



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 165

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 20, 2019

No. 186

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
November 20, 2019.

I hereby appoint the Honorable HENRY CUELLAR to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

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

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

PAST TIME TO PASS USMCA

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

Mr. GIANFORTE. Mr. Speaker, it is time. Actually, it is past time. It is past time for Congress to pass the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement.

Today, I am pleased to join with my colleague and friend, Senator STEVE DAINES, to draw attention to the USMCA's importance to Montana.

President Trump and his trade negotiators have done a great job negoti-

ating this trade deal. USMCA will secure open access to markets in Mexico and Canada, markets critical to Montana farmers, ranchers, manufacturers, and businesses.

USMCA will bring over \$68 billion in new economic growth. USMCA will create 176,000 new American jobs. USMCA helps family farmers and ranchers, which is why 1,000 ag groups from across the country have endorsed it. USMCA increases agricultural exports by \$2 billion a year. USMCA supports American workers.

Speaker, USMCA is a win for Montana and America. But here we are, 355 days, almost a full year, since President Trump signed USMCA, and the deal has gone nowhere in the House.

So, what is the holdup? The Speaker has stalled since the deal was announced. She objected to it. Those objections were addressed, yet here we are.

The Speaker says she is on a path to yes on USMCA. A path to yes, however, isn't a yes. Farmers, ranchers, manufacturers, and business owners deserve certainty, not just a path to yes and more delays.

Unfortunately, just yesterday, Politico reported USMCA faces another delay because of House leadership—another delay. The House has 13 days left this year, 13 days to get this deal done. It is up to Congress to act.

Speaker, the needless delays must end. The Trump administration has done its job and negotiated an agreement that works for Montana and our country. It is time for Congress to do its job.

I urge House leaders to give farmers, ranchers, manufacturers, and business owners the certainty they need. I urge House leaders to move forward with USMCA to create jobs, increase paychecks, and grow our economy.

Let's consider USMCA. Let's vote on USMCA. Let's ratify USMCA.

WE MUST GET USMCA RIGHT

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

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about the United States-Mexico-Canada trade agreement and the need for commonsense change to see that our trade policies with Mexico and Canada better reflect the current economic conditions and the changes that have occurred since the initial act was put together over 25 years ago.

The administration's trade policies, though, currently with these tariff wars, I believe, are not only hurting consumers, but they are hurting our farmers, ranchers, and dairymen and -women. Let's be clear about it: These are hidden taxes that consumers pay and that agriculture pays as well.

The United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement, I think, would address these concerns if we get it right.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Livestock and Foreign Agriculture, opening new trade opportunities for agriculture is one of my top priorities. My home State of California is the number one agricultural State in the Nation, and nearly half of our ag products are exported abroad, over \$20 billion a year.

I am a farmer, third generation. I understand the importance of our ability to trade and have a fair and level playing field.

Mexico and Canada combined is our largest destination for these products. Maintaining these markets is essential to ensure prosperity for our farmers and the viability of our ag economy.

We have had 25 years of a mostly successful trading relationship with Canada and Mexico since signing the North American Free Trade Agreement in 1994, but a lot has changed. It has also resulted in, let's be frank, a loss of jobs that has hurt American families here, and we need to address that. This is an opportunity to deal with the flaws that

□ 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.

H9061

have existed in NAFTA for over 25 years.

Since 2002, Canada has been the United States' top agricultural export market, and Mexico has either been second or third. In 2018, we exported \$143 billion worth of agricultural products to the two countries combined. The amount equaled over a quarter of total U.S. ag exports. That is significant.

The USMCA leaves in place, I think, the key wins for agriculture established under NAFTA. It updates key provisions pertaining to important issues like labor, technology, and the environment. It also provides some new access to Canada's protected dairy market, which I think is important.

The conversations between House Democrats and the administration to hammer out the remaining differences, I think, have been constructive. I disagree with some of the narratives that this has been a delay. We want to get it right. You must get good trade agreements right. Our negotiators are making good progress, including efforts to ensure that enforcement to the agreement is done.

But enforcement of labor standards continues to remain a concern. This is important. Labor in America doesn't want the same impacts that took place under NAFTA, so enforcement of the provisions is critical.

USMCA's labor chapter does reflect a strengthening of standards, including freedom of association and the right to organize in Mexico. We have had numerous delegations meet with our counterparts in Mexico. This spring, Mexico passed landmark labor legislation laying the legal framework for compliance with the United States-Mexico-Canada labor chapter. Now we must ensure that those labor standards are enforced. That is the critical area today.

House Democrats are working in good faith with the administration to put in place assurances that these standards are enforced over the long term.

The same goes for enforcement of environmental and biomedical standards. Commitments need to be made, and they have to be enforceable to make this a successful agreement.

If these issues are addressed, the USMCA would stabilize some trade policies that are otherwise unpredictable with this administration, including serious concerns that President Trump may, as he said, kill NAFTA and reject the deal if we don't pass this. We want to get it done ASAP for sure, but we need to make sure it is done right.

Sound trade policy should not be a partisan issue. I will continue to make sure that we can vote on USMCA as soon as possible. Once again, though, we have to have the assurances. I expect strong passage of an agreement if we can get those assurances, but there must be a way to address this so that we will get to "yes."

Then we can turn our attention to other trade matters. An agreement with China, obviously, is very important and in Europe with the European Union.

Let me say, finally, good trade agreements, I think, mean good-paying jobs. Let me repeat that. Good trade agreements mean good-paying jobs for all Americans. That is obviously what we want to do for our entire economy.

RECOGNIZING AMERICAN EDUCATION WEEK

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize American Education Week.

Every year, this week underscores the importance of access to quality education. It honors the teachers, instructors, and educational mentors who make a difference in the lives of our Nation's learners.

Working to ensure access to high-quality and affordable education for all students is of utmost importance. The American education system should be as diverse as our Nation's students, including learners of all ages, of all socioeconomic backgrounds, and from rural America, urban America, and everywhere in between. That includes students who choose to pursue a traditional 4-year college degree as well as those who choose to attend a trade school or an apprenticeship program.

As co-chair of the bipartisan Career and Technical Education Caucus, I have been pleased to introduce a number of career and technical education bills, alongside my fellow co-chair, Congressman JIM LANGEVIN, which aim to restore rungs on the ladder of opportunity for every American.

Most recently, that includes H.R. 5092, the Counseling for Career Choice Act. H.R. 5092 ensures students have access to quality counseling resources that can help them make more informed decisions about their educational futures and professional career choices. By better equipping these students with the skills to succeed, we are one step closer to closing our Nation's skills gap.

The skills gap is the result of a lack of qualified students in STEM disciplines like nursing, energy, information technology, cybersecurity, and more. Career and technical education is working to empower students by equipping them with employable skills.

To directly address the workforce shortage in cybersecurity, I was proud to cosponsor H.R. 1592, the Cybersecurity Skills Integration Act. This bill would create a pilot program through the Department of Education to award grants to create or expand existing postsecondary CTE programs in cybersecurity competencies.

Career and technical education has support outside of the Education and

Labor Committee as well. I also cosponsored H.R. 898, the Skills Investment Act of 2019. H.R. 898 enhances Coverdell Education Savings Accounts, which are tax-advantaged savings accounts for educational expenses. American workers can use the accounts to pay for skills-based learning, career training, and workforce development. In addition, both workers and employers receive tax credits for contributions to these accounts.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to addressing the shortage of our skilled workforce, we need to continue increasing educational access for students who are living with disabilities. The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act ensures nearly 7 million infants, toddlers, children, and youth with disabilities have access to quality education.

Unfortunately, Congress has fallen short on our commitment to these individuals, and support for students with disabilities has remained underfunded. That is why I was proud to support H.R. 1878, the IDEA Full Funding Act, which would mandate gradual increases in IDEA funding to reach the full funding as promised by Congress when IDEA was passed and to do that by fiscal year 2029.

Lastly, there are many bipartisan bills that support quality education for American learners. I have always believed that we produce the best results for students when we work across the aisle. However, the partisan College Affordability Act, which would reauthorize the Higher Education Act, actually contributes to crippling college costs and widens our Nation's skills gap.

It is my hope that we can offer real solutions like the High-Quality Opportunities in Postsecondary Education Act, or the HOPE Act, which provides institutions with the tools they need to help students prepare for successful careers and successful lives.

This is American Education Week. Let's remember that students deserve better than a one-size-fits-all educational plan.

PASS USMCA BEFORE YEAR-END

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

Mr. ROUDA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of resolving the outstanding issues needed to pass the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement, or USMCA, before the end of the year.

More than 12 million American jobs, including 1.8 million jobs in California, depend on trade with Canada and Mexico. We simply cannot afford to keep the current rules in place if we are to secure our economic future and create better paying American jobs.

□ 1015

Addressing contentious issues in a trade deal are always difficult, but I am optimistic that we can come to a productive resolution if the administration continues to engage with House Democrats in good faith.

USMCA represents an opportunity to fix fundamental flaws in our trade policy, reverse the failings of NAFTA, establish strong, enforceable labor standards across North America, and promote growth in new sectors of each of our economies. Let's get it right this time.

I thank Speaker PELOSI, Chairman NEAL, and House Democratic leadership for their commitment to working families and for ensuring USMCA reflects our core values, and I ask for a vote on USMCA as soon as possible.

RECOGNIZING THE SERVICE OF MS. JENNIFER T. GRAHAM

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Ms. Jennifer T. Graham for being honored by the Zonta Club of Savannah for her work helping single mothers throughout the Savannah area.

Ms. Graham galvanized a citywide effort that has significantly aided hundreds of mothers in our community. She founded Shelter From the Rain, which assists low-income mothers by providing food, job search assistance, baby supplies, mentorship, and more. Since Ms. Graham founded the organization in 2010, Shelter From the Rain has helped over 300 single mothers.

Her background in marketing and outreach, which includes earning a graduate degree in marketing and doing communications for a number of local healthcare companies has helped her maximize the number of mothers her organization reaches.

Thank you, Ms. Graham, for your work making our community a better place to live, and thank you to the Zonta Club for recognizing the important work she is doing. Keep up the great work.

NATIONAL HEALTHY SKIN MONTH

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the month of November as National Healthy Skin Month.

Your skin is your body's largest organ, so it is critical to take care of it. Unfortunately, skin cancer affects around 20 percent of the population.

This month, I encourage everyone to think about ways to keep your skin healthy during your daily activities. For example, wearing sunscreen, moisturizing, washing your face, and protecting against blisters are all measures one can take to stay healthy.

Additionally, I hope everyone will consider visiting a dermatologist this month for a skin evaluation.

Thank you to the American Academy of Dermatology as well as dermatologists around the country for your work to protect this vital part of our health.

RECOGNIZING THE SERVICE OF MS. MEG HEAP

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Ms. Meg Heap, who was recently honored by the

Zonta Club of Savannah for her work to reduce domestic violence against women.

Serving as the district attorney for the Savannah area since 2013, she has spearheaded a number of programs in coastal Georgia to create greater equality for women. She created an early notification prosecutor position for domestic violence and an early notification process for the Victim Witness Program. Additionally, she created a one-stop Chatham County Family Justice Center.

In 2019, the District Attorney Association of Georgia selected her as the District Attorney of the Year.

From Savannah originally, Ms. Heap can be an inspiration to all of us about giving back to your community.

Thank you, Ms. Heap, for all of your work to make Savannah a better place to live, and thank you to the Zonta Club of Savannah for recognizing her achievements.

HAPPY 95TH BIRTHDAY TO MR. HOWARD YOUNG

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. Howard Young, who turns 95 years young on November 25. He has lived in the Savannah area for over 30 years, and, during this time, he has spent countless hours helping others around the community.

After retiring in his 50s, he began to spend each day with a different organization volunteering. On Mondays he works with the Veterans Administration Clinic, on Tuesdays he works with senior citizens.

And the list doesn't stop at Friday. A World War II Navy veteran, he works with veterans to help them get medical benefits on Saturdays and serves at the Isle of Hope Methodist Church on Sundays.

I am proud to have a constituent like Mr. Young in the First Congressional District of Georgia. It is easy to be inspired by his work making the world a better place to live.

As he says: "Each passing day is gone forever, so I want to spend as much of each day as possible helping someone who can't help himself."

Happy birthday, Mr. Young.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF COACH MARVIN KEELAN

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

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, today I rise with a heavy heart to acknowledge the life and legacy of Coach Marvin Keelen. Coach Keelen coached at Gorette Playground in New Orleans, Louisiana.

I met Coach Marvin probably when I was about 13 years old; and he started me out as a bookkeeper at the playground keeping score. Then I went on to be an umpire; then I went on to be a coach.

Coach Marvin passed away this weekend, but over his 34 years of coaching

at Gorette Playground, he has touched the lives of so many young men. We have a Capitol Police officer here that Coach Marvin coached. We have myself and countless others that his direction, his mentorship provided a real pathway for a lot of our young men.

The other thing I would say about Coach Marvin is his family followed in his footsteps. Just two weekends ago, his younger son, Nick, won his first city championship. His other son, Marvin, won a couple of city championships, and Coach Marvin won about seven.

But it wasn't just about competing. It was taking our young kids and making sure that they understood their potential to be whatever they wanted to be, that they could be champions if they wanted to be, that they could actually be U.S. Congressmen.

So I just want to extend my condolences to his wife Jennifer Keelen; his daughter Nikki; his son, Nick; and his other son, Marvin, to let them know that their father has heard those words: "Well done, my good and faithful servant."

CELEBRATING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF JUDGE ANGELIQUE "ANGIE" REED

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, I rise to celebrate the life and legacy of Judge Angelique "Angie" Reed, who passed in the city of New Orleans.

Judge Reed was the quintessential judge. She was fair, but she was firm. She expected the best out of lawyers in front of her, and she demanded nothing less.

She was a proud member of Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority, Incorporated, and, in honor of her, I am wearing my pink tie today. She was also a faithful member of Jack and Jill, that provides mentorship to children and communities all across the country, and she was a faithful member of the New Orleans Chapter of The Links.

Let me just say that her membership in all of these organizations really highlighted her love for New Orleans.

On the national level, she was a member of the Judicial Council of the National Bar Association, even co-chairing the event in New Orleans.

I first met Judge Angie Reed when she was just a young lawyer in the City Attorney's Office and I was a law clerk trying to find my way around. She took me under her wing and taught me life lessons that I would never forget about the practice of law: that it was not about trying to make money; it was not about you, but it was about your client; it was about making a difference; it was about righting a wrong.

Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., in his speech, "Give Us the Ballot," proclaimed that, if you give us the ballot in the South, we will elect judges and put judges on the bench that will love mercy and do justice. Judge Angelique Reed did just that, and she did it better than anyone else.

She leaves behind her daughter, Giana Warren.

And I would just say that the New Orleans community is better off because Angie Reed passed our way, and she will be sorely missed.

She also will hear those words: "Judge Reed, well done, my good and faithful servant."

SUPPORT THE K-9 HERO ACT

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

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to have introduced the K-9 Hero Act last week.

Military and law enforcement K-9s work in tandem with the brave men and women who serve our great Nation. Once these heroes retire from service, the medical treatment they need is often significant enough to create a financial hardship for the individuals who care for them.

The K-9 Hero Act creates a grant program to assist nonprofits that take in retired working dogs or provide financial assistance to the owners of retired working dogs. These grants will cover medical costs, such as veterinarian visits, medical procedures, diagnostic tests, and medications, which tend to average around \$3,000 per year per dog.

As most know, just a few weeks ago, a K-9 played a crucial role in the capture and ultimate killing of ISIS leader Abu Bakr al-Baghdadi. This K-9 took off, racing down an underground tunnel before cornering Baghdadi, leaving him nowhere to run. It is stories like these that inspired me to introduce the K-9 Hero Act.

These dogs assist our Federal Government in ways that no man or machine could, and it is unacceptable to me for them to live with inadequate medical care—or even be euthanized, in some cases—after sacrificing so much for our country.

This bill helps ensure these heroes are well taken care of during retirement and that their need for medical care never prevents them from finding a loving forever home. My K-9-loving colleagues on both sides of the aisle, I believe, should support this legislation.

STOP THE PRACTICE OF TELEABORTION

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my outrage over the practice of teleabortion. This practice, which gets its name from practitioners conducting abortions over the phone or computer, occurs when chemical abortions are induced with no healthcare provider present.

This practice sounds simple, except the woman taking the drugs isn't in a medical facility, no certified medical personnel are present, and if the drugs don't work as planned and the baby is not stillborn, it may still end up in a dumpster and the mother may end up in an emergency room.

The obvious danger is why I filed H.R. 4935, the Teleabortion Prevention Act. This legislation protects women's health by making it a Federal offense for healthcare providers to perform a

chemical abortion without first physically examining the patient, being present during the chemical abortion, and scheduling a follow-up visit for the patient.

Chemical abortions are induced using a two-step abortion pill regimen that can be taken up until the ninth week of pregnancy. Given the serious risks, the FDA has put regulations in place, but pro-abortion groups are looking for ways to get around the law.

If these FDA regulations are ever lifted, chemical abortion drugs could become available by prescription, enabling a single healthcare provider to mail chemical abortion pills to women and young girls across the country, regardless of State pro-life protections and whether they have seen a doctor and had an ultrasound performed. This legislation ensures these much-needed FDA regulations will not be lifted.

No doctor should feel comfortable prescribing a life-ending pharmaceutical drug without physically being there to administer it to the patient.

If the woman's health argument is really more than subterfuge that puts dressing on a tragedy, I urge my colleagues to join me in passing H.R. 4935, the Teleabortion Prevention Act.

NATIONAL MEDAL OF HONOR MONUMENT ACT

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise because yesterday I had the privilege of introducing the National Medal of Honor Monument Act, with my fellow Texan, Congressman MARC VEASEY.

Over the course of our history, over 3,500 United States servicemen and -women have been honored with our Nation's highest military decoration, the Medal of Honor.

The Medal of Honor is awarded to U.S. servicemembers who have distinguished themselves with extraordinary acts of valor. These men and women I am referring to went above and beyond the call of duty on the battlefield in order to preserve our families and way of life.

This legislation ensures that their contribution and patriotism are never forgotten. These heroic individuals deserve to be memorialized with a monument in our Nation's Capitol, among the other great Americans that have helped shape our Nation.

In Texas, we celebrate patriotism, American ideals, and our Nation's heroes. Earlier this fall, the National Medal of Honor Museum Foundation chose my hometown of Arlington, Texas, as the location for the new National Medal of Honor Museum. This legislation makes it official.

Congratulations to Mayor Williams and the rest of Arlington's leadership for bringing it to the 6.8 million Dallas-Ft. Worth residents and the over 14 million visitors Arlington welcomes each year and, most importantly, the 1.8 million veterans and Active-Duty military that call Texas home.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair

declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 29 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DESAULNIER) at noon.

PRAYER

Rabbi Steven Abraham, Beth El Synagogue, Omaha, Nebraska, offered the following prayer:

Our God and God of our ancestors, we stand before You in this sacred Hall to ask for Your blessings upon the Members of this House, the leaders of our country, and the citizens of this great Nation.

May You bless our leaders with the wisdom to follow Your teachings; to speak up for those who cannot speak for themselves; to protect the widow, the orphan, and the stranger.

May You bless our leaders with compassion to open both their hearts and their minds to places and ideas where they are currently closed.

May You bless our leaders with the courage to do what is hard, to do what is unpopular, but to do what is right.

Sovereign of the universe, continue to protect the men and women of our Armed Forces; watch over our elected officials; and continue to grant peace, freedom, and prosperity to the United States.

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 gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GREEN) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

WELCOMING RABBI STEVEN ABRAHAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BACON) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to extend my appreciation for my friend, Rabbi Steven Abraham, and thank him for leading today's session

with the opening prayer. I would also like to welcome his family to this House that belongs to all Americans.

Rabbi Abraham has been the rabbi for Beth El Synagogue since 2013, after moving to Omaha to be the assistant rabbi in 2011. He graduated from rabbinical school at the Jewish Theological Seminary, where he also received a masters of arts in Jewish education. He is also an alumnus of the University of Baltimore.

Since I came to Congress in 2017, Rabbi Abraham has been a trusted friend and adviser for both my staff and me.

I call on all of us to heed the words offered in prayer by the rabbi. We must all humble ourselves to the wisdom of the Almighty, and let us always try to be a voice for the voiceless and serve with compassion and courage.

We face many challenges ahead, but with prayerfulness and good faith in one another, I know we can rise above the trials of today in search of a better tomorrow, all for the sake of our country.

Thank you again, Rabbi Abraham, for being a genuine leader and for being with us today.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WORLD PANCREATIC CANCER DAY

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

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, November 21 is recognized as World Pancreatic Cancer Day, a time to raise awareness and inspire action in the fight against this devastating diagnosis which touches too many families.

It is the third leading cause of cancer deaths in the United States, with a 5-year survival rate of just 9 percent. More than 1,000 new cases are diagnosed around the world every day, and it is estimated that pancreatic cancer will be responsible for 3,000 deaths in New York State this year alone.

The Pancreatic Cancer Action Network and its western New York affiliate have made it their goal to double pancreatic cancer survival. As co-chair of the House Cancer Caucus, I am proud to advocate for robust funding for cancer research to put goals like this within reach.

Recently, researchers at Roswell Park Comprehensive Cancer Center announced promising findings on treatments aimed at overcoming pancreatic cancer's resistance to treatment, but continued funding on projects like this is critical to saving lives.

The need to increase pancreatic cancer survival rates is urgent, and it must be America's goal.

AMERICA APPRECIATES FARMERS

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

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Madam Speaker, as we remember the first Thanksgiving when settlers broke bread with their Native American allies and shared fruits of their harvest, I rise today to thank our Nation's farmers.

As Thanksgiving approaches and we prepare to enjoy the holiday meal with our families, I would be remiss if I did not take time to thank the Americans whose labor allows us to put food on our tables.

Along with our military, our farmers are the hardest working, most skilled, and patriotic citizens in our country. They rise before dawn and work long after dusk to ensure our Nation can feed and clothe the world.

I urge this body to uphold its commitment to our farmers by passing the United States-Mexico-Canada trade agreement and ensure American agriculture remains the strongest and most competitive in the world.

I hope my colleagues will join me today in giving thanks to America's farmers during this Thanksgiving season.

NATIVE AMERICAN HERITAGE MONTH

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

Mr. SCHRADER. Madam Speaker, I rise to honor and recognize Native American Heritage Month.

Oregon currently has nine federally recognized Tribes, three of which I am proud to represent here in Congress: The Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde, the Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians, and the Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs. I work closely with these Tribal governments and with Tribal members, and I am proud to partner with them and support their work.

Oregon's Tribes do incredible work to protect precious natural resources, to save our salmon, to lift up Native youth, to keep our communities safe, and so much more.

I want to specifically thank Siletz Chairwoman Dee Pigsley, Grand Ronde Chairwoman Cheryle Kennedy, and Warm Springs Chairman Raymond Tsumpti for their leadership.

I also want to acknowledge that Grand Ronde, Siletz, and Warm Springs are confederations of Tribes that were terminated in 1954 in an insidious act that ended the government's recognition of Tribal sovereignty and dismissed the government's trust responsibility in western Oregon and across the country. Their restoration is only beginning.

Because of this, Congress must do more to ensure that we are honoring

our commitments to Tribes and taking seriously our trust responsibility.

VETERANS HISTORY PROJECT

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, I am grateful that our office is participating in the Veterans History Project. This project is an ongoing effort by the Library of Congress to collect and preserve personal accounts by American military veterans and families.

I have had the opportunity to meet with local veterans in Aiken and the Midlands to encourage participation. The narratives recorded through this project keep history alive for future generations.

Coordinating the project is Purple Heart recipient Jeffrey Crosby. Across America, citizens can participate at website.loc.gov/vets.

As a veteran, as the son of a Flying Tiger with service in India and China, and as the father of four sons who have served overseas in the Army National Guard and the Navy, I am thankful for the project.

Congratulations, President Donald Trump, with news today that his policies of creating jobs have led to South Carolina's lowest unemployment level in history at 2.6 percent—opportunities for all according to WVOC.

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

THE HOUSE IS CONTINUING THE WORK OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

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

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to highlight the great work of the House of Representatives. For the last 10 months in the 116th Congress, the House of Representatives has passed 18 healthcare bills, 5 gun safety bills, 81 education bills, 47 national security and defense bills, 45 environmental bills, 36 immigration bills, 40 infrastructure and transportation bills, and much more.

My point, Madam Speaker, is that we are continuing the work of the American people. We never lost sight of our promise and commitment to the people of this great country.

We are constantly fighting back the White House's attempt to take away healthcare from millions of Americans, and we are working to lower prescription drug costs.

We will continue supporting our military and ensure that they have all the resources that they need to keep Americans safe.

We will not allow this President to keep us from fulfilling our duty to make our economy stronger, our

schools safer, and to protect us from tyranny.

SAVING RURAL HOSPITALS

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

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, instead of this laser focus on impeachment, we should be doing the people's work and passing a bill to help many Americans across this country who live in rural areas. My bipartisan Rural Health Care Access Act, H.R. 2990, would do just that.

Between January 1, 2010, and March 19, 2019, 102 rural hospitals closed in America. We are facing a crisis for rural America. These closures are increasing almost every year.

While so many of our senior citizens must utilize Medicare, Medicare is not reimbursing all hospitals in rural areas at a sustainable rate. We need to designate all our rural hospitals as Critical Access Hospitals.

Currently, this designation does not apply to those hospitals in rural areas that are slightly less than 35 miles from another hospital. My bill would get rid of this distance requirement, while maintaining all other requirements. It would help stave off the rapid decline of healthcare and protect vital jobs in rural communities.

I urge the Speaker to give my bill a chance.

AFFORDABLE HOUSING FOR ALL

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

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Madam Speaker, pursuing the American Dream has become a daunting task for millions of Americans in need of a place they can call home. We must address affordable housing, as we are in the midst of an acute crisis, and it is sweeping across America.

From my district in Brooklyn, New York, to Portland, Oregon, families coast to coast are getting priced out of their communities and driven into poverty and homelessness. My newly introduced bill, the Affordable Housing and Area Median Income Fairness Act, will attack this crisis head-on.

My bill addresses the clearly flawed model that has been used to calculate area median incomes, which is the basis on which rental rates are set. This outdated model made it harder for our families to afford having a roof over their heads, meanwhile, lining the pockets of big developers.

The Federal Government cannot—must not—continue to be complicit in this travesty.

As cities grow and communities evolve, the ability to afford having a roof over one's head should not be relegated only to those whose incomes afford them luxury.

Madam Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to join me in this crusade for human dignity: affordable housing for all Americans, access to affordable housing.

FARMER OF THE YEAR STEVE KELLEY

(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, I would like to congratulate Mr. Steve Kelley of Carlisle County, Kentucky, for being named the 2019 Kentucky Farm Bureau Farmer of the Year.

It is with great pride that I can say this is the fourth year in a row that a farmer in Kentucky's First Congressional District has been recognized as Kentucky Farmer of the Year.

After receiving his bachelors and masters degrees in agriculture from Murray State University, Steve embarked on a decades-long career farming over 2,500 acres in Carlisle County. His solar farm, as well as his grain, livestock, and timber operations, sets Steve apart and highlights the ambitious future he sees for agriculture in the Commonwealth. He believes that it is his purpose to "leave his farmland in better condition than when he received it."

I am honored to congratulate the 2019 Kentucky Farmer of the Year, Mr. Steve Kelley, and his family on his unwavering work ethic, dedication to the Carlisle County Farm Bureau, and outstanding role in the agriculture community.

FOR THE PEOPLE

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

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Madam Speaker, don't let anybody tell you that all we do here in the House of Representatives is investigate the White House. We have passed 275-plus bipartisan bills for the good of the people.

For hardworking families, we have passed legislation to increase wages and protect pensions.

For American women, we have passed legislation to promote personal security and ensure equal pay for equal work.

For American communities, we have passed legislation to improve public safety by strengthening background checks.

And for our American veterans, we have passed legislation to improve transition assistance and access to mental healthcare.

Rather than govern, Senate Republicans have chosen to play politics. This Congress, they have refused to consider more than 275 House-passed bipartisan bills. Those are bills that have Republican support sitting on the desk of the Senate leader not being passed.

Madam Speaker, I remind Senate Republicans: Do your job. Let's govern wisely and get these bills passed.

□ 1215

RECOGNIZING NATIONAL ADOPTION MONTH

(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. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize November as National Adoption Month.

This month we celebrate the life-changing act of adoption that has touched the lives of so many in our country. American families nationwide open their homes and their hearts to children in search of a stable environment and a forever home.

Despite the many parents that adopt, there are still so many children in the foster care system in search of a place to call home. In 2018, almost half a million children and teenage youth were in U.S. foster care. As a country we must always strive to help the most vulnerable citizens among us. All children in America deserve a permanent family that can provide them with the love, support, and encouragement needed to reach their full potential in life.

During this important awareness month, we recognize the unconditional love adoptive parents provide to their children, and we hope that all children will soon be welcomed into a loving family.

RECOGNIZING HEATHER GLEN FIRE FIRST RESPONDERS

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

Ms. WILD. Mr. Speaker, at around 3 a.m. on Sunday, September 22, a fire broke out and punctured the calm of an assisted living facility in my community, Pennsylvania Seven, at Heather Glen Senior Living in Allentown, Pennsylvania.

Firefighters answered the call, rushing into the building as flames gained force and tore through the roof. With extraordinary skill, they got to work saving the 82 elderly residents as the fire raged, carrying these men and women on their shoulders out of windows on to ladders. They brought all of the residents, as well as the five staff members working that night, to safety swiftly, while containing and ultimately defeating the fire.

In total, 45 agencies across four counties participated in this operation, coming together as a single unit in complete dedication to the mission at hand. In their example we see the best of the Greater Lehigh Valley and of our Nation.

Today, I ask my colleagues from across our country to join me in recognizing and honoring the service, sacrifices, and everyday heroism of these first responders.

Mr. Speaker, before our Nation, I want to thank them for everything they have done. They are the pride of our community.

RECOGNIZING NATIVE AMERICAN HISTORY MONTH

(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, I rise today to recognize Native American History Month and the contributions of Native Americans in my congressional district in central Washington.

With 29 Federally recognized tribes across the State, Washingtonians live alongside Native Americans who serve our communities through entrepreneurship, military service, and sharing their rich and storied cultural history. They are our friends, family, neighbors, and coworkers.

While we recognize that one month out of the year to remember the historical and cultural contributions of our Native friends, we must support them as they face a crisis that has affected Native women for decades. That crisis is of missing and murdered indigenous women.

In Washington, Native Americans make up about 2 percent of the population, but indigenous women account for 7 percent of the State's reported missing women. This includes 31 open cases on or near the Yakama Nation Reservation.

During Native American History Month, I challenge this body to honor the heritage of our Native friends by taking up legislation that will help ensure that missing and murdered loved ones are not part of the history of another generation of Native women.

THANKING CONGRESSMAN HOYER

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

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, and still I rise.

I rise today for a very special purpose. I rise because this House on Monday passed H.R. 3702, the Reforming Disaster Recovery Act of 2019.

I rise today, because in thanking people on Tuesday, I neglected to thank one person who was extremely important in the passage of this legislation. The majority leader Mr. HOYER not only worked to help us bring the legislation to the floor, Mr. HOYER also improved the legislation. When it left our committee, it was a good bill. It had the unanimous consent of the committee.

Some things bear repeating. One hundred percent of the people on the Fi-

nancial Services Committee supported this legislation.

Mr. HOYER helped us by infusing it with some additional language that deals with resiliency that will help us to rebuild better and stronger after there has been a disaster.

Madam Speaker, I thank Mr. HOYER for his leadership. Especially he is thanked for making a good bill a much better bill.

HIGHLIGHTING THE 7-YEAR ANNIVERSARY OF THE DISAPPEARANCE OF KHALIL MAATOUK

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

Mr. BUDD. Madam Speaker, I rise today to highlight the 7-year anniversary of Christian human rights lawyer Khalil Maatouk's unconscionable disappearance at the hands of Syrian dictator Bashar al-Assad.

The regime abducted Maatouk because he had been relentlessly defending Syrian democratic activists. He was last seen on October 2 of 2012.

Khalil Maatouk's ordeal serves as a stark reminder of the Assad regime's barbaric assault on religious and Christian heritage, blatantly violating international humanitarian law. According to a September report from the Syrian Network for Human Rights, the regime is responsible for targeting 61 percent of churches throughout the country.

The United States demands the immediate release of Khalil Maatouk, and I urge the administration to prioritize this case. We must stand up for those who fight for freedom, especially freedom of religion.

RECOGNIZING THE TAINOS AND CARIBS DURING NATIVE AMERICAN HERITAGE MONTH

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

Ms. PLASKETT. Madam Speaker, November is Native American Heritage Month, and I would like to share with you a story, one unknown to most Americans, but one that Virgin Islanders learn at a young age. It is the Caribbean story of Europe's drive for conquest and the resistance of the Native Americans of the Virgin Islands, the Tainos and the Caribs.

In 1493, Columbus and his men landed on Ayay, known now as Saint Croix in the U.S. Virgin Islands. There they met a group of Taino people who had been taken captive by the Caribs. While en route back to their ship with these captives, Columbus' men encountered the fierce Carib villagers, and the first recorded violent conflict between Europeans and Native Americans of the Western Hemisphere ensued, killing one of Columbus' men.

Men and women fought with bows and canoes against gunpowder on ships.

It is our story of Native pride of resistance, of remembering what is yours.

However, the Taino and Carib peoples have left us with so much more. When you use such words as barbecue, guava, canoe, hurricane, potato, maze, savannah, you are connecting with indigenous people who centuries ago journeyed from South America to settle in the archipelago that has given, and continues to give, much to this country and the world.

A STEPPING STONE FOR PEACE IN KASHMIR

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

Mr. OLSON. Madam Speaker, I rise to share the facts and give an update on what is happening in the Jammu Kashmir region. Jammu Kashmir was given special treatment in the Constitution of 1947 in India. It was created by the "Temporary Provisions with Respect to the State of Jammu Kashmir." It is known as article 370.

It was supposed to be a stop-gap measure because the government had not been formed yet. For 70 straight years, this temporary article has forced citizens of Jammu Kashmir to live under different laws than all other Indians; different rules for citizenship, property ownership.

Earlier this year, the Indian Parliament confirmed that article 370's temporary status should end. It ended. It gave the people of Jammu Kashmir the same rights as all Indians. It was a landslide, 125-to-61 in the Rajya Sabha and 370-to-70 in the Lok Sabha. This action is solely about equality for all Indians.

Hopefully, this can be a step toward peace in Kashmir.

IN FAVOR OF THE AMERICAN DREAM

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

Mr. RIGGLEMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to speak in favor of the American Dream; in favor of the bedrock of what has made America: capitalism.

Yesterday, while every cable news channel was transfixed by the Intelligence Committee, the Financial Services Committee was discussing a bill that strikes at the heart of American capitalism.

H.R. 3848, the companion legislation to Senator ELIZABETH WARREN's Stop Wall Street Looting Act, would add regulatory costs and harm job creators. It has a pithy title that is, unfortunately, misleading in purpose. I prefer to call it the stop entrepreneurship act.

This bill would curb private investments in Main Street companies, which would kill jobs, stifle innovation, harm consumers, and strike a major blow to the hallmark of capitalism.

According to the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, even a modest scenario would result in the loss of 6.2 million to 24.3 million jobs across the country. As a small business owner who benefited from private equity when growing my business, I know the value of these types of organizations that provide support and really give a way forward for companies trying to grow.

BRINGING ATTENTION TO HUNGER AND HOMELESSNESS DURING NATIONAL HUNGER AND HOMELESSNESS WEEK

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

Mr. TAYLOR. Madam Speaker, each year during the week prior to Thanksgiving, communities across the country come together to bring awareness to the problems of hunger and homelessness.

Today, I want to recognize the Collin County organizations that work to end hunger and homelessness throughout our community.

Today, there are 42 million Americans facing hunger on any given night, and more than 194,000 people will sleep on the street.

While these numbers are sobering, we are incredibly grateful for those in our community who work to ease the suffering of others, organizations such as the Collin County Homeless Coalition, the Family Promise of Collin County, North Texas Food Bank, Minnie's Food Pantry, and Hope's Door New Beginning Center, Allen Community Outreach, and many, many others who work year-round to take care of those less fortunate.

Through these organizations, volunteers, businesses, and faith communities come together to provide necessities like shelter and nutritious meals. They go above and beyond to ensure those in need have access to basic medical care and hygiene products and even provide training and placement resources for those struggling with homelessness.

PEOPLE ARE TIRED OF CONGRESS SPENDING TAX DOLLARS ON A POLITICALLY MOTIVATED IMPEACHMENT CHARADE

(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, yesterday's public impeachment hearings produced some noteworthy facts. Representative MIKE TURNER's question of Ambassador Volker took apart the Democrats' entire case. Volker confirmed that President Trump never said that Ukraine must investigate the Bidens in order to receive defense aid from the United States.

Further, Representative ELISE STEFANIK's questioning of Tim Morri-

son showed there was no quid pro quo, no bribery, no extortion, and no mention of withholding aid in exchange for investigating the Bidens.

Witnesses have repeatedly stated that no quid pro quo, no bribery took place. These facts, which indeed clear our President, do not change. Meanwhile, President Trump continues to be denied basic due process rights.

Democrat leadership continues to put politics before the people obsessing over impeachment and refusing to work on policies that would actually benefit the American people: ratifying the USMCA, permanently extending the 2017 tax cuts for families, and lowering the cost of prescription drugs.

The people are tired of this Congress spending their tax dollars on a politically-motivated impeachment charade.

□ 1230

WE SHOULD WORK TOGETHER TO COMBAT CANCER

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

Mr. KELLER. Madam Speaker, November is Lung Cancer Awareness Month, an important time for us to highlight the need for more research and better community awareness on this disease.

The statistics surrounding lung cancer are astounding. Approximately 541,000 Americans living today have been diagnosed with lung cancer at some point in their lives. While the rate of new lung cancer cases over the past 4 decades has dropped 36 percent for men, it has risen 84 percent for women.

That is why I am proud to cosponsor H.R. 2222, the Women and Lung Cancer Research and Preventive Services Act. This bill would evaluate and identify opportunities for more research, preventive services, and public awareness campaigns.

Research shows that there is a disparate impact of lung cancer on women, especially women who have never smoked. More research is needed to understand why this is happening and what can be done to stop it.

Preventing cancer should never be a partisan issue. We should be working together to combat the scourge of cancer for the benefit of patients, families, and survivors. H.R. 2222 is a bipartisan effort that would do just that.

STOP IMPEACHMENT FOCUS TO DEAL WITH BORDER

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

Mr. GROTHMAN. Madam Speaker, I stand first of all to thank President Trump for the work he has done at the border and for something that has been almost unpublicized since the mainstream media is busy focusing solely on impeachment.

In May of this year, over 100,000 people were processed at the border and placed in the United States. In September, that number has fallen to under 1,000, solely because of the efforts of President Trump to keep people who come to this country seeking asylum south of the border and because of agreements reached in countries in northern Central America.

However, we must ask this body to stop solely focusing on impeachment and deal with the southern border, making permanent the policy changes of President Trump. My fear is that if President Trump ever leaves, then the real motivation of this impeachment hearing will become apparent, and that is to return to the days of open borders.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. WILD) laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, November 20, 2019.

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

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on November 20, 2019, at 10:39 a.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 1838.

That the Senate passed S. 2710.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 4258.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

CHERYL L. JOHNSON.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1309, WORKPLACE VIOLENCE PREVENTION FOR HEALTH CARE AND SOCIAL SERVICE WORKERS ACT; PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM NOVEMBER 22, 2019, THROUGH DECEMBER 2, 2019; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. DESAULNIER. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 713 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 713

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1309) to direct the Secretary of Labor to issue an occupational safety and health standard that requires covered employers within the health care and social service industries to develop and implement a comprehensive workplace violence prevention plan, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against

consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Education and Labor now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116-37, modified by the amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as the original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the five-minute rule and shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules. Each such further amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such further amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill, as amended, to the House with such further amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. On any legislative day during the period from November 22, 2019, through December 2, 2019—

(a) the Journal of the proceedings of the previous day shall be considered as approved; and

(b) the Chair may at any time declare the House adjourned to meet at a date and time, within the limits of clause 4, section 5, article I of the Constitution, to be announced by the Chair in declaring the adjournment.

SEC. 3. The Speaker may appoint Members to perform the duties of the Chair for the duration of the period addressed by section 2 of this resolution as though under clause 8(a) of rule I.

SEC. 4. Each day during the period addressed by section 2 of this resolution shall not constitute a calendar or legislative day for purposes of clause 7(c)(1) of rule XXII.

SEC. 5. It shall be in order at any time on the legislative day of November 21, 2019, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules as though under clause 1 of rule XV. The Speaker or her designee shall consult with the Minority Leader or his designee on the designation of any matter for consideration pursuant to this section.

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

Mr. DESAULNIER. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consider-

ation of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DESAULNIER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Madam Speaker, yesterday, the Rules Committee met and reported a structured rule, House Resolution 713, providing for consideration of H.R. 1309, the Workplace Violence Prevention for Health Care and Social Service Workers Act. The rule provides 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and the ranking member of the Committee on Education and Labor, makes in order all 10 amendments submitted, and provides for a motion to recommit. It also provides standard recess instructions for next week's district work period.

Madam Speaker, there is an epidemic of violence against healthcare and social workers in the United States. Last year, Department of Labor statistics showed they were nearly five times as likely to suffer a serious workplace violence injury than workers in other industries.

The Government Accountability Office found that rates of violence against healthcare workers in hospitals, nursing homes, and residential care facilities are 5 to 12 times higher than the estimated rates for workers overall. Between 2011 and 2016, 58 hospital workers died as a result of workplace violence.

For me, this matter strikes close to home. In 2010, a Napa State Hospital technician in California, Donna Kay Gross, a constituent, was killed outside the State hospital by a patient under psychiatric care. Donna entered the profession to honor her mother, who battled mental illness and was a patient at that very hospital. She was the mother of three grown children and was raising her granddaughter. Her colleagues described her by saying: First and foremost, Donna was a human service-type person and loved being with people and working with people.

Donna's life was cut short when a patient brutally murdered her to steal jewelry and cash from her.

This story is just one of thousands of incidents that are on the rise. Sadly, violence has become so commonplace for healthcare workers that they think it is part of their job, resulting in only 30 percent of violent incidents being reported.

Some States have stepped up to enact laws to require employers to establish a plan to protect against workplace violence. Donna's story, for example, inspired action in California that I was proud to be a part of when I was chair of the senate labor committee. That action in California served as the basis for the bill before us

today in the rule and tomorrow on the floor.

These workers deserve national action, and they deserve it now. At the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, these workers are not receiving the urgent attention they need. OSHA takes at least 7 years to put out a standard, but in some instances can take up to 20 years.

People like Donna Kay Gross cannot wait that long. To protect the people who dedicate their lives to caring for us, we need to move now. The longer we wait, the more people will suffer.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, today, we are considering a bill that requires the Secretary of Labor to issue a rule on workplace violence prevention in the healthcare and social service sectors.

According to the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, workplace violence is any act or threat of physical violence, harassment, intimidation, or other threatening disruptive behavior that occurs at the worksite. It may be surprising to hear that acts of violence are the third leading cause of fatal occupational injuries. Of these incidences, approximately 8 percent were intentionally caused by another person.

When Americans go to work each and every day, they do not expect to face violence or other harm. The risk is especially high for healthcare providers and social workers. These caregivers can be subject to patients who may not be in control when under the influence of medications, or they may have a mental disorder, upset family members, ongoing domestic disputes, and even gang violence.

The rate of workplace violence resulting in days away from work for healthcare providers is, on average, four times higher than other professions. In addition, healthcare providers and social workers are less likely to report incidents. This may partly be due to the pledge to do no harm and the inclination to forgive patient-caused injuries as accidental. Regardless of the situation, all workers deserve a safe workplace.

The Occupational Safety and Health Administration is responsible for setting the standards to ensure the safety of American workers. Under the general duty clause of the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970, employers must provide employees with a safe work environment. Currently, there is no mandatory standard on workplace violence prevention. However, in calendar year 2015, OSHA published "Guidelines for Preventing Workplace Violence for Healthcare and Social Service Workers" and is currently working on a workplace violence prevention rule.

H.R. 1309 would require the Secretary of Labor to issue a rule on workplace

violence prevention based on OSHA's 2015 guidelines. An interim standard is required within 1 year of the passage of this legislation, and a final rule must be issued within 2 years.

While the goal of this legislation is laudable and important, the timeframe imposed on the Department of Labor and OSHA does exceed the norm. Between 1981 and 2010, the time it took OSHA to develop and issue safety and health standards ranged from 15 months to 19 years, but the average was more than 7 years. While no one believes we should continue to delay worker protections, OSHA has already begun the rulemaking process and is gathering stakeholder input.

