jersey and the Middlesex County College Foundation. She is also a founding board member of Coming Home of Middlesex County, Inc., a non-profit aimed at ending homelessness in the county, which is honoring Freeholder Valenti at their Fall Gala on October 19, 2019.

In addition to serving in elected office, Freeholder Valenti taught at Trenton State College (currently The College of New Jersey) and Rutgers University as well as high schools throughout Middlesex County. She earned her Master of Arts in Teaching in Secondary Education from Seton Hall University and her master's degree in Spanish and Latin American Literature from Rutgers University, and holds her undergraduate degree from Rosemont College in Pennsylvania.

Madam Speaker, once again, it is my great honor to pay tribute to Freeholder Blanquita B. Valenti as she retires as a Freeholder this year. I sincerely hope that my colleagues will join me in thanking her for her commitment to public service and the betterment of our communities.

COMMENDING DR. G. DOUGLAS
RIPLEY FOR HIS CHRISTIAN
LEADERSHIP AND SERVICE TO
NORTH ALABAMA

HON. MO BROOKS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 18, 2019

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Dr. G. Douglas Ripley, for his diligence in ministry and service to others.

On January 1st, 1970, Dr. Ripley received Jesus Christ as his Savior and immediately began to cultivate his relationship with Christ and understanding of the Bible. Within a few weeks he enrolled in the Gulf Coast Bible College at Anderson Church of God and thereafter traveled as a student evangelist, during which time he met his wife, Katy.

In 1973, Dr. Ripley and Katy pastored Open Door Baptist Church in Tennessee, where the church grew from 16 to 1,000 people in a short twelve years. By December of 1985, Dr. Ripley, Katy, and their two children, Jessica and Jeremy, moved to Decatur, Alabama where Dr. Ripley became the Pastor of Moulton Heights Baptist Church. The church grew rapidly, relocating once and having five major renovations from 1988 to 2004. Under Dr. Ripley's leadership, many lives have been impacted.

Known as "Brother Douglas," Dr. Ripley's passion for world missions and discipleship have reached across the world. In fact, he was one of the first pastors to visit Albania and his act of bravery opened the way for more churches to evangelize in Albania.

Madam Speaker, Dr. Ripley's diligent and obedient service to his flock and God is inspiring and sets an example for future generations.

I commend Dr. G. Douglas Ripley for his leadership in the church and passion for service to Christ.

SUPPORTING H.R. 2328, THE REAUTHORIZING AND EXTENDING AMERICA'S COMMUNITY HEALTH ACT

**HON. GREGORIO KILILI CAMACHO
SABLAN**

OF THE NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 18, 2019

Mr. SABLAN. Madam Speaker, now is the time to fix Medicaid funding, the insular areas. This is an area of strong bipartisan agreement—Republicans and Democrats on the House Energy and Commerce committee agree, and something must be done.

H.R. 2328 was reported out of Committee in July. This bipartisan solution would address the serious funding shortfall that all Insular Areas face now that the special Obamacare Medicaid funding has ended.

Our hospital, the Commonwealth Healthcare Corporation (CHCC), and other healthcare providers across the Marianas depend on the availability of Medicaid funds as a significant source of revenue. This special funding provided an average of \$11 Million beyond our statutory cap each year, ensuring CHCC and

other providers remain open so that people can access healthcare services. In Fiscal Year 2018, 49 percent of all third-party payor reimbursements to CHCC were Medicaid. That amounts to \$17.3 Million in revenue representing almost 30 percent of the hospital's total revenue. CHCC relies on Medicaid. With no certainty of funding, the Marianas made the tough decision on June 1, 2019 to cut off Medicaid reimbursements to providers, directing all Medicaid beneficiaries to use the clinics of the CHCC until further notice.

We received an additional \$36 Million for Medicaid in the disaster supplemental H.R. 2157, but in just a month after disbursement, more than half of the funds were paid out to providers, many of which are still owed reimbursements. We know the positive impact that regular access to healthcare can have on a person's overall health—just as we know how much worse a medical event can be for an individual that no longer has regular access. For the Marianas, it is already difficult for people to get to their providers for their specific healthcare needs. The hold imposed on outpatient clinics is evidence that taking this funding away not only threatens low-income families, but everyone at all income levels. It is already happening, and Congress should act now.

I thank Chairman PALLONE, Ranking Member WALDEN, and all the members of the committee for understanding the urgency of the Medicaid crisis in the insular areas and addressing the issue in a bipartisan way.

Let's bring H.R. 2328 to the floor and show that the House is united in our support for the Insular Areas. Let's fix the Medicaid funding cliff.

FLETC ARTESIA 30-YEAR ANNIVERSARY

HON. XOCHITL TORRES SMALL

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 18, 2019

Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico. Madam Speaker, today, October 18, 2019 marks the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center (FLETC), Office of Artesia Operation's 30-year anniversary. On September 22, 1988, President Ronald Reagan signed the Treasury, Postal Service and General Government Appropriations Act, House Resolution 4775, to grant the purchase, renovation, and adaptation of a former college campus in Artesia, New Mexico, as a facility of FLETC. The following year, FLETC-Artesia was officially established as a Training Delivery Point. Today, Artesia, New Mexico, is the second largest FLETC site in terms of workload, and largest in square miles housing up to 1,800 students at any time.

FLETC-Artesia's role in keeping the country safe cannot be understated. For the last three decades, it has remained committed to preparing the federal law enforcement community through strategic partnerships in accordance with a mission to safeguard the American people, our country, and our values. FLETC-Artesia has played a critical role in the initial training of law enforcement officers on the front line—including those joining United States Border Patrol, the Federal Air Marshals and Federal Flight Deck Officers. The Artesia

campus is also home to the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Indian Police Academy, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs Memorial, which honors the service and sacrifice of those who have died in the line of duty.

Since Congress authorized FLETC to purchase, rehabilitate, and expand the site in 1989, over one million officers and agents have been trained. More recently, in fiscal year 2018, FLETC Artesia trained just under 4,000 students.

As a witness to the work that FLETC's Artesia location executes, I am honored to recognize the full extent of FLETC's work, including the diversity and extensiveness of the trainings and the collaboration required for both local and global impact. The commitment to delivering the quality training agents and officers need to successfully do their jobs, protect our communities, and protect themselves is clear.

Law enforcement from across the country and the world travel to Artesia, New Mexico to learn from FLETC's expertise. I am grateful for FLETC's work to serve New Mexico's 2nd Congressional District and our country. FLETC is a cornerstone of our community, and we celebrate its work and impact on FLETC-Artesia's 30-year anniversary.

