



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 165

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, DECEMBER 5, 2019

No. 194

## 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,  
December 5, 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.

### AND STILL I RISE

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

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, and still I rise, with my mnemonic notes.

And still I rise, Mr. Speaker. I rise because I love my country. And because I love my country, I do not rise with any degree of schadenfreude. I take no pleasure in what this House is about to do. I am not gleeful.

I rise because I believe that we must do what Dr. King called to our atten-

tion when he said that, on some issues, you must do that which is neither safe nor politic nor popular. You do it because conscience tells you it is the right thing to do.

I rise to announce that I believe that we are about to do the right thing. And I know that we are doing the right thing for a multiplicity of reasons, one of which is you cannot allow the Chief Executive Officer to send a letter of absolute, intractable defiance indicating that there will be no level of cooperation with the lawful constitutional body that is investigating actions—actions taken by the President.

You cannot allow this kind of recalcitrance to exist, because, if you do, there are no guardrails. We cannot allow a President to move through the land without guardrails. He has to know that there are boundaries.

So I rise to say, today, that this House is moving in a historic direction, that, when it is written across the pages of time that this House took the action that I believe it will take, I think we will all find that it was the right thing to do.

I rise also to say this: The Constitution allows a President to be impeached more than once. If we impeach now or at some time in the near future for one issue that we dearly should, then we find later that the President has other issues that merit impeachment, we can impeach again. There is no limit on the number of times.

I don't think you do it needlessly. Every time I have called it to the attention of this House, there was purpose and reason behind it, and I believe that we can do it more than once if it becomes necessary.

I think the Senate ought to act. I think the Senate ought to convict. But if the Senate does not convict, it does not mean that the House is now hamstrung and cannot move forward again with impeachment.

So I rise with no degree of schadenfreude. I rise with love of coun-

try and heart, and I rise understanding that Dr. King was eminently correct: There are times when we must do that which is neither safe nor politic nor popular. We do it because it is the right thing to do.

I rise because I believe we are embarking upon the right course for this House and for our history.

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

### STEMMING THE TIDE OF OPIOID OVERDOSES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, while still more work needs to be done to confront our Nation's challenges with opioids, I am pleased to report that my home State of North Carolina is working to stem the tide and has witnessed a drop in opioid overdoses.

In my district, Surry County and its healthcare professionals, first responders, and addiction counselors deserve recognition as contributing to the county witnessing a drop of over 75 percent in opioid-related emergency room visits within the last year.

This comes as we implement one of the most significant bills that Congress passed last year, the comprehensive SUPPORT for Patients and Communities Act.

I helped introduce that legislation with bipartisan colleagues, and I am glad to report that the bill is achieving its goal in stemming the tide of addiction by improving prevention and public health efforts, enhancing treatment and recovery programs, and providing communities more tools in their fight.

Again, Mr. Speaker, more work needs to be done to confront our Nation's

□ 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.

H9259

challenges with opioids, but Congress laid the groundwork for this work to be done at the State and local level with the passage of the SUPPORT for Patients and Communities Act.

#### A HISTORIC FIGHT FOR FREEDOM AND AUTONOMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Ms. PLASKETT) for 5 minutes.

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, I want to spend my 5 minutes to tell a story, a history story from the Virgin Islands.

This month and for the next 6 months in the Virgin Islands, we commemorate a historic fight for freedom and autonomy. On the small, 20-square-mile island of St. John, one of the earliest and longest lasting slave rebellions began on November 23, 1733. This rebellion was preceded by incomparable conditions that slaves were living in on the island of St. John in the Virgin Islands.

Conditions were devastating. The life expectancy of slaves in the Virgin Islands never went above the age of 30 years old, and this rebellion was caused by a drought and a plague of insects that placed 1,000 enslaved people of St. John at risk of starvation.

This caused an unprecedented amount of slaves to run away, what we call on the island "marooning," living in the bush. This led to the vicious and inhumane Slave Code of 1733. The new rules threatened amputation, breaking on the wheel, burning alive, and other brutal punishment for those who ran away.

This, then, led to 150 slaves, all of whom were part of the Akwamu tribe from Ghana, to begin an uprising. The Akwamu hoped to turn St. John into an Akwamu-controlled state.

On the evening of November 23, the slaves entered the fort on Coral Bay with cane knives concealed in bundles of wood. They proceeded to kill all of the soldiers at the fort. Others across the island, many who were able to escape, escaped to the island of St. Thomas, where they took word to the governor. The governor then, under pressure, sent troops, sent soldiers to St. John, who were then also destroyed.

The next 10 weeks saw guerilla-style warfare between the troops and the Akwamu rebels. Afraid that the rebellion would spread to the nearby island of Tortola, the British sent reinforcements. They were quickly dispatched and quickly rode back to Tortola.

Again, John Maddox, a privateer from the island of St. Kitts, made a deal with the Danish officials to aid the quelling of St. John. He, too, was not successful.

William Vessup, an owner of a plantation, who was in disrepute with the Danes, attempted to lure slaves onto a ship, the organizers of the rebellion, and told them that they would give them food and support if they would

come on the ship. They did not fall for the trickery, and he also was dispatched.

It wasn't until the Spanish Armada and the French came that this rebellion was able to be quelled in 1734, almost 6 months later; and with it, many were jailed. Some were sent to St. Croix to work to death, which was what they decided to give to them, and many also decided not to go back into slavery and jumped off of a cliff on the island to their death—but to freedom.

These 150 Akwamu on the island of St. John were some of the first African people in the Americas to have a sense of freedom, as volatile and short-lived as it might have been.

It is important to acknowledge, however, that, for the majority of enslaved people on the islands of St. John, St. Thomas, and St. Croix, neither outcome would lead to freedom. The enslaved people on the island of St. John and the rest of the Danish West Indies would ultimately wait another 114 years for the next rebellion for their freedom to come.

#### CELEBRATING THE CAREERS OF THREE CENTRE COUNTY PUBLIC SERVANTS

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, recently, I had the pleasure of traveling back to Pennsylvania's 15th Congressional District to celebrate the careers of three dedicated public servants in Centre County.

Last month, Centre County Treasurer Richard Fornicola and Centre County Controller Chuck Witmer served their last day at the Centre County Courthouse and began their much-deserved retirements.

Rich Fornicola began his term as Centre County treasurer in January 2000 and has worked diligently over the past two decades overseeing every penny that was received and disbursed by Centre County, including hunting permits and fishing licenses, as well as overseeing bids for county contracts.

Chuck Witmer has spent 15 years in public service in Centre County, having worked as the deputy controller for just under 4 years before being elected to serve as county controller. Over the years, Chuck has exhibited fantastic leadership that includes overseeing the county ledger, seeing the budget is adhered to, completing the county audit, and more.

This week, Prothonotary and Clerk of Courts Debra Immel will be serving her last day at the courthouse as well. Debra began her career in Centre County in 1976 as a department clerk and quickly rose through the ranks of deputy prothonotary and acting prothonotary. In 1999, Debra was elected to her current position and has served in county government ever since.

Mr. Speaker, together, these individuals have given more than 90 years of

service to Centre County, and they have worked hard to make Centre County a better place to live. I would like to congratulate Rich and Chuck and Debra on their retirements and wish them all the best in their new life chapter.

#### HONORING THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF COACH JOHN MCKISSICK

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

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of longtime Summerville High School football coach, Hall of Famer, John McKissick, who passed away on Thanksgiving Day.

Coach McKissick was the greatest high school football coach our country has ever seen. In fact, he held the record for the most wins of any football coach anywhere at any single level. Over the course of his 62-year career, he led the Green Wave to 10 State championships and 621 wins.

Coach McKissick was a mentor and a father figure to thousands of student athletes. In total, he coached over 5,000 young men throughout his career.

I had the honor of attending his funeral earlier this week, and I got to meet several of his former players, many in their fifties, sixties, seventies, and even eighties, who all told me about the incredible impact he had on their lives.

He famously told his players that it is not about the Xs and Os; it's about the Jims and the Joes. He called his players his boys. He treated them like family because they were, and that feeling was mutual.

It is impossible to imagine high school football or Summerville without him, but his amazing legacy will live on forever.

May God bless his family, his friends, former players, and the entire Summerville community.

Thank you for everything, Coach.

□ 1015

#### RECOGNIZING THE NEWBERRY FIRE DEPARTMENT

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

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the heroic actions by members of the Newberry Fire Department.

On March 1, 2019, the alpha shift, comprised of Captain Andrew Morris, Lieutenant Brian Beck, Senior Engineer Benjamin Dukes, firefighter Richard Doran, and volunteer firefighter Barry Brown, were working a wreck on Third Street when they received an urgent call of a hit-and-run incident on Louis Rich Road.

The firefighters responded to the call and found the victim of the hit and run

completely unresponsive. The firefighters immediately performed CPR on the victim and as a result of these actions, the person gained a pulse and began breathing. The brave actions of these dedicated public servants resulted in a life being saved, and in the words of the late Prime Minister of Great Britain Winston Churchill, who said the following: There are times when doing one's best is not good enough. One must do what is required.

The brave firefighters of Newberry Fire Department's alpha shift did what was required, and as a result, a life was saved.

#### CONGRATULATING SARI FELDMAN ON HER RETIREMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. FUDGE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize and congratulate Sari Feldman on her recent retirement as the executive director of the Cuyahoga County Public Library.

Ms. Feldman began her tenure at the Cleveland Public Library in 1997 as head of community services, later serving as deputy director. In 2003, Ms. Feldman was named the executive director of the Cuyahoga County Public Library where she oversaw one of the country's busiest public libraries for 16 years.

Ms. Feldman's leadership was instrumental to strengthening the libraries across Cuyahoga County and ensuring they were prepared to engage and serve the community in the 21st century.

Throughout her time as executive director, she directed an expansive \$110 million capital improvement program for the county's libraries and navigated the library system through significant cuts in State funding without reducing hours or service.

From 2015 to 2016, Ms. Feldman also served as the president of the American Library Association, a testament to her importance not only to northeast Ohio but to the entire Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Ms. Feldman for her enduring leadership, service, and dedication to engaging and empowering the Cuyahoga County community.

I congratulate her successor, Tracy Strobel, the new executive director for the Cuyahoga County Public Library.

As a northeast Ohio native with decades of experience, I trust Tracy will continue to advance Cuyahoga County Public Library's mission of being at the center of community life where reading, lifelong learning, and civic engagement thrive.

#### AMERICANS SHOULD RENEW IN THEIR HEARTS OUR NATION'S MOTTO

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

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, our Nation's motto of "In God We Trust" is

inscribed on the wall above our heads. The word "trust" is typically defined as to have confidence, faith, or hope in someone or something. In this case, it is obviously trust in God.

To have confidence or faith or hope in God requires that we know something about God. This knowledge is gained by reading and studying the inspired word of God, which is, of course the Bible. God has revealed Himself to us in the pages of the Bible, and to trust in God means that we also trust His teachings as revealed in the Bible.

Among those teachings is a prescription for the way we should lead our lives, the way we should treat each other, and how we should rely on God and His teachings to, in fact, trust in Him.

John Adams wrote that only a moral and religious people can self-govern. In my opinion, the morals to which he is referring to are laid out in God's teachings in both the Old Testament and the New Testament of the Bible.

Almost every day we hear someone ask for God's blessings on our Nation. The next time you hear someone ask for God to bless our Nation, please ask yourself what is it about America and our Nation that we are asking God to bless? Just what is there about our Nation that is, in fact, blessing?

Are we asking God to bless the killing of more than 61 million babies in the last 46 years? Are we asking God to bless the rancor and incivility that permeates much of our public discourse? These and other issues cause me to fear that we are on the verge of being an unblessable Nation.

The Old Testament is replete with times when God's chosen people, the Nation of Israel, would stray so far from His teachings that He would subject them to awful events and terrible circumstances to cause them to turn their hearts back to Him. I believe that we are on that same destructive path.

We must ask ourselves what should we do to turn our Nation's heart back to God? There is no legislative fix for this problem. The path to a blessing Nation must start in the heart of each one of us. To return to the moral high ground that has allowed our Nation to prosper under God's blessings, we must each have a moral code to live by.

For me that moral code is the Judeo-Christian code found in God's Word. Jesus Christ is my personal savior, and I try to live his teachings every day. Some days I am better at it than others, but each of us must have a moral code that is based on truth, not on whims or feelings. This awakening must start now.

It can start by claiming God's promise to the Nation of Israel that applies to our Nation, as well. It is found in II Chronicles 7:14, which says: "If my people, who are called by my name will humble themselves and pray and seek my face and turn from their wicked ways," emphasis on wicked ways, "then I will hear them from heaven, and I will forgive their sin, and heal

their land." Each of us individually and our Nation as a whole has never needed that promise more than we need it today.

Mr. Speaker, we should renew in our hearts every day our Nation's motto, "In God We Trust."

#### DEMOCRACY IS FACING A CONSTITUTIONAL CRISIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. LAWRENCE) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, more than 200 years ago, the delegates of the Constitutional Convention gathered in Philadelphia to help chart a path forward for the newly independent United States of America.

After deliberation, the Framers established a system of government with three equal branches, the legislative, executive, and judiciary, along with a system of checks and balances to ensure no single branch had too much power. After years of control by a foreign power, our Framers understood the importance of self-governance and ensuring no monarch could once again rule over our country.

Now, more than 200 years since the ratification of our Constitution, our democracy faces a constitutional crisis that the Framers never could have imagined. The office of the President of the United States, the most powerful position in the world, yields immense influence with the expectation to use that power in a principled manner.

However, that principled approach has since vanished as self-interest has consumed the Oval Office. In the pursuit of that self-interest, this President has compromised our national security by withholding critical military assistance to Ukraine, military assistance approved by the Congress, the legislative branch, to provide assistance to preserve their sovereignty and counter Russian aggression.

That same system of checks and balances described in the Constitution over 200 years ago is now under attack. The President, as well as the Members of Congress, take an oath of office when stepping into this amazing place of our Republic to be leaders in our country, to protect, to preserve, and defend the Constitution of the United States as long as we hold this office. As part of that oath, it is my constitutional duty to protect the Constitution from all threats, even within our own government.

This June, I announced my support for the House of Representatives to begin an impeachment inquiry. In the 6 months since then, with new details revealed weekly and daily, my support for the House impeachment inquiry has never been stronger. This President has jeopardized our national security to affect an election; no one is above the law, not even the President.

On Tuesday, The House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence

voted to approve a comprehensive report outlining actions regarding Ukraine and the obstruction of justice. For 2 weeks last month, the American people heard various witnesses share their account of the President and the things that were happening in our government.

As an African American I stand here today, Mr. Speaker, and I am very sensitive to any action to oppress my right to vote. My history as an African American in this country causes me to be very alert. Furthermore, the report details a concerted effort by the White House to defy authorized congressional subpoenas for documents, a right the Supreme Court has affirmed Congress possesses.

During the Constitutional Convention, it was noted that Madison rose and asked his colleagues two questions: "Shall any man be above justice? Shall that man be above it who can commit the most extensive injustice?"

With great power comes great responsibility. That responsibility has been ignored, and it has been demonstrated in the office of our President that his only interest is his self-interest and not that which is the best interest of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, Congress will be tasked with making a decision that will likely alter the course of history. However, taking the evidence into account, this is not a difficult decision. When history looks back, I will be one of the Members of Congress who kept my oath, who served and voted to protect, preserve, and defend the Constitution of the United States.

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

#### RECOGNIZING DRs. LYNN AND SAM COFIELD

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

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in special recognition of my lifelong friends, Drs. Lynn and Sam Cofield of Trigg County, Kentucky, for their remarkable careers and outstanding contributions to their local community and beyond. This year marks their retirement, and I want to congratulate Lynn and Sam for many decades of success.

Lynn and Sam met while attending veterinary school at Auburn University. They married in 1984 and bought the Trigg County Veterinary Clinic located in Cadiz, Kentucky. While practicing veterinary medicine, they also managed a 160-acre farm they called Riverview West. They raised a herd of purebred Charolais cattle and quickly rose to prominence among the cattle industry. Producing and exhibiting Charolais cattle became passions for Lynn and Sam, who continued to expand their influence in the agriculture community.

From 1986 to 1991 Lynn served as Kentucky Junior Charolais Association adviser where I was one of her many students who traveled the livestock show circuit with the Cofield family. Lynn was also active in many organizations over the years ranging from 4-H and FFA to the Kentucky Veterinary Medical Association.

Sam served on the Farm Bureau Board of Directors and the Trigg County Health Department Board. Both Lynn and Sam supplied the Trigg County community with high-quality, honest veterinary medicine until 2019. Their clinic sold in February, and in October they began a hard-earned and much-deserved retirement. In the words of those who know them best, the Cofields are staples in Trigg County and the surrounding communities.

Countless families can tell stories of how the Cofields cared for their pets and livestock from beginning to end. The Cofields let no obstacle prevent them from providing top-notch medical care. Whether in the wee hours of the morning or in the pouring rain, the Cofields were there ready to lend a hand.

Once again, I want to congratulate Drs. Lynn and Sam Cofield on their notable careers and recent retirement. I thank them both for being exceptional leaders in the First Congressional District of Kentucky.

#### HONORING THE WORK OF THE KENTUCKY MAGISTRATES AND COMMISSIONERS ASSOCIATION

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize the work of the Kentucky Magistrates and Commissioners Association headquartered in Frankfort, Kentucky.

On October 30, 2019, the Association provided over 500 new pairs of shoes to Monroe County schools. The shoes were delivered to my hometown and my former school Tompkinsville Elementary. I am deeply grateful to the elected magistrates and commissioners who made this donation on behalf of the KMCA. Their actions represent the best of the Commonwealth and make me proud to represent one of its six congressional districts.

I want to particularly thank several members of the KMCA from the Monroe County Fiscal Court: Magistrates Jamie Veach, Roger Deckard, Ricky Bartley, Ricky Graves, and Mark Williams, in addition to county judge, Mitchell Page. I also want to thank my good friend, J.C. Young, executive director of the Kentucky Magistrates and Commissioners Association for spearheading the effort.

□ 1030

No child should worry that they might leave the house without adequate footwear, and because of the actions of the Kentucky Magistrates and Commissioners Association, Monroe County's most vulnerable are better off today than they were only a few short weeks ago.

Mr. Speaker, once again, I thank the KMCA for choosing Monroe County and for the time and energy they sacrificed

to improve the everyday lives of dozens of schoolchildren. Their efforts are applauded in Kentucky's First Congressional District.

#### CONGRATULATING NEW PAL FOOTBALL

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

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the New Palestine High School football team for winning the Indiana high school Class A football state championship. This marks the second year in a row the Dragons have gone undefeated.

I applaud Coach Kyle Ralph, who now has an 88-4 record in his 7-season tenure at New Pal.

I also congratulate the whole team for their hard work in this fantastic accomplishment. Congratulations to all the Dragon nation.

#### CONGRATULATING EHHS CHEERLEADING

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Eastern Hancock High School cheerleading squad for winning the Indiana Cheer Championship Varsity D division.

After placing fourth at the semi-State competition, the Royals returned to the State competition for a victorious first place win.

The Royal cheerleading squad has displayed dedication, hard work, and sheer talent. They have made the Sixth District very proud.

#### RECOGNIZING GREENSBURG AG TEACHER GREG SCHNEIDER

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Greensburg Community High School agriculture teacher and FFA adviser Greg Schneider.

Greg Schneider was recently awarded the honorary American FFA degree through his commitment to the advancement of ag education. The degree recognizes those who have gone beyond valuable daily contributions to make a positive difference in the lives of their students.

Congratulations to Greg, who has inspired confidence in a new generation of farmers.

#### RECOGNIZING SHELBYVILLE CENTRAL SCHOOL'S KRIS BAKER

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Shelbyville Central Schools' special education coordinator, Kris Baker, for winning a prestigious education award.

Kris' work has earned her the 2019 Early Career Special Education Administrator Award. Ms. Baker won the award for her dedication to autism education and assistive technology at Earlywood Educational Services.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Kris for the work she has done for those in need, and I congratulate her on this honor.

#### CONGRATULATING ANALYTICAL ENGINEERING ON GOLD HIRE VETS MEDALLION AWARD

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Analytical Engineering of Columbus and the May family for receiving the Gold Hire Vets Medallion

Award from the U.S. Department of Labor.

This marks the second year in a row that Analytical Engineering, Inc., has earned this esteemed award. They were 1 of only 12 companies in Indiana to win this award by hiring and retaining veterans.

As a Beirut veteran myself, I appreciate companies like Analytical Engineering for taking care of those who have served our country.

SEND NDAA TO PRESIDENT

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my Democratic colleagues to stop playing political games and send the NDAA to President Trump's desk.

The NDAA has been a bipartisan piece of legislation that we, as Congress, have passed for 58 straight years. The NDAA is essential for our men and women in uniform and for our National Defense Strategy.

Now, in the final hour, House Democrats want to wedge partisan policies into this bill. As Democrats continue to divide Congress over nondefense issues, they play right into the hands of our enemies.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to stop indulging in this political theater and pass the NDAA.

#### 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 34 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

#### AFTER RECESS

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

#### PRAYER

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

God of light, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

Once again we come to You to ask wisdom, patience, peace, and understanding for the Members of this people's House.

Give them the generosity of heart and the courage of true leadership to work toward a common solution to the many issues facing our Nation.

As true statesmen and -women, may they find fortitude to make judgments to benefit all Americans in their time of need.

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

Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's pro-

ceedings and announces to the House her approval thereof.

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

#### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHNEIDER) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. SCHNEIDER led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

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

#### WE ARE RUNNING OUT OF TIME

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

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Madam Speaker, climate change is an immediate and existential threat to our national security, economy, and the future we leave to our children.

This is a global problem that requires urgent international solutions, but the Trump administration is dangerously squandering this crucial moment. Quite simply, we are running out of time.

By formally beginning withdrawal from the Paris climate agreement, the President is ceding American leadership on climate and actively undermining critical efforts to curb emissions and transition to a clean energy economy.

As signatory countries around the world meet this week for a conference in Madrid, I am introducing a resolution, joined by more than 100 of my House colleagues as original cosponsors, condemning the administration's actions. This resolution sends a strong message that the House opposes the President's reckless, irresponsible decision to abandon the climate agreement, and we stand ready to fulfill the commitments that our Nation made under the Paris Agreement to address the climate threat.

I urge my colleagues to join me in this clear call for global action and critically needed U.S. leadership.

#### WAGES ARE RISING IN SOUTH CAROLINA

(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, yesterday, Jessica Holdman with The Post and Courier reported that wages in South Carolina

rose faster than expected this year and will continue to rise. I was alerted to this by Gary David and Christopher Thompson on WVOC by iHeartRadio. I am grateful for President Donald Trump's actions to increase wages by reducing taxes and regulations.

According to Doug Woodward, economist with the University of South Carolina's Darla Moore School of Business, this is the best job market we have seen in a generation. USC economist Joey Von Nessen says, "workers are in high demand right now, and we are seeing strong wage growth as a result. This includes wage growth for workers across the pay scale, with those on the lower end benefiting the most."

By creating jobs, raising wages, and consistently working to promote opportunities, President Trump is continuing his record of keeping his promises. I am grateful that President Trump is focused to work for American families and jobs, despite the failed Russian hoax and today the impeachment hoax.

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

#### CUTS TO SNAP AFFECT EVERYONE

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

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Madam Speaker, I want to talk about the administration's move to cut hundreds of thousands of people from SNAP, our Nation's safety net for those faced with food insecurity.

By the USDA's own estimates, nearly 700,000 people will be hurt by this policy. 700,000, that is appalling. That is 700,000 people who will struggle to feed themselves while they work towards getting back on their feet. That is 700,000 people who will have to decide whether to pay their bills or go hungry.

But this doesn't just affect those who will be cut from the food assistance program, this affects everyone. SNAP dollars are spent in local small businesses and help bring money to struggling communities. Simply put, this rule will make more people go hungry and hurt our communities in the process.

In Congress, we worked together on this issue. We reached a consensus, and we passed bipartisan legislation. So this policy is not what we passed, and it is not what the American people want. I am calling on this administration to stop this cruel policy.

#### RECOGNIZING BITTLE PORTERFIELD

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

Mr. CLINE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to memorialize Roanoke businessman Mr. Bittle Porterfield, III,

who contributed greatly to the arts, education, and business community throughout southwest Virginia.

Among the many civic leadership roles held during his lifetime, Mr. Porterfield served on the Virginia Council on Higher Education, was president of the Taubman Museum of Art, and the Roanoke Valley Chamber of Commerce in addition to being chairman of both the Roanoke Valley Business Council and the United Way of Roanoke Valley.

Mr. Porterfield believed in Roanoke's potential and knew that the Star City could play a pivotal role in cultural development. As a veteran, a Roanoke native, and an innate leader, Mr. Porterfield believed that it was his life's purpose to serve others and his community.

I am grateful for the commitment and passion Bittle Porterfield had for the Roanoke Valley and wish to extend my deepest sympathies to his family for their loss. May they find peace in knowing that his legacy of service will live on through the countless lives he touched.

#### CALLING ATTENTION TO LYME DISEASE

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

Mr. DELGADO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to call attention to an urgent issue in upstate New York. Lyme and tick-borne diseases are deeply prevalent in my district, New York 19, and across the country.

From 2007 to 2017, Lyme disease cases rose by 78 percent in my district. Approximately half of adult deer ticks in the State carry the bacteria that causes Lyme disease. We should be doing all we can to address this and invest in more effective ways to both diagnose and treat this disease.

That is why this week, I, along with fellow members of the bipartisan Lyme Disease Caucus, introduced legislation to supplement congressionally appropriated funding for research with the Stamp Out Lyme Disease Act. Our bill would create a postage stamp to raise awareness about the disease and directly support medical research to treat and cure tick-borne illnesses.

I urge the House to take up this legislation and move us closer to a cure.

#### RECOGNIZING THE REPEAL OF PROHIBITION

(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 the repeal of prohibition. On this day in 1933, the 21st Amendment was ratified, ending the prohibition of alcohol.

Today, throughout Pennsylvania, breweries, wineries, and distilleries

have become one of the Commonwealth's fastest growing industries, and quite frankly, agri-businesses. Pennsylvania is home to more than 300 wineries, which produce more than 1.6 million gallons of wine each year. This equates to roughly \$1.4 billion in economic impact.

Recently, Woody Lodge Winery, a disabled veteran and female-owned business from Cambria County, racked up six awards at the Atlantic Seaboard Wine Association competition, including two best-in-category awards.

The craft beer industry is also booming. Each year, craft brewers pump nearly \$6 billion into Pennsylvania's economy and are responsible for more than 100,000 jobs and generate \$2.2 billion in wages. For the past three years, Pennsylvania has been the number one producer of craft beer in the Nation.

As we look back on 13 long years of prohibition in this country, let's raise a glass to how far we have come in the 86 years since.