According to the OSHA rulemaking process, a rule should take 10 years to complete. There are 7 stages comprised of 48 different steps. For example, one step is listed as "continue discussion with stakeholders." The penultimate stage requires OSHA to send the final rule to the Small Business Administration before submitting the rule to Congress.

□ 1245

This last stage involves developing a small entity compliance guide responding to legal action.

This is bureaucracy at its finest. While it is important to ensure that any rulemaking does not adversely affect the people and industries it is meant to assist, the length of this process far exceeds other administrative rulemakings. Perhaps, rather than pass a bill to require the issuance of a single rule, we should be considering reforms to the entire OSHA rulemaking process. It seems like that may be overdue.

Despite the lengthy process of OSHA rulemaking, as written, this bill truncates established rulemaking procedures. But that is up to us. Until Congress changes this process, OSHA will follow the established framework to develop its workplace violence protection rule.

H.R. 1309 requires covered employees, including hospitals, outpatient facilities, residential treatment facilities—which includes nursing homes—and any other medical treatment or social service clinic at correctional facilities to develop and implement a written workplace violence plan within 6 months of the issuance of a rule. The plan must include identification of violence risks and prevention practices and incorporate reporting and emergency response procedures. In addition, the plan must delineate violent incident investigation procedures and training programs for employees.

Again, the importance of such a plan is undeniable. Six months may be a short timeframe within which to determine all of the required components. In order to produce the most effective plan to ensure employee safety, employers really should be granted adequate time to fully evaluate their workplace, gather input from employ-

ees, and identify the best procedures to ensure a safe environment. It is possible that, given the short timeline, workplace violence prevention plans could be hasty and, therefore, incorrectly assembled.

Here is the good news. There is middle ground. While OSHA's rulemaking process is lengthy, this bill's timeline is short. OSHA is currently gathering feedback from stakeholders and requiring an expedited rulemaking that will limit their input.

While OSHA rulemaking would ensure enforcement of workplace violence prevention policies, according to a 2018 American Hospital Association survey, 97 percent of respondents reported already having a workplace violence prevention policy in place. In 2009, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention stated that additional research was required to identify effective strategies to prevent violence, particularly in healthcare settings.

In addition, the Congressional Budget Office estimates that the cost to private entities will be well over \$2.5 billion the first 2 years of implementation and almost \$1.5 billion annually thereafter. The rule self-executes a manager's amendment that will bring this cost down to \$1.3 billion for the first 2 years and \$700 million annually thereafter.

This mandate may make it difficult for rural hospitals and healthcare providers to continue effectively serving patients in their more rural locations.

Extending the implementation timeline of this bill may help reduce some of these concerns. We had an opportunity to work on a bipartisan basis—this is not a partisan issue—to solve a problem that we all agree needs to be solved. We are, instead, considering a bill that circumvents the established rulemaking process in favor of a swift outcome.

We can all agree that there is a need for OSHA to issue proper workplace violence prevention regulations to protect healthcare providers and social workers. I hope we are able to accomplish this goal, but we should recognize that we are placing burdens on entities through an expedited process that may require modification in the future to ensure a safe and effective workplace for all Americans.

Madam Speaker, for these and other reasons, I urge opposition to the rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY), who has put so much work into this effort.

Mr. COURTNEY. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the rule.

I would just note for the Record that Mr. DESAULNIER and Chairman MCGOVERN deserve great credit because this is basically an open rule. There were eight amendments which were offered to the Rules Committee, and all eight amendments were made in order, including a Republican amendment, which is somewhat in line with Dr.

BURGESS' comments from Mr. BYRNE from Alabama, who is on the committee.

Again, I would just say this shows that the Rules Committee was serious last January when they said we are going to have a new era of bringing down the number of closed rules as much as possible. This is a perfect example of it.

In fact, Politico this morning wrote a story saying that this is actually the first bill to come to the floor that was a completely open rule that accepted every amendment that was offered by Members. I don't know if that is true, but certainly it is true that all amendments were made in order with the rule that is presented. I guess sometimes you sort of wonder: When do people take "yes" for an answer in this Chamber?

Again, Mr. BYRNE can have ample opportunity to make his arguments. I look forward to opposing it on the floor as I did in committee. And again, to me, it seems like a rule that all Members should really support.

So again, just to begin with Mr. DESAULNIER's description of the problem—and, again, Dr. BURGESS certainly did not quibble about the fact that this is a real problem that we are talking about. In 2013, former Congressman George Miller and I asked GAO to look at this problem. They took 3 years to study it. They used Bureau of Labor statistics, Justice Department statistics, they did surveys, and they found, in fact, that we have a really very scary problem in terms of the 15 million healthcare workers who go to work every single day: They are five times more likely to be the victims of intentional assault than any other sector in the U.S. economy.

And what is most alarming is the trajectory is going up. This is not a problem which is sort of level normal operations. It is something that is actually getting worse.

There is no secret why it is getting worse. The heroin-opioid epidemic and the behavioral health problems that exist out there in society make every ambulance call that EMTs are going out for an overdose, every emergency room patient who is coming through the door, every rehab patient who is going into a facility for treatment, all of these now are high-risk situations.

And, yes, there are some hospitals that have taken proactive steps. They have used the OSHA voluntary guidelines; they have looked at the Joint Commission on Hospitals, which has endorsed those guidelines and has, again, written strong advocacy in favor of having a national standard for this problem out there for many workers. And that is why we need to act.

Again, just so we are clear, OSHA, in 2017, as the Obama administration was leaving, put it on their regulatory agenda. They took too long.

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

Mr. DESAULNIER. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. COURTNEY. Madam Speaker, I would be happy to stipulate they took too long.

Since the Trump administration has taken over, in 34 months, they have not held one hearing in terms of stakeholder input. Yes, they scheduled two small business reg review hearings, canceled both, and they have not rescheduled. So, 34 months into this administration, there is nothing happening.

This bill, fundamentally, is about Congress, as it did with bloodborne pathogens, which addressed a crisis in hospitals back in the 1990s and early 2000s—which a Republican Congress, by the way, supported—put a deadline on OSHA to get a rule in place. We are a safer country because Congress took that action. That is what this bill does.

It is 42 months, by the way, in terms of the deadline for the rule and it is 1 year for the interim rule.

We accommodated Republican objections in the committee, made sure everybody gets a comment period on the interim rule, and we also carved out doctors offices, dentists offices, anybody who is not part of the healthcare facility. We shrunk the scope of this bill to healthcare facilities 200,000, which is going to reduce the mandate.

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

Mr. DESAULNIER. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. COURTNEY. Madam Speaker, the cost per facility, which Dr. BURGESS referred to, which was reduced because of the reducing of the scope of the bill, is \$9,000 per facility per year.

So when we talk about the healthcare sector and how much money gets spent in it, how many patients come through the door—and these are not the small independent practice doctors offices. These are healthcare facilities. The fact of the matter is it is \$9,000 a year for 2 years, then it goes down to \$3,000 a year in terms of cost and expense.

What is the benefit? Lower workers' comp cost, less absenteeism, and trying to improve the morale of the people who are doing the right thing in this country in terms of providing care for those who need to be healed, consoled, and cured.

We need to pass this bill.

Again, we made Mr. BYRNE's amendment in order, but we need to reject that amendment which throws it back to OSHA, whose batting average is really a disgrace in terms of getting rules through the process.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Madam Speaker, just so that we are technically accurate, the resolution in front of us today, point number one, it is a structured rule for H.R. 1309. This is not an open rule. I have served in the

United States House of Representatives when we had open rules, and it is a different environment.

Mr. COLE last night in the Rules Committee did make a motion for an open rule on this, saying: If you are going to accept all these amendments, maybe we should open the floor up to all Members. This is an important topic. Let's get their input.

But the request for an open rule was voted down in the Rules Committee. It wasn't really a suspenseful vote. The Republican side lost 4-9, which is generally the way that works out in that committee.

I am grateful that so many amendments were made in order. I think that is important. But I also feel obligated to point out that under no circumstances should this be regarded as an open rule. It is anything but.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Nevada (Mrs. LEE).

Mrs. LEE of Nevada. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, healthcare and social workers are some of the most dedicated, least appreciated workers in this country. They are the workers caring for the sick, the elderly, and the most vulnerable Americans, while usually making just barely enough to get by.

A tough job is made even tougher by the fact that these workers who are treating workers in stress, often in private settings, are five times as likely to be the victims of workplace violence.

What does it say about our country that we can't protect those workers who have dedicated their lives to protecting our most vulnerable citizens? It is unfair, and the bottom line is this: No person should feel unsafe in their place of work.

The Occupational Safety and Health Administration, or OSHA, has the authority to protect American caregivers and healthcare workers from workplace violence, but the reality is that there is no nationwide OSHA standard for how employers are supposed to protect their employees from workplace violence. Not just that, but in 24 States, nearly half the country, public-sector health and social service workers are not covered by OSHA protections.

We have the responsibility and we have the authority to protect America's workers, but we have not given our government or our businesses the tools they need to protect hardworking Americans from workplace violence. The underlying bill of this rule will change that.

The Workplace Violence Prevention for Health Care and Social Service Workers Act would require OSHA to implement a standard for workplace protections for healthcare and social workers. It provides protections for public-sector workers where none existed before, and it identifies risks, so-

lutions, training, and, importantly, protections from retaliation for those workers who report violence in the workplace.

Madam Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this underlying bill and uphold our duty to keep every American safe.

□ 1300

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

Madam Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, Republicans will amend the rule to immediately consider H.R. 1869, the Restoring Investment in Improvements Act. This bill, which has 271 bipartisan cosponsors, would fix a technical error in the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act to allow qualified improvement property to depreciate over 15 years and be eligible for immediate expenses.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. WALORSKI) to further explain the bill.

Mrs. WALORSKI. Madam Speaker, I rise to vote down the previous question.

If we defeat the previous question, Republicans will amend the rule to include the restoration of the 15-year schedule for qualified improvement property, or QIP, as part of H.R. 1309, the Workplace Violence Prevention for Healthcare and Social Service Workers Act.

Madam Speaker, there is strong bipartisan support to fix QIP, which affects restaurants, retailers, and other leaseholders in every congressional district in this country. There are 271 bipartisan cosponsors split nearly evenly between Republicans and Democrats on H.R. 1869, which I helped introduce to resolve this issue.

Fixing QIP is a commonsense solution that would unleash investment, create jobs, and help small businesses grow. However, it also requires urgency, and Congress must do everything in our power to address this issue as soon as possible.

I hope that we defeat the previous question to ensure that restaurants, retailers, and other small businesses are able to unlock the full benefits of tax reform and continue driving our Nation's economic growth forward.

Failing that, I sincerely hope that all sides can come together before the end of the year to enact this bipartisan, commonsense piece of legislation.

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

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

Just a couple of points to my friend from Texas. He is correct on the open process. However, we did allow for all 10 amendments that were submitted to be accepted, and the final vote was 2-9, understanding that that was a foregone conclusion to many of us.

I would just say that this is such an important issue in the urgency, and I would like to join with my colleague to fix the standard and the practice, and to add funding so that the Department can do it.

There is an urgency for problems like this to be solved. We can save money in the long run. When I was in local government, I was on the governing board of our county hospital. Two of our five floors were psych wards. We spent hours and hours in closed sessions dealing with liability issues on those wards.

So when I read this bill, I think that so much of what is in this bill, many of us have already done, at least from California at the local level and at the State level, and it is good business practice.

As somebody who is a former small business owner that had high workers' compensation in the restaurant business, cost avoidance is a good thing. My workers' compensation carrier came out at least once a year to inspect our facilities and see where we could avoid these incidents. So it is just a good business practice.

When I look at this, it makes so much sense. There is a cost to start this, but there is, clearly, in my mind, a fiscal savings and an emotional savings when you think of the lives lost. This is not new, but the demand in the changing trend lines say to me that this is urgent.

So I would like to agree with my friend from Texas and I would be happy to work with him, but with incidents like this, this Department really needs to be ramped up. It is a national embarrassment that it takes 20 years, or 7 years for the Department to do these rules, understanding that you have to work with stakeholders.

So I think there is an element of opportunity here for us. I do think that it is unfortunate, as we talked about in the Rules Committee last night, and Mr. BYRNE talked about, that we couldn't get across the finish line and come together completely as a bipartisan bill.

Having said that, as my friend from Texas alluded to, this is a bipartisan bill. We do have supporters, including Mr. COLE.

Madam Speaker, I have no other speakers, and I understand that the gentleman has no additional speakers, so I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for his comments, and I would agree that the effi-

cient functioning of any Federal agency should always be our highest priority. The efficient use of the taxpayer funding that goes into those agencies or branches of agencies should require our constant attention. We should always be looking to improve the service and the protection that those agencies provide.

I will also predict that this bill is likely to pass with a large margin and it will be bipartisan and will raise the question of why we are not considering it under a suspension of the rules. Nevertheless, that is what the majority has chosen to use their time doing this week, so we have the bill in front of us today.

Workplace violence is a threat that no American should have to face. The threat is particularly high for healthcare providers and for social service workers. These workers dedicate their lives to taking care of others, and they deserve to be taken care of in return.

I support the goal of this legislation. I believe it would benefit from further discussion to ensure that the timeline for issuing a rule and developing a workplace violence prevention plan will produce the most effective and safe outcome for American workers.

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

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

Madam Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from Texas for his comments.

Democratic and Republican administrations have sat idly by while healthcare and social service workers are being beaten, abused, and killed. The problem is not going away. It is getting worse.

In the words of the ranking member of the Rules Committee, the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma, he will be voting for the bill because it is better than what we have got. I certainly agree.

This bill does far better for our frontline workers who we ask to care for us every day. I urge a "yes" vote on the rule and the previous question.

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

AMENDMENT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 713

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 6. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall proceed to consideration in the House of the bill (H.R. 1869) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to restore incentives for investments in qualified improvement property. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except:

(1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and the ranking mi-

nority member of the Committee on Ways and Means; and

(2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 7. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 1869.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

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

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

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 7 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1333

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. WILD) at 1 o'clock and 33 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or votes objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

The House will resume proceedings on postponed questions at a later time.

EXTENDING AUTHORIZATION FOR CAPE COD NATIONAL SEASHORE ADVISORY COMMISSION

Mr. HUFFMAN. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 182) to extend the authorization for the Cape Cod National Seashore Advisory Commission.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 182

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

SECTION 1. CAPE COD NATIONAL SEASHORE ADVISORY COMMISSION.

Effective September 26, 2018, section 8(a) of Public Law 87-126 (16 U.S.C. 459b-7(a)) is amended in the second sentence by striking "2018" and inserting "2028".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN) and the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN).

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

H.R. 182, introduced by Representative BILL KEATING from Massachusetts, would reauthorize the Cape Cod National Seashore Advisory Commission, which expired under current law in September 2018. This bill would reauthorize and extend it until 2028.

Since the national seashore was originally created in 1961, it was actually the first national seashore. It is the second most beautiful national seashore, but it was the first national seashore created.

The advisory commission has served as a main forum for consultation and coordination between local communities and the National Park Service. Comprised of representatives from the six towns within the park, Barnstable County, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and the Secretary of the Interior, this advisory commission gives surrounding communities a voice in the management of the seashore.

I thank Representative KEATING for his leadership in introducing this important legislation, and I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 182.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 182, which extends the authorization of the Cape Cod National Seashore Advisory Commission until 2028.

The Cape Cod National Seashore was established in 1961. It comprises more than 40,000 acres on Cape Cod, Massachusetts. The enabling legislation also provided for an advisory commission comprised of six Cape Cod communities located within the seashore and the county to consult with the Secretary of the Interior about the development of the seashore. This is as it should be.

The Federal Government must be a good neighbor to the communities that its lands impact, and consulting them as partners is a fundamental point of this principle.

One of the unique aspects of this advisory commission is that the Secretary of the Interior cannot issue commercial, industrial, or recreational permits without the advice of the commission, as long as action is taken in a timely manner.

In addition, the commission meets regularly with the park superintendent to discuss specific seashore issues and

to advise him about seashore programs, facilities, and activities, providing valuable local feedback to the national seashore. This feedback helps to promote sound park management, improve public access, and it ensures that the National Park Service is a good neighbor to its surrounding communities.

This is a model of how the Federal Government's land managers should be governed. My only regret is that its provisions don't apply to every community affected by Federal landholdings. I cannot help but note that the Federal Government owns just 1.2 percent of Massachusetts while giving great deference to its local communities. Meanwhile, it owns 46 percent of my State of California and often gives local communities impacted by its lands a dismissive brushoff, which is typical of the experience of our Western States.

In fact, I take this opportunity to ask my colleagues from Massachusetts to consider what would happen to their communities if the Federal Government took over half of the land in their State, removed it from the tax rolls, severely restricted any productive use of that land, and then thumbed its nose at the concerns and complaints of local communities.

Thankfully, this administration has taken a cooperative and supportive position in recent years and has improved conditions greatly, but that doesn't guarantee that future administrations won't revert to the Washington-knows-best approach that has produced no end of problems for the people of our Western States.

Madam Speaker, I urge adoption of the measure, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Madam Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEATING), who is honored to represent the second most beautiful national seashore in America.

Mr. KEATING. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of my bill, H.R. 182, to reauthorize the Cape Cod National Seashore Advisory Commission.

Madam Speaker, I thank the chair from the Committee on Natural Resources for yielding, and I thank both of my colleagues from California for supporting this bill.

The Cape Cod National Seashore was created by President Kennedy in 1961. His vision was to preserve the unique landscape of the outer cape for recreation and enjoyment for all Americans forever. Today, more than 4 million people, both Americans and those from around the world, travel to Cape Cod every year to experience the natural beauty and recreation that the Cape Cod National Seashore provides.

However, when the Cape Cod National Seashore was proposed, it presented challenges to residents of Cape Cod unique to locating a national park on a peninsula with a limited area and with very small communities within that area. In many of the communities in the outer cape, the national sea-

shore was designed to occupy as much as 80 percent of the available land, effectively foreclosing other economic development options after the park was established.

While the promise of President Kennedy's vision for the outer cape was realized, with the national seashore drawing millions of people from around the world to the cape, the importance of the advisory commission to the national seashore and its host communities is still important today, as important as it was almost 60 years ago.

The advisory commission was at the heart of President Kennedy's vision for the national seashore, as he recognized that the host communities would need a voice in the national seashore affairs after the park was formed. To this end, it was important that the host communities retained a formal structure to advise seashore leadership and the Park Service about how actions taken within the park would affect them and their communities.

The reasons for the powers granted to the advisory commission in its enabling legislation are just as persuasive today as they were in 1961. Since what happens on the seashore directly affects the lives of thousands of my constituents in the host communities, those decisions should be made with the input of those communities.

Some have suggested that the authority regarding the commercial activity granted to the National Seashore Advisory Commission in its enabling legislation is no longer necessary. This is simply not the case.

Suggestions that the value of having regulatory unity among the national parklands and the various advisory commissions are unpersuasive when one considers the unique nature of Cape Cod. That such a bureaucratic consideration could possibly outweigh the important benefits that the National Seashore Advisory Commission provides to my constituents is just laughable.

Today, just as in the 1960s, the unique nature of the outer cape presents the same challenges to those who live there with respect to the national seashore. The most effective way to address the concerns of the outer cape community is to ensure that a functioning advisory commission is sitting and can continue to play its important role in the community.

Long ago, President Kennedy envisioned what responsible self-governance looks like on the outer cape, a balance between the seashore, the towns, and a place where all parties could come together, again, in the spirit of sustaining the community as a whole. That is the vision of the advisory commission.

Over the past few years, the outer cape region has faced some of its toughest challenges. With climate change, coastal erosion, ocean acidification, and new concerns about sharks in the waters off Cape Cod, Cape Codders are grappling with some of the

most difficult issues that the communities have seen in years. Under these circumstances, the commission's absence is felt every day.

Madam Speaker, that is why I ask my colleagues to support this straightforward piece of legislation, a bill that has been passed by this House in the last Congress that will reactivate an effective tool that has provided an important role for the Cape Cod community, my community, for nearly 60 years.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Madam Speaker, I ask for adoption of this measure, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Madam Speaker, I respectfully request an "aye" vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 182.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BIG BEAR LAND EXCHANGE ACT

Mr. HUFFMAN. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 255) to provide for an exchange of lands with San Bernardino County, California, to enhance management of lands within the San Bernardino National Forest, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 255

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 "Big Bear Land Exchange Act".

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **COUNTY.**—The term "County" means the County of San Bernardino, California.

(2) **FEDERAL LAND.**—The term "Federal land" means the approximately 73 acres of Federal land administered by the Forest Service generally depicted as "Federal Land Proposed for Exchange" on the Map.

(3) **NON-FEDERAL LAND.**—The term "non-Federal land" means the approximately 71 acres owned by the County generally depicted as "Non-Federal Land Proposed for Exchange" on the Map.

(4) **SECRETARY.**—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Agriculture.

(5) **MAP.**—The term "Map" means the map titled "Big Bear Land Exchange" and dated August 6, 2018.

SEC. 3. EXCHANGE OF LAND; EQUALIZATION OF VALUE.

(a) **EXCHANGE AUTHORIZED.**—Subject to valid existing rights and the terms of this Act, no later than one year after the date that the portion of the Pacific Crest National Scenic Trail is relocated in accordance with subsection (h), if the County offers to convey the non-Federal land to the United States, the Secretary shall—

(1) convey to the County all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the Federal land; and

(2) accept from the County a conveyance of all right, title, and interest of the County in and to the non-Federal land.

(b) EQUAL VALUE AND CASH EQUALIZATION.—

(1) **EQUAL VALUE EXCHANGE.**—The land exchange under this section shall be for equal value, or the values shall be equalized by a cash payment as provided for under this subsection or an adjustment in acreage. At the option of the County, any excess value of the non-Federal lands may be considered a gift to the United States.

(2) **EQUALIZATION.**—If the value of the Federal land and the non-Federal land to be conveyed in a land exchange under this subsection is not equal, the value may be equalized by—

(A) making a cash equalization payment to the Secretary or to the owner of the non-Federal land, as appropriate, in accordance with section 206(b) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1716(b)); or

(B) reducing the acreage of the Federal land or the non-Federal land to be exchanged, as appropriate.

(3) **DEPOSIT AND USE OF FUNDS RECEIVED FROM COUNTY.**—Any cash equalization payment received by the Secretary under this subsection shall be deposited in the fund established under Public Law 90-171 (16 U.S.C. 484a; commonly known as the "Sisk Act"). The funds so deposited shall remain available to the Secretary, until expended, for the acquisition of lands, waters, and interests in land for the San Bernardino National Forest.

(c) **APPRAISAL.**—The Secretary shall complete an appraisal of the land to be exchanged under subsection (a) in accordance with—

(1) the Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land Acquisitions; and

(2) the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice.

(d) **TITLE APPROVAL.**—Title to the land to be exchanged under this Act shall be in a format acceptable to the Secretary and the County.

(e) **SURVEY OF NON-FEDERAL LANDS.**—Before completing the exchange under this Act, the Secretary shall inspect the non-Federal lands to ensure that the land meets Federal standards, including hazardous materials and land line surveys.

(f) **COSTS OF CONVEYANCE.**—As a condition of conveyance, any costs related to the exchange under this section shall be paid by the County.

(g) **MANAGEMENT OF ACQUIRED LANDS.**—The non-Federal land acquired by the Secretary under subsection (a) shall be—

(1) added to, and managed as part of, San Bernardino National Forest; and

(2) managed in accordance with—

(A) the Act of March 1, 1911 (16 U.S.C. 480 et seq.; commonly known as the "Weeks Act"); and

(B) any other laws, including regulations, pertaining to National Forest System lands.

(h) **PACIFIC CREST NATIONAL SCENIC TRAIL RELOCATION.**—Not later than three years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary, in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) and other applicable laws (including regulations), shall relocate the portion of the Pacific Crest National Scenic Trail located on the Federal land to—

(1) adjacent National Forest System land;

(2) land owned by the County, subject to County approval;

(3) land within the Federal land, subject to County approval; or

(4) a combination of paragraphs (1), (2), and (3).

(i) **MAP AND LEGAL DESCRIPTIONS.**—As soon as practicable after the date of the enact-

ment of this Act, the Secretary shall finalize a map and legal descriptions of all land to be conveyed under this Act. The Secretary may correct any minor errors in the map or in the legal descriptions. The map and legal descriptions shall be on file and available for public inspection in appropriate offices of the Forest Service.

(j) **APPLICABLE LAW.**—Section 206 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1716) shall apply to the land exchange authorized under subsection (a).

(k) **ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.**—Any conveyance of Federal land under this Act shall be subject to—

(1) valid existing rights;

(2) the terms of this Act; and

(3) such terms and conditions as the Secretary may require.

SEC. 4. DETERMINATION OF BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled "Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation" for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the House Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN) and the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN).

□ 1345

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

H.R. 255, introduced by Representative COOK, would authorize an equal value exchange between the U.S. Forest Service and San Bernardino County. This exchange would enable the county to build a resource conservation and recovery facility. This will increase efficiency and safety of timber processing and recycling in that area. In return, the Forest Service would receive an undeveloped inholding in the San Bernardino National Forest.

The bill is a perfect example of how, through a collaborative process, we can meet the needs of local stakeholders while continuing to protect our environment and public lands.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate and thank my colleague, Representative COOK, for introducing this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 255, introduced by the gentleman from California (Mr. COOK), authorizes a locally supported equal value land exchange between the Forest Service and San Bernardino County. The county has proposed to convey an inland parcel within the San Bernardino National Forest to the Forest Service in exchange for land further north to be conveyed by the county.

The land conveyed by the county will allow needed forest management infrastructure to be located closer to the forest and promote road safety by reducing the need to drive forest products down narrow, winding roads.

H.R. 255 also authorizes cooperation between the county and the Forest Service to relocate a portion of the Pacific Crest National Scenic Trail, if needed, and requires that the trail relocation be completed before the exchange is consummated.

This legislation is the result of a Congressman who has listened to the voices of his community, an administration sympathetic to the plight of our forest communities, and community members and their local representatives putting forward a reasonable and workable plan that is fair to all parties.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the measure, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from southern California (Mr. AGUILAR).

Mr. AGUILAR. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from California offering me some time, and I want to thank Representative COOK, as well, for his efforts.

I rise in support of the Big Bear Land Exchange Act.

My community in San Bernardino County experiences some of the highest levels of air pollution anywhere in the country, and, in order to combat this pollution, we must find ways to reduce emissions in our region. This bill will help us do just that.

This land exchange between the county and the Federal Government will allow the establishment of a recycling and recovery center in my neighboring district. This facility would decrease the long distances that trucks have to travel to dispose of waste and will allow us to divert this waste by repurposing recyclable materials.

This legislation is good for our communities and is a smart way to help mitigate pollution and combat climate change.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague, Representative COOK, for his work in championing this bill and for his bipartisan collaboration. I have worked with Mr. COOK on a number of issues representing San Bernardino County. Nobody is more thoughtful when it comes to what our future direction holds. I know his heart is in San Bernardino County, as well, and no one will ever doubt that about his intent.

Just because he doesn't want to hang out here with us in this facility often-times doesn't mean that he isn't publicly driven and publicly minded in order to deliver for his constituents. This bill is one of those examples.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to working with my colleague the remainder of the next 12 months and in the years ahead, and I want to thank him for his efforts in this regard.

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

I share my colleague's high words of praise and warmth for our colleague, Mr. COOK, the author of this measure, and I am also somewhat annoyed with him for his decision to leave the Congress at the end of this session for the county board of supervisors.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. COOK).

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. MCCLINTOCK for yielding his time.

I had my speech all prepared, but I am not sure whether it is a San Bernardino lovefest or a beat up on PAUL COOK because he is leaving this institution.

This is an example. Everybody knows that you can work together; you can put your differences aside and get things done. I pride myself on that. I am very, very passionate about certain things.

This bill sounds simple, the pollution going up and down that hill; but, more so, anyone who has lived in a mountain community knows how dangerous it is, particularly in the winter, and more so with a truck with timber on it, the number of accidents that we have on those roads up there—just the deaths—every year. We have always had problems, and it is something I am very, very concerned about.

I do want to commend working with the Pacific Crest Trail Association, working together so we could iron out some of these things.

The relocation, as I think was already mentioned, will include environmental review and will take care before the exchange takes place.

And we have got a lot of people on this: the city of Big Bear Lake, the Friends of Big Bear Valley, Big Bear Fire Department.

By the way, there are big bears up there. If you haven't met one there, stay off the highways.

Anyway, the Big Bear City Community Services Department, the water district, the community healthcare, the chamber of commerce, and the local Big Bear chapter of the Sierra Club—and they have been great on this.

It passed out of the House Natural Resources Committee on a unanimous, bipartisan vote. Last December, nearly identical language passed out of the House as H.R. 5513 with overwhelming bipartisan support.

I appreciate the comments—even the sarcastic comments—of my colleagues,

and I truly am going to miss this institution.

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

I assure my friend, they are not sarcastic. He will be sorely missed in this House.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of this measure and urge my colleague to change his mind and come back next session, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I want to associate myself with the other comments about how much we are going to miss Colonel Cook. We respect him. We admire him. We are amused by him.

Let the record show he just called the Sierra Club great. I want that to be noted.

And although he has found a way, through this bill, to create an equal value exchange, something tells me that in the exchange of Colonel Cook, because we are losing him, the County of San Bernardino is making out a lot better than this institution. So I wish him well and urge a "yes" vote on his good bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KEATING). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 255, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONGRESSMAN LESTER WOLFF OYSTER BAY NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 263) to rename the Oyster Bay National Wildlife Refuge as the Congressman Lester Wolff Oyster Bay National Wildlife Refuge.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 263

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

SECTION 1. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds the following:

(1) The Oyster Bay National Wildlife Refuge was created in 1968. It is located on the north shore of Long Island in eastern Nassau County, is the largest refuge in the Long Island National Wildlife Refuge Complex, and receives the most public use of all the refuges in the Complex.

(2) The State of New York designated Oyster Bay a significant coastal fish and wildlife habitat. It is especially important for wintering waterfowl such as black duck, greater scaup, bufflehead, canvasback and long-tailed ducks. Management activities include wetland restoration and protection of the natural shoreline and vegetation.

(3) The refuge is unique in consisting solely of bay bottom and adjacent shoreline up to the mean high-tide mark. Ninety percent of New York's commercial oyster harvest comes from the refuge. Visitors enjoy fishing, wildlife observation, photography and environmental education. The refuge is truly a national treasure.

(4) Many visitors are unaware that were it not for the tireless work and advocacy of then-freshman Congressman Lester Wolff, this area would today be an 8.5-mile causeway and bridge across Long Island Sound between Oyster Bay and Rye, New York, connecting Nassau and Westchester Counties.

(5) The bridge was first proposed by Robert Moses, the well-known New York City Planner, to divert traffic from New York City. Former Governor Nelson Rockefeller signed into law legislation creating the bridge authorized by the New York State Legislature in 1967.

(6) Congressman Wolff, elected in 1964, quickly decided the bridge would be an intrusion in a pristine area, and that Long Island Sound was a very precious resource that was despoiled. The conservation threats in the mid-1960s were suburban development, wetland filling, and industrial pollution. The fight to preserve this land became an enormous political fight and is considered to be a turning point in New York State's environmental legacy.

(7) With State and local political and community leaders, and especially the North Shore leaders and the Committee to Save the Long Island Sound, Congressman Wolff arranged a meeting with Department of the Interior representatives and local leaders where the idea of creating a wildlife refuge from municipal and privately owned wetlands was created.

(8) The Town of Oyster Bay, in which one end of the bridge was to be located, deeded 5,000 acres of wetlands to the United States to be maintained as a Federal wildlife preserve. It was stipulated that if the Department of the Interior agreed to an intrusion of the property, it would revert to the town. Creating a Federal wildlife preserve provided the land with Federal protection.

(9) Because of the vision, dedication, and perseverance of Congressman Lester Wolff, all of us and future generations can enjoy the beauty and magnificence of this refuge.

SEC. 2. RENAMING THE OYSTER BAY NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE AS THE CONGRESSMAN LESTER WOLFF OYSTER BAY NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE.

(a) **RENAMING.**—The unit of the National Wildlife Refuge System known as the Oyster Bay National Wildlife Refuge and located near Oyster Bay, New York, shall be known as the "Congressman Lester Wolff Oyster Bay National Wildlife Refuge".

(b) **REFERENCES.**—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the unit of the National Wildlife Refuge System known as the Oyster Bay National Wildlife Refuge is deemed to be a reference to the "Congressman Lester Wolff Oyster Bay National Wildlife Refuge".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN) and the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN).

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, this bill would rename the Oyster Bay National Wildlife Refuge in New York as the Congressman Lester Wolff Oyster Bay National Wildlife Refuge.

A long-time Congressman from Long Island, Congressman Wolff was instrumental in creating this refuge and protecting it from unnecessary development. Thanks to his hard work and vision, the Oyster Bay refuge is an important stopover for wintering waterfowl, and it is also a popular destination for outdoor recreation enthusiasts.

At 100 years old, Congressman Wolff is the oldest living Member of Congress. This bill is a fitting tribute to him for his years of conservation leadership, and I urge its adoption.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, as my friend said, this bill renames the Oyster Bay National Wildlife Refuge in honor of Congressman Lester Wolff, former Long Island-North Shore Congressman.

It is certainly appropriate to recognize and honor Congressman Wolff's distinguished eight-term career representing the people of New York by adding his name to the wildlife refuge that he fought so hard to create.

This refuge has become a popular destination for many Americans to enjoy the wildlife and beauty of our outdoor spaces, and, at 100 years of age, Congressman Wolff has the distinction of being the oldest living former Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, it is most fitting we honor a man so dedicated and who has put so much of his life into fighting to protect and conserve this place and fighting for his constituency. I urge adoption of the measure, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SUOZZI), who is the sponsor of this bill.

Mr. SUOZZI. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. HUFFMAN for allowing me this time.

I rise today in support of this bill that I have sponsored, a bipartisan bill, H.R. 263, which, as has been mentioned, would rename the Oyster Bay National Wildlife Refuge as the Congressman Lester Wolff Oyster Bay National Wildlife Refuge.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman GRIJALVA. I want to thank, again, Congressman HUFFMAN and my colleagues on the Natural Resources Committee for their work on this bill, as well as the members of the New York delegation, all of whom are cosponsors of and support this legislation.

Congressman Lester Wolff, who represented my district for 16 years, is our Nation's oldest living former Congressman, and, in January, he will turn 101 years old.

The renaming of the Oyster Bay National Wildlife Refuge in his honor is in recognition of his monumental contributions to the preservation and protection of our environment.

These precious wetlands, at Congressman Lester Wolff's urging, were protected in 1968. It was in 1967 that the New York State Legislature, at the insistence of then-Governor Nelson Rockefeller and the master planner, Robert Moses, authorized a bridge across the Long Island Sound.

Lester immediately saw the bridge would despoil this pristine and precious resource of the Long Island Sound and soon found himself at the center of an enormous political fight. Lester eventually won this fight, and the Oyster Bay Wildlife Refuge was born. Today, it covers over 3,200 acres of one of the most important areas for natural refuge anywhere on the north shore of Long Island and is home to many endangered species.

Not only was Lester a champion for our environment, he also served our Nation honorably in our military. Lester served in the Civil Air Patrol during World War II and commanded the Congressional Squadron of the Civil Air Patrol, rising to the rank of colonel.

In 2014, Wolff received the Congressional Gold Medal, the highest civilian award.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to also support this legislation so we may honor this great Congressman whose efforts were an important part of our Nation's environmental history.

□ 1400

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask for adoption of the measure, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I will close by commending Representative SUOZZI for his bipartisan initiative to honor the legacy of Congressman Lester Wolff. I urge a "yes" vote on this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 263.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SHARK FIN SALES ELIMINATION ACT OF 2019

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 737) to prohibit the sale of shark fins, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.
The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 737

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 “Shark Fin Sales Elimination Act of 2019”.

SEC. 2. PROHIBITION ON SALE OF SHARK FIN.

(a) PROHIBITION.—Except as provided in sections 3 and 4, no person shall possess, offer for sale, sell, or purchase any shark fin or product containing any shark fin.

(b) PENALTY.—For purposes of section 308(a) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1858(a)), a violation of this section shall be treated as an act prohibited by section 307 of that Act.

SEC. 3. EXEMPTION FOR TRADITIONAL FISHERIES, EDUCATION, AND SCIENCE.

Section 2 shall not apply with respect to possession of a shark fin that was taken lawfully under a State, territorial, or Federal license or permit to take or land sharks, if the shark fin is separated from the shark in a manner consistent with the license or permit and is—

(1) destroyed or discarded upon separation;
(2) used for noncommercial subsistence purposes in accordance with State or territorial law;
(3) used solely for display or research purposes by a museum, college, or university, or by any other person under a State or Federal permit to conduct noncommercial scientific research; or
(4) retained by the license or permit holder for a noncommercial purpose.

SEC. 4. EXEMPTION FOR DOGFISH.

(a) IN GENERAL.—It shall not be a violation of section 2 for any person to possess, offer for sale, sell, or purchase any fresh or frozen raw fin or tail from any stock of the species *Mustelus canis* (smooth dogfish) or *Squalus acanthias* (spiny dogfish).

(b) REPORT.—By not later than January 1, 2027, the Secretary of Commerce should review the exemption in subsection (a) and should prepare and submit to the Congress a report that includes a recommendation on whether the exemption should continue or be terminated. In preparing such report and making such recommendation, the Secretary should analyze factors including—

(1) the economic viability of dogfish fisheries with and without the continuation of the exemption;
(2) the impact to ocean ecosystems of continuing or terminating the exemption;
(3) the impact on enforcement of the ban contained in section 3 caused by the exemption; and
(4) the impact of the exemption on shark conservation.

SEC. 5. INCLUSION OF RAYS AND SKATES IN SEA-FOOD TRACEABILITY PROGRAM.

Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Commerce shall revise section 300.324 of title 50, Code of Federal Regulations, to include rays and skates in the species and species groups specified in subsection (a)(2) of such section.

SEC. 6. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) SHARK.—The term “shark” means any species of the orders Pristiophoriformes, Squatiniformes, Squaliformes, Hexanchiformes, Lamniformes, Carchariniiformes, Orectolobiformes, and Heterodontiformes.

(2) SHARK FIN.—The term “shark fin” means the raw, dried, or otherwise processed detached fin, or the raw, dried, or otherwise processed detached tail, of a shark.

SEC. 7. STATE AUTHORITY.

Nothing in this Act affects any right of a State or territory of the United States to adopt or enforce any regulation or standard that is more stringent than a regulation or standard in effect under this Act.

SEC. 8. DETERMINATION OF BUDGET EFFECTS.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled “Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation” for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the House Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN) and the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) each will control 20 minutes.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, this bill would make it legal to possess, buy, or sell shark fins in the United States.

Now, everyone knows sharks are in trouble. Around the globe, one-quarter of sharks and their relatives are threatened with extinction. They are being caught and killed on average 30 percent faster than they can reproduce, in large part due to the demand for their fins to fuel the global shark fin trade. The fins from as many as 73 million sharks enter the shark fin trade every single year.

As top predators in the oceans, they play a critical role in ecosystems impacting our fisheries, coral reefs, and tourism economies. The concern for declining shark populations and the impact of their loss and the impact that loss has on ecosystems and tourism alike has led to increased efforts to conserve sharks globally, including no-take marine reserves, species-specific fishing bans, and shark fin trade bans.

While the United States has banned the practice of shark finning, we have not banned the buying and selling of shark fins, which means that we are still a part of the problem.

States and the private sector are catching on. Already 12 States, three territories, 40 airlines, and 20 major international shipping companies and other corporations such as Amazon, Disney, Hilton, and Grubhub have all refused to partake in this trade that devastates shark populations around the world.

And just this year Canada passed a similar bill, in large part thanks to our efforts here. That is the intention of this bill. When the United States steps up to lead, others will follow.

H.R. 737 would build on the leadership of these States, territories, and companies by eliminating shark fin sales and possession in the United States.

In addition to its 287 bipartisan cosponsors, this bill enjoys the support of recreational fishing interests, aquariums, over 150 scientists, 150 chefs, over 300 dive businesses and over 130 nonprofits. With this overwhelming support and at a time when so many shark populations are depleted, it is of utmost importance that we pass this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend Congressman SABLON for his leadership and also Congressman MCCAUL for his leadership on this bill, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is a bumper sticker bill that purports to save the sharks, but in reality would damage shark fisheries, destroy American jobs, and increase the threats to endangered species.

Let's first define what we agree on. Killing a shark solely to take its fins is contemptible. It is immoral. Herman Melville called such wanton waste blasphemous.

But let us be clear: This practice is already illegal under Federal law. It has been that way since 1993. American fishermen are not the villains in this story, they are the heroes who are adhering to rigorous regulations that require them to account for the full use of their catches.

So what does this bill do? It does exactly what it purports to abhor. Proponents rightly denounce taking the fins and then throwing away the carcass, so they have come up with a bill that would take the carcass but throw away the fins. This bill makes it illegal to possess or purchase a shark fin. The fins are 50 percent of the value of the catch.

If you force shark fishermen to waste literally 50 percent of the value of their catch, you remove their margin and destroy their enterprise. And this does little to stop the illegal trade of shark fins, since almost all of the demand is in east and Southeast Asia, and that market will simply apply upward pressure on the illegal taking of shark fins.

The responsible management of our U.S. fisheries and the exemplary conduct of U.S. fishermen has resulted in a great success story. Since 2000, the domestic shark population has been growing. The index of shark abundance in 2015 was the highest in its 29-year history.

Now, if you force fishermen to throw away 50 percent of the value of each shark they catch, one of two things are going to happen. To stay in business, they will have to take more and more sharks to make up for their loss, or more likely for American fishermen, they will simply go out of business.

If it is the latter, we can expect an out-of-control explosion in shark populations with devastating consequences for endangered marine species, like the right whale. And in either case, American fishermen will suffer to the advantage of the unregulated illegal foreign fishing fleets.

This is an example of two developments that we have had to watch on the Natural Resources Committee since the Democrats took control.

The first is their tendency to cater to emotional pressure groups who have been successful at raising large sums of money by tugging at the heartstrings of gullible donors, but whose bromides end up doing enormous harm to the very populations they purport to protect. Indeed, the Wildlife Conservation Society recently submitted a letter warning of this signed by 60 of our Nation's leading scientific experts in shark science and fisheries.

The second is the tendency to blame Americans first for the excesses and predations of bad foreign actors.

Time and again, American fishermen, American growers, and American consumers have proven to be the law-abiding, conservation-minded, responsible practitioners of a sustainable practice. But the Democrats continue to impose punitive and destructive measures on them to atone for the irresponsible actions of foreign nations.

Mr. Speaker, I urge rejection of the measure, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would just note, that in California, where I authored a very similar ban on the possession, sale, and trade of shark fins, the sky has not fallen, the world has not ended. All of the calamities that my friend just predicted have not taken place, and guess what, there continues to be a sustainable shark fishery for the meat without contributing to the global shark fin trade that is driving the decimation of shark populations around the world.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from The Northern Mariana Islands (Mr. SABLAN), the author of this bill.

Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of my bill, H.R. 737, the Shark Fin Sales Elimination Act.

The act bans the buying and selling of shark fins in the United States, and this widely supported bipartisan bill has gathered 287 cosponsors. A companion bill, S. 877, has been introduced in the Senate as well.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is the largest number of cosponsors for any ocean conservation bill so far in this Congress, and I want to thank my good friend and the distinguished Member from Texas, the Honorable MICHAEL MCCAUL who has worked tirelessly with me on the bill and brings with him the support of 68 Members from his side of the aisle.

This bill has such strong support because it represents an effective way to remove the United States from the dev-

astating global trade in shark fins at zero cost, and because it does so without stopping those who want to fish for sharks and use them for their meat.

Mr. Speaker, sharks are absolutely critical to life in the ocean. As apex predators, they help maintain balance by keeping prey populations in check. They are also critical to the tourism economy off our coastal communities.

In Florida alone, tourists who go diving to see sharks generate more than 200 times the value of the trade in shark fins for our entire country, 200 times the value.

Despite their importance ecologically and economically, sharks are in serious trouble. Each year fins from up to 73 million sharks are sliced off and sold in a global marketplace. And largely due to this demand for fins, some shark species in the population have now declined by more than 90 percent.

Our Nation has wisely banned the inhumane practice of finning sharks and throwing them back into the ocean to drown and die, yet we still allow fins to be bought and sold here. And many of the fins we are buying and selling come from countries that simply do not have the same level of protection the United States gives sharks.

Now is the time for us to take the next step. Only by banning the shark fin trade once and for all within our borders can we ensure we are no longer supporting an unsustainable use of ocean resources. Recognizing this unsustainability, The Northern Mariana Islands, my home, was the first U.S. insular area to ban the trade of shark fins in 2011.

