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:


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 7, 2020, 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, with time equally allocated between the parties and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

HONORING THE LIFE OF TIM STAPLES

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

Mr. Aguilar. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor the life of Tim Staples, a devoted husband, brother, son, and teacher. Tim gave his life working to save the life of another.

As a volunteer for search and rescue team of the San Bernardino County Sheriff’s Department, Tim joined the search for a missing hiker last month on California’s Mount Baldy. Tragically, this would be Tim’s final rescue operation.

Despite the risks, Tim’s endless dedication to serving others guided him through 9 years as a volunteer with the search and rescue team, where he assisted countless operations to help save the lives of fellow San Bernardino County residents.

But his passion for search and rescue was not the extent of Tim’s desire to serve his community. Tim’s desire to serve the community spanned across education and community and civic activities.

He grew up in San Bernardino County, attending Damien High School in La Verne before getting his college education at Gonzaga University in Spokane, Washington.

Tim was a Cub Scout and Boy Scout before becoming an Eagle Scout. He completed the Buckskin Leadership training and dedicated his time to training other Scouts.

Tim was an educator, spending his career as a teacher and coach at both St. Lucy’s High School in Glendora and at his alma mater in Damien.

He is remembered by his family and friends for his love of helping others and often helping complete strangers. From stopping traffic to help push a car through a crowded intersection to driving over 2,000 miles to help a friend move, Tim was always willing to put his full energy and effort behind helping other people, including on his last day.

He is survived by his two sisters, his parents, and his loving wife, Katie. Tim’s students, athletes, friends, family, and all of San Bernardino County are better off as the result of Tim’s endless compassion and drive to serve others.

HONORING THE LIFE OF SERGEANT HARRY AMIGH

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

Mr. Thompson of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor Sergeant Harry Amigh, a resident of Ebensburg, Pennsylvania, and a Korean war veteran.

Sergeant Amigh enlisted in the United States Army in 1948 and would go on to serve in the Battle of Chosin Reservoir, one of the Korean war’s greatest battles. Sergeant Amigh was killed in action during that battle at just 20 years old.

Though his military career ended far too soon, Sergeant Harry Amigh left an incredible legacy behind. I am humbled to be joining the Amigh family this Friday, January 17, to honor his legacy and present the family with seven military awards and medals in his memory.

Sergeant Amigh is the recipient of a Purple Heart; National Defense Service Medal; Korean Service Medal with one Bronze Star; Combat Infantryman Badge; United Nations Service Medal; Republic of Korea-Korean War Service Medal; and Republic of Korea Presidential Unit Citation.

The men and women who have chosen to dedicate their lives to defending the United States are among the most courageous citizens.

Sergeant Amigh loved his country, and he fought valiantly for his country. For that, we are forever indebted to Sergeant Amigh and the many men and women like him who made the ultimate sacrifice.

IN SUPPORT OF IRANIAN PROTESTERS

Mr. Thompson of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of and as a cosponsor of House Republican Leader Kevin McCarthy’s H. Res. 791, supporting the protesters in Iran. H. Res. 791 serves notice to the Iranian regime that the United States is watching and the world is watching.
Sadly, yesterday, my Democratic colleagues blocked a vote on this resolution that expressed support of antigovernment protestors in Iran and condemned Iran's role in the Downing of a Ukrainian civilian aircraft last week.

So what was in this resolution that motivated my Democratic colleagues to prevent consideration?

The resolution would have condemned the Government of Iran for killing 1,500 Iranian citizens who were protesting their government as well as condemned the Government of Iran for shooting down Ukraine International Airlines flight 752, killing 176 people.

In addition, the resolution, in section 3, “condemns the Government of Iran for repeatedly lying to its people and to the world about its responsibility for the Downing of Ukraine International Airlines flight 752”; section 4, “calls on the Government of Iran to refrain from the use of violence, and, B, protect the rights of freedom of expression and peaceful assembly; and,” section 5, “supports the protestors in Iran,” their demands for accountability, and their desire for the Government of Iran to respect freedom and human rights.

Mr. Speaker, I am deeply disappointed that my Democratic colleagues would block a measure expressing support of freedom and human rights, principles that should be afforded to all persons.

HONORING THE LIFE OF ENEDINA CELIZ RAPAN

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

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise to remember and recognize the incredible life of Enedina Celiz Rapan, who passed away this month at the age of 93.

I was raised in a farmworker community where my parents and other farmworkers migrated to the eastern Coachella Valley, where, for many of us, hardship and injustice can feel like the norm; and if it weren't for women like Enedina Rapan, many of us would still believe that it is true, and we would not be standing here where we are today.

Enedina came to America at a young age to work hard, earn her living, and give her children a better life. And while she was working away in the fields, sweating in 120-degree heat with calloused hands, she witnessed the mistreatment of her fellow farmworkers and she saw their suffering.

If there is one thing about Enedina, it is that, when she saw injustice, she would speak up and get to work to fix it. So, when she saw farmworkers laboring for hours on end with no bathrooms nearby, she fought to bring restrooms to the fields. And when she saw seniors in the community going hungry, she organized, asking for donations and cooking meals so they could have dinner to eat.

And Enedina devoted her life to standing up for people who were mis-treated, discriminated against, and vulnerable. There was no voice too soft that Enedina didn’t hear and elevate.

Enedina was a giant for our community, working with the United Farm Workers of America, Cesar Chavez, and Lideres Campesinas to stand up for the rights of farmworkers. She used her tireless will and unmatched strength to pick people up, fight for what is right, and make the Coachella Valley a better place for everyone who lives there.

I am better because of Enedina’s work. My family and the entire farmworker community of the Coachella Valley are all better off because of Enedina’s work.

And she would not be happy with me for being up here talking about her, because she was so humble. A woman who elevated everyone’s voice around her, she would never seek this type of recognition.

Mr. Speaker, today, I want to make sure the country knows Enedina’s story. You know how much she contributed to our community and our unrelenting pursuit of justice.

Enedina will be sorely missed, but her presence will be felt and her life, an inspiration.

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF PETRA RUIZ OF COACHELLA VALLEY

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to tell the Nation about the life and legacy of Petra Ruiz of the Coachella Valley.

Petra Ruiz was an organizer, activist, and leader who used her life to stand up for farmworking women across California.

As the son of farmworkers in the eastern Coachella Valley, I am all too familiar with the social, economic, and political hardships the farmworking community faces on a daily basis. The struggles can often be so great that you have to have someone or something to look up to. For me, and for so many of us in the Coachella Valley, Petra Ruiz was one such inspiration.

Petra was a fierce and loving leader who was held in high esteem, even by the people who didn’t agree with what she had to say. But it was hard not to agree with what she had to say. You see, Petra believed in helping farmworking women across California advocate for themselves, for their families, and for their communities in the struggle for equality and their basic human rights.

Petra got involved in the union movement in the 1970s and was a warrior for justice and equality within the farmworking community through her final days.

A phrase that I have heard repeatedly in talking with members of the community and with her family is “she was always there.” Petra was always there.

Even as a mother and a grandmother to a big family, she worked with the United Farm Workers of America and as a member of Lideres Campesinas to advocate for the rights of the farmworker community. Petra led marches; she attended meetings; she would even go door-to-door with flyers making sure that farmworkers knew their rights.

Petra was a remarkable woman, revered, admired, a mover and shaker, an effective leader who led with her actions as much as she did by her words. She inspired me to never say no to my dreams, to pursue justice at every turn, and to always believe I could make a difference.

Mr. Speaker, while she is missed dearly, Petra’s legacy didn’t end with her passing. Her impact is felt today and will continue in the lives of generations to come.

TIME TO BURN THE BEETLE IN NORTH DAKOTA

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

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, this weekend will be time to burn the beetle. I am talking about the mountain pine beetle and the damage it has done to the Black Hills National Forest. In recent years, that pine beetle has infected 430,000 acres in the Black Hills, leaving millions of dead trees.

Now, the pine beetle thrives in an overly crowded forest. It craves density. So to tackle this problem, Federal, State, and local governments and private citizens have set to work thinning the forest.

Initially, from the very beginning, it has been the State and local partners that have been most proactive and aggressive; but, in recent years, Federal policies have helped as well.

The Forest Service started utilizing the categorical exclusions in the 2014 and the 2018 farm bills, allowing them to more quickly utilize sound forest management practices like tree thinning and controlled burns.

This picture tells the story well. In areas where the forest has been actively managed, the trees live; in areas where they have not been, they die. And now, today, after years of battle, it seems as though we are nearing the end of this particular outbreak.

That is good news, but it is no time to take our foot off the gas. One key action needed is to continue working with the timber industry to set and meet good harvest targets so we can get that excess timber out of the forest.

Mr. Speaker, I started my comments by noting that it was time to burn the beetle, and in Custer, South Dakota, this weekend, that is exactly what they will do at their Burning Beetle arts festival.

It is a good opportunity for us to remember the damage that has been done—430,000 acres—but also to remember the importance of good management, of good stewardship, and of good...
Federal policy when it comes to protecting great resources like the Black Hills of South Dakota.
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AMERICAN HERO RETURNING TO INDIANA'S SIXTH DISTRICT

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

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor an American hero, PFC Louis Wiesehan, Jr., of Richmond, Indiana, and to welcome him home to the Sixth District of Indiana.

PFC Wiesehan was a fellow marine who gave the ultimate sacrifice while fighting on the island of Betio in the Pacific Ocean during World War II. After 77 years, PFC Wiesehan is finally coming home. His remains will be buried in his hometown.

Thank you, PFC Wiesehan, for your service and sacrifice. You will never be forgotten. Semper Fi.

TRADE WITH CHINA

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

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to be recognized to address you here on the floor of the United States House of Representatives.

I come to the floor today to raise the issue and be thankful of the progress that we have made with regard to trade. We have been through a year and a half or more of intense trade negotiations.

Far East and we are coming around to the other side of it with China. In spite of all of way through these trade negotiations, that we have made with regard to trade. We have been through a year and a half or more of intense trade negotiations.

President and I applaud the Trump administration for proposing to update the totally outdated National Environmental Policy Act regulations.

These policies haven’t seen reform in over 4 decades. As a result countless infrastructure projects have been backlog logged for years.

It is time to roll back burdensome regulations that stifle growth.

Modernizing NEPA regulations will allow schools, bridges, and other vital projects to finally move forward safely and efficiently.

I pledge my support for these updates and look forward to the continued improvement of America’s infrastructure.

MARCH FOR LIFE

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to give my wholehearted support for the upcoming March for Life rallies taking place across the Nation next week.

I am a passionately pro-life American and I will always fight for unborn children. It is our duty to protect the most vulnerable and speak for those who cannot speak for themselves.

As millions of Americans march across the Nation next week, I pledge to always stand with their cause.

GREENFIELD-CENTRAL HIGH SCHOOL RADIO STATION

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Greenfield-Central High School Radio Station WRGF for being on air for 20 years. The high school station was established in 1999 and is now a 24/7 on-air public radio station run completely by students and their teacher, Jonathan Hudson.

Greenfield-Central’s radio/TV classes draw 70 students a semester who are able to learn and gain professional experience before they enter college or the workforce. I was able to witness the advantages that these students are able to gain while visiting the facility last fall.

Happy anniversary to WRGF and all the students who participate in the program.

CONGRATULATING NEW PALESTINIEN COACH KYLE RALPH

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate New Palestine football coach, Kyle Ralph.

Coach Ralph is among the list of only 32 coaches nationwide who are finalists for the 2019 Don Shula NFL High School Coach of the Year Award. In his 7 years as head coach at New Palestine, Coach Ralph has built a program that has become a statewide powerhouse.

Throughout his tenure, Coach Ralph has amassed an amazing 88-4 record and has brought three State championships home to New Palestine.

Mr. Speaker, I wish Coach Ralph the best of luck during the ceremony at the NFL Pro Bowl.

NEPA UPDATE

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I applaud the Trump administration for proposing to update the totally outdated National Environmental Policy Act regulations.

These policies haven’t seen reform in over 4 decades. As a result countless infrastructure projects have been backlog logged for years.

It is time to roll back burdensome regulations that stifle growth.

Modernizing NEPA regulations will allow schools, bridges, and other vital projects to finally move forward safely and efficiently.

I pledge my support for these updates and look forward to the continued improvement of America’s infrastructure.

soybeans, it includes a lot of pork, and it fixes that component.

It also addresses the intellectual property issue that has been a big barrier for the trade negotiations with China. The value of U.S. intellectual property—the creation that comes out of the minds of Americans—is pirated by the Chinese somewhere between $500 and $600 billion a year. That gets addressed to a degree in this agreement and it gets addressed again in the next phase of the agreement.

U.S. Trade Representative Lighthizer has spoken on that issue to me, and he seems to be, I will say, fairly confident that we are going to get at least a reasonable beginning to something that is at hand here.

I would add also that it isn’t just China. We are waiting now for the U.S. Senate to pass the USMCA Agreement. It is only the impeachment trial that stands in the way of getting that done. That will happen soon, within about a month or so, or perhaps less.

Further we have Japan, we have South Korea, and by the end of this month the United Kingdom will be out of the E.U., and there is open for a bilateral trade agreement with the British.

If we could get that all done, as I said to the President the other day, we may find ourselves in the very best position we have ever been in, at least in our lifetime, with regard to trade in multiple locations, so that we are diversified in our markets so that we can send out to multiple countries and at the same time have a strong relationship with China and other countries.

We are moving into an excellent position here. We have got a strong economy, and we have got a strong Dow. This really is a great time to make investments in America, and they are doing that from around the world.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the President today.

2020 RESOLUTION

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

Mr. MEUSER. Mr. Speaker, as we begin the new year and a new decade, let’s all commit in this House to doing the job that the people sent us to do. Let us remember the words of Alexander Hamilton: "Here, sir, the people govern; here they act by their immediate Representatives."

Let us commit to working every day 9 to 5 on delivering real results on the issues that matter to our constituents and our country.

These include working to reduce the cost of healthcare, including ending surprise billing, decreasing the cost of prescription drugs, ending prohibitions on association health plans, and ensuring there is no loss of insurance for preexisting conditions.

Also, continuing to ensure that veterans receive the care they deserve and...
have earned. As well as having the backs of our troops by keeping our forces strong and prepared.

Fixing our broken illegal immigration process, first by securing our border and then reforming our laws with a focus on humanitarian, driving workforce development by partnering with the private sector, our schools, career and technical centers, and apprenticeship programs.

Supporting trade agreements that create reciprocal trade and open markets for our U.S.-made products and agricultural goods.

Help assure our students have affordable and accountable educational opportunities.

Continue to grow our domestic energy industry including all-of-the-above and all-of-the-below: clean coal, low-carbon natural gas, and regulated and responsible oil production. We can accomplish this like no other nation on Earth.

We will work to develop and pass a transportation infrastructure bill to keep our roads and bridges safe, to modernize our highway system, and build America for the 21st century.

Finally, we will be fiscally responsible with the people’s money on all spending and work to reduce our deficit.

On the district level, we plan to maximize Opportunity Zones to revitalize our small cities, focus on workforce development to match the enhanced demands of the 21st century workplace, maximize the economic opportunities of our area which will create good-paying jobs, improve our flood mitigation without putting it on the backs of our taxpayers, supporting police and first responders to maintain a high level of public safety, and continue to work to wipe out the terrible epidemic of drug addiction.

Mr. Speaker, if we can accomplish these goals, we will have an incredibly successful 2020 and pave the way for a great American decade.

Let’s stop confusing activity with accomplishment. Let’s keep our eyes on the prize with clear 2020 vision to get things done for the American people.

IMPEACHMENT TRIAL

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

Mr. GREEN of Texas. And still I rise, Mr. Speaker, because I love my country. I rise today to address the trial that will start in the Senate, the trial to impeach the President of the United States of America.

This trial, Mr. Speaker, will not end until the last person has testified. In a sense it is like an opera, and, as you know, Mr. Speaker, the opera isn’t over until the last witness sings, and until the last witness sings, the opera isn’t over, this political opera as it were.

There are witnesses who must be heard. I believe that there are 61 Senators who will find agreement with what I have said. I believe that there are Senators who understand that when they take that oath, they have to stop outside of the normal rhetoric that they may have promoted. I think they have to stand on the Constitution, and I think the Constitution requires them to hear all of the relevant and material evidence.

There are documents that should be heard. There are witnesses that must be heard. Mr. Speaker, I believe the Senators will vote such that documents and witnesses that have not been produced will be produced and the witnesses will be heard.

I believe that this is one of the seminal moments in time for the Members of the Senate, and I think they will understand that this is not just about this time, it is about all time. It is about what historians will say about this date, about the days that will follow.

It really is about who we are and what we stand for in the eyes of the world. Because it is not just about the Members of the House examining what is going on; the people of our country, and, indeed, the people of the planet Earth are viewing this, and they are doing so with great anticipation. They fully expect that the United States that has been a champion for liberty and justice for all, the United States that has the Statue of Liberty, the United States of America that stands for freedom around the world, that the United States of America will live up to its billing, will live up to what we have said, will live up to what we have done in the past, and will allow all evidence to be presented. I believe this.

I also believe that if all of the evidence is properly presented, no one can say that there wasn’t a fair trial. The verdict may not be something that I would agree with, but it will have been a fair trial. If you don’t do this, then it is not a fair trial. It is just a fake trial.

If you don’t do this, there is no need to have the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court present if all you are going to do is receive reports from the Members of the House. You can do that, that is just a briefing. You don’t need the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court there with all of the majesty of the court. You don’t need it.

I say have a trial, not a briefing. If we only have a briefing, this will be justice delayed if not denied. There is a court of appeals and that court of appeals will assemble in November of this year because the Senate itself is on trial. The court of appeals in November will make decisions as to whether or not the Senate has governed itself under the Constitution and has preserved a system that should continue with its current makeup. The people of this country will have the last word.

FARMERS TO BENEFIT FROM CHINA TRADE DEAL

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

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of President Trump’s effort to hold China accountable for its unfair trade practices, and I commend him and Ambassador Lighthizer on achieving the first phase of resetting that relationship.

For years, China has been taking advantage of American manufacturers and producers through currency manipulation, state ownership, stealing our intellectual property, and other unfair and unseemly behavior.

The bottom line is this, Mr. Speaker: They have been cheating Americans, and politicians have let them get away with it for far too long.

Joining me in this historic gallery today are 27 of the hardest working, God-fearing farmers in west Texas. Cochran, Lubbock, and Bailey Counties are represented here today. They know all too well the devastating results of this trade imbalance with China.

President Trump loves the American farmer, and thanks to his hard-fought negotiations, producers from the South Plains and across the country will reap the benefit of China’s new commitment to purchase up to $50 billion in U.S. agricultural products. That is nearly twice the amount ever purchased by China.

These farmers can attest that the pain from China’s retaliatory tariffs is real, resulting in higher input costs, lower commodity prices, and a significant decline in market share in one of our largest export markets.

All of this has come on the heels of record bankruptcies and the steepest decline in farm income since the Great Depression, but our farmers stand with this President because they know he is doing the right thing. They know he is fighting for them, and they also understand that when we get to the other side of this deal, there will be greener pastures for the next generation of farmers and ranchers.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to represent the food, fuel, and fiber capital of the world in west Texas. These cowboys and plowboys who feed and clothe the American people, and fuel the American economy, are a picture of America’s traditional values of hard work, faith in God, and love for their families and fellow man, which, by the way, is the real substance of what makes America great.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of them, I thank the American people for their support through these tough times, and I thank President Trump for putting America first and fighting for a better future for the American farmer.

God bless, and go west Texas.

REMEMBERING LUBBOCK FIRST RESPONDERS

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, this is a very solemn moment for me and all
west Texans. On Saturday morning, west Texas lost two of its finest and bravest first responders.

Lieutenant David Hill of Lubbock Fire Rescue and 27-year-old Lubbock Police Officer Nicholas Reyna were responding to a rollover accident when they lost their lives in the line of duty. A 30-year-old firefighter and paramedic, Matt Dawson, was also injured and remains in critical condition.

This is a tragic reminder that our heroic first responders wake up every single day in the line of duty and risk their lives to keep us safe. These men understood the sacred call to service. They gave the ultimate sacrifice and demonstrated the greatest love for their fellow man.

The Holy Scripture says this: “There is no greater love than this, than to lay down your life for your friends.” May God welcome these earthly heroes into His heavenly kingdom. May He comfort the Reyna and Hill families. May He grant Matt a speedy and full recovery. May He continue to bless and keep those who keep watch over us.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind Members that the rules do not allow references to persons in the gallery.

COMMEMORATING MARTIN LUTHER KING JR. DAY

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

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., and his life of service to our Nation.

Next week, on January 20, we will observe Martin Luther King’s birthday. We know that Dr. King was the most influential civil rights leader in our Nation’s history among so many great civil rights leaders, such as our own Congressman JOHN LEWIS.

Dr. King’s commitment to public service and historic change to our Nation, affected our entire country and society, and reshaped the way we interact. So it is fitting that we observe the 25th anniversary of Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Day as “A Day On, Not a Day Off.”

It serves to remind us to ask ourselves: What are we doing for others? Dr. King called this “life’s most persistent and urgent question.” What are we doing for others in our country?

As a public servant for the past 40 years, I firmly believe that every individual has an ability and an opportunity to make a change. Communities across the United States will host events to commemorate Dr. King’s achievements and give back to the community, including in my own district in the San Joaquin Valley.

I would proudly participate in the Martin Luther King Day Community March in Fresno and Merced, as well. My office will join the city of Fresno at an awareness event to recognize individuals and organizations for their outstanding service to give back to our communities in the spirit of Dr. King.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today also to recognize National Slavery and Human Trafficking Prevention Month. Dr. King called this “life’s most persistent and urgent question.” What are we doing for others in our country?

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize National Slavery and Human Trafficking Prevention Month. I am grateful to the Government and还会的 the Department of State and local governments and other organizations that are out there trying to fight this injustice.

Last year, as co-chairs of the bipartisan Crime Survivors and Justice Caucus, which I helped found with Congressman Ted Poe, Congressman PETE OLSON and I introduced a resolution in the House to prevent, eradicate, and raise the awareness of human trafficking as today’s modern slavery. It calls for the Federal Government to coordinate efforts to fight human trafficking between agencies and with State and local governments and other organizations that are out there trying their best.

Just yesterday, I met with John Cotton Richmond, the State Department’s Ambassador-at-Large to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons, both here and abroad, to discuss how we can work together to fight this injustice.

I promise you, we must fight this injustice. As a member and a co-chair of the Victims’ Rights Caucus, for survivors of these kinds of crimes, we will continue to put this among our highest priorities. The Crime Survivors and Justice Caucus will continue to lead this bipartisan fight to end modern slavery and human trafficking in all its forms.

IN REMEMBRANCE OF COLONEL LEE FRANKLIN WITTER

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, Thursday and Friday of next week, I plan to visit my alma mater, the United States Military Academy at West Point. I hope to spend time with the Department of Social Sciences and thank them for their service to our country and for their current job of training our next generation of warriors.

I am sure that many of the faculty and cadets are aware of Colonel Witter. During my era, we called it sponsoring. This is a critical part of the job that I want to continue to encourage them to do.

You see, I am headed back to West Point to attend the burial of my sponsor, Colonel Witter. I met the Witter family during my first free Sunday morning of Beast Barracks. We met at the Lutheran service in the Old Cadet Chapel in the cemetery.

Colonel Witter and his wife, Mary Ellen, and children, Nanette, Dorinda, and Matthew, welcomed me into their home. They provided a safe haven away from the constant scrutiny of the upper class. They provided a full meal now and then when full meals during my era as a plebe were not always assured.

Having been raised in a large family, they provided a second family, a younger brother that I never had and two younger sisters that I already had plenty of.

As in any family, sometimes I was helpful and sometimes maybe a burden. The Witter family was always there for me, in good times and bad. Whether I was breaking the porch swing or kitchen chairs, seriously burning Mathew, or spending the night when I was told not to, I was also forgiven.

Colonel Witter took a special focus on my school performance. I was on the other dean’s list, the list academic deans pay closer attention to. Graduation was not my first priority, so Colonel Witter would summon me to his office to encourage me and help motivate me academically. When I told him I thought I was doing okay, he responded: “I get your grades.”

I could not have graduated from West Point without the love and support from the Witter family. For this, I will be eternally grateful.

Colonel Witter, 81, passed away Monday, January 6, 2020, in South Carolina. This is a picture of him at the military academy as an instructor. I was blessed to have a chance to be able to visit with him and Mary Ellen a year ago last March.
Colonel Witter was a native of Wausau, Wisconsin. He was the last serving son of 20 children of the late Jerry and Amelia Witter.

Colonel Witter was a veteran of the United States Army, a retired military intelligence officer, and a United States Military Academy professor of social sciences at West Point. He was a decorated military veteran, earning the Legion of Merit, Bronze Star, Meritorious Service Medal, Air Medal, Joint Service Commendation Medal, National Defense Service Medal, Humanitarian Service Medal, Vietnam Service Medal with two bronze stars, Republic of Vietnam Campaign Medal, and the Combat Infantryman Badge. He was preceded in death by his son, Mathew, and all of his 19 brothers and sisters.

Survivors include his wife of 61 years, and my second mom, Mary Ellen; two daughters, and my second sisters, NaNette Jordan of Norwalk, Connecticut, and Garnida Selby of Beaufort, South Carolina. He also had five grand-children: Ashley Bensus of Hong Kong; Taylor Jordan of Boston, Massachusetts; Zachary Jordan of Waterbury, Connecticut; Senior Airman Mathew Selby of Davis-Monthan Air Force Base in Tucson, Arizona; and Thomas Selby of Beaufort, South Carolina.

Funeral services were held yesterday at St. John’s Lutheran Church in Beaufort, South Carolina. I will be attending the funeral service which will take place at West Point Military Academy Cemetery on January 24, 2020, at 10 a.m.

Mr. Speaker. I conclude with Matthew 25:21: “His Lord said unto him, Well done, thou good and faithful servant: thou hast been faithful over a few things. I will make thee ruler over many things: enter thou into the joy of the Lord.”

Beat Navy.

CELEBRATING MONROE COUNTY BICENTENNIAL

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

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, as of today, it has been 4 weeks since House Democrats voted, in a historically partisan manner, to impeach President Donald Trump.

In voting to silence the will of 63 million Americans, they made clear that they were not here to work for the American people but to carry out a personal vendetta. Even a few House Democrats realized that impeachment was not in the best interest of our country, joining Republicans to oppose this baseless crusade.

But after their vote, Speaker PELOSI realized they had made a grave mistake. Their sham process and evidence-free case went against the wishes of the American people.

Knowing their case was baseless, Speaker PELOSI and House Democrats sat on these articles for 1 month. After originally claiming that impeachment was an urgent crisis and insisting that President Trump posed a threat to national security, Democrats sat on their hands and delayed a timely trial on their own shoddy work product.

But the day has finally come where they are sending their weak case over to the Senate. I look forward to the day where Congress may finally move on from this partisan impeachment process that has wasted an amazing amount of time and resources and diverted them from issues that matter most to the American people.

While I am disappointed that we have reached this sad point in this congressional body, I look forward to seeing a more fair and responsible hearing in the Senate.