#### THE AMERICAN PEOPLE STAND BEHIND THE INTERNATIONAL FIGHT TO COMBAT CLIMATE CHANGE

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

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Madam Speaker, this past week I had the privilege to join Speaker PELOSI and several of my colleagues at the 2019 United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change in Madrid, commonly known as COP25.

Our visit sent a message: No matter what the current President says or does, the American people stand behind the international fight to combat climate change. We are still in.

Our only chance to stop the climate crisis is for the entire world to come together on solutions to stop pollution, protect public health, and build a clean energy economy. I was greatly encouraged and reinvigorated by the world leaders I met in Madrid who were deeply passionate and understand the urgency in finding ways forward on this global crisis.

I pledge to bring that passion back to the House as a member of the Select Committee on the Climate Crisis as we continue our work to put together an action plan for both Congress and our country.

□ 1215

#### HONORING MAHANTONGO VALLEY FARM FOR WHITE HOUSE CHRISTMAS TREE

(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, I rise today to honor Mahantongo Valley Farm owners Larry and Joanne Snyder, who reside in Pennsylvania's

Ninth District and whose farm is located in Schuylkill and Northumberland Counties.

One of their beautiful Christmas trees was selected by the President and First Lady to adorn the Blue Room in the White House during this holiday season.

The Snyder's magnificent 23-foot Douglas fir was personally delivered last week by the Snyder family to the White House, where they were greeted by First Lady Melania Trump.

Mahantongo Valley Farms has been in the Snyder family for over 200 years, but this is the first time one of their trees has won the National Christmas Tree Contest. There are over 13,000 Christmas tree farms across the country, making this a truly remarkable accomplishment.

Madam Speaker, I would like to thank the Snyder family for their contribution to this wonderful Christmas tradition and for making Pennsylvania and particularly Pennsylvania's Ninth District very proud.

#### ADDRESS URGENT PRIORITIES OF AMERICA

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Madam Speaker, it has been less than a year since Democrats took back the majority in the House. In that short time, we have passed nearly 400 bills to get government working for the people again, by increasing access to quality, affordable healthcare and protecting coverage for preexisting conditions; by raising family wages; by making bold investments in rebuilding our Nation's infrastructure; and by cleaning up corruption in Washington and getting the government to work for the people again.

We have sent more than 275 bipartisan bills to the Senate, where MITCH MCCONNELL is refusing to vote on them. These bills include legislation to protect and strengthen coverage for preexisting conditions, to ensure equal pay for equal work, and to fight back against the debilitating effects of climate change and ban offshore drilling.

We also voted to give 33 million Americans a long-overdue pay raise by raising the minimum wage, provide Gold Star families with much-needed tax relief, and secure our Nation's elections.

Yet, MITCH MCCONNELL has described himself as the "grim reaper" and won't take up any of this legislation.

We are busy doing the work of the American people. We have passed over 375 bipartisan bills that are sitting in the Senate. It is time for the Senate to take up these bills and address the urgent priorities of the American people.

#### HONORING TREVON TYLER

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

Ms. STEVENS. Madam Speaker, last week, tragedy struck the South Lyon community in Oakland County, Michigan, as we learned of the death of Trevon Tyler.

Just 17 years old, Trevon died from complications following knee surgery.

Trevon was a beloved member of the South Lyon community and a member of the South Lyon East High School football team.

His coach called him “the nicest, most fun-loving, caring kid.” He “walked with a pretty big pep in his step. He always said hi to everybody. Everybody loved him. He was a little bit of a jokester, had this big laugh, always made you smile.”

Trevon’s incredible family, friends, classmates, and teammates are all heartbroken by his passing. His life was cut tragically short, but he will always be remembered by that smile, his laugh, his friendship, and his contributions to our community.

Today, we are called to live our lives more like Tre, with joy and love at the forefront.

---

#### COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, December 5, 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 December 5, 2019, at 9:04 a.m.:

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 5277.

With best wishes, I am  
Sincerely,

CHERYL L. JOHNSON.

---

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4, VOTING RIGHTS ADVANCEMENT ACT OF 2019, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 326, EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES REGARDING UNITED STATES EFFORTS TO RESOLVE THE ISRAELI-PALESTINIAN CONFLICT THROUGH A NEGOTIATED TWO-STATE SOLUTION

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 741 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 741

*Resolved*, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 4) to amend the Voting Rights Act of 1965 to revise the criteria for determining which States and political sub-

divisions are subject to section 4 of the Act, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now printed in the bill, modified by the amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. 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: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the resolution (H. Res. 326) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding United States efforts to resolve the Israeli-Palestinian conflict through a negotiated two-state solution. The amendments to the resolution and the preamble recommended by the Committee on Foreign Affairs now printed in the resolution, modified by the amendments printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be considered as adopted. The resolution, as amended, shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and preamble, as amended, to adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, on Wednesday, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 741, providing for consideration of two measures.

First, the rule provides for consideration of H.R. 4, the Voting Rights Advancement Act of 2019, under a closed rule. The rule self-executes a manager’s amendment offered by Chairman NADLER and provides 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary. The rule provides one motion to recommit.

Additionally, the rule provides for consideration of H. Res. 326, expressing

the sense of the House of Representatives regarding United States efforts to resolve the Israeli-Palestinian conflict through a negotiated two-state solution, under a closed rule.

The rule self-executes two manager’s amendments offered by Chairman ENGEL. The rule provides for 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Madam Speaker, the Voting Rights Act of 1965 is one of the great legislative achievements of American history. It is perhaps the greatest single statute of the 20th century, in a century of great statutes, including the National Labor Relations Act and the Fair Labor Standards Act.

But the Voting Rights Act was born out of the blood, sweat, and tears of the American civil rights movement; in the wake of Freedom Summer; in the murders of Schwerner, Chaney, Goodman, and other civil rights heroes; and in the after the famous March on Washington, where Dr. King made his “I Have a Dream” speech.

The Voting Rights Act transformed American politics by bringing into our elections millions of voters who had been disenfranchised for a century after the Civil War ended. It changed the nature of politics in the Deep South and across the United States, and it changed the politics of the United States Congress as well.

Theoretically, the 13th, 14th, and 15th Amendments had solved the problem of disenfranchisement after the Civil War. The 13th Amendment abolished slavery; the 14th Amendment established equal protection; and the 15th Amendment banned discrimination in voting. But after the dismantling of reconstruction, African Americans were subjected to a regime of disenfranchisement that included violence, terror, grandfather clauses, literacy tests, poll taxes, and an ever-expanding panoply of devices, tricks, and tactics to keep Black people from being able to register to vote and to participate in elections.

The civil rights movement and President Lyndon Johnson fought for the Voting Rights Act, which passed in 1965 and which included a package of strong remedies targeting discriminatory voting practices and devices in the areas where discrimination was most egregious and virulent.

A key component of the Voting Rights Act was section 5, the preclearance requirement, which compelled covered States—that is, the States to which it applied—to stop discriminating and to subject all changes in their voting practices to the Department of Justice or to the United States District Court for the District of Columbia.

States were covered if they had used illegal voting discrimination devices like literacy tests, poll taxes, and character exams, and if fewer than 50 percent of the people were registered to vote or allowed to participate.

The Voting Rights Act was challenged immediately in litigation called *South Carolina v. Katzenbach*, but in 1966, the Supreme Court rejected arguments that the Voting Rights Act violated the Constitution.

The Supreme Court said Congress may use any rational means to effectuate the constitutional prohibition on race discrimination in voting. It upheld the preclearance requirement against attack.

Specifically, it was said by South Carolina that it violated the so-called equal footing doctrine, but the Supreme Court said that the equal footing doctrine applied to the admission of States and not to the Congress' power under section 5 of the 14th Amendment or section 2 of the 15th Amendment.

All of this worked for the Voting Rights Act to usher in a new era of real democracy in America. The preclearance requirement meant that the States, counties, and jurisdictions that had been discriminating had to submit to the Department of Justice or to Federal court their plans for changes. That worked to enfranchise millions of voters across America. It worked for the election of thousands of African American elected officials at the local, State, and Federal levels.

The genius of section 5 was that jurisdictions had to submit potentially discriminatory changes before the harm took place. Anybody can go ahead and sue under section 2 after an election is over, but then it is too late because the harm has already been done, the election has taken place. So even if you win in court, the court is not going to order a rerun of the election. It is not going to require all the voting to take place again, so it is too late at that point.

Section 5 puts the burden on the potentially discriminating parties to prove that they are not discriminating when they make changes in voting laws.

It works all the way up until 2013, when the Supreme Court rendered its 5-4 decision in *Shelby County v. Holder*. The *Shelby County* case struck down the section 4(b) formula for which States were covered, declaring that this formula was now out-of-date because it went back many, many decades to the 1960s and 1970s and that the Congress would need to update the formula to address current needs in the field and to show that the formula relates to the current problems that we are targeting.

The Court said specifically that coverage was based on decades-old data and eradicated practices, like literacy tests, which don't exist anymore. So when it got struck down, dozens of States and counties that were previously required to preclear changes related to voting didn't have to do it anymore, and they began very quickly, almost instantly, to roll back various kinds of voter protections and to pass strict voter identification laws, to pass

massive voter purges, to implement cuts to early voting, to close polling places, and so on.

I am going to read from one of the witnesses who testified before the House Judiciary Committee, Kristen Clarke, the president and executive director of the Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights, who said:

"We have vetted complaints from tens of thousands of voters in Shelby, many revealing systemic voting discrimination. In short, this is how Shelby has impacted our democracy.

"First, we have seen the resurgence of discriminatory voting practices, some motivated by intentional discrimination, and this discrimination has been most intense in the very jurisdictions that were once covered by section 5. They range from the consolidation of polling sites to make it less convenient for minority voters to vote to the curtailing of early voting hours, the purging of minority voters from the rolls under the pretext of list maintenance, strict photo ID requirements, abuse of signature match verification requirements . . . , the threat of criminal prosecution, and more.

□ 1230

"Second, we have seen increased levels of recalcitrants in hostility among elected officials who institute and reinstitute discriminatory voting changes with impunity. . . ."

"Third, the loss of public notice regarding changes in voting practices that could have a discriminatory effect is significant. . . ."

"Fourth, the public no longer has the ability to participate in the process of reviewing practices before they take effect. . . ."

"Fifth, the preclearance process had an identifiable deterrent effect that is now lost.

"Sixth, the status quo is not sustainable. Civil rights organizations are stepping up to fill the void created by the *Shelby* decision at insurmountable expense.

"And finally, this will be the first redistricting cycle in decades" in which redistricting takes place without the Voting Rights Act.

That is one example of testimony that we got from all over America about what the *Shelby County v. Holder* decision meant by dismantling section 5 by knocking out section 4(b) of the Voting Rights Act.

H.R. 4 is doing precisely what the Supreme Court invited us to do in the *Shelby County* decision: to pass a new coverage formula for the Civil Rights Act preclearance requirement based on new data in a new formula designed to address current contemporary problems.

The Judiciary Committee and the House Administration Committee had a combined total of 17 hearings: 9 on the Judiciary side with its Subcommittee on the Constitution, Civil Rights and Civil Liberties, and 8 in the House Administration Committee's

Subcommittee on Elections. They heard about restrictive and discriminatory practices taking place in numerous States across the country, including Texas and Georgia, where, after the end of preclearance, Georgia voters faced a myriad of new voting barriers, including the closure of more than 200 precinct polling places, spoiled voter registration materials, purging of more than 1 million voters in a racially discriminatory way, restrictive voter ID laws, systematic rejection of absentee ballots, and more.

We also looked in North Carolina, which passed a so-called monster voter suppression law, which resulted in race discrimination in accessing the polls, including the closure of dozens of polling sites and long voting lines. The law eliminated same-day voter registration, reduced early voting by a week, curtailed satellite polling sites for elderly and disabled voters, and so on.

Madam Speaker, this legislation is the product of massive legislative inspection of voting conditions across the United States of America today, and it threads the needle that was offered to us by the Supreme Court in the *Shelby County* decision by amending the Voting Rights Act to revise the section 4(b) criteria and providing other voter protections at the same time.

Specifically, the bill creates a new coverage formula that applies to all States and hinges on a finding of repeated voting violations in the preceding 25 years.

It establishes a process for reviewing voting changes in jurisdictions nationwide, focused on a limited set of measures such as voter ID laws and the reduction of multilingual voting materials; it requires reasonable public notice for voting changes; it allows the Attorney General authority to request Federal observers; and it increases accessibility and protection for Native American and Alaska Native voters.

Just turning, now, to H.R. 326, for more than 20 years, American Presidents from both political parties and Israeli Prime Ministers have supported reaching a two-state solution that establishes a democratic Palestinian state to coexist peacefully and constructively side by side with a democratic Israel.

Middle East peace talks have favored the two-state solution and opposed settlement expansions, moves towards unilateral annexation of territories, and efforts to arrive at Palestinian statehood outside the framework of negotiations with Israel.

In 2002, President Bush stated: "My vision is two states, living side by side in peace and security."

In 2013, President Obama reiterated this exact same commitment, stating that: "Negotiations will be necessary, but there is little secret about where they must lead—two states for two peoples."

This resolution emphasizes the sentiment of the past 20 years of peace talks

by expressing the sense of this House of Representatives that only a two-state solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict can ensure Israel's survival as a secure democratic state and fulfill the legitimate aspirations for a secure and democratic Palestinian state. It further expresses the sense that any U.S. proposal that fails to endorse a two-state solution will put a peaceful end to the conflict only further out of reach.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, the right to vote is of paramount importance in our Republic. We all agree on that. Prohibitions against discriminatory barriers to the right to vote have been grounded in Federal law since the Civil War and, more recently, through the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

We all agree: Discrimination should have no place in our voting system. However, the majority would have us believe that the Voting Rights Act does not prevent any of this and would rather pass this partisan legislation for a Federal takeover of elections.

I anticipate that the 2013 Supreme Court case *Shelby County v. Holder* will be brought up many times today, but I would like to point out to my Democratic colleagues that, in that decision, the Supreme Court only struck down one outdated provision of the Voting Rights Act.

This provision, section 4(b), was struck down because it was outdated as it had not been updated since 1975, and it violated principles of equal State sovereignty and federalism. H.R. 4 is, quite simply, unconstitutional, as the Supreme Court had held that Federal control over local elections is allowed only when there is proof of discriminatory treatment in voting.

Further, I believe it is important to point out that other very important provisions of the Voting Rights Act remain in place, including section 2 and section 3.

Section 2 applies nationwide and prohibits voting practices or procedures that discriminate on the basis of race, color, or the ability to speak English. Section 2 is enforced through Federal lawsuits just like every other Federal civil rights law, and the United States and civil rights organizations have brought many cases to enforce the guarantees of section 2 in court, and they may do so in the future, as well.

Section 3 of the Voting Rights Act also remains in place. This section authorizes Federal courts to impose preclearance requirements on States and political subdivisions that have enacted voting procedures that treat people differently based on race in violation of the 14th and 15th Amendments.

If a Federal court finds a State or a political subdivision to have treated people differently based on race, then

the court has discretion now to retain supervisory jurisdiction and impose preclearance requirements as they see fit until a future date at the court's discretion. This is all valid now without this bill.

Section 3 has been utilized recently, in fact. U.S. District Judge Lee Rosen-thal issued an opinion in a redistricting case that required that the city of Pasadena, Texas, be monitored by the Justice Department because it had intentionally changed its city council districts to decrease Hispanic influence.

States should be allowed to implement their own laws regarding their elections and voting security to ensure all results are accurate on election day. State and local governments know more about how to handle their elections than bureaucrats in Washington, D.C.

I applaud State and local governments that are taking the necessary steps to modernize and secure their elections. For example, in Arizona, my home State, we have made continual progress on improving voter turnout and participation.

Mr. RASKIN said that the section that was taken out by the courts was genius. Well, I believe the opposite is true.

Arizona was under this outdated preclearance formula, and I can tell you personally that this section was not genius. Both Arizona Democrats and Republicans, alike, thought to have to preclear every single decision that elected election officials made with the Federal bureaucrats in Washington, D.C., was a total disaster.

Arizona now has free, open, and secure elections, despite not being under this Federal control preclearance anymore. Nearly 80 percent of Arizonans vote by mail. We have a robust online voter registration system, so it is easy to register to vote. We have approximately 1 month of early voting.

While Arizona has made voting easier and more accessible for voters, we have also made our elections more secure by outlining the practice of ballot harvesting. In Arizona, we believe it should be easy to vote and hard to cheat. The policies in Arizona seem to be working, as we have seen in election after election that voter turnout continues to grow.

A couple months ago, I had the opportunity to participate in a field hearing in Phoenix, Arizona, to discuss the Voting Rights Act. There, I spoke with staff of the Maricopa County Recorder, an elected Democrat. She relayed to me how disappointed they were to not have been asked to testify at this hearing as they felt that they had not been able to speak to the story of the successes in Arizona and why they were very concerned about H.R. 4. They did not want the Federal Government preclearing every single decision they made.

Think about it: They don't want to have to go back to the Federal Govern-

ment every single time they change early ballots or voting locations. They, instead, are making great progress and strides. Voter turnout has soared. They don't want bureaucrats in Washington, D.C., slowing down important and time-sensitive decisions.

This rule also includes H. Res. 326.

I am curious why my Democratic colleagues decided to bring forward this nonbinding resolution as opposed to bringing up H.R. 336, a bill that I am personally a proud cosponsor of, which is identical to the text of S. 1, the Strengthening America's Security in the Middle East Act of 2019, which passed the Senate by a vote of 77-23—totally bipartisan—on February 5, 2019. Instead of the nonbinding resolution we have before us today, H.R. 336 would take concrete steps to counter the BDS movement against Israel.

□ 1245

Instead, I am saddened the Democrats brought up this resolution, a resolution that rebukes and ties the hands of the Trump administration and embarrasses Israel. In fact, the resolution expressly states a proposal must be put forward that is consistent with previous administrations' proposals, completely undercutting the Trump administration. This should not be a partisan issue with only Democrat sponsors and not one Republic cosponsor as this bill has. We should not be handicapping our President.

My Republican colleagues on the Foreign Affairs Committee tell me that a resolution that supports a two-state solution, without attempting to undermine the President, could have been bipartisan. However, this resolution singles out settlement expansion and annexation. These are some of the most delicate issues in our bilateral relationship with Israel, and it shines a spotlight on them in the middle of an ongoing and contentious time in Israel.

The resolution spells out specific Palestinian Authority demands without listing critical Israeli preconditions, such as acknowledging Israel's right to exist as a Jewish state with an undivided Jerusalem as Israel's capital and providing assurances for Israel's safety and security through a demilitarized zone.

As a whole, this resolution disproportionately criticizes the Israeli Government while failing to recognize the dangerous actions targeting innocent Israelis that further remove the possibility of peace.

We already voted to support a two-state solution over the summer in H. Res. 246 in a bipartisan manner.

So why do we need this partisan bill?

So, Madam Speaker, I urge opposition to this rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. My good friend from Arizona chides me for having described section 5, the preclearance requirement of the Voting Rights Act, as genius, which is amazing to me because this has been a bipartisan national commitment and a

bipartisan commitment in Congress since 1965 when it passed on a bipartisan basis, since 1982 when it was reauthorized on a bipartisan basis, and since 2006 when President Bush signed it, as well, and celebrated it.

So we have had Presidents Bush, Clinton, and Obama, a continuous array of Presidents, supporting it, and Congresses supporting it.

If you don't have it, here is what happens: The NAACP Legal Defense Fund testified to us about successful litigation they had in Texas against a restrictive voter ID law that had discriminatory racial impact. They won on the lawsuit under section 2, but it was too late.

In the meantime, who was elected in Texas?

A U.S. Senator, all 36 Members of the House of Representatives, a Governor, a lieutenant governor, and so on.

The reason why section 5 is genius and why we need to restore the preclearance formula is because it requires States to submit in advance laws that could be potentially discriminatory.

I was amazed to hear again the language of federalizing control and a Federal takeover of elections when this has been a bipartisan commitment for decades grounded in the Constitution of the United States which tells us in Article I, Section 4 we can regulate elections; Section 2 of the Fifteenth Amendment saying we can regulate elections to prevent race discrimination; Section 5 of the Fourteenth Amendment, and the republican Guarantee Clause, which tells us we must guarantee to people of the States a republican form of government, which means representative government based on democracy.

Finally, I will allow my friend to portray what is going on in her State her way, and she paints a lovely picture. I would just refer her to page 25 of the Judiciary Committee report which says that in Arizona polling places were closed throughout the State, many with significant populations of Latino voters, in advance of the 2016 election. Maricopa County, 31 percent Latino, closed 171 polling places, Mohave County closed 34, and so on. So there is another story to be told there which is embodied in the work.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GOTTHEIMER).

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. Madam Speaker, I thank Mr. RASKIN for yielding me time.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the rule which adopts bipartisan language which I introduced with my good friends, Congressman TOM REED and Congressman TED DEUTCH, reaffirming the United States' ironclad commitment to providing security assistance to our historic ally, Israel, which, as ever, is key to America's national security in the region, especially in our fight against terror.

This vote officially puts to rest the splinter view of adding new conditions

on aid to Israel and reinforces our historic commitment to restoring a two-state solution.

I want to thank my good friend, House Foreign Affairs Committee Chairman ELIOT ENGEL, for his leadership on this issue and for including our language in his manager's amendment.

Madam Speaker, as we have seen in recent weeks, Israel, the democracy in the region, faces threats like no other country of missile and rocket attacks from terrorist organizations, including Hamas, Hezbollah, and Palestinian Islamic Jihad, as well as the ongoing threat of Iranian-backed forces in Syria.

Vital security assistance to Israel, including missile defense funding for Iron Dome, David's Sling, and Arrow 3, helps our ally to defend itself and preserve its qualitative military edge in the region. That is why in 2016 under the Obama administration, the U.S. and Israel signed a 10-year Memorandum of Understanding which constituted the single largest pledge of security assistance to Israel in America history. The MOU also increased the amount of defense dollars that go to U.S. businesses here at home, with as much as \$1.2 billion a year invested in the United States.

We know that this aid helps save countless lives, and we know that the United States is better off when Israel is fully equipped to defend itself. That is why I led a bipartisan amendment with my colleagues, Congressman REED and Congressman DEUTCH, which reaffirms our commitment to providing this assistance without additional conditions or exceptions.

Our amendment was cosponsored by a total of 36 Members of Congress, Republicans and Democrats, who know that this assistance should not be subject to politics. I deeply appreciate all of our colleagues' support for our amendment, for this vital, lifesaving assistance, and for the bipartisan U.S.-Israel relationship.

This language is absolutely necessary because of the extreme and misguided views of some, especially several currently running for our Nation's highest office, who seemingly believe that assistance to Israel should be held hostage until Israel makes concessions according to their beliefs, including how Israel treats Gaza, which is controlled by the foreign terrorist organization Hamas.

We must stand together in rejecting that harmful view—as one Senator called it, the view of having leverage against Israel, our ally.

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

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentleman from New Jersey 10 additional seconds.

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. Madam Speaker, when our ally, Israel, faces more than 450 rockets fired by Palestinian and Jihad terrorists in Gaza, it must have the ability to defend itself, no matter what.

That is why with this vote we commit ourselves to strengthening the U.S.-Israel relationship by ensuring that we fulfill our guarantee to provide vital security assistance to the key democracy in the region.

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

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS).

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I thank my good friend, Mrs. LESKO, for her participation in the Election Subcommittee hearing in Phoenix.

Also, Madam Speaker, I want to thank you personally for your hard work in making sure that every person throughout this great Nation gets that opportunity to vote and for your work in furthering civil discussion and civil rights in your career.

Madam Speaker, I do rise in opposition to the rule for H.R. 4 today.

The Voting Rights Act is currently in place. The bill that we will be debating tomorrow is not a reauthorization of this important and historically bipartisan legislation that has prevented discrimination at the ballot box.

It has only been since the U.S. Supreme Court decision in *Shelby County v. Holder* that Democrats have decided to politicize the Voting Rights Act. This landmark decision left the vast majority of the Voting Rights Act in place.

What it struck down was 40-year-old data and the formula used to determine which States were to be placed under the control of the Department of Justice, known as preclearance. The Supreme Court deemed this data and formula was no longer accurate nor relevant for our country's current climate.

The 2013 opinion held that regardless of how to look at the record, no one can fairly say that it shows anything approaching the pervasive, flagrant, widespread, and rampant discrimination that faced Congress in 1965, and that clearly distinguished the covered jurisdictions from the rest of the Nation.

So what does H.R. 4 do?

It doubles down and would attempt to put every State and jurisdiction under preclearance. This is a bill to federalize elections, regardless of what my colleagues have said in this institution today. During last night's Rules Committee meeting, it became clear that the majority was unable to determine the number of States or jurisdictions that would be covered by this preclearance if H.R. 4 were to become law tomorrow. Apparently, we have to pass this bill before the American people can even find out if they would be subjected to it.

This is a proposition that the majority knows is bad policy, and it is a non-starter for myself, my colleagues in this Chamber, and those in the other body across this Capitol, the Supreme Court, too, but perhaps most importantly, the thousands of local election

officials across the country who would be crippled if this bill were to ever become law.

H.R. 4, the Voting Rights Advancement Act, is not a Voting Rights Act reauthorization bill. This is only about preclearance and the Democratic majority giving the Department of Justice control over all election activity.

While it is not in my committee's jurisdiction in the House Administration Committee, our Subcommittee on Elections majority held seven field hearings and one listening session across the U.S., encompassing eight different States and over 13,000 miles of air travel. Even with this gargantuan effort, the Democrats were still unable to produce a single voter who wanted to vote and was unable to cast a ballot.

This is a great thing. We ought to celebrate it. Credit should be given to the Voting Rights Act for helping to achieve this. The 2018 midterm election produced the highest voting turnout in four decades according to data from the Census Bureau, especially among minority voters. That, again, should be celebrated.

Sections 2 and 3 of the Voting Rights Act that are currently in effect are continuing to safeguard the public from discrimination at the ballot box. Every eligible American who wants to vote in our country's elections should be able to cast a ballot. That is why we have the Voting Rights Act, a great example of a bipartisan solution that is working to help Americans today and protecting Americans from discrimination.

Unfortunately, H.R. 4 is just a political attempt from the Democrats to give the Federal Government more control over how States run their elections. I have now seen four voting bills from the majority come to this floor. All of them have one common theme, and that is to federalize elections.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this rule.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Alabama (Ms. SEWELL), who has been such a magnificent leader on this legislation.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, today I proudly rise to support the rule on H.R. 4, the Voting Rights Advancement Act of 2019.

Voting rights are primal. They are the cornerstone of our democracy. No right is more precious to our citizenship than the right of all Americans to be able to vote. When Americans are not able to cast their ballots, their votes are silenced, and we, especially as elected officials, should be alarmed if any American who wants to cast a ballot is unable to cast a ballot.