As an island culture 3,000-plus years old, the people of the Marianas understand and respect the important role that sharks play in maintaining the life of our oceans. And we are not alone. Twelve U.S. states and two territories have also passed their own shark fin bans.

But this patchwork of State laws can be challenging to enforce, and so this is why we need a Federal ban on the shark fin trade in the United States, and that is why I am asking for your support today.

A ban on the shark fin trade is supported by 45 domestic and international airlines, by 21 shipping companies, seven major corporations and more than 645 U.S. businesses and organizations.

A 2016 national poll found four of five Americans supported a national ban on the buying and selling of shark fins. Hundreds of scientists, chefs, fishers, dive, and surf businesses have written to Congress requesting passage of a national shark fin ban.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for this House to act. Please join me by voting "yes" on this critical bill. Vote "yes" to conserve our oceans and the all-important sharks that live in those waters.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Mr. Speaker, my friend from California says that, well, California's ban hasn't resulted in any calamities. What he forgets is that virtually all shark fisheries in the United States are found in Florida, Louisiana, and North Carolina. Banning shark finning in California is like banning buffalo hunting in Rhode Island; there just isn't any.

My friend from the Marianas tells us that there are 73 million shark fins in the global market annually. That is a very misleading statement. It comes from a report published by Shelley Clarke. That report gives a range of between 26 and 73 million and makes no differentiation between legally and illegally obtained fins, which, unfortunately, is a defect in this bill itself.

Mr. Speaker, for a different opinion, however, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL).

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding.

I rise in support of this bill to help end the inhumane practice of shark finning. After a shark's fins are removed, these majestic creatures are thrown into the ocean to die, and multiple species face extinction.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend, Congressman SABLAN, for his courageous leadership to introduce this bill, which I strongly support.

The United States banned shark finning. Now we must end the shark fin trade. Major retailers, airlines, and shipping companies refuse to ship or sell shark fin products. And 12 states, including my home State of Texas have bans on shark fin trading. It is time for a Federal ban, Mr. Speaker.

The United States led in ending the trade of trafficking ivory and rhino horns, and now we must lead in the shark fin trade itself.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to end and close with a personal thanks to my wife, Linda, who is an oceanographer who spent many years serving our country in Naval intelligence tracking Soviet submarines, and now she tracks sharks by tagging sharks and following them around the world as they exist.

□ 1415

As she told me when she returned from Guadeloupe Island, on the very same boat that Peter Benchley went out on as he saw the majestic great white shark, in his words, he says that the greatest regret of his life was writing the book "Jaws."

I thank Delegate SABLAN, and I thank my wife, Linda, for great testimony before this committee. I stand in strong support, and I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will join us on this momentous day.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, just another shout-out to Congressman MCCAUL and his wife, who was a fantastic witness at the hearing we had on this bill at the Natural Resources Committee, and also for the leadership of the State of Texas and so many other States, territories, and leaders in the

private sector who understand we have to end this terribly wasteful and cruel global shark fin trade.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CUNNINGHAM).

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, down in South Carolina's Lowcountry, we all understand the importance of a healthy ocean and healthy coastlines, and sharks are a part of that story. Unfortunately, many populations of sharks have severely declined due to the demand for their fins. In South Carolina, we have not imported or exported any shark fins in recent years, and a large number of constituents have contacted me in support of this legislation.

Support for this ban is growing across the country. Twelve U.S. States already have shark fin bans. Private companies are also refusing to ship or sell shark fin products.

Just earlier this year, Canada became the first G20 country to ban the shark fin trade. The United States has already banned the act of shark finning, but we continue to import fins from countries that don't have their own finning bans.

Disturbingly, in the United States, our own government data shows that less than 20 percent of our U.S. shark stocks are sustainably managed. It is time for the United States to end its role in the shark fin trade and stop contributing to the decline of our shark populations.

I am grateful to Delegate SABLAN and Chairman GRIJALVA from the Natural Resources Committee for their leadership on this issue. Also, I thank Foreign Affairs Committee Ranking Member McCAUL for his leadership.

Ending the shark fin trade will require a death by a thousand cuts, and we have the opportunity to make a big cut right now. Let's pass the Shark Fin Sales Elimination Act.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, my friend from Texas compared banning shark fins to banning ivory. Of course, the difference is that the U.S. was a major consumer of ivory. It is 1 percent of the entire global shark fin market.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES).

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I want to be upfront. I have caught dozens of sharks in my life. I have released every single one of them intact. I have never gone shark fishing. It was unintentional catch. I have never eaten a shark, never had shark fin soup, nor have I any intention or desire to have any of this. But I do represent a State that does have a shark industry that sustainably harvests those.

Mr. Speaker, I think that it is our obligation to actually go to scientists and to go to fisheries managers to get their opinion on what it is that we ought to be doing here.

So, Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from our Democratic Governor's administration where they talk about this bill.

STATE OF LOUISIANA, DEPARTMENT
OF WILDLIFE AND FISHERIES,

Baton Rouge, LA, July 7, 2017.

Re Shark Fin Trade Elimination Act of 2017,
S. 793, H.R. 1456.

Mr. ACY COOPER,
President, Louisiana Shrimp Association,
Grand Isle, Louisiana.

ACY: As requested by you on June 7, 2017, the department has reviewed the text of Senate bill 793 and House Resolution 1456, also known as the "Shark Fin Trade Elimination Act of 2017" and the "Shark Fin Sales Elimination Act of 2017", respectively. The bills, in their current form, would place unnecessary economic burdens on Louisiana shark fishermen. As long as responsible management is in place, which is currently the case for sharks in the Gulf of Mexico, there is no need for this legislation.

The purpose of these bills as stated by the authors is to "curtail the act of 'finning' sharks while reducing the U.S. contribution to the global shark fin market." The practice of shark finning is already illegal in the United States and Louisiana and has been since the 2000s. All sharks landed in Louisiana must have their fins naturally attached until landed. Once a shark is landed in Louisiana, these fins may then be removed and processed separately.

Information available on NOAA's National Marine Fisheries Service commercial statistics website shows that in 2015, 17,059 kilograms (37,530 pounds) of shark fins were exported from the United States to other countries while 24,016 kilograms (52,835 pounds) of shark fins were imported from other countries. The total estimated global shark fin trade, was an estimated 17,500 metric tons (according to a 2015 F.A.O. report on the state of the global market for shark products). These U.S. total imports and exports amount to less than 1% of shark fins traded globally. This bill will likely have little impact on the global trade in shark fins, especially the illegal trade of shark fins. The majority of shark fin exports do not move through the United States. The majority of fins exported from the United States, in the past, moved through California to the Hong Kong Market. However, since the California ban on shark fins in 2015, the shark fin trade now mainly flows through Mexico and Canada in North America. These bills will do little to reduce global trade or curtail illegal practices on the high seas, but will economically impact responsible U.S. fishermen. Data for 2016 were not yet available.

Sharks are indeed a vital part of the marine ecosystem, however those sharks harvested in the United States, along with their fins, are sustainably harvested in accordance with regulations and quotas established by the NOAA Fisheries Highly Migratory Species Division and the State of Louisiana. By eliminating a domestic market for legally harvested fins, this legislation will only have adverse impacts on Louisiana fishermen who legally harvest sharks and their fins as well as the coastal fishing communities where they live. These bills will create unnecessary regulatory waste of legally harvested shark parts by not allowing fishermen to sell fins from a legally harvestable shark species. These bills ban one part, the most valuable part, of an otherwise legally harvestable animal creating a situation in which an entire fishery would effectively be shut down. They will either not affect global shark fin markets, or at worst, will encourage further development of unregulated harvest to replace the regulated US landings.

The shark fishery is an important winter fishery in Louisiana as it provides a critical seasonal source of income to a number of commercial fishermen until other fisheries open later in the year.

Possible alternative measures to allow the legal shark fishery of the U.S. to continue to harvest and sell legally obtained fins while working to reduce illegal finning practices:

1) Legislation mandating tracking and traceability of legally harvested fins as opposed to an outright ban.

2) Provide for tracking and traceability measures of imported and exported fins to determine legal origin of those fins originating from or entering into the U.S.

3) Prohibit the importation or exportation of shark fins that can't be verified to have come from legally landed sharks.

Sincerely,

JACK MONTOUCKET,
Secretary.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. They say: "As long as responsible management is in place, which is currently the case for sharks in the Gulf of Mexico, there is no need for this legislation."

They say: "The practice of shark finning is already illegal in the United States and Louisiana and has been since the 2000s."

"These bills will create unnecessary regulatory waste of legally harvested shark parts by not allowing fishermen to sell fins from a legally harvestable shark species."

These bills "will either not affect global shark fin markets, or at worst, will encourage further development of unregulated harvest to replace the regulated U.S. landings."

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a National Geographic article from this year that has quotes from the Mote Marine Laboratory in Florida.

SHARK FIN IS BANNED IN 12 U.S. STATES—BUT
IT'S STILL ON THE MENU

SHARK FIN BANS, INTENDED TO REDUCE INSTANCES OF SHARK FINNING, ARE DIFFICULT TO ENFORCE, LEADING SOME TO QUESTION IF THEY'RE WORTH IT

(By Rachel Fobar, Jan. 16, 2019)

But that would be against state law. California is one of 12 states that bans the sale of shark fins—measures to help prevent further declines of shark populations and to deter finning, which has been illegal in U.S. waters since 2000. Although demand for shark fins for soup is greatest in Asian countries, there's significant demand for them in the United States too.

A man who identified himself as the China Gate Restaurant owner's brother says the online listing is a mistake and denies that the restaurant serves the dish.

Finning involves slicing fins off live sharks and tossing the wounded animals overboard, where they sink to the bottom and, unable to swim and pass water over their gills, suffocate, die of blood loss, or get eaten by other predators.

"It's without doubt, the worst act of animal cruelty I've ever seen," says celebrity chef Gordon Ramsay in his television documentary on the shark fishing industry.

Every year, the Animal Welfare Institute, a Washington, D.C.-based nonprofit that supports a national ban on shark fin, updates its list of restaurants that serve shark fin soup and notifies the relevant state enforcement agencies.

But so far, according to the institute, the bans haven't stopped restaurants in at least 10 of the 12 states.

During the past two years, at least five bills relating to the country's shark fin trade have been introduced in the U.S. House of Representatives and the Senate. All five died before becoming laws, leaving the fate of sharks in the U.S. uncertain.

Many countries don't regulate shark finning, says Peter Knights, CEO of WildAid, an environmental group that strives to reduce consumption of wildlife products. What this means, activists say, is that Americans could be getting their fins from countries that catch and mutilate sharks, diminishing their already dwindling global populations.

Because of overfishing and the demand for shark fin for soup, more than a quarter of the world's sharks, rays, and chimaeras (a cartilaginous fish also known as ghost sharks) are considered to be threatened. In a 2012 study, researchers found the DNA of eight different sharks, including the endangered scalloped hammerhead, as well as vulnerable species like the shortfin mako and the spiny dogfish, in soup samples collected from around the U.S.

Shark fin soup has long been a status dish in Asian countries, notably China, where its use can be traced back to an emperor from the Song Dynasty (960-1279) who is thought to have invented the dish to show off his power and wealth. Shark fin eventually became exalted as one of the four treasures of Chinese cuisine, along with abalone, sea cucumber, and fish maw (swim bladders).

Today, it's a luxury dish served at weddings as a sign of respect for guests. Preparation of the soup involves boiling the fins and scraping off the skin and meat, leaving behind softened protein fiber, which is sometimes shredded before it goes into the soup.

What is a luxury to some is a headache to understaffed enforcement agencies in the U.S. states that ban shark fin. They say that cases against shark fin vendors in those states can be hard to make. Because the shark fin trade tends to go underground, it has been compared to the illicit drug trade.

"I know it's going on, I know it's out there," says San Francisco marine warden William O'Brien. "But it's a very private matter—it's not the kind of thing that, you know, people are selling to the public."

In addition, according to several law enforcement agents, fines and jail sentences for violating the shark fin ban are generally light and have little deterrent effect.

Knights says a U.S. ban on sales of shark fin would be a significant step forward because it would send the message that selling and consuming shark fin isn't acceptable anymore. The sale of shark fin, he says, "continues to increase the sort of pressure on sharks worldwide."

But, argues Robert Hueter, director of the Center for Shark Research at Mote Marine Laboratory, in Sarasota, Florida, given how difficult it is for some states to enforce their shark fin bans, a nationwide ban would just drive the shark fin market underground—as it's done in San Francisco.

California has about a third of the country's Asian population and is one of the largest consumers of shark fin outside Asia.

When the shark fin ban passed in California in 2011, San Francisco marine warden William O'Brien says he was "charged up." He'd been keeping a list of restaurants to inspect once the ban went into force.

Almost immediately, he and his team received a tip about a supplier, and they confiscated more than 2,000 pounds of shark fin from a warehouse near San Francisco Bay. He estimates that the haul was worth at least \$500,000. The accused, Michael Kwong, a shark fin wholesaler and vocal opponent of the shark fin ban who said his family had been in the business for four generations, pleaded no contest to violating the shark fin

ban. According to court records, he spent 30 days in jail, paid a court fine, and received three years' probation.

Since then, O'Brien says, the leads have dried up. He suspects restaurants and market owners are now storing their shark fin supplies off premises—perhaps in their homes, which would be off-limits to law enforcement without a search warrant.

"Essentially, the market has gone so far underground that it requires more specialization than I have to dig it up," O'Brien says.

O'Brien's overall responsibilities include monitoring for illegal ivory, the pet trade, and illegal animal products in medication, and he must also check hunting and fishing licenses almost daily. He reckons that in any given month, he's able to devote only about two days to shark fin.

"It would be great if I was like, the shark fin guy, and that was all I did," O'Brien laments.

A complicating factor is that a restaurateur accused of selling shark fin soup may claim it's imitation or made from a species of shark exempt from the ban. Spiny and smooth dogfish sharks, for example, are exempt in New York State. It's possible to identify a species from a freshly cut fin, but once a fin is dried or absorbed in soup, the only way to prove it's a species in violation of the law is through DNA testing.

To ascertain whether a crime has been committed, authorities must establish whether the DNA in a seized sample of soup is actually that of a shark. The specimens Ashley Spicer tests and analyzes as a part of her work in the Wildlife Forensics Lab at the California Department of Fish and Wildlife vary from suspected shark fin soup in plastic to-go containers to frozen fins in vacuum-sealed packaging.

Spicer examined California's 2018 shark cases—all four of them. Only two of those cases were specifically shark fin; the others were a shark attack case and a poaching case. In all, the two shark fin cases she handled in 2018 involved about 20 different shark fins.

Low test numbers don't necessarily represent every California shark fin case that comes to the attention of authorities. If, for example, a case elicits an immediate confession on the part of the accused, authorities may decide that testing isn't necessary.

DNA testing proved successful in a recent case in Plano, Texas, one of the states where shark fin is banned. Mike Stephens, a game warden with the Texas Parks and Wildlife Department, went into a local dim sum restaurant—in uniform—with a colleague and asked for the "special" menu. And there it was: shark fin soup.

To assure them the shark fin was real, not imitation, the restaurant owner's wife led the wardens to a walk-in freezer where they found about six bags of shark fins. Stephens assumes that the owner, Qi Zhou, and his wife didn't realize the real reason behind the wardens' visit until it was too late. Before they left, Stephens says, Zhou's wife told them they weren't the only ones selling shark fin. The supermarket next door was offering it too, she said.

Sure enough, when the wardens went to the supermarket, Tao Marketplace, to investigate, they found nearly 40 shark carcasses, the tail fins removed, on display in the fresh fish aisle and in storage.

Wearing rubber gloves so as not to contaminate the evidence, they sealed the fins from both places in separate containers and overnighted them to a lab in North Carolina for DNA testing.

The case against the supermarket is still pending, but the restaurant owner was found guilty of selling shark fin and paid a fine:

one dollar. The court also ordered Zhou to make a donation to the Animal Welfare Institute, which totaled less than a thousand dollars, Stephens says.

According to the institute, in Texas and most other states, prison sentences for shark fin transgressions are rare and usually don't exceed six months for a first offense. Fines are usually less than a thousand dollars. By contrast, a single pound of dried shark fin can sell for \$400, and shark fin soup can command anywhere from \$50 to \$200.

"It's tough to get jail time on wildlife cases," says Jesse Paluch, a captain with the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation's Bureau of Environmental Crimes Investigation unit. In New York, he says, judges and prosecutors "see so much crime, so wildlife crime is a little bit lower on the spectrum."

In October 1988, when Robert Hueter was getting his start at the Mote Marine Laboratory, he heard from a colleague that a group of fishermen off the Florida Panhandle had been caught harpooning bottlenose dolphins, whose meat and blood they used to bait sharks. Killing bottlenose dolphins was and still is illegal under the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972. When the fishermen caught sharks, they sliced off their fins and threw the mutilated animals, still alive, back into the water.

This is sick, Hueter says he thought at the time. He'd never heard of shark finning, so he contacted Nelson Bryant, a reporter he knew at The New York Times, who wrote a pioneering story about the practice. Today, shark finning is the subject of documentaries, public protests, and Facebook posts.

Hueter says the fishermen were handed minor fines for killing the dolphins—and no penalty for finning the sharks. "There was no crime in what they'd done with the sharks," he says.

Since then, Hueter has been an advocate for sharks. Which is why, he says, he's against a national shark fin ban.

"The folks that are pushing the fin ban campaign want to simplify it to this very simple message—that if we ban the fin trade in the United States, we save sharks all around the world," Hueter says. "That is so simplistic and so wrong."

He says that of course he's against finning and overfishing but that cutting the fins off a legally caught dead shark isn't cruel, and banning a specific dish won't stop shark finning because shark finning is already illegal in U.S. waters. But, he says, a ban will ensure that fins from dead sharks are wasted.

"It would cause [fishermen] to have to throw the fins into the dumpster. It goes totally against our doctrine of full utilization of fishery products—that when we harvest fishes from the sea, we don't want to throw stuff away. We want to use absolutely everything we can."

David Shiffman, a marine conservation biologist with Simon Fraser University, in Vancouver, Canada, and the man behind the popular Twitter account @whysharksmatter, says it's unreasonable for people to criticize using shark fins for soup when they may eat shark meat in other forms.

"There are people who are outraged at the idea of consuming a bowl of shark fin soup who are not outraged at the idea of eating a mako shark steak on the grill," he says. "From my perspective, as a shark conservation biologist, either way you've got a dead shark. Shark fin soup has sort of become this boogie man of ocean conservation."

As an alternative to a national ban, in 2018 Hueter helped draft the Sustainable Shark Fisheries and Trade Act, which Representative DANIEL WEBSTER, a Florida Republican, says he plans to reintroduce this session. This bill, Hueter says, would allow imports

only from countries that prohibit finning and promote shark conservation.

But Susan Millward, director of the marine animal program at the Animal Welfare Institute, says a blanket ban is still the best answer.

"Even if you have a sustainable shark fin trade, there's still going to be a trade in shark finning," she says. "There's always going to be people who want to flout it."

Chinese basketball star Yao Ming pushes a white ceramic cup of shark fin soup across a table. In an aquarium tank to his right, a bleeding computer-generated shark sinks to the bottom. "Remember," he says, staring into the camera lens, "when the buying stops, the killing can too."

Since 2011, consumption of shark fin soup in China has fallen by about 80 percent, both because of national bans on serving shark fin at government banquets and the effect of celebrity-backed awareness campaigns such as Yao Ming's, seen by millions of Chinese.

According to a 2018 WildAid report, when WildAid began its Chinese anti-shark fin campaign in 2006, 75 percent of consumers didn't realize the soup they were eating was made from shark, and many who did know mistakenly thought that sharks' fins grew back after they were cut off.

Many conservationists believe that similar awareness-raising efforts in the U.S. would curb demand. People generally don't give much thought to what they're eating, Millward says. "It's just a lack of connecting the dots with where this product came from, how it started with a live animal and how much suffering was endured to reach this finished product . . . These animals are dying painfully, and their whole ecosystems are being affected—for what?"

Her question begs another: Why shark fin? It's widely known that the fin adds no taste or health benefits to shark fin soup; rather, it gives the soup a crystalline, noodle-like texture, which can be replicated almost indistinguishably with mung bean paste or melon. What's more, because shark fins are cartilage and rigid protein fibers, they need to be cooked for hours, even a full day, to soften them enough to be edible. "If you cook my belt for 24 hours, it would be edible too," Knights says.

Ironically, as conservationists, chefs, and even consumers themselves acknowledge, the flavor of shark fin soup—a dish that has ignited international controversy, spurred people to write countless letters to the United States Congress, and led to a massive awareness campaign—comes not from the fins but from the chicken broth used as the soup's base.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. In fact, the director of shark research for that institute says, "The folks that are pushing the fin ban campaign want to simplify it to this very simple message that if we ban the fin trade in the United States, we save sharks all around the world. That is so simplistic and so wrong.

It would cause fishermen "to have to throw fins into the dumpster. It goes totally against our doctrine of full utilization of fishery products, that when we harvest fishes from the sea, we don't want to throw stuff away. We want to use absolutely everything we can."

David Shiffman, a marine conservation biologist with Simon Fraser University, also talks about how this is a flawed approach. He lays out an alternative, which my friend from Florida, Congressman WEBSTER, and the Mote

Marine Laboratory director of the shark institute there have advocated for as well.

Mr. Speaker, there is no one in this body who supports the concept of shark finning. But let's be clear on that. No one here supports this concept of finning a shark and just letting the rest of it drop to the bottom and die. No one does. But we have to understand that our entire fisheries management practice, the State of Louisiana having one of the largest commercial fisheries in the Nation, that this is part of the overall consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. VEASEY). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. This is part of the overall consideration. Yet this bill attempts to gut legally sustainable shark harvesting that is part of the overall fisheries management process and doesn't take into consideration what impact that will have.

In closing, this bill is not the right approach. I agree with the objective, but all we are doing here is pushing illegally harvested species to other countries, as opposed to truly stopping the problem. There are successful efforts out there that are demonstrated to work, whereas this simply, again, promotes illegal harvesting.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, if this is a question that requires us to listen to the experts and the scientists about how to end the global shark fin trade, then it is not much of a debate, because over 150 scientists are on record supporting this bill. The same consensus exists among leaders at aquariums, academic institutions, and other places.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy and his leadership and our friend from the Northern Mariana Islands for moving this legislation forward.

This is about leadership in terms of ending the global practice. My colleague from Louisiana understates the power that the United States has in terms of getting our policies right. Yes, we have outlawed shark finning in 2010, but the international traffic continues, and we need to take this next step.

This is a progression of efforts to try to deal with animal welfare. This is one of the first arguments we hear whether it is illegal poaching, the ivory trade, or other endangered species, we have been able to set the table on a global stage to be able to change the dynamics, to change the economics, and to change public perception.

Sharks are declining globally. There may be a species or two here or there, but, overall, this apex predator species—so important for the health of the ecosystem—is in peril, and the practice of shark finning is part of this.

Mr. Speaker, you have heard about de-finning while they are still alive and discarding them back in the water which is a very common practice. We know that my State of Oregon is one where people stepped up and ended this barbaric practice. We have mobilized voting initiatives where we deal with problems of trafficking with exotic species. It has proven that our action in 2010 prohibiting the taking of fins was not enough as long as this global trade continues unchecked. There still is a market for the fins in the United States and around the world, and it is fueled by imports sourced from all over the world, including locations with no ban. We are one of the top 15 shark fin importing nations.

Who knew?

As a result, it is highly likely that shark fins sold in the United States came from sharks that have been brutally finned.

I am pleased that we are taking action to do the right thing and ban the trade of shark fins. I hope the Senate takes this bill up quickly and passes it so we can get it enacted into law. This is one of the things we could actually agree with. Mr. Speaker, you have heard the bipartisan support evidenced here today.

But I hope that we can continue forward with an animal welfare agenda. There is a series of bills on a bipartisan basis, for example, the PREPARED Act, to help animals during natural disasters, the Wildlife Conservation and Anti-Trafficking Act to combat wildlife trafficking, and the SAFE Act to prevent horse slaughter.

We have these bipartisan pieces of legislation with major sources of cosponsors. They are teed up and ready to go. I hope this passes today with overwhelming support, and it is one more step as we implement an animal welfare agenda that is one of the areas where we can work together on a bipartisan basis to make the world a little better.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, we hear a lot about the letter signed by 150 scientists in support of this bill. We ought to point out that only 10 of those 150 scientists actually are scientists with expertise in shark fisheries. But every one of the scientists who signed the Wildlife Conservation Society letter in opposition to this bill is recognized as an active professional shark researcher and expert in the field.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WEBSTER).

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. MCCLINTOCK for yielding.

I rise today in opposition to H.R. 737, the Shark Fin Sales Elimination Act. As a Floridian and member of the House Natural Resources Committee, promoting shark conservation has long been a priority of mine. I am glad to see sharks receiving national attention.

Sharks play a crucial role in our ocean's ecosystem, and yet, they face a

grave threat: shark finning, a cruel practice of capturing sharks, clipping their fins, and casting the rest of it to a slow death in the ocean. This practice is cruel and inhumane.

I was a member of the legislature almost 30 years ago when Florida was one of the first States to ban shark finning. Since then, finning has become completely illegal in the United States.

Unfortunately, finning still occurs in unregulated waters around our globe. H.R. 737 will do nothing to protect sharks from being finned in those areas. Instead, it would require American fishermen who legally and responsibly land sharks to destroy or discard their fins, leading to terrible waste.

Many scientists, conservationists, and commercial fishermen have vocally opposed this bill and have said it will not advance shark restoration or stop the practice of finning.

This bill would have a devastating effect on responsible American fishermen, including many in my own district in Florida who have made sacrifices to conserve and rebuild our shark populations.

I offer a separate bill, an alternative, H.R. 788, one that has been sponsored and supported by Senator RUBIO in the Senate and is probably the key bill there for this particular issue. Instead of banning the sale of humanely sourced shark fins, my bill would encourage bad actors in the shark fin market to create science-based management systems for shark conservation.

□ 1430

My bill requires any nation seeking to export shark, ray, or skate to the United States to first be certified by NOAA that it has conservation policies in place that rise to the standards of U.S. fishermen and that forbid nations to practice shark finning.

The U.S. plays an important role on the world stage in fishing management and conservation. H.R. 737 would remove the U.S. from the shark fin market; it would silence the leading voice in shark conservation—my bill would amplify it—and ensure no finned shark fins enter into the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to make the best choice for sustaining shark populations long-term and oppose this deeply flawed bill before us today.

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. WEBSTER for his engagement on this issue. I think his intentions are noble. I think he wants to help end the global shark fin trade. Unfortunately, though, his bill just won't work.

We did incorporate some of that bill, the part, frankly, that would not cost a lot of money. By doing so, we added skates and rays to the seafood import monitoring program. That is a good suggestion, because skates and rays are also not doing well globally, and they deserve our attention.

But the rest of the bill is expensive, cumbersome, and, frankly, it is just not going to work. It would require a complicated, expensive certification scheme that might sound good on paper, but we know the real world that we live in.

In the marine fisheries management in the United States right now, we are years, and sometimes decades, behind having the resources we need for adequate and timely stock assessments, even for the fisheries that we are already trying to manage right now.

So the idea that we would somehow be able to do this, be able to afford it, and also do it in a way that we could comply with in this country so we could hold other countries around the world to that standard, if we are unable to do all of that stuff, then requiring other countries to meet that standard would trigger a WTO violation and we would do nothing to help end the global shark fin trade.

Again, I appreciate the gentleman's interest in this issue. I know that Florida has been said to be the heart of the opposition to this bill, but we should note that 19 members of the Florida delegation support this bill, including 6 Republicans in the Florida delegation.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, let's be very clear: Killing a shark for its fin while throwing away the rest of the carcass is contemptible; it is immoral; it is wrong; and it has been illegal and banned in the United States since 1993. American fishermen don't do this. American fishermen are the good guys in this story.

This bill does something very different. It requires American fishermen to throw away the fins when they kill a shark. That is just as wasteful, just as despicable, and it is not going to stop foreign bad actors. It will kill American fishing. It will destroy the livelihoods of Americans who have followed the law and who are responsibly accounting for their entire catch. It is not going to help our domestic shark populations. They are doing quite fine.

NOAA currently manages 42 shark species, along with the commercial and recreational shark fisheries. None of these 42 species in the Atlantic are listed as endangered under the Endangered Species Act. As I pointed out earlier, the most recent results of the NOAA fisheries' longest running shark survey show our domestic populations increasing, with scientists capturing and tagging more than ever before.

It is a shame that we are here to blame American fishermen, who are following all of the laws and doing everything right.

And remember this: Under H.R. 737, sharks can still be legally caught in U.S. waters; however, they will be forced to cut off the fins and throw them into the garbage. Ask yourself: Is this right?

Congress has long supported the full utilization of landed seafood in order to

obtain the maximum economic value of our limited marine resources, all consistent with the Magnuson-Stevens Act. This legislation will result in little more than wasted resources.

The administration opposes this legislation. It writes:

We cannot support the Shark Fin Sale Elimination Act because of the bill's negative impact on U.S. fishermen that would outweigh its minimal benefit to shark conservation. This would hurt U.S. fishermen who currently harvest and sell sharks and shark fins in a sustainable manner under strict Federal management.

Industry opposes this legislation. They write:

H.R. 737 would effectively put an end to all shark fishing. The revenue realized from fin sales can comprise up to 50 percent of a large coastal shark's value. Requiring the discard or destruction of shark fins is also wasteful, both as a food resource and an economic resource that helps sustain rural coastal fishing communities here in America. It has long been the policy of Congress to encourage full utilization of land and catch in order to obtain the maximum economic value of our limited marine resources.

And, finally, scientists oppose this legislation. Two of the leading scientists in the field write:

If the shark fin trade in the United States were completely eliminated, the direct impact on reducing global shark mortality would likely be insignificant. The elimination of United States-supplied fins in world markets would open the door to increased market share for illegal, unreported, and unregulated fishing nations not practicing sustainable shark fishing, including those that have not yet prohibited finning.

This legislation follows a familiar theme we hear from the other side: Blame Americans first for the world's problems. This legislation is the definition of a solution in search of a problem.

I am sorry that some of my Republican colleagues have been convinced to support this legislation, but I hope that today's debate has shined a bit of truth on the issue.

Let me just quote from the humane society quickly. Their reasoning for this legislation is that: "The United States has a robust market for shark fins, many of which likely were obtained through finning."

Let me state again, "likely were obtained." This is the science and data that we are using to support this legislation, "likely were obtained." Mind you, we make up less than 1 percent of the global market.

Shark finning will continue across the rest of the globe, and it will continue to focus on the market in South and Southeast Asia. We will have lost our ability to have managed our resources and support our local fishing industries.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to oppose this misguided and misconceived legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, again, I agree with my friend: We should listen to the scientists—not the two who my friend

cited in his closing arguments, but how about the over 150 who are on record in support of this bill? We should listen to them.

We should listen to the many States and territories and other nations, including, recently, Canada, our neighbor to the north.

We should listen to the many corporate leaders around the world, all of whom have reached the inevitable conclusion that, if you are serious about ending this wasteful and inhumane and horrific practice of shark finning, then you have to tackle the shark fin trade; you have to ban the possession and sale of shark fins, because, if you don't, we know here in the United States we have banned the practice of shark finning for years, and yet we have continued to be part of and contributed to the global shark fin trade because we don't ban the possession and trade and sale of the fin itself.

That is what this bill does.

And in terms of U.S. fishermen who are, as my friend says, following the laws and doing everything right, well, the good news is they are going to be just fine under this law. We know that because, in States like California, Oregon, Texas, and other places, folks who want to continue fishing for shark meat have been able to do so, even though those States have passed bans just like this on the possession, trade, and sale of shark fins.

This is a good bill. It is an overwhelmingly bipartisan bill. It is a bill that includes support from 19 members of the Florida delegation, including 6 Republicans from that delegation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes," and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BLUMENAUER). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 737, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

NORTH AMERICAN WETLANDS CONSERVATION EXTENSION ACT

Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 925) to extend the authorization of appropriations for allocation to carry out approved wetlands conservation projects under the North American Wetlands Conservation Act through fiscal year 2024.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 295

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 "North American Wetlands Conservation Extension Act".

SEC. 2. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 7(c) of the North American Wetlands Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 4406(c)) is amended by striking "not to exceed—" and all that follows through paragraph (5) and inserting "not to exceed \$60,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2020 through 2024."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands (Mr. SABLAN) and the gentleman from California (Mr. McCLINTOCK) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, this bill would reauthorize the North American Wetlands Conservation Act, a partnership-based program that leverages non-Federal funds to protect and restore wetland and associated habitat.

NAWCA has enjoyed bipartisan support in the past, and this bill is no exception.

The bill authorizes NAWCA for 5 years at \$60 million per year.

NAWCA is considered one of the most cost-effective conservation programs. Each Federal dollar invested in NAWCA is typically matched by more than \$3 from non-Federal partners at the local and State level, including corporations, private landowners, and nonprofits.

Thanks to NAWCA, almost 29.8 million acres of habitat have been protected.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 925 reauthorizes conservation projects under the North American Wetlands Conservation Act, NAWCA, through fiscal year 2024.

I readily concede this is a popular program. Even without an authorization, the appropriators put \$42 million into this last year. The sponsors of the bill, obviously, want more, authorizing \$60 million a year. That is higher than any appropriation to date. I am concerned that, in a time where we are running record and perilous deficits, we ought to consider the level which some of these programs should be funded.

Much of the money under NAWCA is used to obtain conservation easements and wetlands outright to benefit migratory birds and fish. According to

the Fish and Wildlife Service, the program has benefited almost 30 million acres of wetland habitat in North America since its inception 30 years ago. It is a very good thing.

Here is the problem, though: The Federal Government is already land-lord to 640 million acres of the country and is doing a poor job of maintaining what we already have. For example, the National Park Service is facing a nearly \$12 billion deferred maintenance backlog. The question I would raise today is whether we really need to authorize increased funding to buy even more land.

□ 1445

It would be one thing if Congress had taken strong action to address this backlog by moving H.R. 1225 by Congressman ROB BISHOP, the former chairman and currently ranking member of the Natural Resources Committee.

That was a favorably reported bill. It has overwhelming support with 329 bipartisan cosponsors. That bill would take excess funds from new energy development and target these deteriorating lands so that people as well as migratory birds and fish can enjoy them.

I recognize that H.R. 925 simply authorizes an existing program, but it is imperative to take into account the realities that our current Federal lands are facing. Acquiring more land when we can't take care of the land we already control is not a wise use of our resources.

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

Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON), who is the sponsor of the bill.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and I rise in strong support of my bill, H.R. 925, the North American Wetlands Conservation Extension Act.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague, Congressman WITTMAN from Virginia, for coauthoring this measure with me and for his leadership on this issue; not just on this bill, but on this issue. He is a stalwart supporter and he works extremely hard on making sure our wetlands and environment are protected.

As members of the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission, Congressman WITTMAN and I have the privilege of evaluating and approving NAWCA-funded projects in the United States, in Canada, and in Mexico.

On that commission, we share a responsibility to ensure that everyone in America can use and can enjoy the natural resources that belong to all of us.

Since 1989, North American Wetlands Conservation Act grants have funded close to 3,000 projects, carried out by more than 6,000 partners. Every year, restoration and conservation projects funded by NAWCA support 7,500 jobs across our country, from fisheries biologists and engineers, to construction teams and supply retailers.

Federal NAWCA grants require a 10-to-1 nonFederal match, and over the past 30 years, \$1.6 billion in Federal funding has been matched more than 3 to 1 with \$4.7 billion contributed by nonFederal partners.

The result so far has been 29.8 million acres, an area the size of the State of Pennsylvania, of rehabilitated and restored wetlands. These wetlands support ecological health and biodiversity while providing outstanding opportunities for Americans to hunt, to fish, to hike, to bird watch, to farm, and to ranch. The resulting economic activity exceeds \$5 billion every year.

Even those who don't use these lands directly benefit. Wetlands provide natural processes that allow us to have clean, plentiful water supplies. Wetlands protect the lands around them by absorbing flood water and storm surges.

H.R. 925 reauthorizes NAWCA so we can continue the critical work on North America's wetlands that offer tremendous ecological and economic benefits to each and every one of us.

Mr. Speaker, I ask Members to support NAWCA today to make sure that we continue to conserve our public land. Let's work together today on behalf of all Americans, now and for future generations.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN).

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise also in strong support of H.R. 925, the North American Wetlands Conservation Extension Act. And I would also like to thank Mr. THOMPSON for his extraordinary leadership on this legislation and for his service on the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission.

As he spoke about, he has a passion to make sure that we are preserving that habitat we all value and the wildlife that lives there—not just the migratory birds, but all of the other life that it supports. It is critically important that we continue this program. It is one of the truly successful stories in conservation in our Nation, and, again, I want to thank Mr. THOMPSON for his leadership.

This bill works to reduce wetlands disappearance and to conserve migratory bird habitat. The good part about it is that we, in setting aside this land now, predominantly use conservation easements as a mechanism to do that.

I understand the chairman's concern about more acres of land in the Federal inventory and the dollars that it takes to maintain that land. We absolutely have to address that. But the good news here is that many of these acres are in conservation easements, which means they stay in private ownership. They just have an easement from the Federal Government to maintain that critical habitat.

That really is the best of both worlds as well as leveraging private dollars with this. What a great example of how to leverage public dollars with private dollars.

Several years ago, the duck hunters, en masse, came and said: Listen, we want to increase the duck stamp fee so that we can make sure we have the necessary dollars to match the Federal dollars that go into this program. It was extraordinarily successful.

People who enjoy the resources, from bird watchers to hunters and others, have said: We want to put more of our dollars into it. And, again, we are using their tax dollars to leverage those private dollars for this critical habitat.

Our wetlands across the United States are Mother Nature's filter for the water that comes off the land and also Mother Nature's nurseries for all that critical wildlife that lives there, both fish, and birds, and other critters that are critical to these environments. They are disappearing at an alarming rate. This bill helps us stem the loss of those wetlands.

As I have said, the leveraging of private resources is critical. I think Congress should be doing more to identify these types of Federal programs like NAWCA that have proven to be successful. NAWCA matches funding that then contributes to conservation success in our communities. Let's do more of that.

Protecting and restoring and managing wetland habitats is critically important. I would argue, of all of the habitats out there, this habitat, on the scale of value, has the most value across, not just the United States, but across the planet. We have to do more to make sure we are preserving that.

It is critical that we invest efficiently to conserve these areas. Investing efficiently means leveraging that one public dollar to three private dollars, and we want to make sure that we are preserving these areas for use for future generations.

Unfortunately, wetlands continue to disappear at an alarming rate. This helps stem the disappearance of those wetlands.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. SABLON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend Representative THOMPSON and Representative WITTMAN for their work on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and would inquire whether my colleague has any remaining speakers on his side. I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, this is, undoubtedly, a popular program. It does well serve public recreation and use, the very purpose of our public lands, and I certainly don't oppose it.

But I do want to close with this warning: We are continuing to acquire more and more land while we are failing to take care of the enormous estates that we already hold.

LOUIE GOHMERT, my colleague on the Natural Resources Committee, has compared our Federal lands policy to the old miser in town whose mansion is

dilapidated, whose yard is overgrown with weeds, and whose paint is peeling because he spends all of his time and money plotting how he is going to acquire his neighbor's property.

I would like to hope that the bipartisan support for this bill will be accompanied soon with bipartisan support for Mr. BISHOP's bill, H.R. 1225, which would actually take the resources that we are generating from the public lands to assure that we are taking proper care of our public lands.

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

Mr. SABLON. Mr. Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote on this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PAYNE). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands (Mr. SABLON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 925.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FIRST INFANTRY RECOGNITION OF SACRIFICE IN THEATER ACT

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1088) to authorize the Society of the First Infantry Division to make modifications to the First Division Monument located on Federal land in Presidential Park in District of Columbia, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1088

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 "First Infantry Recognition of Sacrifice in Theater Act" or the "FIRST Act".

SEC. 2. MODIFICATION TO FIRST DIVISION MONUMENT.

(a) *AUTHORIZATION.*—The Society of the First Infantry Division (an organization described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and exempt from taxation under section 501(a) of that code), may make modifications (including construction of additional plaques and stone plinths on which to put the plaques) to the First Division Monument located on Federal land in President's Park in the District of Columbia that was set aside for memorial purposes of the First Infantry Division, in order to honor the members of the First Infantry Division who paid the ultimate sacrifice during United States operations, including Operation Desert Storm, Operation Iraqi Freedom and New Dawn, and Operation Enduring Freedom. The First Infantry Division at the Department of the Army shall collaborate with the Department of Defense to provide to the Society of the First Infantry Division the list of names to be added.

(b) *NON-APPLICATION OF COMMEMORATIVE WORKS ACT.*—Subsection (b) of section 8903 of title 40, United States Code (commonly known as the "Commemorative Works Act"), shall not apply to actions taken under subsection (a) of this section.

(c) *FUNDING.*—Federal funds may not be used to pay any expense of the activities of the Society of the First Infantry Division which are authorized by this section.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN) and the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN).

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, this bill introduced by Representative MARSHALL would honor the heroism of the soldiers of the U.S. Army's 1st Infantry Division by authorizing the installation of additional plaques at the First Infantry Division Monument located in the National Park Services' President's Park just south of the White House.

These additions would include the names of over 600 1st Infantry Division soldiers who paid the ultimate sacrifice in service to our Nation during Operation Desert Storm, Operation Enduring Freedom, Operation Iraqi Freedom, and Operation New Dawn, ensuring that these fallen soldiers are not forgotten.

For over 100 years now, soldiers of the U.S. Army's 1st Infantry Division have embodied their motto: "No mission too difficult, no sacrifice too great. Duty first."

I am proud to rise in strong support of this bill and the brave soldiers of the 1st Infantry Division and I want to thank Representative MARSHALL for championing this important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support it, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1088 offered by our colleague from Kansas, Dr. ROGER MARSHALL, authorizes the Society of the 1st Infantry Division to modify the First Infantry Division Monument here in Washington, D.C.

This society seeks to honor its members who died during combat in Operation Desert Storm, Operation Iraqi Freedom, Operation New Dawn, and Operation Enduring Freedom.

The 1st Infantry Division of the United States Army has served our country faithfully with distinction and honor for well over a century now. 12,949 heroes of the "Big Red One" have fallen in the defense of our Constitution and the freedoms it guarantees. A grateful Nation remembers their names

by inscribing them on a monument here in our Nation's Capital.

Every one of them has been faithful to the Division's motto of: "No mission too difficult, no sacrifice too great. Duty first."

It is time to update and add names to the monument to honor these American heroes and to serve as an inspiration and example to the generation whose freedom and security they gave their lives to protect.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the measure, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close, so I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL), the author of this bill.

□ 1500

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today humbled and a bit emotional in support of the First Infantry Recognition of Sacrifice in Theater Act, also known as the FIRST Act.

The FIRST Act modifies the First Infantry Division Monument to include and honor the names of 660 brave soldiers who paid the ultimate sacrifice for our country during Operation Iraqi Freedom, Operation New Dawn, and Operation Enduring Freedom.

The First Infantry Division Monument, located in President's Park, west of the White House, was first conceived by the Society of the 1st Infantry Division to commemorate the lives of soldiers killed serving our country during World War I. Over the years, a total of 12,949 names of fallen soldiers have been inscribed and commemorated on this monument, but it will now take an act of Congress to honor the sacrifices of those 660 recently fallen soldiers and give their families a hallowed place for remembrance.

Throughout history, when the President had decided to send troops into harm's way to protect American lives and uphold American values, he has almost always called upon the 1st Infantry Division.

Indeed the 1st Infantry Division, more commonly known as "The Big Red One," has a heroic and storied past. Established in 1917, the Division celebrated their 102nd anniversary earlier this year, and since 1955, has called Fort Riley, Kansas, its home.

Over the years, the soldiers of The Big Red One have fought in World War I, World War II, the Cold War, the Vietnam war, Operations Desert Shield and Desert Storm, the Balkans peacekeeping missions, the war on terror, and as of today, multiple operations around the globe.

Always first into battle, the Division fired the very first American shots of World War I, providing the United States its first victory in the war to

end all wars at the Battle of Cantigny, France.

Despite suffering more than 1,000 casualties, the 1st Infantry Division bravely captured the village from German forces, defended it against repeated counterattacks, and bolstered the morale of the Allies. The Division returned home in September 1919 with 5 medals of honor.

Next, in World War II, the 1st Infantry Division led the way during the Allied invasion of North Africa, leading to the defeat of the Axis Afrika Korps and capturing over 250,000 soldiers.

The Division then departed for the invasion of Sicily, after a specific request from Lieutenant General George "Old Blood and Guts" Patton. There they faced fierce mountain combat and suffered heavy casualties, with some units losing over half their fighting strength.