ROE V. WADE

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

Mr. BUDD. Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court decision in Roe v. Wade was decided 47 years ago this month. Since Roe was made law, more than 60 million unborn children have had their lives prematurely ended.

This is a matter of conscience, and just like the plurality of American people, I believe that life begins at conception.

In recent years, advances in science and medicine have given us an increasingly vivid picture of what life in the womb is like. A child has a heartbeat at just 6 weeks. A child feels pain at just 20 weeks. Science makes it clear that life exists in the womb, and, therefore, an unborn child is entitled to the most fundamental of human rights, and that is the right to live.

Even the plaintiff in that landmark case, Norma McCorvey, who at that time went by the name Jane Roe, changed her view and worked on behalf of the pro-life movement. She said: I think I have always been pro-life, but I just didn’t know it.

Roe v. Wade is not only a human tragedy but a constitutional one as well.

In our Constitution, power is divided among three branches: Article I, Congress; Article II, the Presidency; and Article III, the courts. Congress makes the laws, the Executive enforces them, and the courts apply them.

Courts should not be in the business of striking down acts of Congress or State statutes simply because the individual judges have political disagreement with what the people’s representatives have decided. In our constitutional system, judges may strike down laws only if those laws conflict with the Constitution, our country’s supreme law.

But that is not what happened in Roe v. Wade. Five Justices created a right to abortion by reinterpreting the Due Process Clause of the Constitution. That clause says that no State may deprive anyone of life, liberty, or property without due process of law. But supporters of the decision have cast doubt on this justification.

Harvard Law School’s Laurence Tribe wrote: “One of the most curious things
about Roe is that, behind its own verbal smokescreen, the substantive judgment on which it rests is nowhere to be found.” And even Justice Ruth Bader Ginsberg had called the decision “heavily judged judicial intervention” that was “difficult to justify.”

Essentially, the Court went out of its way to commit one of the most dramatic cases of judicial overreach in history. Instead of letting each State decide the issues for themselves, five Justices circumvented the system and created a hierarchy of wrong that continues to this day.

Since Roe, individual States have been valiantly trying to impose some sort of moral and legal safeguards on abortion. They have enacted laws prohibiting racial and gender discrimination in abortions; laws requiring women to see ultrasounds of their babies before committing to ending the unborn child’s life; laws prohibiting abortion after a fetal heartbeat has been detected; and laws banning dismemberment abortions, where the doctor would have to physically tear the baby apart. Sadly, all of these laws have been struck down by judges claiming to follow the precedent of Roe v. Wade.

The human toll of this tragic overreach is staggering. Not only have over 60 million innocent children lost their lives, but the mothers of these children have had to live with the lasting psychological impacts that these abortions have had on them. Scientific studies have shown that women who have had abortions have a higher risk of mental health conditions like depression.

How could anyone turn a deaf ear and blind eye to the suffering of these vulnerable children and mothers? This issue transcends what it means to be an American and goes to the core of what makes us human.

Complex issues like this one are often, even today, controversial and, yes, heated tempers; but at the heart of that complexity and emotion lies a simple fundamental truth, and that is that unborn children deserve human rights.

I hope that one day soon the Supreme Court corrects their constitutional error so that the American people can reassert their voice in determining the moral question of our time.

HONORING THE SERVICE AND LEGACY OF DR. DEBORAH FRANK

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

Mr. McGovern. Mr. Speaker, today I am here to recognize the career of a colleague whose work has always been an inspiration, not just to me, but to countless healthcare providers, students, advocates, and patients alike, Dr. Deborah Frank.

Dr. Frank is a woman of many talents and passions. Notably, she has served as a professor of pediatrics at Boston University School of Medicine. One of Dr. Frank’s most impactful community contributions began in 1984, when she founded the Grow Clinic for Children at Boston Medical Center. The clinic is an outpatient center that produces comprehensive specialty medical, nutritional, developmental, social services, and dietary assistance to children.

She is also the founder and principal investigator of Children’s Health Watch, the Grow Clinic’s outreach and research arm, which is a network of pediatric and public health researchers who, like Dr. Frank, are committed to improving child health in America.

The Grow Clinic serves a diverse patient population of mostly low-income families from some of Greater Boston’s poorest communities. But what made the Grow Clinic an essential part of the community is not just its dedication to the underserved and underprivileged; it was Dr. Frank’s commitment to gaining a deeper understanding about the social determinants of her patients’ health.

Her patients knew that they could go to her for their needs beyond physical health. She cared about whether they had housing or warm clothing. She cared about whether they had healthy and nutritious food to eat and whether they were getting enough of it. She even started a food pantry at Boston Medical Center to address her patients’ needs.

Dr. Frank knew that there is more to health than metrics and vitals. It is also your environment and support system. Part of what makes Dr. Frank’s legacy remarkable is that she found a way to become part of that support system.

She came into this line of work with a vision and purpose and, in the process, has changed countless lives in Massachusetts and beyond.

Dr. Frank has testified many times before the Congress, raising awareness on the growing problem of national hunger and its effects on children. She has literally spoken truth to power. Her work will continue to shape the way that healthcare professionals and policymakers understand the correlation between children’s nutrition and health.

Whether she is teaching medical students about “failure to thrive,” making sure her patients have food, or advocating for the criminalization and stigmatization of addicted mothers, Dr. Frank is a true fighter.

She may say she retired, but, honestly, I don’t believe it. Her life’s work has enriched the health and well-being of those around her will not only continue through the organizations that she has worked in her entire life and her entire career, but also through the lives of the children and the families for whom she has advocated. I am sure that you and I won’t be the last to hear from what she believes in, and I thank her for her service to her community and to our country.

Finally, I also thank her for her friendship. She is one of my heroes. She is an inspiration to me and to so many other people, and she is a believer that we can change the world. With her leadership and her inspiration, I believe we can do great things like end hunger in this country once and for all.

So, Mr. Speaker, I want to say to Dr. Frank, on behalf of all my colleagues, thank you for the incredible work that you have done, and we look forward to continuing to work with you and to be guided by your values and your passion.

HONORING THE SERVICE AND LEGACY OF CARL ADRIAN

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

Mr. Newhouse. Mr. Speaker, President Eisenhower said: “The supreme quality for leadership is unquestionable integrity. Without it, no real success is possible.” Today, I rise to recognize a man of integrity, a friend, and a true community leader.

Carl Adrian has served as president and CEO of the Tri-Cities Economic Development Council for 16 years. During his tenure, Tri-Cities has added more than 35,000 jobs, over 1,300 new businesses, and nearly 90,000 new residents, which is a 30 percent increase in population.

Tri-Cites is a national leader in agricultural food processing and viticulture, cutting-edge science and technology advancements, and energy sector development—in countless ways, due to Carl’s advocacy and vision.

From his service on numerous boards, including Visit Tri-Cities and Benton-Franklin Council of Governments, and his efforts co-chairing the search for a new WSU Tri-Cities chancellor to his lasting commitment for the future of Hanford, Carl Adrian demonstrates the best of what it means to be a public servant.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Carl and Rheta on his much-deserved retirement. Our sincere thanks for all of his service to the Tri-Cities.

CONGRATULATING KAYLA BARRON

Mr. Newhouse. Mr. Speaker, when Kayla Barron, of Richland, Washington, graduated from high school, she attended the Naval Academy, commissioning as a Navy officer, and was among the first class of women commissioned to be a submarine officer.

Now she is one of just 48 NASA astronauts in the Nation and could be the first woman to land on the Moon. Kayla was chosen as one of more than 18,000 applicants for NASA’s astronaut basic training program, graduating with her 12 classmates on January 10.

As she works to design the spacesuit for NASA’s Artemis program, she and her classmates will prepare to complete the program’s mission: return humans to the Moon by 2024 and send people to Mars.
Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Kayla on her remarkable accomplishments. I applaud her ability and willingness to go above and beyond to set an example for women of all ages who may be interested in going where no woman has gone before. She has made, and continues to make, our community proud. Central Washington is rooting for her.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to co-sponsor a resolution introduced by my friends Representatives PANETTA and LAMALFA of California to support the longstanding partnership between the U.S. and Australia as we share firefighting resources in times of crisis.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to join me in applauding the firefighters, both American and Australian, who put their lives on the line to protect our land, our wildlife, and our loved ones.

TODAY IS A GREAT DAY FOR AMERICA

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

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, today is a great day for American agriculture and American manufacturing.

Today, the President signs phase one agreement with South Korea. This represents over half of our country’s trade. This sets the stage for the rest of our trade agreements and deficits. Agriculture goods will account for nearly $100 billion of these purchases, providing a much-needed boost to the industry that employs more than 200,000 U.S. farmers and ranchers. We made it through this hard pass, and I am happy to say things will get better soon. The patriotism our Kansas producers have shown has been nothing short of honorable.

Global trade disputes don’t end overnight, and as the President and his team have acknowledged, there is still a lot of work to be done on China. Phase two negotiations are already well under way, and I will continue to advocate for Kansas agriculture and manufacturing directly to this administration.

President Trump’s efforts to solidify deals with our four largest export markets, Mexico, Canada, Japan, and now China will give Kansans the confidence needed to move into the next decade and beyond. These four countries, along with the completed trade deal with South Korea, represent over half of our country’s trade. This sets the stage for the rest of our trade agreements.

We made it through this hard pass, and better days of fair and reciprocal trade lie ahead for many generations.

I thank the President and our entire trade team at USTR for their efforts to protect and grow American jobs, to improve wages, for their commitment to make and keep America great. Keep up the good work.

RECOGNIZING ZENA CARDMAN

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Ms. Zena Cardman, a recent graduate of NASA’s Astronaut Candidate Class XXII, and a native of Urbana, Illinois. Zena was selected in 2017 from a pool of over 18,000 applicants. She is part of the brightest and most skilled minds in the country. The past 2 years of training and her graduation from candidate school earned her the title of astronaut, and she is now eligible for spaceflight.

As a new grad, Zena will support NASA’s current missions, such as the work aboard the International Space Station, the Commercial Crew Program, and the Artemis Program, which has set a goal of sending humans back to the Moon by 2024.

I am proud to recognize Zena today as one of the best minds in space exploration. I know she will be an invaluable asset to NASA. I extend a well-deserved congratulations and congratulations to her graduation and her two firefighters from central Washington in Australia.

In the West, we recognize the catastrophic impact wildfires have on local communities, ecosystems, and environments. My congressional district recently experienced some of the worst wildfires in our State’s history. When we were in need, Australian firefighters were eager to help, and now our local heroes are returning the favor.

As we work to improve land management here at home, I am proud to note the efforts of the media. Instead, the story, the photo of the day will be Speaker PELOSI parading her tardy Articles of Impeachment to the Senate with pomp and circumstance. America can only hope this is the last chapter on this side of the capitol of this made-for-TV impeachment charade.

Why won’t the national media cover this trade agreement story? Because it is another example of a promise made, promise kept by our President. It is another example of our President’s policies working.

Once the Chinese trade agreement is completed, the President will have renegotiated over half of our country’s export-import business. Now, that is making America great again. That is the art of the deal.

As part of the phase one agreement, China will buy $200 billion worth of American goods and services over the next 2 years, nearly doubling our U.S. exports to the country and further narrowing the gap of our longstanding trade agreements and deficits. Agriculture goods will account for nearly $100 billion of these purchases, providing a much-needed boost to the industry that employs more than 200,000 U.S. farmers and ranchers. We made it through this hard pass, and I am happy to say things will get better soon. The patriotism our Kansas producers have shown has been nothing short of honorable.

Now, concerns about China upholding its end of the phase one agreement are legitimate. Decades of China re-neging on commitments aren’t lost on me, but thankfully our negotiation team, led by our trade representative Bob Lighthizer and a fellow Kansan, Gregg Doud, require that this deal includes commitments by the Chinese to purchase an additional $200 billion of American goods and services. The President has made it clear that China must honor the deal. I will continue to advocate for Kansas agriculture and manufacturing directly to this administration.

Concerns about China upholding its end of the phase one agreement are legitimate. Decades of China re-neging on commitments aren’t lost on me, but thankfully our negotiation team, led by our trade representative Bob Lighthizer and a fellow Kansan, Gregg Doud, require that this deal includes commitments by the Chinese to purchase an additional $200 billion of American goods and services. The President has made it clear that China must honor the deal. I will continue to advocate for Kansas agriculture and manufacturing directly to this administration.

President Trump’s efforts to solidify deals with our four largest export markets, Mexico, Canada, Japan, and now China will give Kansans the confidence needed to move into the next decade and beyond. These four countries, along with the completed trade deal with South Korea, represent over half of our country’s trade. This sets the stage for the rest of our trade agreements.

We made it through this hard pass, and better days of fair and reciprocal trade lie ahead for many generations.

I thank the President and our entire trade team at USTR for their efforts to protect and grow American jobs, to improve wages, for their commitment to make and keep America great. Keep up the good work.
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from California (Mr. TED LIEU) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. TED LIEU of California led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

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

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

You have promised, O God, that You are with us wherever we are and whatever we are doing—to heal and to help, to give strength and make us whole.

On this day, the House and the Senate draw our Nation’s attention as the process of impeachment moves forward. Bless all Members of Congress with wisdom; give them the courage to honor the Constitution, as they have promised to do, so that all Americans can proudly observe their government in action.

Opinion and feelings will be on edge. May all Members be filled by Your Holy Spirit and engage each other with goodwill and respect.

May all that is done this day, and in the days to come, be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL
The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day’s proceedings and announces to the House her approval thereof.

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

Ms. DEAN. Madam Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule 1, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker’s approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the Speaker’s approval of the Journal.

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

Ms. DEAN. Madam Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from California (Mr. TED LIEU) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. TED LIEU of California led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

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

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Madam Speaker, today, on the birthday of Clifford Bell, as he is known in western New York for the love he brings to all of those around him, has served as a senior business advisor to Buffalo State’s Small Business Development Center.

He was a colleague of mine in the city of Buffalo Common Council and he has led the Martin Luther King, Jr., celebration in Buffalo for three decades. As a council member Brother Bell was known for the line: “For whom the bell tolls. This Bell tolls for you,” a quote that historically references the interconnectedness of humanity and his commitment to service.

Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., in his “Where Do We Go From Here?” address said: “Hate is too great a burden to bear. I have decided to love.”

Brother Bell has lived a life of love, representing the best of our community and our country. We, as a Nation, can learn from his example.

CONGRATULATING GENERAL JOHN RAYMOND
(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, after a long, embarrassed month, the House will finally transmit the Articles of Impeachment against President Trump to the United States Senate. Yet I understand Speaker PELOSI and her managers will continue to push for witnesses in the Senate trial because, in their words, they want the facts.

That claim is nonsense. House Democrats blocked the testimony of the
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service to others sharing her talents for the betterment of us all.

June was a longtime committee-person of the Greater Glenside Patriotic Association and chairperson of the Glenside Fourth of July Parade. The annual parade is the longest continuous Independence Day parade in America and the pride of our hometown of Glenside. June made it her mission each year to ensure this treasured tradition continued.

June was an environmental activist best remembered for spearheading the yearly Earth Day clean-up of Keswick Avenue.

Even though June was born in Boston and was a Red Sox fan, all of us Phillies fans in Glenside embraced and thanked her for her kind heart, her giving spirit, and her dedication to community.

I join June’s friends, family, and the wider Glenside community in mourning her loss. I am thankful for June’s example of quiet acts of service, and I am better for having known June.

RECOGNIZING NATIONAL MENTORING MONTH

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize January as National Mentoring Month, when we volunteer our time to provide support and guidance for our Nation’s young people so they are better equipped to tackle personal and professional challenges.

A good mentor could be a friend, a family member, a boss, or a school counselor. Effective counseling prior to graduation can assist students in making better informed decisions about their educational options and career prospects.

That is why Congressman JIM LANGEVIN and I introduced the Counseling for Career Choice Act. Despite a great deal of money being invested to improve education, very little has been spent to address career development specifically. This bill authorizes a grant program to give States and local education agencies access to current counseling programs or the means to implement new counseling frameworks.

Additionally, the bill provides resources to ensure counselors can support their students to the best of their abilities. When we equip students with the tools that they need to succeed, they embark on educational journeys that lead to rewarding careers.

Madam Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to join Congressman LANGEVIN and I in support of H.R. 5092, the Counseling for Career Choice Act.

SUPPORT RELIEF FOR NUCLEAR DISTRICTS

(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, I rise today for our Nation’s communities saddled with nuclear waste stockpiles because the Federal Government has failed to meet its obligation to find a permanent repository.

My constituents in Zion understand this all too well. After its nuclear plant closed years ago, tons of pounds of spent nuclear fuel remains.

Literally sitting on the shores of Lake Michigan, the more than 50 casks severely affect the quality of life of the residents of Zion. It deters economic investment, depresses home values, drives up property taxes, and stretches the city’s already-thin budget.

Today, I am proud to reintroduce the STRANDED Act to, at last, provide some compensation for these affected communities. Zion is not alone. Across the country, there are more than a dozen communities with nuclear plants at various stages of decommissioning, with more to come.

Madam Speaker, I am grateful for the support and leadership of Committee on Appropriations Chairwoman NITA LOWEY and Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, and Related Agencies Chairwoman MARCY KAPTUR in reintroducing this bill.

Together, we are fighting to make the Federal Government do right for communities like Zion, and I urge my colleagues to join us.

HONORING THE LIFE OF WILLIE BELTON

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

Mr. ABRAHAM. Madam Speaker, the people of Louisiana recently lost a respected political leader, a businessman, a war veteran, and a civil rights leader, Mr. Willie Belton.

Mr. Belton had a life of service to others. He was awarded the Bronze Star and the Purple Heart under fire, heroically, during the Korean war.

He marched with Dr. Martin Luther King in Washington, Alabama, Tennessee, and Mississippi. Like Dr. King, Mr. Belton always advocated Christian values and nonviolent protests. He also led his local NAACP chapter in Louisiana. In February 2019, he was awarded the Louisiana Medal of Honor.

Madam Speaker, please join me in honoring his lifetime of service to Louisiana and a Louisiana treasure, Mr. Willie Belton, whose memory will, fortunately, live with us forever.

HONORING JULIE BORNSTEIN

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

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Julie Bornstein on her retirement from the Coachella Valley Housing Coalition.

For more than 30 years, Julie has worked tirelessly as an advocate for affordable housing throughout the Coachella Valley. She has dedicated her career to making a difference in the lives of thousands of individuals in Riverside and Imperial Counties.

Her leadership has been instrumental in raising awareness about the homelessness issue so many members of our communities face. Through her efforts, we have seen an increase in the availability of affordable housing throughout the Inland Empire.

Apart from her work in the Coachella Valley Housing Coalition, Julie served in the California State Assembly and was chosen to serve as the chair of the Democratic Caucus.

She went on to serve as director of the California Department of Housing and Community Development. Later, Julie was appointed CEO and president of the Campaign for Affordable Housing.

Madam Speaker, Julie’s work has not gone unnoticed, and the Coachella Valley is a better place because of her. We wish her a happy retirement.

CELEBRATING MARTIN LUTHER KING JR. DAY

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of Dr. Martin Luther King, today being his actual birthday, 91 years ago, in 1929.

Dr. King has become synonymous with the civil rights movement and the right to ensure each and every one of us is treated equally, regardless of our background and upbringing.

His strong Christian beliefs helped him inspire positive social change through peaceful protests and demonstrations.

In a nation plagued by identity politics, his pursuit of liberty is as relevant now as it was during the 1960s. Dr. King demonstrated to the world that it is not the color of a person’s skin that mattered but, rather, the nature of their character. Indeed, it is one of my favorite quotes and one to live by.

The work of Dr. King is not yet done. He remains a shining example of the right way to lead, the right way to peacefully protest, and the right way to inspire.

I look forward to joining the celebration at the Southside Community Center in Orovile, California, this coming Monday, where his life is celebrated and even brought forward by scholarships for the young people who will be there.
HONORING MARTIN LUTHER KING JR. DAY

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

Mrs. HAYES. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.J. Res. 76, a resolution of disapproval of the Secretary of Education’s new borrower defense rule.

This rule would allow lenders protections for students and taxpayers and makes it more difficult for students to access relief for loans obtained for degrees that have no value.

Over 1,200 students in Connecticut have been defrauded by predatory for-profit colleges, and ITT Tech and still await relief. The Department has made the approval process more difficult, leaving hundreds of thousands of students desperately waiting for answers.

Too many first-generation, low-income students, student veterans, and students of color are lured into these fraudulent schools that prioritize profits over helping students advance their education.

The DeVos rule eliminates automatic closed school discharges and weakens the early warning system that forces institutions to invest in the potential debt relief. It puts a greater burden of proof on students, barring them from relief if they cannot file their claims fast enough.

As a career educator who truly understands the equalizing power of education, I say it is unconscionable that the Department of Education and the Secretary do not feel a moral imperative to protect students.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

IN REMEMBRANCE OF PRESTON COPE AND BAILEY HOLT

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

Mr. COMER. Madam Speaker, I rise today in remembrance of the precious lives of Preston Cole and Bailey Holt, two victims of a tragic school shooting at Marshall County High School in Benton, Kentucky, 2 years ago. This tragic event devastated the Benton community and took two lives away from us far too soon.

Preston and Bailey continue to be dearly missed by their families and the Marshall County community, which has shown incredible resilience in the face of this attack. Nevertheless, Preston Cole and Bailey Holt remain in our hearts and minds to this day.

APPOINTING AND AUTHORIZING MANAGERS FOR IMPEachment TRIAL OF DONALD JOHN TRUMP, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 767, I send to the desk the resolution (H. Res. 798) appointing and authorizing managers for the impeachment trial of Donald John Trump, President of the United States, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 798

Resolved, That Mr. Schiff, Mr. Nadler, Ms. Lofgren, Mr. Jeffries, Ms. Demings, Mr. Crow, and Ms. Garcia of Texas are appointed managers to conduct the impeachment trial against Donald John Trump, President of the United States, that a message be sent to the Senate to inform the Senate of these appointments, and that the managers so appointed may, in connection with the preparation and conduct of the articles of impeachment to the Senate and take all other actions necessary, which may include the following:

(1) Employing legal, clerical, and other necessary assistants and incurring such other expenses as may be necessary, to be paid from amounts available to the Committee on the Judiciary under applicable expense resolutions or from the applicable accounts of the House of Representatives.

(2) Requesting from persons and papers, and filing with the Secretary of the Senate, on the part of the House of Representatives, any pleadings, in conjunction with or subsequent to, the exhibition of the articles of impeachment to the managers as may be necessary.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 767, the resolution is debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

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

Madam Speaker, the resolution before us today appoints managers to prosecute the Senate impeachment trial of President Trump.

This trial is necessary because President Trump gravely abused the power of his office when he strong-armed a foreign government to announce investigations into his domestic political rival. He betrayed our country when he used powers of his office, including withholding vital U.S. military assistance, to pressure that government to help him win reelection.

He invited foreign interference into our elections again. He jeopardized our national security. He did all of this for his personal political gain.

And then he violated the Constitution by stonewalling Congress’ efforts to investigate, ordering an absolute blockade of evidence. Despite that, the House was able to uncover powerful evidence that demonstrates, beyond a doubt, the President’s betrayal and violations of the Constitution.

But we still have not heard the whole truth because the President has refused to allow a single document to be turned over to the House in response to our impeachment subpoenas, and he
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has prevented us from hearing key witnesses as well. This is unprecedented.

Our Speaker has led our fight to a fair trial in the Senate. Above all, a fair trial must include additional documents and all relevant witnesses.

The American people have common sense. They know that any trial that does not allow witnesses is not a trial; it is a coverup.

The Speaker’s insistence on this point has gotten results. Just yesterday, we received critical new evidence from the President’s former associate, Lev Parnas, that further proves Mr. Trump’s scheme to pressure Ukraine to go after his personal political opponents.

New witness testimony has become available as well, including John Bolton’s announcement that he would honor a Senate subpoena.

Under today’s resolution, the managers also have broad authority to submit to the Senate any additional evidence that the House may acquire on its own, and we will do so.

The Senate is on trial. We will see whether they conduct a fair trial and allow the witnesses or conduct a cover-up. Today’s resolution is the next step in their inaction and solemn constitutional process. I urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on the resolution, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This impeachment process has been flawed from the outset. It resembles not a congressional action; it resembles, more, a Dr. Seuss book, knowing not which way it goes.

On September 24, the Speaker declared at a press conference the House was conducting an impeachment inquiry. However, contrary to the Speaker’s decree that we were all of a sudden in an impeachment inquiry, the House did not authorize the impeachment inquiry until October 30 by adopting H. Res. 660.

It was said just a moment ago that the Speaker has been leading the fight for a fair trial in the Senate. I wish the Speaker had been leading for a fair hearing in the House instead of trashing our rules.

For those 71 out of 78 days, from the time it was announced at a press conference to the time we finished, the President was not permitted to participate in these meetings. Think of that: 71 days out of 78 in which we actually did something on impeachment, he was not presented the ability to cross-examine fact witnesses, present counter-arguments, no due process at all in those 71 days.

When presented with the opportunity, when it came to the Judiciary Committee, instead of the Judiciary Committee stepping up and actually acting like the Judiciary Committee, the committee of impeachment, we punted.

We had some law professors who already had their basic talking points.

He could have cross-examined them. That would have done a lot of good.

Then we could have had witnesses of staffers that testified—again, a lot of good.

Where were the fact witnesses? Instead of the rubber stamp that we were warned about 20 years ago by the current chairman, we became the rubber stamp.

Democrats repeatedly violated House rules and blatantly abused the rules they wrote. H. Res. 660. Even to this day, we will pass this out in violation of H. Res. 660.

They used inflammatory rhetoric haunting them because this is what they had to do.

One Democrat said: I call for impeachment today because it is one heck of an emergency.

Another said: We have a crime in progress. We have an emergency in our national election that is going on right now.

But my favorite, in December: It is a crime spree in progress.

Oh, the hyperbole just reeks in this room.

When we understand this, if it was such an emergency, if it was in lieu to finding a 911 call, then why did we hold this for almost a month? Well, we have been told that it is to help have a Senate fair trial—be damned the House in-appropriate process we had.

But even now that the process was bad, I am going to go back, and let’s make sure the facts are here because they still haven’t changed:

A phone call that was put out in a transcript in which no pressure was applied, there was no conditionality on anything given in that call or since to do that.

There was also nothing given by the Ukrainians to actually get this money that was released, by the way, before—it was actually a statutory deadline of September 31. They did nothing. They got the money anyway.

But the problem is they want the Senate to do their job for them. But that is not how it works. You see, the Speaker—and what I have heard today even from folks giving 1-minutes, Madam Speaker, is this was all they wanted. It was a political impeachment. They have said he is impeached for life.

This shows the true motivation, I believe, of the other side. It is their dislike for this President and the good work he is doing.

So, Madam Speaker, before I reserve here for a moment, this has always been a political impeachment. Even today, on the floor, the talk of the President being impeached and this always being a stain forgets the Senate trial.

I hope this ends this political impeachment and this body never sees it again.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF), the distinguished chairman of the Intelligence Committee.

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of the resolution.

The task before us is a grave one, but one enabled by a conviction.