RECOGNIZE THE INSTITUTE FOR INCLUSION IN THE LEGAL PROFESSION ON ITS 10TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. DANNY K. DAVIS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 18, 2019

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I rise to recognize the Institute for Inclusion in the Legal Profession on its 10th Anniversary. The legal profession remains one of the least diverse professions in the United States. This adversely impacts the pipeline of women, racial/ethnic minorities, openly LGBTQ+ individuals, individuals with disabilities, and religious minorities, who will serve as future legislators, judges, public policy advocates, civic and community leaders, and the lawyers who can be found daily in boardrooms and courtrooms. While there are an abundance of organizations working to make the American legal profession more diverse and inclusive, and some progress made, much remains to be done.

For ten years, the Institute for Inclusion in the Legal Profession ("IILP") has been working for "Real change. Now." Its approach has differed from more traditional efforts. It has focused on inclusion rather than just diversity. It has emphasized the supply side over the demand side: making the legal profession more hospitable to diverse individuals, one where anyone with the talent, aptitude, ambition, and determination may enter and rise as high as those abilities will permit. It has grounded its work in research and data that go beyond the anecdotal. It discusses the hard issues and tackles the tough questions that need to be resolved before this profession can truly become more diverse and inclusive. It addresses all types of diversity in all practice settings all over the United States. More importantly, everyone in the legal profession has a home within the Institute for Inclusion in the Legal Profession.

I was honored to give remarks during the inaugural year of the formation of the IILP in 2009 and I am pleased to share these highlights from its first ten years of service. The IILP is continuing to publish its "Review on the State of Diversity and Inclusion in the Legal Profession," the only comprehensive compilation of data, statistics, demographics, and thought leadership essays designed in the country. This report has become an important tool to everyone in the legal profession who is concerned about diversity and inclusion issues. In addition, the IILP presented some 40 Symposia on the State of Diversity and Inclusion in the Legal Profession to lawyers all over the United States. These symposia bring together an extremely diverse group of lawyers who learn about all types of diversity and find synergies that allow them to work across lines of difference. The IILP provided the legal profession with the only hard data available on the business case for diversity in "The Business Case for Diversity: Reality or Wishful Thinking?". The IILP published the series, "Competing Interests," which is the only analysis of the conflict between corporate efforts aimed at economy and efficiency with corporate efforts supporting diversity and inclusion in the legal profession and the impact this has upon minority lawyers. The IILP established the Social Impact Incubator, a group of Millennial lawyers from a wide range of backgrounds and practice settings, who are learning to be thought leaders on diversity and inclusion for their generation. The IILP developed the program, "Diversity and Data Privacy in a Digital World." While much has been focused on data privacy issues, this program is the first to examine those issues through the lens of diversity and inclusion concerns. The IILP conducts programs that offer unique and thought-provoking ways to look at and think about diversity and inclusion, such as "The Ethics of Diversity and the Politics of Inclusion," wherein IILP examined challenges to diversity and political considerations that are impacting inclusion efforts; and "Women and Minorities," studying the root causes and potential strategies to address tensions between white women, women of color, lesbians, and trans women. The IILP presented the first conference outside the United State or United Kingdom that was dedicated to diversity and inclusion issues within the legal profession.

For its 10th Anniversary, the Institute for Inclusion in the Legal Profession is celebrating with another thought-provoking program: "Is ROI (Return on Investment) the Appropriate Measure for D&I (Diversity and Inclusion)?" On behalf of the 7th Congressional District of Illinois, I offer my deepest appreciation for the work that you do and encourage that you continue to finding innovative approaches to ensure our legal professionals produce diverse and inclusive workforces.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF MARY BEATRICE BREWER

HON. MARK E. GREEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 18, 2019

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of Mary Beatrice (Bea) Brewer, a resident of Signature Health Care in Erin, Tennessee.

Mary Beatrice Hutchison was born on May 29, 1922 in Benton County, Tennessee. She grew up in Benton County, where she stood out as a high school basketball player. After she graduated, she moved to Detroit to work in a factory supplying the war effort in World War II.

In 1945, Bea married Tom Brewer, a WWII Army Air Corps veteran who survived many months in a German prisoner of war camp. Together, they raised two daughters—Lisa and Kim—and two grandchildren—Jacob and Lauren.

Bea and Tom lived in Houston County, where Tom worked as a teacher and Bea spent twenty years at the Stewart-Houston Times, the local newspaper where she wrote a column and served as editor. After retiring from the paper, she worked at the Houston County Soil Conservation for over twenty years. For the past year, she has been a resident at Signature Health Care.

I ask my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives to join me in congratulating Mary Beatrice Brewer on her induction into the Signature Health Care Hall of Fame.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 18, 2019

Ms. DeLAURO. Madam Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and so I missed Roll Call vote number 564 regarding passage of the SEC Disclosure Effectiveness Testing Act. Had I been present, I would have voted “Yes.”

RECOGNIZING GEORGE FORMA

HON. RAUL RUIZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 18, 2019

Mr. RUIZ. Madam Speaker, I rise to recognize George Forma, who has been a champion for tribes and tribal sovereignty for more than 50 years.

I am honored to represent eleven federally recognized tribes in my district. Each of the eleven tribes has had to fight for their rights and their sovereignty at every turn.

Standing with tribes in that fight and leading with them are the attorneys who represent them in the court of law.

George was instrumental in securing victory for tribes in the Cabazon case that set the groundwork for tribes to transform their on-reservation economies and conduct gaming operations, which has empowered tribes' self-sufficiency to provide adequate housing, schools, and other needed social services for tribal members.

He has successfully helped several tribes fight their unjust termination and achieve recognition as federally recognized tribes.

And over the decades, George has served my constituents, the Morongo Band of Mission Indians, providing advice and counsel with the highest of integrity.

I want to thank George for his work and wish him a long, happy retirement filled with well-earned family time.

IN RECOGNITION OF ANITA TWARDESKY

HON. DEBBIE DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 18, 2019

Mrs. DINGELL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Anita Twardesky and congratulate her for being a Southern Wayne County Regional Chamber (SWCRC) Women of Achievement Award Honoree. Her commitment to our community in Michigan makes her a deserving recipient of SWCRC's Leadership Award.

Riverside Kayak Connection (KRC) is Metro Detroit's premier paddling shop. Established in 2004, KRC offers kayak retail, tours, classes, and events that serve all ranges of paddling abilities. KRC is dedicated to improving kayaking, water trails, and public access in Southeast Michigan. Although based in Wyandotte, KRC is involved in the entire Southeast Michigan community, offering summer rental locations in Belle Isle State Park and Elizabeth Park and providing paddling classes in Southgate and Detroit.