What H.R. 4 does is it restores the Voting Rights Act of 1965 by giving a new coverage formula. In fact, the Roberts Court specifically said in striking down section 4(b) that it was outdated. So H.R. 4 is our effort, the efforts of three committees, hours of testimony, lots and lots of stakeholders, and lots

and lots of people who were American citizens not able to vote; it is that effort that led to a narrowly tailored new coverage formula. That new coverage formula does not look back to the 1960s or to the 1970s. It looks back 25 years, that is 1994 and going forward.

It requires adjudicated violations of voter discrimination. It is narrowly tailored, and it hits the mark as to what the Supreme Court requires us to do in saying that Congress could feel free to update its coverage formula.

The Supreme Court and Roberts, in his opinion, also said that voter discrimination still existed. It admitted that it still existed. And H.R. 4 is our effort to actually provide a modern-day voter coverage formula that will allow States and jurisdictions with the most egregious forms of discrimination to be required to preclear.

□ 1300

The Shelby v. Holder decision originated out of Shelby County, Alabama. I am honored every day to represent Alabama's Seventh Congressional District. It is a district that knows all too well the importance of voting.

You see, my district includes not only Birmingham and Montgomery but my hometown of Selma, Alabama. It was on a bridge in my hometown that our colleague JOHN LEWIS and so many other foot soldiers bled on that bridge for the equal right of all Americans to be able to vote.

This is exactly what H.R. 4 does. It restores the full protections of the Voting Rights Act of 1965. In so doing, it provides a mechanism by which the most egregious States and localities must preclear before the elections. It is so hard to unring the bell once an election has already taken place. So section 2, while it has been used to litigate and to get good results, it only can occur after the election has taken place.

So I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that this is not only an important piece of legislation for our Nation to ensure that every American—American—who has the ability, who is 18 years of age or older, has the right to access a ballot box.

It is clear to me that since the Shelby v. Holder decision, so many States have now instituted voter discrimination laws. Some of them have been in the guise of voter fraud, but the Brennan Center and so many others have found that voter fraud happens minusculely in any election.

It is not about voter fraud. It is about voter suppression, suppressing the voices of certain Americans. And that is un-American, Mr. Speaker.

Just the 2018 midterm elections alone highlight the voter discrimination that occurred.

In Georgia, the Republican candidate for Governor used his power as secretary of state to put 53,000 voter registrations on hold, nearly 70 percent of which belonged to African American voters.

In North Dakota, Republicans established a new requirement that voters must show an ID that they live at a residential street address. It was not enough that they had a P.O. Box. That law was a barrier to thousands of Native Americans who live on reservations and use P.O. Boxes rather than residential street addresses.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DOGGETT). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, as my colleague from Maryland has shown, in Maricopa County, Arizona, which I think is where the gentlewoman is from, there is still voter discrimination.

Mr. Speaker, this is a seminal piece of legislation that will restore rights for the people. All of us, Republicans and Democrats, should be about making sure it is easier to vote, not harder to vote.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote for the rule and the underlying legislation, H.R. 4.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN), my good friend.

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Arizona for yielding me time and for her strong opposition to this rule.

Let's be clear, H. Res. 326 is a one-sided, partisan, and ill-timed resolution. This past summer, Members of this Chamber came to the floor and passed, almost unanimously, a very strong statement opposing the Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions movement, as well as much of the language that is in this resolution, H. Res. 326. This is actually a watered-down version of what we passed last summer. There is nothing in this resolution that we didn't already pass almost unanimously last summer.

So, what happened? We woke up the day after that resolution passed last summer, and the Republicans wanted to pass legislation with teeth. I know that we have a lot of strong, bipartisan support for passing legislation with teeth, S.1/H.R. 336, legislation that already passed the Senate with almost 80 votes. But, unfortunately, for some of my colleagues, they woke up the next day and instead of wanting to pass legislation with teeth that would do something about it, do something about that strong statement that we made, we have been seeing this resolution passed as the main effort for the second half of this year.

In the last 2 years, Israel has been hit by over 2,600 rockets and mortars, and 1,500 of those rockets were fired from the Gaza Strip into Israel in the past year alone. Last week, every headline in the region was about Israel being bombarded with over 450 rockets, and that was just one moment in time.

This resolution fails to not only recognize these latest attacks but all the

persistent assaults on innocent Israelis by Palestinian terrorists. Notice this resolution is reprimanding Israel, but it says nothing about Palestinian terrorists.

My friend on the other side of the aisle, when he was giving his opening remarks, was reprimanding Israel and didn't say anything about Palestinian terrorists murdering innocent Israelis; nothing about the pay-to-slay program where the Palestinians financially reward terrorism and incite violence; nothing about Hamas denying humanitarian aid, calling jihad an obligation, and saying that they do not recognize Israel as a Jewish state.

This reality is lost in this resolution. This resolution completely fails to mention that Israel has made repeated attempts to offer peace proposals to the Palestinian Authority. Time and again, the Palestinian Authority has rejected peace proposals because they refuse publicly and privately to accept a Jewish state in Israel.

This resolution is silent on fundamental facts that shape the way Israel has dealt with this constant threat on its border. This resolution chooses to reference President Obama's policy toward Israel while intentionally leaving out President Trump's policy, ensuring a partisan outcome for this resolution.

Support for Israel in this Chamber has long been bipartisan. For whatever reason, the majority is choosing to advance in the resolution tomorrow that is going to have one of the most partisan votes to ever take place regarding Israel in the history of the House of Representatives. Congratulations.

H. Res. 326 undercuts the administration's efforts to strengthen our critical alliance with our greatest ally, Israel, and the timing of this vote is fooling no one. This resolution is a clear rebuke to the Trump administration's recent reversal of the Obama administration's targeting of Israel with U.N. Security Council Resolution 2334.

If House Democrats want to pass bipartisan legislation with teeth, they should bring S.1/H.R. 336, which has already passed the Senate, as I mentioned, with strong, bipartisan support and was introduced by Congressman MICHAEL MCCAUL in the House. There is even a discharge petition led by Congressman BRIAN MAST for this bill that has almost 200 signatures on it. If it came to a vote in this Chamber, it would pass.

How about we focus on passing legislation that gets through the House? It has already been through the Senate. It will be signed by the President. We will be doing something about that strong statement that we made last summer.

I urge all of my colleagues to vote against this rule and against this partisan resolution.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, all I will observe is that the gentleman from New York oddly begins by attacking a resolution for being a recycled version of language we have already adopted on

a massive bipartisan basis in the House. Then he closes by attacking us for this resolution being partisan and divisive in some way. Obviously, those two things don't match up.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Voting rights guarantee all of our other rights. When Americans are obstructed from freely participating in elections, our democracy is imperiled.

This bill, six long years overdue, restores a key provision of the Voting Rights Act that was wrongfully nullified by Republican-appointed justices.

How troubling that a law that President Lyndon Johnson long ago secured now is being obstructed, while our home State of Texas has become ground zero for voter suppression. State Republicans have aggressively, illegally purged voting rolls. They eliminated mobile voting to quash especially student and senior voters. They enacted a cumbersome voter ID law. And they horribly, illegally gerrymandered our State.

Republicans split 100 voting precincts to create the district which I serve today, creating one of the most crooked districts that weaken the accessibility and accountability of Congress Members. A three-judge Federal court with two Republican-appointed judges unanimously condemned Texas redistricting as intentional racially discriminatory intent in its work.

Fortunately, the Texas Civil Rights Project, MoveTexas, LULAC, and other groups have challenged the suppression, but this bill is essential to offer the protection that they, and our democracy, deserve.

We need preclearance in Texas. We need preclearance to clear away all the obstacles Republicans insist on imposing to ensure that our State remains a voter nonparticipation State for democracy.

Madam Speaker, let's support H.R. 4. Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

If we defeat the previous question, I will bring to the floor H.R. 2207, the Protect Medical Innovation Act of 2019, which most people know as the bill that will eliminate the medical device tax.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. SEWELL of Alabama). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, H.R. 2207 was introduced by Mr. KIND from Wisconsin, and it has 253 bipartisan cosponsors, including myself.

Since the medical device tax was imposed by the Affordable Care Act, commonly known as ObamaCare, folks

have known that it was detrimental to innovation and to patient access to necessary devices and treatments. The 2.3 percent excise tax has been suspended twice because we know it is bad policy. So what are we waiting for?

Madam Speaker, we should be bringing legislation to this floor that showcases how we can work together. The American people need to see us united on issues as important as this. We need to stand together when opportunities like these arise to better the lives and truly help all of our constituencies. H.R. 2207 does just that.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. WALORSKI).

Mrs. WALORSKI. Madam Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to oppose the previous question.

If we defeat the previous question, Republicans will amend the rule to include the repeal of the medical device tax.

The medical device tax takes effect on January 1, 2020, unless Congress acts. Time is of the essence. Yet, my friends across the aisle continue to waste our time and energy and, more importantly, clock time that we need to stop this tax from going into effect.

This is a bipartisan bill with 253 of us cosponsoring it. All I am asking is that the 253 cosponsors get an opportunity before this expires to say stop this, stop the wheels from grinding. Let's do something that counts for our fellow Americans, for senior citizens who are the recipients of a lot of these medical device implants.

It brings quality of life. Oftentimes, it brings the extension of very important quality of life to seniors. It is less time in hospitals. It has been proven—back up on people's feet to engage back in the workforce and their part of the American Dream.

Instead of having nothing happening in a bipartisan way, as our fellow Americans are watching what is happening in this House, if 253 of us agree on this today, we can stop this onerous tax. We can stop costing healthcare and the exorbitant amount of increases sent back down to all of our constituents.

This is a big deal in the State of Indiana, where I come from. What we do in the State of Indiana with 300 medical device manufacturing companies supporting nearly 55,000 good-paying jobs—nationally, the industry directly employs over half a million people.

□ 1315

It is no understatement to say that thousands of jobs are at stake if the medical device tax comes back in 26 days. When the tax was in effect for the 3 years of 2012 to 2015, industry lost almost 30,000 jobs nationwide, according to government data.

Madam Speaker, we should be focusing on important, urgent, bipartisan issues like this. We can do something together to make our constituents and to make our Nation better.

I urge my colleagues to support this important bill. Twenty-six days to go. We can work together. Over 250 of us are cosponsoring this legislation.

I ask, on behalf of every citizen, everybody working in the medical device industry, and for the sake of our own economy, let's do something that makes sense for this country.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time to close.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, in closing, H.R. 4 is totally partisan, without one Republican cosponsor; and H. Res. 326, another totally partisan bill, ties the Trump administration's hands and embarrasses Israel.

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

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

I want to thank my friend from Arizona, who rightfully invites us to focus on legislation that will bring us together.

The gentlewoman from Indiana, who I have not had the good fortune of meeting yet, accuses me of wasting not just time, but something called "clock time," which sounds like a really low blow.

In any event, I think our legislation actually will bring us together and should bring us together. The rule is for two pieces of legislation that I thought ought to have and would have complete bipartisan support.

The first is simply to update the preclearance coverage formula, section 4(b) in the Voting Rights Act, as we were instructed to do by the Supreme Court in the *Shelby County v. Holder* decision.

The Voting Rights Act is the product of a massive political and social struggle in the country to make America move forward, but it had been supported by huge bipartisan majorities in 1965, in 1982, and in 2006. Yet, today, our friends across the aisle now attack it as a Federal takeover of State elections, which is absolutely flabbergasting that the Republican Party, the party of Lincoln, is now attacking the Voting Rights Act and the preclearance requirement for being some kind of assault on Federalism when it vindicates the right of all Americans to vote, as we are not only authorized to do under the 14th and 15th Amendments, but we are obligated to do under the republican Guarantee Clause to make sure that all Americans are in a representative relationship with their government.

So I invite them to come on back over to this side of the Voting Rights Act.

Obviously, we are all for a two-state solution, as American Presidents of both parties have been for, for the last several decades, so I invite them to come back over for that, too.

This resolution cannot be both a tired rehash of everything we have done in the past, as was claimed, but

also some kind of partisan departure. The partisan departure is on their side.

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

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

#### AMENDMENT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 741

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 3. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall proceed to the consideration in the House of the bill (H.R. 2207) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on medical devices. 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 ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 4. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 2207.

Mr. RASKIN. 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.

Mrs. LESKO. 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.

### INSIDER TRADING PROHIBITION ACT

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2534 and to insert extraneous material thereon.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 739 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2534.

The Chair appoints the gentlewoman from Alabama (Ms. SEWELL) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1321

#### IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2534) to amend the Securities Exchange Act of

1934 to prohibit certain securities trading and related communications by those who possess material, nonpublic information, with Ms. SEWELL of Alabama in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services.

The gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Chairwoman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chairwoman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2534, the Insider Trading Prohibition Act, introduced by the gentleman from Connecticut, Representative JIM HIMES.

This long overdue bill creates a clear definition of illegal insider trading under the securities laws so that there is a codified, consistent standard for courts and market participants to better protect the hard-earned savings of millions of Americans and bring certainty to the U.S. securities market.

For nearly 80 years, the Securities and Exchange Commission—that is, the SEC—has sought to hold corporate insiders accountable for insider trading through general statutory antifraud provisions and rules it has promulgated under those provisions. This has resulted in a web of court decisions that generally prohibit insiders with a duty of trust and confidence to a corporation from secretly trading on material, nonpublic corporate information for their own personal gain.

These insiders are also generally prohibited from tipping outsiders, known as tippees, who then trade on the information themselves, even though they know it was wrongfully obtained.

But, because there isn't a statutory definition of "insider trading," there is uncertainty around who is subject to insider trading prohibitions; and, with various court decisions, liability for this type of violation has shifted.

For example, in 2014, an appeals court added a brand-new requirement that the tippee must not just know that information was wrongfully disclosed but must also know about the specific personal benefit that the insider received.

This decision has severely hampered the SEC's ability to prosecute insider trading cases and, according to Preet Bharara, the former U.S. attorney for the Southern District of New York "provides a virtual roadmap for savvy hedge fund managers to insulate themselves from tippee liability by knowingly placing themselves at the end of a chain of insider information and avoiding learning details about the sources of obvious confidential and improperly disclosed information."

So I am pleased that this bill codifies existing case law and overturns this new controversial requirement, creating a clear, consistent standard for the SEC, the courts, and market participants to follow, and does so in a way that, as Columbia Law School professor John Coffee testified before one of our subcommittees, “expands liability in ways that should not be controversial.”

I would like to commend Representative HIMES for his efforts since the bill was marked up in May in committee to ensure that it fairly reflects existing law. In addition to extensive outreach to current and former regulators and prosecutors, investor advocates, and institutional investors, Mr. HIMES also repeatedly engaged with our colleagues on the opposite side of the aisle.

As a result, Ranking Member MCHENRY will offer an amendment which will remove unnecessary ambiguities, clarify the intent of the bill to reflect existing insider trading case law, and ensure that the bill preserves the SEC’s ability to bring bad actors to justice under other related insider trading laws.

I plan to support this amendment as a reasonable bipartisan compromise, so I urge all Members to support this commonsense bill that makes the definition of illegal trading very clear for all so that the SEC can effectively crack down on corporate insiders who illegally trade on inside information.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Chair, preventing fraud and abuse within our financial system and cracking down on bad actors for illegal insider trading is a nonpartisan priority. This kind of fraud and illegal activity hurts everyday investors, and it also makes our markets less efficient, accurate, and reliable.

Current law prohibits trading on material insider information in breach of a fiduciary duty under the antifraud provisions of the Federal securities law.

The Securities and Exchange Commission and the Department of Justice are the Federal agencies tasked with enforcing insider trading. Both agencies regularly use their authority by bringing insider trading cases against bad actors who violate our insider trading laws.

The SEC has not asked for this bill, however, unlike other bills that Republicans have voted for out of this House in the past month. Moreover, Democrats have not fully identified a problem within the current body of the law that inhibits the prosecution of bad actors who illegally trade on material, nonpublic information.

As it is written before us on the floor at this moment, this bill could potentially create more confusion and uncertainty within the law of insider trading. It could even expand liability for

good faith traders, which would hurt the efficiencies of our markets, chill vital information gathering, and weaken investor confidence.

Republican and Democrat SEC chairs alike, with vastly different approaches to enforcement matters, have expressed concern over Congress codifying a prohibition on insider trading into one single statute. Specifically, they voiced concerns that Congress would write a law that could be both overly broad and too narrow at the same time.

I share their concerns with the bill as drafted before us today, and I am pleased to hear that the chair has indicated that the majority will be accepting the ranking member’s amendment shortly.

I am concerned that the current version of the bill, however, does not include an explicit personal benefit test, as set forth by the Supreme Court precedents. I am troubled that an unclear phrasing such as “relating to the market” is overbroad and will allow judges and prosecutors to expand the law.

I am also concerned that the bill, as drafted, lacks an exclusivity provision that would make this bill the exclusive law of the land.

Finally, the rule of construction section before us is troubling, because the Financial Services Committee has not even had a chance to debate this specific language. I fear that this language could add more confusion and uncertainty around insider trading laws, with rogue judges and prosecutors using the language to expand the bounds of insider trading law.

I do believe that the ranking member’s amendment goes a distance in clarifying that, but, as I will talk about, I will be having an amendment later on as well that I believe further clarifies that.

□ 1330

Drafting a statute that appropriately and accurately captures the subtleties of insider trading case law and regulations that have been shaped and finessed over decades into one single statute isn’t easy, to say the least.

Achieving bipartisan support also isn’t easy, especially when it involves nuanced and technical substance such as the body of insider trading law.

My colleague, Ranking Member MCHENRY, will be offering his amendment momentarily that represents a bipartisan agreement with the author to improve the bill by including some Republican priorities and improving the bill to better track current insider trading law.

As I had mentioned, I will be offering an amendment as well in an attempt to further clarify and improve this proposal.

So, while we are unsure exactly what the final product is going to look like here, I do want to commend both Mr. HIMES and Ranking Member MCHENRY for working together to attempt to

reach a bipartisan agreement to improve this bill with the amendment and to make it clear that it is Congress’ intent to codify existing law without broadening it into new areas. I hope that the author of the legislation will accept my amendment as well.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. HIMES), the chair of the Strategic Technologies and Advanced Research Subcommittee of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, and a valued member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. HIMES. Madam Chair, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

I rise, delighted today by our consideration of H.R. 2534, the Insider Trading Prohibition Act, because, after years of work, we are going to produce a bipartisan product which actually does address a significant challenge in insider trading law, and that is, in general, that, to date, there has existed, remarkably, no specific statutory prohibition on insider trading.

I am a believer, as I know everyone else in this Chamber is, that, if we are going to create criminal or civil liability, the legislators of the Congress of the United States should make specific how and when and under what circumstances we do so. And that is what we are doing today, I am delighted to report, in bipartisan fashion.

But let me back up for a second, for those who don’t sit on the committee or watch this particular space all that closely, just to explain why this is important.

Insider trading is an activity in which somebody who has information that they have been entrusted with, or for which they have paid or come by in some dishonest fashion, uses it to secure a market advantage. They have information that others don’t. They trade on that information. That allows them to get a material gain.

There is a problem with that, quite apart from the notion that it is only insiders or those people who are not acting based on their talent or their intelligence or their hard work, but acting based on who they know or, worse yet, who they might have paid, that they are the ones who benefit from our capital markets. I think that notion sort of strikes at the fundamental sense of fairness that we all carry around.

But, inasmuch as this behavior exists, it is profoundly damaging to the capital markets that are such a hallmark of the United States, and it is damaging because those capital markets rely on the confidence that millions of American families have out there that their hard-earned savings can be put into the market, invested, and redeployed in a way that is fair to them, that will create a return, and that they are doing so on a level playing field, not competing with people who may have an inside advantage.

Now, the good news here is that, in the generations preceding us, we have, in fact, prosecuted insider trading, but we have done so under antifraud provisions of the Securities Acts that were passed in the early 1930s; and, as a result, there is not a particularly good fit between the concept of fraud and the concept of insider trading.

And to my friend Mr. HUIZENGA's point, as he knows, this has led to a vast body of court-determined law, starting with the Dirks decision in 1984, moving through *Materia*, *Carpenter*, *O'Hagan*, all court decisions which crafted the concept of liability around insider trading, culminating in the 2014 Newman decision by the Second Circuit, leading then to the *Salman* decision at the Supreme Court in 2016.

All of these cases that I have mentioned have created uncertainty about the nature of liability and have resulted in overturned convictions of people who behaved in ways that would violate our intuitive sense of right and wrong.

So, because of this uncertainty, because of the overturning of convictions, now is the moment for us to finally do what we are here to do, which is to make it very clear what the law of the land is.

So the moment has come to pass this legislation, and I am delighted to say it comes after years of working with experts like the aforementioned Professor John Coffee, past and present Commissioners of the Securities and Exchange Commission, and consultation with prosecutors as well as with defense attorneys.

This is a fairly fiddly and technical area of the law, and so it was my intention, over the years, to make sure that we crafted good law which created liability for bad behavior but which did not, in fact, create liability for behavior like doing a little extra work to secure an advantage in investments.

It was also very, very important to me that this be done on a bipartisan basis. There is really nothing partisan about this bill. Neither party believes in insider trading or wants to support insider trading. This is not a question of balancing regulation or allocating public resources; this is a question of clarity of law.

So I want to close, apart from just saying that that has been the track record of the establishment and writing of this legislation, by thanking Ranking Member MCHENRY and Ranking Member HUIZENGA.

There will be an amendment offered by Ranking Member MCHENRY which the Democrats support. It does improve the bill. It is not really a compromise in the sense that it actually makes for a better bill.

But I am pleased to say that, after a lot of hard work, this is, in fact, the product of some very robust engagement between the Democratic and Republican Representatives in this Chamber. That is not easy to achieve under these circumstances.

So I want to start, first and foremost, by thanking Chairwoman WATERS and Chairwoman MALONEY for their sponsorship and then, again, Mr. MCHENRY and Mr. HUIZENGA, who committed to really understanding what is a technical corner of the law and offered, in good faith, amendments, including some ideas that we will shortly be taking up.

And then, finally, as every Member in this Chamber knows, hard work happens and gets done and leads to success only because of the commitment and very, very hard work of the staff on both sides of the aisle. So, before yielding back my time to the chairwoman, I do want to specifically thank Katelynn Bradley, Ben Harney, David Fernandez, and David Karp from the Financial Services staff; Mark Snyder, my legislative director, and Rachel Kelly, his predecessor, from my staff.

And then, on the Republican side, big thanks to Kimberly Betz, McArn Bennett, and Jamie McGinnis.

Madam Chair, I urge passage of this law. This will be a good thing for the confidence in our capital markets. It will be a good thing in reassuring the American public that we can get things done on a bipartisan basis. On that basis, I urge passage of H.R. 2534, the Insider Trading Prohibition Act.

Mr. HUIZENGA. Madam Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. STEIL), the newest member of the Investor Protection, Entrepreneurship, and Capital Markets Subcommittee.

Mr. STEIL. Madam Chair, I thank my colleague from Michigan. Our districts touch in the middle of Lake Michigan, so I have never been to that part of my district, and maybe the gentleman has not either, but I appreciate him yielding.

I rise today to urge support of the Insider Trading Prohibition Act.

I want to thank Chairwoman WATERS, Ranking Member MCHENRY, as well as Mr. HUIZENGA and Mr. HIMES for their work on this important piece of legislation.

As we have seen far too often in this Congress, partisanship and poison pills can get in the way of progress and good ideas. I think all of us, at our core, agree on that. Although this took a little bit of time, I am pleased that we came here today reaching agreements from earlier in the week.

I spent my time working for a period of time at a publicly traded company. I saw firsthand the importance of having markets that operate efficiently but, also, fairly.

Millions of Americans have retirement accounts, 401(k)s, and pensions as it relates to their retirement, and it is critical that those individuals can rely and trust the markets that they are relying on for their end of life.

Millions of Americans are invested in these markets and these investments, the integrity of which is critical. They need to know that we are fighting on their behalf to ensure the game is not

rigged to help and favor a privileged few.

This bill includes, in particular, important clarifications that will improve our ability to police insider trading. It also incorporates changes supported by the ranking member in an amendment that I offered that I think provides important clarifications to allow the government to go after the bad guys.

This will ensure the bill is targeted at bad behavior and does not inadvertently prevent people from engaging in legitimate trades. It strikes the balance that I think is crucial if we want to have vibrant and trustworthy public markets.

I, again, want to urge my colleagues to support this nonpartisan legislation.

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

Mr. HUIZENGA. Madam Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY), the distinguished ranking member.

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Chair, I thank the ranking member of the Investor Protection, Entrepreneurship, and Capital Markets Subcommittee, Mr. HUIZENGA, for his good work in committee and working on important legislation for economic growth and for his constituents in Michigan.

Madam Chair, preventing and punishing bad actors for illegal insider trading is one of the top priorities of Republicans on the House Financial Services Committee because this illegal activity hurts everyday Main Street investors as well as the integrity and the efficiency of our markets.

Trading on material insider information in breach of a fiduciary duty is currently prohibited by court-made law under the antifraud provisions of the Federal securities laws that we have. The Securities and Exchange Commission and the Department of Justice have the power to bring insider trading cases, and both agencies regularly exercise this power and have done so for decades.

Our body of insider trading laws has been developed through those decades of judicial precedent to protect investors and the markets by punishing bad actors who illegally trade on insider information.

Codifying nuanced case law and regulations that have been developed over decades into a single statute is really difficult. It is a very difficult undertaking, and it is, really, a very delicate piece of legislating that must occur.

Both Republicans and Democrats who have served on the Securities and Exchange Commission have expressed concerns about Congress drafting a statute that accurately captures this extensive and expansive body of law without expanding it into new areas, inadvertently, perhaps, or perfectly by design in some areas.

Moreover, bipartisanship is never easy. It is a give-and-take. It is a difficult process. I appreciate the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. HIMES)

for his willingness to work with us in a bipartisan manner.

The bill on the floor today is not perfect, and, as the gentleman from Connecticut knows, I have several concerns with this bill.

I have concerns about the lack of an explicit personal benefit test consistent with Supreme Court precedent.

I am concerned that ambiguous language currently in the bill, such as “relating to the market,” is ripe for activist judges and overzealous prosecutors and private plaintiffs to exploit, leading to greater uncertainty for anyone involved in investing. That is not what we want; that is not what we seek; and that should not be this undertaking. And I also don’t believe that that is the intention of my colleague from Connecticut in the drafting of this bill.

I am also troubled that the Rules Committee print before us does not include an exclusivity provision establishing that this bill is the insider trading law rather than just an additional action around insider trading.

Finally, the Rules Committee print includes a rule of construction section that has yet to be vetted through the Financial Services Committee; and without a full understanding of the implications of this language, the bill could further open the door for activist judges, overzealous prosecutors, and trial lawyers, creating even more confusion around insider trading law.

□ 1345

That is not good for investors. That is not good for our markets. It is not good for anyone outside of a narrow few that personally benefit through fees around lawsuits.

My amendment, which I will offer in a minute, addresses some of these concerns, and I appreciate my colleague from Connecticut, and I appreciate the chair of the Financial Services Committee, Ms. WATERS, for their engagement so that we can actually come to a bipartisan agreement on this important act.