The impeachment inquiry undertaken by the House of Representatives found that President Donald J. Trump abused his power and sought to cover it up with an unprecedented campaign of official corruption.

He withheld hundreds of millions of U.S. dollars in vital military aid to Ukraine, a close ally at war with Russia, and withheld a coveted White House meeting critical to the Ukrainian leader’s international legitimacy until Ukraine would commit to help President Trump cheat—cheat—in the next election.

President Trump put his own personal interests above the national interests, above our national security, and he failed and he will do it again.

For that reason, he was impeached. And for that reason, the House managers will take the case to the Senate and to the American people, because the appropriate remedy—indeed, the only remedy—is the conviction and removal from office of President Donald Trump.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY).

Mr. MCCARTHY. Madam Speaker, back when this national nightmare began, Speaker PELOSI laid bare her intentions and purely partisan agenda.

She told her Caucus that they needed to “strike while the iron is hot.”

This was always an exercise in raw partisan politics, contrary to the warnings of our Founders. And over the last month, we saw the justification for running the fastest, thinnest, and most partisan impeachment in American history crumbling.

Instead of sending the Articles of Impeachment to the Senate for trial, Speaker PELOSI held them hostage in a failed play to get leverage that she did not—and would never—have.

In terms of concessions, she got nothing: no control, no moral victories—in other words, another failed strategy.

After a month of counterproductive and harmful delays, I have three questions for my friends on the other side of the aisle, the Democrats:

What happened to impeachment being urgent?

What happened to Congress being “on the clock”?

What happened to saying the House would be “derelict in our duty” if we did not act immediately?

These were all the assertions Democrats made over the past several months. I guess it turns out none of them are true.

These delay tactics were self-serving, hypocritical, and discrediting. But they made an important admission, some might even call it a concession.
They proved a very big point: Democrats do not even believe their case was robust enough to win in a trial.

Even the Speaker’s allies admit the delays undermined their case. Some have gone as far as describing it as a “falling-through-the-crack” strategy. These are those who are closest to her.

Senator Feinstein, the senior Democrat from our State of California and the hometown of the Speaker, said: “The longer it goes on, the less urgent it becomes.”

And Chairman Adam Smith, a confidant of the Speaker, said “it was time” to transmit the articles to the Senate.

Both these statements were made last week, before the Speaker relented. They are significant because they were public and they were honest.

I am disappointed these individuals did not have the courage to stand by their initial comments. If impeachment was truly as urgent as Democrats claimed, the majority should not have waited for the Speaker to choose a politically convenient time.

Anyone could have recognized this ploy was backhanded. The House and the Senate are different institutions and, at this point in time, controlled by different parties.

As James Madison wrote in the Federalist Papers, the purpose of bicameralism is to guard against the dangers of encroachment and to stop toxic resolutions from taking effect.

We saw separation of powers prevail against an abuse of power, just as the Constitution intended. The idea of withholding a sloppy impeachment case to force the Senate to change its rules is constitutionally and politically unheard of. Frankly, it is just ridiculous.

In Article section 5, the Constitution clearly states: “Each House may determine the Rules of its Proceedings.” It doesn’t say the House may determine the rules of proceedings in the Senate.

If anything, the Speaker’s actions have only further persuaded Members of the Senate that the evidence of impeachment was neither thorough nor satisfactory.

But do you know what? Let’s be honest. This was never about persuasion. It was never about the rule of law. It was what Alexander Hamilton warned us, that one party would get control, that one party would get control and, as James Madison wrote in the Federalist Papers, the purpose of bicameralism is to guard against the dangers of encroachment.

The reason for this impeachment is the same reason it has taken Democrats 30 days to send the articles to the Senate: just spite. They wanted to stain the President’s record without giving him a fair chance to clear his name.

Last year, we saw House Democrats invert the burden of proof during their fair investigation.

For every American watching, take, for instance, if this was your government, if they switched the burden of proof on you.

We have Congressman Max Rose, a new freshman of the majority, who characterized it this way: “The President says he is innocent, so all we are saying is ‘prove it.’”

God forbid the government accuses you of something as an average American and says you have to prove it. We just switched a fundamental belief of America, but only in this House do we do that.

This “guilty until proven innocent” mentality was an admission that impeachment was not about upholding justice or protecting the rule of law.

Now Democrats have invented an even more destructive standard: you are guilty because they say so.

Our Founders feared this day. Alexander Hamilton warned us of this day. I hoped this day would not come. I would hope that those that uphold the Constitution would believe in the rule of law, instead of the spite or the dislike of a President.

As James Madison wrote in the Federalist Papers, the purpose of bicameralism is to guard against the dangers of encroachment and to stop toxic resolutions from taking effect.

As James Madison wrote in the Federalist Papers, the purpose of bicameralism is to guard against the dangers of encroachment.

As I have said in the past, there is an issue with fairness; but instead of looking to the Senate, Speaker Pelosi should be looking within her own Caucus. From the beginning, this investigation was marred by selective leaks to the media, a completely predetermined process.

Yes, we have been through impeachment before, but it was much different. We believed in the rule of law back then; that you could face your accuser, that you could cross-examine, that the minority could actually ask for witnesses.

The day that impeachment was asked to come forward, I sent a letter to the Speaker asking 10 items, none that were made up. Do you know what they were? The fair process we have always used in the past. The answer was no. Because they have been working on this for 2 1/2 years, they could not let fairness determine the outcome.

Any other prosecutor would be disbarred for such blatant bias, especially if that prosecutor was a fact witness in the case.

The reason for this impeachment is the same reason it has taken Democrats 30 days to send the articles to the Senate: just spite. They wanted to stain the President’s record without giving him a fair chance to clear his name.

Last year, we saw House Democrats invert the burden of proof during their fair investigation.

For every American watching, take, for instance, if this was your government, if they switched the burden of proof on you.

We have Congressman Max Rose, a new freshman of the majority, who characterized it this way: “The President says he is innocent, so all we are saying is ‘prove it.’”

God forbid the government accuses you of something as an average American and says you have to prove it. We just switched a fundamental belief of America, but only in this House do we do that.
earlier, when he got it. No, it was held. Why? Because we were impeaching. That is an amazing agenda, but you promised people you would do it.

This is not a moment this body should be proud of. If Speaker Pelosi likes to say impeachment is a national civic lesson, let us bludgeon this blunder as a teachable moment.

I will make this promise to the American public, because the day will come that the majority will switch. We will uphold the Constitution. We will listen to the words of Alexander Hamilton. And just because somebody else is in an office that we may not like, we will not change the rule of law. We will not accuse them of breaking it and say they have to prove it.

We believe America is more than a country. America is an idea, an idea that, yes, would make students in Iran rise up for the freedom of what they know America to be. That the rule of law was so powerful. This is a moment and a lesson we should learn. This is a moment that will teach our grandchildren that, yes, more than 200 years ago the Founders crafted an amazing country, but they warned us what abuse of power would look like. The sad part is, we are witnessing it. What a contrast in a day and time.

Moving forward, we must not redo these same mistakes in Congress, and my promise to you is: if power were to change, the rule of law would come back. If we have an agenda focused on people, not politics. We would have a voice that you are innocent until proven guilty. We would not abuse our power just for the sheer sake of politics, to say you are impeached forever because I dislike you.

We are better than this. It is a sad day, but the great thing about America, it will all change because the people have the voice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members in the minority would rather talk about anything than try to defend what President Trump actually did, because they can’t.

There is overwhelming evidence that the President pressured the Ukrainian Government to interfere in our election. Then he covered it up. These are high crimes and misdemeanors, and we will prove that in the Senate.

Second, our minority colleagues don’t like our ongoing fight for a fair trial because it got results. New documents and additional witnesses have emerged that unmistakably point to the President’s guilt, and we have exposed the efforts of some in the Senate majority to put on a sham trial.

The American people understand that. Without evidence, without witnesses is no trial at all but a cover-up, and that will not stand. We must protect the Constitution and the integrity of our elections. That is what this is about. We must remove this President to protect our country.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia has 30 seconds remaining. The gentleman from New York has 1 minute remaining, and the gentleman from New York has the right to close.

The gentleman from Georgia is recognized.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I appreciate that. Madam Speaker, is the gentleman from New York ready to close?

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I am ready to close.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, there are no other speakers?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, there are no speakers? A closing is no other speakers.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I have one more speaker, and she will close.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, the gentleman is not ready to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I will take it back. Madam Speaker, give me the time one more time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, two facts just came out right here, and again, we are going to hear in just a moment, but they are facts. Undoubtedly the mics are not working on the other side, on the majority side. We have talked about the facts. There is not overwhelming evidence. We have discussed this over and over until we are blue in the face, but it doesn’t matter because this is a political impeachment.

This has nothing to do with the facts. We have shown that there was nothing done wrong, but that does not matter. When the train is on the tracks, the whistle is blowing, impeachment matters, and the only thing that matters on the timeline, the only real emergency is that there is a 2020 election in which the Democrats can’t stand to see the fact this President is going to win again. They can’t stand the fact of who they have got running, so what do we do? We impeach him, as they said, for life. That is wrong. Vote “no.”

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

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, again, no defense.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California (Ms. Pelosi), the Speaker of the House.

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his exceptional custodianship of the Constitution of the United States, for 13 years the top Democrat on the Constitution, Civil Rights, and Civil Justice Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee. I thank you for your leadership in protecting and defending the Constitution, the oath that we take as Members of Congress.

As I enter into the conversation, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Georgia for his apology for his ridiculous remarks about me and House Democrats. Madam Speaker, I thank Mr. Collins and accept his apology.

Now, I want to go to the purpose of my statement. Why is it that we are on the floor today? My colleagues on both sides of the aisle, we are here today to cross a very important threshold in American history. On December 18, the House of Representatives passed Articles of Impeachment of Donald Trump. Articles of Impeachment for Abuse of Power and Obstruction of Congress.

By his own admission, the President stated that, yes, he had had that conversation with the President of Ukraine, but he didn’t see anything wrong with it. Well, we don’t agree with that assessment.

And, yes, it is a fact when someone is impeached, they are always impeached. It cannot be erased, so I stand by that comment, although I know you don’t like hearing it. I stand by this picture of the American flag, as I did the day that we introduced the Articles of Impeachment onto the floor because every day all over America in classrooms as well as courtrooms and in this Congress of the United States when we meet, we pledge allegiance to this flag of the United States of America and to the republic for which it stands—and to the republic for which it stands, that is what our Nation is. That is the genius, the beautiful, exquisite genius of the Constitution, that we are a republic. That was a decision of our Founders, their vision. They didn’t want a monarchy, they wanted a republic.

When Benjamin Franklin came out of Independence Hall and was asked what do we have, Mr. Franklin, a monarchy or a republic, he said: “A republic, if we can keep it.” I have often wondered why he said that, why that would be in doubt. But we see why it is in doubt right now when the President of the United States has the President say I can do whatever I want. That is a monarchy, that is not a republic that we pledge our allegiance to every single day.

Here we are today with the Articles of Impeachment about to be transmitted to the United States Senate.

I was thinking this morning and I mentioned it in a previous public
The event, the midnight ride of Paul Revere: “Listen, my children, and you shall hear of the midnight ride of Paul Revere.” Listen, my children, and you will hear about an assault on the Constitution of the United States, undermined for which our flag stands by the President of the United States in using appropriated funds enacted in a bipartisan way by this Congress, funds that were meant to help Ukraine fight the Russians. The President that his private ATM machine, I guess, and thought he could say to the President, “Do me a favor.” Do me a favor? Do you paint houses, too? What is this? Do me a favor.

So we have a situation that is very sad. Don’t talk to me about my timing. For a long time I resisted the calls from across the country for impeachment of the President for obvious violations of the Constitution that he committed. But recognizing the divisiveness of impeachment, I held back. Frankly, I said this President isn’t worth it. But when he acted the way he did in relationship to withholding funds from Ukraine in return for a benefit to him that was personal and political, he crossed a threshold. He gave us no choice.

So, children, our Constitution is the vision of our Founders. They were so brave they declared independence. They did it in a timeframe when in the course of human events it becomes necessary. They declared independence. They fought a war of independence and bravely succeeded. They wrote documents, our founding documents, the Constitution. Thank God they made it amendable so we could ever be expanding freedom in our country.

And that, my children, is what you pledge allegiance to, the flag of the United States of America and to the Republic of which it is the Constitution of that Constitution of the United States.

We take that oath. When we become Members of Congress or other public office, we take an oath to protect and defend the Constitution of the United States.

The President of the United States takes an oath to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States, an oath that he has blatantly violated. For this reason, he was impeached by the House of Representatives.

For this reason, we thought it would be helpful to have not only the strong case for impeachment and removal that was put forth in this House, but to know that more was to come. We didn’t make it come because we said that we were going to wait until after Christmas and then be done. They would like to have had us send it over on Christmas Eve so they could dismiss it.

Perhaps they don’t realize that dismissal is coverup, but that has been one of their trains of thought.

Dismissal is coverup.

I was so disappointed the other day, last Friday, I guess, or last Thursday, when the leader of the United States Senate, rather than strengthening the institution in which he serves, became subservient and signed on to a resolution that would dismiss charges.

Dismissal is coverup.

In the last week of the time since we passed the resolution, and not because of the time—we passed it on December 18—on December 20, new emails showed that 91 minutes after Trump’s phone call with the Ukrainian President, a top Office of Management and Budget aide asked the Department of Defense to “hold off” on sending military aid to Ukraine.

On December 29, revelations emerged about OMB Director and Acting Chief of Staff Mulvaney’s role in the delay of aid; the effort by lawyers in the administration to justify the delay; and, most importantly, the alarm that the delay caused within the administration.

On January 2, newly unredacted Pentagon emails, which the House subpoenaed and the President blocked, raised serious concerns by Trump administration officials about the legality of the President’s hold on the aid to Ukraine.

On January 6, former Trump National Security Advisor John Bolton said he would comply with a subpoena compelling his testimony. His lawyer stated he has new relevant information.

On January 13, reports emerged that the Russian Government hacked the Ukrainian gas company Burisma as part of their ongoing effort to influence the U.S. election in support of Trump. Yesterday, House committees—Mr. NADLER, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. ENGEL, and Madam Chair MALONEY—released new evidence, pursuant to a House subpoena, from Lev Parnas—recently photographed with the Republican leader—an associate of Rudy Giuliani, that further proves that the President was a central player in the scheme to pressure Ukraine for his own benefit in the 2020 election.

The Senate leader and the President are afraid of more facts coming to light. That is why the leader signed that dismissal resolution.

A dismissal, again, is a coverup.

The American people will fully understand the Senate’s move to begin the trial without witnesses and documents as a pure political coverup.

Whatever the outcome, the American people want a fair trial, fair to the President, fair to the American people. The American people deserve the truth.

The Constitution requires a trial, a fair trial.

The House is now moving forward with a vote to transmit the articles and appoint managers.

As Speaker, I am proud to appoint outstanding American patriots to serve on the impeachment panel:

Chairman SCHIFF;
Chairman NADLER;
Chairwoman ZOE LOFGREN—this is her third impeachment, as a staffer to a House Judiciary Committee member in the Nixon impeachment, as a member of the Judiciary Committee on the Clinton impeachment, and now as a House manager;
Hakeem Jeffries, the chair of our Caucus, a serious, respected litigator;
Al DEMINGS, a U.S. military police force in Orlando for 27 years and, for part of that time, the first woman and African American police chief of Orlando, so she knows her way around the courtroom;
Jason Crow from Colorado, an Army Ranger who served our country in the military in Iraq and Afghanistan and now in the Congress of the United States, and he too is a respected litigator; and,
Sylvia Garcia from Texas, a judge in a number of capacities in Texas and a member of the Judiciary Committee.

We are very honored that you have taken the responsibility, all of you, to bring the Articles of Impeachment over to the United States Senate with a case for the Constitution.

So, back to the children. We don’t want this President or any President to ever violate the Constitution. It is very, very important that we see that that Constitution is central to who we are as a country, our system of government, our Constitution, so valued, so respected, so honored by everyone who takes an oath of office to support and defend it.

We see the Russians now hacking in Ukraine. It just came out yesterday or the day before. It just reminds me that I think most Americans would think that voters in America should decide who our President is, not Vladimir Putin and Russia deciding who our President is.

I am very concerned that in all of this, whether it is withholding funds for the Ukrainian Government to fight the Russians, whether it is undermining our commitment to NATO, whether it is, again, making decisions of what happens in Syria vis-a-vis Turkey favoring the Russians, that all roads lead to Russia, all roads lead to Putin.

While some in the administration may think that is okay, I don’t, but we do insist and wonder why this President and some in this Congress will not come to the defense of our electoral system by allowing that to happen, denying that it is happening, placing the blame elsewhere.

This is as serious as it gets for any of us. Only the vote to declare war would be something more serious than this. We take it very seriously.

It is not personal. It is not political. It is not partisan. It is patriotic.

Again, I thank our distinguished managers for their courage and their dedication, for being willing to spend the time to do the job to honor the oath that we take and honor the pledge that our children take of allegiance to the flag and to the Republic for which it stands.

Madam Speaker, I urge a “yes” vote. Mr. NADLER, Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.
Mr. JOHN W. ROSE of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this partisan impeachment spectacle that seeks to accomplish what President Trump’s opponents failed to do at the ballot box in 2016. The bedrock of this country is our Constitution. Article II of the United States Constitution grants our President the authority to deal with other nations and their leaders.

This President was lawfully elected by the American people. When President Trump was sworn into office, he assumed the role of our nation’s Commander in Chief. And, as Commander in Chief, he has done absolutely nothing illegal. The impeachment vote today is a sad continuation of the partisan political efforts to undercut President Trump since he was elected in 2016, if not before.

The House majority has wrongly denied President Trump the fair process that was afforded to President Clinton and President Nixon at every stage of their investigations. I am also profoundly disappointed that the House Judiciary Committee refused to hold a minority day hearing in compliance with Clause VI of the Rules of the House, which the Democratic Majority earlier voted to approve.

It should also greatly concern all Americans that co-equal subpoena authority was not granted to the minority during this hyper-partisan impeachment. Rules of impeachment in the House and Senate and the backbone of past impeachment investigations.

My bill, House Resolution 667, would have granted this co-equal subpoena authority to the minority and majority, and I am disappointed that the Speaker never let it be considered by the House.

House Democrats said that it was critical to move forward in an historically fast, hasty manner. Yet, after passing both Articles of Impeachment on December 18, 2019, their sense of urgency died. The House Democratic Majority has waited nearly a month to transmit the “urgent” Articles of Impeachment to the Senate. This change in tone only underscores what Tennesseans knew all along: this is a partisan stunt, motivated purely by political reasons, that mocks our Founding Fathers’ grave concern in undertaking decisions of this great magnitude and the safeguards they designed for our Republic.

It is shameful that the majority has waited nearly a month to bring House Resolution 798 up for a vote. I am deeply alarmed that this delay by House Democrats was a thinly veiled partisan stunt, motivated purely by political reasons, that mocks our Founding Fathers’ grave concern in undertaking decisions of this great magnitude and the safeguards they designed for our Republic.

Instead of working to secure our southern border, protect religious freedom, and rein in out-of-control government spending, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle who stood against this grave injustice and demanded that the House send over the Articles of Impeachment to the Senate without delay.

I want to remind those who are leading this ridiculous waste of taxpayer resources that there will be another election in 2020. The next election is the avenue for deciding a new president, not this. Throughout the history of this country, impeachment has been a rare process. With this impeachment, I worry that in the next 230 years of our Republic, it will be rare that a president is not impeached.

On behalf of my fellow Tennesseans, and on behalf of my constituents in the Sixth District of Tennessee, I stand with our President and Commander in Chief and will vote “no” to appoint and authorize managers for the impeachment trial of President Trump.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 796, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on adoption of the resolution.

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam 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 15-minute vote on adoption of the resolution will be followed by a 5-minute vote on:

Agreeing to the Speaker’s approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yes 228, no 193, not voting 9, as follows:

(Roll No. 18)

YEAS—228

Abraham
Adams
Aguiar
Alben
Algeo
Alford
Allen
Allred
Alo
Alonso
Alonso
Alvarez (CA)
Alvarez (MO)
Alvarez (NM)
Alvarez (TX)
Alvarez (UT)
Alvarez (WA)
Alvarez (WV)
Alvarez of New Mexico
Alvarez of Texas
Alvarez of Utah
Alvarez of Washington
Alvarez of West Virginia
Alvarez, Raúl
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Raul G.
Alvarez, Raul R.
Alvarez, Raul R.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Alvarez, Ruben K.
Mr. HIGGINs of New York changed his vote from "nay" to "aye." 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.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NADLler. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on H. Res. 798.

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

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK.


Hon. Nancy Pelosi, Speaker, House of Representatives.

Washington, D.C.


Hon. Nancy Pelosi, Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Dear Speaker Pelosi: I write to respectfully tender my resignation as a member of the House Committee on Homeland Security.

It has been an honor to serve in this capacity.

Sincerely,

Cheryl L. Johnson.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Financial Services:


Hon. Nancy Pelosi, Speaker, House of Representatives.

Washington, D.C.

Dear Speaker Pelosi: I write to respectfully tender my resignation as a member of the Committee on Financial Services. It has been an honor to serve in this capacity.

Sincerely,

Rep. Peter T. King, Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Homeland Security:


Hon. Nancy Pelosi, Speaker, House of Representatives.

Washington, DC.


It has been an honor to serve in this capacity.

Sincerely,

Semper Fidelis,

Van Taylor, Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Education and Labor:


Hon. Nancy Pelosi, Speaker, House of Representatives.

Washington, DC.

Dear Speaker Pelosi: I write to respectfully tender my resignation as a member of the House Committee on Education and Labor.

It has been an honor to serve in this capacity.

Sincerely,

Van Taylor, Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

PROTECTING OLDER WORKERS AGAINST DISCRIMINATION ACT

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. Scott of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on H.R. 1230, the Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the Clerk will put de novo.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. Scott of Virginia. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of H.R. 1230, the Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act, or POWADA.

I want to thank my colleagues, particularly the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. Sensenbrenner), for working to pass this bipartisan proposal to restore workplace protections for older workers.

In 1967, Congress passed the Age Discrimination in Employment Act, or ADEA, which recognizes the Federal Government’s role in preventing older workers from being forced out of jobs or denied work opportunities because of their age.

Importantly, the ADEA was enforced using an evidentiary standard that gave older workers a fair shot at holding employers accountable for age discrimination. Under this standard, workers seeking to challenge age discrimination in employment only had to prove that age was a motivating factor or one of many motivating factors behind an employer’s discriminatory action.

For decades, this mixed-motive standard was consistent with the evidentiary standard in title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which covers claims of unlawful discrimination on the basis of race, sex, national origin, or religion.

Unfortunately, in 2009, in the Gross v. FBL Financial Services case, the Supreme Court upended decades of precedent, significantly raising the burden of proof for older workers.

In its 5-to-4 decision, the Court held that plaintiffs must prove that age was the decisive and determinative motivating factor for the employer’s conduct. Under this altered framework, older workers cannot prevail unless they can show that the adverse action would not have occurred but for the employee’s age.

This higher threshold not only makes it harder for workers who have suffered
discrimination to achieve redress, it also sends a message to employers that they need not treat age discrimination as seriously as other forms of discrimination.

By amending the ADEA to clarify that the mixed-motive standard is the evidentiary standard for employment claims, the Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act would restore workers’ protections and reestablish a consistent burden of proof for claims alleging discrimination on the basis of age.

The 2009 Gross decision also opened the door for the courts to apply the but-for standard to other civil rights laws, including the Americans with Disabilities Act, the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, and the anti-retaliation provisions of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. The bill before us clarifies that the mixed-motive standard also applies to those three civil rights acts as well.

Despite the bipartisan support in both chambers for this bill, I am disappointed that the White House has already threatened to veto this legislation. In reality, the administration has a troubling pattern of blocking legislation to help the very forgotten workers it promises to support.

In addition to this legislation, the administration has placed veto threats on the Raise the Wage Act, which would gradually increase the minimum wage to $15 an hour by 2025, and the Workplace Violence Prevention for Healthcare and Social Service Workers Act, which would support the safety of healthcare and social service workers.

Mr. Chairman, today the House has a chance to be on record and stand up for the average American worker. I urge a “yes” vote on the Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 1230, the Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act. Let me be clear: every worker, including older workers, should be protected from workplace discrimination at his or her job. This is why Congress has passed a number of laws to protect Americans of all ages against discrimination in the workplace. The Civil Rights Act of 1964, CRA; the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967, ADEA; the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, the Rehab Act; and the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, ADA, makes employment discrimination because of an individual’s race, color, religion, sex, national origin, age, or disability unlawful.

Although I appreciate the stated purpose behind H.R. 1230, the rushed approach taken by committee Democrats and the administration is to prove that this legislation is needed have led to a seriously flawed bill. Careful examination and scrutiny of any legislative proposal is necessary to determine whether it is needed and whether it appropriately and effectively addresses the relevant issues. Unfortunately, in developing H.R. 1230, the committee majority failed miserably in that task.

Committee Democrats chose not to hold a single hearing solely dedicated to examining either age discrimination or H.R. 1230; rather, they examined this bill during a hearing that covered multiple topics and several other pieces of legislation completely unrelated to the bill.

As we have seen many times during the 116th Congress with other legislation, H.R. 1230 was rushed through the Education and Labor Committee without necessary examination, discussion, or consideration. As a result, we are here debating yet another one-size-fits-all “government knows best” mandate that rewards special interests and disregards real-world workplace experiences.

In 2018 older workers earned just 7 percent more than the median for all workers, a large increase from 20 years ago. For workers age 65 and older, employment among younger workers grew by about one-third. Likewise, over the past 20 years, the number of older workers on full-time work schedules grew 2½ times faster than the number working part-time. Rather than sending our workers a mixed-motive standard also applies to those three civil rights acts as well.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 1230, the Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act. Let me be clear: every worker, including older workers, should be protected from workplace discrimination at his or her job. This is why Congress has passed a number of laws to protect Americans of all ages against discrimination in the workplace. The Civil Rights Act of 1964, CRA: the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967, ADEA; the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, the Rehab Act; and the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, ADA, makes employment discrimination because of an individual’s race, color, religion, sex, national origin, age, or disability unlawful.

Although I appreciate the stated purpose behind H.R. 1230, the rushed approach taken by committee Democrats and the White House is to prove that this legislation is needed have led to a seriously flawed bill. Careful examination and scrutiny of

any legislative proposal is necessary to determine whether it is needed and whether it appropriately and effectively addresses the relevant issues. Unfortunately, in developing H.R. 1230, the committee majority failed miserably in that task.

Committee Democrats chose not to hold a single hearing solely dedicated to examining either age discrimination or H.R. 1230; rather, they examined this bill during a hearing that covered multiple topics and several other pieces of legislation completely unrelated to the bill.

As we have seen many times during the 116th Congress with other legislation, H.R. 1230 was rushed through the Education and Labor Committee without necessary examination, discussion, or consideration. As a result, we are here debating yet another one-size-fits-all “government knows best” mandate that rewards special interests and disregards real-world workplace experiences.