Anita Twardesky joined Riverside Kayak Connection in 2006 as Community Outreach Manager. Armed with a breadth of experience in parks and recreation municipal administration, non-profit management, and grant writing, Anita has excelled in her role at RKC. Her high-level professionalism and leadership are especially evident in her additional role as President of Downriver Linked Greenways, a non-profit organization with a mission to facilitate trail planning, development, and marketing of our Downriver land and water trails. Anita's dedicated work in improving and sharing our state's beautiful and fun recreational waterway activities truly makes a difference and inspires future generations to enjoy, protect, and honor these valuable natural resources.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Anita Twardesky as she receives SWCRC's Leadership Award. As the Great Lakes state, Michigan waterways are a central component of our state's identity. Anita's dedication to ensuring all Michiganders can use these natural resources every year is worthy of commendation. Anita truly deserves SWCRC's Leadership Award.

HONORING THE ROTARY CLUB OF WHITE PLAINS, NEW YORK ON ITS 100TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. NITA M. LOWEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 18, 2019

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Speaker, I rise to honor the Rotary Club of White Plains, New York, as the institution celebrates its 100th anniversary on Saturday, October 19.

Established on October 1, 1919, the Rotary Club of White Plains was the 540th club

charged by Rotary International and among the earliest Rotary clubs in Westchester County. The club focuses on raising funds to help local charities continue the critical, often challenging, work of helping those in need in the City of White Plains and across the Lower Hudson Valley.

In addition to local efforts, including scholarship programs to support White Plains area college students and sponsoring the Glen D. Loucks Memorial Track and Field Games, the Rotary Club of White Plains' philanthropic work has expanded internationally. The group has made crucial contributions to the reconstruction and redevelopment efforts in the City of Bahia de Caraquez, Ecuador, after the city's infrastructure was greatly damaged by an El Niño storm in 1998.

The Rotary Club of White Plains has been an invaluable partner in making the City of White Plains and the surrounding area a healthier and more prosperous community. Madam Speaker, I urge my fellow members of Congress to join me in expressing both congratulations and thanks to the Rotary Club of White Plains and its former and current leaders and members for their century of distinguished service to our community.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. HENRY C. “HANK” JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 18, 2019

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Madam Speaker, on October 17, I was recorded as a yes vote on Congresswoman Wagner's Amendment to H.R. 1815. To clarify, here is the correct information with respect to that vote: Roll Call Vote Number 563: No

HONORING MILLIE MARSHALL

HON. LARRY BUCSHON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 18, 2019

Mr. BUCSHON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the career of Millie Marshall as she retires after 28 years with Toyota. I've had the privilege of getting to know Millie over the past three years that she has served as plant President for Toyota's manufacturing facility in Princeton, Indiana, which is located in the Eighth District of Indiana. I have appreciated Millie's efforts to work with me and to keep me updated about the exciting things and new investments taking place at the plant. During her time as president, the plant has experienced significant growth, which has in turn grown jobs and the economy in Southwest Indiana.

Millie has been an outstanding leader who is well known for her unwavering commitment to mentoring and sponsoring women in the STEM fields. As the first female president in Toyota's history and recipient of several Women in Leadership awards, she helped pave the way for other female leaders, not only at Toyota but across Indiana and the nation. I will miss working with Millie, and I wish her all the best as she begins this next phase of her life.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY
OF JAMES COAKLEY

HON. MARK E. GREEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 18, 2019

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and service of a great American hero, James "Shimmie" Coakley.

Mr. Coakley was born on March 15, 1920 and raised in Houston County, Tennessee. He married Mildred Clark Coakley in 1940, and they remained together for the next 73 years and 9 months until her passing.

Mr. Coakley was drafted in December of 1944, and he fought in France and Germany as part of the 143rd Infantry Regiment, 36th Division under General Dwight D. Eisenhower. Mr. Coakley was honorably discharged from the Army as corporal in 1946 with a combat wound from shrapnel.

After surviving a ten day journey back across the Atlantic through a hurricane, Mr. Coakley began a longtime career back in Tennessee with the Meriwether Lewis Electric Company, where he served for 33 years. In retirement, he enjoys spending time with family and visiting the residents of Signature Healthcare of Erin, TN.

Mr. Coakley currently holds the distinction of being the oldest living WWII veteran in Houston County. I ask my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives to join me in congratulating Mr. James Coakley on his induction into the Signature Healthcare Hall of Fame.

MISSING AND MURDERED
INDIGENOUS WOMEN

SPEECH OF

HON. TOM COLE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 2019

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring attention to and urge Congressional action on the Crisis of Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women.

Mr. Speaker, more than 4 in 5 American Indian and Alaska Native women have experienced violence in their lifetime. More than half of American Indian and Alaska Native Women have experienced sexual violence in their lifetime.

American Indian and Alaska Native women are over one and half times more likely than White women to have experienced violence in the past year. Native women face murder rates more than 10 times the national average in some parts of the country. They also are almost 2 times as likely to have experienced rape than non-Hispanic White women over the course of their lifetime.

Given all these statistics of acts of violence, 96 percent of American Indian and Alaska Native women victims of sexual violence experience violence at the hands of a non-Native perpetrator. To reiterate, nearly all of the violence committed against Native women are committed by non-Natives.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe the protection of all women and children is or should be

treated as partisan issue. Tribal governments, through trust and treaty obligations should have the same authority as states to protect women and children in vulnerable situations. All states, tribal and local law enforcement authorities should have access and the use of the same tools to prevent these crimes, on or off the reservations. Hunters know where to hunt; fishermen know where to fish. And predators know where to prey.

I am pleased to see the House has taken action on this issue with the passage of the reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act, and I urge the Senate to take up this important legislation and include strong tribal provisions to ensure tribal governments have all the resources available to protect their communities.

IN RECOGNITION OF KIMBERLY
KRAMER

HON. DEBBIE DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 18, 2019

Mrs. DINGELL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Kimberly Kramer and congratulate her on being a Southern Wayne County Regional Chamber (SWCRC) Women of Achievement Award Honoree. Her commitment to our community in Michigan makes her a deserving recipient of SWCRC's Entrepreneur Award.