The 1st Infantry Division would then return to England in preparation for the Invasion of Normandy. On D-Day, June 6, 1944, soldiers from The Big Red One would once again lead the assault on German forces in landings at Omaha Beach. They would then go on to fight a continuous offensive across France and into Germany, suffering over 20,000 casualties throughout the war.

After the war, the 1st Infantry Division provided protection for occupied Germany and maintained security at the Nuremberg trials. The Division played a pivotal role in World War II and would return home with 16 members being awarded the Medal of Honor.

The 1st Infantry Division has been active all over the world, assisting in combat and humanitarian missions for over 100 years. Since the Division's establishment, more than 13,000 soldiers of the 1st Infantry Division have lost their lives in battle. Today, soldiers from the Division stand at the ready in over 15 countries. We sleep peacefully here at home because they stand at the ready abroad.

It is our duty as Members of Congress to ensure these fallen soldiers are not forgotten by passing the FIRST Act and allowing the inclusion of the names of these 660 fallen soldiers who paid the ultimate sacrifice.

I am proud to represent them as they continue to exemplify their motto: "No mission too difficult, no sacrifice too great. Duty first."

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

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I commend Congressman MARSHALL for that very moving presentation and for the impressive history that he recounted of the 1st Infantry Division.

This is a great bill, an important bill, and I know we are all very proud to support it. I urge a "yes" vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1088, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize the Society of the First Infantry Division to make modifications to the First Division Monument located on Federal Land in President's Park in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MULTINATIONAL SPECIES CONSERVATION FUNDS SEMIPOSTAL STAMP REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2019

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1446) to require the United States Postal Service to continue selling the Multinational Species Conservation Funds Semipostal Stamp until all remaining stamps are sold, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1446

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 "Multinational Species Conservation Funds Semipostal Stamp Reauthorization Act of 2019".

SEC. 2. REAUTHORIZATION; REQUIREMENT TO SELL ALL STAMPS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2(c) of the Multinational Species Conservation Funds Semipostal Stamp Act of 2010 (39 U.S.C. 416 note; Public Law 111-241) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by striking "of at least 6 years,"; and

(B) by inserting before the period at the end the following: "and ending not earlier than the date on which the United States Postal Service provides notice to Congress under paragraph (5)"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

"(5) REQUIREMENT TO SELL ALL STAMPS PRINTED.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—The United States Postal Service shall sell each copy of the Multinational Species Conservation Fund Semipostal Stamp that the United States Postal Service prints under this Act.

"(B) NOTIFICATION OF CONGRESS.—The United States Postal Service shall notify the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Oversight and Reform of the House of Representatives when all copies of the Multinational Species Conservation Fund Semipostal Stamp printed under this Act have been sold."

(b) RETROACTIVE APPLICABILITY.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect as if enacted on the day after the date of enactment of the Multinational Species Conservation Funds Semipostal Stamp Reauthorization Act of 2013 (Public Law 113-165; 128 Stat. 1878).

SEC. 3. DETERMINATION OF BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled "Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legisla-

tion" for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the House Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN) and the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1446. It is a bill that would require the U.S. Postal Service to continue selling the Multinational Species Conservation Funds Semipostal Stamp. It would require those continued sales until such time as the remaining stamps are sold.

Now, since 2010, these stamps have been sold by the U.S. Postal Service to support international conservation efforts, but the authorization for these sales has expired, leaving 49 million stamps unsold—printed, but unsold. Americans care deeply about wildlife, and by purchasing these stamps, they can support the Multinational Species Conservation Fund, which includes five grant programs that support the conservation of African and Asian elephants, great apes, marine turtles, rhinos and tigers.

Between 2011 and 2017, the stamp sales from this program generated \$3.9 million, and that money went to conservation projects related to antipoaching, capacity building, community engagement and outreach, habitat restoration, and raising public awareness of wildlife trafficking.

Mr. Speaker, 49 million stamps have already been printed. They are sitting and waiting to be sold. This bill doesn't authorize the printing of any new stamps, but it does direct the U.S. Postal Service to continue selling the stamps it has printed until they are exhausted.

At a time when so many species are threatened with extinction due to climate change, habitat loss, and exploitation, we must do more to protect wildlife.

Mr. Speaker, I do not have another speaker at this point, and I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES,
Washington, DC, September 30, 2019.

Hon. ELIJAH E. CUMMINGS,
Chair, Committee on Oversight and Reform,
House of Representatives, Washington DC.

DEAR CHAIR CUMMINGS: I write to you concerning H.R. 1446 the, "Multinational Spe-

cies Conservation Funds Semipostal Stamp Reauthorization Act of 2019."

I appreciate your willingness to work cooperatively on this legislation. I recognize that the bill contains provisions that fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Oversight and Reform. I acknowledge that your Committee will not formally consider H.R. 1446 and agree that the inaction of your Committee with respect to the bill does not waive any future jurisdictional claim over the matters contained in the bill that fall within your Committee's Rule X jurisdiction.

I will ensure that our exchange of letters is included in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the bill. I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and look forward to continuing to work with you as this measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

RAÚL M. GRIJALVA,
Chair,
House Natural Resources Committee.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND REFORM,
Washington, DC, October 16, 2019.

Hon. RAÚL GRIJALVA,
Chairman, Committee on Natural Resources,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN GRIJALVA: I am writing to you concerning the bill H.R. 1446, the Multinational Species Conservation Funds Semipostal Stamp Reauthorization Act of 2019. There are certain provisions in the legislation which fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

In the interest of permitting your committee to proceed expeditiously to consideration of this important bill, I am willing to waive this Committee's right to consider the bill. I do so with the understanding that by waiving consideration of the bill, the Committee does not waive any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill which fall within its Rule X jurisdiction. I request that you urge the Speaker to name members of this Committee to any conference committee which is named to consider such provisions.

Please place this letter into the committee report on H.R. 1446 and into the Congressional Record during consideration of the measure on the House floor. Thank you for the cooperative spirit in which you have worked regarding this matter and others between our respective committees.

Sincerely,

ELIJAH E. CUMMINGS,
Chairman.

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. CLAY for this legislation and for his being amenable to changes that make this bill one that every Member can support.

This legislation raises money through the voluntary purchases of a special stamp that in turn funds valuable conservation efforts of iconic global species such as tigers, elephants, rhinos, great apes, marine turtles, and their habitats.

Anyone who wants to help these efforts can do so by purchasing these stamps; a small surcharge for which is then deposited in the Multinational Species Conservation Funds. These funds in turn provide grants for conservation work around the globe. To date, over \$5.7 million have been raised

by this low-key and entirely voluntary effort.

While the authority to sell these popular stamps has expired, the stockpile of 49 million stamps still exists. Mr. CLAY accepted amendments to allow the stockpile to be depleted before new stamps are printed that prevents waste and protects taxpayers.

International conservation of these important species is a shared goal of both Democrats and Republicans, and this bill is a very good example of that seemingly rare opportunity for all of us to come together for the benefit of wildlife, their habitat, and, of course, the American people who enjoy both for generations to come.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the measure, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK). It is good to have bipartisan support for this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1446, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOMESTEAD NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1472) to rename the Homestead National Monument of America near Beatrice, Nebraska, as the Homestead National Historical Park.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1472

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

SECTION 1. HOMESTEAD NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The first section of the Act of March 19, 1936 (16 U.S.C. 450u), is amended by striking “designated” and all that follows through the end and inserting “designated the ‘Homestead National Historical Park’”.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the unit of the National Park System known as “The Homestead National Monument of America” shall be considered to be a reference to the “Homestead National Historical Park”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN) and the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Members have

5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the measure under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1472, introduced by my friend Representative SMITH from Nebraska, would rename the Homestead National Monument of America near Beatrice, Nebraska, to the Homestead National Historical Park.

In 1862, President Lincoln signed the Homestead Act, and this enabled citizens to own a portion of the vast public lands across the Western United States.

To commemorate the first claim under the Homestead Act, Congress established the Homestead National Monument of America in 1936; serving as a lasting memorial to the over 1.6 million claims that built the American West.

Today, the Homestead National Monument of America consists of the first site successfully claimed under the Homestead Act, the Freeman School, a heritage museum, hiking trails, and 100 acres of restored tall grass prairie. Redesignating this important monument as a national historical park would provide a more accurate and appropriate description of the scope and complexity of the site's resources and would conform the park's designation to Park Service standards.

Mr. Speaker, again, I thank my colleague Representative SMITH for introducing this bill, and I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1472. I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1472, offered by our colleague, Congressman SMITH of Nebraska, would redesignate the Homestead National Monument of America to simply the Homestead National Historical Park.

Congress authorized this commemoration in 1936 after acquiring the site of the Daniel Freeman homestead. It was set aside as a lasting memorial to the settlers who built the American West as a result of the Homestead Act of 1862 and its successors.

In total, 207 million, or 10 percent, of all land in the United States was settled under the Homestead Act. The name of the monument with the redundant qualifier “of America” has made it an anomaly within the National Park system. This bill simply removes that redundancy and conforms more clearly with the naming customs of the National Park Service.

Redesignating the unit as a national historical park will further clarify the unit's characteristics in keeping with the modern designations that the Park Service maintains.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the measure, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. SMITH), the author of the measure who brings it to the floor today.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I certainly appreciate my colleagues and their support of our effort to change the name from Homestead National Monument of America to the Homestead National Historical Park. Obviously, some of the reasons have been outlined.

I appreciate the chairman and ranking member for bringing this legislation to the floor. It is supported by the entire Nebraska delegation, and even more importantly, by local stakeholders.

And as was mentioned, the Homestead Act of 1862 was signed by President Lincoln, and it absolutely helped shaped the American West. It allowed U.S. citizens to earn ownership of a portion of the vast public lands owned by the Federal Government across the Western U.S.

Ultimately, the Federal Government granted title to 10 percent of the land in the U.S. through this program. It gave millions a chance to build a new life for themselves, their families and for future generations.

In order to claim a 160-acre parcel of land under the Homestead Act, a homesteader was required to be at least 21 years of age or the head of a household, build a home on the land, improve and farm the land for 5 years, and pay an \$18 filing fee.

□ 1515

The Homestead Act remained in place through 1976, with provisions allowing for homesteading in Alaska through 1986.

President Ronald Reagan said the Homestead Act “ensured that the great western prairies of America would be the realm of independent, property-owning citizens—a mighty guarantee of freedom is difficult to imagine.”

We are very proud that the very first claim under the Homestead Act was made by a man named Daniel Freeman, near Beatrice, Nebraska, in Nebraska's Third District. To memorialize this milestone, as well as the 1.6 million other claims which built the American West, the Homestead National Monument of America was established, also near Beatrice.

Unfortunately, referring to this site as a monument brings images of a single, static monument, such as a statue, an obelisk, or even a natural feature like the Scotts Bluff National Monument near my hometown of Gering, Nebraska, not of an extensive park that celebrates the pioneering homesteaders of many years ago.

Homestead National Monument consists of a heritage museum, the Freeman School mentioned earlier, as well

as the tallgrass prairie, hiking trails, a forest, farming demonstrations, and much more.

Referring to this site as a historical park instead of a monument would far more clearly describe the opportunities to take in this living-history site. In fact, according to the Friends of Homestead, 89 percent of first-time visitors to the facility were confused by the name.

On behalf of the people of Nebraska and, particularly, the citizens of Beatrice and Gage County, Nebraska, I appreciate this opportunity to advocate in support of this proposal today.

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

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the other gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY).

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, first, let me thank two of my good friends, Ranking Member MCCLINTOCK and Chairman HUFFMAN, for the cordial and elevated discussion today about something that might appear small in the big scheme of things, particularly with what is going on in Congress, but, nonetheless, is a good, working part of functioning government on this House floor.

This is important to us in Nebraska, and it is important to the rest of America. I am pleased that my good friend, Congressman ADRIAN SMITH, has been working on this effort to rename the Homestead National Monument of America to the Homestead National Historical Park to clear up some confusion. This small but important change will more accurately reflect the nature and mission of this unique National Park Service unit.

The Homestead Act of 1862, as we have heard, really did forever change the direction of our Nation. Let me take us through a few facts that have already been mentioned but I think worthwhile emphasizing.

In exchange for the \$18 filing fee and just a commitment to improve the land, any U.S. citizen could farm 160 acres and own it outright after 5 years. Almost inconceivable to us today, but that is how this began.

The National Park Service unit dedicated to telling the extraordinary story of these incredible pioneers is located in Beatrice, Nebraska.

And I thank Chairman HUFFMAN for clarifying how it is appropriately pronounced: Beatrice, Nebraska.

Before redistricting earlier, I used to represent this area. It is only about 50 minutes from my home in Lincoln, so it is a part of the broad neighborhood of the First and Third Congressional Districts.

Homestead is located on the site of one of the first homestead claims in the United States, and it commemorates the lives and accomplishments of these early homesteaders. It also celebrates those hardy individuals who, through harsh storms, brutal drought, wind, snow, and isolation, actually helped grow this country.

This minor name change will clear up any confusion about this important site because the word "monument" generally applies to a single individual or a unique topographical feature. Homestead is so much more. It is a unique piece of open prairie, as we have heard. It houses the historical records of so many settlers, and many visitors come looking to learn a little bit more about their ancestors.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to particularly recognize one individual, Mr. Mark Engler, who is Homestead's superintendent and a friend of the Nebraska delegation who sees us quite a lot, along with everyone else in the Beatrice community who have helped to maintain Homestead as a gem of the Midwest and a treasure for all Americans.

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

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill. The community of Beatrice—I just had to say it one more time because I like that pronunciation—is fortunate to be home to what will hopefully soon be America's newest historical park, the Homestead National Historical Park, and is also fortunate to have been represented over the years by these two fine gentlemen from Nebraska.

Mr. Speaker, I urge an "aye" vote on this bipartisan bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1472.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SANTA MONICA MOUNTAINS NATIONAL RECREATION AREA BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT STUDY ACT

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1487) to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study of portions of the Los Angeles coastal area in the State of California to evaluate alternatives for protecting the resources of the coastal area, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1487

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 "Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area Boundary Adjustment Study Act".

SEC. 2. RESOURCE STUDY OF THE LOS ANGELES COASTAL AREA, CALIFORNIA.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) SECRETARY.—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior.

(2) STUDY AREA.—The term "study area" means the coastline and adjacent areas to the Santa Monica Bay from Will Rogers State Beach to Torrance Beach, including the areas in and around Ballona Creek and the Baldwin Hills and the San Pedro section of the City of Los Angeles, excluding the Port of Los Angeles north of Crescent Avenue.

(b) SPECIAL RESOURCE STUDY.—

(1) STUDY.—The Secretary shall conduct a special resource study of the study area.

(2) CONTENTS.—In conducting the study under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall—

(A) evaluate the national significance of the study area;

(B) determine the suitability and feasibility of designating the study area as a unit of the National Park System;

(C) consider other alternatives for preservation, protection, and interpretation of the study area by the Federal Government, State or local government entities, or private and nonprofit organizations;

(D) consult with interested Federal agencies, State or local governmental entities, private and nonprofit organizations, or any other interested individuals; and

(E) identify cost estimates for any Federal acquisition, development, interpretation, operation, and maintenance associated with the alternatives.

(3) APPLICABLE LAW.—The study required under paragraph (1) shall be conducted in accordance with section 100507 of title 54, United States Code.

(4) REPORT.—Not later than 3 years after the date on which funds are first made available for the study under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a report that describes—

(A) the results of the study; and

(B) any conclusions and recommendations of the Secretary.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN) and the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN).

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1487, introduced by my colleague TED LIEU from California, would direct the National Park Service to conduct a special resource study to determine the suitability and feasibility of designating a new national recreation area along the Santa Monica Bay coastline or incorporating the area into the existing Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area.

Expanding the National Park Service to include this area would significantly enhance recreational and public lands access in one of our Nation's most congested, polluted, and park-poor regions, Los Angeles County.

Although our public lands belong to all Americans, many simply don't have the opportunity or the resources to visit these incredible places. H.R. 1487 would help us take an important step toward ensuring that public lands access exists for all Americans, and I thank my colleague Congressman LIEU for championing this proposal.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1487 authorizes a special resource study of portions of the Los Angeles coastal area in California to evaluate alternatives for land management, including designating the coastal area as a unit of the National Park System.

While I do not oppose authorizing a special resource study of this area, I hope that Congress will exercise caution before adding significant amounts of coastline to the existing Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area, which is already struggling to manage its current resources and is increasingly beginning to resemble Lincoln's story of a farmer who said, "I ain't greedy for land. I just want what joins mine."

In 2018, because of bad land management, the vast majority of this same area burned in the massive Woolsey fire. More than 21,000 of the 23,595 National Park Service acres, about 88 percent of the land, were burned. This included most of the Western Town at Paramount Ranch, the 1926 Peter Strauss Ranch home, most of the joint National Park Service/UCLA La Kretz Research Center, two ranger residences, and an attached archives building.

Further, the National Park Service is already stretched perilously thin and facing a nearly \$12 billion deferred maintenance backlog that we discussed in an earlier bill.

Although I recognize that this measure simply authorizes a study and doesn't transfer any land or jurisdiction, it is imperative that we take into account the realities that our parks are facing and the devastating consequences of a land management policy that can only be described as benign neglect. As we are discovering, the consequences are anything but benign.

Mr. Speaker, with that caveat, I urge adoption of the measure, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. TED LIEU).

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman HUFFMAN for his leadership and for supporting this legislation, and I thank Congressman McCLINTOCK for supporting this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1487, the Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area Boundary Adjustment Study Act.

In the 1970s, Congress established the Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area to preserve natural and historic sites and to provide recreational, educational, scientific, and public health benefits to our greater Los Angeles community.

Today, it spans more than 150,000 acres in Los Angeles and Ventura Counties, including parts of the Santa Monica Bay Watershed in my congressional district. Much of the Santa Monica Bay Watershed, however, remains outside of the national recreation area. This includes several miles of beaches and acres of wetlands that stand to benefit greatly from Federal resources.

My bill would commission the National Park Service to conduct a 3-year special resource study to determine whether to expand the boundary of the existing Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area or create a new national recreation area altogether.

The study would cover the entire Santa Monica Bay coastline, from Venice Beach to Torrance Beach, as well as the Ballona Wetlands, Ballona Creek, Baldwin Hills, and the San Pedro coastline.

While conducting the study, the National Park Service will consult with State and local government groups, community groups, nonprofits, and residents.

The study would become a basis for future congressional action to modify the national recreation area borders. Expanding the national recreation area would allow the watershed to benefit from available Federal, scientific, and infrastructure resources, enabling better conservation and recreational use. It would also help Federal agencies enter into cooperative agreements to manage the land and carry out improvement projects aimed at connecting trails, building wildlife corridors, and more.

Importantly, all of this would be accomplished without affecting private property rights or creating unfunded mandates on State or local governments.

The Los Angeles coastal region stands to benefit tremendously from increased Federal resources to preserve open space for conservation and recreation, and I am proud to have the support of many of my colleagues in the Los Angeles delegation. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of H.R. 1487.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I would urge adoption of the measure with the caveats I have already discussed, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I urge an "aye" vote with no caveats, and I thank the gentleman, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1487, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1530

HONG KONG HUMAN RIGHTS AND DEMOCRACY ACT OF 2019

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 1838) to amend the Hong Kong Policy Act of 1992, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 1838

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Hong Kong Human Rights and Democracy Act of 2019".

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

- Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
- Sec. 2. Definitions.
- Sec. 3. Statement of policy.
- Sec. 4. Amendments to the United States-Hong Kong Policy Act of 1992.
- Sec. 5. Annual report on violations of United States export control laws and United Nations sanctions occurring in Hong Kong.
- Sec. 6. Protecting United States citizens and others from rendition to the People's Republic of China.
- Sec. 7. Sanctions relating to undermining fundamental freedoms and autonomy in Hong Kong.
- Sec. 8. Sanctions reports.
- Sec. 9. Sense of Congress on People's Republic of China state-controlled media.
- Sec. 10. Sense of Congress on commercial exports of crowd control equipment to Hong Kong.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term "appropriate congressional committees" means—

(A) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate;

(B) the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate;

(C) the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate;

(D) the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate;

(E) the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate;

(F) the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives;

(G) the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives;

(H) the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives;

(I) the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives; and

(J) the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives.

(2) SOCIAL CREDIT SYSTEM.—The term "social credit system" means a system proposed by the Government of the People's Republic of China and scheduled for implementation by 2020, which would—

(A) use existing financial credit systems, public records, online activity, and other tools of surveillance to aggregate data on every Chinese citizen and business; and

(B) use such data to monitor, shape, and rate certain financial, social, religious, or political behaviors.

(3) UNITED STATES PERSON.—The term “United States person” means—

- (A) a United States citizen;
- (B) a lawfully admitted permanent resident of the United States; or
- (C) an entity organized under the laws of—
 - (i) the United States; or
 - (ii) any jurisdiction within the United States, including a foreign branch of such an entity.

SEC. 3. STATEMENT OF POLICY.

It is the policy of the United States—

(1) to reaffirm the principles and objectives set forth in the United States-Hong Kong Policy Act of 1992 (Public Law 102-383), namely that—

(A) the United States has “a strong interest in the continued vitality, prosperity, and stability of Hong Kong”;

(B) “[s]upport for democratization is a fundamental principle of United States foreign policy” and therefore “naturally applies to United States policy toward Hong Kong”;

(C) “the human rights of the people of Hong Kong are of great importance to the United States and are directly relevant to United States interests in Hong Kong [and] serve as a basis for Hong Kong’s continued economic prosperity”;

(D) Hong Kong must remain sufficiently autonomous from the People’s Republic of China to “justify treatment under a particular law of the United States, or any provision thereof, different from that accorded the People’s Republic of China”;

(2) to support the high degree of autonomy and fundamental rights and freedoms of the people of Hong Kong, as enumerated by—

(A) the Joint Declaration of the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the Government of the People’s Republic of China on the Question of Hong Kong, done at Beijing December 19, 1984 (referred to in this Act as the “Joint Declaration”);

(B) the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, done at New York December 19, 1966; and

(C) the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, done at Paris December 10, 1948;

(3) to support the democratic aspirations of the people of Hong Kong, including the “ultimate aim” of the selection of the Chief Executive and all members of the Legislative Council by universal suffrage, as articulated in the Basic Law of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region of the People’s Republic of China (referred to in this Act as the “Basic Law”);

(4) to urge the Government of the People’s Republic of China to uphold its commitments to Hong Kong, including allowing the people of Hong Kong to govern Hong Kong with a high degree of autonomy and without undue interference, and ensuring that Hong Kong voters freely enjoy the right to elect the Chief Executive and all members of the Hong Kong Legislative Council by universal suffrage;

(5) to support the establishment of a genuine democratic option to freely and fairly nominate and elect the Chief Executive of Hong Kong, and the establishment by 2020 of open and direct democratic elections for all members of the Hong Kong Legislative Council;

(6) to support the robust exercise by residents of Hong Kong of the rights to free speech, the press, and other fundamental freedoms, as provided by the Basic Law, the Joint Declaration, and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights;

(7) to support freedom from arbitrary or unlawful arrest, detention, or imprisonment for all Hong Kong residents, as provided by the Basic Law, the Joint Declaration, and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights;

(8) to draw international attention to any violations by the Government of the People’s Republic of China of the fundamental rights of the people of Hong Kong, as provided by the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, and any encroachment upon the autonomy guaranteed to Hong Kong by the Basic Law and the Joint Declaration;

(9) to protect United States citizens and long-term permanent residents living in Hong Kong, as well as people visiting and transiting through Hong Kong;

(10) to maintain the economic and cultural ties that provide significant benefits to both the United States and Hong Kong; and

(11) to coordinate with allies, including the United Kingdom, Australia, Canada, Japan, and the Republic of Korea, to promote democracy and human rights in Hong Kong.

SEC. 4. AMENDMENTS TO THE UNITED STATES-HONG KONG POLICY ACT OF 1992.

(a) REPORT.—Title II of the United States-Hong Kong Policy Act of 1992 (22 U.S.C. 5721 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 201(b), by striking “such date” each place such term appears and inserting “the date of the enactment of the Hong Kong Human Rights and Democracy Act of 2019”; and

(2) adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 205. SECRETARY OF STATE REPORT REGARDING THE AUTONOMY OF HONG KONG.

“(a) CERTIFICATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (b), the Secretary of State, on at least an annual basis, and in conjunction with the report required under section 301, shall issue a certification to Congress that—

“(A) indicates whether Hong Kong continues to warrant treatment under United States law in the same manner as United States laws were applied to Hong Kong before July 1, 1997;

“(B) addresses—

“(i) commercial agreements;

“(ii) law enforcement cooperation, including extradition requests;

“(iii) sanctions enforcement;

“(iv) export controls, and any other agreements and forms of exchange involving dual use, critical, or other sensitive technologies;

“(v) any formal treaties or agreements between the United States and Hong Kong;

“(vi) other areas of bilateral cooperation that the Secretary determines to be relevant; and

“(vii) decision-making within the Government of Hong Kong, including executive, legislative, and judicial structures, including—

“(I) freedom of assembly;

“(II) freedom of speech;

“(III) freedom of expression; and

“(IV) freedom of the press, including the Internet and social media;

“(viii) universal suffrage, including the ultimate aim of the selection of the Chief Executive and all members of the Legislative Council by universal suffrage;

“(ix) judicial independence;

“(x) police and security functions;

“(xi) education;

“(xii) laws or regulations regarding treason, secession, sedition, subversion against the Central People’s Government of the People’s Republic of China, or theft of state secrets;

“(xiii) laws or regulations regarding foreign political organizations or bodies;

“(xiv) laws or regulations regarding political organizations; and

“(xv) other rights enumerated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, done at Paris December 10, 1948, and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, done at New York December 19, 1966; and

“(C) includes—

“(i) an assessment of the degree of any erosions to Hong Kong’s autonomy in each category listed in subparagraph (B) resulting from actions by the Government of the People’s Republic of China that are inconsistent with its commitments under the Basic Law or the Joint Declaration;

“(ii) an evaluation of the specific impacts to any areas of cooperation between the United States and Hong Kong resulting from erosions of autonomy in Hong Kong or failures of the Government of Hong Kong to fulfill obligations to the United States under international agreements within the categories listed in subparagraph (B); and

“(iii) a list of any specific actions taken by the United States Government in response to any erosion of autonomy or failures to fulfill obligations to the United States under international agreements identified in this certification and the report required under section 301.

“(2) FACTOR FOR CONSIDERATION.—In making each certification under paragraph (1), the Secretary of State should consider the terms, obligations, and expectations expressed in the Joint Declaration with respect to Hong Kong.

“(3) ADDITIONAL CERTIFICATIONS.—The certification under section (1) shall be issued annually, but the Secretary may issue additional certifications at any time if the Secretary determines it is warranted by circumstances in Hong Kong.

“(b) WAIVER AUTHORITY.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of State may waive the application of subsection (a) if—

“(A) the Secretary determines that such a waiver is in the national security interests of the United States; and

“(B) on or before the date on which the waiver takes effect, the Secretary notifies the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives of the intent to waive such subsection;

“(2) PARTIAL WAIVER.—Except for the list of actions described in subsection (a)(1)(C)(iii), the Secretary of State may waive relevant parts of the application of subsection (a) if the President issues an Executive order under section 202 that suspends the application of any particular United States law to Hong Kong.”

(b) VISA APPLICANTS.—Title II of the United States-Hong Kong Policy Act of 1992 (22 U.S.C. 5721 et seq.), as amended by subsection (a), is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 206. TREATMENT OF HONG KONG APPLICANTS FOR VISAS TO STUDY OR WORK IN THE UNITED STATES.

“(a) VISA ELIGIBILITY FOR CERTAIN HONG KONG STUDENTS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, applications for visas to enter, study, or work in the United States, which are submitted by otherwise qualified applicants who resided in Hong Kong in 2014 and later, may not be denied primarily on the basis of the applicant’s subjection to politically-motivated arrest, detention, or other adverse government action.

“(b) IMPLEMENTATION.—The Secretary of State shall take such steps as may be necessary to ensure that consular officers are aware of the policy described in subsection (a) and receive appropriate training and support to ensure that the policy is carried out so that affected individuals do not face discrimination or unnecessary delay in the processing of their visa applications, including—

“(1) providing specialized training for all consular officers posted to the United States Embassy in Beijing or to any United States consulate in the People’s Republic of China,

the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region, or the Macau Special Administrative Region;

“(2) instructing the United States Consulate in Hong Kong to maintain an active list of individuals who are known to have been formally charged, detained, or convicted by the Government of Hong Kong Special Administrative Region or by the Government of the People’s Republic of China, or intermediaries of such governments, based on politically-motivated considerations related to their exercise of rights enumerated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, done at Paris December 10, 1948, or the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, done at New York December 19, 1966, to facilitate the cross-checking of visa applications for Hong Kong residents; and

“(3) updating any relevant United States Government websites with information on the policy described in subsection (a).

“(c) COOPERATION WITH LIKE-MINDED COUNTRIES.—The Secretary of State shall contact appropriate representatives of other democratic countries, particularly those who receive a large number of applicants for student and employment visas from Hong Kong—

“(1) to inform them of the United States policy regarding arrests for participation in nonviolent protests in Hong Kong; and

“(2) to encourage them to take similar steps to ensure the rights of nonviolent protesters are protected from discrimination due to the actions of the Government of Hong Kong and of the Government of the People’s Republic of China.”.

SEC. 5. ANNUAL REPORT ON VIOLATIONS OF UNITED STATES EXPORT CONTROL LAWS AND UNITED NATIONS SANCTIONS OCCURRING IN HONG KONG.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter until the date that is 7 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Commerce, in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of State, shall submit a report to the committees specified in subsection (b) that includes—

(1) an assessment of the nature and extent of violations of United States export control and sanctions laws occurring in Hong Kong;

(2) to the extent possible, the identification of—

(A) any items that were reexported from Hong Kong in violation of the laws referred to in paragraph (1);

(B) the countries and persons to which the items referred to in subparagraph (A) were reexported; and

(C) how such items were used;

(3) an assessment of whether sensitive dual-use items subject to the export control laws of the United States are being—

(A) transshipped through Hong Kong; and

(B) used to develop—

(i) the Sharp Eyes, Skynet, Integrated Joint Operations Platform, or other systems of mass surveillance and predictive policing; or

(ii) the “social credit system” of the People’s Republic of China;

(4) an assessment of the efforts by the Government of the People’s Republic of China to use the status of Hong Kong as a separate customs territory to import items into the People’s Republic of China from Hong Kong in violation of the export control laws of the United States, whether as part of the Greater Bay Area plan, through the assignment by Beijing of Hong Kong as a national technology and innovation center, or through other programs that may exploit Hong Kong as a conduit for controlled sensitive technology;

(5) an assessment of whether the Government of Hong Kong has adequately enforced sanctions imposed by the United Nations;

(6) a description of the types of goods and services transshipped or reexported through Hong Kong in violation of such sanctions to—

(A) North Korea or Iran; or

(B) other countries, regimes, or persons subject to such sanctions for engaging in activities—

(i) relating to international terrorism, international narcotics trafficking, or the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction; or

(ii) that otherwise present a threat to the national security, foreign policy, or economy of the United States; and

(7) an assessment of whether shortcomings in the enforcement of export controls or sanctions by the Government of Hong Kong necessitates the assignment of additional Department of the Treasury, Department of Commerce, or Department of State personnel to the United States Consulate in Hong Kong.

(b) COMMITTEES SPECIFIED.—The committees specified in this subsection are—

(1) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate;

(2) the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate;

(3) the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate;

(4) the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives; and

(5) the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives.

(c) FORM OF REPORT.—The report required under subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

SEC. 6. PROTECTING UNITED STATES CITIZENS AND OTHERS FROM RENDITION TO THE PEOPLE’S REPUBLIC OF CHINA.

(a) POLICY STATEMENTS.—It is the policy of the United States—

(1) to safeguard United States citizens from extradition, rendition, or abduction to the People’s Republic of China from Hong Kong for trial, detention, or any other purpose;

(2) to safeguard United States businesses in Hong Kong from economic coercion and intellectual property theft;

(3) pursuant to section 103(7) of the United States-Hong Kong Policy Act of 1992 (22 U.S.C. 5713(7)), to encourage United States businesses “to continue to operate in Hong Kong, in accordance with applicable United States and Hong Kong law”; and

(4) pursuant to section 201(b) of such Act (22 U.S.C. 5721(b)), to evaluate, not less frequently than annually and as circumstances dictate whether the Government of Hong Kong is “legally competent to carry out its obligations” under treaties and international agreements established between the United States and Hong Kong.

(b) RESPONSE TO THREAT OF RENDITION.—Not later than 30 days after the President determines that legislation proposed or enacted by the Government of Hong Kong would put United States citizens at risk of extradition or rendition to the People’s Republic of China or to other countries that lack protections for the rights of defendants, the President shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees that—

(1) contains a strategy for protecting United States citizens and businesses in Hong Kong;

(2) assesses the potential risks of the legislation to United States citizens residing in, traveling to, or transiting through Hong Kong; and

(3) determines whether—

(A) additional resources are needed for American Citizen Services at the United States Consulate in Hong Kong; and

(B) the Government of Hong Kong is “legally competent” to administer the United States-Hong Kong Agreement for the Surrender of Fugitive Offenders, done at Hong Kong December 20, 1996, or other relevant law enforcement agreements between the United States and Hong Kong.

SEC. 7. SANCTIONS RELATING TO UNDERMINING FUNDAMENTAL FREEDOMS AND AUTONOMY IN HONG KONG.

(a) IDENTIFICATION OF PERSONS RESPONSIBLE FOR UNDERMINING FUNDAMENTAL FREEDOMS AND AUTONOMY IN HONG KONG.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The President shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees, in accordance with paragraph (2), that identifies each foreign person that the President determines is responsible for—

(A) the extrajudicial rendition, arbitrary detention, or torture of any person in Hong Kong; or

(B) other gross violations of internationally recognized human rights in Hong Kong.

(2) TIMING OF REPORTS.—The President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees—

(A) the report required under paragraph (1)—

(i) not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(ii) not less frequently than annually thereafter in conjunction with the publication of the report required under section 301 of the United States-Hong Kong Policy Act of 1992 (22 U.S.C. 5731); and

(B) an update to the report not later than 15 days after any new action is taken under subsection (b) based on the discovery of new information described in paragraph (1).

(3) CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN INFORMATION.—In preparing the report required under paragraph (1), the President shall consider—

(A) information provided jointly by the chairperson and ranking member of each of the appropriate congressional committees; and

(B) information obtained by other countries or reputable nongovernmental organizations that monitor violations of human rights abuses.

(4) FORM.—The report required under paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

(b) IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS.—The President shall impose the sanctions described in subsection (c) with respect to each foreign person identified in the report required under subsection (a)(1).

(c) SANCTIONS DESCRIBED.—The sanctions described in this subsection are the following:

(1) ASSET BLOCKING.—The President shall exercise all of the powers granted to the President under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) to the extent necessary to block and prohibit all transactions in property and interests in property of a foreign person identified in the report required under subsection (a)(1) if such property and interests in property are in the United States, come within the United States, or come within the possession or control of a United States person.

(2) INELIGIBILITY FOR VISAS, ADMISSION, OR PAROLE.—

(A) VISAS, ADMISSION, OR PAROLE.—An alien described in subsection (a)(1) is—

(i) inadmissible to the United States;

(ii) ineligible to receive a visa or other documentation to enter the United States; and

(iii) otherwise ineligible to be admitted or paroled into the United States or to receive any other benefit under the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.).

(B) CURRENT VISAS REVOKED.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—An alien described in subsection (a)(1) is subject to revocation of any visa or other entry documentation regardless of when the visa or other entry documentation is or was issued.

(ii) IMMEDIATE EFFECT.—A revocation under clause (i) shall—

(I) take effect immediately; and

(II) automatically cancel any other valid visa or entry documentation that is in the alien's possession.

(3) PENALTIES.—The penalties provided for in subsections (b) and (c) of section 206 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1705) shall apply to a foreign person that violates, attempts to violate, conspires to violate, or causes a violation of paragraph (1) to the same extent that such penalties apply to a person that commits an unlawful act described in subsection (a) of such section 206.

(d) IMPLEMENTATION.—The President may exercise all authorities provided under sections 203 and 205 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1702 and 1704) to carry out this section.

(e) WAIVER.—The President may waive the application of sanctions under this section with respect to a person identified in the report required under subsection (a)(1) if the President determines and certifies to the appropriate congressional committees that such a waiver is in the national interest of the United States.

(f) EXCEPTIONS.—

(1) EXCEPTION FOR INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES.—Sanctions under this section shall not apply to any activity subject to the reporting requirements under title V of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3091 et seq.) or any authorized intelligence activities of the United States.

(2) EXCEPTION TO COMPLY WITH INTERNATIONAL OBLIGATIONS AND FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT ACTIVITIES.—Sanctions under subsection (c)(2) shall not apply with respect to an alien if admitting or paroling the alien into the United States is necessary—

(A) to permit the United States to comply with the Agreement regarding the Headquarters of the United Nations, signed at Lake Success June 26, 1947, and entered into force November 21, 1947, between the United Nations and the United States, or other applicable international obligations; or

(B) to carry out or assist law enforcement activity in the United States.

(3) EXCEPTION RELATING TO IMPORTATION OF GOODS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The authorities and requirements to impose sanctions authorized under this section shall not include the authority or a requirement to impose sanctions on the importation of goods.

(B) GOOD DEFINED.—In this paragraph, the term “good” means any article, natural or manmade substance, material, supply, or manufactured product, including inspection and test equipment, and excluding technical data.

(g) TERMINATION OF SANCTIONS.—The President may terminate the application of sanctions under this section with respect to a person if the President determines and reports to the appropriate congressional committees not less than 15 days before the termination takes effect that—

(1) information exists that the person did not engage in the activity for which sanctions were imposed;

(2) the person has been prosecuted appropriately for the activity for which sanctions were imposed;

(3) the person has credibly demonstrated a significant change in behavior, has paid an appropriate consequence for the activity for which sanctions were imposed, and has credibly committed to not engage in an ac-

tivity described in subsection (a)(1) in the future; or

(4) the termination of the sanctions is in the national security interests of the United States.

(h) SUNSET.—This section, and any sanctions imposed under this section, shall terminate on the date that is 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(i) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ADMISSION; ADMITTED; ALIEN.—The terms “admission”, “admitted”, and “alien” have the meanings given those terms in section 101 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101).

(2) FOREIGN PERSON.—The term “foreign person” means a person that is not a United States person.

SEC. 8. SANCTIONS REPORTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In accordance with section 7, the President shall submit, to the appropriate congressional committees, a report that includes—

(1) a list of each foreign person with respect to which the President imposed sanctions during the year preceding the submission of the report;

(2) a description of the type of sanctions imposed with respect to each such person;

(3) the number of foreign persons with respect to which the President terminated sanctions under section 7 during that year;

(4) the dates on which such sanctions were imposed or terminated, as applicable;

(5) the reasons for imposing or terminating such sanctions; and

(6) a description of the efforts of the President to encourage the governments of other countries to impose sanctions that are similar to the sanctions authorized under section 7.

(b) NONAPPLICABILITY OF CONFIDENTIALITY REQUIREMENT WITH RESPECT TO VISA RECORDS.—The President shall publish the report required under subsection (a) without regard to the requirements of section 222(f) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1202(f)) with respect to confidentiality of records pertaining to the issuance or refusal of visas or permits to enter the United States.

SEC. 9. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA STATE-CONTROLLED MEDIA.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the United States condemns the deliberate targeting and harassment of democracy activists, diplomatic personnel of the United States and other nations, and their families by media organizations controlled by the Government of the People's Republic of China, including Wen Wei Po and Ta Kung Po;

(2) the Secretary of State should clearly inform the Government of the People's Republic of China that the use of media outlets to spread disinformation or to intimidate and threaten its perceived enemies in Hong Kong or in other countries is unacceptable; and

(3) the Secretary of State should take any activities described in paragraph (1) or (2) into consideration when granting visas for travel and work in the United States to journalists from the People's Republic of China who are affiliated with any such media organizations.

SEC. 10. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON COMMERCIAL EXPORTS OF CROWD CONTROL EQUIPMENT TO HONG KONG.

It is sense of Congress that the Department of Commerce, in conjunction with other relevant Federal departments and agencies, should consider appropriate adjustments to the current United States export controls with respect to Hong Kong to prevent the supply of crowd control and surveil-

lance equipment that could be used inappropriately in Hong Kong.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on S. 1838.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, the passage of the Hong Kong Human Rights and Democracy Act today will once again demonstrate our support for the people of Hong Kong. The House passed our version of the bill several weeks ago, and this version passed the Senate last night as well, demonstrating, without a doubt, that the U.S. Congress stands with the people of Hong Kong even during a particularly troubling time.

We are seeing the escalation of violence in unprecedented ways, indiscriminate use of force against students, and troubling reports of Chinese forces directing and manipulating the security forces in Hong Kong.

However, as Joshua Wong said when he was last here with us on Capitol Hill just a few weeks ago, the “people of Hong Kong will never walk alone.” That is a quote. Never has this been truer than today.

Although the abuses and injustices that have been endured by the people of Hong Kong are clear and evident to everyone, the policy challenge that this presents for the United States is far more nuanced.

It is my expectation that, when implementing this legislation, the Secretary of State will understand congressional intent that this legislation is designed to help the U.S. Government and the U.S. Congress better evaluate the erosion of Hong Kong's autonomy and, ultimately, stem the tide of China's aggressive behavior toward the people of Hong Kong.

Our objective is not to punish Hong Kong, but to help preserve and protect Hong Kong's autonomy in the face of Beijing's flagrant disregard for “one country, two systems,” which they had promised. As such, we believe it is in the national security interest of the United States to protect the autonomy of Hong Kong.

It is with that intent that this entire legislative exercise has been undertaken. I hope that in evaluating how to apply the mandates in this bill, this administration, and any future administration, will give the best interest of the people of Hong Kong the highest consideration.

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

First of all, I want to thank the distinguished chairman and the ranking member, Mr. McCAUL, for their strong support for this effort, both bills that are up today.

And I would also especially like to thank the Speaker for her leadership as well.

Mr. Speaker, since the 1989 Tiananmen Square massacre 30 years ago, I have had the privilege of working with colleagues on both sides of the aisle, including, and especially, Speaker PELOSI, JIM MCGOVERN, my good friend—and he is the chairman of the China Commission, and I am ranking member—and Congressman Frank Wolf, a former Member who was tenacious in his fight for human rights, the rule of law, and democracy for the people of China.

We have always believed that every person deserves better than the brutality so many endure in the systematic violations of their universally recognized human rights. China's ruthless dictators do not agree, and they are driven—they are obsessed—to tighten their control.

Today, Mr. Speaker, Hong Kong is burning. The status quo is no longer. The brutal government crackdown on democracy activists has escalated. Tragically, under President Xi Jinping, human rights abuse throughout China has significantly worsened, including the pervasive use of torture, religious persecution, human trafficking, and genocide against Muslim Uighurs.

Last month, Mr. Speaker, President Xi ominously warned of even more brutal violence to come in Hong Kong, threatening “crushed bodies and shattered bones.”

And the Hong Kong Government, itself, prefers bullets and batons over peaceful and political dialog that would address the Hong Kong people's rightful grievances.

That is a sad and disgusting reality, and it is what the Chinese Government, however, does best: suppress, repress, torture, kill, and censor.

With the passage of the Hong Kong Human Rights and Democracy Act, the United States Congress is making it clear that beating, torturing, and jailing democracy activists is absolutely wrong. We stand in solidarity with the people of Hong Kong. There will be strong sanctions, other ramifications, for this crackdown, for this abuse of power.

The people of Hong Kong have feared for their freedom for a long time.

In 2014, Mr. Speaker, I met with Martin Lee and Anson Chan, two titans of Hong Kong's democracy movement. They and Scott Flipse, of the China Commission, and I met in my office for hours as we discussed the Chinese Communist Party's growing influence and their attempts that had already begun to degrade autonomy and human rights in Hong Kong.

That is, Mr. Speaker, the genesis of this bill and our 5-year effort to push back on Beijing's pernicious interference in Hong Kong.

In the midst of the 2014 Umbrella Movement, I first introduced, joined by Speaker PELOSI, the first Hong Kong Human Rights and Democracy Act. My CECC co-chair, Senator BROWN of Ohio, introduced the same bill in the Senate.

Over the years, in 2015 and 2017, Senator RUBIO and I upgraded the bill to reflect the kidnapping of book sellers, the disqualification of elected lawmakers, and the political prosecutions of Joshua Wong, Nathan Law, Benny Tai, and many others. However, every time, every single time we pushed for passage, there was vigorous opposition from diplomats, so-called experts, committee chairs, and U.S. business interests in Hong Kong.