In 2018 older workers earned just 7 percent more than the median for all workers, a large increase from 20 years ago. For workers age 65 and older, employment among younger workers grew by about one-third. Likewise, over the past 20 years, the number of older workers on full-time work schedules grew 2½ times faster than the number working part-time. Rather than sending our workers a
Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman SCOTT for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, today, by supporting the bipartisan Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act, we can protect the civil rights of older workers who are striving to provide for themselves and their families.

According to recent data from the Census Bureau and the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the percentage of retirement-age Americans in the labor force has doubled since 1985. Unfortunately, age discrimination in the workplace remains disturbingly pervasive. According to the AARP, three in five workers over the age of 45 reported seeing or experiencing age discrimination on the job. Americans are living and working longer, and we must do all we can to protect them from discrimination.

My home State of Oregon has one of the most rapidly aging populations in this country. I have heard from workers, many in the technology industry, who have been dismissed or denied employment because of their age. My office has helped older workers who have filed age discrimination complaints at the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, but the burden and the timelines are very uncertain.

In 1967 Congress passed the Age Discrimination in Employment Act, or ADEA, to prohibit age discrimination in the workplace and to promote the employment of older workers. Then in 2009 the Supreme Court in the Gross case changed the burden of proof for workers and made it much harder for workers to prove age discrimination. This bipartisan bill simply returns the burden of proof to what it was for decades before the Gross case.

I joined Chairman SCOTT and Congressman SENSBRENNER in reintroducing the bipartisan Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act to amend the ADEA and our other core civil rights laws to address the anti-aging discrimination provision of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act, the Americans with Disabilities Act, and the Rehabilitation Act of 1973. We need to make our laws clear. Unlawful discrimination in the workplace is unacceptable.

Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman SCOTT and Congressman SENSBRENNER for their work on this important issue, and I urge all of my colleagues to support this bill.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN), who is the co-chair of the Bipartisan Disabilities Caucus.

Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his exceptional leadership in bringing this bill to the floor.

Mr. Chair, I rise in support of Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act.

Age is just a number. We hear that all the time, and there is so much truth to it. Yet, each year, too many Americans over the age of 40 face discrimination, not filed across this country. In fact, AARP reports that over half of older workers have seen or experienced age discrimination.

Congress outlawed workplace discrimination against older Americans over 50 years ago in the Age Discrimination in Employment Act. However, due to a misguided 2009 Supreme Court ruling, older Americans still face negative employment actions.

As the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission acknowledged in 2018, "Age discrimination remains a significant and costly problem for workers, their families, and our economy." This is simply unacceptable, and it is wrong.

Employees over the age of 40 bring talent, experience, and wisdom to an office. Additionally, these workers are more likely to stay at their companies. On average, Americans between the ages of 55 and 64 stick with their employer for 22 years as long as employees aged 25 to 34. Even more disheartening is the effect age discrimination has on disabled workers.

Mr. Chairman, I include in the RECORD a letter from the Consortium for Citizens with Disabilities in support of the bill.

CONSORTIUM FOR CITIZENS WITH DISABILITIES

DEAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS: As co-chairs of the Consortium for Citizens with Disabilities Rights Task Force, we write to urge your support passage of H.R. 1230, the Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act. We attach our letter of June 10, 2019 in support of the bill. CCD is the largest coalition of national organizations working together to advocate for federal public policy that ensures the self-determination, independence, integration, and inclusion of children and adults with disabilities in all aspects of society.

Sincerely,

JENNIFER MATHIS,
Bazelon Center for Mental Health Law.

SAMANTHA CRANE,
Autistic Self-Advocacy Network.

CO-CHAIRS,
CCD Rights Task Force.

HEATHER ANSLEY,
Paralyzed Veterans of America.

KELLY BUCKLAND,
National Council on Independent Living.

CONSORTIUM FOR CITIZENS WITH DISABILITIES

June 10, 2019.

Hon. BOBBY SCOTT,
Chair, Education and Labor Committee.
Washington, DC.

Hon. VIRGINIA FOXX,
Ranking Member, Education and Labor Committee.
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SCOTT AND RANKING MEMBER FOXX: As co-chairs of the Consortium for Citizens with Disabilities Rights Task Force, we write to express our strong support for the Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act (POWADA) (H.R. 1230) and the Transformation to Competitive Employment Act (H.R. 873). CCD is the largest coalition of national organizations working together to advocate for federal public policy that ensures the self-determination, independence, integration, and inclusion of children and adults with disabilities in all aspects of society.

POWADA would correct a Supreme Court decision, Gross v. FBL Financial Services, Inc., that narrowly interpreted the Age Discrimination in Employment Act to require that unlawful discrimination be the "but-for" cause of an employer’s conduct in order to be actionable. Some courts have also applied this but-for cause requirement to claims of disability-based employment discrimination under the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), making it harder for people with disabilities to prevail on workplace discrimination claims.

POWADA is an important opportunity to restore workplace rights for people with disabilities. People with disabilities have the lowest employment rates of any group tracked by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, and their labor force participation rate has consistently been less than half of that of people without disabilities. Attitudinal barriers among employers are among the top reasons for these low rates. It is critically important to address barriers to employment for people with disabilities, and POWADA would help do that.
We also support the Transformation to Competitive Employment Act, which was discussed along with POWADA in your May 21, 2019 hearing on Eliminating Barriers to Employment. This bill would provide incentives to assist providers of subminimum wage employment for people with disabilities to transform the services that they provide to focus on competitive integrated employment, and would make grants available to state agencies to collaborate in developing the services needed to support the individuals served by these providers to secure and maintain competitive integrated employment.

The Transformation to Competitive Employment Act represents an important step toward ending the practice of paying subminimum wages to employees with disabilities under Section 14(c) of the Fair Labor Standards Act and expanding the supported employment services needed to ensure that people with disabilities who are served in subminimum wage sheltered workshops to receive the services they need to secure and maintain competitive integrated employment. This bill is another important measure that would bring needed expansion of real employment opportunities for people with disabilities.

We stand ready to work with you to help secure passage of H.R. 1230 and H.R. 873, both of which are important steps to address barriers to full and meaningful employment of people with disabilities.

Sincerely,

JENNIFER MATHIS,
Bazelon Center for Mental Health Law.
SAMANTHA CHAIKIN,
Autistic Self-Advocacy Network.
KELLY BUCKLAND,
National Council on Independent Living.
CO-CHAIRS,
CDD Rights Task Force.
MARK RICHERT,
National Disability Institute.
HEATHER ANSLEY,
Paralyzed Veterans of America.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chair, as it outlines, people with disabilities already face significant barriers to competitive, integrated employment, and we cannot allow another barrier to remain in their way.

Mr. Chair, I am proud to vote in favor of strengthening the Age Discrimination in Employment Act, and I thank my good friend, Chairman SCOTT, for championing this effort.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to join me in restoring justice for American workers and voting in favor of final passage.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania.

Ms. WILD. Mr. Chair, H.R. 1230, the Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act, will ensure equal access to justice for those who have suffered age discrimination. It will create uniformity in our laws that a worker need prove only that age discrimination was a motivating factor for employer’s action. Older workers like Mr. Gross, the victim of workplace discrimination and a misguided Supreme Court decision, deserve this bill.

Mr. Chair, I urge a “yes” vote on this bill.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle contend that the 2009 Supreme Court decision in Gross v. FBL Financial Services has weakened age discrimination protections. They also contend the decision had deterred workers from seeking relief from age bias. Let’s look at the data.

In the 9 years preceding the 2009 Supreme Court decision in Gross, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, the EEOC, the primary agency that enforces Federal laws that make it illegal to discriminate, received an average of 19,320 charges of discrimination per year relating to age discrimination.

Yet, our employment laws treat age discrimination in every form it takes. Yet, our employment laws treat age discrimination differently, more harshly, than other employment discrimination claims.

We must condemn employment discrimination in every form it takes. Yet, our employment laws treat age discrimination claims under the Age Discrimination in Employment Act differently, more harshly, than other employment discrimination claims.

We have an opportunity to restore fairness in our legal system.

The Supreme Court of our country has made clear, Mr. Chair, the time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Chair, H.R. 1230, the Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act, will ensure equal access to justice for those who have suffered age discrimination. It will create uniformity in our laws that a worker need prove only that age discrimination was a motivating factor for employer’s action. Older workers like Mr. Gross, the victim of workplace discrimination and a misguided Supreme Court decision, deserve this bill.

Mr. Chair, I urge a “yes” vote on this bill.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle contend that the 2009 Supreme Court decision in Gross v. FBL Financial Services has weakened age discrimination protections. They also contend the decision had deterred workers from seeking relief from age bias. Let’s look at the data.

In the 9 years preceding the 2009 Supreme Court decision in Gross, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, the EEOC, the primary agency that enforces Federal laws that make it illegal to discriminate, received an average of 19,320 charges of discrimination per year relating to age discrimination.

Yet, our employment laws treat age discrimination in every form it takes. Yet, our employment laws treat age discrimination claims under the Age Discrimination in Employment Act differently, more harshly, than other employment discrimination claims.

We have an opportunity to restore fairness in our legal system.

The Supreme Court of our country has made clear, Mr. Chair, the time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania.

Ms. WILD. Mr. Chair, H.R. 1230, the Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act, will ensure equal access to justice for those who have suffered age discrimination. It will create uniformity in our laws that a worker need prove only that age discrimination was a motivating factor for employer’s action. Older workers like Mr. Gross, the victim of workplace discrimination and a misguided Supreme Court decision, deserve this bill.

Mr. Chair, I urge a “yes” vote on this bill.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle contend that the 2009 Supreme Court decision in Gross v. FBL Financial Services has weakened age discrimination protections. They also contend the decision had deterred workers from seeking relief from age bias. Let’s look at the data.

In the 9 years preceding the 2009 Supreme Court decision in Gross, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, the EEOC, the primary agency that enforces Federal laws that make it illegal to discriminate, received an average of 19,320 charges of discrimination per year relating to age discrimination.

Yet, our employment laws treat age discrimination in every form it takes. Yet, our employment laws treat age discrimination claims under the Age Discrimination in Employment Act differently, more harshly, than other employment discrimination claims.

We have an opportunity to restore fairness in our legal system.

The Supreme Court of our country has made clear, Mr. Chair, the time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Chair, I thank Chairman SCOTT for yielding to me, and I rise in strong support of H.R. 1230, the Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act.

This month, House Democrats are taking historic action to fight for our older Americans across the country. As co-founder and co-chair of the Democratic Caucus Task Force on Aging and Families, I am proud to announce that our Older Americans Caucus and the Democratic Caucus Task Force on Aging and Families, which we will introduce in the coming weeks, already has over 100 cosponsors.

That resolution reflects a covenant with senior citizens and urges the Congress to uphold the dignity of older Americans and their families.

Through that resolution, House Democrats are affirming that seniors have the right to live with dignity and with independence, including the right to high-quality healthcare, the right to safe senior living, the right to financial security, including protecting against age discrimination in the workplace.

The bill that we are voting on today signals that we are taking those rights so seriously that we are not just making statements about it, but we are taking bold action. The bill before us ensures that senior citizens who have been victims of age discrimination can have their claims adjudicated fairly without having to jump through all kinds of arbitrary hoops created by a micromanaged court system.

Protecting older workers is about more than just adjudicating claims of discrimination. It is about ensuring
older workers have the dignity that they deserve.

Mr. Chair, I urge all of my colleagues to support this measure.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, older workers are doing quite well in today's modern economy. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, BLS, employment for workers age 65 and older tripled from 1988 to 2018. Employment for younger workers grew by a third. The number of employed people age 75 and older nearly quadrupled from 461,000 in 1988 to 1.8 million in 2018.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle paint a bleak picture of these valued workers standing in the workforce, when, in fact, employment trends for older workers are positive in recent decades. According to BLS in 1998, the median weekly earnings of older full-time workers was 77 percent of the median for workers age 16 and up. In 2018, older workers earned 7 percent more than the median for all workers.

The labor force participation rate for older workers has been rising steadily since the late 1990s. Participation rates for younger age groups either declined or flattened over this period.

Over the past 20 years, the number of older workers on full-time work schedules grew 2½ times faster than the number working part time.

As I said, the picture is bright.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. FRANKEL).

Ms. FRANKEL. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman from Virginia and my colleagues for their work on this bill.

Mr. Chair, Ben Franklin signed the Declaration of Independence at age 70. Granma Moses started painting at age 76. We should never, ever put an age limit on our dreams or the ability to make a living.

But here is the thing, Mr. Chair: You can be a dedicated employee, having spent decades building a career that you are proud of, taking care of your family, putting your kids through college, saving for your future. You need and want to work and, one day, when you are ready, retire with dignity. But then, your life is shattered. Your bosses say: “You are fired.”

They list their reasons. However, you know the truth. You have been let go. You are ready, retire with dignity. But losing a career is bigger than just financial security. Separating adults from the dignity of work has a broader impact on the well-being of communities like my district, where I serve one of the largest constituencies of older Americans in the entire country.

But losing a career is bigger than just financial security. Separating adults from the dignity of work has a broader impact on the well-being of communities like my district, where I serve one of the largest constituencies of older Americans in the entire country.

This bill strengthens the ADEA by reaffirming the pre-2009 standard, simply, that age discrimination cannot be a motivating factor in employment decisions.

I am proud to support H.R. 1230 on behalf of the many constituents of the 21st District who have advocated for this bill for over a decade.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

It is encouraging to see more and more older Americans continue to make invaluable contributions in the workplace, and committee Republicans are committed to eliminating discrimination in the workplace to ensure a productive and competitive workforce.

Unfortunately, H.R. 1230 is an unnecessary and misleading bill that does not “protect older workers” and is yet another case of false advertising and empty promises.

Committee Democrats failed to allow a proper examination of H.R. 1230, depriving members of the opportunity to review the legislation appropriately before it was considered by the committee, and, as a result, we are left
with the ill-advised bill before us today. This one-size-fits-all, government-knows-best approach is not the answer and will significantly benefit trial lawyers at the cost of older American workers. I strongly encourage a “no” vote on H.R. 1230, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chair, it has been more than a decade since the Supreme Court heightened the burden of proof for workers seeking to legally challenge age discrimination in the workplace; however, our responsibility to ensure that no older Americans are forced out of a job or denied a work opportunity because of age has not changed.

At a time when Americans are working longer into their lives, we need policy solutions that empower older workers and Sen. Sensenbrenner for working with us to bring this important legislation to the floor. I want to remind everyone exactly what this bill does. Under the bill and before 2009, if a person alleged age discrimination, that was the beginning of the case. The defendant would be able to show that they would have been fired or not hired anyway, but that is on the defendant to show. If they don’t show that, then it is proven discrimination, entitling the plaintiff to damages. If the defendant can show that it would have done it anyway, discrimination is already proved, and, as the gentlewoman from North Carolina pointed out, attorney’s fees would be available.

Under the new law, after 2009, not only do you have to prove that you were discriminated against, told we don’t higher old people, you also have to prove that you would have gotten the job anyway.

Well, you don’t have that information. You can’t show that you would have gotten the job. You don’t know the qualifications of the person who was hired.

So, Mr. Chair, we know that this legislation is extremely important. Older workers want this legislation, as evidenced by a letter of support from the Leadership Council of Aging Organizations, over two dozen organizations representing over 40 million citizens; another letter, joined by 26 advocacy organizations supporting the bill; and, finally, a letter of support from AARP.

Mr. Chair, I include these letters in the Record.

Leadership Council of Aging Organizations, December 9, 2019.

Hon. Michelle McCannell, Minority Leader.
Hon. Chuck Schumer, Minority Leader, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.
Hon. Nancy Pelosi, Speaker.
Hon. Kevin McCarthy, Minority Leader, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Dear Majority Leader McCannell, Minority Leader Schumer, Speaker Pelosi, and Minority Leader McCarthy: The Leadership Council of Aging Organizations (LCOA) is a coalition of 69 national nonprofit organizations concerned with the well-being of America’s older population and committed to representing their interests in the policy-making arena.

We are writing to urge you to vote for passage of the Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act (S. 485, H.R. 1230). The Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act (POWADA) is bipartisan and bicameral legislation sponsored in the Senate by Senators Bob Casey (D-PA) and Chuck Grassley (R-IA). The House version is sponsored by Representatives Bobby Scott (D-VA) and Jim Sensenbrenner (R-WI).

POWADA is bipartisan, limited legislation to restore fairness and well-established legal standards on workplace discrimination that were undermined by court decisions.

To ensure equal treatment and equal opportunity in employment, the civil rights laws make clear that discrimination in the workplace “because of” a protected characteristic or activity is unlawful. For decades, this meant that discrimination may not play any role in employment practices.

Ten years ago, on this date, the Supreme Court erected a new and substantial legal barrier in the path of equal opportunity for older workers.

In a series of cases, including Gross v. FBL Financial Services, Inc. (2009), the Supreme Court imposed a much higher burden of proof on workers who allege age discrimination than is required of those who allege discrimination based on race, sex, national origin, or religion. Provoking that discrimination tainted the employer’s conduct was no longer enough; after Gross, courts have continued to chip away at protections.

Under the new law, after 2009, not only do you have to prove that you were discriminated against, told we don’t higher old people, you also have to prove that you would have gotten the job anyway. Will you have to show that you would have gotten the job anyway? You don’t know the qualifications of the person who was hired.

So, Mr. Chair, we know that this legislation is extremely important. Older workers want this legislation, as evidenced by a letter of support from the Leadership Council of Aging Organizations, over two dozen organizations representing over 40 million citizens; another letter, joined by 26 advocacy organizations supporting the bill; and, finally, a letter of support from AARP.

Mr. Chair, I include these letters in the Record.

Leadership Council of Aging Organizations, December 9, 2019.

Hon. Michelle McCannell, Minority Leader.
Hon. Chuck Schumer, Minority Leader, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.
Hon. Nancy Pelosi, Speaker.
Hon. Kevin McCarthy, Minority Leader, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Dear Majority Leader McCannell, Minority Leader Schumer, Speaker Pelosi, and Minority Leader McCarthy:

The Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act (POWADA) is bipartisan and bicameral legislation sponsored in the Senate by Senators Bob Casey (D-PA) and Chuck Grassley (R-IA). The House version is sponsored by Representatives Bobby Scott (D-VA) and Jim Sensenbrenner (R-WI).

POWADA is bipartisan, limited legislation to restore fairness and well-established legal standards on workplace discrimination that were undermined by court decisions.

To ensure equal treatment and equal opportunity in employment, the civil rights laws make clear that discrimination in the workplace ‘because of’ a protected characteristic or activity is unlawful. For decades, this meant that discrimination may not play any role in employment practices.

Ten years ago, on this date, the Supreme Court erected a new and substantial legal barrier in the path of equal opportunity for older workers. In Gross v. FBL Financial Services, Inc. (2009), the Supreme Court imposed a much higher burden of proof on workers who allege age discrimination than is required of those who allege discrimination based on race, sex, national origin, or religion.

Proving that discrimination tainted the employer’s conduct was no longer enough; after Gross, courts have continued to chip away at protections.

Under the new law, after 2009, not only do you have to prove that you were discriminated against, told we don’t higher old people, you also have to prove that you would have gotten the job anyway. Well, you don’t have that information. You can’t show that you would have gotten the job. You don’t know the qualifications of the person who was hired.

So, Mr. Chair, we know that this legislation is extremely important. Older workers want this legislation, as evidenced by a letter of support from the Leadership Council of Aging Organizations, over two dozen organizations representing over 40 million citizens; another letter, joined by 26 advocacy organizations supporting the bill; and, finally, a letter of support from AARP.

Mr. Chair, I include these letters in the Record.
must now prove that retaliation was the de-
cisive cause for their adverse treatment. University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center v. Nassar (2013).

Disability Discrimination—The Supreme Court has not yet ruled on whether workers subjected to disability discrimination must also meet this higher standard of causation. But lower-court decisions and circuit court opinions have ruled that disability-based employment discrimination must be established under the higher, "but-for" causation standard.

This line of court decisions has made it ex-
pONENTially more difficult for workers who have experienced workplace discrimination to have their day in court and prove their case. These decisions have also sent a terrible message to employers and the courts that some types of discrimination are just as wrong, or as unlawful, as other forms of discrimi-
 nation. P OWA D would restore the causation standard that was in effect and consistently applied by the courts before 2009, and make Congress’ intent clear that discrimination in the workplace is never acceptable. Please support H.R. 1230 and swiftly pass this bi-
 partisan legislation.

Sincerely,

N A C Y L E A M O N D, 
Executive Vice President, 
Chief Advocacy & Engagement Officer.

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

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chair, today, I rise in support of H.R. 1230, the Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act, which will restore protections for older Amer-
 icans against age discrimination in the work-
place. This legislation will ensure that older workers will once again have the same legal protections against age discrimination as those that exist for discrimination based on race, religion, sex, or national origin.

As the cost of living rises and retirement savings shrink, Americans now more than ever before are faced with the necessity of working later into their lives. It is critical that we, as members of this body, en-
 sure that age discrimination protections for older workers because if older workers lose their jobs, they are far more likely to face long-term unemployment. We must guar-
 antee that age discrimination should be treat-
ed just as seriously as any other form of work-
place discrimination.

This bill amends four laws—the Age Dis-
 crimination in Employment Act, Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Americans with Disabilities Act, and the Rehabilitation Act. It
 ensures that the higher burden of proof for age discrimination claims are lowered to in-
 clude mixed-motive claims. This mimics the stan-
 dard practices for workplace discrimination claims based on race, religion, sex, or national origin.

As a member of the House Democratic Caucus Task Force on Aging & Families, I am proud to support our seniors and their families in communities across our country through the Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act.

The CHAIR. All time for general de-
bate has expired.

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

In lieu of the amendment in the na-
ture of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Education and Labor, printed in the bill, an amend-
ment in the nature of a substitute con-
sting of the text of Rules Committee
Print 116-46, shall be considered as adopted.

The bill, as amended, shall be consid-
ered 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. 1230

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act”.

SEC. 2. STANDARDS OF PROOF.

(a) AGE DISCRIMINATION IN EMPLOYMENT ACT OF 1967.—
The CHAIR. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in House Report 116-377. Each such further amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the joint considered read, shall 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. DESAULNIER

SEC. 1. EFFECTIVE DATE AND APPLICABILITY. This Act, and the amendments made by this Act, shall apply to all claims pending on or after the date of enactment of this Act.


The CHAIR. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in House Report 116-377. Each such further amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the joint considered read, shall 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.
We all agree. American workers should be protected from discrimination in the workplace in every form possible. It is already against the law to discriminate based on a workers’ age, as it should be. Congress has enacted separate nondiscrimination statutes, and the Age Discrimination in Employment Act because age discrimination includes issues that are different from other forms of discrimination addressed in other statutes.

Under H.R. 1230, a plaintiff can argue that workplace age discrimination is a motivating factor that led to an employer’s unfavorable employment action. Allowing such mixed-motive claims will lead to more frivolous litigation and upset the careful balance Congress enacted in the Age Discrimination in Employment Act.

Unfortunately, H.R. 1230 will not help workers. Under the bill, a plaintiff is very unlikely to receive any monetary damages from a defendant because most employers would be able to show to the court they would have taken the same employment action, regardless of the worker’s age. The only parties who will win in nearly all cases in H.R. 1230 are trial lawyers.

Disappointingly, Democrats have chosen to further their pro-trial-lawyer agenda by bringing H.R. 1230 up for consideration, a bill falsely advertised as a protection for workers. H.R. 1230 is yet another one-size-fits-all mandate that fails to address the purported problem, ignores real world experiences, and disregards decades of Supreme Court decisions.

This amendment does nothing to address the fundamental flaws in H.R. 1230; it is redundant with other government reports, and will not provide the House with timely information. I urge my colleagues to oppose it.

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

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS), my friend.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I thank my good friend Mr. DESAULNIER from California for yielding. I also thank my good friend Ms. FOXX, the ranking member of the Education and Labor Committee and also Chairman SCOTT for his leadership on the bill we are considering this afternoon, the Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act.

My amendment highlights the discrimination that women face in the workplace based not only on gender but on age, as well.

According to a 2018 report from the EEOC, women, especially older women, but also those at middle age, were subjected to more age discrimination than most older men. In fact, some research suggests that ageism at work begins at age 40 for women, 5 years earlier than men. This is unacceptable, and we must find ways to correct the problem.

This amendment would require the Department of Labor and the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission to conduct a comprehensive study on these age discrimination cases. DOL and the EEOC would then be required to make recommendations for best practices to combat age discrimination of women in the workplace.

The challenges that women face are not partisan issues, and together we can and should, Mr. Chairman, make every effort to address them. Employers should make, and have the right tools to make, conscious efforts to ensure that women have equal rights and opportunities in the workplace regardless of their age.

I encourage my colleagues to support my amendment to protect older adults from age discrimination.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, even though I am not opposed to it.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maine (Ms. PINGREE), who worked hard with the sponsor of this amendment.

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chairman, I thank Mr. SCOTT for yielding and also his leadership on the bill we are considering this afternoon, the Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act.

Maine is the oldest State in the union by median age, and older Mainers are an important part of our workforce. As we experience a tight labor market with low unemployment, it is natural to think that this workforce would have the necessities available to them, and yet we often hear about constituents who struggle to find and keep work that supports them and their families.

When age discrimination is a factor, these workers deserve fair treatment under the law. I am proud to be a cosponsor of the underlying bill and urge my colleagues to vote ‘yes.’
I am also proud to offer this important amendment with my colleague, Congressman DAVIS, that addresses the connection between age and gender discrimination. Countless studies have shown that women are hired less and paid less in many fields. Comprised by the reality of age discrimination, that means older women are disproportionately impacted by bias in the workplace.

The National Bureau of Economic Research backs this up. In a 2015 field experiment, from older women got substantially fewer callbacks from employers than those from older men, younger men, and younger women. Our amendment would direct the Department of Labor and the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission to collect data on the disproportionate impact of age discrimination on older women and make recommendations for how to address that impact.

Women are deeply, materially harmed by inequities in our economy. On average, they take home lower salaries, are able to save less for retirement, and receive less in Social Security benefits.

In tandem with age discrimination, all this means that we are leaving older women vulnerable. Addressing this intersection is about economic security, making sure that older women have the chance to work in fair environments for equitable pay.

I ask my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time I have remaining.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield as much time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Puerto Rico (Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLO´N), my good friend.

Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLO´N. Mr. Chairman, I thank Congressman DAVIS for yielding to me to speak on this bipartisan amendment. And thank you for allowing me to be a cosponsor of this amendment.

The Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 was signed into law more than 52 years ago. Yet, according to the American Association of Retired Persons, AARP, three in five older workers have seen or experienced age discrimination. Between 1997 and 2018, 423,000 workers filed an age discrimination complaint averaging 20,142 claims per year. This figure is 22 percent of all workplace discrimination claims.

Furthermore, AARP reports that 76 percent see age discrimination as a barrier to finding a new job. The Puerto Rico Department of Labor and Human Resources states that there are more than 300,000 women age 35 or older on the labor force on the Island. This population represents 28.8 percent of all workers in an economy that has experienced a structured downturn for more than a decade.

This amendment simply requires the labor secretary and the chair of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission to submit a report determining the number of women who may have been discriminated against because of their age.

As vice chair of the Congressional Caucus for Women’s Issues, I am proud to support this measure to assist aging women in the workforce.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE). Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Virginia for yielding. And I thank the sponsors of this very important amendment. Mr. DAVIS and Ms. PINGREE.