Kimberly Kramer established Your Look Logos, LCC, a promotional product distributor in Lincoln Park, Michigan in 2013. As a member of the Advertising Special Institute, Your Look Logos supplies companies with every promotional product companies can imagine like branded mugs, pens, tote bags, t-shirts, and watches from over 3,000 suppliers. With a mission to help business owners create long-lasting and memorable relationships with clients, Your Look Logos specializes in consulting with businesses to find the best promotional products to suit their unique needs.

Being involved in customer service for over 25 years, Kimberly Kramer personally knows the importance of cultivating meaningful relationships between businesses and their clients. Six years ago, she put her professional experience into action, creating a company that would help others generate brand awareness and leave a lasting impression on the clients they encounter. Since its inception, Your Look Logos has become an important resource for many businesses across Michigan, especially throughout Metro Detroit.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Kimberly Kramer as she receives SWCRC's Entrepreneur Award. Kimberly's dedication to helping business thrive and establish deeper connections with clients has truly made a difference in our community. We are grateful for her work and wish her and Your Look Logos continued success in the years ahead.

CONGRATULATING DR. JASON
DINKO ON THE RECEIPT OF THE
INAUGURAL FOUNDERS AWARD

HON. DANIEL MEUSER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 18, 2019

Mr. MEUSER. Madam Speaker, it is with great admiration that I rise today to congratulate Dr. Jason Dinko of Luzerne County on receiving the inaugural Founders Award from Geisinger Commonwealth Foundation.

Dr. Dinko, graduated from Geisinger Commonwealth School of Medicine in 2014. Throughout his career, he has consistently demonstrated his remarkable care and compassion for his patients and our community. Dr. Dinko earned his undergraduate degree from Marywood University and completed a residency in family medicine near Pittsburgh. He now serves the people of Montour County as a family medicine clinician for Geisinger in Danville, where the courtesy and compassion he shows his patients has earned him a reputation in the community for quality care. I can think of no one more deserving of this honor.

On behalf of the U.S. House of Representatives and the citizens of Pennsylvania's Ninth Congressional District, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Dr. Dinko on this great honor and thank him for his care of the people of our community.

HONORING THE ROTARY CLUB OF
PEEKSKILL, NEW YORK ON ITS
100TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. NITA M. LOWEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 18, 2019

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Speaker, I rise to honor the Rotary Club of Peekskill, New York, as the institution celebrated its 100th anniversary on Thursday, October 17.

Established in 1919, the Peekskill Rotary Club was the 547th club chartered by Rotary International and among the earliest Rotary clubs in Westchester County. The club focuses on raising funds to help local charities continue the critical, often challenging, work of helping those in need in the City of Peekskill and across the Lower Hudson Valley. The more than 10,000 people who attend the club's annual fundraiser at Peekskill High School are a testament to the widespread support for the club's contributions to our community.

A highlight of its 10 decades of service was the Rotary's involvement in recovery efforts after the attacks on the World Trade Center on September 11, 2001. Rotary volunteers assisted the Salvation Army in coordinating the delivery of supplies to workers at Ground Zero and raised funds for the families of the four victims who were Peekskill residents. The club also designated a memorial monument and tree to those four individuals at Riverfront Green Park on July 4, 2002.

The Rotary Club of Peekskill has been an invaluable partner in making the Lower Hudson Valley a healthier and more prosperous community. Madam, Speaker, I urge my fellow members of Congress to join me in expressing

both congratulations and thanks to the Rotary Club of Peekskill and its past and current members for their century of service to our community.

HONORING TC AND MAEGAN
SCHWINDLING AND ALL ADOPTIVE
FAMILIES IN ALABAMA

HON. ROBERT B. ADERHOLT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 18, 2019

Mr. ADERHOLT. Madam Speaker, our opening prayer yesterday morning was offered by Pastor Phil Waldrep from Decatur, Alabama. I want to thank Pastor Waldrep for his dedication to the scripture and his passion for families.

Six years ago, Pastor Waldrep's extended family grew through the gift of adoption. In Spring of 2013, his oldest daughter, Maegan Schwindling, and her husband, TC, began pursuing adoption from the Democratic Republic of Congo. They were matched at the beginning of summer 2013 with a young girl in Lubumbashi, DRC.

Things took an unfortunate turn a few months later. On September 25, 2013, adoptions from the DRC came to a halt as President Kabila blocked internationally-adopted children from leaving the country. Child placement agencies and adoptive families scrambled to find their way through this roadblock yet they were undeterred in getting these children home.

I had the privilege of meeting Maegan and several other Alabama families during this season while they were stuck with children on the other side of the world. We worked closely with the Congressional Caucus on Adoption and the U.S. State Department to help these families be united here in their new homes.

Pastor Waldrep's granddaughter Zoe finally came home to the United States with Maegan and TC on April 16, 2016. She became a proud American citizen on September 27, 2016—almost 3 years to the day after President Kabila suspended international adoptions in the DRC.

On Thursday, a little over 6 years after Zoe's journey with her family began, Zoe was in the gallery to watch her grandfather open the House of Representatives in prayer. Zoe has suffered loss and tragedy in her life, but through the gift of adoption and the love and care of her parents and extended family, she has become a true example of beauty in broken places.

As the House Republican co-chair of the Congressional Caucus on Adoption, I'm honored to recognize the Schwindlings and all of the adoptive families in Alabama. Next month we will celebrate National Adoption Month. May Zoe's story be a reminder to us all of the magnitude of loss and the beauty of coming home that can be found in adoption stories across the country.

IN MEMORY OF REVEREND
THEODORE GIBSON

HON. DONNA E. SHALALA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 18, 2019

Ms. SHALALA. Madam Speaker, I rise in honor of Reverend Theodore Gibson, champion of civil rights in Miami.

Born in 1915, Reverend Gibson emerged as a leader in South Florida's desegregation movement. Determined that his son would attend an integrated school, Reverend Gibson filed a lawsuit against Dade County Public Schools. He also led desegregation efforts at lunch counters and department stores, and even helped integrate Crandon Park Beach by leading a swim-in.

Reverend Gibson served as president of the Miami NAACP from 1954 to 1964. During that time, he refused to turn over the names of the members of the local NAACP chapter to the Florida state legislature, which was hunting for communist influence in American political organizations. Reverend Gibson was arrested and fined for standing up for the dignity of the NAACP.

In 1972, Reverend Gibson was appointed to the Miami City Commission, where he continued to promote civil rights and empower African American communities. A powerful orator and moral leader, Reverend Gibson devoted himself to the Christ Episcopal Church in Coconut Grove, where he served as a rector until his death in 1982. He is survived by his wife, Thelma Gibson.