So passage of this legislation is long overdue.

My House bill, cosponsored by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), my good friend and colleague, and 46 other bipartisan cosponsors passed last month on October 15.

Today, we consider a final bill derived from working with our colleagues in the United States Senate. Specifically, the act directs the Secretary of State to report and certify to Congress, annually, whether Hong Kong continues to deserve special treatment under U.S. law, different from Mainland China, in such matters as trade, customs, sanctions enforcement, law enforcement cooperation, and protection of human rights and the rule of law.

It directs the State Department not to deny entry visas based primarily on the applicant's arrest or detention for participating in nonviolent protest activities in Hong Kong.

It requires, for the next 7 years, an annual report from the Commerce Department on whether Hong Kong Government adequately enforces U.S. export controls and sanctions laws, including on those goods and services transshipped to North Korea, Iran, or other countries relating to the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, narcotics trafficking, and more.

It requires an assessment of whether U.S. origin items, including software, technology, and services, have been transferred from Hong Kong to China in violation of U.S. law and have been used by China for mass surveillance, predictive policing, or for the so-called social credit system.

I know some Members might be wondering: What is the social credit system? It is a ubiquitous, totalitarian, “brave new world” system scheduled for implementation by 2020 that uses public records, online activity, and other tools of surveillance to aggregate data on every Chinese citizen and business and use that data to monitor, shape, and rate financial, social, religious, or political behaviors.

The bill requires the President to submit a strategy to Congress, to pro-

tect U.S. citizens and businesses in Hong Kong from the erosion of autonomy and the rule of law because of actions taken by the Chinese Government.

It requires the President to identify and sanction persons in Hong Kong or in Mainland China responsible for extrajudicial rendition and gross violations of internationally recognized human rights.

The Chinese Government warns us repeatedly not to interfere in China's internal affairs, but the only interference we see is Beijing's meddling in the democratic freedoms of Hong Kong. All I see and this body sees, my fellow colleagues, is Beijing's failure to honor the promises made in the 1984 Sino-British declaration, an international treaty. All we see is Beijing's failure to honor the promises of Hong Kong's Basic Law.

We cannot avert our eyes to what is happening in Hong Kong. We cannot silence our voices when the rule of law, democracy, human rights, free speech, and autonomy are being threatened in Hong Kong. We must remain steadfast in support of the people of Hong Kong.

The whole world has a stake in a peaceful and just resolution in Hong Kong. The passage of the Hong Kong Human Rights and Democracy Act is an important signal that this Congress, Democrat and Republican alike, House and Senate, considers Hong Kong's freedoms and autonomy a critical interest of the United States and the international community.

In Hong Kong, they encourage each other to keep pressing forward with the phrase “Jia you.” So today, I say to you, all of you in Hong Kong: “Jia you.” Your cause is a noble, one and you will not be forgotten.

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), our Speaker of the House, who has been very, very active in Hong Kong freedom.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairman for yielding.

I salute him and Mr. McCAUL, the ranking member of the Foreign Affairs Committee. To you, Mr. Chairman and Mr. McCAUL, thank you for affording this opportunity to vote on the Hong Kong Human Rights and Democracy Act.

This is a proud day for the U.S. Congress, for our values of freedom and justice, and for the people of Hong Kong.

For 6 months, the people of Hong Kong have stirred the hearts of all freedom-loving people with their extraordinary outpouring of courage and their refusal to relinquish their demand for democracy, the democratic freedoms, and the rule of law which was promised more than two decades ago.

Today, the Congress is sending an unmistakable message to the world that the United States stands in solidarity

with the freedom-loving people of Hong Kong, and we fully support their fight for freedom.

We salute Chairman MCGOVERN, a leading voice for human rights in China and around the world, our Congressional-Executive Commission on China chair and also chair of the Tom Lantos Human Rights Commission.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman SMITH, just listening to him talk about we are into our third generation of freedom-loving people in Hong Kong.

I am so glad Mr. SMITH acknowledged the work of our distinguished former colleague, Frank Wolf, who was so, so very much a part and still continues to be a spiritual leader to us in this regard.

We have worked with Martin Lee and Anson Chan way back when and—so late 1980s, early 1990s—then into this new century with another generation; and now, three generations, Martin Lee still being involved, but with Joshua Wong and Nathan Wong and all of the young participants who are there, because it is a sad situation.

In 1997, when the United Kingdom transferred Hong Kong to China, America was hopeful that the people of Hong Kong would achieve the “high degree of autonomy”—that is in quotes—“high degree of autonomy” that they were promised. Today, it is beyond question that China has utterly broken that promise.

America has been watching for years as the people of Hong Kong have been increasingly denied their full autonomy and faced with a cruel crackdown on their freedoms and an escalation of violence.

Most recently, the violent attacks against students at Hong Kong Polytechnic University have shocked the world as unconscionable and unacceptable.

More than 1,000 young people were denied food, water, first aid. Scores were sent to the hospital for hypothermia after attempting to escape through a sewer, and hundreds now languish in jail cells.

Right now, frightened parents of the students who remain on campus are holding vigil outside, praying that their children will be safe, clutching signs reading: “Save the kids. Don’t kill our children,” and, “They are children of God. Let them go.”

In the Congress, Democrats and Republicans stand united with the protestors and with the people of Hong Kong. We have stood united in a bipartisan way.

It has been a very unifying issue for us, whether we are talking about the autonomy of Tibet that the Chinese are trying to destroy, the culture, the language, and the region of Tibet; the Uighurs, where 1, 2, 3, maybe 3 million Uighurs are under education camps, which the Chinese Government says they really enjoy being in—Oh, really?—or human rights violations, suppression of human rights throughout all of China.

□ 1545

If America does not speak out for human rights in China because of commercial interests, we lose all moral authority to speak out on human rights elsewhere.

Since Tiananmen Square, many of us in a bipartisan way have been fighting this fight, and we have seen that commercial interests always win the fight. It has always for them been about money.

To those who take the repressive Chinese Government’s side, I say: What does it profit a person to gain the whole world and suffer the loss of his soul?

Today the House is proud to once again pass the bicameral, bipartisan Hong Kong Human Rights and Democracy Act to reaffirm America’s commitment to human rights, democracy, and the rule of law in the face of Beijing’s crackdown.

I see we have been joined by the distinguished ranking member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Mr. MCCAUL. I thank him for his leadership in bringing this legislation to the floor. I acknowledged him earlier, along with our distinguished chairman, Mr. ENGEL.

We are proud to pass the Senate version of Chairman MCGOVERN’s Protect Hong Kong Act to suspend sales on dangerous munitions to the Hong Kong police, and we also salute Senator MERKLEY in his leadership in passing that on the Senate floor.

The future of Hong Kong, the future of autonomy, freedom, and justice for millions is at stake. America must take a stand with Hong Kong. I am so pleased that we are making our statement in Congress in the House and in the Senate on both sides of the aisle, Democrats and Republicans unified in speaking out for democracy.

I urge a “yes” vote on both of these bills.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL), the ranking member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

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

I rise today in support of the Hong Kong Human Rights and Democracy Act. Two months ago I had the opportunity to join a press conference with Speaker NANCY PELOSI, Chairman ENGEL, my colleague, CHRIS SMITH, and Hong Kong prodemocracy activists Joshua Wong, Nathan Law, and Denise Ho to denounce China’s authoritarian brutality.

I said it then and I will say it again; today we stand here not as Republicans or Democrats, but as Americans united in our strong support for Hong Kong.

And I would like to take this opportunity to speak directly to the people of Hong Kong, who I know are watching this right now. America stands with you, and America will always support you. We hear you sing our national anthem. We see you carrying our

American flag. This is a battle between democracy versus dictatorship, liberty versus tyranny, and freedom versus oppression.

This bill sends a clear message to China that there will be consequences to the ruthless and brutal actions. Congress, the United States, and the world will not stand by idly as the Chinese Communist Party fights for itself and not its own people.

Again, I want to thank the authors of this bill. I am proud to be a part of this movement, this cause. And we have seen quite a bit of response on social media on this bill coming directly from the people of Hong Kong to the Members who are on this floor saying thank you for standing up for us.

That is democracy in action. That is what this country stands for. And it is a proud moment, I think, for both sides of the aisle as we are going through this time in our history to be able to stand together for democracy and such a great movement and cause for freedom.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), an important leader on this issue.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 1838, the Hong Kong Human Rights and Democracy Act.

I want to say thank you to Speaker NANCY PELOSI for her incredible leadership in ensuring that the House made a timely and unequivocal statement in support of the Hong Kong people at this very important and vital time.

I would also like to thank Congressman CHRIS SMITH of New Jersey, as well as Chairman ENGEL and Ranking Member MCCAUL for bringing this legislation to the floor today. I also appreciate the leadership of Senators RUBIO, CARDIN, and MENENDEZ for all that they have done.

Mr. Speaker, in recent months, the situation in Hong Kong has worsened as the Chinese and Hong Kong Governments have escalated repression against the protest movement and provoked more violence and chaos.

The recent attacks on university campuses, including last weekend against students at Hong Kong Polytechnic University raises disturbing questions on the strategy of the Chinese and Hong Kong Governments. Protestors were violently assaulted and not even allowed to escape without facing a barrage of tear gas and police brutality.

It is long past time for the Chinese and Hong Kong Governments to try a different approach that respects the people of Hong Kong and restores the people’s faith in the autonomy of the government. That is what political leaders do, they use dialogue and negotiation to achieve their goals. The demands of the protestors are reasonable, and an independent inquiry into the police violence is more than justified.

In what was initially a positive development, this week the Hong Kong High Court decided that the government’s recent facemask ban was unconstitutional. Unfortunately, the fierce

response by Beijing to that ruling and claim of sole jurisdiction over constitutional review almost certainly violates the basic law, subverts the rule of law, and further undermines whatever trust the Hong Kong people have left in their governing institutions.

If the Hong Kong court system is not sufficiently autonomous, then it is difficult, if not impossible, to argue that Hong Kong is sufficiently autonomous. It should be clear by now that Hong Kong's leaders are beholden to the Chinese Government, and the independence of the judiciary is being undermined.

The "one country, two systems" framework enshrined in the 1984 Sino-British Joint Declaration and Hong Kong's basic law has been rapidly eroding and has now reached a point when the United States has no choice but to modify its policy toward Hong Kong.

It is time we put the Chinese Government on annual notice that further erosion of autonomy or a crackdown will cause the city, which serves as an important financial haven for wealthy Chinese elites, to lose its special economic, financial and trade arrangement with the United States.

Further, the legislation authorizes sanctions against individuals who violate human rights, and states that Hong Kong visa applicants should not be denied entry to the U.S. on the basis of politically-motivated arrests due to their protest activities.

Today a Chinese official said that they will take strong opposing measures if the Hong Kong Human Rights and Democracy bill passes.

Well, I have a message for Beijing: The United States will not stand idly by while the Chinese Government stifles free expression and tightens its grip on Hong Kong.

Over the years, Hong Kong has prospered and become the financial center of Asia because of its strong commitment to the rule of law, good governance, human rights, and an open economic system.

We must use our leverage to help the people of Hong Kong in their struggle to secure a democratic future that protects Hong Kong's autonomy and way of life.

I am proud to support this legislation, which we will pass today with an overwhelmingly bipartisan majority.

I now call upon the President of the United States, who has been way too silent on this issue, to sign the bill into law.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOHO), the ranking member of the Asia, the Pacific, and Nonproliferation Subcommittee.

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, I just want to give a shout-out to the bipartisan nature of this bill. Both sides are working strongly on this. Chairman ENGEL, thank you. Mr. MCGOVERN, thank you. CHRIS, thank you for doing what you

have done. It is true leadership. And to see Speaker PELOSI down here, I think it speaks loudly to how America stands on this.

In September, I, too, had the honor of meeting with a few of the courageous leaders of Hong Kong student unions. They were advocating for peace, liberty, and freedom. These are basic innate human rights that have been taken away from Hong Kongers by the authoritarian overreach of the Chinese Communist Party Complex, which is comprised of Xi Jinping, the Politburo of the Chinese Communist Party, and leadership within the People's Liberation Army.

As protests in Hong Kong continue into the sixth month, Xi Jinping still refuses to take responsibility for this unrest. The cause is simple: theft of basic rights and freedoms, not a separatist movement or foreign influence. Members of this body have been accused of being the cause of the protests. Speaker PELOSI was named individually. Senator SCHUMER, MARCO RUBIO, and I were named as the cause of the Hong Kong protests.

This disdain was sparked by the introduction of the infamous extradition bill by Chief Executive Carrie Lam at the command of the CCPC and has grown into what are known as the five demands. Had Xi Jinping and his cohorts just honored the 1997 international agreement between Great Britain and China, which allows Hong Kong to remain a self-ruling, semi-autonomous province, none of this would have occurred.

Not upholding one's contract has consequences. Disregarding contracts breaks trust and dishonors the country, its leaders, and its people. The narrative that the Chinese Communist Party Complex has created for itself is that China cannot and should not be trusted and that the party will go to great lengths to dismantle free societies in their backyard.

The survival of democracy and freedom exposes the failures of communism. Xi Jinping, along with his cohorts' lack of acknowledgment of their failures, whether from deliberate denial or complete ignorance, was demonstrated by Mr. Han Zheng, China's Vice Premier, who said he believes antigovernment protests are damaging the "one country, two systems" formula, and again, are caused by a separatist movement and foreign influence.

While sitting next to Chief Executive Carrie Lam, he continued, "We firmly support the Special Administrative Region Government to adopt more proactive and more effective measures" to solve the social problems.

Since I wrote this, they have come out and said they expect to have brutality ramped up to bring these people under control. The proactive and more effective measures referred to by Mr. Han Zheng are intimidation, brutality, imprisonment and death.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Florida an additional 1 minute.

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, as the international community is well aware, Beijing's standard procedure for dealing with unrest is well documented. In the end, Xi Jinping will leave no stone unturned in his quest to destroy democracy. The party will spare no one in their fight to protect communist ideals and power. Chief Executive Lam will be Beijing's sacrificial lamb and removed for two reasons: one, the Communist Party must save face and have a scapegoat; and two, Xi Jinping and the Communist Party must maintain their authority and not show weakness.

Communism fears free thought and cannot survive in it. And I am honored to stand with the Hong Kong protestors in their important cause. I urge my colleagues to also stand with the courageous individuals in Hong Kong and pass the Hong Kong Human Rights and Democracy Act.

"Jia you" to our Hong Kong friends standing up for your basic human rights.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN), and I ask unanimous consent that he be allowed to control the time.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HILL).

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey, my good friend, for yielding, and I have to thank him for his decades of service and leadership here for free expression and for liberty in Hong Kong.

I was moved by the Speaker's tribute and appreciate her 30 years of work there. I thank Mr. ENGEL for his leadership, and, of course, my good friend from California, who now is controlling the time for the majority.

□ 1600

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Hong Kong Human Rights and Democracy Act and stand in solidarity with the people of Hong Kong.

For 6 months, we have witnessed Hong Kong citizens protest for their right to live in a free and fair political system, an expectation they fully have. Over the last several weeks, we have witnessed the government become increasingly violent as it cracks down on protests. It is sad to see death and destruction come to this beautiful and energetic place.

For three decades, I have traveled to Hong Kong and witnessed their innovative spirit and their extraordinary work ethic. In fact, Hong Kong was the model for the post-World War II Asian

Tiger growth and prosperity now shared across the region. When a proponent of welfare statism queried progrowth economist Melvyn B. Krauss, "But how many Hong Kongs can the world have?" the professor responded, "As many as the world will allow itself."

The 7 million citizens of Hong Kong are looking to us for a voice and for leadership, and with today's vote, we will deliver. I call on President Trump to sign this important measure into law with expediency and show the world that America supports the people of Hong Kong, their right to free expression, and their democratic governance guaranteed under the five-decade arrangement agreed to in 1997 by the People's Republic of China and the United Kingdom.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. SMITH for his leadership, and I urge all of my colleagues to support this measure.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I will close when the gentleman has closed on his side, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, the United States' and the world's response to the Tiananmen Square massacre 30 years ago and the massive crackdown that was unleashed after that, because of that weak response, has enabled unrelenting and pervasive human rights abuses ever since.

Had we been strong and predictable and said that human rights matter, had we linked it to MFN, most-favored-nation status, and stuck to it, we would have had a different China today that, at least more than it does today, would have respected the rule of law and human rights.

We cannot recommit that mistake by being weak and vacillating in the face of this terrible, terrible attack on the people of Hong Kong and on their autonomy.

Remember, what we are asking Xi Jinping, Carrie Lam, and all the other leaders in Hong Kong and in Beijing to do is just honor your promises; you made solemn promises that you are violating now with impunity.

We have to be very clear that if we enable that, if we look the other way, then we become unwittingly, perhaps, but complicit in this terrible degrading of the human rights situation for the people of Hong Kong.

Mr. Speaker, I want to remind my colleagues as well, and I think we all know this, but this bill is the work of so many who deeply care, many Members across the aisle, bipartisanship at a time when that seems to be pretty much a rare commodity, but when it comes to Hong Kong, we are all there joined together arm-in-arm speaking out on behalf of these tremendous leaders who suffer and go to prison and endure tear gas and worse each and every day.

I want to mention some of the staff members, and there are many. When

we had the bill up on the 15th, I mentioned even more. But these members were instrumental in working on the legislation over the past 5 years. Remember, this is the fourth time I introduced it, and I have worked with MARCO RUBIO and others. This is a bicameral and bipartisan bill.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank former staff directors of the Congressional-Executive Commission on China, Paul Protic and Elise Anderson, for their important work on Hong Kong and China. I want to thank Piero Tozzi of my staff for his focus on human rights in China and around the world. I particularly want to mention the contribution made to this legislation by Scott Flipse of the CECC, the Congressional-Executive Commission on China.

In 2014, Dr. Flipse first convinced me. We had met, and he said that we have a problem in Hong Kong and that we need to address it. I was co-chair of the China Commission. Then we had meetings with Chinese leaders and Hong Kong leaders. We began to see that what was taking place in somewhat slow motion before our eyes was that there was a long-term Beijing plan to undermine Hong Kong's autonomy and that the U.S. needed to focus its efforts on countering that plan. He has been a stalwart advocate for the people of Hong Kong ever since, and I, again, want to thank him for his critical contributions to this legislation.

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

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume for the purpose of closing.

We vote today on S. 1838, but this is not just a Senate bill. This is a bill very similar to the one introduced in this House by the gentleman from New Jersey. This House has already voted on this bill and supported it overwhelmingly. Today, once again, we show the world our commitment to the people of Hong Kong and to the preservation and protection of Hong Kong's autonomy, given China's aggressive attempts to undermine the "one country, two systems" approach.

With this important legislation, we send a clear signal that the United States will hold those undermining Hong Kong's rights and autonomy accountable and that the American people stand shoulder to shoulder with the people of Hong Kong. With few exceptions, the people of Hong Kong have fought for their rights through peaceable protest, and we stand with them.

Mr. Speaker, I hope all Members will join me in supporting the passage of this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCGOVERN). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 1838.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

PROHIBITING THE COMMERCIAL EXPORT OF COVERED MUNITIONS ITEMS TO THE HONG KONG POLICE FORCE

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 2710) to prohibit the commercial export of covered munitions items to the Hong Kong Police Force.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 2710

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

SECTION 1. DEFINITIONS.

(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term "appropriate congressional committees" means—

(A) the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

(2) COVERED MUNITIONS ITEMS.—The term "covered munitions items" means tear gas, pepper spray, rubber bullets, foam rounds, bean bag rounds, pepper balls, water cannons, handcuffs, shackles, stun guns, and tasers.

(3) HONG KONG.—The term "Hong Kong" has the meaning given such term in section 3 of the United States-Hong Kong Policy Act of 1992 (22 U.S.C. 5702).

(4) HONG KONG POLICE FORCE.—The term "Hong Kong Police Force" means—

(A) the Hong Kong Police Force; and

(B) the Hong Kong Auxiliary Police Force.

SEC. 2. PROHIBITION ON COMMERCIAL EXPORT OF COVERED MUNITIONS ITEMS TO THE HONG KONG POLICE FORCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (b), beginning on the date that is 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall prohibit the issuance of licenses to export covered munitions items to the Hong Kong Police Force.

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—The prohibition set forth in subsection (a) shall not apply to the issuance of a license with respect to which the President submits to the appropriate congressional committees, not fewer than 30 days before the date of such issuance, a written notice—

(1) certifying that the exports to be covered by such license are important to the national interests and foreign policy goals of the United States; and

(2) describing the manner in which such exports will promote such interests and goals.

SEC. 3. SUNSET.

The prohibition under section 2 shall expire one year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members

have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on S. 2710.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, let me start by thanking Senator MERKLEY for his hard work on this legislation. The House a few weeks before passed a similar measure, the PROTECT Hong Kong Act, authored by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), whom I was about to refer to as the Chair but has now joined us here in the regular seats of the House.

Such bipartisan, bicameral legislation supporting the people of Hong Kong is a testament to the relationship between our two peoples, but it is also an indication of Congress' deep concern over the growing violence in Hong Kong.

In recent weeks, we have seen an escalation in the conflict between Hong Kong's security forces and the people of Hong Kong. The same police forces sworn to protect the people are now indiscriminately targeting people with tear gas, pepper spray, and water cannons. I am particularly heartbroken over the images of students under siege and parents begging the police not to shoot their children.

We have seen similar images before, just 30 years ago in Beijing. The fact that these horrors are now taking place in Hong Kong, a beacon of democracy and human rights, is worrisome. I am deeply concerned by the recent escalation of violence, and I call on all parties to exercise restraint and seek a peaceful solution to address the very legitimate concerns of the people of Hong Kong.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this important measure and ensure that U.S. companies are not contributing to the suppression of Hong Kong's people in their fight to secure their freedoms and their democracy.

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of S. 2710, a bill that would prohibit the commercial export of covered munition items to the Hong Kong Police Force.

Mr. Speaker, I especially want to thank my good friend and colleague, Chairman MCGOVERN, for his legislation, which is pretty much a companion bill that passed a little over 1 month ago, again, on the whole idea of U.S.-originated equipment being exploited in Hong Kong against these protesters. I thank him for doing that. We have raised this at hearings, and his bill was a great bill.

As the largest protest movement Hong Kong has ever seen continues, major concerns have arisen about the

Hong Kong police's independence and professionalism. The people of Hong Kong are rightfully furious about well-documented cases of excessive force, brutal tactics, and tolerance of violence against protesters. The Hong Kong police themselves are now a cause of the protests.

There has been widespread police misuse of crowd control equipment and less-lethal weaponry, including incidents that have seriously injured journalists.

I am glad this bill is before us. After it passes, it goes to the President, and I fully expect he will sign it into law.

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

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, Members of this House will remember that, just a few months ago, we passed very similar legislation in the House to the bill that is in front of us today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), who is an important leader on this issue. The gentleman wrote the House version of this bill.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from California (Mr. SHERMAN) for his leadership on this and so many other important issues to uphold a high standard of human rights.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 2710, the Placing Restrictions on Tear-gas Exports and Crowd Control Technology to Hong Kong Act, otherwise known as the PROTECT Hong Kong Act.

I am proud to have introduced this bipartisan legislation, along with my colleagues CHRIS SMITH from New Jersey and RO KHANNA from California, in the House. Senator MERKLEY and Senator CORNYN introduced it in the Senate.

This bill responds to the excessive and unnecessary use of force by the Hong Kong police targeting those engaged in peaceful protests.

The PROTECT Hong Kong Act prohibits U.S. exports of police equipment to Hong Kong, including tear gas, pepper spray, grenades, rubber bullets, foam rounds, beanbag rounds, pepper balls, water cannons, stun guns, and tasers.

The Hong Kong Police Force is simply out of control. The reckless and escalating use of violence flies in the face of manufacturer guidelines and international standards on the use of force. In recent days, the world has seen eyewitness evidence showing protesters sprayed with tear gas directly in the face at short distances, rampant beatings and arbitrary arrests of people ages 11 to 74, police driving at high speeds into crowds, and unarmed protesters shot with live rounds.

The British Government already suspended export licenses for the sale of tear gas and crowd control equipment until concerns about human rights abuses are addressed. The United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights called for an investigation of

the use of crowd control tactics in Hong Kong.

Mr. Speaker, enough is enough. It is time for American companies to stop selling police equipment that is being used to suppress peaceful protests.

Mr. Speaker, today, we will cast votes on two pieces of legislation that will make it crystal clear to Beijing that we in this Congress in a bipartisan manner stand in solidarity with the protesters of Hong Kong, and we also stand with them in their demands, among which is there needs to be an independent investigation and inquiry into the brutal tactics of the Hong Kong Police Force.

It is absolutely outrageous. It is unacceptable. It goes beyond the pale. We have all seen the pictures, the photographs, and the videos that are on social media. Anybody who cares about human rights will stand with us proudly and vote for these two pieces of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this PROTECT Hong Kong Act.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume for the purpose of closing.

Mr. Speaker, we have watched as the Chinese Communist Party works to break down and undermine the "one country, two systems" framework that has paved the way for a strong relationship between Hong Kong and the United States.

This has motivated millions of Hong Kongers, the people of Hong Kong, to take to the streets for months to protest in defense of their basic human rights. These prodemocracy activists have faced tear gas, pepper spray, and rubber bullets by a police force sworn to protect them, and now they face lethal force as well.

□ 1615

The passage of this bill demonstrates, once again, to the people of Hong Kong that the United States stands with them in their protest of China's erosion of the autonomy and the way of life that was promised them back in 1997.

It takes a step to ensure that U.S. companies demonstrate a commitment to U.S. values in this regard, making sure that U.S. companies aren't facilitating violence against the protesters by selling what we, sadly, know can be lethal crowd control mechanisms.

This bill is an important part of Congress' response by the effort of Beijing to deprive Hong Kong of the autonomy and democracy that it was promised back in 1997.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CUELLAR). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from

California (Mr. SHERMAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 2710.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 713;

Adoption of House Resolution 713, if ordered; and

Motions to suspend the rules and pass:

H.R. 737,
S. 1838, and
S. 2710.

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

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1309, WORKPLACE VIOLENCE PREVENTION FOR HEALTH CARE AND SOCIAL SERVICE WORKERS ACT; PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM NOVEMBER 22, 2019, THROUGH DECEMBER 2, 2019; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 713) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1309) to direct the Secretary of Labor to issue an occupational safety and health standard that requires covered employers within the health care and social service industries to develop and implement a comprehensive workplace violence prevention plan, and for other purposes; providing for proceedings during the period from November 22, 2019, through December 2, 2019; and providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 223, nays 194, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 632]

YEAS—223

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

NAYS—194

Abraham	Bost	Collins (GA)
Aderholt	Brady	Comer
Allen	Brooks (AL)	Conaway
Amash	Brooks (IN)	Cook
Amodei	Buchanan	Crawford
Armstrong	Buck	Crenshaw
Arrington	Bucshon	Curtis
Babin	Budd	Davidson (OH)
Bacon	Burchett	Davis, Rodney
Baird	Burgess	DesJarlais
Balderson	Byrne	Diaz-Balart
Banks	Calvert	Duncan
Barr	Carter (GA)	Dunn
Bergman	Chabot	Emmer
Biggs	Cheney	Estes
Bilirakis	Cline	Ferguson
Bishop (NC)	Cloud	Fitzpatrick
Bishop (UT)	Cole	Fleischmann

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

NOT VOTING—13

□ 1647

Mr. KENNEDY changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 209, nays 205, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 633]

YEAS—209

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

DeGette	Kuster (NH)	Raskin	McKinley	Rogers (AL)	Thompson (PA)	Cisneros	Jeffries	Price (NC)
DeLauro	Lamb	Rice (NY)	Meadows	Rogers (KY)	Thornberry	Clark (MA)	Johnson (GA)	Quigley
DelBene	Langevin	Rose (NY)	Meuser	Rooney (FL)	Tipton	Clarke (NY)	Johnson (TX)	Raskin
Delgado	Larsen (WA)	Rouda	Miller	Rose, John W.	Turner	Clay	Joyce (OH)	Reed
Demings	Larson (CT)	Roybal-Allard	Mitchell	Rouzer	Upton	Cleaver	Kaptur	Reschenthaler
DeSaulnier	Lawrence	Ruiz	Moolenaar	Roy	Van Drew	Clyburn	Katko	Rice (NY)
Deutch	Lawson (FL)	Ruppersberger	Mooney (WV)	Rutherford	Wagner	Cohen	Keating	Rice (SC)
Dingell	Lee (CA)	Rush	Mullin	Scalise	Walberg	Cole	Keller	Riggleman
Doggett	Lee (NV)	Ryan	Murphy (FL)	Schrader	Walden	Conaway	Kelly (IL)	Roe, David P.
Doyle, Michael F.	Levin (CA)	Sánchez	Murphy (NC)	Schweikert	Walker	Connolly	Kelly (PA)	Rogers (KY)
Engel	Levin (MI)	Sarbanes	Newhouse	Scott, Austin	Walorski	Cook	Kennedy	Rooney (FL)
Escobar	Lieu, Ted	Scanlon	Norman	Sensenbrenner	Waltz	Correa	Khanna	Rose (NY)
Eshoo	Lipinski	Schiff	Nunes	Sherrill	Watkins	Costa	Kildee	Rose, John W.
Espallat	Loeb sack	Schneider	Olson	Shimkus	Weber (TX)	Courtney	Kilmer	Rouda
Evans	Lofgren	Schrier	Palazzo	Simpson	Webster (FL)	Cox (CA)	Kim	Roybal-Allard
Finkenauer	Lowenthal	Scott (VA)	Palmer	Smith (MO)	Wenstrup	Craig	Kind	Ruiz
Fletcher	Lujan	Scott, David	Pence	Smith (NE)	Westerman	Crenshaw	King (NY)	Ruppersberger
Foster	Luria	Sewell (AL)	Perry	Smith (NJ)	Williams	Crist	Kinzinger	Rush
Frankel	Lynch	Shalala	Peterson	Smucker	Wilson (SC)	Crow	Kirkpatrick	Ryan
Gallego	Malinowski	Sherman	Posey	Spanberger	Wittman	Cuellar	Krishnamoorthi	Sánchez
Garamendi	Maloney,	Sires	Ratcliffe	Spano	Womack	Cunningham	Kuster (NH)	Sarbanes
Garcia (IL)	Carolyn B.	Slotkin	Reed	Staubert	Woodall	Davids (KS)	Kustoff (TN)	Scanlon
Garcia (TX)	Maloney, Sean	Smith (WA)	Reschenthaler	Stefanik	Wright	Davidson (OH)	LaMalfa	Schakowsky
Golden	Matsui	Soto	Riggleman	Steil	Yoho	Davis (CA)	Lamb	Schiff
Gomez	McBath	Speier	Rice (SC)	Steube	Young	Davis, Danny K.	Langevin	Schneider
Gonzalez (TX)	McCollum	Stanton	Robb	Stewart	Zeldin	Davis, Rodney	Larsen (WA)	Schrader
Green, Al (TX)	McGovern	Stevens	Rodgers (WA)	Stivers		Dean	Larson (CT)	Schrier
Grijalva	McNerney	Suozzi	Roe, David P.	Taylor		DeFazio	Lawrence	Schweikert
Haaland	Meeks	Swalwell (CA)				DeGette	Lawson (FL)	Scott (VA)
Harder (CA)	Meng	Takano	Bishop (GA)	Gallagher	Schakowsky	DeLauro	Lee (CA)	Scott, David
Hastings	Moore	Thompson (CA)	Carter (TX)	Hudson	Serrano	DelBene	Lee (NV)	Sewell (AL)
Hayes	Morelle	Thompson (MS)	Cooper	Lewis	Timmons	Delgado	Levin (CA)	Shalala
Heck	Moulton		Flores	McEachin	Vela	Demings	Levin (MI)	Sherman
Higgins (NY)	Mucarsel-Powell		Fudge	Porter		DeSaulnier	Lipinski	Sherrill
Himes	Nadler		Gabbard	Richmond		Deutch	Loeb sack	Simpson
Horsford	Napolitano					Diaz-Balart	Lofgren	Slotkin
Houlahan	Neal	Torres (CA)				Dingell	Lowenthal	Smith (NJ)
Hoyer	Neguse	Torres Small (NM)				Doggett	Lowey	Smith (NJ)
Huffman	Norcross	Trahan				Doyle, Michael F.	Lujan	Smith (WA)
Jackson Lee	O'Halleran	Trone				Emmer	Luria	Smucker
Jayapal	Ocasio-Cortez	Underwood				Engel	Lynch	Soto
Jeffries	Omar	Vargas				Escobar	Malinowski	Spanberger
Johnson (GA)	Pallone	Veasey				Eshoo	Maloney,	Speier
Johnson (TX)	Panetta	Velázquez				Espallat	Carolyn B.	Stanton
Kaptur	Pappas	Visclosky				Estes	Maloney, Sean	Staubert
Keating	Pascrell	Wasserman				Evans	Marshall	Stefanik
Kelly (IL)	Payne	Schultz				Finkenauer	Mast	Steil
Kennedy	Perlmutter	Waters				Fitzpatrick	Matsui	Steube
Khanna	Peters	Watson Coleman				Fletcher	McAdams	Stevens
Khanna	Phillips	Welch				Fortenberry	McBath	Stivers
Kilmer	Pingree	Wexton				Foster	McCarthy	Suozzi
Kim	Pocan	Wild				Frankel	McCaul	Swalwell (CA)
Kind	Pressley	Wilson (FL)				Gaetz	McCollum	Takano
Kirkpatrick	Price (NC)	Yarmuth				Gallego	McGovern	Thompson (CA)
Krishnamoorthi	Quigley					Garamendi	McHenry	Thompson (MS)
						Garcia (IL)	McNerney	Thompson (PA)
						Garcia (TX)	Meeks	Tipton
						Golden	Meng	Titus
						Gomez	Meuser	Tlaib
						Gonzalez (OH)	Mitchell	Tonko
						Gonzalez (TX)	Moolenaar	Torres (CA)
						Gooden	Mooney (WV)	Torres Small (NM)
						Gottheimer	Moore	Trahan
						Granger	Morelle	Trone
						Green, Al (TX)	Moulton	Turner
						Griffith	Mucarsel-Powell	Underwood
						Grijalva	Murphy (FL)	Upton
						Grothman	Nadler	Vargas
						Guest	Napoli tano	Veasey
						Guthrie	Neal	Vela
						Haaland	Neguse	Velázquez
						Hagedorn	Norcross	Visclosky
						Harder (CA)	O'Halleran	Wagner
						Hastings	Ocasio-Cortez	Walden
						Hayes	Olson	Walorski
						Heck	Omar	Wasserman
						Higgins (NY)	Pallone	Schultz
						Himes	Panetta	Waters
						Hollingsworth	Pappas	Watkins
						Horn, Kendra S.	Pascrell	Watson Coleman
						Horsford	Payne	Webster (FL)
						Houlahan	Pence	Welch
						Hoyer	Perlmutter	Wexton
						Hudson	Perry	Wild
						Huffman	Peters	Wilson (FL)
						Hunter	Peterson	Woodall
						Hurd (TX)	Phillips	Wright
						Jackson Lee	Pingree	Yarmuth
						Jayapal	Pocan	Zeldin
							Pressley	

NOT VOTING—16

□ 1656

Mr. GOTTHEIMER changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 633.

SHARK FIN SALES ELIMINATION
ACT OF 2019

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 737) to prohibit the sale of shark fins, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 310, nays 107, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 634]

YEAS—310

Abraham	Correa	Hice (GA)	Adams	Bilirakis	Bustos	Abraham	Banks	Bucshon
Aderholt	Crawford	Higgins (LA)	Aguilar	Blumenauer	Butterfield	Aderholt	Biggs	Byrne
Allen	Crenshaw	Hill (AR)	Allred	Blunt Rochester	Calvert	Allen	Bishop (NC)	Cheney
Amash	Cunningham	Holding	Amodei	Bonamici	Carbajal	Amash	Bishop (UT)	Cline
Amodei	Curtis	Hollingsworth	Arrington	Bost	Cárdenas	Armstrong	Cloud	Cloud
Armstrong	Davidson (OH)	Horn, Kendra S.	Axne	Boyle, Brendan F.	Carson (IN)	Baird	Brooks (AL)	Collins (GA)
Arrington	Davis, Rodney	Huizenga	Babin	Brindisi	Carter (GA)	Balderson	Buck	Comer
Babin	DesJarlais	Hunter	Bacon	Brooks (IN)	Cartwright			
Bacon	Diaz-Balart	Hurd (TX)	Barr	Brown (MD)	Case			
Baird	Duncan	Johnson (LA)	Barragán	Brownley (CA)	Casten (IL)			
Balderson	Dunn	Johnson (OH)	Bass	Buchanan	Castor (FL)			
Banks	Emmer	Johnson (SD)	Beatty	Budd	Castro (TX)			
Barr	Estes	Jordan	Bera	Burchett	Chabot			
Bergman	Ferguson	Joyce (OH)	Bergman	Burgess	Chu, Judy			
Biggs	Fitzpatrick	Joyce (PA)	Beyer		Cicilline			
Bilirakis	Fleischmann	Katko						
Bishop (NC)	Fortenberry	Kelly (MS)						
Bishop (UT)	Fox (NC)	Kelly (PA)						
Bost	Fulcher	King (IA)						
Brady	Gaetz	King (IA)						
Brindisi	Gianforte	King (NY)						
Brooks (AL)	Gibbs	Kinzing						
Brooks (IN)	Gohmert	Kustoff (TN)						
Buchanan	Gonzalez (OH)	LaHood						
Buck	Gooden	LaMalfa						
Bucshon	Gosar	Lamborn						
Budd	Gottheimer	Latta						
Burchett	Granger	Lesko						
Burgess	Graves (GA)	Long						
Byrne	Graves (LA)	Loudermilk						
Calvert	Graves (MO)	Lucas						
Carter (GA)	Green (TN)	Luetkemeyer						
Chabot	Griffith	Marchant						
Cheney	Grothman	Marshall						
Cline	Guest	Massie						
Cloud	Guthrie	Mast						
Cole	Hagedorn	McAdams						
Collins (GA)	Harris	McCarthy						
Comer	Hartzler	McCaul						
Conaway	Hern, Kevin	McClintock						
Cook	Herrera Beutler	McHenry						

NAYS—107

Crawford	Jordan	Rodgers (WA)	Carson (IN)	Grijalva	McCarthy	Sires	Thompson (PA)	Waltz
Curtis	Joyce (PA)	Rogers (AL)	Carter (GA)	Grothman	McCaul	Slotkin	Thornberry	Wasserman
DesJarlais	Kelly (MS)	Rouzer	Cartwright	Guest	McClintock	Tipton	Tipton	Schultz
Duncan	King (IA)	Roy	Case	Guthrie	McCollum	Smith (NE)	Titus	Waters
Dunn	LaHood	Rutherford	Casten (IL)	Haaland	McGovern	Smith (NJ)	Tlaib	Watkins
Ferguson	Lamborn	Scalise	Castor (FL)	Hagedorn	McHenry	Smith (WA)	Tonko	Watson Coleman
Fleischmann	Latta	Scott, Austin	Castro (TX)	Harder (CA)	McKinley	Smucker	Torres (CA)	Weber (TX)
Foxx (NC)	Lesko	Sensenbrenner	Chabot	Harris	McNerney	Soto	Torres Small	Webster (FL)
Fulcher	Lieu, Ted	Shimkus	Cheney	Hartzler	Meadows	Spanberger	(NM)	Welch
Gianforte	Long	Smith (MO)	Chu, Judy	Hastings	Meeks	Spano	Trahan	Wenstrup
Gibbs	Loudermilk	Smith (NE)	Cicilline	Hayes	Meng	Speier	Trone	Westerman
Gohmert	Lucas	Spano	Cisneros	Heck	Meuser	Stanton	Turner	Wexton
Gosar	Luetkemeyer	Stewart	Clark (MA)	Hern, Kevin	Miller	Stauber	Underwood	Wild
Graves (GA)	Marchant	Taylor	Clarke (NY)	Herrera Beutler	Mitchell	Stefanik	Upton	Williams
Graves (LA)	Massie	Thornberry	Clay	Hice (GA)	Moolenaar	Steil	Van Drew	Wilson (FL)
Graves (MO)	McClintock	Van Drew	Cleaver	Higgins (LA)	Mooney (WV)	Steube	Vargas	Wilson (SC)
Green (TN)	McKinley	Walberg	Cline	Higgins (NY)	Moore	Stevens	Veasey	Wittman
Harris	Meadows	Walker	Cloud	Hill (AR)	Morelle	Stewart	Vela	Womack
Hartzler	Miller	Waltz	Clyburn	Himes	Moulton	Stivers	Velázquez	Woodall
Hern, Kevin	Mullin	Weber (TX)	Cohen	Holding	Mucarsel-Powell	Suozzi	Visclosky	Wright
Herrera Beutler	Murphy (NC)	Wenstrup	Cole	Hollingsworth	Mullin	Swalwell (CA)	Wagner	Yarmuth
Hice (GA)	Newhouse	Westerman	Collins (GA)	Horn, Kendra S.	Murphy (FL)	Takano	Walberg	Yoho
Higgins (LA)	Norman	Williams	Comer	Horsford	Murphy (NC)	Taylor	Walden	Young
Hill (AR)	Nunes	Wilson (SC)	Conaway	Houlahan	Nadler	Thompson (CA)	Walker	Zeldin
Holding	Palazzo	Wittman	Connolly	Hoyer	Napolitano	Thompson (MS)	Walorski	
Huizenga	Palmer	Womack	Cook	Hudson	Neal			
Johnson (LA)	Posey	Yoho	Correa	Huffman	Neguse			
Johnson (OH)	Ratcliffe	Young	Costa	Huizenga	Newhouse			
Johnson (SD)	Roby		Courtney	Hunter	Norcross			
			Cox (CA)	Hurd (TX)	Norman			
			Craig	Jackson Lee	Nunes			
			Crawford	Jayapal	O'Halleran			
			Crenshaw	Jeffries	Ocasio-Cortez			
			Crist	Johnson (GA)	Olson			
			Crow	Johnson (LA)	Omar			
			Cuellar	Johnson (OH)	Palazzo			
			Cunningham	Johnson (SD)	Pallone			
			Curtis	Johnson (TX)	Palmer			
			Davids (KS)	Jordan	Panetta			
			Davidson (OH)	Joyce (OH)	Pappas			
			Davis (CA)	Joyce (PA)	Pascarell			
			Davis, Danny K.	Kaptur	Payne			
			Davis, Rodney	Katko	Pelosi			
			Dean	Keating	Pence			
			DeFazio	Keller	Perlmutter			
			DeGette	Kelly (IL)	Perry			
			DeLauro	Kelly (MS)	Peters			
			DeBene	Kelly (PA)	Peterson			
			Delgado	Kennedy	Phillips			
			Demings	Khanna	Pingree			
			DeSaulnier	Kildee	Pocan			
			DesJarlais	Kilmer	Posey			
			Deutch	Kim	Pressley			
			Diaz-Balart	Kind	Price (NC)			
			Dingell	King (IA)	Quigley			
			Doggett	King (NY)	Raskin			
			Doyle, Michael	Kinzinger	Ratcliffe			
			F.	Kirkpatrick	Reed			
			Duncan	Krishnamoorthi	Reschenthaler			
			Dunn	Kuster (NH)	Rice (NY)			
			Emmer	Kustoff (TN)	Rice (SC)			
			Engel	LaHood	Riggleman			
			Escobar	LaMalfa	Roby			
			Eshoo	Lamb	Rodgers (WA)			
			Españillat	Lamborn	Roe, David P.			
			Estes	Langevin	Rogers (AL)			
			Evans	Larsen (WA)	Rogers (KY)			
			Ferguson	Larson (CT)	Rooney (FL)			
			Finkenauer	Latta	Rose (NY)			
			Fitzpatrick	Lawrence	Rose, John W.			
			Fleischmann	Lawson (FL)	Rouda			
			Fletcher	Lee (CA)	Rouzer			
			Fortenberry	Lee (NV)	Roy			
			Foster	Lesko	Roybal-Allard			
			Foxx (NC)	Levin (CA)	Ruiz			
			Frankel	Levin (MI)	Ruppersberger			
			Fulcher	Lieu, Ted	Rush			
			Gaetz	Lipinski	Rutherford			
			Gallego	Loeb	Ryan			
			Garamendi	Lofgren	Sánchez			
			Garcia (IL)	Long	Sarbanes			
			Garcia (TX)	Loudermilk	Scalise			
			Gianforte	Lowenthal	Scanlon			
			Gibbs	Lowey	Schakowsky			
			Gohmert	Lucas	Schiff			
			Golden	Luetkemeyer	Schneider			
			Gomez	Luján	Schrader			
			Gonzalez (OH)	Luria	Schrier			
			Gonzalez (TX)	Lynch	Schweikert			
			Gooden	Malinowski	Scott (VA)			
			Gosar	Maloney	Scott, Austin			
			Gottheimer	Carolyn B.	Scott, David			
			Granger	Maloney, Sean	Sensenbrenner			
			Graves (GA)	Marchant	Sewell (AL)			
			Graves (LA)	Shalala	Baird			
			Graves (MO)	Mast	Balderson			
			Green (TN)	Matsui	Banks			
			Green, Al (TX)	McAdams	Barr			
			Griffith	McBath	Simpson			