Now, Republicans continue to support sensible bipartisan insider trading bills, such as the one that Chairwoman WATERS and I brought forth, or she brought forth, as the first action of our committee on this House floor in this Congress, which was promoting Transparent Standards for Corporate Insiders Act, which we passed out of this Chamber. And starting off with the fact that we are going to be tough on bad actors from the Financial Services Committee and doing it in a bipartisan way shows our seriousness. And this bill before us is an addition to that seriousness that we take against bad actors in our area of jurisdiction.

Finally, I would say this: We currently have out of decades of lawsuits, decades of regulatory enforcement, we have the greatest clarity on insider trading that we have ever had in this Nation, and that is due to two Supreme Court cases, in particular, giving us serious rules of the road. And I think

that clarity is good. And what we want out of this legislation is to put in statute what is confirmed and established currently in the marketplace and currently in the courts of law.

This is not to create more confusion or more lawsuits, but rather, codify what is a well-regulated, bright-line space that we currently have. And we want to take that consistency that we currently have and establish it in statute. And that is the reason why Republicans have engaged deeply with Democrats over the last 5 months to come to some reasonable conclusion on this important matter of banning insider trading.

So Congress will have its say. I believe we will have a bipartisan vote for final passage, if my amendment is adopted, and I would hope that that would take place. And we have had good conversations along those lines, and I think we have workable language that could be acceptable to all in this body.

I want to thank everyone who has participated, but most particularly Mr. HIMES from Connecticut. While we don’t agree on every issue—heck, I don’t think you would get reelected in Connecticut if you agreed with me on every issue, nor I in North Carolina in my district—bipartisanship is a hard thing, but if we are going to do big, important things, we have to try for that. And when you are in the majority, it is implicit you have more votes than those in the minority.

So Democrats could pass this bill on their own. They could. And if they wanted to just use this as a political issue, they could just jam the language they have; they could, right? But it was your willingness to reach out, so that we could actually have a big bipartisan vote, rather than a narrow victory. That is also something that is a marker, that most in this country don’t hear about, that we actually do talk. We may disagree on big things, we may, and from time to time Chairwoman WATERS and I have had our public disagreements, but at the same time we have been able to come to terms on important things in our jurisdiction and get things done.

So while that is not the everyday case for this Congress, when it happens, I think we should actually acknowledge it. Not that anybody is going to pat us on the back for it, but we should acknowledge it.

I thank my colleagues on the Democrat side of the aisle for their work, and I thank my colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle for their work, as well.

Mr. HUIZENGA. Madam Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Chair, I would like to take this time to, again, congratulate the work that has been done. I do believe that there is additional work that is before us.

I will be having an amendment that I will be offering a little later on, and at this point, I think, as it is coming to-

gether, there still is not going to be total agreement or total unanimity. You will see with the ranking member’s amendment a number of Republicans who will join this bill. I believe that with the adoption of my amendment you would see even further Republican support of the underlying bill.

There will be some dissent. There is dissent within the industry. There is dissent within those prosecutors and the regulators. As I had noted, both Republican and Democrat chairs of the SEC and commissioners of the SEC have said that having Congress act on this particular issue will set off a new chain of events, a new set of legal challenges that will take years to settle in the courts, as well, and they are comfortable with the options that they have the way current law has settled.

Having said that, again, as the ranking member had said, in an attempt to codify a number of those Supreme Court rulings is commendable. I tend to be one who believes that Congress has a responsibility to review and look at and examine whether they should codify precedent.

I find it interesting that on both sides this happens and with the regulators, and that everyone seems to pick and choose a little bit as to what subject area they would like to codify and what subject area they would continue to like to have flexibility on, based on those lawsuits.

At this time the ranking member and his work with the gentleman from Connecticut has made significant progress, and I look forward to adopting the gentleman from North Carolina’s amendment and the potential adoption of my amendment, as well, as we move forward.

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

Ms. WATERS. Madam Chair, I yield myself the remainder of my time.

Madam Chairwoman, H.R. 2534, the Insider Trading Prohibition Act, is a long overdue piece of legislation that simply spells out the definition of illegal insider trading under the securities laws. It creates clarity for participants in financial markets and empowers the SEC to punish bad actors.

As we have discussed, this bill is supported by groups, including the Council of Institutional Investors, the California State Teachers’ Retirement System, the North American Securities Administrators Association, Healthy Markets, and Public Citizen.

Madam Chair, I thank the ranking member, Mr. MCHENRY, for his very kind comments. I thank him for his cooperation. I thank him for recognizing that it is possible to have bipartisan legislation. And I thank him for recognizing that Mr. HIMES has worked very hard to ensure that he would have this as bipartisan legislation, rather than simply having the Democrats try to run roughshod over the opposite side of the aisle to get this done.

I urge all Members to vote “yes” on this important bill. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

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

In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Financial Services, printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116-39, shall be considered as adopted.

The bill, as amended, shall be considered as the original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the 5-minute rule and shall be considered as read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 2534

*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 "Insider Trading Prohibition Act".*

**SEC. 2. PROHIBITION ON INSIDER TRADING.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—*The Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78a et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 16 the following new section:*

**"SEC. 16A. PROHIBITION ON INSIDER TRADING.**

*"(a) PROHIBITION AGAINST TRADING SECURITIES WHILE AWARE OF MATERIAL, NONPUBLIC INFORMATION.—It shall be unlawful for any person, directly or indirectly, to purchase, sell, or enter into, or cause the purchase or sale of or entry into, any security, security-based swap, or security-based swap agreement, while aware of material, nonpublic information relating to such security, security-based swap, or security-based swap agreement, or relating to the market for such security, security-based swap, or security-based swap agreement, if such person knows, or recklessly disregards, that such information has been obtained wrongfully, or that such purchase or sale would constitute a wrongful use of such information.*

*"(b) PROHIBITION AGAINST THE WRONGFUL COMMUNICATION OF CERTAIN MATERIAL, NONPUBLIC INFORMATION.—It shall be unlawful for any person whose own purchase or sale of a security, security-based swap, or entry into a security-based swap agreement would violate subsection (a), wrongfully to communicate material, nonpublic information relating to such security, security-based swap, or security-based swap agreement, or relating to the market for such security, security-based swap, or security-based swap agreement, to any other person if—*

*"(1) the other person—*

*"(A) purchases, sells, or causes the purchase or sale of, any security or security-based swap or enters into or causes the entry into any security-based swap agreement, to which such communication relates; or*

*"(B) communicates the information to another person who makes or causes such a purchase, sale, or entry while aware of such information; and*

*"(2) such a purchase, sale, or entry while aware of such information is reasonably foreseeable.*

*"(c) STANDARD AND KNOWLEDGE REQUIREMENT.—*

*"(1) STANDARD.—For purposes of this section, trading while aware of material, nonpublic information under subsection (a) or communicating material nonpublic information under subsection (b) is wrongful only if the information has been obtained by, or its communication or use would constitute, directly or indirectly—*

*"(A) theft, bribery, misrepresentation, or espionage (through electronic or other means);*

*"(B) a violation of any Federal law protecting computer data or the intellectual property or privacy of computer users;*

*"(C) conversion, misappropriation, or other unauthorized and deceptive taking of such information; or*

*"(D) a breach of any fiduciary duty, a breach of a confidentiality agreement, a breach of contract, a breach of any code of conduct or ethics policy, or a breach of any other personal or other relationship of trust and confidence.*

*"(2) KNOWLEDGE REQUIREMENT.—It shall not be necessary that the person trading while aware of such information (as proscribed by subsection (a)), or making the communication (as proscribed by subsection (b)), knows the specific means by which the information was obtained or communicated, or whether any personal benefit was paid or promised by or to any person in the chain of communication, so long as the person trading while aware of such information or making the communication, as the case may be, was aware, consciously avoided being aware, or recklessly disregarded that such information was wrongfully obtained, improperly used, or wrongfully communicated.*

*"(d) DERIVATIVE LIABILITY.—Except as provided in section 20(a), no person shall be liable under this section solely by reason of the fact that such person controls or employs a person who has violated this section, if such controlling person or employer did not participate in, or directly or indirectly induce the acts constituting a violation of this section.*

*"(e) AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES.—*

*"(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commission may, by rule or by order, exempt any person, security, or transaction, or any class of persons, securities, or transactions, from any or all of the provisions of this section, upon such terms and conditions as it considers necessary or appropriate in furtherance of the purposes of this title.*

*"(2) DIRECTED TRADING.—The prohibitions of this section shall not apply to any person who acts at the specific direction of, and solely for the account of another person whose own securities trading, or communications of material, nonpublic information, would be lawful under this section.*

*"(3) RULE 10B-5-1 COMPLIANT TRANSACTIONS.—The prohibitions of this section shall not apply to any transaction that satisfies the requirements of Rule 10b-5-1 (17 C.F.R. 240.10b5-1), or any successor regulation.*

*"(f) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Section 10(b) and 14(e) and any judicial precedents from judicial decisions under such sections shall apply to the purchase or sale of or entry into, any security, security-based swap, or security-based swap agreement to the extent such decisions do not conflict with the provisions of this section."*

*(b) COMMISSION REVIEW OF RULE 10B-5-1.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Securities and Exchange Commission shall review Rule 10b-5-1 (17 C.F.R. 240.10b5-1) and make any modifications the Securities and Exchange Commission determines necessary or appropriate because of the amendment to the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 made by this Act.*

*(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—The Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78a et seq.) is further amended—*

*(1) in section 21(d)(2), by inserting ", section 16A of this title" after "section 10(b) of this title,";*

*(2) in section 21A—*

*(A) in subsection (g)(1), by inserting "and section 16A," after "thereunder,"; and*

*(B) in subsection (h)(1), by inserting "and section 16A," after "thereunder,"; and*

*(3) in section 21C(f), by inserting "or section 16A," after "section 10(b)".*

The CHAIR. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in House Report 116-320. Each such further amend-

ment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. MCHENRY

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 116-320.

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 1, beginning on line 17, strike "relating to the market for" and insert "any nonpublic information, from whatever source, that has, or would reasonably be expected to have, a material effect on the market price of any".

Page 2, beginning on line 11, strike "relating to the market for" and insert "any nonpublic information, from whatever source, that has, or would reasonably be expected to have, a material effect on the market price of any".

Page 3, line 21, insert before the period the following: "for a direct or indirect personal benefit (including pecuniary gain, reputational benefit, or a gift of confidential information to a trading relative or friend)".

Page 5, strike lines 12 through 17 and insert a closing quotation mark and a period.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 739, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Chair, as I just mentioned a few minutes ago, I have concerns with H.R. 2534, the Insider Trading Prohibition Act in its current form. And, Madam Chair, my amendment addresses several of these concerns and improves this bill to better demonstrate congressional intent of codifying current insider trading law and not expanding it.

I thank the bill's sponsor, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. HIMES) and his staff for their diligence and patience in working with us over the last few months and over the recent Thanksgiving holiday. I also want to thank both of our staffs, as well as the Waters' staff. And I want to thank Mr. HIMES for agreeing to support this amendment in order to make this underlying bill a bipartisan approach to codify insider trading law and punish bad actors.

My amendment reflects Republican priorities discussed at our May markup, such as the inclusion of an explicit personal benefit test consistent with Supreme Court precedent, the removal of the novel rule of construction section from the Rules print of this bill, and a clarification of ambiguous words to ensure judges and prosecutors know that this bill is not intended to expand or create new insider trading liability.

The bill as drafted does not explicitly include the so-called personal benefit test, a significant element of insider trading law that prosecutors must currently satisfy in certain insider trading cases. In the 2016 *Salman* case, the Supreme Court noted that in order for a violation to have occurred, the insider or “tipper” providing the material, nonpublic information must have received a direct or indirect personal benefit, including but not limited to, pecuniary gain, reputational benefit, or a gift of confidential information to a trading relative or friend.

Including an explicit personal benefit test, as set forth by the Supreme Court, ensures that this important test cannot be read more broadly by judges than the Supreme Court has allowed, and also, this prevents activist judges and overzealous prosecutors from reading the test out of law entirely.

My amendment also clarifies the ambiguities within the “relating to the market” phrasing in the underlying bill. This phrase “relating to the market” is not a legal term of art defined within the existing body of insider trading law, nor is it defined in this bill. It is entirely plausible for an activist judge or a rogue prosecutor to interpret this phrase far more broadly than the drafters of the bill intended.

This amendment provides a limiting principle by applying only to nonpublic information that has or is reasonably expected to have a material effect on the market price of a security. This ensures that the statute will still capture cases where the receipt of material, nonpublic information was not from the company itself, but from another source. This is referenced in the Supreme Court’s 1987 *Carpenter* decision.

Finally, my amendment strikes the rule of construction section in the underlying bill that was not reviewed or debated in the House Financial Services Committee. I believe this provision is, at best, unnecessary and at worst, could have been read as giving a congressional stamp of approval for a poorly reasoned judicial set of decisions.

□ 1400

As such, my amendment would ensure that Congress’ intent is to simply codify existing law, not expand liability or create additional defenses for those accused of insider trading. This is about codifying what is already existent, period, end of statement.

That being said, my amendment does not achieve all the Republican goals that we have previously outlined in our committee markup and committee hearing. Unfortunately, the bill, even if it is amended by this amendment, still will not contain an exclusivity provision to make this the exclusive law of the land for insider trading.

While my amendment does not make this bill perfect, it does allow for Congress to exercise its Article I authority to produce a comprehensive insider trading law for the first time and does

so in a bipartisan manner that simply intends, we believe, to codify current insider trading law without expanding liability to good-faith people innocent under the law.

Mr. Chair, I urge its adoption, and I thank the bill’s sponsor for working with us on it.

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

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, even though I am not opposed to it.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. KENNEDY). Without objection, the gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

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

First, I thank Ranking Member MCHENRY for offering this amendment to H.R. 2534 to help further ensure that this commonsense bill codifies the law against insider trading in a fair manner.

When we marked up the bill in committee in May, I understood that my Republican colleagues had several concerns with the bill but nevertheless voiced their support in hopes of having those concerns addressed before the bill made its way to the House floor.

At the end of the day, those concerns amounted to wanting additional clarity that H.R. 2534 reflected the current judge-made law against insider trading, aside from the controversial 2014 appeals court decision that has been subject to criticism from many sides.

After months of discussion with the bill’s sponsor, Representative HIMES, Ranking Member MCHENRY has crafted this amendment to do just that. In particular, the amendment would clarify that the existing law that requires the SEC to establish some personal benefit to a tipper in cases involving tipper and tippee liability; clarify that the material, nonpublic information that forms the basis of liability may be related to either a specific security or to any security if that information would have or reasonably be expected to have a material effect on the market price of that security; and remove the rule of construction to avoid confusion and ambiguity and to ensure that this act is not the exclusive means by which the SEC, the Department of Justice, or private litigants may pursue insider trading.

If the amendment is accepted, I believe that the bill would provide the SEC with clear additional authority to bring to justice corporate insiders and others who take unfair advantage of confidential information. In addition, because the bill uses the same terms identified in the current case law against insider trading, the SEC and market participants can easily understand what those terms mean.

Again, Mr. Chair, I thank Ranking Member MCHENRY for strengthening the bill, and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this amendment.

Mr. Chair, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Con-

necticut (Mr. HIMES), the sponsor of this important legislation.

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Chairman, what is the balance of time available?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from California has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Chairman, I thank Ranking Member WATERS for yielding me time.

I rise very briefly to welcome the amendment by Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. MCHENRY raised four substantive points. Three of those points are incorporated in this amendment, which we are very happy to accept.

I think it is, again, not a compromise, but an improvement of the bill.

In my very little remaining time, we did have discussions about exclusivity. As the ranking member knows, the idea here is to create a law under which insider trading is prosecuted. That is the objective.

As the ranking member knows, it is a fairly complicated situation when including specific exclusivity language. Ultimately, that was not included in the ranking member’s proposed amendment here, but we should continue to work together to make sure that this is about clarifying and simplifying and making more efficient rather than making more complex.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. HUIZENGA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 116-320.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 1, line 10, strike “AWARE OF” and insert “USING”.

Page 1, line 14, strike “aware of” and insert “using”.

Page 2, line 22, strike “aware of” and insert “using”.

Page 2, beginning on line 24, strike “aware of” and insert “using”.

Page 3, line 3, strike “aware of” and insert “using”.

Page 3, line 23, strike “aware of” and insert “using”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 739, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

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

Mr. Chair, I will be brief. I am concerned that the bill before us today focuses specifically on awareness of information rather than the use of wrongful information in connection with security trading.

Specifically, this bill defines trading while “aware” of material and nonpublic information or communicating material and nonpublic information as wrongful only if the information was obtained by way of, or its communication or use would constitute: theft, bribery, misrepresentation, espionage; a violation of Federal computer data and intellectual property protection and privacy laws; conversion, misappropriation, or other deceptive means; and any breach of a fiduciary duty, a contractual relationship, a code of conduct, or a personal confidence or trust.

A person violates the bill’s prohibitions on trading with and communicating material on nonpublic information so long as this person “knew” the information was wrongfully obtained, actively avoided gaining such knowledge, or recklessly disregarded the wrongful use, communication, or obtainment of this information.

It does not matter, under the bill, whether they know the method by which the information was obtained or communicated or if any benefit actually came from communication of the information.

In short, Mr. Chair, I believe that this would, in turn, allow activist judges and prosecutors to go after individuals regardless of their intention or actual profit from wrongful actions.

That is why my amendment is very simple. It would strike all occurrences of the phrase “aware of” and insert the word “using.” In other words, you can be aware of something, but if you are not going to actually use that information, why would you be held to a criminal standard?

My amendment would have the effect of limiting who can be prosecuted under this bill to people who actually use wrongful information to gain a profit.

As we all know, in our lives, there are all kinds of rumors around us all the time, whether it is about our work life or our family or whatever might be going on, somebody in the neighborhood. It is hard to know what information is actually true or actually accurate.

What we have currently is this assumption that being aware of something makes you criminally liable versus actually using that information.

The current bill could allow prosecution of people who traded and are simply aware of information but perhaps would have traded regardless of their awareness of that information.

I am prepared to support this underlying bill with the adoption of my amendment.

I was pleased to see the adoption of the amendment from the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY). I believe these are perfecting amendments. I believe that these are issues that need to be further addressed.

While I, too, have some concerns about exclusivity and some of the other things that the gentleman from

North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY) discussed, I believe that this particular issue is of significance, and it is sufficient enough and significant enough to pull my support across the finish line as we move forward on this.

Mr. Chair, I urge all of my colleagues to accept this perfecting amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chair, I strongly oppose Representative HUIZENGA’s amendment that replaces the bill’s standard of illegal insider trading while “aware of” material, nonpublic information with trading while “using” material, nonpublic information.

This narrower standard is inconsistent with current law, would severely weaken the bill, and would create substantial enforcement hurdles to the benefit of bad actors and to the detriment of the SEC.

If the amendment is adopted, the SEC would have to prove that the reason the defendant traded was because of a specific piece of information. That means that the SEC would have a hard time proving its case in court unless it had an email from a defendant explaining his motive for trading. Not many bad actors engaging in illegal insider trading are that dumb.

Moreover, such a change would benefit insider traders at hedge funds or other market intelligence firms because they would merely have to tell the judge that they had other reasons or data to support their trade.

The SEC’s existing rule 10b-5 clearly states that the appropriate standard is awareness. Changing it to “use,” as Representative HUIZENGA’s amendment would do, dramatically and substantially weakens the SEC’s authority to prosecute insider trading.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to reject the amendment offered by Mr. HUIZENGA.

Mr. Chair, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. HIMES), the sponsor of this important legislation.

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairwoman WATERS for yielding me the time.

I rise in reluctant opposition to this amendment because it has been a hallmark of this process that I very much enjoyed working with Mr. MCHENRY and Mr. HUIZENGA. The reason I rise in opposition is really twofold or threefold.

Number one, as Mr. HUIZENGA may recall, the original draft of the bill would make it prosecutable to prosecute somebody who is in possession of material, nonpublic information. My Republican friends correctly pointed out that we are often in possession of information that we may not be aware of. Certainly, if you were to take a

look at my email inbox, you would know that to be true. So at the suggestion of the Republicans, we changed the standard from “in possession” to “aware of.”

While I know that Mr. HUIZENGA is acting in good faith, Chairwoman WATERS got it exactly right. If we go to a use standard, it would require prosecutors to actually get inside the motivation of why somebody made a trade. They would have to prove that you made this trade because you had inside information.

In support of Mr. HUIZENGA’s good faith, I understand where he is coming from, but let’s also face that the confluence of circumstances where you have material, nonpublic information and you were going to do that trade at precisely that moment is a very, very rare event.

While I understand where Mr. HUIZENGA is coming from, what I would suggest is, instead of creating probably an impossible prosecutorial burden, let’s acknowledge that if in that very rare event where you want to make a trade and you happen to be in possession of material, nonpublic information, let that trade go by. That is rare enough that it shouldn’t in any way, I think, speaking as somebody who has spent time in this industry, compromise the effectiveness or the efficiency of our capital markets.

Again, reluctantly, I stand in opposition to Mr. HUIZENGA’s amendment. I hope he will nonetheless support the underlying bill.

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

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

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

## RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 196, noes 231, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 648]

AYES—196

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

Guthrie  
Hagedorn  
Harris  
Hartzler  
Hern, Kevin  
Herrera Beutler  
Hice (GA)  
Higgins (LA)  
Hill (AR)  
Holding  
Hollingsworth  
Hudson  
Huizenga  
Hurd (TX)  
Johnson (LA)  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson (SD)  
Jordan  
Joyce (OH)  
Joyce (PA)  
Katko  
Keller  
Kelly (MS)  
Kelly (PA)  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kinzinger  
Kustoff (TN)  
LaHood  
LaMalfa  
Lamborn  
Latta  
Lesko  
Long  
Loudermilk  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Marchant  
Marshall  
Massie  
Mast

McCarthy  
McCaul  
McClintock  
McHenry  
McKinley  
Meadows  
Meuser  
Miller  
Mitchell  
Moolenaar  
Mooney (WV)  
Mullin  
Murphy (NC)  
Newhouse  
Norman  
Nunes  
Olson  
Palazzo  
Palmer  
Pence  
Perry  
Posey  
Ratcliffe  
Reed  
Reschenthaler  
Rice (SC)  
Riggleman  
Roby  
Rodgers (WA)  
Roe, David P.  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rooney (FL)  
Rose, John W.  
Rouzer  
Roy  
Rutherford  
Scalise  
Schweikert  
Scott, Austin  
Sensenbrenner

Shimkus  
Simpson  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smucker  
Spano  
Stauber  
Stefanik  
Steil  
Steube  
Stewart  
Stivers  
Taylor  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Timmons  
Tipton  
Turner  
Upton  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walker  
Walorski  
Waltz  
Watkins  
Weber (TX)  
Webster (FL)  
Wenstrup  
Westerman  
Williams  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Woodall  
Wright  
Yoho  
Young  
Zeldin

## NOES—231

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

Demings  
DeSaulnier  
Deuth  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Doyle, Michael F.  
Engel  
Escobar  
Eshoo  
Español  
Evans  
Finkenauer  
Fletcher  
Foster  
Frankel  
Fudge  
Gallego  
Garamendi  
García (IL)  
García (TX)  
Golden  
Gomez  
Gonzalez (TX)  
Green, Al (TX)  
Grijalva  
Haaland  
Harder (CA)  
Hastings  
Hayes  
Heck  
Higgins (NY)  
Himes  
Horn, Kendra S.  
Horsford  
Houllahan  
Hoyer  
Huffman  
Jackson Lee  
Jayapal  
Jeffries  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson (TX)  
Kaptur  
Keating  
Kelly (IL)  
Kennedy  
Khan  
Kildee  
Kilmer  
Kim  
Kind  
Kirkpatrick  
Krishnamoorthi  
Kuster (NH)

Lamb  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Lawrence  
Lawson (FL)  
Lee (CA)  
Lee (NV)  
Levin (CA)  
Levin (MI)  
Lewis  
Lieu, Ted  
Lipinski  
Loebsack  
Lofgren  
Lowenthal  
Lowe  
Luján  
Luria  
Lynch  
Malinowski  
Maloney  
Carolyn B.  
Maloney, Sean  
Matsui  
McAdams  
McBath  
McCollum  
McEachin  
McGovern  
McNerney  
Meeks  
Meng  
Moore  
Morelle  
Moulton  
Mucarsel-Powell  
Murphy (FL)  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Neguse  
Norcross  
Norton  
O'Halleran  
Ocasio-Cortez  
Omar  
Pallone  
Panetta  
Pappas  
Pascrell  
Payne  
Perlmutter  
Peters  
Peterson  
Phillips

Pingree  
Plaskett  
Pocan  
Porter  
Pressley  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Raskin  
Rice (NY)  
Richmond  
Rose (NY)  
Rouda  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruiz  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan  
Sablan  
Sánchez  
Sarbanes  
Scanlon  
Schakowsky  
Schiff

Schneider  
Schrader  
Schrier  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Sewell (AL)  
Shalala  
Sherman  
Sherrill  
Sires  
Slotkin  
Smith (WA)  
Soto  
Spanberger  
Speier  
Stanton  
Stevens  
Suzuki  
Swalwell (CA)  
Takano  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Titus

Tlaib  
Tonko  
Torres (CA)  
Torres Small (NM)  
Trahan  
Trone  
Underwood  
Van Drew  
Vargas  
Veasey  
Vela  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters  
Watson Coleman  
Welch  
Wexton  
Wild  
Yarmuth

## NOT VOTING—9

Biggs  
Cartwright  
Gabbard

Gosar  
Hunter  
Radewagen

San Nicolas  
Serrano  
Wilson (FL)

## □ 1442

Mses. McCOLLUM, FUDGE, Messrs. LOEBSACK, PETERS, SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, PHILLIPS, DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. LURIA, Mses. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, MUCARSEL-POWELL, Messrs. MALINOWSKI, NADLER, ROSE of New York, CICILLINE, CLYBURN, PAYNE, Ms. BASS, and Mrs. HAYES changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Messrs. BUCHANAN, LAMBORN and JOHNSON of Louisiana changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. PAYNE). There being no further amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. KENNEDY) having assumed the chair, Mr. PAYNE, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2534) to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to prohibit certain securities trading and related communications by those who possess material, nonpublic information, and, pursuant to House Resolution 739, he reported the bill, as amended by that resolution, back to the House with a further amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

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

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

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

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

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 5-minute vote on passage of the bill will be followed by 5-minute votes on ordering the previous question on House Resolution 741; and adoption of House Resolution 741, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 410, nays 13, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 649]