I rise to support the underlying bill, the Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act that I am very proud to have been a cosponsor of. This is an important initiative to give to hardworking Americans who, because of the growth of this population senior citizens, older Americans, they are ready to work in the workforce and provide their experience, their thoughtful, and their leadership.

Unfortunately, a Supreme Court decision in the 2000s turned this upside down by requiring those older Americans to be burdened by the responsibility of saying, it is only the fact that we are old or that there are not multiple reasons why I could have been fired. How dangerous that is when an older American feels vulnerable?

The underlying amendment is also very important, defining women who may have had to get out of the workforce to raise their children or to not get promotions so they can tend to their children or other matters or be a caretaker for other family members.

I ask my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I urge a “yes” vote on this bipartisan amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk. The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 8, beginning on line 3, strike “date of enactment” and insert “effective date.” Add the following at the end:

SEC. 3. EFFECTIVE DATE.
(a) GAO STUDY.—Subject to subsection (b), this Act and the amendments made by this Act shall not take effect until the date the Government Accountability Office reports to Congress the results of a study such Office carries out to determine whether—
(1) the Supreme Court’s decisions in Gross v. FBL Financial Services, Inc., 557 U.S. 167 (2009), and Texas Southwestern Medical Center v. Nassar, 570 U.S. 338 (2013), have discouraged individuals from filing age discrimination charges and title VII retaliation charges with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission,
(2) such decisions have discouraged individuals from filing age discrimination cases and title VII cases, and
(3) the success rates of age discrimination cases and title VII cases brought has decreased.
(b) LIMITATION.—If the results of the study carried out under subsection (a) show that individuals have not been discouraged as described in subsection (a), that the success rate of cases described in such subsection has not decreased, then this Act and the amendments made by this Act shall not take effect.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 790, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

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

When considering any legislation, the House should first determine whether the legislation is needed and, next, whether the bill under consideration will adequately address or improve the situation.

The Committee on Education and Labor, unfortunately, did not have a full hearing on H.R. 1230 and heard from only one witness, invited by the Democrats, about the bill at a general hearing on multiple topics.

This legislation, at the very least, deserves a standalone hearing so that committee members and the House could get more information to make a considered decision regarding this legislation.

Publicly available data does not show the Supreme Court decisions in Gross v. FBL Financial Services or Nassar v. University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center have discouraged individuals from filing discrimination charges with the EEOC, which is the primary agency that enforces Federal laws that make it illegal to discriminate. A discrimination charge is a signed statement asserting employment discrimination.

The lone Democrat-invited witness who testified in favor of H.R. 1230 at the Committee on Education and Labor’s hearing in May, which covered
American workers age 45 and older say age discrimination on the job. That is 60 percent, according to an AARP study released last year, necessary or warranted.

People may be winning cases, but they aren't going to court in the first place. Court decisions show that the plaintiffs have continued to win age discrimination and Title VII retaliation cases in the wake of the Supreme Court's decisions in Gross and Nassar. This amendment will provide Congress much-needed data on the impact of the two Supreme Court cases at issue in H.R. 1230.

If the GAO report indicates Gross and Nassar have not discouraged individuals from seeking relief or from achieving it, the bill would not go into effect. The courts have failed to interpret the ADEA as a civil rights statute and, instead, have narrowly interpreted these protections and broadly construed the statute's exceptions, compounding the barriers facing older workers.

I ran into those cases over and over, Mr. Chairman. The enactment of the Age Discrimination in Employment Act, or ADEA, in 1967 was an important part of Congress' work to protect civil rights in the 1960s. Over the years, the courts have failed to interpret the ADEA as a civil rights statute and, instead, have narrowly interpreted these protections and broadly construed the statute's exceptions, compounding the barriers facing older workers. The Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act is a bipartisan proposal that realigns the legal standard for proving age discrimination, to simplify the requirement so employees have a genuine mechanism to fight back under the law, just like with the standards for proving discrimination based on sex, race, or national origin. It is that simple.

This amendment is designed to keep this bill from going into effect indefinitely. There is no deadline for GAO to conduct the study this amendment requires and report back to Congress. It is a delay tactic when we already have mountains of evidence telling us that older workers are facing discrimination at work. They need protection now.

Finally, this Congress has been holding hearings on this issue for years. We have had four hearings over the last 9 years. It is time to act.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. Levin of Michigan, Mr. Chairman, I rise today to speak in opposition to the amendment. Against Discrimination Act is a bipartisan proposal, and it has undergone substantial debate since it was first introduced over a decade ago. The Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act is a bipartisan proposal, and it has undergone substantial debate since it was first introduced over a decade ago. The Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act is a bipartisan proposal, and it has undergone substantial debate since it was first introduced over a decade ago.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.
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Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Mr. Chair, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

I would like first to recognize the leadership of Chairman BOBBY SCOTT, my Potomac partner from Virginia, chairman of the Subcommittee on Education and Labor, and the hard work and the bipartisan work done in that committee to bring this important bill to the floor.

Mr. Chair, older workers are critical to our economy and workplaces. However, 6 in 10 older Americans report seeing or experiencing age discrimination on the job. More than half of older workers are fired from their jobs before they retire. If they find a new job, 9 in 10 never match their prior earnings.

A 2009 Supreme Court decision created a higher burden of proof for workers claiming age discrimination than any other form of discrimination.

Enforcement statistics from the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission show the number of age discrimination complaints has been rising.

In the year 2000, the EEOC received roughly 10,000 age discrimination complaints. That number climbed to over 20,000 complaints in 2017, or 23 percent of all discrimination claims filed.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment would require the EEOC to submit a annual report to Congress on the number of age discrimination claims under this act.

It is important that Congress receives this information in a timely and transparent way to ensure our older workers are being properly protected and heard.

Discrimination is discrimination, whether it is age, race, gender, faith, gender identity, or sexual orientation, and all should be treated fairly under the law.

My amendment and the underlying bill are commonsense pieces of legislation that would restore fairness for all workers.

Mr. Chair, I strongly encourage my colleagues to support my amendment and the underlying proposed legislation.

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

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from North Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Chair, as I understand it, this amendment requires the Chair of the EEOC, the primary agency that enforces Federal laws that make it illegal to discriminate, to submit five annual reports to congressional committees on the number of age discrimination claims brought to the EEOC under this act.

These reports will come after H.R. 1230 unnecessarily reduces the burden of proof in these cases and nullifies decades of Supreme Court precedent.

Before discussing my concerns with this amendment, I admit I am puzzled that it requires a study on how this legislation will affect future age discrimination claims when evidence is sorely lacking that there is a need for H.R. 1230 in the first place.

The lone witness who testified on H.R. 1230 before the Committee on Education and Labor, and I quote, acknowledged that EEOC data has not shown workers are discouraged from filing age discrimination charges with the EEOC following the Supreme Court’s 2009 decision in Gross v. FBL Financial Services.

This witness testified that: “It is difficult to quantify the impact that the Gross decision has had on the number of older workers who bring cases and the number of those who win them.

More information is needed as to whether H.R. 1230 is needed or whether it was useful, but Democrats were unable to provide it.

With respect to this amendment, I have concerns about the feasibility of the mandated reports. The amendment requires the EEOC to report each year for 5 years on charges filed with the EEOC under H.R. 1230.

H.R. 1230 expands liability by allowing mixed-motive claims in cases involving the Age Discrimination in Employment Act, ADEA, and three other statutes. However, when a worker files charges with the EEOC, the worker will likely not indicate whether the charge involves mixed motives, nor is the EEOC likely to be able to classify charges as mixed motive or not. The EEOC, therefore, will be unable to determine whether charges have been filed pursuant to H.R. 1230.

I am very doubtful the EEOC would be able to comply with this amendment’s requirements, and Congress should not include an unrealistic mandate on an agency.

As I said before, we don’t need to be doing studies after the bill is passed, Mr. Chair. We need to know whether this bill is necessary. We don’t think it is necessary, and doing the studies afterward seems a little ridiculous.

The amendment does nothing to address the fundamental flaws in H.R. 1230 and places an unrealistic mandate on the EEOC. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to oppose it.

Since the gentleman has yielded back, I believe, I will yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. Brown). The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MS. TLAIB

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 116-377.

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end, add the following:

SEC. 5. REPORT BY THE UNITED STATES COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS.

(a) REPORT.—With funds appropriated in advance to carry out this section, and consistent with the operational and procedural requirements of the United States Commission on Civil Rights, the Commission shall submit to the appropriate committees of the Congress a report analyzing of the status of Federal mixed motive age discrimination in employment claims made against Federal agencies, including—

(1) the number of such claims, specified by the Federal agency against which such claims are made; and

(2) the number of such claims, specified by the Federal agency against which such claims are made.

(b) SUBMISSION OF REPORT.—The report required by subsection (a) shall be submitted not later than 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 790, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. TLAIB) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Michigan.

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Chair, I would like to begin by thanking our chairman, Chairman BOBBY SCOTT, and his staff for working with me on this and for their bipartisan leadership on this bill. I am grateful the chairman was able to allow us to better serve what I lovingly call Michigan’s 13th District strong.

Before us is an amendment that requires, within 5 years, the United States Commission on Civil Rights to submit a comprehensive analysis and review of Federal mixed-motive age discrimination in employment claims made against Federal agencies.

Unfortunately, the Supreme Court has made it harder for older workers to prove that they were discriminated against at their job based on age.

This bill will strengthen protections against age discrimination for our residents by placing greater accountability on the hiring practices of large corporations rather than placing it on the shoulders of our older working-class residents.

We know that when an older resident and worker loses their job, they are far more likely to join the ranks of the long-term unemployed community and that their age plays a significant role in this. I heard countless stories back in my district of older residents who had significant struggles landing other jobs after they were laid off during the auto bailout in Michigan.

One of my residents, Lena, was laid off at 55 years old after 22 years with Ford Motor Company. She tried for 6 months to get a similar position, to no avail. She told me: “When they see 22 years with a company, they know how old you are.” Since then, she had to relocate her family after her 9 months of severance pay ran out.

Passing this bill means that we will be safeguarding our older Federal workers from having to go through similar challenges.

My amendment is a protection measure that requires the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights to submit an analysis
of mixed-motive age discrimination in Federal employment claims. We have to fight back against these motivating factors that have nothing to do with a person’s experience or ability.

It is important that when we pass legislation, we ensure that it has public benefit, in the outcome, in order to be transparent and accountable to the residents who we serve back home.

For the sake of our residents and to protect our older workforce, Congress must ensure that age is not again a motivating factor in employment decisions.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Chair, I claim time in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, this amendment requires the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights to produce a report on mixed-motive claims in age discrimination cases filed by Federal employees against their Federal agency employers. I have several concerns with this amendment.

First, the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights is a small agency that is not well equipped to undertake such a study. This amendment requires “funds appropriated in advance,” otherwise known as taxpayer dollars, to be spent to do the report, which means the agency doesn’t have the resources to take on this mandate.

Second, while H.R. 1230 was only referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, this amendment involves the interests of two other committees that are not represented in this debate. The Judiciary Committee has jurisdiction over the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, which is tasked with doing the report directed by the amendment, and the Oversight and Reform Committee has jurisdiction over the employment relationships between Federal agencies and their employees.

Third, this report will be submitted to Congress no later than 5 years after the bill goes into effect. I am not sure what good a report published 5 years from now will do for us who are being asked. I voted on H.R. 1230 now.

Fourth, perhaps most importantly, there is a lack of evidence that a report is needed on age discrimination claims in Federal agencies. The Committee on Education and Labor received no evidence on this matter.

With H.R. 1230, Democrats have chosen to further their pro-trial lawyer agenda with legislation that masquerades as a protection for workers.

H.R. 1230 is yet another one-size-fits-all approach that fails to address the purposed problem, neglects the experiences of workers and employers, and disregards decades of Supreme Court precedent.

This amendment does nothing to address the fundamental flaws in H.R. 1230, and it directs a small agency to conduct a study without a clear basis of the need for that study.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Chairman, I think it is really important to note that this came about because the last report that we could find on age discrimination in this particular area is from the 1970s. It is about time that we bring this forward.

We could not find anything anywhere that specifically looked at this particular Federal mixed-motive age discrimination kind of study, again, since the 1970s.

The burden of proof is just too high on Federal employees. We need to go back and be very centered around making sure that there is equal access to proving a discrimination case of this type.

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

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Chair, this is a solution in search of a problem.

We all know that it is almost impossible to fire a Federal employee. In fact, I think the number is less than 1 percent who are fired each year.

Maybe the reason we haven’t had an updated report is because there hasn’t been the need for an updated report. I think, again, this is a totally unnecessary amendment, and I am totally opposed to it.

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

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Ms. TLAIB).

The amendment was agreed to.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina, Mr. Chair, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. TLAIB) having assumed the chair, Mr. CUellar, 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. 1230) to amend the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 and other laws to clarify appropriate standards for Federal employment discrimination and retaliation claims, and for other purposes, with Mr. CUellar in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 116–377 offered by the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. TLAIB) had been disposed of.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. ALLEN

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, the unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 116–790 offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 790 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in recess on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 1230.

Will the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CUellar) kindly resume the chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. Brown of Maryland) at 4 o’clock and 2 minutes p.m.

PROTECTING OLDER WORKERS AGAINST DISCRIMINATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 790 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 1230.

Will the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CUellar) kindly resume the chair.

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 further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1230) to amend the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 and other laws to clarify appropriate standards for Federal employment discrimination and retaliation claims, and for other purposes, with Mr. CUellar in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 116–377 offered by the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. TLAIB) had been disposed of.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. ALLEN

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, the unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 116–790 offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—aye votes 257, noes 257, not voting 15, as follows: [Roll No. 19]

AYES—163

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderston
Banks
Bengston
Bugs
Bustos
Bishop (NC)
Bishop (UT)
Conaway
Brady
Brooks (AL)
Buck
Bushon
Budd
Burgess
Bushing
Burress
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Collins (GA)
Comer
Cook
Crenshaw
Curtis
DesJarlais
Dial-Balart
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Etters
Ferguson
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Fox (NC)
Pulicher
Gaetz
Mr. SMUCKER, Mr. Speaker, I am in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman from Pennsylvania recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion?

Mr. SMUCKER. Mr. Speaker, this motion to reconsider ensures that nothing in H.R. 1230 shall be construed to alter the status of a truck driver who is an independent contractor if the truck driver is currently considered to be an independent contractor under Federal law.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. SMUCKER. Mr. Speaker, Democrats in Congress and in State legislatures across the country are currently working to enact an unnecessary, backward-looking, and false legal standard for determining employee status. Their standard would deprive millions of Americans of the opportunity to work independently and to start their own businesses.

It seems like bad ideas like this often start off in California, and the Democrats’ desire to all but eliminate independent contracting is no exception. A California law, known as Assembly Bill 5, is wreaking havoc on workers in industries ranging from freelance journalism to ride-sharing and many more.

The result is havoc for workers and their livelihoods.

Mr. SMUCKER. Mr. Chair, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollover No. 19.

The Acting CHAIR (Ms. Cicilline). The result of the vote was announced that 215 House Democrats voted to support the measure.

Ms. DEAN, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. WILSON, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. SMUCKER, Ms. SCHENK, Mr. COOPER, and Mr. HUAZENG, Messrs. GORETTI, Mr. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. RYAN, Ms. SOTO, Ms. RAHALL, and Ms. CICILLINE, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1230) to amend the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 and other laws to clarify appropriate standards for Federal employment discrimination and retaliation claims, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 790, reported the bill, as amended by that resolution, back to the House with sundry further amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered to be laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The motion to reconsider the order that the bill be engrossed and read a third time is withdrawn.
Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to stand up for older workers and the protections that they need and deserve.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), the chairman of the committee.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, this motion, as my colleague has indicated, is a distraction. This has nothing to do with truck drivers or the PRO Act. We are talking about discrimination against older workers. We are talking about victims of discrimination, not who gets to discriminate against them.

We have a problem that older workers are facing discrimination, and everybody knows it. National organizations representing senior citizens, advocacy groups, and civil rights groups, including the AARP, have all written letters asking us to protect workers against discrimination.

We are correcting the Supreme Court case and the Gross decision, which makes it very difficult, if not impossible, for older workers to prove their cases. We need to defeat this distraction and pass the bill to protect older working Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I hope we can defeat the motion and pass the bill.

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

The motion to recommit is a mockery of this important legislation that is designed to protect older working Americans.

I urge my colleagues to stand up for older workers and the protections that they need and deserve.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), the chairman of the committee.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, this motion, as my colleague has indicated, is a distraction. This has nothing to do with truck drivers or the PRO Act. We are talking about discrimination against older workers. We are talking about victims of discrimination, not who gets to discriminate against them.

We have a problem that older workers are facing discrimination, and everybody knows it. National organizations representing senior citizens, advocacy groups, and civil rights groups, including the AARP, have all written letters asking us to protect workers against discrimination.

We are correcting the Supreme Court case and the Gross decision, which makes it very difficult, if not impossible, for older workers to prove their cases. We need to defeat this distraction and pass the bill to protect older working Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I hope we can defeat the motion and pass the bill.

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

The motion to recommit is a mockery of this important legislation that is designed to protect older working Americans.

I urge my colleagues to stand up for older workers and the protections that they need and deserve.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), the chairman of the committee.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, this motion, as my colleague has indicated, is a distraction. This has nothing to do with truck drivers or the PRO Act. We are talking about discrimination against older workers. We are talking about victims of discrimination, not who gets to discriminate against them.

We have a problem that older workers are facing discrimination, and everybody knows it. National organizations representing senior citizens, advocacy groups, and civil rights groups, including the AARP, have all written letters asking us to protect workers against discrimination.

We are correcting the Supreme Court case and the Gross decision, which makes it very difficult, if not impossible, for older workers to prove their cases. We need to defeat this distraction and pass the bill to protect older working Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I hope we can defeat the motion and pass the bill.

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

The motion to recommit is a mockery of this important legislation that is designed to protect older working Americans.

I urge my colleagues to stand up for older workers and the protections that they need and deserve.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), the chairman of the committee.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, this motion, as my colleague has indicated, is a distraction. This has nothing to do with truck drivers or the PRO Act. We are talking about discrimination against older workers. We are talking about victims of discrimination, not who gets to discriminate against them.

We have a problem that older workers are facing discrimination, and everybody knows it. National organizations representing senior citizens, advocacy groups, and civil rights groups, including the AARP, have all written letters asking us to protect workers against discrimination.

We are correcting the Supreme Court case and the Gross decision, which makes it very difficult, if not impossible, for older workers to prove their cases. We need to defeat this distraction and pass the bill to protect older working Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I hope we can defeat the motion and pass the bill.

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

The motion to recommit is a mockery of this important legislation that is designed to protect older working Americans.

I urge my colleagues to stand up for older workers and the protections that they need and deserve.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), the chairman of the committee.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, this motion, as my colleague has indicated, is a distraction. This has nothing to do with truck drivers or the PRO Act. We are talking about discrimination against older workers. We are talking about victims of discrimination, not who gets to discriminate against them.

We have a problem that older workers are facing discrimination, and everybody knows it. National organizations representing senior citizens, advocacy groups, and civil rights groups, including the AARP, have all written letters asking us to protect workers against discrimination.

We are correcting the Supreme Court case and the Gross decision, which makes it very difficult, if not impossible, for older workers to prove their cases. We need to defeat this distraction and pass the bill to protect older working Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I hope we can defeat the motion and pass the bill.

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

The motion to recommit is a mockery of this important legislation that is designed to protect older working Americans.

I urge my colleagues to stand up for older workers and the protections that they need and deserve.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), the chairman of the committee.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, this motion, as my colleague has indicated, is a distraction. This has nothing to do with truck drivers or the PRO Act. We are talking about discrimination against older workers. We are talking about victims of discrimination, not who gets to discriminate against them.

We have a problem that older workers are facing discrimination, and everybody knows it. National organizations representing senior citizens, advocacy groups, and civil rights groups, including the AARP, have all written letters asking us to protect workers against discrimination.

We are correcting the Supreme Court case and the Gross decision, which makes it very difficult, if not impossible, for older workers to prove their cases. We need to defeat this distraction and pass the bill to protect older working Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I hope we can defeat the motion and pass the bill.

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

The motion to recommit is a mockery of this important legislation that is designed to protect older working Americans.

I urge my colleagues to stand up for older workers and the protections that they need and deserve.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), the chairman of the committee.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, this motion, as my colleague has indicated, is a distraction. This has nothing to do with truck drivers or the PRO Act. We are talking about discrimination against older workers. We are talking about victims of discrimination, not who gets to discriminate against them.

We have a problem that older workers are facing discrimination, and everybody knows it. National organizations representing senior citizens, advocacy groups, and civil rights groups, including the AARP, have all written letters asking us to protect workers against discrimination.

We are correcting the Supreme Court case and the Gross decision, which makes it very difficult, if not impossible, for older workers to prove their cases. We need to defeat this distraction and pass the bill to protect older working Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I hope we can defeat the motion and pass the bill.

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

The motion to recommit is a mockery of this important legislation that is designed to protect older working Americans.

I urge my colleagues to stand up for older workers and the protections that they need and deserve.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), the chairman of the committee.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, this motion, as my colleague has indicated, is a distraction. This has nothing to do with truck drivers or the PRO Act. We are talking about discrimination against older workers. We are talking about victims of discrimination, not who gets to discriminate against them.

We have a problem that older workers are facing discrimination, and everybody knows it. National organizations representing senior citizens, advocacy groups, and civil rights groups, including the AARP, have all written letters asking us to protect workers against discrimination.

We are correcting the Supreme Court case and the Gross decision, which makes it very difficult, if not impossible, for older workers to prove their cases. We need to defeat this distraction and pass the bill to protect older working Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I hope we can defeat the motion and pass the bill.

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

The motion to recommit is a mockery of this important legislation that is designed to protect older working Americans.

I urge my colleagues to stand up for older workers and the protections that they need and deserve.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), the chairman of the committee.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, this motion, as my colleague has indicated, is a distraction. This has nothing to do with truck drivers or the PRO Act. We are talking about discrimination against older workers. We are talking about victims of discrimination, not who gets to discriminate against them.

We have a problem that older workers are facing discrimination, and everybody knows it. National organizations representing senior citizens, advocacy groups, and civil rights groups, including the AARP, have all written letters asking us to protect workers against discrimination.

We are correcting the Supreme Court case and the Gross decision, which makes it very difficult, if not impossible, for older workers to prove their cases. We need to defeat this distraction and pass the bill to protect older working Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I hope we can defeat the motion and pass the bill.

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

The motion to recommit is a mockery of this important legislation that is designed to protect older working Americans.

I urge my colleagues to stand up for older workers and the protections that they need and deserve.
So the motion to recommit was rejected.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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 had appeared to have it.

**RECORDED VOTE**

**Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.**

A recorded vote was ordered.

The **SPEAKER pro tempore**. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—aye 261, noes 155, not voting 13, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roll No. 21</th>
<th>Number of Ayes</th>
<th>Number of Noses</th>
<th>Number of Not Voting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0000-261</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0000-261</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.
HONORING HAROLD MEEK
(Mr. McCarthy asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. McCarthy. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of Harold Meek, a community leader and devoted family man, who, sadly, passed away on December 24, 2019.

To many of us, Harold was more than a neighbor. We considered him family, and his legacy will live on through those who knew him.

Harold had a wonderful life with his wife, Kay, and recently celebrated 48 years of marriage. He will be dearly missed by his loving wife, Kay; children Mark, Jol, and Vivienne; and grandchildren Cody, Clint, Jordan, and Julia.

Harold moved to Bakersfield in 1958 to work with his brother, Leo, in what would be the beginning of a lifelong career in the automotive industry. After 17 years working at his brother’s dealership, Harold joined Three-Way Chevrolet, which later became Three-Way Automotive Group, in 1973.

Under Harold’s leadership, the Three-Way Automotive Group experienced years of prosperity, gaining national recognition and receiving multiple industry awards. Known as one of the greats among Bakersfield car dealers, Harold led Three-Way to various accolades, including seven consecutive titles as the number one retail volume Chevrolet dealer in California, as well as being named the top retail Chevy dealer in the world in June and July of 2005.

Harold was also recognized with the 2003 Time Magazine Quality Dealer Award, a true testament to his commitment to exceptional sales performance and customer service.

This welcoming attitude extended to his personal life and philanthropic endeavors. He was involved in more than 250 civic and charitable organizations, including the American Cancer Society, the Bakersfield Women’s Business Conference, and Make-A-Wish Foundation, just to name a few.

A dedicated Republican, Harold was also active in local, state, and national politics. He served on the board of committees of numerous Gubernatorial and Presidential campaigns in California and managed campaigns for city council, county supervisor, and State assembly candidates.

After retiring, Harold enjoyed cheering on his Oklahoma Sooners football team, Friday night dinners with his close-knit family, afternoons with his grandchildren, and watching NASCAR races on television with his son.

Harold truly embodied what it means to be a community leader and, above all, a family man. On behalf of Californian Districts Judy and I extend our deepest condolences to the Meek family, and we join them in honoring the life of Harold Meek.

ADDRESSING THE TRAGEDY OF OUR NATIONAL DEBT
(Mr. Murphy of North Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. Murphy. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address the tragedy of our national debt.

Out of control spending is the single greatest nonviolent threat to our Nation. This year alone, the Federal deficit increase exceeded $1 trillion.

Just to give some perspective, a trillion $1 bills stacked from the ground would reach 60,000 miles into space. The International Space Station is only at 200 miles. This stack would reach one-quarter of the distance to the Moon.
The current debt is at $23 trillion, which amounts to $70,000 per American. It continues to compound year after year without any relief in sight.

It is estimated that the national debt will rise to 93 percent of GDP in the next 10 years. That means that for every $100 that this Nation makes, $93 would have to go toward servicing our debt.

Mr. Speaker, this is a national tragedy. We are bankrupting our children and our children's children's future. We must stop this impending disaster. I urge my colleagues and associates to help us address real solutions.

TEXAS HAS HISTORICALLY LED NATION IN REFUGEE RESETTLEMENT

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

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to take a stand against Governor Abbott of Texas and his decision to end our refugee resettlement in my home State of Texas. This decision is going to welcome xenophobia and bigotry and is contrary to the values that we hold dear in Texas.

Texas, as some of you may or may not know, has historically led our Nation in refugee resettlement. Our State has always opened its doors to people in need and welcomed refugees with open arms to provide an opportunity for refugees to contribute to the general common good of all Texans.

Texas has now become the first State—I say that with shame—to bar refugees. It is contrary to the values that we hold dear in Texas.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Governor to look at Tarrant County, which is the county that I live in, and the decision that they made to continue taking refugees.

As of today, the courts have stayed this heinous order. This decision still sets a dangerous precedent.

I urge him to reverse his decision and show the rest of the Nation that Texas stands for inclusion, and let these churches—evangelical churches, liberal churches, Black churches, White churches—work together on these refugee programs. Let's let them continue to work together for the greater good of the country.

IRTAN PROTESTERS

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

Mr. GUEST. Mr. Speaker, the people of Iran are protesting the current Iranian regime that has for decades suppressed the Iranian people and denied them the freedoms that we as Americans hold near and dear. The Iranian people are protesting to hold the Iranian Government responsible for the history of brutality against its own citizens and the world.