Reverend Gibson dedicated his life to promoting the rights and welfare of the African American community of Miami. His influence continues to resonate in South Florida and will be felt for years to come. I'm proud to honor his memory.

IN RECOGNITION OF SARAH KEW

HON. DEBBIE DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 18, 2019

Mrs. DINGELL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Sarah Kew and congratulate her for being a Southern Wayne County Regional Chamber (SWCRC) Women of Achievement Award Honoree. Her commitment to our community in Michigan makes her a deserving recipient of SWCRC's Unsung Heroine Award.

Kiwanis International is a global community of clubs and members with a mission to "empower communities to improve the world by making lasting differences in the lives of our children." Kiwanis Clubs throughout our community embody this mission and tirelessly strive to serve the needs of children in creative ways by tackling hunger, improving literacy, promoting leadership, and offering guidance.

Kiwanis Clubs throughout Michigan cannot operate without strong and effective leaders who demonstrate a true commitment to the organization's mission. As Kiwanis of Michigan

District 5th Lieutenant Governor, Sarah Kew dutifully leads our community's Kiwanis Clubs, working quietly behind the scenes to ensure the organization continues to improve the lives of our children. Known amongst her peers and colleagues for her high degree of professionalism, compassion, and ambition, and she is well-loved and cherished by so many within the Kiwanis organization and beyond. Sarah truly embodies all the qualities of an admirable leader—she humbly strives for excellence without seeking praise or recognition for any of her significant accomplishments.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Sarah Kew as she receives SWCRC's Unsung Heroine Award. Sarah's dedication to our community's children is remarkable, and her continued leadership in the Kiwanis Club is deeply appreciated. Sarah truly deserves the SWCRC Unsung Heroine Award.

HONORING BILL WINKKY IN
HONOR OF HIS EIGHTIETH
BIRTHDAY

HON. TOM REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 18, 2019

Mr. REED. Madam Speaker, today I rise to honor Bill Winkky who recently celebrated his eightieth birthday.

Bill Winkky, son of Mary Emma and Robert Winkky, was born in Kingston, New York on September 29, 1939. In his eighty years of life, he has been a mentor, a friend, a father, a husband and an all-around good man that deserves to be recognized.

In 1963, Bill married Charlotte Sommerfeld and has remained by her side for the past fifty-six years. Bill has such dedication to his wife and his family, it is heartwarming to see.

Yet, his family is not the only thing he has been dedicated to over the years. He was a teacher, dedicating thirty-two and a-half years to educating and enriching the lives of the youth he taught. He also coached several sports, including football, wrestling, swimming and track. The hours he spent dedicated to young people were well spent, and he had a profound impact on his students.

Bill also has dedicated time to serving people as the Town of Veteran supervisor for ten years and continues to hold this role now.

It is not often you have the pleasure of meeting a man as dedicated to helping others as Bill Winkky. He is a pillar in the community, has given so much of himself to our youth through his coaching and teaching tenure. He continues to do a great deal as the Town of Veteran supervisor. I am honored to know him, and I am equally honored to celebrate his achievements, his legacy of hard-work, compassion and community-mindedness here today.

Given the above, I ask that this Legislative Body pause in its deliberations and join me to honor Bill Winkky on his eightieth birthday.

CONGRATULATING NOBLE “BUD”
QUANDEL ON THE RECEIPT OF
THE INAUGURAL FOUNDERS
AWARD

HON. DANIEL MEUSER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 18, 2019

Mr. MEUSER. Madam Speaker, it is with great admiration that I rise today to congratulate Ninth District Resident, Noble “Bud” Quandel of Schuylkill County, Pennsylvania on receiving the inaugural Founders Award from Geisinger Commonwealth Foundation.

Mr. Quandel began his career as a laborer and apprentice while attending Bloomsburg University, since succeeding his father in 1976, he has served as Chairman and CEO of Quandel Enterprises. Although under his guidance, his business has experienced great success across the country, Mr. Quandel has remained a cornerstone of our community. Mr. Quandel has overseen significant Quandel projects throughout our community including Geisinger’s Medical Sciences Building and the new Geisinger St. Luke’s facility in Orwigsburg.

Mr. Quandel has consistently demonstrated his commitment to being a good friend, businessman and neighbor. From producing “quicklime” for local building projects, Quandel later added consulting services and instituted an Employee Stock Ownership Program that gave all its employees a vested interest in the company’s success.

On behalf of the U.S. House of Representatives and the citizens of Pennsylvania’s Ninth Congressional District, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Noble “Bud” Quandel on this great honor and thank him for his commitment to the betterment of our community.

CELEBRATING AULTMAN HOSPITAL AND CANTON CITY PUBLIC HEALTH BEING HONORED WITH THE AHA DICK DAVIDSON NOVA AWARD

HON. ANTHONY GONZALEZ

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 18, 2019

Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Aultman Hospital and Canton City Public Health in Canton, Ohio—winners of the 2019 American Hospitals Association Dick Davidson NOVA Award for their joint efforts to create the Stark County Toward Health Resiliency for Infant Vitality and Equity (THRIVE) program.

THRIVE promotes women’s health before, during and after pregnancy. After conducting a fetal infant-mortality review, the collaborating stakeholders selected interventions that would have the greatest possible impact on overall infant mortality and the disparity between white and black infant mortality rates. THRIVE’s goals include raising awareness of the value of prenatal care, linking women to prenatal services, addressing barriers to prenatal care and meeting socio-economic needs. THRIVE also focuses on safe sleep education, policies and resources to stop the problem of

infants dying at home because of unsafe sleeping conditions.

While local hospitals provided the initial collaborative funding, additional funding was provided by the Ohio Department of Medicaid and the March of Dimes. THRIVE’s strength is also due to other collaborative partners such as local school districts, community health providers and faith-based groups. It is THRIVE’s stated goal that every baby born in Stark County has the opportunity to reach his or her First Birthday. I can think of no more noble goal.

I applaud Aultman Hospital and Canton City Public Health for their leadership in developing THRIVE to address the pressing public health concern of infant mortality in Stark County. It is my earnest hope your efforts become the model for addressing Ohio’s Infant Mortality Rates as well. I think we all look to the day when every child born in the great State of Ohio can reach their First Birthday.

Congratulations on earning the 2019 American Hospitals Association Dick Davidson NOVA Award.

CELEBRATING THE RETIREMENT OF COMMAND SGT. MAJ. WAYNE T. BREWSTER

HON. JOHN SHIMKUS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 18, 2019

Mr. SHIMKUS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Command Sergeant Major Wayne T. Brewster, on his retirement from the United States Army Reserve, after more than 34 years of faithful service to our nation.