## YEAS—410

Abraham  
Adams  
Aderholt  
Aguilar  
Allen  
Allred  
Amodei  
Arrington  
Axne  
Babin  
Bacon  
Baird  
Balderson  
Banks  
Barr  
Barragán  
Bass  
Beatty  
Bera  
Bergman  
Beyer  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (UT)  
Blumenauer  
Blunt Rochester  
Bonamici  
Bost  
Boyle, Brendan F.  
Brady  
Brindisi  
Brooks (AL)  
Brooks (IN)  
Brown (MD)  
Brownley (CA)  
Buchanan  
Buck  
Bucshon  
Budd  
Burchett  
Burgess  
Bustos  
Butterfield  
Byrne  
Calvert  
Carbajal  
Cárdenas  
Carson (IN)  
Carter (GA)  
Carter (TX)  
Case  
Casten (IL)  
Castor (FL)  
Castro (TX)  
Chabot  
Cheney  
Chu, Judy  
Cicilline  
Cisneros  
Clark (MA)  
Clarke (NY)  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Cline  
Cloud  
Clyburn  
Cohen  
Cole  
Collins (GA)  
Comer  
Conaway  
Connolly  
Cook  
Cooper  
Correa  
Costa  
Courtney  
Cox (CA)  
Craig  
Crawford  
Crenshaw

Crist  
Crow  
Cuellar  
Cunningham  
Curtis  
Davids (KS)  
Davis (CA)  
Davis, Danny K.  
Davis, Rodney  
Dean  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
DeLauro  
DelBene  
Delgado  
Demings  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Doyle, Michael F.  
Duncan  
Dunn  
Emmer  
Engel  
Escobar  
Español  
Estes  
Evans  
Ferguson  
Finkenauer  
Fitpatrick  
Fleischmann  
Fletcher  
Flores  
Fortenberry  
Foster  
Foxy (NC)  
Frankel  
Fudge  
Fulcher  
Gaetz  
Gallagher  
Gallego  
Garamendi  
García (IL)  
García (TX)  
Gianforte  
Gibbs  
Gohmert  
Golden  
Gomez  
Gonzalez (OH)  
Gonzalez (TX)  
Gooden  
Gottheimer  
Granger  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (LA)  
Graves (MO)  
Green (TN)  
Green, Al (TX)  
Grijalva  
Grothman  
Guest  
Guthrie  
Haaland  
Hagedorn  
Harder (CA)  
Hartzler  
Hastings  
Hayes  
Heck  
Hern, Kevin  
Herrera Beutler  
Hice (GA)  
Higgins (LA)  
Higgins (NY)  
Himes

Holding  
Hollingsworth  
Horn, Kendra S.  
Horsford  
Houllahan  
Hoyer  
Hudson  
Huffman  
Hurd (TX)  
Jackson Lee  
Jayapal  
Jeffries  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson (LA)  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson (SD)  
Johnson (TX)  
Jordan  
Joyce (OH)  
Joyce (PA)  
Kaptur  
Katko  
Keating  
Keller  
Kelly (IL)  
Kelly (MS)  
Kelly (PA)  
Kennedy  
Khanna  
Kildee  
Kilmer  
Kim  
Kind  
King (NY)  
Kinzinger  
Kirkpatrick  
Krishnamoorthi  
Kuster (NH)  
Kustoff (TN)  
LaHood  
LaMalfa  
Lamb  
Lamborn  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Latta  
Lawrence  
Lawson (FL)  
Lee (CA)  
Lee (NV)  
Lesko  
Levin (CA)  
Levin (MI)  
Lewis  
Lieu, Ted  
Lipinski  
Loebsack  
Lofgren  
Long  
Loudermilk  
Lowenthal  
Lowe  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Lujan  
Luria  
Lynch  
Malinowski  
Maloney  
Carolyn B.  
Maloney, Sean  
Marchant  
Marshall  
Mast  
Matsui  
McAdams  
McBath  
McCarthy  
McCaul  
McClintock  
McCollum

McEachin Richmond  
 McGovern Rigglesman  
 McHenry Roby  
 McKinley Rodgers (WA)  
 McNeermy Roe, David P.  
 Meadows Rogers (AL)  
 Meeks Rogers (KY)  
 Meng Rooney (FL)  
 Meuser Rose (NY)  
 Miller Rose, John W.  
 Mitchell Rouda  
 Moolenaar Rouzer  
 Mooney (WV) Roybal-Allard  
 Moore Ruiz  
 Morelle Ruppertsberger  
 Moulton Rush  
 Mucarsel-Powell Rutherford  
 Mullin Ryan  
 Murphy (FL) Sánchez  
 Murphy (NC) Sarbanes  
 Nadler Scalise  
 Napolitano Scanlon  
 Neal Schakowsky  
 Neguse Schiff  
 Newhouse Schneider  
 Norcross Schrader  
 Norman Schrier  
 Nunes Schweikert  
 O'Halleran Scott (VA)  
 Ocasio-Cortez Scott, Austin  
 Olson Scott, David  
 Omar Sensenbrenner  
 Palazzo Sewell (AL)  
 Pallone Shalala  
 Palmer Sherman  
 Panetta Sherrill  
 Pappas Shimkus  
 Pascrell Simpson  
 Payne Sires  
 Pence Slotkin  
 Perlmutter Smith (MO)  
 Perry Smith (NE)  
 Peters Smith (NJ)  
 Peterson Smith (WA)  
 Phillips Smucker  
 Pingree Soto  
 Pocan Spanberger  
 Porter Spano  
 Posey Speier  
 Pressley Stanton  
 Price (NC) Stauber  
 Quigley Stefanik  
 Raskin Steil  
 Ratcliffe Steube  
 Reschenthaler Stevens  
 Rice (NY) Stewart  
 Rice (SC) Stivers

NAYS—13

Amash Griffith  
 Armstrong Harris  
 Biggs Hill (AR)  
 Bishop (NC) Huizenga  
 Davidson (OH) King (IA)

NOT VOTING—7

Cartwright Gosar  
 Eshoo Hunter  
 Gabbard Reed

□ 1453

Mr. CRAWFORD changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to be present during roll call vote number 649. Had I been present, I would have voted: on roll call vote number 649, YES.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4, VOTING RIGHTS ADVANCEMENT ACT OF 2019, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 326, EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES REGARDING UNITED STATES EFFORTS TO RESOLVE THE ISRAELI-PALESTINIAN CONFLICT THROUGH A NEGOTIATED TWO-STATE SOLUTION

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. 741) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4) to amend the Voting Rights Act of 1965 to revise the criteria for determining which States and political subdivisions are subject to section 4 of the Act, and for other purposes, and providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 326) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding United States efforts to resolve the Israeli-Palestinian conflict through a negotiated two-state solution, 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.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 228, nays 196, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 650]

YEAS—228

Adams Cuellar  
 Aguilar Cunningham  
 Allred Davids (KS)  
 Axne Davis (CA)  
 Barragán Davis, Danny K.  
 Bass Dean  
 Beatty DeFazio  
 Bera DeGette  
 Beyer DeLauro  
 Bishop (GA) DeBene  
 Blumenauer Delgado  
 Blunt Rochester Demings  
 Bonamici DeSaunier  
 Boyle, Brendan Deuch  
 F. Dingell  
 Brindisi Doggett  
 Brown (MD) Doyle, Michael  
 Brownley (CA) F.  
 Bustos Engel  
 Butterfield Escobar  
 Carbajal Eshoo  
 Cárdenas Espailat  
 Carson (IN) Evans  
 Case Finkenauer  
 Casten (IL) Fletcher  
 Castor (FL) Foster  
 Castro (TX) Frankel  
 Chu, Judy Fudge  
 Cicilline Gallego  
 Cisneros Garamendi  
 Clark (MA) Garcia (IL)  
 Clarke (NY) Garcia (TX)  
 Clay Golden  
 Cleaver Gomez  
 Clyburn Gonzalez (TX)  
 Cohen Gottheimer  
 Connolly Green, Al (TX)  
 Cooper Grijalva  
 Correa Haaland  
 Costa Harder (CA)  
 Courtney Hastings  
 Cox (CA) Hayes  
 Craig Heck  
 Crist Higgins (NY)  
 Crow Himes

Matsui  
 McAdams  
 McBath  
 McCollum  
 McEachin  
 McGovern  
 McNeermy  
 Meeks  
 Meng  
 Moore  
 Morelle  
 Moulton  
 Mucarsel-Powell  
 Murphy (FL)  
 Nadler  
 Napolitano  
 Neal  
 Neguse  
 Norcross  
 O'Halleran  
 Ocasio-Cortez  
 Omar  
 Pallone  
 Panetta  
 Pappas  
 Pascrell  
 Payne  
 Perlmutter  
 Peters  
 Peterson  
 Phillips  
 Pingree  
 Pocan

NAYS—196

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

Porter  
 Pressley  
 Price (NC)  
 Quigley  
 Raskin  
 Rice (NY)  
 Richmond  
 Rose (NY)  
 Rouda  
 Roybal-Allard  
 Ruiz  
 Ruppertsberger  
 Rush  
 Ryan  
 Sánchez  
 Sarbanes  
 Scanlon  
 Schakowsky  
 Schiff  
 Schneider  
 Schrader  
 Schrier  
 Scott (VA)  
 Scott, David  
 Sewell (AL)  
 Schultz  
 Shalala  
 Sherman  
 Sherrill  
 Sires  
 Slotkin  
 Smith (WA)  
 Soto  
 Spanberger

Speier  
 Stanton  
 Stevens  
 Suozzi  
 Swalwell (CA)  
 Takano  
 Thompson (CA)  
 Thompson (MS)  
 Thompson (PA)  
 Titus  
 Tlaib  
 Tonko  
 Torres (CA)  
 Torres Small  
 (NM)  
 Trahan  
 Trone  
 Underwood  
 Van Drew  
 Vargas  
 Veasey  
 Vela  
 Velázquez  
 Vislosky  
 Wasserman  
 Schultz  
 Waters  
 Watson Coleman  
 Welch  
 Wexton  
 Wild  
 Wilson (FL)  
 Yarmuth

Womack Wright Young Stanton Torres Small Visclosky  
Woodall Yoho Zeldin Stevens (NM) Wasserman

□ 1515

## NOT VOTING—6

Cartwright Gosar Jayapal  
Gabbard Hunter Serrano

□ 1503

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.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic de-  
vice, and there were—yeas 226, nays  
196, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 651]

## YEAS—226

Adams Finkenauer Maloney, Sean  
Aguilar Fletcher Matsui  
Allred Foster McAdams  
Axne Frankel McBeth  
Barragán Fudge McCollum  
Bass Gallego McEachin  
Beatty Garamendi McGovern  
Bera Garcia (IL) McNeerney  
Beyer Garcia (TX) Meeks  
Bishop (GA) Golden Meng  
Blumenauer Gomez Moore  
Blunt Rochester Gonzalez (TX) Morelle  
Bonamici Gottheimer Moulton  
Boyle, Brendan Green, Al (TX) Mucarsel-Powell  
F. Grijalva Murphy (FL)  
Brindisi Haaland Nadler  
Brown (MD) Harder (CA) Napolitano  
Brownley (CA) Hastings Neal  
Bustos Hayes Neguse  
Butterfield Heck Norcross  
Carbajal Higgins (NY) O'Halleran  
Cárdenas Himes Ocasio-Cortez  
Carson (IN) Horn, Kendra S. Omar  
Case Horsford Pallone  
Casten (IL) Houlihan Panetta  
Castor (FL) Hoyer Pappas  
Castro (TX) Huffman Pascarell  
Chu, Judy Jackson Lee Payne  
Cicilline Jayapal Perlmutter  
Cisneros Jeffries Peters  
Clark (MA) Johnson (GA) Peterson  
Clarke (NY) Johnson (TX) Phillips  
Clay Kaptur Pingree  
Cleaver Keating Pocan  
Clyburn Kelly (IL) Porter  
Cohen Kennedy Pressley  
Connolly Khanna Price (NC)  
Cooper Kildee Quigley  
Correa Kilmer Raskin  
Costa Kim Rice (NY)  
Courtney Kind Richmond  
Cox (CA) Kirkpatrick Rose (NY)  
Craig Krishnamoorthi Rouda  
Crist Kuster (NH) Roybal-Allard  
Crow Lamb Ruiz  
Cuellar Langevin Ruppertsberger  
Davids (KS) Larsen (WA) Rush  
Davis (CA) Larson (CT) Ryan  
Davis, Danny K. Lawrence Sánchez  
Dean Lawson (FL) Sarbanes  
DeFazio Lee (CA) Scanlon  
DeGette Lee (NV) Schakowsky  
DeLauro Levin (CA) Schiff  
DelBene Levin (MI) Schneider  
Delgado Lewis Schrier  
Demings Lieu, Ted Schriener  
DeSaulnier Lipinski Scott, David  
Deutch Loeb sack Sewell (AL)  
Dingell Lofgren Shalala  
Doggett Lowenthal Sherman  
Doyle, Michael Lowey Sherrill  
F. Luján Sires  
Engel Luria Slotkin  
Escobar Lynch Smith (WA)  
Eshoo Malinowski Soto  
Españillat Maloney, Soto  
Evans Carolyn B. Speier

Stanton Torres Small Visclosky  
Stevens (NM) Wasserman  
Suoizzi Trahan Schultz  
Swalwell (CA) Trone Waters  
Takano Underwood Watson Coleman  
Thompson (CA) Van Drew Welch  
Thompson (MS) Vargas Wexton  
Titus Veasey Wild  
Tonko Vela Wilson (FL)  
Torres (CA) Velázquez Yarmuth

## NAYS—196

Abraham Granger Palazzo  
Aderholt Graves (GA) Palmer  
Allen Graves (LA) Pence  
Amash Graves (MO) Perry  
Amodei Green (TN) Posey  
Armstrong Griffith Reed  
Arrington Grothman Reschenthaler  
Babin Guest Rice (SC)  
Bacon Guthrie Riggleman  
Baird Hagedorn Roby  
Balderson Harris Rodgers (WA)  
Banks Hartzler Roe, David P.  
Barr Hern, Kevin Rogers (AL)  
Bergman Herrera Beutler Rogers (KY)  
Biggs Hice (GA) Rooney (FL)  
Bilirakis Higgins (LA) Rose, John W.  
Bishop (NC) Hill (AR) Rouzer  
Bishop (UT) Holding Roy  
Bost Hollingsworth Rutherford  
Brady Hudson Scalise  
Brooks (AL) Huizenga Schweikert  
Brooks (IN) Hurd (TX) Scott, Austin  
Buchanan Johnson (LA) Sensenbrenner  
Buck Johnson (OH) Shimkus  
Bucshon Johnson (SD) Simpson  
Budd Jordan Smith (MO)  
Burchett Joyce (OH) Smith (NE)  
Burgess Joyce (PA) Smith (NJ)  
Byrne Katko Smucker  
Calvert Keller Spano  
Carter (GA) Kelly (MS) Stauber  
Carter (TX) Kelly (PA) Stefanik  
Chabot King (IA) Steil  
Cheney King (NY) Steube  
Cline Kinzinger Stewart  
Cloud Kustoff (TN) Stivers  
Cole LaHood Taylor  
Collins (GA) LaMalfa Thompson (PA)  
Comer Lamborn Thornberry  
Conaway Latta Timmons  
Cook Lesko Tipton  
Crawford Long Tlaib  
Crenshaw Loudermilk Turner  
Curtis Lucas Upton  
Davidson (OH) Luetkemeyer Wagner  
Davis, Rodney Marchant Walberg  
DesJarlais Marshall Walden  
Diaz-Balart Massie Walker  
Duncan Mast Walorski  
Dunn McCarthy Waltz  
Emmer McCaul Watkins  
Estes McClintock Weber (TX)  
Ferguson McHenry Webster (FL)  
Fitzpatrick McKinley Wenstrup  
Fleischmann Meadows Westerman  
Flores Meuser Williams  
Fortenberry Miller Wilson (SC)  
Foxx (NC) Mitchell Wittman  
Fulcher Moelenaar Womack  
Gaetz Mooney (WV) Woodall  
Gallagher Mullin Wright  
Gianforte Murphy (NC) Yoho  
Gibbs Newhouse Young  
Gohmert Norman Zeldin  
Gonzalez (OH) Nunes  
Gooden Olson

## NOT VOTING—8

Cartwright Gosar Schrader  
Cunningham Hunter Serrano  
Gabbard Ratcliffe

□ 1511

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.

□ 1515  
COMMEMORATING THE 75TH ANNI-  
VERSARY OF PEACEFUL ZION  
BAPTIST CHURCH

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

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, I rise  
today to commemorate one of my dis-  
trict's most venerable churches. This  
year marks the 75th anniversary of the  
Peaceful Zion Baptist Church in East  
Orange, New Jersey.

It has been known as a sanctuary for  
those in need throughout that time. It  
runs a food pantry for those in need of  
a meal. It provides clothing for those  
who could use a warm coat or socks.

The community of Peaceful Zion is  
so strong that members have been  
known to bring food to ailing families.  
One of its members said: "Everyone is  
there for one another."

Congratulations to Peaceful Zion  
Baptist Church on its 75th anniversary.  
They are a blessed beacon of loving  
care in my 10th District in New Jersey.

YESTERDAY'S IMPEACHMENT  
HOAX

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

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Madam Speaker,  
this morning, Speaker PELOSI an-  
nounced that yesterday's hearing in  
the Judiciary Committee will, with  
"leading American constitutional  
scholars," give Congress no choice—no  
choice—but to impeach the President.  
But let's take a look at who exactly  
testified at yesterday's impeachment  
hoax.

Professor Karlan donated over \$12,000  
to liberal Democrat politicians, went  
after the President's 13-year-old son,  
and she can't even walk past the  
Trump Hotel without having to cross  
the street.

Professor Gerhardt donated thou-  
sands of dollars to former President  
Obama and Hillary Clinton. He also  
worked against Justice Kavanaugh  
during his nomination process.

Professor Feldman called for the  
President's impeachment in 2017 based  
on a tweet, just over a month into his  
Presidency.

However, Professor Turley, who  
voted against the President, had this  
to say about the lack of evidence  
against President Trump: "Impeach-  
ments have to be based on proof, not  
presumptions."

Abuse of power? Madam Speaker, an  
impeachment with this fact pattern is  
an abuse of power by the House of Rep-  
resentatives.

DEMOCRATS ARE WORKING FOR  
THE GOODNESS AND GREATNESS  
OF THIS NATION

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was  
given permission to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, we do have a very solemn responsibility to uphold the rule of law, but it is important to note that Democrats and the majority in the House have worked every day for the American people.

Among the 400 bills that we have supported are: H.R. 986, the Protecting Americans with Preexisting Conditions Act of 2019, legislation that I have consistently worked on for almost a decade; the Equality Act, which gives equality to all people; the Paycheck Fairness Act, to treat women fairly; the Climate Action Now Act and other legislation to recognize the crisis in climate change; national flood insurance, which my constituents in Texas are desperate for; directing the removal of United States Armed Forces from hostilities in the Republic of Yemen; and then, of course, a signature bill that I have written over a 2-year period, the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act, which expands the rights of Native Americans and provides \$291 million for our law enforcement and prosecutors.

Finally, let me say, I was very proud to stand for H. Res. 183, condemning anti-Semitism as hateful expressions of intolerance, which are contradictory to the values and aspirations that define the people of the United States, and condemning anti-Muslim discrimination and bigotry against minorities as hateful expressions of intolerance.

We have been working on behalf of the American people. We ask the other body to work, but we are doing our job for the goodness and the greatness of this Nation.

#### PENNSYLVANIA'S 12TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT'S ENERGY ECONOMY IS BOOMING

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

Mr. KELLER. Madam Speaker, the energy economy of Pennsylvania's 12th Congressional District is booming, creating good-paying jobs and providing low-cost energy to thousands of families across the Commonwealth and our Nation.

As evidence of this, our district is happy to welcome Thailand-based natural gas company BKV to Pennsylvania's 12th Congressional District. Next week, BKV will be opening an office in Tunkhannock, Pennsylvania. They will join other natural gas companies in Pennsylvania's 12th Congressional District that are creating jobs, giving back to the community, and helping our rural district thrive with the resources right under our feet.

Pennsylvania's 12th Congressional District plays an important role in our national energy portfolio, producing between one-tenth and one-twentieth of the country's entire natural gas supply on any given day.

Energy produced in PA-12 lowers energy costs, creates an energy-independent United States, and allows our allies to no longer be reliant on energy resources from countries that do not share our values.

Natural gas companies have helped with community revitalization and in creating a robust economy of downstream jobs. The present and future of PA-12 is bright because of the natural gas industry, and, for the benefit of my community, our State, and our Nation, I will continue to support its growth and expansion in Congress.

#### STOP ROBOCALLS

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

Mr. LIPINSKI. Madam Speaker, robocalls, just mentioning them is enough to make anyone's blood boil.

Robocalls interrupt our time with family and friends, scam people out of their hard-earned money while spoofing numbers to make calls look local, and even clog up the phone lines of hospital emergency rooms. In 2018, Americans, collectively, received 48 billion robocalls.

I cosponsored legislation earlier this year to stop robocalls, and the House voted yesterday to pass the final version, which we expect to be signed into law.

The TRACED Act strengthens penalties and extends the statute of limitations on violations; it requires phone companies to authenticate where calls are coming from and help customers easily block them at no extra charge; and it requires continued work by the Federal Government to combat emerging robocall methods.

This is a clear win for the American people and shows what we can do here when we work together.

#### VIRGINIA SUPPORTS THE SECOND AMENDMENT

(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, 40 Virginia localities have declared themselves "Second Amendment sanctuaries," resolving to support the Constitution and stand against infringements on the Second Amendment.

Across my district, thousands of citizens are rallying outside the meetings of their local government to show their strong support for the rights of gun owners.

Virginia has always been a cradle of constitutional rights. There is no divide between our rural and urban populations. All of us want to defend our rights as citizens of the United States of America.

I represent the same district that James Madison represented in the first Congress. He understood America's

rights to bear arms when he wrote it into our Constitution.

I am a strong supporter of the Second Amendment, and I am proud to stand with the people who are speaking up for their constitutional rights and for the Commonwealth of Virginia.

James Madison would be proud. I know I am.

#### 12 DAYS OF SALT

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

Ms. SHERRILL. Madam Speaker, on the second day of SALT, my constituents have said to me that they send more money to Washington and get back less than almost any other State in the country. The SALT cap compounds the attack on New Jersey, forcing our residents to send even more money to Washington without a return on that investment.

For every dollar New Jersey sent to Washington in 2017, we got back only 82 cents. That puts us in 49th place, almost dead last in State return on Federal tax dollars. And this was before the Federal Government stripped the full SALT deduction.

Meanwhile, States like Kentucky got back \$2.35 for every dollar they sent to Washington. That is nearly three times what New Jersey gets.

The 2017 tax bill unfairly targets States like mine that pay more than their fair share. We fund projects in Kentucky and do not see that same investment, say, on things like infrastructure, for example, in our State.

We need to restore the SALT deduction cap and keep money in the pockets of New Jerseyans so we can continue to power the Nation's economy.

#### CONGRATULATING SANGAMON COUNTY'S WILLIAMSVILLE HIGH SCHOOL

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

Mr. LAHOOD. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Sangamon County's Williamsville High School, who, last week, won the Class 3A Illinois State football championship, the school's first ever.

On Friday night at Huskie Stadium in DeKalb, Illinois, the Williamsville Bullets rallied late in the fourth quarter to win a thrilling 46-42 game against Byron High School. With just 3 minutes remaining and Byron leading 42-39, the Williamsville defense stonewalled Byron to force a turnover. The Bullets then marched down the field, and junior quarterback Conor McCormick fired a game-winning touchdown to secure the State title.

The Bullets' offense set a 3A championship record with 550 yards of total offense. Wide receiver Brandon Bishop set a record for receiving yards with

230, and quarterback Conor McCormick set the record with 335 passing yards and four touchdowns.

The Williamsville football team has made all of central Illinois proud with their accomplishments this season. The never-give-up spirit that embodied this team was on full display in their State championship, and their historic season is a testament to the hard work of these young men.

I congratulate Coach Aaron Kunz and the Williamsville High School Bullets.

□ 1530

#### HONORING ANGELA MCSHAN

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

Mr. VAN DREW. Madam Speaker, I would like to join the United States Coast Guard in welcoming the recently commissioned U.S. Coast Guard cutter *Angela McShan*. The ship is part of a new fleet of cutters that boasts short response times and larger vessels, which will help patrol the coast from south Jersey all the way down to the Caribbean.

This cutter was named after the late Master Chief Angela McShan, who served the Coast Guard for over 20 years, and she was the first Black woman to earn the title of master chief petty officer.

The cutter was commissioned with the help of McShan's seven brothers and sisters in boarding the cutter for the first time and raising the flag so the ship could set sail.

I am excited to see the U.S. Coast Guard Training Center Cape May flourish with the upgrade of the new cutter, and I am honored to have a hero like Angela McShan watching over our officers from heaven.

Madam Speaker, we are proud of Angela McShan. We are proud of the Coast Guard, both in the United States of America and in south Jersey.

#### REMEMBERING PEARL HARBOR

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

Mr. SPANO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the lives of those who fought and those who died so valiantly during the attacks at Pearl Harbor. On December 7, 78 years ago, the unthinkable happened. Our Nation was attacked in one of the most horrific events we have ever endured on our own soil. That day that will live in infamy also compelled the United States to enter the second World War.

The bombs that destroyed the USS *Arizona*, 169 aircraft, and most of our Pacific fleet, rocked the Nation to its core. The attack killed almost 2,500 servicemembers plus 49 civilians and wounded 1,200 more. They were sons and daughters, they were brothers and sisters, and above all, they were heroes.

And today we stand with those who lost family and friends, and we stand with the heroes who have defended and those who continue to defend our freedoms today and our way of life. We must never forget, and we must always honor their sacrifice.

#### DEMOCRATS HAVE PLEDGED TO TAKE ACTION

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

Mr. MORELLE. Madam Speaker, in January, House Democrats pledged to get to work for the people and take action to uplift the lives of everyday Americans.

I am so proud of the progress we have made and the proposals we have advanced that would have real, meaningful impacts on our communities. Unfortunately, our partners in the United States Senate have abdicated their responsibility to do the same.

We have sent over 300 bipartisan bills to the Senate so far this year, and not one has been taken up for a vote. This includes legislation to keep our communities safer by enacting universal background checks on all gun sales, legislation that would raise the minimum wage, safeguard our elections, protect people with preexisting conditions, and ensure equal pay for equal work.

We were elected to serve the American people, and I will keep fighting alongside my colleagues in the House to advance legislation that improves the lives of everyone who calls our Nation home. I call upon the United States Senate to do the very same.

#### THE RIGHT TO VOTE IS SACRED

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

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4, the Voting Rights Advancement Act.

The right to vote is sacred and must not be infringed upon. Sadly, our Nation has a long and even bloody history of racial voter suppression, but lately that suppression has been supercharged by the terrible decision in *Shelby County v. Holder*. This case gutted key protections of the Voting Rights Act, allowing for States to prevent certain groups from accessing the ballot through voter ID laws, closing polling locations, and even purging voter rolls.

I will be pleased to vote in favor of H.R. 4, as it represents a major step toward ensuring every citizen has the ability to vote. H.R. 4 will create a new coverage formula for repeated voting rights violations in the last 25 years and establish practice-based preclearance to focus administrative or judiciary review narrowly on suspect voting practices.