They are marching in the streets for the deaths of 82 Iranians, 63 Canadians, 20 Ukrainians, 4 Afghans, 4 Britons, and 3 Germans when the Iranian military destroyed the passenger plane upon which they were flying. They are marching in the streets against years of brutality at the hands of the Supreme Leader and the terrorist Iranian Revolutionary Guard.

Make no mistake, Mr. Speaker, these people are marching for their freedom and the future of their country.

President Ronald Reagan in his farewell address to our Nation described our country as a bright, shining city on a hill that served as a beacon for freedom-loving people everywhere. As that beacon, we must stand with the protesters who seek freedom from this brutal regime.

HEALTHCARE

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

Ms. WEXTON. Mr. Speaker, before coming to Congress, I served for 5 years in the Virginia General Assembly, and the proudest vote I ever took in Richmond was to pass Medicaid expansion in Virginia.

Today, as a result of that expansion, more than 375,000 Virginians now have coverage under Medicaid. It has been a win-win for everyone involved—for those who would otherwise go uncovered and for the hospitals and healthcare providers who often provide service to the uninsured without compensation. A recent study has even suggested that Medicaid expansion has saved thousands from opioid overdoses.

Medicaid expansion saves lives, and the success we have seen in Virginia is thanks to the Affordable Care Act.

Americans need to know that while my colleagues and I are fighting to protect and strengthen the ACA, Donald Trump and the congressional Republicans are in court right now working to strike down the ACA with no plan or replacement.

Without the ACA, Medicaid expansion, which covers 17 million Americans, is in jeopardy, and so is coverage for more than 130 million Americans with preexisting conditions. With so much at stake, I urge my Republican colleagues to end their attacks. In the meantime I will continue to fight back.

KERRY MCCOY PRESERVE ARKANSAS AWARD

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

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Ms. Kerry McCoy who is being honored with the 2019 Special Recognition for Outstanding Stewardship from Preserve Arkansas.

In 1975 Kerry founded her successful business, Arkansas Flag and Banner, with $400 in savings, and to start she sold flags door to door.

In 1990 she expanded the business by purchasing the famed, yet neglected, historic Taborian Hall in Little Rock, Arkansas. Built in 1916, Taborian Hall once hosted legendary entertainers like Duke Ellington, Ella Fitzgerald, Billie Holiday, and Etta James.

Throughout the 1990s and early 2000s, Kerry slowly and meticulously renovated Taborian Hall. In 2009 she founded the nonprofit Friends of the Dreamland Ballroom to save and protect the space that had once been the centerpiece of the hall. Kerry has since produced a documentary and published a book about the building. And I was proud to support her grant for a Civil Rights Preservation Grant from the National Park Service in 2018.

I applaud Kerry for the efforts to preserve Taborian Hall and the Dreamland Ballroom, and I congratulate her on this special recognition from Preserve Arkansas.

CONGRATULATING THE NDSU BISON

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

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to congratulate the NDSU Bison football team for winning the FCS National Championship.

On January 11, NDSU defeated James Madison University 28-20 in a thrilling game that came down to the final seconds. Bison quarterback Trey Lance racked up 166 yards on the ground during the game and finished the season with 28 touchdowns and zero interceptions. He is the first freshman ever to win the Walter Payton Player of the Year Award and the Jerry Rice National Freshman of the Year Award.

Bison safety James Hendricks intercepted a pass on the goal line to ice the game and ensure another Bison National Championship.

They finished the season 16-0, the first NCAA team to do so since Yale in 1884. During this unprecedented run, NDSU has won eight championships in 9 years and compiled a record of 126-8. They have lost only one game in 9 years, and they have defeated five FBS schools along the way, two of which were ranked at the time they played NDSU.

Congratulations to the players, coaches, and fans of the most dominant college football program in this country.

And a special happy birthday to Bison fan Jessica Unruh.
CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.

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

Mr. SPANO. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to celebrate the life of Dr. Martin Luther King Jr.

Dr. King lived a life dedicated to serving and being a voice for the oppressed across our Nation. His message of nonviolence resonated with many Americans during a tumultuous period of our history when basic civil rights were being denied to many based on the color of their skin.

Drawing inspiration from his Christian faith, Dr. King believed his protests were the strongest weapon to achieve freedom and equality. In the end he paid the ultimate price, choosing courage over fear to overcome hatred and ignorance.

He famously preached: “Darkness cannot drive out darkness; only light can do that. Hate cannot drive out hate; only love can do that.”

Because of Dr. King’s influence, all Americans can gather together to celebrate diversity and the growth of human rights for each of us. I hope that everyone will join me in commemorating and remembering Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., for his leadership, his sacrifices, and his legacy.

UNDER ROE V. WADE WE ARE KILLING A BABY A MINUTE

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

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, because of Roe v. Wade, we are killing a baby a minute.

Mr. Speaker, another baby just lost its life.

JOHN WALCZAK’S RETIREMENT FROM FAA

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

Mr. VAN DREW. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to recognize John Walczak. He is retiring after an impressive 37 years and 2 months at the FAA. He started working at the FAA in 1982 as a student through Stockton State College now called Stockton University.

He learned three computer languages: Ultra, JOVIAL, and Basic Assembly. He started working full-time in 1984 as a computer programmer and worked his way up the ranks over the years to become STARS DT&E Test Director, which eventually would become IDQT Test Director. He was also the application lead for requirements. John retired on January 3, 2020. I thank John, his community thanks him, and his country thanks him for his service. Our world is safer because of John and the work that he has done. We are so unbelievably proud of your accomplishments, John. Congratulations, and may God bless you.

CONGRESSIONAL PROGRESSIVE CAUCUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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. Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to represent the Congressional Progressive Caucus where we have close to 100 members all across the country that are pushing forward our progressive values that I think are extremely important, especially in a district like mine, frontline communities and many communities of color that are suffering from issues around poverty, jobs, environment, education, displacement, and so forth. So I am very honored to be representing our caucus today with the Special Order.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN), who is my good colleague from New Jersey.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

I rise in support of the resolutions presented by my friends from California, Congresswoman LEE and Congressman KHANNA. They are long overdue.

The actions of this President over the last few weeks are an escalation of the reckless, arrogant, and ignorant foreign policy of this White House, if you can even call these hasty decisions a policy. The President’s actions lack a coherent strategy. He lacks an understanding of history, and he lacks the foresight to see the consequences of his actions.

Last week, the House and the Senate received briefings that failed to answer our questions about the basic facts behind the decision to kill Major General Qasem Soleimani. Republican Senators themselves said the briefing was so poorly presented that they left more opposed to the President’s actions than before they were briefed.

In other words, the more we learn about the decision, the less faith anyone has in the White House’s ability to make these decisions.

Some of the questions asked by Members of Congress in that briefing were unanswered for so-called security reasons. Yet they were later addressed in interviews and press conferences by members of the administration as they tried to cover for the President’s lies and obfuscations.

That is why I will join Democrats, and hopefully any Member of the House and Senator, to present another resolution to prevent another endless war, in voting for these bills to limit the President’s ability to engage in further aggression with Iran and keep American troops out of harm’s way.

The President has spent the days since his ill-advised attack blustering to reporters and on twitter, including threatening to attack cultural sites, a war crime of which the only outcome would be maiming and killing civilians.

Just last week he ticked off a list of Iranian aggressions that he claimed were the result of the Iran deal. In fact, many of them cited occurred only after his foolish decision to pull out of the deal. These resolutions are critical to curtailing any further misguided action by President Trump.

The fact is, this action that he has taken makes Americans less safe. It threatens our diplomats abroad with retribution, it threatens our military personnel in the region, and it threatens Americans working in the region.

Many, many years ago, Senator George McGovern said: “I am fed up to the ears with old men dreaming up wars for young men to die in.” Well, I am fed up too, and so are the American people.

Reports suggest the President thought this move would be celebrated by Americans. But I speak for myself and the hundreds of constituents who have messaged me when I say: No more, Mr. Trump. We don’t want this war. We don’t want war with Iran. No continuing escalation, no more killings, and no more sending our daughters and sons into harm’s way to appease the fragile egos of the men in the White House.

I call on all my colleagues to support the resolutions of my colleagues, Ms. LEE and Mr. KHANNA.

And I send a clear message to the White House: Your days of reckless misadventures with the lives of Americans are over.
should view it whether or not those actions made Americans safer and strengthened America's national security interests in the region and around the world.

The fact that Soleimani got what he deserved does not mean that this decision was strategically wise or that it enhanced American security.

I, frankly, have been shocked by some of the arguments being put forth by my colleagues in support of the President and the criticism being directed at Members of Congress for taking our war powers responsibility seriously.

Have we become so completely partisan that Members of Congress no longer care at all about the checks and balances put in place to protect our democracy? I heard Members on the other side describe the idea of even holding a hearing on the administration's actions against Iran as absurd.

The idea that we, as Congress, would sit by and allow this administration or any administration to take our country to the brink of war and just trust them, despite conflicting explanations, obvious falsehoods, and a complete lack of strategy and planning, is what is absurd.

What is absurd is the Secretary of State spending nearly 2 years agitating for armed conflict with Iran and then refusing to come to explain himself after he succeeds in convincing the President that this was a good idea.

If you are Secretary of State while the country enters into a tense military conflict, you should expect to clear your schedule and get up to Congress to make your case. Yet, the Secretary had somewhere more important to be yesterday.

That is a shocking abrogation of his duty to report to this body, which has the sole power to declare war on behalf of the American people.

One could think that if the Secretary was so confident in his intelligence, so confident in his justification, and so confident in his strategy that he would be eager to present it and defend it to Congress.

We know he has been making the rounds on television, yet he fails to appear under oath where he can be held accountable. Perhaps that has something to do with the conflicting stories that have been coming out of the administration concerning their justification for the strike against Qasem Soleimani.

First, we were told that there was an imminent threat against the United States, but Secretary Pompeo couldn't say when or where that attack might occur and presented no underlying or raw intelligence to support that conclusion.

Then, the President said Soleimani was plotting to attack up to four American Embassies in the region. Yet, this was not mentioned in the briefings to Congress, and other senior officials in the administration were unaware of such a plot.

Other officials have linked the Soleimani killing to past and future attacks Soleimani might have been plotting with no specificity, while others have reported that the killing was first planned as long as 7 months ago.

The conflicting explanations coming out of this administration, combined with their unwillingness to share details with Congress or the American people, leave us no choice but to conclude that the President acted outside of the authority under the War Powers Resolution and took unilateral military action against a senior government official without proper authorization.

I have heard others make the argument that none of this matters. Soleimani is a bad guy and got what he deserved. The Iranians have backed off so it is all fine.

That is today. What about the next time? When an administration believes it can launch a military strike that might lead with no information-sharing, no legal justification, and no oversight, who knows what they will do next.

Nearly every step taken over the past 2 years by President Trump and Secretary Pompeo has seemed designed to create conflict with Iran by asserting maximum pressure. Without any option or plan for a negotiated solution, armed conflict became more and more likely.

There is no evidence that we are safer today than we were before the killing of Soleimani. In fact, we know we are less safe.

We have stopped the training of Iraqis in the fight against ISIS. There are more American troops that have been sent to the region. We have now suffered two attacks on bases that house American and allied forces. This notion that we are safer today is simply belied by the facts.

So we are in a dangerous situation, and it doesn't appear that the administration has any strategy or plan for next steps, other than the farfetched wish that Iran will be so cowed in the face of their blister that it will agree to all of their demands. That seems unlikely and doesn't represent any thoughtful or coherent planning.

Forgive me if I don't want to repeat the mistakes of the past and put my trust in officials when they march us into war and claim: "Trust us. This is necessary."

I will not be responsible for sending the men and women of Rhode Island—or any other State, for that matter—into harm's way so that the President can feel like a big shot and his advisers can finally achieve the war they seem to have been building toward since he took office.

I am disgusted by the Secretary's absence yesterday. He should appear before the committee as soon as possible, and that means within days, to explain himself, the administration's position, and their plan for preventing Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon and promoting America's national security and keeping America safe.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me time.

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congresswoman Tlaib for leading this conversation today. I am seeing some of my colleagues on the floor today who remember the story that I want to tell.

This was the fall of 2002, and there was a vigorous debate going on whether or not we should be sending our troops to declare war on Iraq and take out Saddam Hussein. The story went that there were weapons of mass destruction.

Yes, we had briefings. They were in the north. They were in the south, the west, and the east. They were there all right, we were told.

The vote was going to come up on the Authorization for Use of Military Force, AUMF, in Iraq. There was one voice in particular that stood out and still stands out to me, a woman who was the ranking Democrat on the Intelligence Committee. Her name was Nancy Pelosi. She stood up in our meetings and said, no, there is no intelligence to justify that we go to war in Iraq.

A group of us got together. I see Congresswoman Barbara Lee, the only Member who, because we were already in Afghanistan, voted against that war, who put together a group called the Out of Iraq Caucus. We went door-to-door, literally, and asked our Democratic friends in the House to say no to this war because it was not necessary.

At the end of the day, even though the press story had already been written that somehow it was almost a unanimous vote, 60 percent of the Democrats in the House of Representatives voted against that war in Iraq.

That was over 17 years ago. We still have troops in Iraq. We spent trillions, literally trillions of dollars, and the loss of life on all sides, including our precious American soldiers that we sent—most Americans today agree that that war was a disaster and that we shouldn't have done it. We learned a lesson.

When it came time to talk about the threat that we knew was there, the nuclear weapons threat, we worked with President Barack Obama in a diplomatic way to pass the Iran agreement that actually stopped Iran from developing nuclear weapons that would threaten not only the United States and the region but the rest of the world as well. They were inspectors that would report to us. Every month, we got a report that said it was working.

Along comes Donald Trump, who had said even in the campaign that this is a really bad idea, that this was a terrible agreement. Lo and behold, just a few weeks ago, he decided—it seems like a long time. Not long ago, he decides, all
of a sudden, that it is a really important thing for us to go after Iran while Soleimani, the general, who is part of the government, is in Iraq.

No one is crying over the death of Soleimani. The question is: Is the United States safer now than it was? The answer is a resounding no.

That is why I am in strong support of the legislation by BARBARA LEE that says we will sunset that 2002 Authorization for Use of Military Force in Iraq and the legislation by RO KHANNA that will prohibit the use of Federal funds for military action in or against Iran unless Congress specifically authorizes it or declares war or such actions are undertaken consistent with the War Powers Resolution of 1973.

In other words, come to Congress. That is who we are. That is our job. We are the ones who are supposed to say war or peace. The most important things we do is decide whether we send our young men and women into harm’s way to sacrifice their lives.

We have to exert our authority. We have to exert our authority right now. I stand by that legislation. We won’t need, and the American people don’t want, another endless war in Iran or anywhere in the Middle East. It is time to say no, to say that Congress doesn’t want, another endless war in Iran or anywhere in the Middle East. It is time to say no, to say that Congress is going to make those decisions, and to do it now.

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague from California (Ms. LEE), my mentor. The original squad member is what I like to call her. I so appreciate the leadership role that she plays in the Congressional Progressive Caucus, especially in trying to suspend and stop all war efforts by our country.

Ms. LEE of California, Mr. Speaker, first, I thank my colleague, who is a bold and brilliant progressive here. Congresswoman Rashida TLAIB, I thank her for organizing this Special Order tonight, but I also thank her for her leadership and for hitting the ground running in the House of Representatives. We have been quite remarkable to be able to work with her and to see how she understands the issues around peace and justice, that peace and justice go together.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Congresswoman Schakowsky for her speech tonight and for her presentation, for laying out the chronology and historical record for how we got here and how we, unfortunately, were misled by the lies of the Bush administration into this tragic, endless war, an war that went very much for her leadership, for her friendship, and for staying the course because this has been, what, 19 years now? We have to repeal this authorization.

Mr. Speaker, let me just say to Representatives JAYAPAL and MARK POCAN, who co-chair our Progressive Caucus, their tireless leadership in the Progressive Caucus has really helped with making sure that the public understands all the issues that we are dealing with, it relates to global peace and security.

I chair the Progressive Caucus’ Global Peace and Security Task Force, and we are very clear on why we must stop a possible catastrophic war with Iran and reassert our constitutional duty over matters of war and peace.

Mr. Speaker, I invite all of my colleagues and the rest of the CPC to support the report of the 2001 and 2002 Authorizations for Use of Military Force. I am pleased that the House leadership has agreed to bring my repeal of the 2002 AUMF to the floor in 2 weeks, and I encourage Members on both sides of the aisle to cosponsor that legislation.

Firstly, with the 2001 authorization, 19 years ago, Congress passed a 2001 Authorization for Use of Military Force, AUMF. It was supposedly against Afghanistan, as it relates to the horrific events of 9/11.
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It was a blank check, however, for endless war. It was a 60-word authorization. Now we have a Congress where—or at least the House—less than 25 percent of current Members actually voted on that authorization, which, of course, I adamantly opposed.

This authorization itself gives any President authority to wage limitless war at any time, anywhere, for any reason, in perpetuity. According to the Congressional Research Service, the AUMF has been used as a blank check by three administrations to justify military force more than 40 times in 18 countries.

Mr. Speaker, I include the CRS report in the RECORD.

[From the Congressional Research Service, February 16, 2018]

MEMORANDUM

Subject: Presidential References to the 2001 Authorization for Use of Military Force in Publicly Available Executive Actions and Reports to Congress

From: Matthew B. Thorson

Policy Legislation, 7–4589.

This memorandum was prepared to enable distribution to more than one congressional office.

This memorandum sets out information and analysis concerning presidential references in public official notifications and records concerning the Authorization for Use of Military Force (2001 AUMF; Public Law 107–40; 50 U.S.C. §1541 note), enacted in response to the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks on the United States, in relation to military and other action. It contains very brief discussions of the relevant provisions of the 2001 AUMF, and the uses of U.S. armed forces connected with the AUMF authority, as well as excerpted language and other information from the notifications.

USE OF MILITARY FORCE AUTHORIZATION LANGUAGE IN THE 2001 AUMF

Section 2(a) of the 2001 AUMF authorizes the use of force in response to the September 11 attacks:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SEC. 2. AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES.

(a) In General. — The President is authorized to use all necessary and appropriate force against those nations, organizations, or persons he determines planned, authorized, committed, or participated in the acts set forth in section 2(b) against the United States that occurred on September 11, 2001, or harbored such organizations or persons, in order to prevent any future acts of international terrorism against the United States by such nations, organizations, or persons.

The 2001 AUMF does not include a specified constitutional report requirement, but states that the authorization is not intended to supersede any requirement of the War Powers Resolution, which does require consultation and reporting on continuing deployments of U.S. armed forces into imminent or ongoing hostilities.

EXECUTIVE BRANCH POLICY CONCERNING USE OF MILITARY FORCES AUTHORIZED UNDER THE 2001 AUTHORIZATION

Prior to the U.S. military campaign against the Islamic State that began in summer 2014, executive branch officials made statements that included certain interpretations concerning the 2001 AUMF, including the following:

The 2001 AUMF is primarily an authorization to enter into and prosecute an armed conflict against Al Qaeda and the Taliban in Afghanistan.

The 2001 AUMF authorizes the President to use military force against Al Qaeda and the Taliban outside Afghanistan, but such uses of force must meet a higher standard of threat to the United States and must use limited, precise methods to strike individual targets rather than general military action against enemy forces.

Because the 2001 AUMF authorizes U.S. involvement in an international conflict, the international law of armed conflict informs the authority within the 2001 AUMF.

This law permits the use of military force against forces associated with Al Qaeda and the Taliban as co-belligerents; such forces must be operating in some sort of coordination and cooperation with Al Qaeda and/or the Taliban, not just share similar goals, objectives, or ideologies.

This interpretation of the scope of 2001 AUMF authority can be seen to fit within the international framework of presidential power to use military force against those posing a threat to U.S. national security and U.S. interests. In situations where the 2001 AUMF or other relevant legislation does not seem to authorize a given use of military force or related activity, the executive branch will determine whether the President’s Article II powers as Commander in Chief and Chief Executive, as interpreted by the executive branch itself, might authorize such actions.

In this way, similar to the judicial action to meet U.S. counterterrorism objectives might be interpreted to fall under different authorities, of which the 2001 AUMF is just one, although important.

DECEMBER 2016 LEGAL FRAMEWORK REPORT ON USE OF MILITARY FORCE

President Obama issued a report in December 2016 entitled, “Report on the Legal and Policy Frameworks Guiding the United States’ Use of Military Force, and Related National Security Operations.” Among other matters, the report deals with the legal justifications for the U.S. ongoing use of military force against the Islamic State, which according to the Report has taken place in the form of airstrikes, military advice and training of foreign forces, joint military action to support the Syrian Armed Forces and Syrian rebel groups, and military activities of U.S. special operations forces in Iraq, Syria, and Libya. The Report asserts that the President’s 2001 AUMF, arguing certain factors as determinative:

1. The 2001 AUMF authorizes the President to use military force to prevent any future acts of international terrorism against the United States by such nations, organizations, or persons.” Among other matters, the report deals with the legal justifications for the U.S. ongoing use of military force against the Islamic State, which according to the Report has taken place in the form of airstrikes, military advice and training of foreign forces, joint military action to support the Syrian Armed Forces and Syrian rebel groups, and military activities of U.S. special operations forces in Iraq, Syria, and Libya. The Report asserts that the President’s 2001 AUMF, arguing certain factors as determinative:

1. The 2001 AUMF authorizes the President to use military force to prevent any future acts of international terrorism against the United States by such nations, organizations, or persons.” Among other matters, the report deals with the legal justifications for the U.S. ongoing use of military force against the Islamic State, which according to the Report has taken place in the form of airstrikes, military advice and training of foreign forces, joint military action to support the Syrian Armed Forces and Syrian rebel groups, and military activities of U.S. special operations forces in Iraq, Syria, and Libya. The Report asserts that the President’s 2001 AUMF, arguing certain factors as determinative:

1. The 2001 AUMF authorizes the President to use military force to prevent any future acts of international terrorism against the United States by such nations, organizations, or persons.” Among other matters, the report deals with the legal justifications for the U.S. ongoing use of military force against the Islamic State, which according to the Report has taken place in the form of airstrikes, military advice and training of foreign forces, joint military action to support the Syrian Armed Forces and Syrian rebel groups, and military activities of U.S. special operations forces in Iraq, Syria, and Libya. The Report asserts that the President’s 2001 AUMF, arguing certain factors as determinative:

1. The 2001 AUMF authorizes the President to use military force to prevent any future acts of international terrorism against the United States by such nations, organizations, or persons.” Among other matters, the report deals with the legal justifications for the U.S. ongoing use of military force against the Islamic State, which according to the Report has taken place in the form of airstrikes, military advice and training of foreign forces, joint military action to support the Syrian Armed Forces and Syrian rebel groups, and military activities of U.S. special operations forces in Iraq, Syria, and Libya. The Report asserts that the President’s 2001 AUMF, arguing certain factors as determinative:
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2. Al Qaeda was identified as the primary organization responsible for the September 11, 2001 attacks.

3. Organized, armed groups that are co-belligerent with Al Qaeda against the United States are targetable under the 2001 AUMF pursuant to the law of international armed conflict and/or force.

4. With specific regard to the Islamic State, the United States determined in 2004 that Al Qaeda in Iraq (AQI), the predecessor organization of the Islamic State, was either part of Al Qaeda itself or an associated force in 2004 and has used force against the group under 2001 AUMF authority since that time, including in Iraq, its name to the Islamic State (or ISIL or ISIS).

5. The fact that the Islamic State has asserted a split between itself and Al Qaeda does not divest the President of his previous authority to use force against the Islamic State, as the Islamic State’s conflict with the United States and its allies has continued.

6. Congress has supported military action against the Islamic State by specifically funding the military campaign and providing authority to assist groups fighting the Islamic State in Iraq and Syria.

RECORDS OF EXECUTIVE ACTIONS AND PRESIDENTIAL NOTIFICATIONS RELATING TO CONGRESS CONCERNING THE 2001 AUMF

Since 2001, Presidents George W. Bush, Barack Obama, and Donald Trump have referenced public notifications that the 2001 AUMF is the legal authority underlying or continuing certain military or related actions (including non-lethal military activities such as detentions and military trials), as U.S. armed forces continue to fight Al Qaeda, the Taliban, and violent extremist and terrorist groups designated as associated with Al Qaeda and the Taliban. These notifications reference both statutory and constitutional authority for the President to take such action, as well as statutory provisions requiring congressional notification, including reference to provisions in the 2001 AUMF.

As will be discussed in detail below, the manner in which Presidents have presented information on military deployments and actions in these notifications, the constitutional and statutory authority for such actions, and the reporting requirements for such actions, have varied over time, making it difficult to aggregate such information.

NOTIFICATIONS OF DEPLOYING U.S. ARMED FORCES AND/OR USING MILITARY FORCE IN VIOLENCE TO THE 2001 AUMF

Presidents Bush, Obama, and Trump have provided formal notifications of military deployments and/or action to Congress at various times since enactment of the 2001 AUMF, referring to that authorization to various degrees and ends. While presidential reports to Congress concerning the use of military or related activities undertaken by the U.S. armed forces initially provided a fairly simple and straightforward discussion of actions and related authorities, over time these reports became increasingly detailed, complicated, and difficult to decipher with regard to determining applicable presidential authority. At times, both Presidents have relied primarily on their constitutional Article II powers as Commander in Chief and Chief Executive. In both notifications, he referred to the 2001 AUMF as evidencing the continuing support of Congress for combat specifically and state he had taken such action pursuant to 2001 AUMF authority. The President referenced these notifications that he was reporting on these actions to Congress consistent with both the War Powers Resolution and the 2001 AUMF. It is possible to conclude that reporting action consistent with the 2001 AUMF would mean that the action was considered taken pursuant to 2001 AUMF authority. See Table 1 below for more information and precise language related to 2001 AUMF references in these notifications.

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, I hope you look at this map, and you will see exactly where the 2001 authorization has been used for military strikes and force.

Two decades later, as outlined in the Afghanistan Papers, which I hope the Speaker has read, published in The Washington Post, I believe this was in December, the false justifications and inconsistencies led to a 19-year, endless war—Washington Post, Afghanistan Papers.

The Pentagon consistently misled and lied to the American people about our progress in Afghanistan. This endless war has caused countless deaths of servicemembers, innocent civilians. It has cost trillions of dollars. It has created repercussions throughout the region and the world.

It is truly concerning, and I urge my colleagues to read through the details of this report. Our own generals and envoys did not know then, and still do not know what our strategy was or why we are still involved in this war.

We must ask ourselves: Why are we putting our servicemembers into harm’s way? Why are innocent civilians’ lives in flux? Why are we making our country less safe?

But it wasn’t just in 2001 when we passed an open-ended authorization. Next, in 2002, I stood here with my colleagues to urge us not to rush to war in Iraq based on false intelligence, most specifically, weapons of mass destruction, and to vote against the 2002 AUMF.

I offered then an amendment to this authorization that would have prevented this war by requiring that the inspectors go to verify that there were weapons of mass destruction before military action. That seemed reasonable. At least we should have had the data and the information to justify the use of force.