Command Sergeant Major Brewster was born in Odin, IL and graduated from Sterling High School in Sterling, IL in 1983. In 1985, Command Sergeant Major Brewster completed Basic Combat Training and Advanced Individual Training as an Infantry Soldier at Fort Benning, GA. During his 34 years of service, Command Sergeant Major Brewster would serve with gallantry at every command level, finishing his service as the Command Sergeant Major for Army Reserve Medical Command in Pinellas Park, FL. In his civilian capacity, Command Sergeant Major Brewster is a Firefighter and Engineer for Poudre Fire Authority and has been in the fire service since 1993.

Madam Speaker, I thank Command Sergeant Major Brewster for his 34 years of dedicated service, and wish him well as he starts this next chapter in his life.

IN HONOR OF THE MEMORY OF JANIE MARIE JONES

HON. DEBBIE DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 18, 2019

Mrs. DINGELL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor the esteemed life of Janie Marie Jones. Ms. Jones passed away on September 29, 2019 which greatly saddened our entire community. Her remarkable service to the Washtenaw County community is worthy of commendation.

Born in 1934, Ms. Jones grew up in Louisiana and Texas. After marrying, she moved to Detroit, Michigan with her two children. Ms. Jones was a devoted mother, selflessly putting the needs of her children before her own, and even delayed pursuing her own education until they were sufficiently grown. At the age of 35, Ms. Jones received her high school diploma from Robichaud High School and continued her education at Concordia College. She earned her Baccalaureate degree in 1989, and later took classes toward a master’s degree in education in the years before her illness.

Ms. Jones quickly became a fixture of the Washtenaw County Community. Upon receiving her degree, she shared her enthusiasm for education with our community’s children by working as a substitute teacher and volunteer for Head Start in Ypsilanti. Furthermore, Ms. Jones was recognized as a dedicated advocate for our community’s veterans. She worked as a respiratory therapist at the Ann Arbor Veterans Administration Medical Center and also served veterans in a volunteer capacity, where she helped them navigate the complex federal system and connect with the services and resources they needed.

In addition to her work in healthcare, Ms. Jones was selected to join the Washtenaw County Sheriff’s Department in 1965 and was a trailblazer in this field. Ms. Jones was the first black woman deputy in the department’s history, breaking the glass ceiling for other women in our community. Furthermore, she served on the Workforce Development Board, the Citizens Council to the Juvenile Court, and the Superior Township Planning Commission and Board of Review. Ms. Jones dedicated her life working for causes she believed in, and her efforts truly affected change throughout her community.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the legacy of Janie Marie Jones. We will forever remember her remarkable life, devotion, and service. She will be dearly missed. May she rest in eternal peace.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF DR. JAMES STADLER

HON. MICHAEL F. Q. SAN NICOLAS

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 18, 2019

Mr. SAN NICOLAS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of a good man, Dr. James Stadler. Dr. Stadler is the beloved son of Edward Stadler, Sr. and Wanda Stadler. He was a longtime resident of Guam, a faithful servant, a husband, father, grandfather, and a beloved pediatrician in our community on Guam.

Dr. James Stadler was born and raised in Mt. Clemens, Michigan, and graduated from St. Mary High School in 1967. From there, he went on to pursue his undergraduate studies at Michigan State University. He then graduated with honors from the University of Michigan Medical School, Ann Arbor, in 1974 and completed his internship and residency in Pediatrics touching the hearts of many children at the Children’s Hospital of Los Angeles in 1977.

In that same year, our island was blessed with a man who dedicated his life to the service of others, particularly our children, as he

was called to Guam on an 18-month contract with FHP. He brought his loving wife and 11-month old son at the time, Jeffrey. His courage and curiosity gave our island a graceful and beloved gift—and that was Dr. James Stadler, who eventually decided to make Guam home.

Dr. Stadler worked with FHP Clinic for 42 years, but also wore many other hats in our community. He was the Chairman of Pediatrics at the Guam Memorial Hospital, and in this role, he was instrumental to the opening of the first Pediatric and Neonatal Intensive Care Units. He also served as the GMH Medical Director from 2005 to 2010, held multiple volunteer teaching jobs such as ACLS and BLS instructor for GMH, directed and in-charge of Medical Symposiums held in Guam, and was the President of the Guam Medical Society when he was barely 30 years old. This man was a pioneer in Guam's medical community.

But all these hats he wore do not even begin to define the real character behind Dr. James Stadler—an honorable man of his word, an angel for children, and someone to truly count on. He is survived by his wife Virgie, his children Jeffrey, Joseph, James, Jennifer, and Jonathan, and his granddaughter, Olivia. His mark will forever be imprinted on the hearts of all of us, and I join the people of Guam in honoring the memory of Dr. James Stadler and commemorating his many contributions to our island. I extend my sincere condolences to the entire Stadler family. His legacy will inspire us now and forever.

HONORING THE PUBLIC SERVICE
OF MR. TERRY McDONALD

HON. JIM BANKS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 18, 2019

Mr. BANKS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. Terry McDonald for his two decades of service as Mayor of New Haven, Indiana. Since his election in 1999, Terry has worked diligently to usher in a new era of prosperity for the second-largest city in Allen County.

Under Terry's leadership, New Haven has seen increases in commercial and industrial activity and heralded improvements in its public schools and infrastructure. He has brought the city to a new level of prominence within our great state and made his constituents proud.

Above all, Terry has always seen his position not as a job, but as a service and a duty. As he does in his role as a minister, Terry seeks to use his God-given talents to assist those who need it the most. His first priority has always been assisting those around him. Officials at all levels of government can learn a great deal from the honesty and integrity of men like Mayor Terry McDonald.

As Terry's time in public office draws to a close, I wish him and his family nothing but the very best as he continues his life of service.

CELEBRATING BREMOND'S 150TH
ANNIVERSARY

HON. BILL FLORES

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 18, 2019

Mr. FLORES. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the one-hundred-and-fiftieth anniversary of the City of Bremond, Texas.

It is an honor to represent Bremond and its residents in the U.S. House of Representatives.

Bremond has supported thousands of families and businesses throughout the years, and I am proud to offer my congratulations on their sesquicentennial milestone.

Located in Robertson County, Bremond was established along the Houston and Texas Central Railway, which was built through the area in 1869.

The city is named in honor of Paul Bremond, an entrepreneur and founder of the Houston, East and West Texas Railway.

The first train pulled into Bremond on June 15, 1870, with over 1,000 well-wishers present for the occasion.