With the House approving H.R. 4, we take a major step forward, and I urge prompt action by the other body.

#### PEACE PROCESS IN UKRAINE

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, next week, leaders from Ukraine, France, Germany, and Russia will meet to discuss a road forward to peace in Ukraine. President Zelensky was elected with a clear mandate to bring to an end Russia's illegal war on Ukraine.

The question we must ask is: Peace at what cost to liberty?

Russia illegally invaded Ukraine, already leading to the deaths of over 14,000 Ukrainians and the displacement of millions. The enemy of liberty seeks to undermine democratic institutions that have secured peace in Europe since the second World War ended.

During these sensitive negotiations, freedom lovers stand shoulder to shoulder with the Ukrainian people. America will not tolerate any nation that bullies Ukraine into a sham peace that only rewards Kremlin aggression.

We join with the Ukrainian people in welcoming a just peace in Ukraine. However, any peace agreement cannot provide legal cover for Russia's land grab. Peace can only come to Europe when Russia respects the integrity of Ukraine's borders.

Madam Speaker, liberty on the European Continent hangs in the balance. Today we must do what is right and stand with Ukraine's people so that tomorrow she will have a lasting peace and Europe, as well.

#### CONGRATULATING THE RIVER ROUGE FOOTBALL TEAM

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

Ms. TLAIB. Madam Speaker, I rise today to give a hearty congratulations to our Panthers, the River Rouge High School football team on winning their first ever state championship. Thirteenth District strong is so incredibly proud.

In a dramatic game, our River Rouge Panthers prevailed over setbacks early on to defeat a formidable opponent. This hard-earned victory is a testament to the countless hours of training put in by this dedicated team, as well as the support of its coaches and our parents.

As legendary basketball coach Phil Jackson once said, "The strength of the team is each individual member. The strength of each member is the team."

Please join me in recognizing our River Rouge High School football team, the Panthers, and Coach Corey Parker for their outstanding accomplishment.

Congratulations, Panthers.

#### ECONOMIC JUSTICE ISSUES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. WEXTON). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the

gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. TLAIB) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Ms. TLAIB. Madam Speaker, today, I am representing the Congressional Progressive Caucus in our Special Order so that we can push forward on a number of agendas, especially on economic justice issues. I am really proud to join many of my colleagues today as we talk about housing for all across the United States of America.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. OMAR).

Ms. OMAR. Madam Speaker, I rise today to discuss the basic and dire human right that so many of us take for granted, the right to a safe and stable home.

Last week, families across this country gathered around in their dining rooms to give thanks and break bread, but many families in my home district were not sitting around for a holiday dinner. Instead, they were facing an indescribable tragedy. The day before Thanksgiving, a fire broke out in a 25-story public housing building in the Cedar-Riverside neighborhood of Minneapolis where I grew up. Five people lost their lives. And more than a week later residents are still in the hospital recovering from their injuries.

After the brave men and women of the local fire department cleared the scene and controlled the blaze, we discovered an almost unbelievable reality. These homes were not equipped with sprinklers. You see, these buildings are so old that it is exempt from laws that require such lifesaving equipment.

And that isn't the only egregious safety issue that our public housing residents are forced to endure.

There has been a ban on building new public housing since the 1990s. In fact, the Cedar-Riverside building that sustained the fire was built in the 1960s. And the Federal Government has been underfunding the repair and maintenance needs of the homes for years. In Minnesota, the backlog of repair needs totals over \$300 million. So not only are these homes half a century old, they are practically being held together with little more than hope and masking tape.

Make no mistake, we, as lawmakers, bear responsibility for the deplorable conditions of our public housing and for the deplorable and unsafe conditions that millions of Americans are living in today. This is our fault. The Federal Government has all but abandoned public housing.

We cannot continue to pretend that we can't see the crumbling buildings in our districts. We can't continue to ignore the hundreds of thousands who experience homelessness because of waiting lists for housing assistance. And it goes beyond the homeless population.

Millions of Americans are living every single day in fear of eviction. Twelve million Americans are paying more than half of their income in rent, and about 6,300 people are evicted every single day.

How can we in Congress call ourselves leaders if we continue to ignore this crisis?

I, for one, refuse to continue down that path. It is time for a bold and progressive solution.

I will be introducing legislation that ensures every public housing unit in this country is equipped with sprinklers, so that we never see another devastating tragedy like the one that befell the residents of my district. And we will be demanding accountability from HUD, requiring the agency to report on exactly how many units are not fitted with sprinklers and how much money the agency needs to fix this glaring hazard. But that is not enough.

Last month I introduced Homes for All Act, which would make an historic investment of \$1 trillion in public housing and low-income housing and build a record 12 million new homes over the next 10 years.

My bill would also ensure that public housing residents are guaranteed access to important wraparound services like employment assistance, child care, and financial literacy courses.

And just as important, my bill would make sure that public housing funding is a mandatory part of our Federal budget, meaning that the government wouldn't be able to abandon these new homes or neglect their upkeep. Public housing would now be treated like any other important guaranteed source of assistance, like Social Security and Medicare.

While my legislation is bold, it is also absolutely necessary. Every human being has a right to a safe and affordable home. And without an historic investment in our public housing stock and greater accountability for the safety of our residents, we will continue to face tragedies like the ones that claimed the lives of five people in Cedar-Riverside last week. We cannot let that happen, and I will not let that happen.

Madam Speaker, I thank Congresswoman RASHIDA TLAIB for allowing this conversation to take place today.

Ms. TLAIB. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. GOMEZ).

Mr. GOMEZ. Madam Speaker, I thank the Congresswoman from Michigan for having this Special Order on such an important issue.

When you look at inequality in America, you have to start with housing, because inequality often is started by how much a person pays to house their family, to house their kids, to house their family members.

In order to solve for inequality, we have to solve the housing crisis. And in order to solve the housing crisis, we have to acknowledge and rectify America's shameful history of discriminatory housing practices.

Policies and practices like redlining, segregation, blockbusting, and steering that denied low-income people and communities of color access to homeownership and created the housing disparities that are still prevalent today.

□ 1545

In America, homeownership is how we build wealth, and it determines your family's likelihood of success.

In America, whether you rent or you own, where you live determines where your kids go to school.

In America, it often determines how far you commute to work.

In America, it often determines how far you are from a grocery store and healthy options for food for your family. It also determines what public services are available to you.

But, unfortunately, many low-income individuals and people of color have been denied this opportunity.

We still have an opportunity to make amends and rectify the inequalities that have persisted in low-income neighborhoods and communities of color.

The Tax Code is one of the most powerful tools we have. That is why I re-introduced the Rent Relief Act.

This bill aims to reduce the rent burden by creating a new refundable tax credit for families that are paying more than 30 percent of their income in rent and utilities because no family should be forced to choose between paying rent and meeting their basic needs. This would put more money in the pockets of families at a time when wages have remained stagnant and housing costs have increased.

This bill has the potential to transform lives, provide millions of the lowest income people with a breadth of opportunities, and provide opportunities to climb the economic ladder by redistributing the benefits of homeownership to the lowest income earners.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to cosponsor this important piece of legislation.

Ms. TLAIB. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ), my good colleague.

Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. Madam Speaker, I thank Congresswoman TLAIB for hosting this Special Order hour on housing and our chair for presiding during this very critical conversation.

We are here today to talk about one of the most core, important issues facing the American people, which is housing.

Each and every year, it feels as though, as our wages remain stable or the same, rent is going up, and it becomes harder and harder to afford the very things that keep ourselves afloat and alive, whether it is healthcare, housing, or an education.

During the financial crisis of 2008, American households lost \$16 trillion in wealth. Many lost their homes and saw their savings and retirement funds depleted. More than half of all renters in America, over 21 million households, were rent-burdened in 2015, meaning that they spent 30 percent or more of their income on rent.

We are in one of the worst renter crises in a generation. At a time when our

country is at its wealthiest, in the city of New York, we are seeing populations of people who are homeless at the highest rates since the Great Depression. But there is another way.

When we start to legislate housing as a human right, we begin to change our priorities and move away from looking at housing as a for-profit commodity for speculation and toward something that should be guaranteed for all Americans at an affordable rate that can be accessible to all working people in America.

That is one of the reasons why I have introduced A Place to Prosper Act, which includes provisions like universal rent control, just cause evictions, a ban on income discrimination, access to counsel, improving the quality of the housing stock, and a disclosures requirement on corporate landlords to rein in bad actors.

Additionally, we also know that the area of housing and construction is one of the largest contributors to carbon emissions, which is why we have also introduced the Green New Deal for Public Housing Act. What that does is that it works and aims to decarbonize the entire public housing stock in the United States of America.

It is what must be done; it is in accordance with the science; and it changes the value system through which we approach housing away from the volatile boom-and-bust speculative environment and toward a secure and stable economic environment that treats housing as a right.

Ms. TLAIIB. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), my good colleague.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy in permitting me to speak on this and for organizing what I think is one of the most important discussions that this Congress needs to have.

Housing is fundamental. It has been the major source of wealth generation for millions of middle-class Americans and an even greater source of wealth accumulation for upper income Americans.

But, sadly, it has been a source of discrimination and widening income inequality because of decades of systematic discrimination by the Federal Government against people of color, especially African Americans.

I am embarrassed that in my community, returning World War II veterans were denied opportunities to live in neighborhoods where they could actually afford the loans. The redlining practices denied them an opportunity to be able to secure government-financed lending.

We had practices in the real estate industry that actively steered people away from certain neighborhoods. We had areas where people resisted allowing people of color to move in. The Federal Government did not enforce constitutional antidiscrimination provisions.

Madam Speaker, the consequences of decades of neglect, discrimination, and

underinvestment is visible today in most major American cities. It is obvious in my community, where we are seeing a homeless population that is persistent and growing.

We are seeing in communities large and small people who are rent-burdened, as my colleagues have already referenced, with half the people paying more than a third of their income, many of them over half, if they can qualify as renters at all.

The Federal Government has systematically reduced its modest housing footprint, not being involved in new housing construction for low-income and extremely low-income people.

There is no way, despite Ben Carson's mumbo jumbo, that those people can be self-sufficient, in terms of housing. They need direct government assistance.

The failure to have adequately housed them plays out in our streets. Inadequate housing has health consequences. In fact, we are watching now some of America's hospital systems realizing that fact and investing in housing opportunities and wrap-around services because people who are not adequately housed actually cost society far more.

We are watching steps that are being taken in the private sector to recognize that this is the quickest way to close that income inequality gap. It is the quickest way to strengthen communities. In fact, it has profound consequences for education.

Children who are housed not in concentrated poverty but in housing opportunities that integrate them into broader communities have much better performance in schools without increasing the number of teachers, without increasing the per capita spending per pupil. Where those children live is the most profound indicator of future academic success.

I have been troubled with this issue for years. This summer, I spent time developing a report on why the Federal Government needs to get back into the housing game. It is entitled "Locked Out: Reversing Federal Housing Failures and Unlocking Opportunity." It is available on my website.

Madam Speaker, I am deeply concerned that we finally recognize housing is a fundamental right. The United Nations recognized it as a fundamental human right in 1948, and we are a long way from that point.

We need to invest in reducing the shortage of 7 million affordable rental homes available to extremely low-income people. No State has an adequate supply of affordable homes.

I propose building 12 million new public housing units and fully funding all the maintenance need in the existing public housing stock rather than slowly starving the authorities in their ability to maintain an adequate housing stock.

I think it is past time to create a renter's tax credit to cover the difference between the rent and wages or

making Section 8 vouchers an entitlement program available for all who qualify.

Yes, it will be expensive, but we are already spending huge amounts of money subsidizing housing. The problem is that the subsidies go to people who need the help the least. The mortgage interest deduction provides most of the support for people at the upper income levels, people who already have housing. In countries around the world that don't even have a mortgage interest deduction, there is no great variation in homeownership rates.

We can adjust that now. There is an opportunity for us, and I have proposed equalizing the benefit of the mortgage interest deduction by converting it into a credit so that it treats people at various income levels equally.

I also think it is past time to eliminate a mortgage interest deduction for second homes and, instead, invest that money in helping people who don't have housing today.

It may seem to some that these are ambitious proposals, but I would suggest that the cost of past discrimination, the cost of inaction, costs us far more in terms of wasted human potential, increased law enforcement, increased health costs, and poor academic performance.

Madam Speaker, I deeply appreciate my colleagues coming forward with this discussion and working together on provisions that can make a difference.

We just had the Republicans pass the largest transfer of wealth in America's history, adding \$2 trillion to our national debt and doing nothing to deal with the housing crisis. In fact, it created housing burdens in States by wiping out the deduction for State and local income taxes, for instance.

I think it is time for us to stop paying for failure, to reassess our policies, to reverse decades of past discrimination, and to do things that will make a difference for American families.

Ms. TLAIIB. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. EVANS), my good colleague.

Mr. EVANS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman, my colleague from the great city of Detroit and from Michigan, for showing this leadership.

"None of us are home until all of us are home." This is the slogan of Project HOME, an organization in my district that empowers individuals to break the cycle of poverty and homelessness, starting with permanent supportive housing.

Safe, affordable housing is the basis of stability and well-being. Secure housing improves health outcomes, helps children perform better in school, and can break generational cycles of poverty. But given the skyrocketing cost of rent, which is outpacing incomes, secure housing is out of reach for many low-income families.

Lacking a fixed address makes it harder to land a job, enroll children in school, apply for assistance and benefits.

□ 1600

The affordable housing shortage is a crisis in my district and in many other cities and neighborhoods across the Nation.

I represent Philadelphia, a city which has a poverty rate of around 25 percent. Let me repeat that, a city with a poverty rate of about 25 percent. Most low-income renters spend at least half of their income on housing. This leaves no room for unexpected expenses such as medical bills, which can quickly send vulnerable families into housing inability, eviction, and, sometimes, homelessness.

We must increase funding for programs that help the most vulnerable, including children, people with disabilities, and seniors, such as homeless assistance grants and the housing choice voucher program.

Those living in poverty, including 400,000 in the city of Philadelphia, are struggling to find safe and affordable places to live. Over 40,000 families are on the Philadelphia Housing Authority waiting list—40,000 are on that list.

Most low-income renters in Philadelphia receive no government assistance with their housing costs, driving many to rely on alternative arrangements to secure shelter.

These are steps that we can take to address this growing crisis. We must invest in preserving existing public housing and improving health and safety through increased funding for the Public Housing Operating Fund and the Public Housing Capital Fund.

In the city of Philadelphia, the Philadelphia City Council recently passed a right to counsel law, providing attorneys for low-income families facing evictions.

But millions of Americans in other cities and communities face evictions every year. This lack of access to legal representation has led to unjust evictions. I am an original cosponsor of the Eviction Protection Act, which creates grants to provide legal representation to those facing eviction.

It is not an accident that two Members who stood up here are also members of the Ways and Means Committee, as I am. We all recognize that we can use the Tax Code to lift our neighborhoods and boost our stability in housing.

Yes, we can use the Tax Code. I am happy that my colleagues are from the Ways and Means Committee, and we should work together on that.

I support the expansion of the low-income housing tax credit—especially the credits for securing extremely low-income households—to bring capital to underserved regions.

Access to affordable housing is a right. It is time Congress acknowledges that fact. All Americans deserve quality homes—all Americans. None of us are home until all of us are home.

I want to stress that message: None of us are home until all of us are home.

Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman, again, from Detroit, Michigan,

for her leadership in bringing us together to talk about a subject that is very key to a lot of our survival. It is extremely essential that we have that opportunity, but it starts with leadership, and it starts today. We need to be relentless on this subject, and we need to be no nonsense.

Ms. TLAIB. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GARCÍA), my good colleague.

Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I thank Congresswoman TLAIB for bringing up this subject of the affordable housing shortage across our country. I want to speak about the affordable housing crisis that is unfolding across this country and affecting thousands of my constituents in the city of Chicago.

Throughout the Chicago area, there are just over 90,000 affordable, available rental homes, but the National Low Income Housing Coalition estimates that there are over 326,000 low-income renter households. That is right. Less than one in three households in Chicago have access to affordable housing.

The immense lack of housing is making it impossible for low-income communities to stay in our city. It is transforming my district, driving communities of color away from areas where they have lived for many, many decades.

According to the Chicago Community Trust, Chicago has lost more than 100,000 African American residents in the past 10 years alone. The Logan Square neighborhood in my district has lost more than 20,000 Latino residents and nearly 10,000 African Americans over the past 15 years.

Five years ago, Chicago's city council passed an ordinance encouraging transit-oriented development. I believe that improving transportation and mobility for our neighborhoods and tying that to affordable housing is critically important.

However, we know that development, when done incorrectly, can lead to gentrification, displacement, and racially inequitable outcomes. Since Chicago's ordinance passed, only one affordable housing development has been completed; another is getting off the ground.

I am planning to introduce legislation to incentivize equitable transit-oriented development, legislation to create Federal funding for affordable housing to be built near public transit so workers can get to and from jobs, school, and healthcare, as well as take advantage of the city's fine cultural amenities.

This bill will be a crucial step in addressing the enormous problems we are discussing today. If we can address the topics raised by the many speakers who are bringing home the urgency that Congress needs to act in this field of needed affordable housing, we can become a better country.

Madam Speaker, I thank Congresswoman TLAIB for taking the initiative and for hosting this discussion that can benefit our country.

Ms. TLAIB. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY), my good colleague.

Ms. PRESSLEY. Madam Speaker, I thank Representative TLAIB for her leadership on this and so many social justice issues. I really appreciate her organizing this Special Order hour, and I hope that, in some ways, it assures the American people that we have not lost sight of them and that this Congress continues to lead and to legislate on those issues of care, concern, and consequence to the American people. I know this is the number one constituent call that my district office receives, and I am certainly not alone in that.

Housing First is not just an approach to ending homelessness; it is a fundamental truth that should guide everything we do in these Chambers. When we speak of our priorities, when we speak of the important work we hope to do here, housing must come first.

Housing is the foundation of everything, and, therefore, must be foundational to everything that we seek to accomplish here as a body. Housing is a critical determinant of health and wealth and must be the foundation of our fight for greater justice for all.

I also would like to reiterate some of the points made earlier regarding our young people learning.

Earlier today, we heard from some young people about many of the barriers and obstacles to their readiness to learn. Housing was chief amongst them. As we see our families destabilized by growing gentrification and displacement and more families experiencing homelessness, this is certainly a contributor and a barrier to their readiness to learn. It is traumatic to not have a home.

I want to thank my sister in service, Representative ILHAN OMAR, for providing us with a vision for the future of housing: housing as a right; housing as a guarantee; housing for all.

In cities across the country, including those in my district, the housing supply lacks both in quantity and quality. According to the National Low Income Housing Coalition, in my district, the Massachusetts Seventh, two-thirds of residents and renters and those at minimum wage must work at least 84 hours a week to afford a decent one-bedroom at-fair-market-rent apartment.

When housing is in such short and perpetually deteriorating supply, we must ask ourselves: Where do we expect people to go?

When housing prices continue to skyrocket and we are constantly redefining affordability to hide that reality, where can people go?

For decades, this Nation's public and affordable housing supply has been chronically underfunded. Any serious solution must match the scale of this unprecedented crisis.

States must act; cities must act; and the Federal Government must act. How

we choose to spend our money is a direct reflection of our values.

Representative OMAR's Homes for All Act invests a total of \$1 trillion into our Nation's affordable housing stock. I was proud to be an original cosponsor of Homes for All, just as I was proud to cosponsor Senator WARREN's American Housing and Economic Mobility Act.

However, it is the work of activists and agitators on the ground that has pushed this issue to the forefront. While there is still much to do, I am heartened by the efforts of my colleagues, and I associate myself with all of their thoughtful and impassioned comments and legislative proposals highlighted during this Special Order hour.

We must continue to mobilize, to organize, and to legislate until Homes for All is no longer a promise, but a guarantee.

Ms. TLAIB. Madam Speaker, I know from my district in Detroit and throughout the 11 other surrounding communities, for us, being the third poorest congressional district in the country, housing is critical, critical not only for economic stability, but also in providing a safe haven for many of our families across the district.

Poverty is complex. A number of factors, including State and Federal policy failures and racial and gender inequities, have resulted in so much increased poverty, especially among children. Adjusting poverty requires that deep public investment in housing and other infrastructure, healthcare access, and public school investment, coupled with criminal justice reform policies designed to repair a history of segregation and continued exploitation.

Less than a year, Madam Speaker, into its enactment, the opportunity zone program has already resulted in millions of dollars of wasteful spending and possible corruption.

From cities like Chicago and Baltimore to the city of Detroit, billionaires were able to divert public tax dollars through a tax break called the opportunity zone that was supposed to lead to access to housing for our most vulnerable in communities like mine.

Instead, Madam Speaker, what we heard from an investigative report—ProPublica published an article, titled: "How a Tax Break to Help the Poor Went to NBA Owner Dan Gilbert." The article contained disturbing details that suggest that opportunity zones that were in the Trump tax scam had designated census tracts that did not meet the legal criteria and that political donations and influence had overridden the law to reward donors with generous tax breaks supposedly intended to benefit the poor.

Madam Speaker, in the article, billionaire Dan Gilbert's Quicken Loans company donated \$750,000 to President Trump's inauguration fund, hosted Ivanka Trump in 2017 for a panel discussion, and last year Dan Gilbert watched the midterm election returns at the White House with President

Trump, who has called Gilbert "a great friend." In return, Madam Speaker, three census tracts in downtown Detroit where Gilbert owns valuable property were selected for these large tax breaks through the opportunity zones.

According to ProPublica, multiple studies have found that property values in those zones increased because of this tax break. At least one of those census tracts did not meet the poverty requirement for being an opportunity zone and appears to have been designated solely due to political influence.

So, if we are going to talk about housing justice, we are going to talk about impacting and helping ensure that housing is a human right, we also need to take out the corruption and the political influence.

Email exchanges revealed Quicken executives working in concert with the White House to designate tracts with Gilbert's investments as opportunity zones. Madam Speaker, Quicken Loans lobbyists were directly involved in the selection process at every level, lobbying the city, State, and Federal officials to include Gilbert's investment zones in the opportunity zone law.

□ 1615

So I am asking us as we stand for housing for all that we need to restore public trust in our Federal Government which has been eroded with the rules that have been applied unevenly here and seem to reward the wealthiest and the best-connected among us. It appears that a tax program supposedly designed to benefit the poorest among us is now being used to reward political donors and wealthy investors.

I have asked the Committee on Ways and Means to investigate the actions by billionaire Dan Gilbert, and I have also asked the Treasury to respond to some of those questions.

This is why instead of these tax breaks for the wealthy and for billionaire-led development, I have proposed the BOOST Act.

The BOOST Act would give 3 to \$6,000 to families making less than \$100,000. It would instantly lift up 45 percent of Americans living in poverty now. Sixty-four million children would be instantly uplifted out of poverty. The BOOST Act would be paid for by repealing the Trump tax scam. In there, Madam Speaker, you saw not only the opportunity zones, but a number of tax breaks for the wealthy that only benefited the folks who are corporate-led who have actually been tainting our process to get access to affordable housing in this Chamber.

So I ask my colleagues, as we propose many fixes to access affordable housing and to repair some of the historic segregation zoning laws and the continued exploitation among many of our neighbors, that we also make sure that we are ensured that corruption within our government is not expanding and that we are holding those accountable who are trying to taint that process.

So I really appreciate my colleagues, members of the Congressional Progressive Caucus, in standing strong for housing as a human right.

Many of the proposals you see forward, Madam Speaker, will only depend on whether or not we can implement it in a way that is just and is very democratic and, again, has really clear oversight. Things like the opportunity zone are not the direction that we need our country to go in, and I am looking forward to introducing legislation that would not only ask for repealing the opportunity zone but actually use it for land trust and community trust funds, things that will be rooted within communities and help those who, again, are seeing homeownership among communities of color decrease, seeing increases between 30 to 50 percent of their income going towards rent. I think the way we have to do it is all those goals, not only proposals, but also making sure that we are implementing it in a way that is just and fair.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN).

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for the opportunity to speak, and I commend her for her stellar effort to bring justice to the housing circumstance in our country.

I am honored to say that I did visit her congressional district, and we had a field hearing that was quite successful. She truly is engaged and involved in making a difference in her community.

Madam Speaker, I was there in 2008 when we had the housing crisis. I remember when Secretary Paulson came before the committee. He was there in need of some funds for what were called toxic assets. He was there because the market was in a free fall. He was there because there was an imminent crisis that had to be contained.

I remember him asking for a large sum of money with few pages, probably less than 5 pages. He wanted us to infuse capital into a process that would allow us to purchase these toxic assets. He was indicating to us that this was an emergency. He did not ask for hundreds of millions of dollars. He did not ask for tens of billions of dollars. He requested hundreds of billions of dollars.

I do recall that I spoke to constituents, and being the judicious person that I was, I did pay attention to my constituents who encouraged me and insisted that I not bail out the big banks. That was the language that was used: Do not bail out the big banks, AL.

I was judicious. I listened to my constituents. When we took the vote on the floor to accord the sum of 700-some billions of dollars, I remember standing over in the door and looking at the vote. I could also see the stock market at the same time. As the bill was failing, the stock market was crashing. It was a day that I will never forget. I went back home, and I visited with my constituents.

The constituents said to me: AL, what is wrong with you? You did not vote to save my 401(k). You let the market fall. You could have voted to support us.

I learned an invaluable lesson that day. The lesson is this: there are times when you have to do what you know to be the best thing, even when your constituents might stand in opposition to it. That is the lesson that I carry with me to this day. I came back. We had a second vote, and I voted for the funds necessary to deal with the toxic assets.

One of the reasons why I was so concerned about this was because I understood what was happening. There were instruments that were in the marketplace that were not suitable for everyone. We had something called a 327 and a 228; 3 years, 2 years of a fixed rate, and then 27 years or 28 years of a variable rate. This was not suitable for everyone. We had no-doc loans, meaning no documents necessary, and you could walk in and work out some means by which you could acquire a loan, Madam Speaker. We had negative amortization, a process that allowed you to at some point continue to owe more than you initially borrowed.

We had something called the yield spread premium. The yield spread premium allowed the person who originated your loan to originate a loan for you for an amount in excess of what you qualified for. Here is how it worked: That person would check to see what you were eligible for as a rate. You could qualify for a loan at 5 percent, but at that time because of the yield spread premium, the person originating could come out and say, good news, I have a loan for you for 8 percent. You qualify for 5, you get a loan for 8 percent interest, and the person would never have to tell you that you qualified for the 5 percent. The money between 5 and 8 was called the spread, and the yield on that spread could be shared with the person who originated the loan and the lender, the yield spread premium.

Poor people, well, people who are of little means who acquired homes with these 327s and 228s, that I mentioned where the rate would go up and down, they lost homes. It is said that in the African American community a generation of wealth was lost—a generation. The community is still recovering from the 2008 downturn.