But, of course, my amendment only received, I believe it was, 72 votes. Shame on us.

But if it had passed, it would have exposed the lie that the war was based on. There were no weapons of mass destruction in Iraq.

So it is time to repeal that outdated authorization. And as I stand here, as I signed up to serve this country, I say, the American people do not want another catastrophic war of choice in the Middle East.

Make no mistake: The dangerous and reckless actions taken by President Trump have brought us to the brink of an all-out war with Iran. Since day one, Trump and his warmongering administration have inched us closer to war with Iran. They have completely neglected diplomacy at every turn.

Secretary Pompeo is the Secretary of State and should be our chief diplomat. Instead, we see our chief diplomat promoting the use of force in the Middle East.

Ending the effective and successful Iran nuclear deal, known as the JCPOA, once again, this administration has made us less safe and has allowed Iran to move forward to begin to look into how to develop a weapon. That is outrageous, when we had verified the fact that they had stopped this.

We have, also, unfortunately, increased troop presence in the Middle East and promoted a dangerous and maximum pressure campaign with Iran and increasing economic sanctions.

This administration is giving Members of Congress and the American people conflicting and contradictory information. We were told the President authorized the assassination of General Soleimani due to an “imminent threat,” as permitted by the War Powers Act. Now Secretary of Defense Mark Esper is saying that he has seen no evidence of an “imminent threat” and conducted the strike for “deterrence.” Unfortunately, they can’t even keep up with their own lies.

Now, more than ever, Congress needs to exercise our constitutional responsibility to stop these endless wars. That
is why I am proud to have voted last week in support of Congresswoman Slotkin’s War Powers Resolution to limit the President’s military action regarding Iran and prevent this crisis from spiraling out of control.

I am also pleased that my bipartisan bill, H.R. 2456, would repeal the 2002 authorization. That is going to be taken up in 2 weeks.

The administration has falsely claimed it can justify the use of force against Iran by conducting assassinations and strikes in Iraq. It doesn’t make any sense.

My amendment to repeal the 2002 AUMF was included in the House-passed fiscal 2020 NDAA, National Defense Authorization Act, and voted on a bipartisan basis, but it was stripped by Republicans from the final bill. And now, unfortunately, we know why Senator McConnell and the Trump administration used it to do so. We understand their strategy now as it relates to that and what happened in Iraq.

When Congress passed the 2002 AUMF before the invasion of Iraq, many of us did not support it. It was, indeed, again, to address the perceived threat posed by Saddam Hussein as it related to weapons of mass destruction. U.S. military deployments and operations carried out pursuant to the 2002 AUMF, dubbed Operation Iraqi Freedom—remember that—officially concluded in 2011, no more.

Almost 18 years after the resolution’s passage, we still have this authorization and the billions it has been used in any current military operations, and it shouldn’t be used.

In 2 weeks, we will take up Congresswoman Kimanka’s bill, which I am proud to cosponsor, to prohibit funds from being used in any current military operations, and it shouldn’t be used.

In 2 weeks, we will take up Congresswoman Tlaib’s bill, which I am proud to cosponsor, to prohibit funds from being used in any current military operations, and it shouldn’t be used.

In 2 weeks, we will take up Congresswoman Tlaib’s bill, which I am proud to cosponsor, to prohibit funds from being used in any current military operations, and it shouldn’t be used.

In 2 weeks, we will take up Congresswoman Tlaib’s bill, which I am proud to cosponsor, to prohibit funds from being used in any current military operations, and it shouldn’t be used.

In 2 weeks, we will take up Congresswoman Tlaib’s bill, which I am proud to cosponsor, to prohibit funds from being used in any current military operations, and it shouldn’t be used.

In 2 weeks, we will take up Congresswoman Tlaib’s bill, which I am proud to cosponsor, to prohibit funds from being used in any current military operations, and it shouldn’t be used.

In 2 weeks, we will take up Congresswoman Tlaib’s bill, which I am proud to cosponsor, to prohibit funds from being used in any current military operations, and it shouldn’t be used.

In 2 weeks, we will take up Congresswoman Tlaib’s bill, which I am proud to cosponsor, to prohibit funds from being used in any current military operations, and it shouldn’t be used.

In 2 weeks, we will take up Congresswoman Tlaib’s bill, which I am proud to cosponsor, to prohibit funds from being used in any current military operations, and it shouldn’t be used.

In 2 weeks, we will take up Congresswoman Tlaib’s bill, which I am proud to cosponsor, to prohibit funds from being used in any current military operations, and it shouldn’t be used.

In 2 weeks, we will take up Congresswoman Tlaib’s bill, which I am proud to cosponsor, to prohibit funds from being used in any current military operations, and it shouldn’t be used.

In 2 weeks, we will take up Congresswoman Tlaib’s bill, which I am proud to cosponsor, to prohibit funds from being used in any current military operations, and it shouldn’t be used.

In 2 weeks, we will take up Congresswoman Tlaib’s bill, which I am proud to cosponsor, to prohibit funds from being used in any current military operations, and it shouldn’t be used.

In 2 weeks, we will take up Congresswoman Tlaib’s bill, which I am proud to cosponsor, to prohibit funds from being used in any current military operations, and it shouldn’t be used.

In 2 weeks, we will take up Congresswoman Tlaib’s bill, which I am proud to cosponsor, to prohibit funds from being used in any current military operations, and it shouldn’t be used.

In 2 weeks, we will take up Congresswoman Tlaib’s bill, which I am proud to cosponsor, to prohibit funds from being used in any current military operations, and it shouldn’t be used.

In 2 weeks, we will take up Congresswoman Tlaib’s bill, which I am proud to cosponsor, to prohibit funds from being used in any current military operations, and it shouldn’t be used.

In 2 weeks, we will take up Congresswoman Tlaib’s bill, which I am proud to cosponsor, to prohibit funds from being used in any current military operations, and it shouldn’t be used.
against Iran, unless legislation is passed to specifically authorize such military action and clarify that Congress has not already authorized the use of force against Iran, specifically indicating those 2001 and 2002 Authorizations for Use of Military Force do not authorize war with Iran. We need to pass that.

The bill’s text matches an amendment that passed on the House floor with 251 votes just last summer. And I would hope we would find members of the House in both parties who voted for it last summer to add their voice and urge their Republican colleagues in the Senate to join us to permit a vote.

We have H.R. 2456 to repeal the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq, the resolution of 2002 led by Congresswoman BARBARA LEE, who spoke so eloquently here a few moments ago. Again, I once promised and supported it. It would eliminate the authorization for the use of force against Iraq resolution of 2002. And again, this matches a bipartisan amendment passed last summer with 242 votes.

These are simple, commonsense, bipartisan, and it is time for us to enact them into law. These were stripped out in the process of the budget that Republicans in the Senate and the administration would not go along with, but it is time, especially given the reckless acts of this administration recently, to go back, revisit, and approve each of these elements when we are given an opportunity on the floor of the House. I am absolutely convinced, based on conversations I have had with friends of mine, well-meaning Members of Congress at the time, who voted for that authorization, who voted for the war who felt that that was on the conscience and supported it. It would eliminate the authorization for use of force against Iraq resolution of 2002.

From day one this administration has antagonized Iran, tearing up the successful nuclear deal, imposing crippling unilateral sanctions that hurt everyday people a lot more than they hurt the Iran leadership. Our foreign policy has been driven by warmongers obsessed with regime change, despite a long and bloody American track record of failed regime change around the globe. Pumed by a military industrial complex that demands new targets for its weapons, we have roamed from continent to continent destabilizing governments and learning no lessons. We have made it actually worse.

The American people have seen what happens when we in Congress fail to live up to our duty as their representatives. When we don’t ask the tough questions of our soldiers, our men and women are sent to fight and die in Iraq for weapons of mass destruction that do not exist. Families from Vietnam to Libya are torn apart by bombs and bullets, and children across Southeast Asia are born without arms and legs because weapons like Agent Orange poison innocent civilians to this day.

Let us finally, mercifully learn our lesson now. We must solve our differences through diplomacy. No war with Iran not now, not ever. We live in a country where endless wars have been normalized, but it is not normal. It shouldn’t be normal.

When we demand a debt-free college education or healthcare for all, the establishment, folks in this Chamber ask how much will it cost and who will pay for it? However, we throw billions of dollars away on broken weapons systems. We spend trillions on sending our Armed Forces to die in rich people’s wars.

When we demand basic dignity and opportunity to thrive, that is when the establishment starts pretending to care about deficits and debt.

We are awake to this game, and we are not playing it anymore. We must dismantle our war economy and reinvest in the people’s economy. Last week’s vote on the War Powers Resolution is a great first step toward reigning in the war machine, but we must go further. We need to pass Representative LEE’s bill to repeal the 2002 Authorization for Use of Military Force, which this administration is pretending authorizes their military maneuvers. And we need to pass Representative KHANNA’s bill to prohibit military spending on a war with Iran, right now, before another attack is ordered.

We must all keep up the pressure and ask those tough questions and keep up the fight for the American people who are still to this day saying: Stop lying to us before you go to war. Stop using our men and women as campaign moves, rather than trying to keep our Nation safe.

We can stop this march to war, but it is going to take all of us and take courage to do this.

I thank my good colleagues from the Congressional Progressive Caucus for their amazing and incredible courage in our fight for the American people who are saying: Stop lying to us before you go to war. Stop using our men and women as campaign moves, rather than trying to keep our Nation safe.

I thank the 13th District for their faith and support in the work that I am doing in this Chamber. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President and to address their remarks to the Chair.

THE 47TH ANNUAL MARCH FOR LIFE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, next week tens of thousands of women and men from around the country will March For Life, making clear to the country and to the world that women and unborn babies deserve the respect that most respectable citizens of this country deserve.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana, Congressman JIM BANKS, who has been a leader in defending the innocent and most vulnerable.
Mr. BANKS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his tireless efforts on behalf of the unborn.

Mr. Speaker, although the ruling in Roe v. Wade significantly altered the fabric of our Nation, Hoosiers will never give up in defense of the fundamental right to life.

In my corner of the State of Indiana in the northeast corner of the State, we have one of the most active and robust pro-life organizations in the country, the Allen County Right To Life.

Mr. Speaker, the Allen County Right To Life works every day to advance the cause of life at our State house in Indianapolis and the courts and in our own community. I am excited to share today that they will soon be incorporating the counties of Adams, DeKalb, LaGrange, Noble, Steuben, and Wells Counties to join forces under the name Right To Life of Northeast Indiana.

Indiana is now considered the sixth pro-life State in the country. The remarkable progress in Indiana over these last 4 decades would not have been possible without the steadfast support of this organization and pro-life activist Cathy Humbarger.

Mr. Speaker, each year the Allen County Right To Life leads an annual bus trip to Washington for the National March for Life, and this year they will be descending on our Nation’s capital with a record-breaking 650 pro-life students and advocates from northeast Indiana, and I could not be prouder.

Mr. Speaker, this incredible organization is also expecting a record-breaking 2,500 Hoosiers at the 2020 Northeast Indiana March for Life in Fort Wayne this coming Saturday. And I will be marching alongside those 2,500 Hoosiers back home in Fort Wayne to honor those of whom never had the chance to march for themselves.

I believe that all life is sacred, and I ask that all Americans wherever you are in the country to join me in marching to reaffirm this principle.

Mr. Speaker, March for Life 2020 in Fort Wayne and across Indiana was certainly a demonstration of Hoosiers standing together to protect the lives of the unborn.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HARRIS), my distinguished friend and colleague, the co-chairman of the Congressional Pro-Life Caucus, Dr. ANDY HARRIS is a board-certified anesthesiologist who has served so ably at Johns Hopkins and elsewhere.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congresswoman ROBY for her very powerful statement and her leadership here in the U.S. House.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HARRIS), my distinguished friend and colleague, the co-chairman of the Congressional Pro-Life Caucus. Dr. ANDY HARRIS is a board-certified anesthesiologist who has served so ably at Johns Hopkins and elsewhere.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congresswoman ROBY for her very powerful statement and her leadership here in the U.S. House.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HARRIS), my distinguished friend and colleague, the co-chairman of the Congressional Pro-Life Caucus. Dr. ANDY HARRIS is a board-certified anesthesiologist who has served so ably at Johns Hopkins and elsewhere.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congresswoman ROBY for her very powerful statement and her leadership here in the U.S. House.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HARRIS), my distinguished friend and colleague, the co-chairman of the Congressional Pro-Life Caucus. Dr. ANDY HARRIS is a board-certified anesthesiologist who has served so ably at Johns Hopkins and elsewhere.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congresswoman ROBY for her very powerful statement and her leadership here in the U.S. House.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HARRIS), my distinguished friend and colleague, the co-chairman of the Congressional Pro-Life Caucus. Dr. ANDY HARRIS is a board-certified anesthesiologist who has served so ably at Johns Hopkins and elsewhere.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congresswoman ROBY for her very powerful statement and her leadership here in the U.S. House.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HARRIS), my distinguished friend and colleague, the co-chairman of the Congressional Pro-Life Caucus. Dr. ANDY HARRIS is a board-certified anesthesiologist who has served so ably at Johns Hopkins and elsewhere.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congresswoman ROBY for her very powerful statement and her leadership here in the U.S. House.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HARRIS), my distinguished friend and colleague, the co-chairman of the Congressional Pro-Life Caucus. Dr. ANDY HARRIS is a board-certified anesthesiologist who has served so ably at Johns Hopkins and elsewhere.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congresswoman ROBY for her very powerful statement and her leadership here in the U.S. House.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HARRIS), my distinguished friend and colleague, the co-chairman of the Congressional Pro-Life Caucus. Dr. ANDY HARRIS is a board-certified anesthesiologist who has served so ably at Johns Hopkins and elsewhere.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congresswoman ROBY for her very powerful statement and her leadership here in the U.S. House.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HARRIS), my distinguished friend and colleague, the co-chairman of the Congressional Pro-Life Caucus. Dr. ANDY HARRIS is a board-certified anesthesiologist who has served so ably at Johns Hopkins and elsewhere.
Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for having this Special Order. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to reflect on the 47th anniversary of the Roe v. Wade Supreme Court decision which has had a devastating effect on protecting the sanctity of life and advancing the rights of the unborn.

This ill-fated decision has had drastic, negative consequences and has expanded the abhorrent practice of abortion across this country.

But despite the devastating effects Roe v. Wade has had on the sanctity of life, I am inspired to stand up for life, let us be united once again here in Washington, D.C., which have been so very, very effective.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT), my good friend and colleague. The gentleman was the prime author of the law to save born-alive children, a law that we are looking now to strengthen with 199 cosponsors which is Representative ANN WAGNER’s bill. I thank the gentleman for his leadership.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank CHRIS SMITH for his leadership and his commitment to advancing pro-life legislation for literally decades now. He has been a leader for many of us, and we have watched and followed his footsteps in many ways.

A previous speaker, ANDY HARRIS, mentioned that his birthday is next week, and I share something with him because my birthday happens to be next week as well. Not only is it next week, but it is on January 22, which is the very day that the horrific Roe v. Wade decision was issued.

For decades now, I literally, on my birthday, with all of the joy that you have with your family or with friends and colleagues in celebrating your birthday, I can’t help but think of those millions and millions of little, innocent, unborn babies that were not born, that have never experienced life because of a tragic decision that was made that they had no part in making, but their life was ended before they were able to share the blessing that life is.

That is why we need to overturn that horrific Roe v. Wade decision. Many of us have been working for years and
years now to do that, or to do every-
thing we can up to that point until, ul-
timately, the court makes that deci-
sion.

We have a responsibility, I believe, to
protect the most vulnerable among us,
and that is the innocent, unborn babies. It
was one of the principal reasons that I
wanted to come to Congress. It was one of
the principal reasons that I wanted to
be on the Judiciary Committee.

I was blessed to be chosen by one of
the legends in the pro-life community,
probably the father of the pro-life
movement here in the House, and that
was the late Henry Hyde who chaired
the Judiciary Committee.

Next to Henry, Chris Smith certainly
is the leader since Henry. But as the
gentleman mentioned, as a member of
the Judiciary Committee, it took me a
number of years and I was able to work
my way up to the chair of that com-
mittee. Many people—many babies—we think tens
of thousands every year—that that has
saved, but we are still losing so many
other innocent, unborn lives here in
this Nation. There have been 61 million
since Roe v. Wade that we know of.

I will call all of my colleagues who are here this evening and spending
their time to do something, I think,
which is probably one of the most wor-
thy things we can do with our time
here in the House, and that is to try to
protect those who cannot protect
themselves. I thank everyone that is here.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr.
Speaker, I thank the gentleman so
much and thank him for reminding the
Members, as well as those who might
be watching on C-SPAN, of the selfless-
ness of the pro-life movement.

The people who will be marching are
doing it for others, and, increasingly,
at every march, there are more women
who are postabortion who now speak
out on behalf of their lost child. And
they admonish and encourage others
not to make that same terrible, irre-
versible mistake.

I yield to the gentleman from Ne-
braska (Mr. PORTENBERRY), my good
friend and colleague.

Mr. PORTENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I
thank Congressman Smith for yielding.

First of all, let me acknowledge the
gentleman’s tireless work on behalf of
human rights, justice, and human dig-
nity. The gentleman is authentically
the conscience of this Congress, and I
am so grateful for his leadership and
dependable friendship.

Mr. Speaker, as you walk down this
isle as I just did, if you will notice
this beautiful rostrum in this well
where we speak, along the sides of the
rostrum here are a couple of words.

Mr. Speaker, to-night, we mourn the 47th anniversary
of Roe v. Wade. Today, we mourn the
loss of over 50 million American lives.

Mr. Speaker, my good friend and col-
leagues from New Jersey, and my col-
leagues here tonight all know that I
dedicated my professional life to deliv-
ering babies. Every day, every other

ments of what it means to be an Amer-
ican: union, justice and peace. But
there is another word that is often
overlooked and it is right here. It says:
“Tolerance.”

We are living in a very interesting
age. We are living, in a certain sense,
in a divided age. We seem to be strug-
gling with our narrative as a nation,
particularly politically. But something
beautiful is happening.

This is a new generation among
which is probably coming that is wrestling with these deeper
questions as to how you build a more
just nation: how you include people
who have been left out. How do you
struggle for peace? How do you find au-
thentic freedom, liberty?

Tolerance creates the space for pro-
tection of that sacred space of con-
science, of deliberation that we have in
this body that is built upon a funda-
mental foundation of life: the protec-
tion of the ideals of life.

We cannot say that we are going to
include everybody and celebrate diver-
sity except for them, the littlest ones,
the most vulnerable, who have never
had a chance to live. We have to
do better.

The young people cannot reconcile
this paradox. They can’t. That is why
tens of thousands of them are going to
to come here next week—and a number of
them are from my home State of Ne-
braska, and I am very proud of them—
and they are going to do the American
thing. They are going to exercise their
civil rights for the noblest of senti-
ments; namely, tolerance for the most
innocent, for the most vulnerable.

They are going to say to us who are
older, who have to shepherd this Na-
tion: Please, please open your hearts
and minds. We have to do better. We
must do better.

No matter how deep the problem, no
matter how severe the circumstance,
we should be loving enough, caring
even more; being big enough, and we certainly
have resources enough to be a commu-
nity that cares and loves and helps no
matter how difficult the cir-
cumstances.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr.
Speaker, I thank the gentleman very
much for his very eloquent remarks
and for his clarity as well. He has al-
ways been such a clear speaker, and I
thank him so much.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman
from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL), and I
would like to point out to the Chair
that we have so many doctors, M.D.s,
who are speaking on behalf of unborn
children and their moms. I want to
thank the gentleman, Dr. Marshall,
for his efforts.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, to-
night, we mourn the 47th anniversary
of Roe v. Wade. Today, we mourn the
loss of over 50 million American lives.
day for 30 years, I had the honor to deliver a baby. Sometimes it was one. I delivered as many as 12 babies in a day.

But a subject I have never talked about up here, a subject that few Americans talk about, is infertility and miscarriages. Millions of Americans talk about it, and miscarriages are hundreds of thousands of women have these problems, and for whatever reason, when I took care of women with miscarriages, women who so desperately wanted to have a baby—it might be her third, her fourth, her fifth miscarriage—and who were unable to have a baby, it was at moments like that that I thought about Roe v. Wade.

It never made sense to me. This morning, I read from the Book of Ecclesiastes and try to make sense of life up here. Still, here I am, 50-some years of age, and I haven’t found the answer. How can I live in a country where in one hospital I am fighting to help a woman keep a baby, and 100 miles away, the largest abortion clinic in the country is taking life away?

How can we live in that type of a country? Tonight I pledge, I recommit my support and my efforts to protect life.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman so much for his words.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding a moment.

Mr. Speaker, here we are again, marking this tragic anniversary as we do every year. The reason we have such sorrow and such a burden in our souls because it is such an unspeakable sorrow what has happened to nearly 60 million innocent, unborn children in this country.

Our Nation’s birth certificate is the Declaration of Independence, and it states what has been said as the American creed, and we know it by heart: “We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.”

The Founders recognized life first among those inalienable rights because they acknowledged that we are made in the image of a holy God, and because of that, there are some very serious implications that follow.

It is every single human life has inestimable dignity and value. And our value is not related in any way to our socioeconomic status, the color of our skin, what ZIP Code we live in, how talented we may be, or what we can contribute to society; it is because we are endowed by our creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.”

---
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And I will just say this in the very brief moment that I have. Tonight we will continue to pray, we will continue to work, we will continue to legislate, and we will continue to march and stand for our men and women and children and the sanctity of every single life. And I will fulfill the promise of our Nation’s birth certificate is realized.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA).

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the right to life for every unborn child.

But before I start, I want to thank the gentleman from Jersey for his tireless work and efforts to reverse this decision and to make sure that life is what we are about in this country, because, tragically, in the 47 years since Roe v. Wade, there have been more than 60 million abortions in our country.

This is more than a statistic. These are innocent lives lost. Even if this decision is brought back before the Supreme Court, abortions can still be prevalent due to the increasing use of chemical abortion pills. That is why I am the SAVE Moms and Babies Act, is necessary, to ensure that the current FDA policy regulating these dangerous pills will stay in place—preventing expanded use—to protect the health and safety of women.

I am a committed advocate for pro-life policies, for the protection of the sanctity of life. I appreciate and thank those who offer an unwavering dedication to defending the unborn, despite a culture that often marginalizes pro-life values. Such perseverance is incredibly inspiring. It is an important reminder that we must all be a voice for the voiceless.

The fight for life must continue.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROSE).

Mr. ROSE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, today, on behalf of the tens of millions of voices forever lost to abortion since Roe v. Wade, I come before this body to mourn the tragic loss of life our country has experienced in this last 47 years.

The Tennesseans I represent overwhelmingly support the right to life; and like most folks in Tennessee’s Sixth Congressional District, I firmly believe that life begins at conception. Throughout my first term in Congress, I have been proud to fight for the children still to come who cannot speak for themselves.

As a father, I am especially touched by the solemn and joyous responsibility our Heavenly Father entrusts to us through the blessing of little ones. Even one child’s life shortened before reaching his or her own God-given potential is a tragedy, and yet that has happened tens of millions of times in the last 47 years since Roe v. Wade was decided in the Supreme Court.

Heartbreakingly, Norma McCorvey, also known as Jane Roe, was a real mother, and, ultimately, she was a real advocate for the unborn. Later in her life, Ms. McCorvey came to faith in God and joined the pro-life community in believing that every child’s life is worth protecting.

Ms. McCorvey is no longer with us, but her story lives on. Today I call on my colleagues to search their souls, just as Ms. McCorvey—Jane Roe—did and choose life.

Who are we to decide which precious children designed by God have the chance to live on this Earth and which do not?

Our country was founded with this belief underscored: “that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.”

With the words of the Declaration of Independence in mind, I signed onto an amicus brief supporting life in the upcoming June Medical Services v. Gee Supreme Court case. It is well past time for the Supreme Court to uphold the right to life and overrule Roe v. Wade.

Ms. McCorvey—Jane Roe—agreed, and, overwhelmingly, so do the Tennesseans that I represent.

In this new decade, may our country’s legacy be of life and a new generation of hope.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG), my good friend and colleague.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, “Around her neck hung a gold necklace that said ‘Best Mom,’ a Christmas present from her two daughters.”

“Stefanie closed her eyes, just as she does at the dentist. ’That way I don’t have to see what’s going on,’ she said. ’Ten minutes later, the sleepless nights, the tighter jeans, the third child that she said would have strained the family’s finances, were a memory.’”

That shocking article was in the Chicago Tribune 17 years ago, 2003. That child who would have strained the family’s finances would have been a senior high school student and who knows what more.

Back then, 40 million babies had been aborted since Roe v. Wade. Today, 61 million. January 22 marks the 47th anniversary of Roe v. Wade.

As recently as yesterday, in committee, I heard abortion defended as a “woman’s constitutional right to choose, the best for her own body and interests.”

Now, someone decried the fact that there are so many men standing and speaking today, but we men have always stood to defend the innocent and to defend our families. So, proudly, today, we do the same.

Charles Darwin said, “great is the power of steady misrepresentation.”
And so we have created a lie. We have chosen a lie. We have been sold a lie. We have lived a lie. We have even tried to make it the truth, but it is still a lie. And children, innocents, and women have been hurt because of it; and, ultimately, all life has been cheapened.

May God change our hearts.

Our children are not our burdens; they are our hope. Our children are tomorrow’s dreams and ideas and imagination. Our children are the pioneers who unlock more secrets of God's universe, harness new technologies for peace, strive to create a world freer from want, and bring forth long-awaited cures for dreaded diseases. They are our artists, our poets, who will make life more vivid and colorful, and the faithful one who will serve God and their fellow beings.

Babies aren’t a choice once they are conceived; they are a gift from our loving creator, God. Thomas Jefferson wisely wrote: "I believe in God who gave us life, gave us liberty at the same time."

And so I end by saying human liberty is inseparably linked to human life. God helps us as a nation to choose life and liberty.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FLORES).

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. SMITH for all his great work to protect life and to reflect the values that this country holds dear.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in remembrance of the millions of innocent lives lost in the 47 years since the tragic Supreme Court decision, Roe v. Wade.

Since 1973, freely accessible abortion has fostered a culture of death in America, and the expansion of clinics like Planned Parenthood have normalized abortion and stolen the futures of over 50 million innocent lives.

Here are some statistics from Planned Parenthood’s own annual report:

In 2019 alone, they aborted 345,670 innocent, defenseless lives. Think about that from a personal perspective. That is over 100,000 more persons than the population of Waco and McLennan County, Texas, the largest county in Texas District 17, which has over 250,000 plus Texans.

This genocide constitutes over 96 percent of their pregnancy resolution services sold, with all of them; which prenatal and adoption referral services accounted for less than 4 percent of pregnancy resolution services.

While they may seek to mask their intentions under the banner of women’s health, make no mistake, Planned Parenthood, an abortion factory dedicated to providing, protecting, and expanding access to abortion.

Moreover, something else to think about is that at least 50 percent of those babies killed are girls. Recent reports indicate that over 50 percent of children of color. Think about the misogyny and the racism of those gender-cidal numbers.