NOT VOTING—13

Bishop (GA)	Gabbard	Richmond
Carter (TX)	Gallagher	Serrano
Cooper	Lewis	Timmons
Flores	McEachin	
Fudge	Porter	

□ 1703

Mr. HUDSON changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HONG KONG HUMAN RIGHTS AND DEMOCRACY ACT OF 2019

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 1838) to amend the Hong Kong Policy Act of 1992, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 417, nays 1, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 635]

YEAS—417

Abraham	Barragán	Brindisi
Adams	Bass	Brooks (AL)
Aderholt	Beatty	Brooks (IN)
Aguilar	Bera	Brown (MD)
Allen	Bergman	Brownley (CA)
Allred	Beyer	Buchanan
Amash	Biggs	Buck
Amodei	Bilirakis	Bucshon
Armstrong	Bishop (NC)	Budd
Arrington	Bishop (UT)	Burchett
Axne	Blumenauer	Burgess
Babin	Blunt Rochester	Bustos
Bacon	Bonamici	Butterfield
Baird	Bost	Byrne
Balderson	Boyle, Brendan	Calvert
Banks	F.	Carbajal
Barr	Brady	Cárdenas

NAYS—1

Massie

NOT VOTING—13

Bishop (GA)	Gabbard	Richmond
Carter (TX)	Gallagher	Serrano
Cooper	Lewis	Timmons
Flores	McEachin	
Fudge	Porter	

□ 1711

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROHIBITING THE COMMERCIAL EXPORT OF COVERED MUNITIONS ITEMS TO THE HONG KONG POLICE FORCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 2710) to prohibit the commercial export of covered munitions items to the Hong Kong Police Force, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 417, nays 0, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 636]

YEAS—417

Abraham	Bass	Brooks (IN)
Adams	Beatty	Brown (MD)
Aderholt	Bera	Brownley (CA)
Aguilar	Bergman	Buchanan
Allen	Beyer	Buck
Allred	Biggs	Bucshon
Amash	Bilirakis	Budd
Amodei	Bishop (NC)	Burchett
Armstrong	Bishop (UT)	Burgess
Arrington	Blumenauer	Bustos
Axne	Blunt Rochester	Butterfield
Babin	Bonamici	Byrne
Bacon	Bost	Calvert
Baird	Boyle, Brendan	Carbajal
Balderson	F.	Cárdenas
Banks	Brady	Carson (IN)
Barr	Brindisi	Carter (GA)
Barragán	Brooks (AL)	Cartwright

Case	Guthrie	McClintock	Smith (MO)	Thornberry	Waltz
Casten (IL)	Haaland	McCollum	Smith (NE)	Tipton	Wasserman
Castor (FL)	Hagedorn	McGovern	Smith (NJ)	Titus	Schultz
Castro (TX)	Harder (CA)	McHenry	Smith (WA)	Tlaib	Waters
Chabot	Harris	McKinley	Smucker	Tonko	Watkins
Cheney	Hartzler	McNerney	Soto	Torres (CA)	Watson Coleman
Chu, Judy	Hastings	Meadows	Spanberger	Torres Small	Weber (TX)
Cicilline	Hayes	Meeks	Spano	(NM)	Welch
Cisneros	Heck	Meng	Speier	Trahan	Wenstrup
Clark (MA)	Hern, Kevin	Meuser	Stanton	Trone	Westerman
Clarke (NY)	Herrera Beutler	Miller	Stauber	Turner	Wexton
Clay	Hice (GA)	Mitchell	Stefanik	Underwood	Wild
Cleaver	Higgins (LA)	Moolenaar	Steil	Upton	Williams
Cline	Higgins (NY)	Mooney (WV)	Steube	Van Drew	Wilson (FL)
Cloud	Hill (AR)	Moore	Stevens	Vargas	Wilson (SC)
Clyburn	Himes	Morelle	Stewart	Veasey	Wittman
Cohen	Holding	Moulton	Stivers	Vela	Womack
Cole	Hollingsworth	Mucarsel-Powell	Suozzi	Velázquez	Woodall
Collins (GA)	Horn, Kendra S.	Mullin	Swalwell (CA)	Visclosky	Wright
Comer	Horsford	Murphy (FL)	Takano	Wagner	Yarmuth
Conaway	Houlihan	Murphy (NC)	Taylor	Walberg	Yoho
Connolly	Hoyer	Nadler	Thompson (CA)	Walker	Young
Cook	Hudson	Napolitano	Thompson (MS)	Walorski	Zeldin
Correa	Huffman	Neal	Thompson (PA)		
Costa	Huizenga	Neuge			
Courtney	Hunter	Newhouse			
Cox (CA)	Hurd (TX)	Norcross	Bishop (GA)	Gabbard	Richmond
Craig	Jackson Lee	Norman	Carter (TX)	Gallagher	Serrano
Crawford	Jayapal	Nunes	Cooper	Lewis	Timmmons
Crenshaw	Jeffries	O'Halleran	Flores	McEachin	Webster (FL)
Crist	Johnson (GA)	Ocasio-Cortez	Fudge	Porter	
Crow	Johnson (LA)	Olson			
Cuellar	Johnson (OH)	Omar			
Cunningham	Johnson (SD)	Palazzo			
Curtis	Johnson (TX)	Pallone			
Davids (KS)	Jordan	Palmer			
Davidson (OH)	Joyce (OH)	Panetta			
Davis (CA)	Joyce (PA)	Pappas			
Davis, Danny K.	Kaptur	Pascarell			
Davis, Rodney	Katko	Payne			
Dean	Keating	Pelosi			
DeFazio	Keller	Pence			
DeGette	Kelly (IL)	Perlmutter			
DeLauro	Kelly (MS)	Perry			
DeBene	Kelly (PA)	Peters			
Delgado	Kennedy	Peterson			
Demings	Khanna	Phillips			
DeSaulnier	Kildee	Pingree			
DesJarlais	Kilmer	Pocan			
Deutch	Kim	Posey			
Diaz-Balart	Kind	Pressley			
Dingell	King (IA)	Price (NC)			
Doggett	King (NY)	Quigley			
Doyle, Michael F.	Kinzing	Raskin			
Duncan	Kirkpatrick	Ratcliffe			
Dunn	Krishnamoorthi	Reed			
Emmer	Kuster (NH)	Reschenthaler			
Engel	Kustoff (TN)	Rice (NY)			
Escobar	LaHood	Rice (SC)			
Eshoo	LaMalfa	Riggleman			
Españat	Lamb	Roby			
Estes	Lamborn	Rodgers (WA)			
Evans	Langevin	Roe, David P.			
Ferguson	Larsen (WA)	Rogers (AL)			
Finkenauer	Larson (CT)	Rogers (KY)			
Fitzpatrick	Latta	Rooney (FL)			
Fleischmann	Lawrence	Rose (NY)			
Fletcher	Lawson (FL)	Rose, John W.			
Fortenberry	Lee (CA)	Rouda			
Foster	Lee (NV)	Rouzer			
Foxx (NC)	Lesko	Roy			
Frankel	Levin (CA)	Roybal-Allard			
Fulcher	Levin (MI)	Ruiz			
Gaetz	Lieu, Ted	Ruppersberger			
Galleo	Lipinski	Rush			
Garamendi	Loeb	Rutherford			
Garcia (IL)	Loeb	Ryan			
Garcia (TX)	Lofgren	Sánchez			
Gianforte	Long	Sarbanes			
Gibbs	Loudermilk	Scalise			
Gohmert	Lowenthal	Scanlon			
Golden	Lowey	Schakowsky			
Gomez	Lucas	Schiff			
Gonzalez (OH)	Luetkemeyer	Schneider			
Gonzalez (TX)	Lujan	Schrader			
Gooden	Luria	Schrier			
Gosar	Lynch	Schweikert			
Gottheimer	Malinowski	Scott (VA)			
Granger	Maloney,	Scott, Austin			
Graves (GA)	Carolyn B.	Scott, David			
Graves (LA)	Marchant	Sensenbrenner			
Graves (MO)	Marshall	Sewell (AL)			
Green (TN)	Massie	Shalala			
Green, Al (TX)	Mast	Sherman			
Griffith	Matsui	Sherrill			
Grijalva	McAdams	Shimkus			
Grothman	McBath	Simpson			
Guest	McCarthy	Sires			
	McCauley	Slotkin			

NOT VOTING—14

Bishop (GA) Gabbard Richmond
Carter (TX) Gallagher Serrano
Cooper Lewis Timmons
Flores McEachin Webster (FL)
Fudge Porter

□ 1722

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to cast my votes on November 20, 2019 for rollcall 632, rollcall 633, rollcall 634, rollcall 635, and rollcall 636. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on rollcall 632, "yes" on rollcall 633, "yes" on rollcall 634 (H.R. 737—Shark Fin Sales Elimination Act), "yes" on rollcall 635 (S. 1838—Hong Kong Human Rights and Democracy Act of 2019), and "yes" on rollcall 636 (S. 2710—To prohibit the commercial export of covered munitions items to the Hong Kong Police Force). I am proud to support the people of Hong Kong.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO THE CANADA-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CASTEN of Illinois). The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 276d and the order of the House of January 3, 2019, of the following Member on the part of the House to the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group:

Mr. HUIZENG, Michigan

MOMENT OF SILENCE IN HONOR OF THE PASSING OF MRS. FAHARI JEFFERS

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

Mr. VARGAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, along with my colleagues, SUSAN DAVIS, SCOTT PETERS, MIKE LEVIN, and Chairwoman MAXINE WATERS, to honor Mrs. Fahari Jeffers, who passed away on October 30, for her outstanding actions as a tireless civil rights and labor leader and motivator

and as the cofounder of the United Domestic Workers of America.

In 1977, Fahari Jeffers and her husband, Ken Msemaji, formed the United Domestic Workers organizing committee under the mentorship of Cesar Chavez. It was the first known labor organization for domestic workers in the United States of America and only the third labor union in U.S. labor history to be founded by Latinos or African Americans.

Additionally, Mrs. Jeffers served as United Domestic Workers' secretary-treasurer and first general counsel until 2005.

Ms. Jeffers worked tirelessly as lead negotiator for all union contracts throughout the State of California, pursuing life improvements that helped millions of Americans in the State and nationwide.

Her model collective bargain rights law of 1999 is patterned across California and the Nation, where over 2 million home care workers enjoy union rights. Fahari regarded writing this legislation as one of her proudest accomplishments.

Asserting rights for our Nation's domestic workers gave way to the passage of the first-ever Federal Domestic Workers Bill of Rights in 2013.

Mrs. Jeffers used her skills and experience to represent and defend the rights of one of the most underrepresented and underpaid working groups in our society: our home care workers, who clean, cook, and provide personal care assistance to the sick and disabled.

In 2018, Fahari was inducted into the San Diego County Women's Hall of Fame.

At home in National City, the devoutly Catholic couple adopted 16 children over the years. Survivors include her husband of 44 years, Ken Msemaji; her siblings, Rose Glasford of Bermuda, Karama Broach of North Carolina, Joe Jeffers of Colorado, Vickie Jeffers of North Carolina, and Dr. Adam Jeffers of the United Arab Emirates; and her adopted children.

We would like to honor Fahari Jeffers for her dedication and lifelong commitment to civil rights, the labor movement, and the community.

I ask that Members and guests in the gallery rise for a moment of silence.

REBUILDING SMALL BUSINESSES AFTER DISASTERS ACT

Ms. CRAIG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 862) to extend the sunset for collateral requirements for Small Business Administration disaster loans, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 862

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 “Rebuilding Small Businesses After Disasters Act”.

SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF SUNSET FOR COLLATERAL REQUIREMENTS FOR SBA DISASTER LOANS.

Section 2102(b) of the RISE After Disaster Act of 2015 (15 U.S.C. 636 note) is amended, in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “4 years” and inserting “7 years”.

SEC. 3. GAO REPORT ON DEFAULT RATES.

Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate and the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives a report comparing—

(1) the performance, including the default rate, of loans made under section 7(b)(1) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(b)(1)) during the period—

(A) beginning on January 1, 2000; and

(B) ending on the date on which the Small Business Administration began making loans in accordance with the amendment made by section 2102(a) of the RISE After Disaster Act of 2015 (Public Law 114–88; 129 Stat. 690); and

(2) the performance, including the default rate, of loans made under 7(b)(1) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(b)(1)) in accordance with the amendment made by section 2102(a) of the RISE After Disaster Act of 2015 (Public Law 114–88; 129 Stat. 690).

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1730

HOOR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

RECOGNIZING NATIONAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP MONTH

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize November as National Entrepreneurship Month.

America has always been known as a land of innovation, and entrepreneurs combine innovation with capitalism.

But there is a group of future business leaders that need our help, the minority entrepreneurs. Many do not get the funds they need, based on bias in the banking and loan industry. Too many bank managers still refuse to see minorities as worthy of loans. When they do get them, minorities are charged higher interest rates on average than Whites. Many do not even fill out the loan applications because they

know they will be rejected. Major banks have programs to deal with it, but clearly more needs to be done. We need to make sure loans are distributed based on credentials of the applicant, not the color of his or her skin.

RECOGNIZING ALZHEIMER'S AWARENESS MONTH

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

Mr. BURCHETT. Mr. Speaker, November is Alzheimer's Awareness Month. I rise to recognize the millions of Americans across this great country who are living with Alzheimer's disease and related dementias.

Alzheimer's is a frightening disease that has impacted several individuals close to me. My Aunt Jane lost her battle with the disease, while my Aunt Virginia continues to fight it. Additionally, the legendary Pat Summitt, a friend of mine—she actually came to my father's funeral—who coached the University of Tennessee Lady Vols basketball team for 38 seasons, lived with and brought awareness to Alzheimer's disease before passing away in 2016.

I am especially thankful for the caregivers who assist those living with a memory disorder. Friends, family members, and trained professionals care for these patients and make sacrifices to ensure their comfort. These efforts must not be overlooked, Mr. Speaker.

Individuals diagnosed with Alzheimer's need to know they are not alone in their battle against this difficult illness. And while I remain optimistic about new treatments and ongoing research to find a cure, this November I encourage my constituents and colleagues to take a moment to think about those Americans living with Alzheimer's disease and say a prayer for them and their families and to show support for the caregivers who look after and advocate for them.

RECOGNIZING LATINA EQUAL PAY DAY

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

Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL. Mr. Speaker, today we recognize Latina Equal Pay Day. I want to start by emphasizing that the gender pay gap is real, and it hurts Latina women and families.

We know that Latinas make only 54 cents for every dollar that a White non-Hispanic male makes for doing the same job. Let that sink in for just one moment. In 2019, Latina women get paid 54 cents for every dollar a non-Hispanic man makes for the same work.

In fact, a Latina must work an additional 35 years to catch up to the earnings of a 60-year-old man, averaging to about \$1.1 million in loss of earnings during a 40-year career. Continuing to

ignore this disparity has repercussions in many aspects of our economy, and it leaves over 40 percent of families that are headed by a Latina in poverty.

We must find a way to close the wage for the sake of our mothers, our sisters, our daughters, and our families.

RECOGNIZING SCOTT SEWELL

(Ms. FOXX of North Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Scott Sewell for his 4 years of service as president of the Winston-Salem Police Foundation. When he steps down as president in December, Mr. Sewell will be able to look back on his term and be extremely proud of the successes he has had.

Mr. Sewell has led the foundation in a manner that truly gives back to the community. One such example is when, under his leadership, the foundation donated to the Winston-Salem Police Department the Operation Sweet Reads truck, which will be used to engage with local children with ice cream and promote literacy and education.

Scott Sewell has served his community well, and he will continue to do so even after his term has ended. He is an exemplary member of the community, and I am proud to call him a friend and to recognize his service.

HONORING MIKE MAROTTA, SR.

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

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of Mike Marotta, Sr., an entertainment legend, a Monterey native, and a cornerstone of the Italian American community on the central coast of California in my district.

I am sorry to say, Mike passed away earlier this week at the age of 98. Mike was a family man, a businessman, and a civic leader.

But I have to say everyone who knew him knew that music was Mike's first and everlasting love. He taught himself how to play the accordion when he was 11 years old. He would then take the accordion down to the bay and play for the Italian fishermen coming back and unloading their catch.

His musical journey even led him to Hollywood eventually, where he played with stars like Roy Rogers and Dale Evans. During his military service during World War II, he entertained the troops throughout the United States.

Now, recently you could find Mike playing Italian songs with his kids and grandkids and even at the Paisano Club, but also you could find him continuing his tradition of playing for fishermen and our community at the Festa Italia Santa Rosalia, the premier Italian American festival on the central coast of California.

My condolences are with his family. Mike's civic-mindedness and his musical gift will be missed by our community, but his legacy and his love of music will be carried on by his family and friends through his everlasting songs played by his son, but most importantly, through the love in our hearts for Mike Marotta, Sr.

RECOGNIZING RITA BISHOP

(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 rise today to recognize Roanoke Superintendent of Schools, Rita Bishop.

Superintendent Bishop has served the students of Roanoke City for more than 12 years and will retire at the school year's end. Her tenure is marked with significant accomplishments, and I applaud the passion she exudes for the students of her district.

During her time of service to the community, graduation rates improved from 60 percent in 2007 to now over 90 percent. Further, under her leadership, all schools have achieved full accreditation division wide, a feat that had never before been accomplished.

Additionally, Ms. Bishop was essential in launching Roanoke's summer enrichment program RCPS-Plus. This program seeks to address what is known as the "summer slide" by ensuring knowledge is not lost between school years. Last summer, a record 3,400 students enrolled in this program.

I want to thank Ms. Bishop for her dedication to improving the city's education system and wish her a happy, well-deserved retirement.

RECOGNIZING LOCAL PAGEANT TITLEHOLDERS

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

Mr. VAN DREW. Mr. Speaker, I want to highlight three exceptional young ladies who reside in my district in south Jersey. They are pageant titleholders who work for the greater good of our community.

Madison Stiles is a Salem County native, who uses her title to promote mental health awareness. She is an avid volunteer through her community and is a fantastic advocate for the important subject of mental health.

Miss Vineland 2019, Marissa Marchese, who resides in Vineland, New Jersey, created a platform called "Homeless Has a Face" that allows her to educate individuals on the harsh realities of being displaced and share the stories of those who are not fortunate enough to have a roof over their heads.

Lastly, but certainly not least, Jaslene Candelaria, at the young age of 11, created a platform that collects stuffed animals, blankets, and inspirational cards for cancer patients of all

ages. Her goal is to bring joy and smiles to patients, and she visits various hospitals throughout her community to make sure to do so.

Mr. Speaker, I thank them all for their selfless and benevolent work throughout their communities. Our future is in wonderful hands with them. They are our heroes, and may God bless them.

CONGRATULATING LAKELAND LINDER INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

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

Mr. SPANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Lakeland Linder International Airport on receiving their second Department of Transportation grant, this time totaling \$8½ million.

Lakeland Linder has over 125,000 aircraft operations annually and is becoming a central hub for major companies like Amazon.

The airport is also home to the NOAA Hurricane Hunters, the Central Florida Aerospace Academy, and Polk State College's Aerospace programs.

This grant provides the funding to make needed improvements to the aging runway and infrastructure that will further attract new businesses and jobs.

Well done to Airport Director Eugene Conrad and his team for their vision and hard work. He contributes significantly to District 15 and our economic growth, and we thank him.

SOMETHING HAS GOT TO GIVE

(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, in our conversation about gun violence, one side sees the need for background checks. The other side prefers to "enforce the laws we already have." Yet we do not have universal background checks, so we cannot enforce it. Meanwhile, our children are exposed.

This year there have been 45 school shootings in 46 weeks, 370 mass shootings by the end of October. That is more than one per day. Something has got to give.

Senator MCCONNELL said he will hold a vote on our background check bill only if President Trump says he will sign it.

So let me address the President directly from the heart: Sir, I have two granddaughters. Aubrey is eight; Ella is just one-month old. When Aubrey attends terrifying active shooter drills, what would you have me tell her? How about when she notices that we have laws barring certain people from owning guns, but that much of the time we don't bother to check who is who? Or when she realizes that her leaders could have put basic lifesaving safeguards in place, and they chose not to,

what shall I say to her? What would you tell her?

President Trump, my granddaughters, your grandchildren need your leadership, and so does America.

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

HONORING LOUIS BRINNER

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

Mr. GUEST. Mr. Speaker, on November 22, Louis Brinner, a World War II veteran from Mississippi, will celebrate his 100th birthday.

Mr. Brinner served in the United States Army as a private first-class with the 645th MP Company. After enlisting at Camp Shelby, Mississippi, on May 8, 1941, he fought alongside Allied troops in Italy, which were successful in liberating Italian cities such as Rome and Naples in the Rome-Arno campaign.

For his service, Mr. Brinner earned decorations, including the American Defense Service Medal, European-African-Middle Eastern Campaign Medal, and a Good Conduct Medal.

Mr. Brinner was discharged from the Army on October 16, 1945, after more than 4 years of honorable service to the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Mr. Brinner for his dedicated service to our country and to wish Mr. Brinner the happiest of birthdays.

□ 1745

HONORING FAHARI JEFFERS

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

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, my friend Fahari Jeffers' legacy as a civil rights and labor rights leader in American history had its beginning in the Black Power movement. She joined the San Diego chapter of the U.S. organization in 1967 and served as a teacher in the weekend School of Afro-American Culture for Children.

A dedicated civil rights advocate and cultural rights powerhouse, she became involved in labor union organizing, having convened the major African People's gatherings in the 1970s and worked with the NIA cultural organization in San Diego.

Fahari was proud of her roots in the Black Power movement. Her early work prepared her for the work that Cesar Chavez recruited and trained her and her husband, Ken Msemaji, to do in founding and building the United Domestic Workers of America. Today, over 200,000 California homecare workers and nearly 2 million nationally work under union contracts. Her model of collective bargaining rights law is now patterned across the Nation. On Sunday, March 18, 2018, Fahari Jeffers

was inducted into the San Diego Women's Hall of Fame for her work in co-founding the United Domestic Workers of America.

With her passing, the State of California and our Nation suffered a tremendous loss. She will be remembered for her "sí, se puede" attitude and for exemplifying the meaning of her Swahili given name, Fahari, which means magnificent, and magnificent she was.

SUPPORT BIPARTISAN PATH FOR USMCA

(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 in support of the continued effort by the U.S. Trade Representative and the Democratic working group to finalize the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement, the USMCA.

Oklahoma workers, families, businesses, and our Nation benefit from free and fair international trade. Every day, Oklahomans create and export world-class products, and two of our largest trading partners are our neighbors to the north and the south.

In 2018 alone, Oklahoma exported a total of \$5.6 billion in manufactured goods. Nearly half of those went to Mexico and Canada. In the same year, Oklahoma agriculture exports to Mexico and Canada totaled \$154 million.

A stronger trading relationship with Mexico and Canada means a stronger economy for Oklahoma. It is imperative that Congress finish negotiating and pass a strong trade agreement to restore certainty in our trading relationship with Canada and Mexico and support millions of American jobs in the process.

Though finding common ground is not easy, it is critical, and I support the USTR and lawmakers' work to find a bipartisan path forward for this important trade agreement.

HONORING TRACY SINGLE ON TRANSGENDER DAY OF REMEMBRANCE

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

Mrs. FLETCHER. Mr. Speaker, today, on Transgender Remembrance Day, I rise to remember Tracy Single, who was killed in July of this year in my district, the 15th transgender woman of color murdered this year.

A music lover with an eye for fashion and an ear for music, 22-year-old Tracy moved to Houston to pursue her dream of becoming a rapper. Tension around her gender identity forced her out of her home, and she experienced a very hard time, but she was persistent and upbeat, always working to achieve her goals.

Her life reminds us that creative and vibrant people can thrive even in the

most difficult circumstances. And her death reminds us that transgender people are under attack and must have equal protection under the law.

HONORING TOM VASQUEZ

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

Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to honor the memory of my dear friend Tom Vasquez, who passed away on July 23. Tom was one of the founders of our progressive movement in Chicago, and we were partners in many battles.

He was born in Matamoros, Mexico, and eventually found his way to Chicago, settling in the working-class community of Little Village. In the early 1980s, Tom was part of a group of young people who saw the disparities and lack of political representation in our community and sought to address these inequalities.

He stepped up, led the change, and helped create the Independent Political Organization of the 22nd Ward. He was a precinct captain for many years. He organized block clubs and he was involved in schools in the local community. On election day, he was always getting people to the polling places. He attended many community meetings and mentored many young people in the community. He did this all while holding a full-time job with the Chicago Transit Authority and being a member of a local union.

Tom's passing has left a gap not only for his family but for the entire community that benefited from his service and commitment to justice.

Tom, may you rest in peace.

NATIONAL BIBLE WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GREEN of Texas). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the topic of my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, it is a great honor for me to come to the House floor tonight to commemorate National Bible Week. This is an opportunity to celebrate the tremendous influence of the Bible on the freedoms we enjoy today in America.

We are truly blessed to live in a nation where we are free to worship and read the Holy Scriptures without fear of persecution. There are many places

throughout the world where such freedoms do not exist.

Americans have the right under our wonderful system of government to respect and study the Bible or any other system of belief that they so choose or even none at all. That is the beauty of the American way, and I believe it goes all the way back to the Bible.

In 1941, President Franklin Delano Roosevelt declared the week of Thanksgiving to be National Bible Week. The National Bible Association and the U.S. Conference of Bishops have designated the specific days of November 18 to 24 as National Bible Week this year. This is the week set aside to recognize the Bible as a foundational building block of Western civilization, the Judeo-Christian heritage, and the legacy that motivated and shaped the founding of the United States.

In this hour, we will hear from Members of Congress from all throughout the United States from various faith traditions and denominations speak about what the Bible means to them. We are here, in keeping with tradition, to recognize National Bible Week.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. RODGERS), who is a good friend and colleague.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I want to say thank you to the gentleman from Colorado for bringing us all together tonight for National Bible Week.

Over the weekend, I finished reading through the Bible in a year, and I can testify that it has been the best year of my life in giving me perspective and quiet confidence for every day, reminding me to lead with love.

The Bible says to love your enemies and pray for those who persecute you. The Word of God is the source of love, joy, peace, patience, kindness, goodness, and self-control. Everything that we long for in life is found in the Word of God, the Bible.

So why haven't I been more faithful to read the Bible every day earlier in my life? Because, like a lot of people, I didn't always feel like I had enough time, or I struggled to relate to the language.

Why read the Bible? Why wake up 15 minutes early each day? Why go to all that trouble? That was my struggle for many, many years.

The Bible says in Psalm 90:12: "Teach us to number our days, that we may gain a heart of wisdom."

Psalm 103 says that "our days are few and brief, like grass, like flowers, blown by the wind and gone forever," yet the Word of God endures forever.

It is the Bible that provides us answers to our questions about life more than any other book, seminar, or self-help program.

The Bible also offers words of encouragement and hope at a time when despair has come over our country. We have record suicides. A million people in America attempted suicide last

year, and 47,000 committed suicide. I grieve this loss.

The deaths of despair are skyrocketing: suicide, drug overdoses, opioids, alcohol, and drug abuse. People are giving up on life.

The Bible says in Matthew that not a single sparrow can fall to the ground without your Father knowing it. And the very hairs on your head are numbered, so don't be afraid, you are more valuable to God.

We need the truth and the wisdom of the Bible. As Proverbs 12:18 says: "Careless words stab like a sword, but wise words bring healing."

As I begin a second year of taking 15 minutes a day to read the Bible and then pray, I would invite each one of you to join me. Let's do it together. Let's agree that it cannot be business as usual. Let's see what God could do on Capitol Hill through Members and staff who daily walk the Halls of Congress—Democrats and Republicans, House and Senate, men and women—if we all read through the Bible in 2020.

I am convinced the Democrats can't fix it. The Republicans can't fix it. Only God can fix it.

My daily prayer is 2 Chronicles 7:14: "If my people, who are called by my name, will humble themselves and pray and seek my face and turn from their wicked ways, then I will hear from Heaven, and I will forgive their sin and will heal their land."

Lord God, heal our land. May You bring order out of chaos. Lift the heaviness of misery and despair and busyness. Remind us that You are with us in everything we do.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her words of wisdom, her personal experience, and for being here tonight.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BABIN).

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my dear colleague for having this.

Since Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1941, every U.S. President has declared the week of Thanksgiving to be National Bible Week. Next week, we will, once again, celebrate this beloved book, which continues to mold the lives of millions and even billions around the world.

It is fitting that we take time today to bring attention to the very book that was so influential in the founding of our Nation. The Holy Bible was perhaps the most accessible book to our Founding Fathers. Its principles gave them invaluable insights into human nature, civic virtue, political authority, and the rights of citizens.

Personally, I consider it a huge and great privilege to speak on the House floor today about a book that has had such a profound influence on my life and on the life of our country, and it continues to do so daily.

As a believer in Christ, the Bible has shaped the way that I have lived my life, whether conducting my business as a dentist in Woodville, Texas, raising my family, or serving the good peo-

ple of the 36th District of Texas right here in the House of Representatives.

I believe that the Bible is more than a book of inspiration and comfort or a compilation of moral teachings. I believe that it really is the Holy Word of God that contains the truth and teachings of His love for us and His plan for redemption through faith in Jesus Christ, His Son.

In history's greatest love story, the Bible tells us that God sacrificed His Son to redeem us from depravity. In John 3:16, we read: "For God so loved the world, He gave His only begotten Son that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish but have everlasting life."

Centuries before, in one of my favorite passages, the Book of Job prophesied of Christ the Redeemer who is to come:

For I know that my Redeemer lives,
And He shall stand at last on the Earth;
And after my skin is destroyed, this I know,
That in my flesh I shall see God,
Whom I shall see for myself, and my eyes
shall behold, and not another.
How my heart yearns within me.

Whenever I read these words, I am reminded of my Lord's steadfast love for me and His promise to always be with and guide me through every chapter of my life.

□ 1800

As we approach the 78th National Bible Week, I want to encourage my fellow Americans out there to take a moment to open the Bible and to read these profound words. No matter if it has been a while since you have read the Bible or you read it every single day, may each of us spend time reminding ourselves of the Word of God, especially during this season of thanks.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for sharing his heart with us tonight.

Throughout American history, many of our great leaders have turned to the Bible for guidance, faith, and hope.

President Abraham Lincoln once said of the Bible: "I have but to say, it is the best gift God has given to man. All the good the Savior gave to the world was communicated through this book. But for it we could not know right from wrong. All things most desirable for man's welfare, here and hereafter, are to be found portrayed in it."

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON), as we go across the country and hear from folks all over this great country of ours.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank my brother in the Lord from Colorado for hosting this Special Order tonight, during a special week where we commemorate the Holy Word, the Bible.

Mr. Speaker, since 1941, every President since Franklin Delano Roosevelt has declared the week of Thanksgiving as National Bible Week.

It is fitting that we celebrate this week along with the national day of

Thanksgiving. Both the Bible and this annual holiday provide us with the time to reflect on what is most important in our lives: our faith, our creator, our family, and our love for one another.

Mr. Speaker, part of my family lineage can be traced back to those Pilgrims who set out for the New World in search of religious freedom. They endured both hardship and sacrifice at a heavy cost to be able to freely worship without persecution.

Forty-five of the 102 Mayflower passengers died in the winter of 1620 to 1621, and the Mayflower colonists suffered greatly during their first winter in the New World from lack of shelter, scurvy, and general conditions of hardship. They brought with them, though, their faith and several Bibles.

The event that Americans commonly call the First Thanksgiving was celebrated by the Pilgrims after their first harvest in the New World in October of 1621. This feast lasted 3 days, and, as accounted by attendee Edward Winslow, it was attended by 90 Native Americans and 53 Pilgrims.

Thanks to William Bradford's journal, we have knowledge of how these Pilgrims gave thanks. The question remains as to whom and why did they do this.

As people of faith, I would like to believe they were acting out the lessons of the Bible, such as that found in Psalm 107. This Scripture states the theme of God's loyal love and redemption. It is written for at the time of Israel in exile.

Wandering and overwhelmed by circumstances, I could see why these early Pilgrims could find solace in this Scripture. They also found themselves wandering and enduring hardship.

The Bible illustrated the power of giving thanks to the Lord, the importance of assuming thankfulness as a human attitude.

These words indicate not just a knowledge of, but also a recognition and a relationship through, the Word of God that the Bible offers.

I don't know if the Pilgrims referenced this Scripture in preparing or dealing with the hardships that they endured. I do know that the Bible and the Word within it was important to these travelers and early settlers.

The Bible has had a tremendous influence in my life and the lives of millions of Americans. The Scriptures inside serve as a guide for us in both times of trouble and in times of triumph. And, for that reason, it remains the best-selling book of all time.

During this week, I am thankful for the strong community of faith that I have come to know through weekly Bible studies and prayer service here in the United States Capitol and, certainly, back in my district and my home community. It is a time where we put aside differences and come together to share the love and the Gospel of Jesus Christ.

The words of the Bible unite people, nations, and even politicians as we

come together to celebrate faith, fellowship, and prayer.

As I prepare to close, let me share these thoughts.

God chose Israel; America chose God; and God's first love is Israel. Let's make America God's lasting love.

Mr. Speaker, let us also celebrate the First Amendment, which affirms our right to choose and exercise faith without government coercion or retaliation.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his words, and I thank him for reminding us about the Pilgrim tradition, especially as we enter this week of Thanksgiving.

It is interesting, in American history, we have two different strains of life going on in this country: We had people starting in Jamestown looking for gold, looking to make money, putting up with slavery; but we had people in Massachusetts who wanted to just have religious freedom, and they had a whole different view of the world and of God and the Bible. They were the start of the abolitionist movement. So I am glad that Mr. THOMPSON brought us the Pilgrim tradition tonight.

Ronald Reagan, when he designated National Bible Week, said, when he was in office: "When I took the oath of office, I requested the Bible be opened to II Chronicles 7:14."

CATHY MCMORRIS RODGERS mentioned this earlier. It reads: "If my people, which are called by my name, shall humble themselves, and pray, and seek my face, and turn from their wicked ways, then I will hear from Heaven, and will forgive their sin, and will heal their land."

This passage expresses my personal hopes for the future of this Nation and the world.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. ESTES).

Mr. ESTES. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend and fellow colleague from Colorado, Representative LAMBORN, for hosting this Special Order tonight as we honor National Bible Week.

Every President since Franklin Delano Roosevelt inaugurated the first one in 1941, every President has since declared the week of Thanksgiving as National Bible Week. It follows a long history, stretching back to the founding of our country, of our leaders turning to their faith and the Bible as guidance for our Nation.

This is just as important now as it was at our country's founding and in the midst of terrible world wars.

This week, I am reminded of a passage in Luke 17, verses 5 through 6: "The apostles said to the Lord, 'Increase our faith.' The Lord replied, 'If you have the faith the size of a mustard seed, you would say to this mulberry tree, "Be uprooted and planted in the sea," and it would obey you.'"

And also in Luke 17, verse 10, "So it should be with you. When you have done all you have been commanded, say, 'We are unworthy servants; we have only done our duty.'"

In this passage, Jesus' apostles plead for more faith to make it easier for them to sacrifice and to do all that they have been asked to do. But Jesus answers them by pointing out that, if they had only the tiniest bit of faith—that, the size of a mustard seed—no task would be too difficult. This included even the apostles' seemingly impossible task to "go out and make disciples of all nations."

But instead of increasing the measure of their faith, Jesus tells his apostles to humble themselves and be steadfast in accomplishing all that was asked of them.

As public servants and representatives, I believe we, too, are called to humble ourselves and to be unwavering in serving our fellow Americans. The American people have put their trust in us to preserve our democracy, protect our God-given rights, defend our country, and champion the American Dream. This is not an easy task. But, as Jesus pointed out, anything is possible if we humble ourselves, do our job, and have faith.

I know for me, personally, I rely on teachings like this one in the Bible to better serve my fellow Kansans and our country.

I am also thankful to live in a country where we are free to practice our faith, as well as to all the Americans who have served to protect this freedom.

As we approach National Bible Week, I hope my colleagues and all Americans, regardless of their faith background, take some time to reflect on their own calling to serve, as well as the gift of religious liberty.

Like the Bible, public service and religious liberty are cornerstones of our country, and I am honored to recognize those here tonight and throughout National Bible Week.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Kansas, in the Nation's heartland, for sharing his thoughts with us tonight. I am going to share my own story.

When I was a freshman at the University of Kansas—also there in America's heartland—in the 1970s, someone approached me and asked me if I knew what the Bible was about. I said: Yeah, sure I know what is in it."

But do you know what? I said that without ever having read any of it for myself. Kind of presumptuous on my part.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if there are any people listening in here to us today who are in the same position. Maybe they think they know what it is about, but they have never looked at it for themselves.

The only honest thing I could do at that point was to read for myself. So I read the Gospel of John, and as I read it, I discovered that I didn't know what was in there at all. It was totally different than what I had expected.

And I found a man in there who said: "I am the way, the truth, and the life. No one comes to the Father but

through me." So I ended up discovering for myself a relationship with Jesus Christ, who became my Lord and Savior.

Mr. Speaker, that is what I know from personal experience. It is better to read the Bible for oneself and not just take someone else's word for it. For me, it made all the difference in the world. My life has been totally different as a result.

As David said in Psalms: "The unfolding of your words gives light; it gives understanding to the simple"—Psalm 119:130.

So, as we celebrate National Bible Week, we remember the importance of faith in both our private and our public lives. We recognize the Bible's powerful message of hope. We cherish the wisdom of the Bible, and we thank God for providing this holy book that has truly been, in the words of Scripture, a lamp unto our feet and a light unto our path.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING), another person from the heartland of America.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Colorado for yielding to me and for leading here on this National Bible Week.

I would like to start out with just a touch of levity, because we are called to address the Speaker, and I know that the Speaker happens to also be a man of God and a Bible scholar.

In addressing the Speaker, I enjoy revisiting Ecclesiastes 10:2, which says: "A wise man's heart is at his right, but a fool's heart at his left."

I couldn't resist that, and I pray that you forgive me, Mr. Speaker, for that bit of levity at this time.

I would move on to my favorite verse, which is Ecclesiastes 9:10: "Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might."

It calls us not to just wander through this life and touch things gently and kind of let the flow of life go by, but we are given gifts by God. He fills us with skill sets that we haven't yet developed, whether it is intellectual, whether it is physical, but skill sets of the heart, and to put our vigor to those things that please Him.

So with that verse in mind each morning, I pray that God will loan me the measure of his wisdom, that He would have me use this day to go forth and glorify Him. And if there is time for a little extra blessing, let me do so with joy. That sustains me through every day.

Another verse that sustains me through these future days came to me this morning at our gathering. This is the first chapter of Jeremiah, verse 17, that says: "Meet them undaunted, and they shall have no power to daunt thee."

That says, in my vernacular, never let them see you sweat, but go forth with courage and with confidence. Do those things that God calls you to do, and do so with your might.

I also look back on a verse in James that has caught my eye for some time,

and it calls us, I think, in the right way, Mr. Speaker: "Count it all joy, my brothers, when you meet trials of various kinds, for you know that the testing of your faith produces steadfastness. And let steadfastness have its full effect, that you may be perfect and complete, lacking in nothing."

That fits with a prayer that I offered for years when we went through the farm crisis years of the 1980s. Things were falling down around us. The economy had essentially collapsed, and my neighbor's farms were being sold weekend after weekend in farm sales.

I was being tested in a similar way myself. Each day, I would pray that God would be finished testing me and start to use me.

□ 1815

And we should take joy in that test before we are made perfect in the tests that He provides for us. I know they are in the Book of James, which is one that has stood out for me for a long time, and that is: If you fail to do what you know is right, then you have sinned.

And I recall an issue that was going on in the Iowa State legislature. I was here in Congress, but I needed a bill introduced and moved in the State legislature. There were those who knew it was the right thing to do, but they didn't have the courage to introduce it because leadership was pushing against them, and it was going to be a big political fight.

But I found a young man who is my State representative today, and when I raised the issue with him, he said: I will do this. And I said: You understand the burden of this and the potential consequences if you step forward in this arena?

And he looked at me and he said: If I don't introduce this bill, I will not be able to receive final absolution.

Whoa, that told me something about the man and the character and the faith of this man. I don't know if this verse in James was something that had been branded on his heart. The meaning of it was—the words, I don't know—but he had to be thinking, if he failed to do what he knew was right, then he would have sinned.

But he stepped forward and did what he knew was right. And I appreciate Mr. LAMBORN, the gentleman from Colorado, speaking today about Western civilization and about the foundation of Western civilization. It is everywhere where the footprint of Judeo-Christianity laid the foundation, this Western civilization. The values in it are rooted in the Old and the New Testament.

America would not and could not be the great Nation it is today if we were not a nation that was rooted in Biblical values. And I think that is something indisputable.

Mr. Speaker, I want to bring something to the attention of this Congress and people across this country that not a lot of people know. And this was in

Jamestown in 1607. When they landed at Jamestown, the first thing that the settlers did as they arrived there, they erected a cross. They knelt. They took Communion, and they prayed.

The prayer is so profound, Mr. Speaker, that it should be hanging on the walls or somewhere around this Congress, and I don't know that it is. But here is their prayer, 1607, in this New World:

"We do hereby dedicate this land, and ourselves, to reach the people within these shores with the Gospel of Jesus Christ, and to raise up godly generations after us, and with these generations take the Kingdom of God to all the Earth. May this Covenant of Dedication remain to all generations, as long as this Earth remains, and may this land, along with England, be Evangelist to the world. May all who see this cross remember what we have done here, and may those who come here to inhabit join us in this covenant and in this most noble work that the Holy Scriptures may be fulfilled."

If that doesn't speak to the American destiny, I don't know what does. It had to be the hand of God on them. There is no way a mortal would have understood the path that they were all to follow and all that follow them.

I appreciate the opportunity to address this topic, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. Many of the early American settlers, we reference them many times. They came to the New World with the express purpose of following the Bible according to the convictions of their own consciences.

One of the first acts of Congress during the tumultuous beginning of our Nation was the authorization of an American published Bible. The war with the British had cut off any supply of Bibles from England.

Our Founding Fathers understood how important it was for the American people to have Bibles. Robert Aitken, a private citizen, brought this need to the attention of Congress. In his letter, he wrote: "This work is an object worthy the attention of the Congress of the United States of America, who will not neglect spiritual security, while they are virtuously contending for temporal blessings."

So in 1782, Congress reviewed, approved, and authorized the first known English language Bible to be printed in America. They passed a congressional resolution. I am not sure how many votes this would get if we brought this today. I know I would support it.

"Resolved: That the United States in Congress assembled, highly approve the pious and laudable undertaking of Mr. Aitken, as subservient to the interest of religion, as well as an instance of the progress of the arts in this country, and being satisfied from the above report of his care and accuracy in the execution of the work, they recommend this edition of the Bible to the inhabitants of the United States, and hereby authorize him to publish this

recommendation in the manner he shall think proper."

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARRINGTON).

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague, Mr. LAMBORN, my brother in Christ, and one of our spiritual leaders here in this great Chamber.

I so appreciate the gentleman leading this effort to pay tribute to God's holy, inherent, infallible, active Word, that Word that has created the heavens and the Earth. The Word that became flesh and dwelt among us in the person of Jesus, God's Son.

This Word of God, this Bible that we speak of, I don't know that there is any book that has had a greater influence on the world. It is no accident that the words behind me above our Speaker and our Nation's motto are "In God we trust." And as we trusted God, God blessed us.

As I trust Him in my life, He blesses me. And when I depart as His child, as a follower of Jesus, and I say to Mr. LAMBORN that I have to confess, I depart from time to time. And when I do, I don't have that peace that surpasses understanding, that hope and that joy unspeakable, but because of this great gift of the Bible, I cannot only know the will of God, the mind of God, the character of God, I can actually have a relationship with God.

And that is mind-blowing. And the fact that I wouldn't run to the Bible every day first thing when I get up, and I wouldn't cling to it at night, every night, before I went to bed, is also mind-boggling, knowing the power and the richness, the depth of the wisdom of God in those Holy Scripture.

And one of my favorite things to talk about back home is—and I do this often with school children—I talk about what has made America great. Because like all of us, they have heard that statement over the last couple of years, and they, I am sure, have pondered that question. What has made America great? And how do we make America great again?