I believe that we do have to reconsider how we address housing in this country. There are some people who are born into poverty. They are not born into plenty. For those who are not born into poverty, it is not easy to work your way to plenty. So we have to have housing as a means by which they can acquire and accumulate wealth.

One of the things that I tried to do—and there are many things that can be done—is to use something called alternative credit scoring. This is where you will score a person's light bill, gas bill, water bill, phone bill, and cable bill

and use that information with the traditional credit to allow that person to have maybe the little additional help needed so as to acquire a loan. It is a pilot program. We have passed the bill out of committee. It is H.R. 123.

This piece of legislation will allow many, many persons with thin files and with little credit, because they haven't been in the credit market, to get a home. Many people who are paying now X number of dollars for rent will be able to acquire a home for X minus some amount, meaning less than what they are paying for rent, they will be able to acquire a home.

I am pleased to say that many of the prudential agencies are in agreement and are encouraging this. Just today we had a hearing with the Housing, Community Development and Insurance Subcommittee, and Mr. Montgomery, who is the head of FHFA, was there. I will be visiting with him. He and I agreed to have an appointment so that we can talk about these things and see what we can do to help with homeownership for persons who were not born in the suites of life and many who now find themselves living in the streets of life.

This is something that is an imperative. It is a moral imperative. It is something that we have to do because we want to have a just society, and a just society would afford an equal opportunity to all to have a place to call home. In the richest country in the world, every person ought to have a fair opportunity to have a place to call home.

I thank the gentlewoman for allowing me to share, and I encourage her to continue on her mission to bring justice to those who find themselves living in places that, quite frankly, most people in Congress would not live in under any circumstances, but, unfortunately, we are not doing enough to help others to be extricated from the circumstances of which we speak.

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

#### PRESCRIPTION DRUG PRICING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Madam Speaker, what we are going to do today is actually sort of a little follow-up with a couple of other things sprinkled in here.

I want to walk through, once again, some of the numbers and some of the good things that have happened. I want to talk also about H.R. 3, which is a reference pricing bill that has gone through Ways and Means in regard to pharmaceuticals that actually I don't think anybody understands what the underlying mechanisms are on how Europe and those actually do set drug pricing and to understand the rationing that will be coming with that.

But, first off, what is the greatest threat to our society?

I am going to argue it is actually the coming mountain of debt. It is not Republican or Democrat, it is called demographics. There are 74 million of us who are baby boomers. 74 million baby boomers were born in an 18-year period, we have our earned entitlements coming, and we functionally have no cash in the bank for them. So this board is really, really important, and I can't believe I don't see it in everyone's office here.

This is a 30-year window. Let's actually just pull out Social Security and Medicare. Madam Speaker, you do realize that if you look at the Social Security and Medicare from the numbers, we have \$23 trillion in the bank. Now, this one is not inflation adjusted, so these are raw numbers, but \$23.1 trillion, if you want to be accurate, in the bank, but when we roll Social Security and Medicare in and their financing costs—the money has to be borrowed to keep the promises—we are functioning at \$103 trillion in debt.

□ 1630

It is math. It is not Republican or Democratic. It is demographics. We are getting older as a society.

Since 1971, our birthrates have been below replacement rates. We need to deal with the reality of math, but as this place now proceeds, we will make math partisan. But the math will always win.

It breaks my heart because there are things we can do policy-wise that make it work, that keep us under or right about that 95 percent debt-to-GDP, and we survive our demographic bubble. But we have people around here that say crazy things that have no basis in economics, no basis in the math, no basis in our demographics. The cruelty they are bringing down on our society and my 4-year-old daughter, destroying her future, is because of the unwillingness to own a calculator.

So, one more time, if we pull Social Security and Medicare out of our 30-year window, we have \$23 trillion in the bank. If we put them back in, we are \$103 trillion in debt in that 30-year window. Remember, just the growth of Social Security, Medicare, healthcare entitlements, just the growth every 5 years equals the entire Defense Department.

When you hear some of our brothers and sisters on the left come behind the microphone and say, "Well, if we would just reduce defense spending," you can wipe out all of defense spending, and in 5 years, you are back where you began.

That is the reality of our demographics. How many people have you heard come behind these microphones in the last year, other than myself and maybe one or two others who work on these things? It is silent because it is really hard to talk about. It is really difficult. It is scary. It is the single thing that destroys our economic vitality for the future. But once again, it would require owning a calculator.

It is lots of people's fault, but it is Congress' fault, but it is decades old.

Here is where most of that comes from. If you take some of the math for a couple that retires today—it is not their fault; this is just the math—they will have put about \$161,000 into Medicare. They are going to receive just shy of \$500,000 out. Take that, functionally, \$300,000-plus difference, multiply it by 74 million, and now you understand the driver of our debt.

You will hear people come behind the microphone and say, "Well, it is waste and fraud," or, "We don't tax rich people enough." Those are all absurd. The percentage of tax revenues as the percentage of GDP is within the margin. Waste and fraud, yes, we need to deal with it, but it would be a fraction of these numbers.

Remember, we are about to come up on the 2-year anniversary of tax reform. This last fiscal year, unlike every economist that the left brought to us out of the crazy—and I know that is mean, but it is true.

Things that were being said on this floor when we debated tax reform, reforming our system: "Oh, revenues are going to crash." "The world is coming to an end." "It is Armageddon."

We went up over 4 percent in what they call receipts growth last year. Our problem is that we spent dramatically more than that. I think our spending was approaching almost 7 percent growth because we had so many things added to spending. About half of that 7 percent is just, once again, demographics. But we grew revenues even with the tax reform slightly over 4 percent.

There should have been joy around here, if you think about where we are economically. You all saw the applications for unemployment today, 10,000 down from what the projection was.

Once again, we are demonstrating the labor markets are a miracle. They are remarkable. I don't think there is anyone living today who has lived in a time that is this economically stable, when you look at our labor markets, when you look at wage growth, the lack of inflation.

There should be joy on this floor, talking about the miracle of our brothers and sisters who were being written off just a couple years ago because they didn't have a high school education, didn't have a certain skill, were going to be part of the permanent underclass.

It turns out those folks who were willing to write off those brothers and sisters, those Americans, were wrong. That population—and I hate this term, but we use it—those lower quartiles of economics—education, skill sets—who were being written off, they have had the fastest movement of income. You saw the number, if anyone cares about these things.

Last year, a single woman, no partner in the house: 7.6 percent growth in wages. These are numbers that I can tell you from being on the Joint Economic Committee for years that every

economist we would bring in would look at us like we were out of our minds if we predicted numbers like that. Where is the joy?

The fact of the matter is there has been more progress in the last 24 months for our brothers and sisters who have physical issues, have had substance abuse issues, have had criminal records, these sorts of things, coming back into the labor force.

There is this thing called U-6 data, U-4 data, all these things. When you see the unemployment rate and all this information of workers who might be—we use the term "marginally attached" and haven't been looking, who quit looking, the number of those who are moving into the labor force that we barely give any credit for when we see the top-line number because the top-line number is those who are looking.

There is an economic miracle happening right now when you see the robustness, the stability of our labor markets. Shouldn't the debate on this floor be: It is working for our brothers and sisters who we have always said were poor or that we were writing off. Something is working for them. How do we keep doing more? How do we keep adopting the policies that are working and avoid the crazy policies of just a couple years ago that didn't work, that punished these populations?

These are the folks who had just a really crappy decade. They fell further behind every single year. There is some math out there, and it is not all put together. I am being maybe a little pathologically optimistic here, but there are some preliminary numbers that last fiscal year could be the very first year in modern times where income inequality did not grow and potentially shrank. It is not because wealthy people didn't make more money. It is because poor people made more money than they had before.

Where is the joy? Where is the discussion of how we do more of this?

It turns out, for all those out there who are busting their backsides, working, paying into programs like Social Security and Medicare, why aren't we being honest with them that the scale of the unfunded nature is devastating?

If you are a young person today, do understand that when you hit your peak earning years, your tax rate will have to be double today's just to maintain these basic earned benefits. There is a path, but that path requires a whole bunch of things.

It is going to be my very last board that I am going to put up because you have to have incredible economic robustness, and you have to have a tax system that maximizes economic vitality, an immigration system that maximizes economic vitality, a regulatory system that uses smart technologies to maximize labor force incentives, family formation incentives, technology adoption incentives, all these things. And there is a path to deal with this.

Then what happens this week is the discussion of H.R. 3, which is the drug

reference pricing model. Almost no one has read it or understood the actual mechanisms it is offering.

Why do I bring this up as part of an economic discussion? Part of the miracle we are about to live is that we are about to live in a time where technology, if we legalize it, is about to crash the price of healthcare.

Technology is something that looks like a big kazoo that you blow into that instantly tells you that you have the flu, instantly can update your medical records on your phone. If we make it legal, it can instantly order your antivirals.

When I talk about healthcare technology, it is a whole string of things that will keep us healthy. But the other side is that we are about to live in the time of miracles. The single-shot care for hemophilia, it is here. It is going to be really expensive, but hemophilia is also really expensive.

We should be talking about ways to have more of these disruptive pharmaceuticals that take care of hemophilia, ALS, Crohn's, cystic fibrosis, and sickle cell anemia. We are on the cusp of having the pharmaceuticals that either stabilize or cure these.

They are incredibly expensive. These are small populations, but remember, 5 percent of the population with chronic diseases is the majority of our healthcare spending.

If we go back to the slide here, the majority of what is about to hit us over the next 30 years is Medicare. It is healthcare spending.

What happens if you crash the price of healthcare? Well, one of the ways you do that is you cure people.

The Democrats are pushing a piece of legislation that sounds at first really good. "Hey, we are going to lower new drug prices by reaching out to a handful of European countries and getting their prices. Then you can't go more than that, or we are going to give you a 95 percent tax," which if you reverse it is a 1,950 percent tax.

Except, you have to understand, and I know this board is really hard to read, we are going to use the Great Britain model. What is a year of you being healthy worth? It is an honest question because that is what is about to be imported into the country. For you, your family, your child, what are you willing to believe is the value of a year of health? If you are in Great Britain, their model, their formula, is \$38,000.

If this breakthrough pharmaceutical would make you healthy for 1 more year and costs more than \$38,000, it is not purchased. It is not part of the formulary. That is what the Democrats are saying we need to import into this country.

So understand that the Democrats are about to say a year of you being healthy is not worth \$38,001. I don't think they know that. I don't think anyone who has read it understood how this handful of European countries builds their pricing mechanisms, but they do it by scarcity.

They basically say, “Hey, I know this would cure you for the next year, but you are out of luck. It is over \$38,000 here in Great Britain, so you are on your own.”

At a certain level, this is just incredibly cruel. How could you look someone in the eyes and say: “I value your life at \$38,000 for a year of you being healthy.” But that is the cruelty that is being discussed.

At first, it sounds really wonderful: “Hey, we are going to lower drug prices by using reference pricing.” But the fact of the matter is, how do you tell Americans that what this means is not only are you not going to be able to have these things that keep you healthy anymore because they are going to be outside the price window, but the other thing is there was a major report put together early this week that also said a substantial number of the drugs, like 100-plus, that are in the pipeline, that are about to cure our brothers and sisters who are part of that 5 percent of the chronic conditions that is the majority of our healthcare spending, those cures are going to stop because they are really expensive, really risky, really hard to put together?

The vast majority of them fail, so they sort of roll the dice and say: “If we succeed, we get a fairly decent payday, but it is going to pay for a whole lot of failed drug trials.”

We are about to make a policy decision as a country: “We are not going to cure you. You get to suffer.”

The pharmaceutical industry, for all the frustrations, they will go back to what they were doing a couple of decades ago, saying they are just going to do a derivative on an existing drug, so, therefore, they have very little research costs. They already know what their profit margin is. It is nice and safe to do.

The things the Republicans did in this Congress, where we did the CURES Act a few years ago, where we created a pipeline to cure people, that pipeline is about to get crushed.

You have to understand the cruelty of this. This is just math. This is what other countries do on their formula.

If you really wanted to crash the price of pharmaceuticals, it turns out, yes, there is a whole list of things that are bipartisan: the way you deal with the capital that is used for the investments, the way you do the patents, the way you allow competing types of biologics and others come to market.

But there is another crazy thought experiment here that almost no one has ever talked about. Do you realize that half the pharmaceuticals that will be picked up today, so half the pharmaceuticals someone is going through a drive-through for or walking into their pharmacy for right now, half of them will not be used or will not be used properly? Just part of the thought experiment.

They will not be used or will not be used properly. That is going to cost the country about half a trillion dollars

this year. It is 16 percent of the total U.S. healthcare expenditures because people don't take their prescribed pharmaceuticals properly, and they get sick and die.

It turns out we have all sorts of things we could do today, but it requires being creative. Let's face it, this is an absolute creativity-free as well as a math-free zone.

The little bottle that has the top that tells you when grandma has opened it so that you know she is taking her pharmaceuticals that keep her alive, we have that technology. It is not very expensive. It changes drug efficacy usage because you know when you took it.

How many of you know someone that has multiple pharmaceuticals they take, and they have to take them at certain parts of the day? We now have little distribution devices. There are several of them on the market that drop the pills, tell you the time, let you know if you don't pick them up. It rings your phone, rings the family's phone, if they are not picked up.

□ 1645

It turns out there are technology things that could actually change almost a half a trillion dollars of expenses a year. This is dramatically bigger than blowing up the cures that are coming, but it requires some creativity to understand that half of the pharmaceuticals that are being picked up today will not be taken or will not be taken properly.

Another proposal—and do it more as a thought experiment: For really high-value pharmaceuticals, go look in your own personal medicine cabinet right now. How many of them are still sitting in there? They are just getting old. You did not take them. They are just sitting there.

Why don't we package those high-value ones in a double-layer blister pack or in a pod that keeps them sterile and allow you to return them? Maybe there are folks in our society who those really expensive pharmaceuticals, if they were returned and could be redistributed, they would still be sterile.

There are creative ideas where you could have this massive disruption in the price that we as Americans put out in our drug costs. But it requires some creativity instead of the arrogance of we are basically going to blow up your future. Because that is what is being proposed to us.

But this number is stunning, if I came to you and said, if you could change the way pharmaceuticals are used and have the efficacy of proper use, it is 16 percent of all the healthcare expenditures of this country.

I threw this slide in as more back to: Remember how we were just talking about Medicare and, functionally, that is the ultimate driver of our future debt and, unless we have a disruption in healthcare costs—not debates about

how we finance, but disruption in the cost. Let me give you a single example of what the investment in cures means.

I know this chart is almost impossible to read, but the simple point is about 30 percent of Medicare spending is going to be diabetes. A single cure—now, diabetes is complex. We know it is more than the production of insulin. There are autoimmune responses. There is 1 and 2. It is complex, but do the thought experiment with me.

If you cured diabetes tomorrow, almost 30 percent of that unfunded liability of Medicare goes away. That is why it is so incredibly important we are investing in these cures that H.R. 3 is about to destroy.

We always either start or end with this slide. We are trying to make a simple point that, if we can get the policy correct here, we can have an amazing future. The United States can have an amazing future.

But we have spent almost the year here—2019, we have, functionally, done nothing.

Do you remember all the promises of we are going to work bipartisan because we have a Republican Senate and then, obviously, the left, the Democrats, control the House here? We are going to work together. We are going to do all these creative things together. And we have done none of it.

We have spent lots of time on impeachment. We have pushed out a handful of bills that were just almost crazy in their policy sets to satiate the radicalized face of the Democrats.

I am sorry. I know that is mean, but it is true.

So let's take a step backwards and pull out our calculators and understand, once again, that 30-year window, \$103 trillion of debt—if you actually normalize it to inflation adjusted. Okay. So it is, at today's discount rate—I am not sure. It would probably be somewhere in the \$83 trillion of debt, inflation adjusted.

So here is our argument: Get the things that grow the economy right. We have demonstrated getting the Tax Code right has produced a miracle of economic growth in the way of labor participation. Our brothers and sisters, people, are working. And it turns out those have cascade effects in everything from health to there will be falls in substance abuse use. We see great things happening.

But with economic growth, we have to get immigration correct. We have to get trade correct. We have to get the way we regulate, using technology. Instead of a 1938 model of fill out lots of paperwork and shove it in a file cabinet, and when you screw up, we pull out the file cabinet so we can sue you, using crowdsource technology where we know, if you screw up, we catch you instantly and we can fix it right then.

There are amazing changes right here.

Population stability: How do you encourage families? How do you build an immigration system that actually is

more talent-based so you maximize economic growth so we can keep our economic promises?

How do you encourage people to be in the labor force?

One of the very odd things we see in the data is that December, a year ago, suddenly we saw in the data statistics millennial females moving into the labor force at substantial numbers but millennial males still substantially underperforming. Why? Is this the opioid crisis? Are there other factors?

We need to know those sorts of things because, it turns out, when we have entire quartiles of our population who are underperforming in the labor market, it has really bad societal cascade effects.

So let's work on policies that get as many folks who are interested. Whether you be retirement age or that millennial male, what do we have to do as a society to encourage, to prod, to push for you to be in the labor force? Because that is important not only to you as an individual, but it is really important to the country's economic stability.

Technology disruption: We just talked about the curative drugs that are coming. We also can talk about the sensors and the other things that are going to allow us to stay healthy. How do we update the laws so that thing like that flu kazoo isn't illegal?

There is a reason you didn't go to Blockbuster Video last weekend. Technology changes. We need to make sure our law sets are sympathetic to the changes that can reduce our prices in healthcare, to protect the environment and so many other things.

Yet we are decades behind in the way we write laws here and understanding how to future-proof those laws so, when we have disruptive technologies—and anyone who is really interested in this, pull out your phone. Go to a search engine, and go look up “MIT ambient air capture” and look at the miracle they have.

If what they have published is correct on, now, their price per ton—they believe they can pull CO<sub>2</sub> right out of the air or do it right over a smokestack. If those numbers are correct, we now have a major change in CO<sub>2</sub> emissions in the world because of our ability now, at amazing prices, to be able to pull it almost right out of the air.

These technologies are here. Why aren't we here talking about them on the floor, and how to encourage more of it and how to get it rolled out in society, not only here, but across the world? Because, if you actually care about global warming—or climate change or whatever the current pop term is—it turns out there are amazing technology disruptions that are here. The only problem is they don't allow you to control other people's lives; they just solve the problem. And are we about solving the problem or just the control freaks who are often the Members of this body?

And then other things: The earned entitlements. You have earned your

Social Security. You have earned your Medicare. Are there things we can do in those benefits to encourage you to stay healthier; to, if you feel like it, work; to actually, instead of taking your benefits, say how long would you like—if we gave you a spiff, would you wait?

There is tinkering you can do here that actually makes the programs more sound. And if you do it all together, we believe we have a model that provides an economic future where we are not destroyed by the growing debt.

But there is no single answer. It is going to have to be almost a holistic approach of lots of types of policies woven together, and every single one of them needs to be about the reality of our demographics.

And now the experiment I will ask you all to engage in: Watch the floor this week and see how many people will ever come behind these microphones and talk about the economic growth and survival of this country because of what is about to happen, the debt that is about to crush us and the fact that we are not talking about it. Instead, we are busy, basically, doing levels of absurdity around here.

The cruelty you have just also subjected my 4-year-old daughter to—and her economic future—you should all be ashamed of yourselves, ourselves, myself, because there is a path. The problem is this path doesn't ideologically satiate those who have just gone so extreme.

But the math is real, the math works, and the math, Madam Speaker, always wins.

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

#### IMMIGRATION POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Madam Speaker, obviously, most of the newspapers, insofar as people still read newspapers, most of the TV shows in the last month have focused on the impeachment hearings. And we all know that, at the end of the day, impeachment or no impeachment, President Trump is not going to be removed in the next year.

So the question is: Why are we spending so much time on impeachment?

I have felt, in the long-term future of America, the most significant thing going on right now is what is going on with immigration policy in the United States; and as long as this impeachment hearing has taken the top of the page in the newspaper, immigration is at the bottom of the page.

I believe one of the primary reasons for keeping immigration from the public is they don't want the public to know what is going on in immigration or what isn't going on in Congress with regard to immigration.

At its worst, we allowed over 140,000 people in this country in May. President Trump has been asking for help in this crisis, and he has gotten no—or virtually no help from Congress. Nevertheless, things that President Trump has done on his own have reduced that figure, if only temporarily.

I mention again, 145,000 people caught and processed in May and probably over another 10,000 people not even processed. That number has gone down to around 45,000 in September, and we believe it will be even lower in October. This is largely because of things that President Trump has done on his own.

He has negotiated with the Mexican Government—to a certain extent, under threat of tariffs—to put Mexican troops on the southern border.

The Mexican Government is patrolling the interior of its country for people trying to work their way north, and President Trump has reached agreements with the triangle countries of Central America, the countries of Guatemala, El Salvador, and Honduras, and they are currently taking people coming from farther south who need asylum.

President Trump has also—we wish he was doing more here, but he began building a wall, and we are working our way toward adding another 450 miles of wall by the end of next year. This is a significant improvement toward what it should be, but we are still well short of where we want to be.

What should Congress be doing, or what should we be focusing on while Congress is spending time debating impeachment?

First of all, we have a shortage of detention beds. So, when ICE is trying to remove people from this country, there are a lack of beds to place people in. There is no reason why, given the amount of money we are spending here, that should not be taken care of.

There have been requests for another 5,000 people in the Border Patrol, and there are still, unquestionably, people streaming across this border every month who aren't even counted because we are not taking care of them.

□ 1700

But there are other things that can be done as well. There is the Trafficking Victims Protection Act.

Some people talk about children being separated from their parents. This is something that Congress can solve on its own.

Right now, if children try to come here, single children from Mexico and Canada, they are returned to their parents to make their families whole. In a loophole in the law, if children come here from countries other than Canada and Mexico, we are bound to keep them and separate them from their families.

Congress should act, and the same law that applies to Mexico and Canada should apply to Venezuela or Honduras or Guatemala. We have no business allowing the current law to continue in

which people are coming here while their parents are in another country.

We have the Flores settlement in which, right now, people have to be released after being detained for 20 days. Given the slowness of our court system, it is not unusual for people to have to be released prior to the time when a hearing takes place. Again, Congress should act and spend time on that rather than continue to spend time on impeachment.

We continue to have a problem with sanctuary cities in which, when we want to remove people even from incarceration types of facilities or from jails, particularly from jails, sanctuary municipalities are not allowing us to remove people, even criminal people.

Congress should act, and Congress has not acted, so that we do not allow these sanctuary cities to forbid access to the jails for ICE to remove people from this country.

Another thing that should be done is something should be done about the credible fear standard and when people are allowed in this country and when people are not allowed in this country. But, again, Congress has refused to act.

I want to point out that we can do all these things without being anti-immigrant.

And something that hasn't been noticed in the most recent year: Over 800,000 new people were sworn into this country, and President Trump is doing nothing to reduce that figure. As a matter of fact, that 830,000 figure is well over the 700,000 figure of the relatively recent past.

President Trump is a friend of legal immigration, but we have to stop being a friend of illegal immigration.

In other things that encourage people to come here, Secretary Carson is going to bat and trying to keep our limited, low-income housing stock available for our own citizens and not people who are here illegally. It would be good if Congress stepped up to the plate and said we are going to put our homeless veterans ahead of people who are in this country illegally.

President Trump is also trying to put work requirements in the SNAP program. And let's be honest: If we have a program giving away free food without a work requirement, that is an inducement for people from other countries to come here.

Congress should, again, convene and bring bills to the floor that put a work requirement with the SNAP benefit. A work requirement with a SNAP benefit, making it a less advantageous welfare program, would stop sending the message for the rest of the world to come into the country.

So, in summary, there are a variety of things that have to be done and that Congress should be acting on and that the mainstream media and even the conservative media should be paying attention to because they are going to affect the future of this country for the next 10 or 20 or 30 years, unlike the impeachment inquiries which we know

are going nowhere, although the impeachment inquiries are keeping other things off the page.

We need more detention beds.

We have to change the credible fear standard so that less people are able to come in this country without doing something, without having a genuine fear.

We have to change the 20 days in the Flores settlement so we are not required to release people in the country.

And above all, we have to change the Trafficking Victims Protection Act so that we can remove children from this country and send them back to their parents in Central America.

I don't know why, with so many people in this institution purporting to claim that they want families together, we do not amend our current laws and do with other countries what we already do with Mexico and Canada, and that is tell an unaccompanied minor: You belong with your parents. We are not going to separate you from your parents.

However, Congress is not acting. And I think one of the reasons they are able to get away with not acting on this is because the papers are filled with impeachment, impeachment, impeachment all day long.

So, in summary, I hope we pay attention to the number of people coming in this country.

I hope we congratulate President Trump on the things he was able to do without Congress doing anything, congratulate him on the reduction of—I will play with my mind here a little bit—reduction of over 70 percent, about 75 percent reduction in the number of people who are processed in this country compared to 4 or 5 months ago.

But I also think we have to pay attention to the things that we are not finishing at this time, and I hope the media and the American public does not take its eye off the immigration ball while we focus on the impeachment hearing.

And I really hate to say it, but I do believe one of the reasons why some people want to keep impeachment in the news is, as long as impeachment dominates the news, we are not talking about Congress' neglect in doing what they should do to secure our border and to make sure that the people coming here are people coming here for legal green cards, legal work visas, and, eventually, to be sworn in as legal citizens.

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

#### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Robert F. Reeves, Deputy Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 5277. An act to amend section 442 of title 18, United States Code, to exempt certain interests in mutual funds, unit investment trusts, employee benefit plans, and re-

tirement plans from conflict of interest limitations for the Government Publishing Office.

#### BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Cheryl L. Johnson, Clerk of the House, reported that on December 4, 2019, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills:

H.R. 887. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 877 East 1200 South in Orem, Utah, as the "Jerry C. Washburn Post Office Building".

H.R. 1252. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 6531 Van Nuys Boulevard in Van Nuys, California, as the "Marilyn Monroe Post Office".

H.R. 1253. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 13507 Van Nuys Boulevard in Pacoima, California, as the "Ritchie Valens Post Office Building".

H.R. 1526. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 200 Israel Road Southeast in Tumwater, Washington, as the "Eva G. Hewitt Post Office".

H.R. 1844. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 66 Grove Court in Elgin, Illinois, as the "Corporal Alex Martinez Memorial Post Office Building".

H.R. 1972. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1100 West Kent Avenue in Missoula, Montana, as the "Jeannette Rankin Post Office Building".

H.R. 2151. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 7722 South Main Street in Pine Plains, New York, as the "Senior Chief Petty Officer Shannon M. Kent Post Office".

H.R. 2325. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 100 Calle Alondra in San Juan, Puerto Rico, as the "65th Infantry Regiment Post Office Building".

H.R. 2334. To designate the Department of Veterans Affairs community-based outpatient clinic in Odessa, Texas, as the "Wilson and Young Medal of Honor VA Clinic".

H.R. 2451. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 575 Dexter Street in Central Falls, Rhode Island, as the "Elizabeth Buffum Chace Post Office".