In the late 1800's and early 1900's Bremond was thriving; it was a major cotton center, with a number of gins running continually.

The city has stood the test of time and been resilient; providing generations of families a great quality of life.

In recent years, Bremond High School has been a Texas football powerhouse. They won three consecutive 2A State Championships—2014, 2015 and 2016.

The citizens of Bremond are a hardy people, and the pride of the city and its residents has never been greater.

Madam Speaker, please join me in commemorating the City of Bremond and its proud residents for their one-hundred-and-fiftieth anniversary.

In recognition of this occasion, I am pleased to fly a United States flag over the United States Capitol to honor Bremond's sesquicentennial anniversary.

As I close, I urge all Americans to continue praying for our country during these difficult times, for our military men and women who protect us from external threats, and for our first responders who protect us here at home.

HONORING STEUBEN RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE, INC. FOR ITS SEVENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY

HON. TOM REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 18, 2019

Mr. REED. Madam Speaker, today I rise to recognize Steuben Rural Electric Cooperative, Inc. for its seventy-fifth anniversary.

The Steuben Electric Association, Inc., was formed in July 1941 under the Transportation Corporations Law and was later converted to an electric distribution cooperative in 1942. At that time, the cooperative had five hundred and three miles of line and one thousand three hundred members. Two years later, its first electric line was energized.

Cooperatives such as Steuben Rural Electric made it possible for rural areas to have

access to electric during the 1930s in areas that would not have otherwise had this service. Without these ingenious organizations, our rural areas would not be what they are today—we owe a debt of gratitude to the rural electric movement that allowed our farmers to use lights instead of lanterns and brought much needed power to the people of these rural communities.

In 1969, the Steuben Rural Electric Cooperative, Inc. and the Chautauqua-Cattaraugus Electric Cooperative, Inc. began discussing the possibility of a merger. That merger came to completion in 1970 and made the Steuben Rural Electric Cooperative the largest of four New York cooperatives.

However, these services are still needed, from Steuben County to Cattaraugus County and beyond. Currently, the cooperative has grown to include one thousand one hundred miles of line, serving six thousand three hundred homes, farms and small businesses. With such a rich legacy and a bright future, I know we will see many more great things from Steuben Rural Electric Cooperative.

Given the above, I ask that this Legislative Body pause in its deliberations and join me to recognize Steuben Rural Electric Cooperative, Inc. for their seventy-fifth anniversary.

IN RECOGNITION OF JAMES (JIM)
HOECKER FOR HIS EXEMPLARY
CAREER IN ENERGY LAW AND
POLICY

HON. DEBBIE DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 18, 2019

Mrs. DINGELL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Jim Hoecker, someone who has been the voice of the electric transmission industry and a dedicated public servant at the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. Mr. Hoecker has announced his retirement from his current role as Executive Director and Counsel to the WIRES coalition at the end of this year. His distinguished career is worthy of commendation.

Mr. Hoecker is a widely-recognized expert in the field of electric transmission. His invaluable insight has helped advance the interests of the electric grid among policymakers, industry leaders, and others who share WIRES' belief in the need to invest in the nation's transmission network.

Prior to working with WIRES, Mr. Hoecker held several positions at FERC, serving as legal counsel, commissioner, and ultimately as chairman from 1997 to 2001. Among his achievements at FERC were the developments of electric transmission and natural gas pipeline open access and the creation of regional transmission organizations. After his career at FERC, Hoecker founded Hoecker Energy Law & Policy PLLC and joined Husch Blackwell LLP, where he will remain active in his law and consultancy practice. Hoecker holds a J.D. from the University of Wisconsin Law School and a Ph.D from the University of Kentucky.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Jim Hoecker and his exemplary career. Taking the steps to ensure that our country has a robust electrical transmission grid is no small task, and Mr. Hoecker

has more than risen to the challenge. We thank him for his tireless advocacy on behalf of the electric transmission grid with WIRES and at FERC.

TRIBUTE TO ARMENIANS OF COLORADO, INC. ON ITS 40TH BIRTHDAY

HON. JASON CROW

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 18, 2019

Mr. CROW. Madam Speaker, I would like to pay tribute to Colorado's oldest and largest Armenian American organization—Armenians of Colorado, Inc. (AOC)—for their four decades of community building.

Established in 1979 by several families, Armenians of Colorado (AOC) is a nonprofit organization that has grown to serve the Front Range's vibrant Armenian American community. From teaching the Armenian language and cultural traditions to raising awareness about Armenian history, AOC has been the pillar of the Centennial State's rapidly growing, vibrant Armenian community. Its purpose is to foster a cohesive Armenian community and to further the understanding of Armenian history, culture, language, and customs within the community and to the general public.

AOC's landmark achievement, the Colorado State Capitol Armenian Memorial Garden, was established in 1982 with the planting of a blue spruce and installation of a memorial plaque in commemoration of the 1.5 million victims of the Armenian Genocide. In 2015, on the centennial anniversary of the commencement of the Armenian Genocide, AOC renovated the Colorado State Capitol Armenian Memorial Garden and installed a replica of a medieval

Armenian khachkar (cross-stone) in memory of the victims of all crimes against humanity and in tribute to Coloradans who participated in the Near East Relief's philanthropic efforts to rescue and raise 132,000 orphans of the Armenian Genocide. This khachkar memorial is a recreation of one of the 3,000 Djulfa cross-stones destroyed during the Nagorno-Karabakh War.

Because the fact is, while the Armenian genocide occurred generations ago and an ocean away, we still feel its pain. We have seen how easily the same motives that allowed the Armenian genocide to occur still happen to today. As we have learned, all too often an assault on any ethnic group or religion is an assault on all of us.

AOC has also been instrumental in partnering with the Armenian National Committee of America to establish the Sardarapat Armenian Memorial Highway in my District in 2018 to mark the centennial anniversary of the establishment of the Armenian Republic and to celebrate Armenian Genocide survivors' determination to save their nation from total extinction.

On its 40th birthday, I wish AOC many more successes in its commendable mission of serving the educational and cultural needs of Colorado's vibrant Armenian American community.

IN HONOR OF ERIN TIDERMAN-GROSS AND DEIRDRE ABRAMS

HON. RUSS FULCHER

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 18, 2019

Mr. FULCHER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor two wonderful teachers from

Idaho: Mrs. Erin Tiderman-Gross of Meridian, Idaho, and Mrs. Deirdre Abrams of Donnelly, Idaho who have been awarded the Presidential Award for Excellence in Mathematics and Science Teaching. This award is the highest honor bestowed by the United States government for teachers in science, technology, engineering, mathematics, and computer studies. I am proud today to recognize the hard work of Mrs. Abrams and Mrs. Tiderman-Gross and their dedication, commitment, and passion for our students' success in the sciences.