Well, I say America is great because America is free. And no other Nation in all of the world has been gifted with that freedom like the United States. And I say America is great because America is brave. It is the 1 percent in every generation that is willing to sacrifice everything for these liberties and the opportunities that we are blessed with. But, ultimately, what makes America great is the goodness of America.

Alexis de Tocqueville who set out to study what makes America great, said these words, and I think they are important for us to reflect on. He was a French philosopher. He came over here for a year, kind of a sabbatical, and his thesis was: What makes America great?

He said: "I sought for the greatness and genius of America in her commodious harbors and her ample rivers—and it was not there . . . in her fertile

fields and boundless forests and it was not there . . . in her rich mines and her vast world commerce—and it was not there . . . in her democratic Congress and her matchless Constitution—and it was not there. Not until I went into the churches of America and heard her pulpits aflame with righteousness did I understand the secret of her genius and power. America is great because she is good, and if America ever ceases to be good, she will cease to be great.”

So I say this from my own personal perspective in my own life, and I say this to this great Chamber and to this amazing country we have been blessed to live in; we must return to the Bible and our relationship with God, so His goodness, through the power of the Holy Spirit will flow through us, so we can love our neighbors, serve our communities, and we can make America great again.

Amen. God bless America. And I thank the gentleman for this great opportunity to share in this tribute to the Bible, God's Holy Word.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative ARRINGTON for his heartfelt comments and for being here tonight and sharing with us.

One reason many people respect the Bible is that so many prophecies for telling future events have come true exactly as foretold. It is one of the reasons I look at whenever I ask myself: Is the Bible really true? Is it just a collection of stories and legends, or is it rooted in history and fact?

So when I look at the prophecies of the Bible, that gives me the answer. In the Old Testament, there are many predictions that were given to prove that the speaker who claimed to be divinely inspired really was or not. If, and when, those predictions or prophecies came true, it validated the words of that speaker.

In the Book of Daniel, for instance, there are scores of detailed prophecies that were literally fulfilled. So skeptics who want to criticize the Bible have fallen back on the position that Daniel must have been written of after the facts about which they talk about.

But, the Book of Daniel is found in its entirety in the Greek Septuagint and partially in the Dead Sea Scrolls, which were discovered in later years and now we know predated the events that were talked about in the Book of Daniel. So Daniel gave prophecies that came true in history.

So the critics of the dating of the Book of Daniel are the ones who are not being honest. The rise and fall of empires, the capture and destruction of cities, the destiny of kings, all of these are prophesied about in minute detail, and history has literally confirmed hundreds of such prophecies as having come true.

So that is one of the reasons I believe in the Bible and know it to be true, and not just a nice collection of stories.

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

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of National Bible Week

and thank Congressman LAMBORN for the time tonight to recognize the importance of honoring God's Word.

As was said, 7 or 8 years ago, FDR declared National Bible Week just before the start of World War II. Just as it was then, the Bible is God's gift to us, standing the test of time, and serving as our guide during times of both joy and hardship. It is the way that God speaks to us.

I was born in rural America in Georgia and as most youngsters, I was baptized at an early age because I believed in John 3:16:

That God who gave us his Son, His begotten Son, that who shall ever believe in Him shall not perish but have eternal life.

What an amazing gift.

And almost 20 years ago—and of course, there are many highs and lows during my time since then—but some 20 years ago, in one of those times of despair, I made a covenant with God. And that covenant was to put Him first.

And that meant an intense study of His Word. And He actually showed me how to change my priorities and put Him first because I had this thirst for His Word as soon as I got up in the morning. In fact, I would wake up and I would be quoting His Word because of something I thought of during the night.

I learned that my strength and abilities did not come from myself, but through Him, and Him alone.

□ 1830

In this great country, we pride ourselves on freedom, and that freedom is knowing that God is our strength and His grace has no limits.

I often pray that thy kingdom come on Earth as it is in Heaven, and the Bible reveals to us that we already have a glimpse of what that is like.

Genesis 1:26 through 28 shows us that, from creation, we were all made in God's image and likeness. Now, wouldn't the world be a much better place if we treated each other, our relationships, as if we were with God himself in those relationships.

Our country's very foundation comes from Judeo-Christian values, and these principles are woven throughout our founding documents.

The Bible says we were created for God's purpose and God's image and in His likeness.

If we study His Word and put it into action to value all people, even those we disagree with, I am certain that the division and hurt in this country would heal.

We are a divided nation, and we have a divided government. You know, Jesus prayed for us in John 17:21 that we would be one, just as He and the Father are one.

The enemy divides; God unites. And if we trust God, as His word says—and just above me, above the flag, says, if we put our trust in God, it would unite all of us here around those important issues that our Founders and the American people care about.

I believe that if we actually, in this Chamber, debated what the Scriptures say about the very issues that divide us—and they are very divisive issues that we deal with on this floor every day—if we took the Scriptures and debated what the Scriptures say about those issues, that we would all come to agreement that God is correct and that his way is the only way.

In fact, his instruction in Joshua 1:8 was: “Do not let this book of law depart from your lips. Be careful to do what it says; meditate on it night and day, and we will be prosperous and successful.”

America stands as a beacon of hope for the rest of the world and can truly be a shining city upon a hill that God described if we treat each other with the dignity and respect that God shows us how to do through His Word.

I pray that God gives me the strength and humility to serve Georgia's 12th District so that more people come to know and love Christ, the truth, so that the truth will set us free.

God bless America. God bless His great Word.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia for his words and for being here tonight.

We have been on the Pacific Coast. Now we are with Georgia on the Atlantic Coast. We have been hearing from Texas, people from Texas down at our Mexican border, and we are about to hear from someone from Wisconsin, our border with Canada in the north of our country. And as Mr. GROTHMAN comes forward, I want to just say a word about archaeology.

It is a historical fact that there are archaeological discoveries that have validated accounts in the Bible, which gives trustworthiness to the Bible that we acknowledge during this National Bible Week.

Time and time again, archaeology has shown that Biblical personalities, locations, and events actually existed in time and space. They weren't just made-up stories.

Claims by critics that a Bible statement was simply made up have been debunked by later archaeological discoveries more times than we can say. The Jewish archaeologist Nelson Glueck has said: “It may be stated categorically that no archaeological discovery has ever controverted or controverted a Biblical reference.”

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN).

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to address National Bible Week.

The Bible is very important in this country. In part, it is important because it is the Word of God, and that makes it the most important book, but it is a particularly important book in America, and it is a book that everybody should familiarize themselves with because I don't think you can understand either the Declaration of Independence or our Constitution without reading the Bible.

You have to remember what America was like in its founding and probably

at least the first 125 years after its founding. People learned to read by either learning to read the Bible itself or maybe learning to read another book, such as “The New England Primer,” which had many excerpts from the Bible in it, or “McGuffey’s Fourth Reader,” which had 10 chapters, which were solely parts of the Bible and also included the Sermon on the Mount.

The Puritans, of course, who were such an important factor in the founding of America, encouraged everyone to read the Bible. In 1782, the U.S. Congress even commemorated an American Bible. The reason they commemorated an American Bible is, at that time, there was somewhat of a crisis in America. We had a Revolutionary War going on. It was difficult to get Bibles from England. So somebody else had to get a Bible or they had to get Bibles in other ways, and Congress talked about that. But when you think about that, you realize why, for so many early Americans, the Bible was so important to them.

It is kind of funny nowadays where they pretend that there is a separation between church and state in America, because John Jay, who was the first Chief Justice of the United States, was also president of the American Bible Society; and I could go on at length from early Supreme Court decisions in which they talked about the importance of God and made reference to the Bible.

Other important Americans early on, Andrew Jackson, the Bible is “the rock on which our Republic rests.”

We can take two things out of this: First of all, we could remember that the great Andrew Jackson felt the Bible was very important, and, secondly, remind people—because a lot of people around here don’t know it—that we are a Republic.

Abraham Lincoln, of course, was known as our greatest Biblical President. There are all sorts of lessons in the Bible.

I think in First Samuel it is interesting to read when the Lord did not like Israel turning from Him and viewing Him as primarily their king over Israel, but instead they wanted kind of a strong central government under a king—example one of many lessons that I think our forefathers read when they designed our wonderful country.

But in any event, I think, for National Bible Week, what every one of us should do is take some time to read the Bible, particularly the parts of the Bible in which Israel was formed, because I think it was very important for our forefathers because they envisioned our country as a country which would be pleasing to God, and they wanted the type of country that God would love and bless. I think we have been given that love and blessings not so much because of the way we behave today, but because of the faith of our forefathers.

So, again, my encouragement for whoever sits at home and listens to

this, maybe say: Can I read the book of Deuteronomy or read First Samuel and learn a little bit of the Bible, not only the Bible for its own right, but to remember the type of books that were being read by our forefathers when they wrote our Constitution, when they wrote our Declaration of Independence, and those books which created their view of the world.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. GROTHMAN for his words tonight, and I appreciate him being here.

Listen to what President Harry Truman said during his address at the Attorney General’s Conference on Law Enforcement Problems: “The fundamental basis of this Nation’s law was given to Moses on the Mount. The fundamental basis of our Bill of Rights comes from the teachings which we get from Exodus and St. Matthew, from Isaiah and St. Paul. I don’t think we emphasize that enough these days.”

He continued: “If we don’t have the proper fundamental moral background, we will finally wind up with a totalitarian government which does not believe in rights for anybody except the state.”

Now, we have been hearing from people from the Atlantic to the Pacific, from the Canadian to the Mexican border. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER), my friend and colleague from the Nation’s heartland.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. It is great to be here tonight.

I just came from the Library of Congress, and there are a lot of books there, but there is one book in particular that is there, and it is in the homes of many American families right now that I would call the most dangerous book in the world.

It is a book that people are being put in prison for just having possession of. It is a crime in many nations for people to own this book, to read this book. There are thousands and thousands of people in prison right now in other parts of the world who are being tortured and killed because they possess this book.

I was reading earlier today about a country where there are people in prison who have friends who tear this book up into little pieces, and they smuggle it into the prison. And that person takes them, and they piece together those pages so that they can not only read this book, but they can memorize it. Because as one of the prisoners said: “Even though they can take the paper away, they can’t take away what’s hidden in your heart.”

And there is another story from another country where parents, if they have the privilege of getting one of these books, it is so precious they read it at night to their families and then they hide it.

But the schools and the government trick their children in playing a hide-and-seek game, and they trick the children into telling their teachers if their

parents have that book and where it is. And they are given candy if they win this “game,” and then, sadly, they realize their parents are taken away to prison camps as a result of that.

So what is this book that I think is really one of the most dangerous books in the world? It is the Bible. It is the Bible. It is what we are commemorating this week.

But why is it so dangerous? Why are governments around the world so threatened by it? It is because it is the Word of God. I will say that again: The Bible is the Word of God.

Now, that seems radical. I mean, some people would view that as radical, but people who have read this book, whose lives have been transformed by it, who have experienced the power of it, who have been set free from difficulties in their life and the chains of either sin or the chains of bondage of a government that is trying to oppress them will tell you it is the most precious book in the world. And that is why governments fear it, and that is why people seek it, and that is why everyone should take advantage—especially in America—of reading it. That is why it is such a popular book.

By far, it is the world’s most popular book. There is no other book, fact or fiction, which comes close. Most estimates place the number of Bibles printed each year at 100 million.

Mr. Speaker, 20 million Bibles are sold each year in the United States alone. The American Bible Society estimates that 9 out of 10 American households—or almost 9—87 percent of American households own a Bible. In fact, they say the average American family owns three Bibles.

My question tonight to all of us is: Are we reading it?

Having a Bible and not reading it would be just like being frustrated that you need to go somewhere and having a car in the garage but just not taking it out, or complaining about the room is so dark when you just don’t go over and turn the light switch on, or having no idea how to go somewhere when you can just turn on your Google Maps on your phone.

The Bible is the source of help; it is the source of power; and it is the source of direction in our lives—and it is right there in our homes, too many times, sadly, gathering dust.

In my own life, I started off going to church with my parents as a child, but I never read the Bible myself. It was something, we used it on Sunday, and the pastor would share a verse or two, and that was it.

And then I went to camp when I was 13. It was a Youth for Christ Camp. I learned that we could read the Bible ourselves and how powerful it is to, every day, start your day off reading from God’s Word, talking to Him through prayer, listening to Him through prayer, and getting inspiration and guidance for your life.

And it was a revolutionary idea, so I started doing that when I was 13, continued that through my teenage years

to the present. And I can't tell you what a difference that has made in my life.

Day after day, I would pick up the Bible to read, maybe 15 minutes before the schoolbus came, and what I read that day would be something that later on, a couple hours later, I would face at school. Whether it would be something dealing with one of my classmates or a hard test or being sick, it doesn't matter.

□ 1845

They say the Bible is living and active, and it really is. That is one thing that makes it so special, because it is very, very powerful.

There have been many instances in my life where the Bible has made a difference for me. But I want to certainly say the most important verse is not just because it is the word of God; it is because it points me to how I can have a personal relationship with him. And that is John 3:16.

I don't know about you, but I love football. Many times when you watch a football game, somebody is holding up a poster that says, "John 3:16." I hope you go and read what that says because it is so powerful. It says, "For God so loved the world." That is what makes this different than other religions. God is a god of love, and because He loved the world, He gave His one and only Son that whoever believes in Him should not perish but have eternal life. It goes on and says, "For God did not send his Son to condemn the world but to save the world through him."

I believed that when I was 9 years old, and I am so thankful to have the privilege of knowing God and that God has made a way for each one of us to know that.

I would, this week, encourage all of us to get our Bible off that shelf, dust it off, open it up, and experience knowing God, hearing from Him, and receiving the hope, healing, and help that only God can provide.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Missouri for her passionate and powerful words.

Our last speaker now before we conclude our hour is from the great State of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, John Adams, our first Vice President, such a prominent fixture within the Continental Congress, Declaration of Independence, so important to our founding, such a strong antislavery personality—and he was very, very learned, constantly reading—said: I have examined all the religions, and the result is that the Bible is the best book in the world.

Patrick Henry, who gave the stem-winding speech that moved so many to support the Revolution, said: The Bible is a book worth more than all the other books that were ever printed.

Benjamin Rush, also a Founder, a dear friend of John Adams, said: "By renouncing the Bible, philosophers

swing from their moorings upon all moral subjects. . . . It is the only correct map of the human heart that has ever been published."

And I love what C.S. Lewis said in his book "The Case for Christianity." He was discussing dualism, this idea that there are two equal forces in the universe and that they are at war, and we don't know how it is going to come out.

He said there is a war going on, but it is not between two equal forces. It is between a master and a rebel, and we happen to live in rebel-occupied territory. Basically, he goes on to say, can you imagine being behind enemy lines and getting a message from your home headquarters and you don't even pick it up and read it?

Those of us who are Christians, we believe that God gave us this book of messages, just like C.S. Lewis said. Unfortunately, many don't pick them up.

It is well known that Thomas Jefferson, though he was not a deist, believed the Bible, not all of the miracles. But the story is told that he was coming down—and CRS has verified he came to church every Sunday here in the Capitol. He usually rode his horse. When Madison came every Sunday—he was here in D.C.—he came down to the Old House Chamber.

But someone asked Jefferson: Where are you going this Sunday morning?

He said: I am going to church in the Capitol.

He had a big Bible under his arm.

He said: But you don't believe everything they do.

He said: Sir, I am the highest elected magistrate in this country. It is imperative that I set the proper example.

I thank my friend for setting that same proper example.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for his words, and I thank him and all the others who have spoken here tonight from all over this great country of ours for their heartfelt comments.

It has been an honor and a pleasure for me to commemorate National Bible Week this evening. I am grateful to my colleagues who joined me to honor, respect, and commemorate the Word of God.

Mr. Speaker, the prophet Isaiah, thousands of years ago in this book right here, the Bible, in Isaiah 40:8 says: "The grass withers, the flower fades, but the word of our God stands forever." Those are powerful and true words.

Civilizations have risen and fallen, generations have come and gone, yet here today, on November 20, 2019, we are still celebrating the enduring Word of God given to us starting thousands of years ago.

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

TRANSGENDER DAY OF REMEMBRANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of Jan-

uary 3, 2019, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. PRESSLEY. Mr. Speaker, before I begin, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of the Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. PRESSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in remembrance of Rita Hester, a Black transgender woman killed in the Massachusetts Seventh District, for whom Transgender Day of Remembrance was established in 1999.

I rise today because, 20 years later, many more lives continue to be stolen. This year, we have been robbed of at least 22 transgender people because of hate, fear, and vitriol—22 souls, the majority of whom are Black transgender women; 22 people whose families, friends, and partners are forever marred by grief; 22 experiences of secondhand trauma for transgender people everywhere.

Among them we remember: Dana Martin, Jazzaline Ware, Ashanti Carmon, Claire Legato, Muhlaysia Booker, Michelle "Tamika" Washington, Paris Cameron, Chynal Lindsey, Chanel Scurlock, Zoe Spears, Brooklyn Lindsey, Denali Berries Stuckey, Tracy Single, Bubba Walker, Kiki Fantroy, Jordan Cofer, Pebbles LaDime "Dime" Doe, Bailey Reeves, Bee Love Slater, Jamagio Jamar Berryman, Itali Marlowe, and Brianna "BB" Hill.

May they rest in peace and power.

Today, we remember still others not included on this list because their missing persons reports remain uninvestigated or because they are misgendered and deadnamed after their death because the people closest to them refused to recognize their truths.

We remember those who die from preventable illnesses, poverty, and violence as a result of discrimination in healthcare, employment, education, and housing.

We remember transgender women Johana Medina and Layleen Polanco, victims of an unjust and cruel immigration and criminal legal system.

Mr. Speaker, colleagues, the transgender community deserves to be seen safe and celebrated. However, due to this administration's policies that continue to neglect, unfairly target, and commit violence against them, this is not the case.

However, so as not to define the transgender community only by their trauma, today, I also rise to lift the talents and strengths of this community.

I honor you, my transgender friends, for your bravery to honor your truths, for intentionally creating a beautiful and rich community, and for being role models as leaders of social change.

I stand before you committed to listening to your needs, to recognizing and centering transgender lives, not just today but every day, and to being your partner in ending this devastating crisis.

Last week, I introduced the People's Justice Guarantee, a resolution that reaffirms our collective right to live free from injustice. I rise today resolved in the fight to ensure our rights to dignity, liberation, and justice—justice for transgender people, justice for all in America.

Mr. Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield to the gentleman from the great State of California (Mr. TAKANO).

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Massachusetts for yielding.

I know the gentlewoman has read the names of the Black trans women who were taken from us far too soon due to bigotry, hatred, and transphobia that is running rampant in our country, but if she will permit me, I will also enter their names. I will read them aloud. I believe we should honor them not just once but many times over.

So, I rise in honor of Dana Martin, Jazzaline Ware, Ashanti Carmon, Claire Legato, Muhlaysia Booker, Michelle “Tamika” Washington, Paris Cameron, Chynal Lindsey, Chanel Scurlock, Zoe Spears, Brooklyn Lindsey, Denali Berries Stuckey, Tracy Single, Bubba Walker, Kiki Fantroy, Jordan Cofer, Pebbles LaDime “Dime” Doe, Bailey Reeves, Bee Love Slater, Jamagio Jamar Berryman, Itali Marlowe, and Brianna “BB” Hill.

These are the names we know of transgender and nonconforming people who have been killed in America in the year 2019, so far.

We cannot ignore this epidemic that is plaguing the trans community. We cannot forget their stories. We cannot stop fighting to protect trans lives.

On this Transgender Day of Remembrance, we remember their names.

I would like to say also that I appreciated that our Speaker met today with actress and activist Ms. Ross, who is quite a champion of transgender people. Our Democratic Caucus chairman, HAKEEM JEFFRIES, led a roundtable. Many Members of Congress appeared at that roundtable to listen to the needs of the transgender community. I thank them for showing their support today.

Ms. PRESSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for those powerful words. Like the gentleman, I agree that we cannot say those names enough.

Mr. Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield to the gentleman from the great State of Missouri (Mr. CLEAVER).

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her work in this area, which is desperately needed.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak on today's Transgender Day of Remembrance.

For 20 years, November 20 has marked a solemn day in the LGBTQ-plus community. Vigils are held in

communities nationwide in honor of all the transgender people who were senselessly and dementedly killed for simply being who they are.

I told my transgender friends and families: Never seek to change who you are. Be exactly who you are.

Transgendered women of color are especially vulnerable to violence and are 4.3 times more likely to become homicide victims than all women, according to the Human Rights Campaign.

This year alone, at least 22 transgender and gender-nonconforming Americans have been killed in the United States. Ninety-one percent of them were Black women.

I am sad to say that three transgender people of color were murdered in the greater Kansas City area, two in my congressional district.

Brooklyn Lindsey was a 32-year-old Black transgender woman. Those who knew her say she was intelligent, had a good sense of humor, and was loved by many. By many accounts, she was outgoing and happy. She enjoyed dancing, helping others, and wanted to be a life coach.

On June 25, she was found shot to death on an abandoned porch in Kansas City, Missouri.

□ 1900

Jamagio Jamar Berryman, also known as Ja'leyah Jamar, was 30 and a Black gender nonconforming person. Ja'leyah was passionate about fixing and working on cars, designing hair, and spending quality time with family.

They were shot and killed in Kansas City, Kansas, on September 13. They left behind a 5-year-old daughter named Ja'Mya, their parents, seven siblings, nieces and nephews, and many others who loved them deeply.

And most recently, Brianna “BB” Hill was a 30-year-old Black transgender woman who was fatally shot in Kansas City, Missouri, on October 14. Brianna was a beloved member of her community, a fan of the Kansas City Chiefs, and loved spreading joy by sharing funny videos on her Facebook page.

The Department of Housing and Urban Development has removed requirements for applicants for homeless funding maintain antidiscrimination policies and demonstrate efforts to serve LGBTQ-plus people and their families.

The Department of Defense has implemented a ban on transgender troops.

These are just a few instances that shows that the United States of America—at least the administration—is in the midst of a nervous breakdown.

Change is still needed to protect the LGBTQ citizens nationwide.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the for gentlewoman for allowing me to speak.

Ms. PRESSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for those words and for telling us more about those we were prematurely robbed of all that they had to contribute to this world. It is important that we continue to bring

their names into this well, into this august institution, so that we are compelled to continue to do this work, understanding that this is—behind every number—this is not about statistics. These are about people, people of flesh and bone who loved and were loved.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from the great State of New Jersey (Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN), my friend and sister in service.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me and for leading in this Special Order hour.

Mr. Speaker, I stand here tonight to remind my colleagues and the world that our transgender community needs us.

Bigotry, hate, and violence against transgender people has reached a level that requires a whole day devoted to simply remembering everyone who has lost his or her life. This year alone, over 300 have been murdered.

That is to say nothing of the transgender people who were bullied or harassed to the point of taking their own lives just simply for accepting every part of themselves.

There is no doubt in my mind that an administration that has endorsed hate at every turn and outright exclusion of our transgender friends and family is part of the problem. Our actions in this body need to be part of the solution.

I am proud to be a part of the Equality Caucus Transgender Equality Task Force, and I am determined to see us continue to take real steps that will protect the rights and the freedoms of all people.

As a founding chair of the Congressional Caucus on Black Women and Girls, I am committed to recognizing the value and need of our transgender sisters.

As the chair of the CBC's Emergency Task Force on Black Youth Suicide and Mental Health, I am actively working to ensure transgender youth receive the support and the care and the love to overcome the hate of our society.

This is a community in dire need, and I join my colleagues and so many others in stepping up and speaking out.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for the opportunity to speak.

Ms. PRESSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her leadership and for always fighting for those too often ignored, left out, and left behind. We are grateful for her.

Now, just as I close, as we wrap this Special Order hour, Transgender Day of Remembrance is about remembering lives we have lost too soon, but it should also be about remembering the bravery of transgender people everywhere. I rise again to acknowledge the contributions, often overlooked, of transgender women of color who have been champions of social change.

It was transgender advocates in my district who established the first Transgender Day of Remembrance in 1999 in honor of Rita Hester, a Black

transgender woman described as vivacious, outgoing, and loved by many people.

On this day, I rise to remember the transgender women of color who were catalysts for the LGBT rights movement in the United States and around the world. We remember the bravery of Miss Major Griffin-Gracy and the late Sylvia Rivera, and Marsha P. Johnson in the face of the police who violently raided the Stonewall Inn in New York City in 1969, detaining and arresting people simply for being themselves.

When faced with compounded transphobia, racism, sexism, and homophobia, transgender people have marched and resisted. When confronted with structural barriers, transgender people have organized and advocated.

I remain committed, along with the dedicated members of my team—and I want to issue a special thanks to Jenny Curt for her contributions to today's Special Order hour—committed not only to lifting the stories of those lives lost, but to working in partnership, legislating boldly. I see their power; I honor their activism.

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

NATIONAL TRANSGENDER DAY OF REMEMBRANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. DEAN). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GARCÍA) is recognized for the remainder of the hour as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois. Madam Speaker, before I begin, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the subject of the Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois. Madam Speaker, first of all, I would like to thank Representative PRESSLEY for dedicating this time in honor of the Transgender Day of Remembrance and, of course, naming many of the victims of violence who have met this fate simply for being who they are. As a member of the Equality Caucus, I am proud to call her my colleague and my friend.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN).

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, and still I rise. And I rise tonight with a degree of sadness because we have this day, this national Transgender Day of Remembrance.

It is a sad thing such that you have to have an occasion such as this. You should never have to set aside time annually to remember those who have lost their lives to violence. But because it happens, we must be here.

What Dr. King reminds us was right then and is right now: "Injustice any-

where is a threat to justice everywhere." Injustice against the trans community is a threat to every community.

It seems that murder of Black transgender women is becoming almost a crisis in this country. Fatal antitransgender violence in the United States is on the rise, and most of the victims are Black transgender women: the largest number of transgender homicides, a record number in 2017, 29 killed; last year, 26 killed, most of them Black.

Why is this happening? Well, one reason might be because this administration tends to promote a narrative that marginalizes people who are already being marginalized. Such a narrative has a means of trickling down.

The tone and tenor of society is set by those at the top. Those at the top have to be mindful of the messages that they send.

So I am honored to observe this day, and I would like to speak very tersely about someone whose story cannot be told in 5 minutes.

Itali Marlowe was my constituent. She was found in the driveway of a local residence, shot multiple times, the 19th trans person to die by violence in our Nation this year. All but one of these victims has been a trans woman of color.

This day allows us to memorialize those who have been murdered as a result of transphobia. But I pray for a day when this day will no longer exist, when all people will be accepted in a society that proclaims liberty and justice for all.

INCOME INEQUALITY AND COLLECTIVE BARGAINING RIGHTS

Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois. Madam Speaker, tonight, we find ourselves at a troubling time for all workers across the country: Income and wealth inequality are at an all-time high, and union representation is at a historic low. These facts mean that all workers have a harder time making ends meet.

It is time to reset the balance of power in our economy between working people and corporate interests.

For decades, collective bargaining rights have been under relentless assault, especially by the Republican Party, in an effort to disempower working people and hand our democracy to corporate America. Tonight, I am proud to bring together my colleagues from the Congressional Progressive Caucus and our friends to talk about the PRO Act.

The Protecting the Right to Organize Act is a landmark step to restore the rights of working people to join unions and collectively fight for fair wages and working conditions.

The PRO Act rebalances the scales between workers and corporations by enacting strong enforcement measures against employers who violate labor laws, strengthening the right to negotiate and organize unions, and empowering workers to report abuses of their rights.

I thank my colleagues for joining me to stand up for workers and their right to organize.

I also want to recognize the true creators of wealth in our economy, the working men and women of America.

To begin tonight's deeper conversation, I call on a person who represents a district that has been at the heart of growing the economy and driving the economy for average Americans over a long period of time. He comes from trade union organizing and represents an overwhelmingly working-class district in the great State of Michigan.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from the great State of Illinois for organizing this special session to talk about what I consider to be the single most transformative piece of legislation that we are considering right now, the PRO Act, the Protecting the Right to Organize Act.

And why would it be so transformative? Because, as Representative GARCÍA mentioned, inequality of wealth and income has grown to proportions we have not seen in 100 years in this country.

From 1980 to 2014, income for the bottom half of earners, the whole bottom half of American workers, grew 1 percent; whereas, income for the top 1 percent grew 205 percent.

And why? Because workers have lost all voice and power in this economy. Workers do not have the freedom to form unions.

At its high-water mark in the late forties and early fifties, a third of American workers had collective bargaining, and they built the middle class in this country over the post-war decades. Today, 6 percent of workers in the private sector—6 percent—have collective bargaining, have unions, and so they have no real ability to get their fair share of the American pie and to rebuild the American Dream.

The PRO Act would do so much to change this.

Truly, it reminds me of my days organizing nursing home workers, kind of a long time ago, in the 1980s, in Michigan and Indiana and Massachusetts and Rhode Island. It was so hard for workers to form a union. Their employer could do almost anything, and that is true to this day.

□ 1915

So, for example, your employer can make you go in a room, and if you refuse to attend, they can fire you. And the sole purpose of the meeting is to tell you how bad forming a union would be for both of you. They can make you individually go into their office and tell you that the union would be a bad thing.

This kind of intimidation tactic has led to a crisis in our economy. And people like to talk about free markets and capitalism. All I want to see is a free market for worker organizing in this

country. And all the best research suggests that if we really had one, about a third of workers would, again, be in unions, and it would completely transform the economy.

So let me just hit a couple of the things that the PRO Act would do that would be so important.

First of all, it would recognize the realities of the 21st century economy. Workers could organize and bargain with whatever companies share control of their employment. So, hello, McDonald's franchises, hello, Courtyard by Marriott. Any companies that have franchises, both the franchisee and the franchisor could be joint employers.

Employers could not prevent workers from organizing and could not avoid the responsibility for workers by misclassifying them as independent contractors. That is rampant in today's economy. Employers under the PRO Act would not be able to just call their workers supervisors willy-nilly to deny them the right to organize. And workers' rights to organize would be recognized in all the electronic formats that we use to communicate today.

Another thing that is key is that at long last, the PRO Act would end the right to freeloader, a disease that has been spreading in this country since the late 1940s that says that in our system, even though a union has to represent all the employees in a workplace, it prevents union employers from negotiating contracts that simply say that all the workers have to pay their fair share for administering the contract. We would end 60 years of efforts to destroy the labor movement simply by allowing what I learned in law school as the freedom of contract. An employer and a union are free to negotiate that all the workers pay their fair share.

The list of improvements in the core area of an organizing campaign is really impressive. Just to pick a couple of them.

Employers couldn't gerrymander the bargaining union to pick out who is for or against the union, so to choose the voters in a sense. Elections would have to happen much faster. If a worker is fired for organizing a union, as I saw happen so many times, the NLRB would have to go for an immediate injunction to get them reinstated. If the workers felt intimidated by having an election on the employer's work site, then the NLRB could have it at a neutral location. So many commonsense things just to allow workers to organize freely.

So let me just sum up and say, I would love to talk about all the provisions, but it would take me all night, and I want to yield to my colleagues.

All we are asking for is that workers in this country have their rights recognized across the globe in the international labor organizations provisions so that they can have freedom of assembly, freedom to organize, and freedom to bargain a contract. And, Representative GARCÍA, that would do

more to make our country more just and beautiful than anything else we could do.

Mr. Speaker, I am so proud to stand up tonight for the PRO Act, and I thank Representative GARCÍA for his leadership in making this happen.

Mr. GARCÍA of ILLINOIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative LEVIN for sharing that story, his own personal knowledge and experience of working to empower working people so that they have good wages, good working conditions and very critically what is at the heart of the PRO Act, organizing to have leverage to level the playing field and to arrive at what is the best contract for workers in a worksite setting.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), who happens to be the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues to speak in support of H.R. 2474, the Protecting the Right to Organize Act, or the PRO Act.

The PRO Act was reported out of the Committee on Education and Labor on September 25, and it is the most comprehensive legislation in recent history to strengthen workers' rights to organize and bargain for higher wages, better benefits, and safer working conditions.

Labor unions have long fueled our Nation's prosperity. Wage growth and worker productivity rose steadily together when union membership was at its peak, around 30 percent, between the end of World War II and 1973. Union members earn significantly higher salaries, they are more likely to enjoy better benefits and also much more likely to work in a safe workplace. This had the effect of creating an economy where most working families could achieve a basic standard of living. But unfortunately, in the last 4 decades, union membership has plummeted, and income inequality has soared.

Despite the clear benefits of strong unions, just one in 10 workers currently is a union member and only 6 percent of private sector workers are union members.

Low union membership certainly does not mean that American workers have given up on unions. In fact, according to a poll of workers across the country conducted by the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 48 percent of nonunion workers say they would vote to join the union if given the opportunity.

Regrettably, what is keeping workers from joining unions are weak labor laws, aggressive employer opposition to unions, and relentless political attacks that have dismantled workers' rights to organize.

To that point, the PRO Act would deter employers from violating workers' rights to form a union in five key ways:

First, the PRO Act puts some teeth into the law by authorizing civil mone-

tary penalties for companies that inflict serious economic harm on employees by violating the National Labor Relations Act, in doing things such as firing union supporters for engaging in protected activities. This would update the current law, which provides no civil penalties today for employers who violate the NLRA, leaving no meaningful deterrent for employers who choose to violate workers' rights.

Second, the PRO Act would streamline procedures and guarantee swift remedies for workers. Currently, if workers prove that they were unlawfully fired for organizing, they may have to wait years before being reinstated and receiving back pay. The PRO Act would guarantee temporary reinstatement for workers whose cases are found to have merit while their cases are being adjudicated. This would also make the National Labor Relations Board orders immediately applicable to all parties involved in proceedings, just like those of other Federal agencies.

Third, the PRO Act would protect the integrity of union elections by providing remedies when employers interfere with union representation elections. It also establishes mediation and arbitration procedures to encourage employers and unions to reach a first collective bargaining agreement after the union is formed.

Fourth, the PRO Act would modernize labor law by clarifying exactly which employees and employers are covered by the National Labor Relations Act. Too often employers misclassify their employees as independent contractors or anything but employees. This tactic allows employers to avoid their legal obligations to their workers. The PRO Act safeguards against these practices and also protects workers' First Amendment rights to engage in peaceful picketing and other free speech activities.

Finally, the PRO Act fosters transparency, so employees know their rights under the law. Other labor laws require employers to post notices of employee rights like Title 7 of the Civil Rights Act, the Family Medical Leave Act, and OSHA. The PRO Act will similarly guarantee the employers notify the employees of their rights.

At its heart this legislation is about restoring workers' rights to organize and restoring balance to the economy. By passing the PRO Act, we can take an historic step towards improving the quality of life for workers and families across the country.

So I thank the Progressive Caucus for sponsoring this Special Order and giving us the opportunity to promote the PRO Act.

Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative SCOTT, who, of course, is also the Chair of the Education and Labor Committee. Part of the reason why he knows so much about the bill is he happens to be the bill's chief sponsor.

Mr. Speaker, we are going to hear from another part of the country, and

we are going to the West Coast to get a better understanding of why representatives in this House from all over the country are uniting behind this important piece of legislation.

Next, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO), who is a member of the Congressional Progressive Caucus and also chairs the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the U.S. Congress.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois for yielding.

I rise today, Mr. Speaker, to join the voices of the working men and women of our country demanding better wages, better working conditions, better benefits. I rise for working families, for those working multiple jobs and struggling to get by while CEOs are making multiple millions of dollars and reaping the benefits of their labor.

And this is all during a time over the past several decades where productivity of the American economy has gone up while wages from those who have created that productivity have stayed flat. And if we want to achieve income equality or less income inequality, the answer is in giving workers leverage on the economy.

So I rise to defend workers' rights, their right to rise up in their workplace and use their collective power to demand better from their employer. That is the leverage that I am talking about.

Right now employers and corporate interests are doing everything they can to strip workers of their protections. In fact, they have already done that. They have already participated in weakening our labor laws and made it more difficult for workers to organize. And Representative LEVIN of Michigan started to explain the complex ways in which organizing is made more difficult; how elections can run forever; and how employers have an unfair advantage in those elections; and how the will of the workers in the workplace to organize and unionize can be thwarted.

And once unions are formed, there are many efforts to bust unions and silence the voices of workers, which, let me be clear, is illegal. And that is why we need to pass the PRO Act to make sure that penalties are enforced. We do have laws on the books, but there is not enough enforcement. We need to put an end to these antiunion activities.

If we want to reduce economic inequality, support working people and working families and ensure that the American Dream is within reach for all, then let's pass this bill. It is time to reaffirm our support for working people in America.

Mr. GARCIA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California. Before we go to the East Coast and hear the voices of working people there and why they support the PRO Act, I would like to share with you a brief story about myself in Chicago.

When I was growing up in Chicago, both of my parents were proud union

members. In fact, they were both Teamsters. My father worked at a cold storage facility, and my mother worked at a candy factory on Chicago's West Side. Both relied on their union jobs to raise our family, and they retired on their union pensions, which enabled them to purchase a comfortable home for their family.

There will be more stories from Chicago, but right now I would like to go to the East Coast and hear from another member of the Progressive Caucus. He hails from the State of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. NORCROSS).

Mr. NORCROSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak on the importance of the Protecting the Right to Organize, or as we know it, the PRO Act.

□ 1930

We heard several of my colleagues talk about the pros of what literally is taking place and how difficult it is. As many people know, and as we have heard here, there are 218 lawyers in Congress, but there is only one electrician and one electrician who spent his career not only doing the electrical work but representing workers.

I have spent 37 years in the IBEW, literally having to retire from that as I came here and took my oath of office to represent the people of the First District.

When we look at what is happening today in this country, it is the end of a long line of abuses, those things that have happened over the course of the last three decades in particular, the decline of union membership. Many of those on the other side of the aisle like to say that it is because people don't want it. This couldn't be any further than the truth.

Today, close to 80 percent of employees would vote for a union if they could—80 percent. This is quite a different figure than the 6 percent that you heard representing private employers, Mr. Speaker. That is because it has been rigged. I can say that because I am one of the few Members who speak on this floor who have been to the National Labor Relations Board and who has conducted elections. I have done it repeatedly. I see the cheating that takes place. That is why we have the PRO Act.

Earlier this year, we voted on something that I thought would have been unanimous, the Raise the Wage Act. The minimum wage in this country hasn't been raised in over 11 years—11 years—\$7.25 an hour.

Tell me out there, can you live on \$7.25 an hour?

We change that.

Predictably, over the next 7½ years, that would raise to \$15 an hour. But our colleagues on the other side of the aisle say: They don't need a raise.

That is how unbelievable some of this is. Tell me, can you live on that?

The PRO Act is simply listening to the people whom we work with who want a voice and who want to be able

to grow the business that they are working for so that they can share in those wages. That is where the PRO Act comes in.

I mentioned I was an electrician, and I still am. I am not doing much work the way I used to, but as I told my kids, I am an electrician with a tie now. But I saw firsthand people who would say: I want the chance to do better. I want the chance for us collectively to bargain.

They would come to see us and say: Can you help me?

We said: Sure we can.

We gathered together, and we speak with one voice, go to the NLRB, which is the labor relations board that makes the rules, and say: Here is a bargaining group of 8 to 10 men and women who want to become part of the IBEW, or speak collectively as we call it. Then the fight begins.

Occasionally, Mr. Speaker, you would have a contractor who says: Do you know what? After talking to them, I think this is a good way of working together to try to grow my business and to take care of my employees.

Unfortunately, for those who want to cheat the system, they start to say: Well, he is an independent contractor. He just started here. He is an apprentice.

They try to break up the groups. When they talk about bargaining groups as my colleague, Mr. LEVIN, talked about, it is about breaking that apart.

All this does is level the playing field and make it fair so those workers who want to vote to collectively bargain can do it in a fair and open way so the elections aren't rigged. Fair and open, we hear that so much today.

The PRO Act protects workers because the other thing that the employer will do is fire the one who spoke up: We will take care of the one who is causing the trouble.

I am trying to do better for my family, and I talked to my employer about a raise, and he doesn't want to do it, so I call up the union and say: Can you help me? And I get fired for that.

There is no recourse for bad actors. The PRO Act would change that and level the playing field so there are penalties when you break the law. It is like having speed limits with no police on the road. That is what it is like now. They are free to do whatever they want.

The PRO Act restores the fairness of the economy against those workers who are rigged. Workers win, but just as important, business wins. They grow together. It is just not a one size fits all. We understand working together is what this does.

We see so often the tragedies of what happened from the same crew who won't vote to raise the minimum wage in 11 years and who are the same ones fighting this.

Together, we can do better. Raise the level of fairness so that all employees will have a voice at their workplace.

Again, I thank the gentleman for bringing us together. I look at my colleagues out here who understand this on a gut level. To the Representatives who are listening tonight, go home and talk to the average guy on the street and say: Do you want to make it better, to raise your family, to have a decent wage? Then you will hear yes.

I recommend voting "yes" for the PRO Act.

Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for sharing that wonderful story.

Women in this body overwhelmingly support the PRO Act for good reason. The PRO Act would help level the playing field and move all of us toward a greater sense of economic justice.

This evening, we are very fortunate to hear from a voice also from the East Coast who will get to the crux of why this is such an important tool for economic justice in our country. She is a member of the Progressive Caucus of this body and someone who is passionate and compassionate about providing equal opportunity for everyone in our country.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN).

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me, and I thank the gentleman for taking on this Special Order hour and leading it.

Organized labor has always been the foundation of good-paying jobs that support a thriving middle class. That is why it is vital that we support legislation like the PRO Act, finally empowering the National Labor Relations Act to do the important work of protecting workers' rights.

Since the day that law was enacted in 1935, big businesses and their allies in the Republican Party have worked to weaken it. Their efforts have brought us to a point where union membership has cratered, and not coincidentally, inequality has grown.

The PRO Act implements penalties for employers who illegally fire workers because they try to form a union or are simply pro-union in their thinking. Today, we see employers out in the open on Twitter flagrantly violating the NLRA and threatening their employees if they even think about forming a union.

The PRO Act will allow workers to stand up and say to their boss: Joining together with my co-workers is right, and you will not threaten me with cuts to my hours, my pay, or my job.

This law will put an end to the practice of company bosses dragging their feet in collective bargaining negotiations in order to break the spirit of workers and avoid their legal responsibility to honor the wishes of their workers.

The PRO Act also recognizes the changing face of workers and ensures that those working multiple jobs do not lose their right to organize when they change shifts.

The part of this bill that I find most energizing is its protection of that

most fundamental right of workers, the foundation of worker power from which all labor power is derived, the right to strike, the right to stand with your fellow worker and say: We will not accept these conditions another minute. We will not work another day until our demands are heard and our rights are respected.

The right to stand with your union sisters and brothers and withhold your labor is finally recognized under this bill.

If workers can put their sweat into building the greatest country in the world, how dare we say to them that they cannot join their fellow workers to demand a fair share of what they built?

This bill is the most important labor rights bill in years, and today, I am proud to be a member of the party of the working men and women, the Democratic Party, as we pass this bill. I thank the gentleman for the opportunity.

Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, if I could inquire how much time is remaining in the Special Order hour?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GREEN of Texas). The gentleman has 11 minutes remaining.

Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois. Before I introduce and as a prelude to the remarks that we will hear from the following speaker, I would like to share a story about the great city that I hail from and the great State that I represent here, the State of Illinois. It has a proud labor history that is filled with stories of courage and sacrifice by workers striving to organize.

Since the 1800s, workers organized in mines and factories fighting the abuses of powerful industrial interests. Chicago earned the reputation as a city of big shoulders, a working-class and hardworking city. Workers were killed in the Haymarket massacre of 1886, a struggle that led to the 8-hour day and the end of child labor.

The country's first national strike started in Chicago when train workers across the country joined a strike that began in Pullman, Illinois. Federal troops were sent in to break up the Pullman Strike, but it was so significant that Congress created Labor Day shortly afterward.

One of the Nation's most deadly mine disasters happened in Illinois in 1909. The tragedy prompted better enforcement of child labor laws and advanced the movement for workers' compensation.

Working people joining forces in unions helped lift up all workers across the country.

With that opening remark, Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield next to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN), who also happens to be one of the cochairs of the Congressional Progressive Caucus.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for all the work that he has done on behalf of his constituents, the people of Chicago, and really the people of the entire country.

I know this is the gentleman's second event today alone on behalf of workers, and I thank the gentleman for his outspoken representation on behalf of people who need a voice in Congress. I think we heard earlier tonight there are about 200-plus lawyers in this body. A majority of Congress are millionaires. Not to say that if you are a millionaire, you can't empathize with working people, but it is another thing to come from a background like I do.

I had a union specialty printing shop, a small shop for nearly three decades, a member of International Union of Painters and Allied Trades, IUPAT, for nearly three decades.

I can tell you the benefits that have happened for my family and the people I work with by having good, union-supporting wages and good, union-supporting benefits and why that matters so much.