H.R. 3144. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 8520 Michigan Avenue in Whittier, California, as the "Jose Ramos Post Office Building".

H.R. 3314. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1750 McCulloch Boulevard North in Lake Havasu City, Arizona, as the "Lake Havasu City Combat Veterans Memorial Post Office Building".

Cheryl L. Johnson, Clerk of the House, further reported that on December 5, 2019, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill:

H.R. 5277. To amend section 442 of title 18, United States Code, to exempt certain interests in mutual funds, unit investment trusts, employee benefit plans, and retirement plans from conflict of interest limitations for the Government Publishing Office.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GROTHMAN. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 7 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, December 6, 2019, at 9 a.m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

3187. A letter from the Director, Issuances Staff, Food Safety and Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Publication Method for Lists of Foreign Countries Eligible To Export Meat, Poultry, or Egg Products to the United States [Docket No.: FSIS-2018-0027] (RIN: 0583-AD72) received December 2, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3188. A letter from the Acting Principal Director, Defense Pricing and Contracting, Defense Acquisition Regulations Systems, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Repeal of Temporary Statutory Authorities (DFARS Case 2019-D040) [Docket: DARS-2019-0066] (RIN: 0750-AK86) received December 3, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Armed Services.

3189. A letter from the Senior Legal Advisor for Regulatory Affairs, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — IMARA Calculation Under the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program (RIN: 1505-AC62) received December 3, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3190. A letter from the Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Regulatory Capital Rule: Capital Simplification for Qualifying Community Banking Organizations (RIN: 3064-AE91) received December 3, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3191. A letter from the Deputy Chief, Disability Rights Office, Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Misuse of Internet Protocol (IP) Captioned Telephone Service [CG Docket No.: 13-24]; Telecommunications Relay Services and Speech-to-Speech Services for Individuals with Hearing and Speech Disabilities [CG Docket No.: 03-123] received December 2, 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.

3192. A letter from the Chief, Pricing Policy Division, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Reform of Certain Part 61 Tariff Rules [WC Docket No.: 18-276]; Petitions for Limited Waiver of Rule 61.74(a) [WC Docket No.: 17-308] received December 2, 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.

3193. A letter from the Deputy Bureau Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Bridging the Digital Divide for Low-Income Consumers [WC Docket No.: 17-287]; Lifeline and Link Up Reform and Modernization [WC Docket No.: 11-42]; Telecommunications Carriers Eli-

gible for Universal Service Support [WC Docket No.: 09-197] received December 2, 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.

3194. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 18-083, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3195. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 19-066, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3196. A letter from the Federal Liaison Officer, Patent and Trademark Office, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — International Trademark Classification Changes [Docket No.: PTO-T-2019-0036] (RIN: 0651-AD44) received December 2, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3197. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2019-0483; Product Identifier 2019-NM-053 AD; Amendment 39-19795; AD 2019-23-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 2, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3198. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Fokker Services B.V. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2019-0666; Product Identifier 2019-NM-086-AD; Amendment 39-19792; AD 2019-22-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 2, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3199. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Textron Aviation Inc. (Type Certificate Previously Held by Beechcraft Corporation) Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2019-0959; Product Identifier 2019-CE-051-AD; Amendment 39-19804; AD 2019-23-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 2, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3200. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2019-0323; Product Identifier 2019-NM-026-AD; Amendment 39-19785; AD 2019-22-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 2, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3201. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Company Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2019-0894; Product Identifier 2019-NE-32-AD; Amendment 39-19798; AD 2019-21-51] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 2, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3202. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's notice of proposed rulemaking — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Defense and Space S.A. (Formerly Known as Construcciones Aeronauticas, S.A.) Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2019-0869; Product Identifier 2019-NM-162-AD] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 2, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3203. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2019-0400; Product Identifier 2019-NM-022-AD; Amendment 39-19776; AD 2019-21-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 2, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3204. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2019-0258; Product Identifier 2018-NM-134-AD; Amendment 39-19783; AD 2019-22-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 2, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3205. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Pratt & Whitney Canada Corp. Turbo-shaft Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0739; Product Identifier 2015-NE-07-AD; Amendment 39-19782; AD 2019-22-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 2, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3206. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31280; Amdt. No.: 3877] received December 2, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3207. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31281; Amdt. No.: 3878] received December 2, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3208. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment and Amendment of Area Navigation (RNAV) Routes; Southeastern United States [Docket No.: FAA-2019-0124; Airspace Docket No.: 18-ASO-18] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received December 2, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3209. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E

Airspace; Tomahawk, WI [Docket No.: FAA-2019-0651; Airspace Docket No.: 19-AGL-24] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received December 2, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3210. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2019-0611; Product Identifier 2019-NM-095-AD; Amendment 39-19793; AD 2019-22-14] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 2, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3211. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2019-0667; Product Identifier 2019-NM-085-AD; Amendment 39-19791; AD 2019-22-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 2, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3212. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment, Revocation, and Establishment of Air Traffic Service (ATS) Routes; Western United States [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0221; Airspace Docket No.: 17-ANM-24] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received December 2, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

Mr. GRIJALVA: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 2405. A bill to reauthorize and amend the National Sea Grant College Program Act, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 116-323). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky:

H.R. 5305. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study to assess the suitability and feasibility of designating certain land as the Kentucky Wildlands National Heritage Area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut (for himself and Mr. BUCHANAN):

H.R. 5306. A bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to clarify the mailing requirement relating to social security account statements; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. SEWELL of Alabama:

H.R. 5307. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 115 Nicol Avenue in Thomasville, Alabama, as the "Postmaster Robert Ingram Sr. Post Office"; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. RYAN (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Mrs. HAYES):

H.R. 5308. A bill to amend the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 and the Richard B Russell National School Lunch Act to eliminate reduced price breakfasts and lunches and to require that the income guidelines for determining eligibility for free breakfasts and free lunches be 200 percent of the poverty level, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RICHMOND (for himself, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. COHEN, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. EVANS, Mrs. HAYES, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. MOORE, Ms. OMAR, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. RUSH, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. VEASEY, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, and Ms. WILSON of Florida):

H.R. 5309. A bill to prohibit discrimination based on an individual's texture or style of hair; to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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.

By Mr. WALTZ (for himself and Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico):

H.R. 5310. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Defense to prescribe regulations to allow emergency response providers to use mobile commissaries or exchange store deployed to an area covered by a declaration of a major disaster or emergency under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HUFFMAN:

H.R. 5311. A bill to amend the Cooperative Forestry Assistance Act of 1978 to renew the National Urban and Community Forestry Advisory Council and to amend the Act of October 14, 1980 to remove the limitation on the transfer of amounts available under the reforestation trust fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee (for himself and Mr. COURTNEY):

H.R. 5312. A bill to authorize the creation of a commission to develop voluntary accessibility guidelines for electronic instructional materials and related technologies used in postsecondary education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MORELLE (for himself and Mr. WENSTRUP):

H.R. 5313. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow for certain residential rental property to be depreciated over a 30-year period; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts (for herself, Mr. MCKINLEY, Ms. SLOTKIN, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. CISNEROS, and Mr. STIVERS):

H.R. 5314. A bill to enable registered apprenticeship programs to better serve veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. BEATTY (for herself, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. HECK, Mr. GREEN of Texas, and Mr. CLEAVER):

H.R. 5315. A bill to amend the Financial Institutions Reform, Recovery, and Enforce-

ment Act of 1989 to establish a Financial Agent Mentor-Protégé Program within the Department of the Treasury, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. COX of California (for himself, Mr. COSTA, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. HARBER of California, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 5316. A bill to provide for the restoration of the original carrying capacity of canals impacted by land subsidence, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. FLETCHER:

H.R. 5317. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 315 Addicks Howell Road in Houston, Texas, as the "Deputy Sandeep Singh Dhaliwal Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois (for himself, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. TLAIB, and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 5318. A bill to amend certain banking laws to establish requirements for bank mergers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. HECK (for himself, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. COLE, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. YOUNG, Ms. MOORE, and Ms. GABBARD):

H.R. 5319. A bill to reauthorize the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana:

H.R. 5320. A bill to require States and units of local government receiving funds under grant programs operated by the Department of Justice, which use such funds for pretrial services programs, to submit to the Attorney General a report relating to such program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MCBATH (for herself and Mr. CARTER of Georgia):

H.R. 5321. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to expand, enhance, and improve public health data systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MEEKS (for himself, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. CLAY, and Mrs. BEATTY):

H.R. 5322. A bill to establish or modify requirements relating to minority depository institutions, community development financial institutions, and impact banks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Small Business, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. O'HALLERAN (for himself, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, Ms. HAALAND, and Mr. LUJÁN):

H.R. 5323. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to expand supportive services for Native American aging programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself, Mr. BANKS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Mr. CISNEROS):

H.R. 5324. A bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out a pilot program on information sharing between the Department of Veterans Affairs and designated relatives and friends of veterans regarding the assistance and benefits available to the veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. PRESSLEY:

H.R. 5325. A bill to reduce exclusionary discipline practices in schools, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. SÁNCHEZ (for herself and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY):

H.R. 5326. A bill to amend titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act to prohibit skilled nursing facilities and nursing facilities from using pre-dispute arbitration agreements with respect to residents of those facilities under the Medicare and Medicaid programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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 Ms. SHALALA (for herself and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ):

H.R. 5327. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to end the immigrant visa backlog, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. SPEIER (for herself, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. RUSH, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. SLOTKIN, and Ms. DEAN):

H.R. 5328. A bill to require certain information be reported with respect to principal investigators who have discriminated, including harassed, on the basis of sex (including gender identity, sexual orientation, pregnancy, childbirth, medical conditions related to pregnancy and childbirth, parental status, and sex stereotype), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committees on Oversight and Reform, and Science, Space, and Technology, 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. STEUBE:

H.R. 5329. A bill to require that the Federal Government procure from the private sector the goods and services necessary for the operations and management of certain Government agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Ms. TLAIB:

H.R. 5330. A bill to amend the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act to provide a timetable for verification of medical debt and to increase the efficiency of credit markets with more perfect information, to prohibit consumer reporting agencies from issuing consumer reports containing information about debts related to medically necessary procedure, about and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. COSTA (for himself, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Ms. FUDGE, and Mr. MARSHALL):

H. Res. 742. A resolution recognizing the continued success of the Food for Peace Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SCHNEIDER (for himself, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. PANETTA, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. TONKO, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. RUSH, Ms. MOORE, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. CASTEN of Illinois, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mrs. DAVIS of Cali-

fornia, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. WELCH, Mr. POCAN, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HECK, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. COOPER, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. CISNEROS, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. CORREA, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. STANTON, Mr. CASE, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. KILMER, Ms. UNDERWOOD, Mr. KEATING, Mr. NEGUSE, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEVIN of California, Mr. BEYER, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. PAPPAS, Ms. MENG, Mr. COSTA, Ms. BASS, Mr. COHEN, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. CRIST, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. SOTO, Mr. DEFAZIO, Miss RICE of New York, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. DELGADO, Mr. COX of California, Mr. KIND, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. GALLEGGO, Mrs. AXNE, Mr. CLAY, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. FRANKEL, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. RYAN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. PETERS, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. SCHRIER, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. ROUDA, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, Mrs. FLETCHER, Ms. FINKENAUER, Mr. MALINOWSKI, Ms. STEVENS, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. NEAL, Mr. NADLER, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. LOEBACK, Mr. EVANS, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. BERA, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. TITUS, Mr. SIRES, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. WATERS, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. NORCROSS, Ms. FUDGE, and Ms. SEWELL of Alabama):

H. Res. 743. A resolution expressing strong disapproval of the President's formal notification to the United Nations of his intent to withdraw the United States from the Paris Agreement; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Missouri (for himself, Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. WALTZ, Mr. GUEST, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. HICE of Georgia, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma, Mr. RIGGLEMAN, Mr. ARRINGTON, Mr. BANKS, Mr. WALKER, Mr. YOHO, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. BABIN, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. LONG, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. MARSHALL, and Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia):

H. Res. 744. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the Senate should amend its rules to require a sitting United States Senator actively seeking election to the Presidency of the United States to recuse himself or herself

from the impeachment trial of an incumbent President of the United States who is serving his or her first term in office; to the Committee on Rules.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

147. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 59, respectfully urging the president of the United States to designate a state funeral for the last surviving Medal of Honor recipient from World War II; which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

148. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 74, respectfully urging the United States Congress to enact H.R. 613/S. 165, the TRICARE Reserve Select Improvement Act; which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

149. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 19, respectfully urging the United States Congress to repeal the Government Pension Offset and the Windfall Elimination Provision of the Social Security Act; which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

## 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. ROGERS of Kentucky:

H.R. 5305.

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

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut:

H.R. 5306.

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

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

By Ms. SEWELL of Alabama:

H.R. 5307.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 7

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 5308.

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

Article 1, 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. RICHMOND:

H.R. 5309.

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

This bill is introduced pursuant to the powers granted to Congress under the General Welfare Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 1), the Commerce Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 3), and the Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 18).

Further, this statement of constitutional authority is made for the sole purpose of compliance with clause 7 of Rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives and shall have no bearing on judicial review of the accompanying bill.

By Mr. WALTZ:

H.R. 5310.

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

Article I, Section 8, which provides Congress the power "to provide for the common Defence" and "to make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces".

By Mr. HUFFMAN:

H.R. 5311.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: 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. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee:

H.R. 5312.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. MORELLE:

H.R. 5313.

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

Article I, Section 8, clause 18

By Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts:

H.R. 5314.

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

Article I Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. BEATTY:

H.R. 5315.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, "To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes."

By Mr. COX of California:

H.R. 5316.

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

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mrs. FLETCHER:

H.R. 5317.

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

Clause 7 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois:

H.R. 5318.

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

Article I, Section VIII, Clause III

By Mr. HECK:

H.R. 5319.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution: "The Congress shall have power . . . To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian Tribes."

By Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana:

H.R. 5320.

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

U.S.C. Article I, Section 8

By Mrs. MCBATH:

H.R. 5321.

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

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

By Mr. MEEKS:

H.R. 5322.

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

Article I

By Mr. O'HALLERAN:

H.R. 5323.

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

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. PETERS:

H.R. 5324.

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

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. PRESSLEY:

H.R. 5325.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

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

By Ms. SANCHEZ:

H.R. 5326.

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

Article 1 Section 8

By Ms. SHALALA:

H.R. 5327.

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

Article I, Section 8, clause 4 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. SPEIER:

H.R. 5328.

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 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. STEUBE:

H.R. 5329.

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

Article 1, Section 8

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

To borrow money on the credit of the United States;

To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;

To establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization, and uniform Laws on the subject of Bankruptcies throughout the United States;

To coin Money, regulate the Value thereof, and of foreign Coin, and fix the Standard of Weights and Measures;

To provide for the Punishment of counterfeiting the Securities and current Coin of the United States;

To establish Post Offices and Post Roads;

To promote the Progress of Science and useful Arts, by securing for limited Times to Authors and Inventors the exclusive Right to their respective Writings and Discoveries;

To constitute Tribunals inferior to the supreme Court;

and Offenses against the Law of Nations;

To declare War, grant Letters of Marque and Reprisal, and make Rules concerning Captures on Land and Water;

To raise and support Armies, but no Appropriation of Money to that Use shall be for a longer Term than two Years;

To provide and maintain a Navy;

To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces;

To provide for calling forth the Militia to execute the Laws of the Union, suppress Insurrections and repel Invasions;

To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining, the Militia, and for governing such Part of them as may be employed in the Service of the United States, reserving to the States respectively, the Appointment of the Officers, and the Authority of training the Militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress;

To exercise exclusive Legislation in all Cases whatsoever, over such District (not exceeding ten Miles square) as may, by Cession of particular States, and the acceptance of Congress, become the Seat of the Government of the United States, and to exercise like Authority over all Places purchased by the Consent of the Legislature of the State in which the Same shall be, for the Erection of Forts, Magazines, Arsenals, dock-Yards, and other needful Buildings; And

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

By Ms. TLALIB:

H.R. 5330.

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

Article I, Section 8, clause 3

#### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 3: Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 20: Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio.

H.R. 40: Ms. SHALALA.

H.R. 186: Ms. UNDERWOOD.

H.R. 218: Mr. KELLER.

H.R. 372: Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. STANTON, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. BASS, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. CLEAVER, and Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H.R. 413: Mrs. AXNE.

H.R. 600: Mr. STANTON.

H.R. 763: Mr. BERA.

H.R. 779: Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee.

H.R. 849: Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. NEGUSE.

H.R. 912: Ms. FINKENAUER.

H.R. 934: Mrs. MILLER.

H.R. 935: Mr. FORTENBERRY.

H.R. 1049: Ms. MCCOLLUM and Mr. KHANNA.

H.R. 1108: Mr. GOMEZ and Mr. CASTRO of Texas.

H.R. 1126: Mr. NEGUSE.

H.R. 1154: Mr. MCADAMS.

H.R. 1159: Mr. POSEY.

H.R. 1171: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.

H.R. 1175: Mrs. MCBATH.

H.R. 1179: Mr. BYRNE.

H.R. 1185: Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 1228: Mr. CÁRDENAS and Mr. POSEY.

H.R. 1240: Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 1367: Mr. TONKO, Ms. SHALALA, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 1380: Mr. DOGGETT and Mr. VARGAS.

H.R. 1418: Mr. KHANNA.

H.R. 1441: Mr. LOUDERMILK.

H.R. 1530: Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH.

H.R. 1570: Mr. LAMB, Ms. SHALALA, and Mr. HOLDING.

- H.R. 1642: Mr. KATKO.  
H.R. 1679: Mr. RICHMOND.  
H.R. 1694: Ms. TLAIB.  
H.R. 1695: Mrs. AXNE and Mrs. LEE of Nevada.  
H.R. 1713: Mr. HUFFMAN, Mrs. FLETCHER, Mr. RASKIN, and Ms. CLARKE of New York.  
H.R. 1765: Mr. TRONE and Ms. SPANBERGER.  
H.R. 1766: Mr. CUNNINGHAM and Mr. COSTA.  
H.R. 1767: Mr. KIM.  
H.R. 1769: Ms. FINKENAUER.  
H.R. 1801: Mr. NEGUSE.  
H.R. 1878: Mr. LAMB and Ms. SPEIER.  
H.R. 1882: Mr. LAWSON of Florida.  
H.R. 1917: Mrs. HARTZLER.  
H.R. 1948: Mr. COSTA, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, and Ms. HOULAHAN.  
H.R. 1987: Mr. KIM.  
H.R. 2073: Ms. UNDERWOOD and Mr. BARR.  
H.R. 2074: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.  
H.R. 2117: Mr. COX of California.  
H.R. 2339: Ms. SÁNCHEZ.  
H.R. 2377: Ms. UNDERWOOD.  
H.R. 2382: Mr. TIPTON.  
H.R. 2405: Mr. STAUBER.  
H.R. 2420: Ms. ADAMS and Ms. FINKENAUER.  
H.R. 2466: Ms. SHALALA.  
H.R. 2474: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.  
H.R. 2491: Mr. CONNOLLY and Mr. CORREA.  
H.R. 2586: Mr. KHANNA.  
H.R. 2616: Mr. GRIJALVA.  
H.R. 2623: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.  
H.R. 2700: Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina.  
H.R. 2747: Ms. SLOTKIN.  
H.R. 2771: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.  
H.R. 2788: Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma.  
H.R. 2808: Mr. KILDEE.  
H.R. 2842: Mr. TRONE.  
H.R. 2895: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.  
H.R. 2896: Mr. PANETTA and Mr. VISCLOSKEY.  
H.R. 2912: Ms. SLOTKIN and Mrs. AXNE.  
H.R. 2953: Mr. COLE.  
H.R. 2970: Mrs. AXNE.  
H.R. 2975: Mr. NEAL.  
H.R. 3073: Mrs. HAYES.  
H.R. 3077: Mr. GREEN of Tennessee and Mr. PAYNE.  
H.R. 3107: Ms. HOULAHAN, Mr. KELLER, Mr. STEUBE, and Mr. LARSEN of Washington.  
H.R. 3157: Ms. HAALAND.  
H.R. 3219: Mr. BACON.  
H.R. 3220: Mr. NEGUSE.  
H.R. 3225: Mr. HUFFMAN.  
H.R. 3235: Mr. WELCH.  
H.R. 3241: Mr. SCHWEIKERT.  
H.R. 3302: Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma.  
H.R. 3451: Mr. CONNOLLY.  
H.R. 3452: Mr. CONNOLLY.  
H.R. 3497: Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina.  
H.R. 3534: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.  
H.R. 3559: Mr. GRIJALVA.  
H.R. 3582: Mr. KENNEDY and Mr. RASKIN.  
H.R. 3584: Mr. LEWIS and Mrs. AXNE.  
H.R. 3632: Mr. EMMER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. HECK, and Mr. MCGOVERN.  
H.R. 3685: Mr. GRIJALVA.  
H.R. 3711: Mr. KILMER.  
H.R. 3742: Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. EVANS, Mr. SABLAN, and Mr. HURD of Texas.  
H.R. 3789: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.  
H.R. 3794: Mr. LAMBORN and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.  
H.R. 3816: Mr. BALDERSON.  
H.R. 3824: Ms. KELLY of Illinois.  
H.R. 3851: Mr. LAMB, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, and Ms. WILD.  
H.R. 3884: Mr. LOWENTHAL.  
H.R. 3912: Ms. MENG.  
H.R. 3975: Mr. COX of California.  
H.R. 3980: Mr. BUCSHON.  
H.R. 4090: Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma.  
H.R. 4101: Mr. TED LIEU of California.  
H.R. 4117: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.  
H.R. 4193: Mr. STAUBER and Mrs. AXNE.  
H.R. 4227: Mr. WELCH, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. VAN DREW, Mrs. RODGERS of Washington, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. ESHOO, and Mr. BALDERSON.  
H.R. 4228: Mr. MEEKS and Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.  
H.R. 4229: Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. VAN DREW, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. BALDERSON, and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.  
H.R. 4280: Mr. POCAN.  
H.R. 4331: Mr. COSTA and Mr. PHILLIPS.  
H.R. 4388: Mr. COSTA.  
H.R. 4397: Ms. STEVENS and Mr. PERLMUTTER.  
H.R. 4429: Mrs. MILLER.  
H.R. 4436: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.  
H.R. 4438: Mr. KENNEDY.  
H.R. 4468: Mr. MOOLENAAR and Mrs. BEATTY.  
H.R. 4482: Mrs. LURIA.  
H.R. 4489: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.  
H.R. 4540: Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CORREA, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. TITUS, and Mr. CARBAJAL.  
H.R. 4624: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.  
H.R. 4672: Mr. CALVERT, Mr. HUNTER, and Mr. NUNES.  
H.R. 4674: Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. SCHA-KOWSKY, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, and Mr. SMITH of Washington.  
H.R. 4681: Mr. RYAN.  
H.R. 4691: Ms. WILD.  
H.R. 4712: Mr. TONKO.  
H.R. 4804: Mr. RASKIN, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Mr. POCAN.  
H.R. 4807: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.  
H.R. 4817: Mr. TIPTON and Mr. RUTHERFORD.  
H.R. 4836: Mr. NEGUSE.  
H.R. 4868: Mrs. HARTZLER.  
H.R. 4874: Mr. HUFFMAN.  
H.R. 4890: Mrs. HAYES.  
H.R. 4894: Mr. COOPER.  
H.R. 4897: Mr. COLE.  
H.R. 4900: Mr. COMER.  
H.R. 4928: Mr. SMITH of Washington.  
H.R. 4940: Mr. ROY and Mr. CONAWAY.  
H.R. 4941: Mr. HECK.  
H.R. 4945: Mr. LAMB.  
H.R. 4957: Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico and Ms. HAALAND.  
H.R. 4980: Mr. HIGGINS of New York and Mrs. TORRES of California.  
H.R. 4986: Mr. GRIJALVA.  
H.R. 5010: Mr. LEVIN of Michigan.  
H.R. 5036: Mr. MCGOVERN.  
H.R. 5041: Mr. HORSFORD, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. SCANLON, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. RUSH, Mr. HARDER of California, and Ms. UNDERWOOD.  
H.R. 5048: Mr. DEFazio.  
H.R. 5050: Ms. TLAIB and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.  
H.R. 5056: Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma.  
H.R. 5078: Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma.  
H.R. 5092: Mr. COLE and Mr. HARDER of California.  
H.R. 5104: Mr. COHEN.  
H.R. 5119: Mr. POCAN.  
H.R. 5139: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.  
H.R. 5166: Mr. KILDEE.  
H.R. 5173: Mr. BYRNE.  
H.R. 5175: Mr. ROUZER and Mr. SMUCKER.  
H.R. 5176: Ms. JACKSON LEE.  
H.R. 5180: Mr. GRIJALVA.  
H.R. 5185: Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. PANETTA, and Mr. NEGUSE.  
H.R. 5191: Mr. FITZPATRICK.  
H.R. 5205: Mr. POCAN.  
H.R. 5230: Mr. KHANNA, Mr. HARDER of California, Mrs. HAYES, and Mr. VAN DREW.  
H.R. 5243: Mr. SERRANO.  
H.R. 5245: Ms. SLOTKIN.  
H.R. 5246: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.  
H.R. 5267: Mr. HECK and Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.  
H.R. 5269: Mr. KIND.  
H.R. 5299: Mr. MOULTON, Mr. ESPAILLAT, and Ms. NORTON.  
H.J. Res. 2: Mrs. MCBATH.  
H.J. Res. 22: Mr. KELLER.  
H. Res. 69: Mr. CASTRO of Texas.  
H. Res. 220: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.  
H. Res. 223: Mr. VELA.  
H. Res. 255: Mr. COURTNEY and Mr. WATKINS.  
H. Res. 277: Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. VARGAS, and Mr. DEUTCH.  
H. Res. 349: Mr. BACON and Mr. COX of California.  
H. Res. 399: Mrs. MCBATH.  
H. Res. 421: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.  
H. Res. 452: Mr. COX of California, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. WRIGHT, and Mr. MALINOWSKI.  
H. Res. 467: Mr. LANGEVIN and Mr. KILMER.  
H. Res. 527: Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. ROUDA, and Ms. PORTER.  
H. Res. 641: Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, and Mrs. TORRES of California.  
H. Res. 672: Mr. GUEST, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. COOK, Mr. COHEN, and Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.  
H. Res. 678: Mrs. HARTZLER and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.  
H. Res. 682: Mr. COSTA.  
H. Res. 705: Mr. MEEKS and Mrs. AXNE.  
H. Res. 734: Mr. HILL of Arkansas, Mr. KELLER, Mrs. HARTZLER, and Mr. COLE.  
H. Res. 736: Mr. ARRINGTON, Mr. MAST, Mr. ABRAHAM, and Mr. FULCHER.

---

**PETITIONS, ETC.**

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

68. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the County Commissioners of Gaines County, TX, relative to a Resolution respectfully asking the leadership of the United States Senate and the United States House of Representatives to fully support and vote to ratify the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement; which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.