At Rocky Mountain High School in Meridian, Idaho—my hometown—Mrs. Tiderman-Gross teaches advanced placement biology and has acted as a mentor to hundreds of students in the National Honor Society. Mrs. Tiderman-Gross is an adviser in one of the largest, most-active National Honor Society Chapters in Idaho. She has impacted countless families, students, and community members through her work, and after 24 years, continues to share her passion for biology with her students.

At Donnelly Elementary School, Mrs. Abrams has taken the world to her students through place-based learning. Mrs. Abrams has given her students hands-on educational trips to study rainbow trout populations, pollinator gardens, and cattle data to improve water quality. Her students even share their water quality data with local government agencies. Mrs. Abrams has been an educator for 23 years and continues to be a shining example of innovative teaching in the sciences.

I thank Mrs. Erin Tiderman-Gross and Mrs. Deirdre Adams for their passion and commitment to their students. This honor bestowed upon them is a testament to their dedication and I am so proud of their representation of the great State of Idaho.

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

The Senate was not in session and stands adjourned until 3 p.m., on Monday, October 21, 2019.

Committee Meetings

No committee meetings were held.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 34 public bills, H.R. 4733–4766; and 7 resolutions, H. Res. 639–645 were introduced. **Pages H8257–59**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H8260–61**

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

H.R. 2819, to extend the authority for the establishment of a commemorative work in honor of Gold Star Families, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 116–243); and

H.R. 1568, to assist in the conservation of the North Atlantic right whale by supporting and providing financial resources for North Atlantic right whale conservation programs and projects of persons with expertise required for the conservation of North Atlantic right whales, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 116–244, Part 1).

Page H8257

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein she appointed Representative Neguse to act as Speaker pro tempore for today.

Page H8231

Outsourcing Accountability Act of 2019: The House passed H.R. 3624, to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to require the disclosure of the total number of domestic and foreign employees of certain public companies, by a yea-and-nay vote of 226 yeas to 184 nays, Roll No. 567.

Pages H8233–42

Pursuant to the Rule, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in

the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Financial Services now printed in the bill.

Pages H8237–38

Rejected:

Huizenga amendment (No. 1 printed in part C of H. Rept. 116–237) that sought to exempt issuers from making these disclosures if they are required to make a CEO pay ratio disclosure or disclosures relating to conflict minerals (by a recorded vote of 184 ayes to 229 noes, Roll No. 565); and

Pages H8238–39, H8240–41

Hill (AR) amendment (No. 2 printed in part C of H. Rept. 116–237) that sought to require disclosure of the information under the bill only if that information is material information for investors (by a recorded vote of 187 ayes to 224 noes, Roll No. 566).

Pages H8239–40, H8241–42

H. Res. 629, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 1815) and (H.R. 3624) was agreed to Wednesday, October 16th.

Meeting Hour: Agreed by unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12 noon on Monday, October 21st for Morning Hour debate.

Page H8251

Quorum Calls—Votes: One yea-and-nay vote and two recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H8240–41, H8241–42 and H8242–43. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 9 a.m. and adjourned at 1:24 p.m.

Committee Meetings

AI AND THE EVOLUTION OF CLOUD COMPUTING: EVALUATION HOW FINANCIAL DATA IS STORED, PROTECTED, AND MAINTAINED BY CLOUD PROVIDERS

Committee on Financial Services: Task Force on Artificial Intelligence held a hearing entitled “AI and the Evolution of Cloud Computing: Evaluation How Financial Data is Stored, Protected, and Maintained by Cloud Providers”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

ONLINE PLATFORMS AND MARKET POWER, PART 3: THE ROLE OF DATA AND PRIVACY IN COMPETITION

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Anti-trust, Commercial, and Administrative Law held a hearing entitled “Online Platforms and Market Power, Part 3: The Role of Data and Privacy in

Competition”. Testimony was heard from Rohit Chopra, Commissioner, Federal Trade Commission; and public witnesses.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR MONDAY, OCTOBER 21, 2019

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

No meetings/hearings scheduled.

House

Committee on Rules, Full Committee, hearing on H.R. 2513, the “Corporate Transparency Act of 2019”, 5 p.m., H-313 Capitol.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

3 p.m., Monday, October 21

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

12 noon, Monday, October 21

Senate Chamber

Program for Monday: Senate will resume consideration of the protocol to the North Atlantic Treaty of 1949 on the Accession of the Republic of North Macedonia (Treaty Doc. 116–1), and vote on the motion to invoke cloture thereon at 5:30 p.m.

House Chamber

Program for Monday: To be announced.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Aderholt, Robert B., Ala., E1308
 Balderson, Troy, Ohio, E1303
 Banks, Jim, Ind., E1310
 Brooks, Mo, Ala., E1304
 Bucshon, Larry, Ind., E1306
 Cole, Tom, Okla., E1307
 Crow, Jason, Col., E1311
 Davis, Danny K., Ill., E1305
 DeLauro, Rosa L., Conn., E1306

Dingell, Debbie, Mich., E1304, E1306, E1307, E1308,
 E1309, E1310
 Flores, Bill, Tex., E1310
 Fulcher, Russ, Idaho, E1311
 Gonzalez, Anthony, Ohio, E1309
 Green, Mark E., Tenn., E1304, E1305, E1307
 Johnson, Henry C. "Hank", Jr., Ga., E1306
 Lipinski, Daniel, Ill., E1303
 Lowey, Nita M., N.Y., E1306, E1307
 Meuser, Daniel, Pa., E1307, E1309
 Pallone, Frank, Jr., N.J., E1304

Posey, Bill, Fla., E1303
 Reed, Tom, N.Y., E1308, E1310
 Ruiz, Raul, Calif., E1306
 Sablan, Gregorio Kilili Camacho, Northern Mariana
 Islands, E1303, E1304
 San Nicolas, Michael F.Q., Guam, E1309
 Shalala, Donna E., Fla., E1308
 Shimkus, John, Ill., E1309
 Torres Small, Xochitl, N.M., E1305



Congressional Record

printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Publishing Office, at www.govinfo.gov, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Publishing Office. Phone 202-512-1800, or 866-512-1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, contactcenter@gpo.gov. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197-9000, or phone orders to 866-512-1800 (toll-free), 202-512-1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202-512-2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Publishing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.