The problem we have right now in this country and the problem that we have across so many States is an organized effort going after working people by going after their ability to have a voice in their workplaces by having unions. We have watched attacks across the country, including in my home State of Wisconsin, where States have gone to a so-called right-to-work law. What that is often referred to as a "right-to-work-for-less" law because when you get these laws often, on average, people lose over 3 percent in pay in States that do this. But we have watched those laws happen across the country.

Federally, under the Trump administration, we have watched laws that make it harder for working people who win the legal right to form a union, through a union election. They run into all kinds of stumbling blocks. All too often, there is no legal recourse against an employer who violates the rules or stacks the deck against people and doesn't allow that vote to actually form that union.

That is the real problem that we are facing. That is what we are talking about tonight with the PRO Act. That is what we are trying to address in Congress.

What I think is so very important to raise is the reason people want to have a union is because it will help not only their family but their communities by lifting up everyone. When you have a union job, you are more likely to get more pay and better benefits than people who are not in union jobs.

That is why the public support is so strong right now for unions with 64 percent support for unions, one of the highest percents we have seen in this country. And 67 percent of people 18 to 34, millennials, even more than the population as a whole, see this as a way to have a voice in their workplace.

□ 1945

Here are some of the things they support: expanding union rights, banning right-to-work-for-less laws, ensuring a first contract for new unions—if you

vote for a union, you should be able to get a contract for your union—making so-called independent contractors employees, and protections for workers on strike.

All of those things I just mentioned are included in the PRO Act. All those things could be possible for workers across the country.

We know that when we have had the least amount of income inequality in our country, back in the 1950s, is when we had the greatest representation of people in unions. Now that we have got one of the smallest amounts of people—about 11 percent, nationwide, in public and private employee unions—we have the greatest gap in income that we have had in this country.

There is no surprise there is a lot of pushback from not only people on the other side of the aisle, but from the United States Chamber of Commerce, which is not your local business in your chamber of commerce, but it is the big businesses in this country that don't want to take care of their workers. Instead, they want to send all the profits up to their shareholders, so very few get a lot and everyone else gets the crumbs that are left over.

Just to give you an idea of some of the actions we see by these companies: 75 percent of private-sector employers hire outside consultants to run antiunion campaigns when workers try to form a union; 63 percent force their employees to attend closed-door meetings to hear antiunion propaganda; and over half of employers threaten workers in these meetings, they threaten their jobs.

You have a one-in-five chance, if you are a union organizer, of losing your job because, right now, you can get away with it with this administration and how they enforce our labor laws.

But here is the reality. If you don't have a union in your company right now, this is what you get when you have a union:

Health insurance: 75 percent of people in a union participate in job-provided health insurance versus about 48 percent nationwide;

Pensions: 70 percent of people versus 13 percent nationwide;

Paid sick leave: 91 percent of people who are in a union have paid sick leave, and the median weekly earnings are \$207 more a week. That is \$11,000 a year more if you are a member of a union, in a similar job, than if you are not.

That is the real reason we see the attacks on working people trying to have a voice in their workplaces, and that is why we see people not trying to lift this bill.

This is so important that, in this Congress, we take this bill up in the House of Representatives and we pass this bill and we give, finally, an edge to help push a little more assistance to workers who want to have a say in the workplace than what employers have had because of this administration, because of States that have passed bad

laws, that make it harder, again, to have a say in your workplace.

This is an important piece of legislation. The Congressional Progressive Caucus has made this issue a priority. We are going to make sure there will be a vote this session in Congress. We are going to try to make the Senate take this up as well.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Chicago. His help on this and so many issues has been so very important. We are going to do everything we can to get this done this session.

Mr. GARCIA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for his remarks.

So what is the essence of the Protect the Right to Organize Act? We have heard from my colleagues today about the many ways that unions have made America strong. From the 8-hour day to building the middle class, we have a lot to thank the labor movement for. Unions are an integral part of increasing wages and addressing income inequality.

Still, special interest-funded attacks on labor laws have eroded union membership for years. For too long, greedy companies have used extreme measures to stop working people from exercising their right to join together and negotiate for their rights and their working conditions.

While the economy is working very well for the wealthy, our middle class continues to shrink. The cause is simple: policy choices, especially by Republicans in the House at this time, in the Senate, in State legislatures, and the Presidency that have stripped workers of the power to stand together.

The Protecting the Right to Organize Act is a historical proposal that restores fairness in the economy by strengthening the Federal laws to protect workers' rights to organize.

We need the PRO Act at a time when Trump wages war against the labor movement. We need the PRO Act to build an economy that works for all working families and not just the wealthy.

The lessons I learned from unions—that individual justice is only as good as collective justice—continue to inform my career in public service, and I hope every worker can have the opportunities that unions gave me.

I got a chance to work at a young age. I joined a union. It helped me pay for my college education. I did well in the community that I still live in. That is why I approach banding together for the welfare of working people.

Tonight, you have heard from people from coast to coast, all over our country, from the South and from the heartland. These are individuals who are fighting for working people to, again, level the playing field and create a real purpose of economic justice to lift everyone up in our country.

As we move forward with the PRO Act, I call upon the American public to understand that it is time for economic justice and it is time for prosperity for

all. And, with that, I ask them to call on their Representatives in the U.S. Congress to make this law a reality for all working men and women across the Nation.

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

ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I really haven't ever become friends with General Michael Flynn. He doesn't object to being called Michael Flynn, even though he earned the title of "General," even though he has not been treated fairly at all and has actually been treated unjustly.

There is an article today from Margaret Cleveland in *The Federalist*. It talks about Michael Flynn's case, and I am learning some things.

I think the world of Sidney Powell. She is an amazing attorney. She is a friend. But there is a motion pending before Federal Judge Emmett Sullivan on a motion to compel and motion for sanctions that attorney Sidney Powell had filed.

"Powell's motion seeks to force Federal prosecutors to provide Flynn an array of documents withheld from his attorneys and to sanction government lawyers for their failure to provide relevant evidence to the defense team in a timely manner."

Now, as a former judge—and I have prosecuted, I have defended, and I have been a chief justice, but nothing is more infuriating to me, when it comes to our justice system, than prosecutors who are unjust, who lie, who misrepresent. And it looks like all of that has been occurring in Michael Flynn's case or with deference to, like Colonel Vindman, General Michael Flynn.

This article points out: "Then, mere days after the final briefing came in," to Judge Sullivan, "Federal prosecutors found themselves forced to admit that, for nearly 3 years, they had wrongly identified the authors of the handwritten notes taken by the FBI agents during their January 24, 2017, interview of then-National Security Advisor Flynn. Prosecutors had told defense counsel, and the court, that the notes written by Peter Strozik had been compiled by FBI Agent Joe Pietka, and those taken by Pietka had been written by Strozik."

"This embarrassing mea culpa surely added strength to Powell's plea for access to other withheld evidence. After all, if Federal prosecutors made such a basic blunder concerning key evidence, what other mistakes lay buried in the undisclosed evidence?"

This goes on and points out that, at a minimum, things that are being set out now "would also support the withdrawal of Flynn's guilty plea—something Powell does not appear to be considering at this time—including"—and

here is the circumstance that is just phenomenal, that, in a Federal district court we could have Justice Department attorneys who are this flagrantly abusive of the process.

So, “Flynn’s original attorneys had a conflict of interest preventing them from representing Flynn in the criminal case; Flynn did not intentionally make false statements to the FBI agents; the FBI agents entrapped Flynn; Flynn’s purported misstatements were immaterial to the investigation into supposed Russia collusion and, thus, no crime occurred; the government engaged in selective prosecution and charged Flynn solely because of his relationship to Trump; prosecutors used threats to induce Flynn’s plea; the prosecutors’ failure to timely disclose exculpatory and impeachment evidence invalidates Flynn’s plea; and that egregious prosecutorial and government misconduct mandates dismissal of all charges against Flynn.”

If you go down further, more revelations.

“The government had pushed Flynn’s previous attorneys at Covington and Burling LLP, in February 2017, to quickly file a registration statement under the Foreign Agent Registration Act, FARA, for Flynn Intel Group, FIG. Federal prosecutors later obtained indictments against Flynn’s FIG business partners for supposed Foreign Agent Registration Act violations, and still later, the prosecutors branded Flynn a co-conspirator in the FARA case. There was a clear conflict of interest, which the government failed to mention to Judge Sullivan.

“Further, since Flynn last appeared before Sullivan, the government’s FARA case against his FIG partners has imploded. Following a 6-day trial, a jury had convicted Flynn’s former business partner, Bijan Rafiekian, of acting as an unregistered agent of Turkey, conspiring to act as an unregistered agent of Turkey. . . .”

It says: “But Federal Judge Anthony Trenga stepped in and tossed the guilty verdict, concluding that no ‘rational jury could conclude that Rafiekian conspired with Alptekin or anyone else.’ Judge Trenga further held that ‘there is no evidence of discussions or suggestions, let alone any agreement express or implied, to either avoid filing under FARA or to cause the filing of a false FARA registration statement.’”

□ 2000

“That the government’s FARA case against Flynn’s business partner proved bogus should also trouble Sullivan because, according to Powell’s earlier court filings, the special counsel’s office had informed Flynn’s ‘counsel in the summer of 2017 that it was going to indict the FARA case then, had obtained authorization to target Michael Flynn, Jr.—who had a newborn—and had seized all his electronic devices.’

“The threat was clear: Plead guilty and cooperate or we will prosecute your son. And given Judge Trenga’s conclusion in the Rafiekian case that there was no evidence of a FARA crime, there is an added postscript: We will prosecute your son on bogus charges.”

Unbelievable. It also should be quite scary to someone situated as Michael Flynn, General Flynn, that the Federal Government, the DOJ—especially when they use unscrupulous and unethical means—they can convict anybody, even when there is no evidence whatsoever as Judge Trenga found, there was no evidence whatsoever.

I don’t know these people, but I know the Federal judge said there was no evidence whatsoever. And, yet, the jury came back—I am sure the judge was just thinking: I will let the jury find there is no evidence because there is none.

And when they came back and convicted, wow, the judge is going: I have got to throw this out. This is totally bogus.

“The threat also wasn’t a one off. After Powell took over representation of Flynn, federal prosecutors attempted to force Flynn to testify at Rafiekian’s trial that Flynn had knowingly made false statements in the FARA filings—something Flynn denies. When Flynn refused to lie, federal prosecutors abruptly added Michael Flynn, Jr. to the witness list for the Rafiekian trial, but then never called him to testify.”

Total intimidation. Total effort to intimidate. Very unethical.

“The government, according to Powell, also had an FBI agent contact Flynn, Jr. directly, even though the younger Flynn was represented by counsel.” Also quite unethical.

Boy, the unethical conduct in this Department of Justice hasn’t gone away. It hasn’t stopped with Strzok and Page, being gone—Bruce Ohr, all of these others that appeared to conspire to defeat a Presidential candidate, and then to try the coup to take him out.

“The government, according to Powell, also had an FBI agent contact Flynn, Jr. directly.

“These maneuvers corroborate the prosecutors earlier use of Flynn, Jr. as a pawn to pressure his father to plead guilty.”

I mean, this stuff is just amazing. And if they can do this to someone who spent over 30 years dedicated to the defense of his country, all kinds of decorations for heroism, and powerful friends in Washington, they can do this to him, it is difficult to think about the terrible situation of someone without money, without friends.

If these people can be this unscrupulous to people with some power, it just bodes very poorly for this little experiment in self-government when the judicial branch, or I am sorry, the executive branch’s prosecutorial wing is this abusive. Absolutely incredible. A bit frightening, actually.

So I would like to also touch on some of the testimony that has gone on in yesterday’s hearing, the part where we had Jennifer Williams and Lieutenant Colonel Vindman.

He said, I think, that he has been in over 20 years. Didn’t make Colonel. And I have known people, you know, my 4 years in the Army, we saw those folks. They were so self-righteous on the one hand, maybe they didn’t get a promotion they thought they deserved. Maybe it was because they did something like Vindman did and was trashing the United States to Russians when he was overheard by a superior that reprimanded him for it.

Sometimes it is just because there is a mean superior that doesn’t want somebody promoted. But for whatever reason, he didn’t become a full Colonel. Here he is, harping after he had been called Lieutenant Colonel over and over by my friend, DEVIN NUNES, he interrupts and demands—and I notice he didn’t always call people Congressman. That didn’t bother me, but it is just quite interesting that he has such a double standard for himself and for others.

But when you look at the testimony, especially page 2, it is interesting—and actually, this is from our friend ADAM SCHIFF, Congressman ADAM SCHIFF—“Colonel Vindman, we have seen”—and I guess it should have been Lieutenant Colonel Vindman—“we have seen far more scurrilous attacks on your character, and watched as certain personalities on Fox have questioned your loyalty. I note that you have shed blood for America, and we owe you an immense debt of gratitude.” So that is the case, we owe him a debt of gratitude for defending our country.

I do love history and I point out down the hall when we are in the rotunda to groups, we have got General Gates standing there accepting surrender from the British, and he was not the real hero of the Battle of Saratoga, and that was the biggest victory since December 24, 1776, probably.

And it was a big one, but it wasn’t Gates. I read another book on the Revolution just months ago, and this book was saying Gates never got out of his tent, whether it was cowardice or whatever, he never would get out of his tent. But there was this great, brave, courageous, young major that just knew they could defeat the British there at Saratoga if they get on going and attack them. Gates wouldn’t give the order, so this major rallied folks, and they went down and they attacked the British, and they defeated them.

So the real hero of Saratoga wasn’t General Gates. It was this major, a tough, strapping guy. He took them on, and he was wounded. And he carried a limp with him probably the rest of his life. He was wounded. He was hurt severely. But we owe that guy a debt of gratitude for his defense of his country.

Of course, later on, he got upset that he had been slighted and didn’t get a promotion like Gates’ immediate subordinates, and then that caused him to

fall prey to the British talking him into helping them because they would pay him, and they would appreciate him a whole lot more than Washington and others. And, of course, then he ended up setting up Washington to be kidnapped by the British.

But I am amazed how many people don't know that we owe a great debt of gratitude to Major Benedict Arnold, because without him, there is no victory at the Battle of Saratoga, and that was a huge victory, so very important to our becoming an independent country.

So anyway, it is just interesting when you think about history and people who demand to be given respect, and if they are not, they get rather snippy.

And I don't know that I have ever met Lieutenant Colonel Vindman, but to find out that he was trashing the United States to Russians, and it was just intriguing to go through his testimony.

For example, he said this about the investigation into the 2016 elections, Bidens, Burisma.

"I stated to Ambassador Sondland that this was inappropriate and it had nothing to do with national security. Dr. Hill also asserted his comments weren't proper. Following the meeting, Dr. Hill and I agreed to report the incident to the NSC's lead counsel."

So it is interesting. Further, he was asked by Mr. Goldman: "On September 10, the Intelligence Committee requested the whistleblower complaint from the Department of National Intelligence."

He wasn't aware of that. But it is just, wow, so September 10, they obviously knew all about the so-called whistleblower complaint.

But when you get over here to part of the questioning by Congressman NUNES: "Did you ask or encourage any individual to share the substance of the July 25th phone call or any matter associated with the call with any member of the press?"

"I did not."

And he goes on like that. And then he said:

"Lieutenant Colonel Vindman, did you discuss the July 25th phone call with anyone outside the White House on July 25th or the 26th, and if so, with whom?"

And he said: "Yes, I did. My core function is to coordinate U.S. Government policy, interagency policy, and I spoke to two individuals with regards to providing some sort of readout of the call."

NUNES says: "Two individuals that were not in the White House?"

Vindman: "Not in the White House." And that is Lieutenant Colonel Vindman. "Not in the White House, cleared U.S. Government officials with appropriate need to know."

"And what agencies were these officials with?"

Lieutenant Colonel Vindman said: "Department of State, Deputy Assist-

ant Secretary George Kent, who is responsible for the portfolio, Eastern Europe including Ukraine, and an individual from the office of—an individual in the intelligence community."

And that is where NUNES says: "As you know, the intelligence community has 17 different agencies. What agency was this individual from?"

And that is when Chairman SCHIFF said: "If I could interject. We don't want to use these proceedings"—and then cross talk—"we need to protect the whistleblower."

And what is really interesting, of course, is when he calls out Congressman NUNES. "It's Lieutenant Colonel Vindman, please." So I want to make sure that I don't slight him.

He says—and he is under oath—"I don't know who the whistleblower is. That is correct."

And yet, he gets down to there is two people. He identifies one, and Chairman SCHIFF interrupts and doesn't want him to out the other person, because that would be outing the whistleblower.

And, yet, Chairman SCHIFF and Lieutenant Colonel Vindman say they don't know who the whistleblower is, but it must be that one that he has been told not to answer because that would give away the whistleblower's identity.

And yet, they say, we don't know who the whistleblower is, but we are down to one person, but we don't know who it is. Even though if he gives the name, it will out the whistleblower. It is just really amazing when you look at this stuff.

And it is actually rather tragic. There was a question Mr. Castor says: "And are you aware, and George Kent testified a little bit about this last week, that under the Obama administration, the U.S. Government encouraged Ukraine to investigate whether Zlochevsky used his government position to grant himself or Burisma exploration licenses. Are you aware of that?"

And Lieutenant Colonel Vindman said: "I would defer to George Kent. He's a fount of knowledge on Ukraine, much deeper knowledge than I have. If he attested to that, then I'd take his word for it."

Well, isn't it interesting that Mr. Kent knew that the Obama administration was trying to get to the bottom of corruption about Burisma, and, yet, he freaks out, not Kent, but Lieutenant Colonel Vindman, freaks out over Burisma being brought up, that that is some kind of crime for an impeachable offense, basically, for President Trump to bring up the corruption and including Burisma.

But isn't that interesting? He didn't bring up there is a problem with the Obama administration bringing it up, just President Trump.

□ 2015

But Ranking Member NUNES also brings up that, I asked Ms. Williams about this, about, if she had ever

accessed, without authorization, colleagues' computers. She answered no. And he goes on through some of that.

But you get down here and then it is turned over to JIM JORDAN. Congressman JORDAN said, "Mr. Morrison said this: 'I had concerns about Lieutenant Colonel Vindman's judgment. Among the discussions I had with Dr. Hill—that is Fiona Hill—in the transition with our team, its strength, its weaknesses, and Fiona and others had raised concern about Alex's—he should have said Lieutenant Colonel Vindman's—judgment'. When Mr. Morrison was asked by Mr. Castor, 'Did anyone ever bring concerns to you that they believe Colonel Vindman may have leaked something,' Mr. Morrison replied, 'yes.'"

They thought he was a leaker well before this all happened.

So your boss had concerns about your judgment—your favored boss, Dr. Hill—had concerns about your judgment, your colleagues had concerns about your judgment, and your colleagues felt that there were times when you leaked information. Any idea where they might have gotten those impressions, Colonel Vindman?

He calls him "Colonel." He gave him a promotion.

But Vindman says "yes." And then he raised an OER that was somewhat glowing, but actually the answer should have been "no," if he was being truthful, because he later says, "I can't say why Mr. Morrison questioned my judgment."

But Congressman JORDAN goes on: "Colonel, it's interesting, we deposed a lot of people in the bunker, in the basement of the Capitol, over the last several weeks, but of all those depositions, only three of the individuals we deposed were actually on the now-somewhat-famous July 25 phone call between President Trump and President Zelensky. There was you, the individual sitting beside you, Ms. Williams, and then there, of course, was your boss, Mr. Morrison. . . ."

"When we asked Ms. Williams who she spoke to after the call, about the call, she was willing to answer our questions, and Chairman SCHIFF allowed her to answer the questions. When we asked Mr. Morrison who he spoke to after the call, about the call, he was willing to answer our question and Chairman SCHIFF allowed him to answer our question. But when we asked you, you first told us three individuals at the NSC, your brother and two lawyers. And then you said there was a group of other people you communicated with, but you would only give us one individual in that group, Secretary Kent. And the chairman would only allow you to give us that name. When we asked you who else you communicated with, you would not tell us. So what I want to know first, how many other people are in that group of people you communicated with outside the four individuals I just named?"

"Mr. JORDAN, on a call readout"—this is Lieutenant Colonel Vindman—

“on a call readout, certainly after the first call, there were probably a half a dozen or more people that I read out. Those are people with the proper clearance and the need to know. In this case, because of the sensitivity of the call, Mr. Eisenberg told me not to speak to anybody else. I only read out, outside of the NSC, two individuals.”

So very interesting there. And it is interesting, too, that, you know, the fact is if Lieutenant Colonel Vindman, say hypothetically he leaked—as he had been suspected of in other case or cases—say he leaked in this case to people that didn’t have proper clearance, he probably would try to assert: I was named as a whistleblower, and once I had that status, you can’t prosecute me. And then there would be a motion to dismiss, this kind of thing.

And ultimately, the courts would say: Wait a minute. The whistleblower statute does not protect the whistleblower, because to protect a whistleblower, the person being complained about has to be within the department or agency from the person complaining. The President is not in the Intel agencies or department, and so it just wouldn’t work. And, of course, previously you had to have direct knowledge.

And I would submit, if you look, treason is something the President can be impeached for, but under the Constitution, that requires two people with direct knowledge as direct witnesses, not hearsay—can’t be hearsay—direct witnesses to a crime. They have to testify. If you don’t have two, you can’t prove treason under the Constitution. It is out.

And I would submit, the Senate would do well—if this is sent down there—to require the same thing of whatever bogus charge ends up coming their way, because that is all we have seen so far, but require two people with direct evidence. A bunch of people have been convicted of treason. No President has ever been removed. So if we are going to remove a President, it ought to require two direct witnesses as well. And so it ought to be a short trial.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today and November 21.

Mr. COOPER (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today and November 21 on account of birth of first grandchild.

Mr. LEWIS (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o’clock and 20 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the

House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, November 21, 2019, at 9 a.m.

BUDGETARY EFFECTS OF PAYGO LEGISLATION

Pursuant to the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (PAYGO), Mr. YARMUTH hereby submits, prior to the vote on passage, for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that H.R. 255, the Big Bear Land Exchange Act, as amended, would have no significant effect on the deficit, and therefore, the budgetary effects of such bill are estimated as zero.

Pursuant to the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (PAYGO), Mr. YARMUTH hereby submits, prior to the vote on passage, for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that H.R. 737, the Shark Fin sales Elimination Act of 2019, as amended, would have no significant effect on the deficit, and therefore, the budgetary effects of such bill are estimated as zero.

Pursuant to the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (PAYGO), Mr. YARMUTH hereby submits, prior to the vote on passage, for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that H.R. 1446, the Multinational Species Conservation Funds Semipostal Stamp Reauthorization Act of 2019, as amended, would have no significant effect on the deficit, and therefore, the budgetary effects of such bill are estimated as zero.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

3033. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule — Significant New Use Rules on Certain Chemical Substances (18-1) [EPA-HQ-OPPT-2018-0627; FRL-10001-30] (RIN: 2070-AB27) received November 18, 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.

3034. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule — Air Plan Approval; Ohio; Second Limited Maintenance Plans for 1997 Ozone NAAQS [EPA-R05-OAR-2019-0216; FRL-10002-25-Region 5] received November 18, 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.

3035. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule — Approval and Promulgation of State Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants; West Virginia; Control of Emissions from Existing Municipal Solid Waste Landfills [EPA-R03-OAR-2019-0187; FRL-9999-80-Region 3] received November 18, 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.

3036. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule — Significant New Use Rules

on Certain Chemical Substances (17-3); Technical Correction [EPA-HQ-OPPT-2017-0464; FRL-10001-43] (RIN: 2070-AB27) received November 18, 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.

3037. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule — Air Quality Designation: FL; Redesignation of the Duval County Ozone Unclassifiable Area [EPA-R04-OAR-2019-0374; FRL-10002-48-Region 4] received November 18, 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.

3038. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule — Air Plan Approval; Arizona; Maricopa County Air Quality Department [EPA-R09-OAR-2019-0497; FRL-10002-13-Region 9] received November 18, 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.

3039. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule — Air Plan Approval; GA; Miscellaneous Revisions [EPA-R04-OAR-2018-0711; FRL-10002-46-Region 4] received November 18, 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.

3040. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule — Air Plan Approval; Illinois; Emissions Reduction Market System Sunset [EPA-R05-OAR-2019-0032; FRL-10002-26-Region 5] received November 18, 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.

3041. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a notification of a deployment of additional U.S. Armed Forces personnel to Saudi Arabia, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1543(c); Public Law 93-148, Sec. 4(c); (87 Stat. 555) (H. Doc. No. 116—82); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

3042. A letter from the Officer for Civil Rights and Civil Liberties, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department’s Office for Civil Rights and Civil Liberties Fiscal Year 2018 Semiannual Report, Third and Fourth Quarters, pursuant to 6 U.S.C. 345(b); Public Law 107-296, Sec. 705; (116 Stat. 2219); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

3043. A letter from the Board Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Administration’s Office of Inspector General Semiannual Report to Congress covering the period of April 1, 2019, through September 30, 2019; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

3044. A letter from the Board Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Administration’s Performance and Accountability Report for FY 2019, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3515(a)(1); Public Law 101-576, Sec. 303(a)(1) (as amended by Public Law 107-289, Sec. 2(a)); (116 Stat. 2049); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

3045. A letter from the Board Chairman, Audit Committee Chairman, Farm Credit System Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation’s report to the President addressing the requirements of the Federal Managers’ Financial Integrity Act and the Inspector General Act of 1978; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

3046. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, National

Park Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Hot Springs National Park; Bicycling [NPS-HOSP-28641; PPMWROW2/PMPOUP05.YP0000] (RIN: 1024-AE50) received November 18, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3047. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Commercial Aggregated Large Coastal Shark and Hammerhead Shark Management Group in the Atlantic Region; Retention Limit Adjustment [Docket No.: 150413357-5999-02] (RIN: 0648-XT024) received October 28, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3048. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Small-Mesh Multispecies Fishery; Inseason Adjustment to the Northern Red Hake Possession Limit [Docket No.: 180209147-8509-02] (RIN: 0648-XX010) received October 28, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3049. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Economic Exclusive Zone Off Alaska; Pollock Fishery by Vessels Using Trawl Gear in the Western Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 150818742-6210-02] (RIN: 0648-XY045) received October 28, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3050. A letter from the Acting Chief Privacy Officer, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's Privacy Office 2018 Data Mining Report to Congress, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 2000ee-3(c)(1); Public Law 110-53, Sec. 804(c)(1); (121 Stat. 363); to the Committee on Homeland Security.

3051. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Medicare and Medicaid Programs: CY 2020 Hospital Outpatient PPS Policy Changes and Payment Rates and Ambulatory Surgical Center Payment System Policy Changes and Payment Rates. Price Transparency Requirements for Hospitals to Make Standard Charges Public [CMS-1717-F2] (RIN: 0938-AU22) received November 19, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

Mr. PALLONE: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 370. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy to carry out a program relating to physical security and cybersecurity for pipelines and liquefied natural gas facilities (Rept. 116-303, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of Union.

Mr. DEFAZIO: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 1132. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to establish a grant program to support the restoration of San Francisco Bay; with an amendment (Rept. 116-304, 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 Transportation and Infrastructure discharged from further consideration, H.R. 370 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on the Budget discharged from further consideration, H.R. 1132 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTED BILL SEQUENTIALLY REFERRED

Under clause 2 of rule XII, bills and reports were delivered to the Clerk for printing, and bills referred as follows:

Mr. PALLONE: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 370. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy to carry out a program relating to physical security and cybersecurity for pipelines and liquefied natural gas facilities; Rept. 116-303, Pt. 1; referred to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure for a period ending not later than November 20, 2019, for consideration of such provisions of the bill as fall within the jurisdiction of that committee pursuant to clause 1(r) of rule X.

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. GRIJALVA (for himself and Mr. LOWENTHAL):

H.R. 5186. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of the Interior from issuing new oil or natural gas production leases in the Gulf of Mexico under the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to a person that does not renegotiate its existing leases in order to require royalty payments if oil and natural gas prices are greater than or equal to specified price thresholds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. WATERS:

H.R. 5187. A bill to facilitate the development of affordable housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H.R. 5188. A bill to export clean energy technology around the world; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts (for herself and Mr. CARTER of Georgia):

H.R. 5189. A bill to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to establish a Medicaid demonstration program to develop and advance innovative payment models for freestanding birth center services for women with a low-risk pregnancy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HARDER of California (for himself, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico, and Mr. STEUBE):

H.R. 5190. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide assistance for

health centers and rural health clinics to implement electronic provider consultation and related telemedicine services; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. YARMUTH (for himself, Mr. BACON, Mrs. HAYES, and Ms. JAYAPAL):

H.R. 5191. A bill to reauthorize the Run-away and Homeless Youth Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BEYER:

H.R. 5192. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act, and the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to require group health plans and health insurance issuers to include on any insurance card issued by such plan or issuer information on the nearest in-network hospital or urgent care facility; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. BUSTOS (for herself, Mr. MCKINLEY, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. MENG, Ms. MOORE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. POCAN, and Mr. RYAN):

H.R. 5193. A bill to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act to extend and expand the provision requiring the use of iron and steel products that are produced in the United States in projects funded through a State drinking water treatment revolving loan fund; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CASTEN of Illinois (for himself, Ms. WILD, Mr. TONKO, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. PETERS):

H.R. 5194. A bill to require the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, in consultation with the heads of other relevant Federal agencies, to develop financial risk analyses relating to climate change, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself, Mr. GARCIA of Illinois, Ms. NORTON, Mr. SIRES, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. RUSH, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. MOORE, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 5195. A bill to prohibit air carriers from imposing fees that are not reasonable and proportional to the costs incurred by the air carriers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. DELGADO (for himself and Mr. ROSE of New York):

H.R. 5196. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to prohibit a separate segregated fund of a corporation which is engaged in the manufacture of opioids from making contributions or expenditures in connection with elections for Federal office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Ms. GARCIA of Texas (for herself and Mr. GOODEN):

H.R. 5197. A bill to add establish the treatment of managed stablecoins under the securities laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. GOLDEN (for himself and Mr. CARTER of Georgia):

H.R. 5198. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act regarding the patient medication information required to be included in the labeling of prescription drugs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LUJAN (for himself, Mr. BURGESS, Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico, Mr. KINZINGER, Ms. HAALAND, and Mr. GIANFORTE):

H.R. 5199. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to expand the capacity to improve health outcomes and increase access to specialized care; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. RUSH (for himself, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. BABIN, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. COHEN, Mr. DUNN, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, and Mr. WILLIAMS):

H.R. 5200. A bill to amend title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act to require group health plans and health insurance issuers offering group or individual health insurance coverage to provide coverage for prostate cancer screenings without the imposition of cost-sharing requirements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. MATSUI (for herself and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio):

H.R. 5201. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide coverage under the Medicare program of certain mental health telehealth services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. MCBATH (for herself, Mr. WOODALL, Mr. BEYER, and Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee):

H.R. 5202. A bill to apply cooperative and small employer charity pension plan rules to certain charitable employers whose primary exempt purpose is providing services with respect to mothers and children; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PETERSON (for himself and Mr. ARMSTRONG):

H.R. 5203. A bill to establish the Rural Export Center, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. PORTER (for herself, Mr. COURTNEY, and Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL):

H.R. 5204. A bill to direct the Secretary of Education to study student mental health at institutions of higher education and to issue guidance on compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act for mental health and substance use disorder policies of institutions of higher education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RYAN (for himself and Mr. TRONE):

H.R. 5205. A bill to amend the Worker Adjustment and Retraining Notification Act to support workers who are subject to an employment loss, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SMITH of Washington:

H.R. 5206. A bill to amend the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act to establish

a fund to provide support services for individuals participating in certain training activities under such Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. VELA:

H.R. 5207. A bill to amend section 235 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to remove authorization to implement the Migrant Protection Protocols, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL (for herself, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. GARCIA of Illinois, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. SOTO, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. VELA, Mr. CARDENAS, Mr. GALLEGU, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. BARRAGAN, Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico, and Mrs. TRAHAN):

H. Con. Res. 76. Concurrent resolution recognizing the significance of equal pay and the disparity in wages paid to Latina women in comparison to men; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. ESHOO (for herself and Mr. COLLINS of Georgia):

H. Res. 717. A resolution recognizing the 50th anniversary of the internet; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. GABBARD (for herself and Mr. HURD of Texas):

H. Res. 718. A resolution supporting the designation of "GivingTuesday" and strong incentives for all people of the United States to volunteer and give generously; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. FINKENAUER (for herself, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. COLE, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico, Mrs. RODGERS of Washington, Mr. LATTI, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. KIND, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. LOEBSACK, and Mrs. AXNE):

H. Res. 719. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Rural Health Day; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. HAALAND (for herself, Mr. COLE, Mr. COX of California, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. HECK, Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma, Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. MULLIN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. PERRY, Ms. TLAI, Mrs. TORRES of California, and Mr. YOUNG):

H. Res. 720. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the International Olympic Committee should correct Jim Thorpe's Olympic records for his unprecedented accomplishments during the 1912 Olympic Games; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana (for himself and Mr. MCADAMS):

H. Res. 721. A resolution calling for the establishment of an app ratings board to enforce consistent and accurate age and content ratings of apps on internet-ready devices and calling on technology companies to ensure the implementation of user-friendly and streamlined parental controls on devices used by minors; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SHAKOWSKY, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. HAALAND, Ms. CRAIG, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. SCANLON, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. SMITH of

Washington, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. NADLER, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. TLAI, Mr. SIRE, Mr. PHILLIPS, Mr. MCEACHIN, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. MENG, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. POCAN, Ms. WEXTON, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. CRIST, Ms. PRESSLEY, Ms. OMAR, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mrs. LEE of Nevada, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. SHALALA, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. SANCHEZ, and Mr. CORREA):

H. Res. 722. A resolution supporting the goals of Transgender Day of Remembrance; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. WILD (for herself, Ms. FRANKEL, Ms. NORTON, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. HOULAHAN, Mr. KEATING, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. TRONE, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mrs. DINGELL, and Mr. COSTA):

H. Res. 723. A resolution encouraging all nations to end sexual violence against girls through in-country data-driven reforms as demonstrated by multiple African nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Mr. REED introduced A bill (H.R. 5208) to authorize the President to award the Medal of Honor to Major Brian R. Chontosh, United States Marine Corps (retired), for acts of valor on March 25, 2003; which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

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. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 5186.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Const. art. I, sec. 8, cl. 3

To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes;

U.S. Const. art. IV, sec. 3, cl. 2, sen. a

The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rule and Regulations respecting the Territory of other Property belonging to the United States;

By Ms. WATERS:

H.R. 5187.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H.R. 5188.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 2

By Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts:

H.R. 5189.

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

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

By Mr. HARDER of California:

H.R. 5190.

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

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. YARMUTH:

H.R. 5191.

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. BEYER:

H.R. 5192.

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

Article 1, Section 8

By Mrs. BUSTOS:

H.R. 5193.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CASTEN of Illinois:

H.R. 5194.

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

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

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 5195.

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

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. DELGADO:

H.R. 5196.

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

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

By Ms. GARCIA of Texas:

H.R. 5197.

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

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

By Mr. GOLDEN:

H.R. 5198.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. LUJÁN:

H.R. 5199.

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

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. RUSH:

H.R. 5200.

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

Article 1, Section 8

By Ms. MATSUI:

H.R. 5201.

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

Article 1, Section 8 of the US Constitution

By Mrs. MCBATH:

H.R. 5202.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: Congress shall have power "To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes."

By Mr. PETERSON:

H.R. 5203.

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

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is in clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Ms. PORTER:

H.R. 5204.

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

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

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 5205.

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

Article. I.

Section. 8.

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

By Mr. SMITH of Washington:

H.R. 5206.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. VELA:

H.R. 5207.

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

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. REED:

H.R. 5208.

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

Article I, Section 8

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 20: Mr. ARMSTRONG, Mr. CLINE, and Mr. GOSAR.

H.R. 33: Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 129: Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma.

H.R. 155: Mr. WRIGHT.

H.R. 218: Mr. VAN DREW.

H.R. 553: Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina and Mr. MEUSER.

H.R. 587: Mr. NEGUSE and Ms. SLOTKIN.

H.R. 589: Mr. CLINE and Mr. ALLEN.

H.R. 655: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 744: Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico.

H.R. 757: Mr. STANTON.

H.R. 784: Mr. CLINE.

H.R. 808: Mr. YOUNG.

H.R. 837: Mr. WOMACK.

H.R. 865: Ms. GARCIA of Texas and Mr. RUIZ.

H.R. 912: Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. SAN NICOLAS, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. RYAN, Ms. BONAMICI, and Mr. LEVIN of Michigan.

H.R. 1002: Mr. VEASEY.

H.R. 1035: Mr. KELLER.

H.R. 1042: Mr. VEASEY, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, and Ms. LEE of California.

H.R. 1043: Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, and Mr. SARBANES.

H.R. 1049: Mr. KATKO, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. JEFFRIES, and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.

H.R. 1139: Ms. GARCIA of Texas.

H.R. 1154: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.

H.R. 1166: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.

H.R. 1220: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.

H.R. 1257: Mr. STEUBE.

H.R. 1329: Mr. TRONE.

H.R. 1374: Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER and Mr. BUCHSON.

H.R. 1380: Mr. VEASEY.

H.R. 1398: Mr. GUEST, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mr. KIM.

H.R. 1434: Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 1570: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.

H.R. 1603: Ms. PINGREE.

H.R. 1605: Mr. MEUSER.

H.R. 1737: Mr. TED LIEU of California.

H.R. 1753: Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina.

H.R. 1766: Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.

H.R. 1814: Mr. COX of California, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, and Mrs. HARTZLER.

H.R. 1869: Mr. YOHO, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. PERRY, Mr. GREEN of Tennessee, and Mr. BISHOP of Utah.

H.R. 1923: Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Ms. BONAMICI, and Ms. GABBARD.

H.R. 1975: Mrs. AXNE, Mr. ALLRED, Mr. TRONE, and Ms. HOULAHAN.

H.R. 1987: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 2013: Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 2073: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 2086: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.

H.R. 2111: Mr. TED LIEU of California and Ms. MOORE.

H.R. 2137: Mr. FOSTER, Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee, and Mr. VAN DREW.

H.R. 2208: Mr. NADLER, Mr. ROSE of New York, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Ms. SPEIER.

H.R. 2213: Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico.

H.R. 2222: Mr. KELLER.

H.R. 2224: Mr. TED LIEU of California.

H.R. 2256: Mr. LANGEVIN.

H.R. 2315: Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 2321: Mr. KIM.

H.R. 2344: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 2382: Mr. MARSHALL and Ms. PLASKETT.

H.R. 2415: Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania and Mr. CARBAJAL.

H.R. 2431: Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas and Mr. MCKINLEY.

H.R. 2441: Mr. SHERMAN and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 2599: Mr. CRIST.

H.R. 2650: Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma.

H.R. 2651: Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 2653: Mr. GOLDEN.

H.R. 2680: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.

H.R. 2720: Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 2733: Mr. PETERSON.

H.R. 2747: Mr. COX of California.

H.R. 2771: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

H.R. 2775: Mrs. TORRES of California, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. NEAL, and Ms. KELLY of Illinois.

H.R. 2867: Mr. POCAN, Ms. ESCOBAR, and Ms. TLAIB.

H.R. 2924: Mr. TED LIEU of California.

H.R. 2986: Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 2990: Ms. SHALALA.

H.R. 3036: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 3038: Ms. CLARKE of New York.

H.R. 3107: Mr. LAHOOD and Mrs. MCBATH.

H.R. 3113: Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. GOLDEN, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, and Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 3157: Mr. NEGUSE.

H.R. 3165: Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 3197: Mr. COURTNEY and Mr. HARDER of California.

H.R. 3219: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 3349: Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, and Mr. OLSON.

H.R. 3369: Mrs. DEMINGS.

H.R. 3463: Mr. VAN DREW.

H.R. 3495: Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. LAHOOD, and Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 3529: Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico.

H.R. 3565: Mr. SHIMKUS and Mr. GREEN of Tennessee.

H.R. 3632: Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 3646: Mr. YOHO and Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee.

H.R. 3657: Mr. ARMSTRONG and Mr. STANTON.

H.R. 3742: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina and Mr. PHILLIPS.

H.R. 3760: Mr. DOGGETT.

H.R. 3794: Ms. SLOTKIN.

- H.R. 3829: Mr. STEUBE.
H.R. 3867: Mr. QUIGLEY.
H.R. 3896: Mr. SUOZZI.
H.R. 3909: Mr. EMMER and Mr. GOTTHEIMER.
H.R. 3960: Mr. COX of California and Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 3961: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. KIM, and Mr. LOEBSSACK.
H.R. 3977: Ms. MOORE.
H.R. 4002: Mr. VAN DREW.
H.R. 4022: Ms. PINGREE.
H.R. 4030: Mr. YOHO.
H.R. 4056: Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. AMODEI, and Mr. YOUNG.
H.R. 4069: Mr. DESJARLAIS.
H.R. 4101: Mr. KIM.
H.R. 4107: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 4189: Mr. COMER and Ms. SLOTKIN.
H.R. 4236: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 4248: Ms. HAALAND.
H.R. 4249: Mr. TED LIEU of California.
H.R. 4297: Mr. LEVIN of California.
H.R. 4304: Mr. BROWN of Maryland.
H.R. 4348: Ms. GABBARD, Ms. MATSUI, and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.
H.R. 4370: Mrs. LESKO.
H.R. 4386: Mr. VAN DREW.
H.R. 4426: Mr. COHEN, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 4429: Mr. TRONE.
H.R. 4447: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.
H.R. 4495: Mr. LAMALFA.
H.R. 4588: Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico, Mr. PHILLIPS, and Mr. KEATING.
H.R. 4589: Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. HAGEDORN, and Mr. HURD of Texas.
H.R. 4672: Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. MATSUI, and Mr. ROUDA.
H.R. 4674: Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. DEFazio, Ms. DEAN, and Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 4679: Mr. KIM.
H.R. 4680: Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Ms. BARRAGÁN.
H.R. 4681: Mr. KILMER, Mr. FORTENBERRY, and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.
H.R. 4686: Ms. STEFANIK.
H.R. 4691: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 4748: Mr. TED LIEU of California.
H.R. 4754: Mr. CRENSHAW.
H.R. 4764: Mr. YOUNG.
H.R. 4768: Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 4811: Mr. FULCHER.
H.R. 4821: Mr. YOUNG.
H.R. 4864: Mr. HARDER of California, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mrs. AXNE.
H.R. 4873: Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. VELA.
H.R. 4889: Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico.
H.R. 4890: Mr. HASTINGS.
H.R. 4894: Mr. ROUDA.
H.R. 4914: Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 4920: Mrs. RODGERS of Washington, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, and Mr. STEUBE.
H.R. 4934: Mr. BRADY.
H.R. 4935: Mr. WATKINS, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, and Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 4951: Mr. MCCAUL.
H.R. 4980: Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. GAETZ, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H.R. 4984: Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. RUSH, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. BASS, Mrs. BEATTY, and Mr. EVANS.
H.R. 4986: Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. CASTEN of Illinois.
H.R. 4988: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
H.R. 4995: Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. TRONE, and Ms. CRAIG.
H.R. 4996: Mr. TRONE, Mr. CRENSHAW, and Mr. GUTHRIE.
H.R. 5004: Mr. NEAL.
H.R. 5010: Mr. HUFFMAN and Mr. NEGUSE.
H.R. 5017: Mr. HASTINGS and Ms. TLAIB.
H.R. 5042: Mr. GRIJALVA and Ms. BASS.
H.R. 5046: Mr. HUDSON.
H.R. 5052: Mr. RUSH and Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 5104: Mr. DEFazio.
H.R. 5117: Mr. GIBBS, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, and Mr. STIVERS.
H.R. 5129: Mr. PHILLIPS.
H.R. 5133: Mrs. MCBATH and Mr. CLINE.
H.R. 5138: Ms. LEE of California.
H.R. 5141: Mr. UPTON.
H.R. 5163: Mr. KILDEE.
H.R. 5164: Mr. BEYER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. MOORE, Mr. PANETTA, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. SUOZZI, and Ms. JUDY CHU of California.
H.R. 5166: Mr. REED.
H.R. 5169: Mr. LAMALFA.
H.J. Res. 78: Mrs. HARTZLER and Mr. ALLEN.
H. Res. 49: Mr. COSTA.
H. Res. 51: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
H. Res. 69: Mr. TRONE.
H. Res. 138: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H. Res. 230: Ms. SCANLON.
H. Res. 452: Mr. CICILLINE.
H. Res. 538: Ms. GARCIA of Texas and Mr. LEVIN of Michigan.
H. Res. 546: Mr. HECK.
H. Res. 682: Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. CÁRDENAS, and Ms. STEVENS.
H. Res. 688: Ms. HAALAND.
H. Res. 694: Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. HASTINGS, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, and Mr. PAYNE.