I strongly believe that life begins at conception, and as a father and a Christian, I am deeply committed to protecting the sanctity of life. In the 116th Congress, I have sought to be a voice for those who cannot speak for themselves and have cosponsored over 20 bills to that effect, and, unfortunately, the U.S. is one of them. But Americans want better: 82 percent of Americans believe that abortion should be restricted. However, radicals on the left are taking abortion to a new extreme trying to justify killing a healthy, 7-pound baby up until the point of birth.

Can you imagine?

Some even try to justify killing a baby who survives an abortion attempt. In fact, we have a petition on this floor called the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, and there are 240 Members of this body who refuse to sign that petition. This is repugnant.

Can you imagine, as the Virginia Governor described, a baby born in a botched abortion: What we do is make the child comfortable and then talk with the mother and the other stakeholders to decide whether we kill the baby.

That is un-American.

In the 47 years since Roe v. Wade, we killed over 60 million of these children. That is why I am proud to cosponsor H.R. 50 which will memorialize the unborn by raising the United States flag to half-staff on the 22nd of January each year.

Mr. Speaker, I pray that the hearts and minds of every person in this country, particularly those who are Members of this body, will change and vote for life.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my good friend and colleague for his very eloquent statement.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOHO).

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to tell Congressman CHRIS SMITH how proud I am, that he is one of my heroes for doing what he is doing. The gentleman has never wavered on this.

Mr. Speaker, as we approach the anniversary of Roe v. Wade, it is a solemn reminder of the tragedy that continues to befall some of our Nation’s unborn children. We should repeat this again on Mother’s Day.

For 47 years the Nation has allowed the sanctity of life to be questioned and infringed upon. All of us in this Chamber are here because we were granted the blessing of life. We were allowed to live our lives and decide what path we wished to embark upon. Unfortunately, not all Americans are allowed this choice. Some children are stopped before they can even defend themselves.

I, along with many of my colleagues, cannot and will not accept that reality. A reality where we as a nation provide more protection for an unhatched bald eagle or a turtle embryo, i.e., an egg,
than we do the children of our own species.

It is my hope that on this anniversary we can pray for the souls of those children lost and work towards a future where all children are allowed to decide when they are born and whether they live or not, a Nation of ours. Our Founding Fathers were grounded in the Christian principles this Nation was founded on.

2 Chronicles 7:14: "If my people, who are called by my name, will humble themselves, and pray and seek my face, and turn from their wicked ways; then will I hear from heaven, and I will forgive their sin, and will heal their land."

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, again I point out to my colleagues that there are so many medical doctors who are part of this pro-life effort. Hopefully, their views, like all of ours, but theirs especially, will be weighed and, hopefully, people will agree to the great work that Dr. Joyce is doing.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. JOYCE).

Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. And I want to acknowledge Mr. Speier from New Jersey for taking such courageous leadership on this very important issue. We as a body and they thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, 47 years of the amoral destruction of life is 47 years too long. As a physician, my pro-life conviction is rooted in the Hippocratic oath's commitment to protecting human life. In the medical community, each of us is called to do everything in our power to protect the patients to whom we are assigned. Each of us pledges to do no harm.

Mr. Speaker, Roe v. Wade directly contradicts this oath. Each life is a precious gift that is truly worthy of our protection.

As our Nation marks another tragic anniversary of Roe v. Wade, I remain committed to serving as a steadfast voice for the voiceless. As we continue this fight, I remain eternally hopeful that our Nation will someday value all human life for its inherent worth and its dignity.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. WATKINS), who represents the Second Congressional District.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for his leadership on this. This Congress is better because of it, and this Nation is better because of the gentleman's efforts.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to be a voice for the voiceless. There is no effort more important than our protecting the sanctity of life. As a true political freshman, new to Congress and new to politics, I was so proud that the first bill I put my name on was to defund Plan B Parenthood.

Most recently I introduced H.R. 4800, the Pro-LIFE Act. My bill would close the "valuable consideration" loophole by prohibiting the sale of human fetal issues. These are unborn babies' hearts, livers, bones, and brains that are used in experiments. I urge my colleagues to please sign on to my Pro-LIFE Act, H.R. 4800.

May God bless the unborn, and may God have mercy on us all.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CLOUD), who is my friend and colleague.

Mr. CLOUD. Mr. Speaker, January 22 marks the 47th anniversary of the United States Supreme Court decision, Roe v. Wade. On that day, in a historic moment of judicial overreach and without legislative action, the Supreme Court declared abortion legal in our country. Since then 61 million babies have been robbed of their right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Today we know much more than we did when Roe v. Wade was handed down. Decades of scientific advancements have revealed much about the development and vitality of the unborn child. We know, for example, beyond any shadow of a doubt that unborn babies feel and react to pain at just 20 weeks, which means, yes, they do feel the pain of an abortion.

Fetal heart rate monitors and 3D ultrasounds are commonly used by expectant mothers today. The use of this technology was very limited in 1973, but now we know that the sounds of heartbeats and images of a moving baby reveal one thing to us, and that is life. Continued scientific discovery and the technological advancements have only strengthened the case that the life of a child yet to be born is precious.

I do believe that everyone has a right to life and equal protection under the law. Thomas Jefferson once said: "Indeed I tremble for my country when I reflect that God is just, that His justice cannot sleep forever." I pray for the country on this Nation. I pray that we in this Chamber and those across our Nation will continue to work together to end this injustice.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield to another gentleman from Texas (Mr. WRIGHT), and I thank him for sponsoring the Teleabortion Prevention Act and the Child Custody Protection Act.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Mr. Smith for his incredible leadership on the issue in the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, 47 years ago the moral and religious fabric of the United States was tragically torn. As a result of the Roe v. Wade decision, 61 million unborn children have lost their lives, and millions of women and families have been torn apart by abortion. I promised my constituents that I would be a voice for the voiceless in Washington, and I have no intention of breaking that promise.

Over the past year my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have time and time again blocked legislation that protects the unborn and women's health. Last year we saw lawmakers block the Born-Alive Survivors Protection Act over 80 times, explicitly endorsing infanticide.

A number of important pro-life bills have been introduced in this Congress, including, as Mr. Smith mentioned, my Teleabortion Prevention Act and the Child Custody Protection Act that protects young women who are being taken across State lines for an abortion. Both have been stalled by partisan politics.

We also saw lawmakers in New York and Virginia cheer legislation that would allow abortions in the ninth month of pregnancy when most babies are viable. This is an outrage. Protecting the voiceless unborn is one of the most significant contributions we can make in our lives, and we, as a nation, need to get back to protecting it.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. GUEST), who represents the Third Congressional District.

Mr. GUEST. Mr. Speaker, Jeremiah 1:5 states: "Before I formed you in the womb I knew you, before you were born I set you apart." In Roe v. Wade that have passed since Roe v. Wade, over 45 million Americans have tragically been robbed of their lives through abortion. The fight to protect the lives of our unborn children, however, has grown stronger since Roe v. Wade.

As we have developed a better understanding of the immense consequences that abortion inflicts on the mother, our society, and, most importantly, the child in the womb, individual States, including my home State of Mississippi, have enacted more than 1,000 preventive laws to protect the unborn. As a pro-life Member I am proud to join the bipartisan group of Representatives and Senators who have filed an amicus brief that outlines the arguments of why Roe v. Wade should be overturned.

I am grateful for the tremendous leadership of President Trump and his administration to ensure the Federal Government's regulatory efforts to preserve life.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage every American to join the movement to protect our unborn children and support efforts to defend the right to life.

THE 47TH ANNUAL MARCH FOR LIFE

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. Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, some of my friends up here should have more interesting things to say, so I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), who is my good friend.
Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON).

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman CHRIS SMITH for his dedication and leadership, and I thank Congressman GROTHMAN from Wisconsin for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, on January 22, 1973, the Supreme Court struck down State and Federal right-to-life laws in their decision on Roe v. Wade. Since then over 61 million unborn children have been stripped of their right to life, and our country has denied itself future teachers, doctors, farmers, neighbors, friends, and loved ones.

I am grateful to stand with my colleagues in Congress to defend the right to life for the unborn. In the House we have worked to pass commonsense pro-life legislation such as H.R. 962, the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act. This bill would give a child the right to live if he or she is born alive after an abortion or attempted abortion. With over 190 cosponsors, this bill has been shamefully dropped by House Democrats for a vote 80 different times.

Last weekend I attended the Right to Life Dinner featuring Governor Henry McMaster and First Lady Peggy McMaster and appreciated participating with thousands of citizens across the State for a program emceed by Attorney General Alan Wilson at the Statehouse in Columbia.

South Carolina Citizens for Life work tirelessly to protect innocent human lives, and I appreciate the leadership of Lisa Van Riper, Holly Gatling, Alexia Newman, Karen Iacovelli Forster, Brenda Hucks, and Sally Zaleski for their hard work and dedication.

I look forward to welcoming next weekend the participants for the March for Life in Washington. Each year tens of thousands of students from across America will show their appreciation of life.

This year is special in that my oldest grandson and namesake, Addison Wilson III, will attend with a delegation from Holy Trinity Classical Christian School of Beaufort, South Carolina.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA).

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN), my colleague, and also CHRIS SMITH for his tireless leadership on this.

In the 47 years since Roe v. Wade, more than 60 million children whose lives have ended too soon. Life is the most fundamental human right, and I believe that life begins at conception.

Science continues to build a case for this, and as technology develops, women are getting a clearer view of the lives inside them when they go to the doctor’s office. At just 6 weeks, an ultrasound can detect a child’s heartbeat. At 20 weeks, a baby, we know, can feel pain in the womb. Unfortunately, many States still allow abortions after this stage.

There is no fooling anyone anymore on this. These are true lives inside the womb, not just clumps of cells. Science and technology can now attest that life exists in the womb. If this is true, as I believe it is, those 60 million unborn babies deserved to have the most basic right, the right to live.

Mr. Speaker, I thank all those pro-life lawmakers who will be here this month at the March for Life and those who are doing it at home in their communities, at those clinics, at those pro-life centers. They have to endure a lot of harsh rhetoric from people on the other side of this. They, indeed, are doing the Lord’s work. May God bless them, and I thank them for being part of this.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. Biggs), my friend.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate Mr. GROTHMAN for yielding. I appreciate the gentleman for yielding and appreciate him sharing his time with us, and Representative SMITH for his tireless work on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I am immensely grateful to live in Arizona, a State that prioritizes the protection of the unborn. During my tenure in the Arizona State Legislature, we passed dozens of pro-life bills. In fact, Arizona was recently named one of the top three pro-life States in the Union by Americans United for Life.

I appreciate the efforts of pro-life advocates across my district who have worked tirelessly to help countless women choose life for their unborn babies. The Arizona March for Life is taking place this weekend in Phoenix, and I wish them great success.

You see, pro-abortion advocates are the Luddites of our time. They deny the reality of what science has repeatedly demonstrated this unborn. There is nothing that we do in Congress that will have efficacy if we choose to and fail to protect the most innocent among us.

This Congress, I introduced H.R. 2742, the Abortion Is Not Health Care Act, to prevent abortions from being considered a tax-deductible medical expense. I have also cosponsored nearly two dozen bills seeking to protect the unborn, including the Pain-Capable Untold Stories Act. Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, the Defund Planned Parenthood Act, and the Heartbeat Protection Act.

As we are here tonight, I can’t help but think of when my wife was pregnant and we expected each of our children. Karen without today’s technology, we knew that each of those children was special, a unique individual, alive and helpless, dependent upon us, and that we had a responsibility for their safety and well-being.

How can this Nation, founded under the principles and understanding of God’s direction and hand in the formation of this country, how can we expect the affirming and continued blessings of the Deity, whom we all revere, if we continue to sacrifice on the altar of selfishness these unborn children?

Mr. Speaker, I call on my colleagues to end this practice.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) for their work in this area.

Mr. Speaker, there was a time not long ago when STEVE KING at the Conservative Opportunity Society had a young lady named Nalona Trivino who came and spoke to us. An extraordinary woman, she was top in her class, as I recall, and became pregnant at 16. She was encouraged by some to abort the child, but she didn’t. She didn’t go through with it. There was an opening for director at a Planned Parenthood facility in Sherman, Texas, for which she would apply.

She was thrilled when she had the chance to be director. But she had that daughter who meant and means so much to her, and she was surprised at the monthly meetings that the thing that was pushed most was not to get the number of abortions up, but if they would push taking birth control pills to the younger girls, then that would ensure that they would have revenue up from abortions, that the key was getting birth control pills to the youngest girls. They were more likely to come many days and get pregnant, and they would come back in for an abortion.

That was the way they were trained. They were trained to encourage the young girls that came in: We will keep this between us. If you have money, it can't be trusted, but we can. We will keep your secrets, and you can have a very open lifestyle and enjoy yourself. If there are problems, you come back to me. You don't have to tell me.

That is so destructive to the family. It is destructive to the mother-child relationship. It has led to the millions of abortions that have been performed, as sanctioned by Planned Parenthood.

One other thing I have to mention that struck me so harshly, in the Committee on the Judiciary, we had a doctor that did late-term abortion. He said he did over a thousand of them and never thought about it. The mom’s cervix was not dilated so for a late-term abortion—and he was very graphic about the manner in which you went in.

You would find something that seemed linear, and it was either an arm or a hand. You had to pull it off. Once you had done that four times, you had to feel for something bulbous, he said, and then that had to be crushed. Then, you could remove the child.

After his daughter was tragically killed in a car accident, he couldn’t do it anymore. The thought of pulling a little child apart was more than he could bear.
Mr. Speaker, it ought to be more than Americans could bear, coming between a mother and daughter, the mother who wants the best for her child. It should be unthinkable for a loving, caring, nonabusive mother. That is why it is unthinkable, but that is what is going on. That is what Roe v. Wade has led to.

You may say: Well, you are just a guy. What do you know? I have defended what some people said were indefensible people, and it is an honor to stand up and defend a child that can't speak.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DAVIDSON).

Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I thank my colleagues who have taken the time tonight to speak in defense of life.

Next week, a beautiful, peaceful protest will take place here in Washington, the March for Life, in which not tens but hundreds of thousands of Americans will gather, including many from the Eighth District of Ohio.

When I have looked across that vast crowd in the past on the National Mall, I have been filled with hope for our future because the faces in that crowd are overwhelmingly young people. The younger generations are increasingly pro-life. They feel the effects of more than 60 million elective abortions carried out in America since 1973.

These 60 million lives had so much potential. They could have been someone's spouse, brother, sister. They would have been mothers and fathers in their own right, but their lives were snuffed out by abortion.

We should, of course, have compassion for the women whose babies' lives have ended through abortion. Too often, they lacked support, been pressured or deceived into a fateful choice to end their baby's life.

Mr. Speaker, I especially want to honor and encourage women like Mya, the former head of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention's Abortion Surveillance Unit, said live births 'are little known because organized medicine, from fear of public clamor and legal action, treats them more as an embarrassment piled up than a problem to be solved. It is like turning yourself in to the IRS.' he goes on, 'for an audit. What is there to gain? The tendency is not to report because there are only negative incentives.'

Mr. Speaker, I would remind my colleagues that Philadelphia abortionist Kermit Gosnell, one of the few who got caught, was convicted for murder, for killing children who were born alive after attempting abortions.

The grand jury said it this way: 'Gosnell had a simple solution for unwanted babies he delivered: He killed them. He didn't call it that. He called it 'ensuring fetal demise.' The way he ensured fetal demise was by sticking scissors into the baby's neck and cutting the spinal cord. He called that 'snipping.'"

Mr. Speaker, we have tried the whole year to bring the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act introduced by Ann Wagner and 191 of us to a vote here in this House. I, again, with my colleagues, appeal to the leadership: These children need protection. The unborn children need protection.

Congressmen Andy Biggs and Doug LaMalfa said it so well a few moments ago, that we have such a clearer picture of the unborn as well. Andy said, even without today's technology, he and his wife knew there was a baby. Ultrasound shatters the myth that an unborn child is nonhuman, alive, and extremely vulnerable.

Mr. Speaker, let's protect the children.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I will address a few topics tonight, but before I start on these other topics, I, as well, will address the March for Life.

As has been mentioned, we are dealing with the 47th anniversary of Roe v. Wade. Hopefully, over 200,000 people will be here in Washington next week, and those of us where we are doing our work back in the district so I won't be able to be here for it.

It is still kind of amazing that, in 1973, I think it was seven out of nine judges, which is kind of a bad testimony to the law schools of this Nation.

As a matter of fact, recently, things have gotten worse. I am sure my colleagues have talked about the bill recently signed into law in New York, which, in essence, a goal appears to be allowing you to snuff out the life of a newborn baby right before it is born.

There is danger that a similar law is soon going to pass in Virginia.

I challenge the clergy in this country. And I know some of them don't like to say uncomfortable truths, apparently, but I challenge them to do something here.

Somebody just mentioned the movie "Gosnell," and there is another movie, "Unplanned." I think these are movies that would be wise for the clergy in this country to make sure people were aware of so they saw exactly what was going on.

Obviously, what we have here is kind of a silent ending of millions of lives. Most people do not know it is going on. It doesn't affect them on a daily basis. But it is time for the clergy and churches of this country to step up to the plate.

I wish well for all the people who are going to come from all over the country and attend the March for Life.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, there are other things I am going to address right now, one a little bit related. I
would like to talk a little bit about the Knights of Columbus.

We live in a society that claims to value diversity and tolerance; however, sometimes things bubble up in this town. It is apparent that some people are hated and the intolerance applies to them.

I am speaking, of course, of the fact that, about 2 years ago, a little over 2 years ago now, a U.S. Senator from California, with a confirmation hearing on a Federal judge, decided to weigh in and felt that, if you were a member of the Knights of Columbus, perhaps you shouldn’t become a Federal judge.

Recently, rereading the statements made there and the lack of outrage at what, apparently, was a religious test, or close to a religious test, to become a Federal judge, I thought I would like to take a little bit about the Knights of Columbus, which is very active in my district.

The Knights were founded as a Catholic group in 1882, in Connecticut, and, currently, there are about 2 million Knights having fish fries for the United States, but there are also some in Canada, New Zealand, England—or Britain—and a few other countries.

They have been active during that time, and they do a lot to help people. They seem almost ubiquitous in my district with all the fundraisers they have.

A few weeks ago, I attended a meat raffle for the Princeton Knights of Columbus in which they were helping out a Vietnam veteran who had cancer. I want to point out that the Knights will help out not just Catholic people, but people who aren’t Catholic as well.

The Princeton Knights were also doing a chili fundraiser to help a gentleman with prostate cancer.

Other groups I see around, can be seen: the Cedarburg Knights selling Tootsie Rolls for Special Olympics or pregnancy health centers; the Fond du Lac Knights having fish fries for youth hockey and handicapped children.

You see the Neenah Knights running concession stands at the Packers games, the Mayville Knights doing a calendar fundraiser for the local food pantry, the Oshkosh Knights doing a bowling fundraiser for coats for kids, or Men for Christ. I mean, you see the good works that the Knights are doing everywhere.

I wish I had time to go through all the other organizations and list exactly the fundraisers they have. The Two Rivers, Manitowoc, Sheboygan, Fredonia, Horicon, wherever I go, I see the Knights are active helping people out.

I always kind of consider the Knights of Columbus kind of like mom and apple pie. You know, you could stand here in Congress, and Congressmen would go out of their way to praise groups like the Knights of Columbus and be seen with the Knights of Columbus.

But, apparently, they are not so much like mom and apple pie anymore.

We have had Members of this body, and not from small, insignificant States. Members of this body apparently now feeling that that is something to be attacked for. And, of course, it is not.

They are helping out at the Special Olympics, they have hockey; that has caused them to be hated or feel that they shouldn’t be part of the public square. It is, of course, that they are active in the Catholic church, a church that is pro-life, that apparently some people feel that the Knights of Columbus, therefore, should step aside and can’t be trusted to make decisions as far as where we are going in the United States of America.

Recently, Joe Biden came out, actually, and even said that the Senator from California would make a great Vice President. I mean, can you imagine that?

Can you imagine, 40 years ago, in this country, somebody saying that the Knights of Columbus, that a member of the Knights maybe shouldn’t be a Federal judge?

That is a great thing she says. Let’s make her a Vice President. I think that is a great thing.

In any event, speaking on behalf of myself, I would like to thank the Knights for all they do around the Sixth Congressional District. I hope they continue to speak out on Christian issues, on Catholic issues.

I hope the other clergy, clergy who may not be Catholic themselves, realize that they could be next to be targeted by these Members of Congress. But, again, I thank the Knights of Columbus for all they do.

Mr. Speaker, I guess I have a few minutes more here. I have, what, 5 more minutes?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 5 minutes remaining.

IMPEACHMENT AND IMMIGRATION

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, we spent a lot of time, too much time on this impeachment thing. I think the reason people want to talk about impeachment is they don’t like to talk about all the things that ought to be getting done that Congress isn’t doing when they are talking about impeachment.

I want to, one more time, talk about what I think is the number one issue that is going to destroy America, and that is the immigration situation. We continue to have people come across the border.

President Trump, on his own, has dropped the number of people coming in this country from over 50,000 allowed in this country and placed in this country last May to under 1,000 by the Border Patrol in December.

Nevertheless, laws should be changed quickly to make sure that this does not continue, or should be changed quickly before some of these Federal judges try to stop President Trump from trying to do what he is doing.

The Congress should be brought in to change the credible fear standard to make sure everybody under the Sun can’t say that they should be a refugee.

We want to change the laws with regard to the Traffic Victim Protection Reparations Act. Right now, so people understand, if we get somebody under age 18 from Canada or Mexico from Canada or Mexico—we have to send them back; from other countries, we are forced to keep families apart.

I know President Trump would desperately like to return a minor from Honduras or Venezuela or Cuba back to their parents, but right now, he is forbidden from doing that because Congress refuses to act.

We should be cracking down on welfare for illegal immigrants right now, which serves as an inducement for the most irresponsible of people to come to the United States, but Congress doesn’t act.

We have built, or we are soon going to build, 100 miles toward the wall, but we still need more money. We hope we have enough money by the end of the year. But that is not going to be enough, particularly when you consider that, right now, the DEA thinks that 95 percent of the fentanyl, cocaine, heroin, or meth in this country is coming across our borders.

I will guarantee you there are people who are going back to their districts next week and, at their townhalls, are claiming that they care about the over 60,000 people who died last year from these drugs, but they aren’t doing anything to enforce that border where 95 percent of these drugs—fentanyl, cocaine, heroin, and meth—are coming across.

It is time we act there, as well. We need more money for what we call non-intrusive technology so we can determine when these drugs are coming across in cars or otherwise, as well as it would be a good thing to get more dogs.

We have been down at the border myself and seen how effective they are at preventing these drugs from coming across that are killing so many people.

In any event, I hope the rest of the public and our mainstream media, as well as our conservative media, don’t fall apart and don’t fall into the trap of being all impeachment all the time over the next 3 or 4 months.

Remember all the people who are dying because of the drugs coming across the border. Remember the huge burden on the United States as more people come across the border for things such as welfare-type benefits, and imagine what type of future America has if we don’t begin to enforce our laws.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Byrd, one of its clerks, announced that the Secretary inform the House of Representatives that the Senate is ready to receive the Managers appointed by
the House for the purpose of exhibiting articles of impeachment against Donald John Trump, President of the United States, agreeably to the notice communicated to the Senate, and that at the hour of 12:00 noon, on Thursday, January 16, 2020, the Senate will receive the managers on the part of the House of Representatives, in order that they may present and exhibit the articles of impeachment against Donald John Trump, President of the United States.

The message also announced that the Secretary of the Senate notify the House of Representatives that at the hour of 2:00 p.m., on Thursday, January 16, 2020, in the Senate Chamber, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the articles of impeachment against Donald John Trump, President of the United States.

AMERICA IS BECOMING MORE PRO-LIFE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 3, 2019, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) for 30 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege and honor to address you here on the floor of the House of Representatives. And given that we have had some serious discussion here this evening, I really appreciate my colleagues and others who have spent an hour addressing the life issue here.

As we come up on the anniversary of Roe v. Wade, January 22—I believe that is a date that will live in infamy—the Supreme Court building. We often host bus to get here, and they gather on The Mall for the events and the speeches and the rally and then march to the Supreme Court building. We often host them here with some hot chocolate.

Each of these years that go by, I meet more and more young people that have become part of the pro-life network. So the network that is here, it strengthens people. They look around and they see that they are not alone. They come from churches; they come from schools; they come from families; they come from neighborhoods; and they understand that they are not alone, that there is a patchwork of people that are active across this country that is emerging into the majority in America.

I will submit that we are now a majority pro-life nation, and that would be consistent with polling, the Barna poll that we did about, I suppose, a year and a half ago or a little more that showed that, just on the Heartbeat bill alone, which I happen to be the author of, H.R. 490, that we saw 61 percent support for the Heartbeat bill, without exceptions. Republicans were up at about 85 or 86 percent; independents were around in the 60th percentile; and Democrats are even in support of it, in the majority, at 59 percent of Democrats.

So it would have been that America was a little bit ignorant about the beginning of life and the science of life and the moment that life begins, but we all knew that in our hearts when, in 1973, it was one thing, and it was a political atrocity that was driven and in which people were attached to your lapels and your delegation credentials that are out there. And on a Thursday afternoon at 3:00 I see on the tri-fold schedule there that said Christian Women for Choice are gathering there in San Diego at a location about a block and a half away from the convention center.

Something called me internally and said, you have to go down there and see what is going on. I was curious. What scenes would we see from Christian Women for Choice? I took a friend with me and we went down and found this area. It was about an acre, I suppose, in size, maybe a little less, chain-link fence all the way around, stairs in the middle, big old speakers up there and microphones. There were people still milling around, but there wasn’t a program going on on the stage at that point.

I went to an individual that looked like he was at least associated with somebody in charge and I asked him who was the leader of this and who is the head of the Christian Women for Choice. And he said, that is my wife, and he pointed to her and took me over and introduced me. We ended up on the stage. And as that conversation began, it became a debate.

And I remember there in San Diego, for every delegate—I remember the number they told me—and I always rolled it as 15,000 people in that city to cover the convention.

So we had quite a lot of press in that protest zone where they would be looking for controversy. So the leader of Christian Women for Choice and I went at it in kind of a no-holds barred debate that just clashed back and forth between us. And several of the others would chime in for her, and every once in a while her husband would put his chin up over her shoulder, and he would work some things at me, too.

Mr. Speaker, I was working from home and convicted enough, having enough conviction for those that don’t understand what that means, that I could just unload all of the things that needed to be said in the middle of that debate.

She began to demand that we go out and collect the billions of dollars in child support that is owed by deadbeat dads is what she called them. And I said, I am happy to do that. I think the people that pay their child support, and I will be working to do that—it turned out in the Iowa Senate for starters—but you can’t make that
claim because that father doesn’t have anything to say about whether that child is going to be born or not. If the mother is the only one that has anything to say, then when that child is born you don’t have the claim that the father needs to be in the child’s life. Save the baby’s life, protect this baby, and then we can hold the father to this. I am happy to do that. You don’t have any claim to that, because you don’t give the father any say in whether that baby is going to be born or not, and they were helpless to do anything about it. They want the baby. They say, I will raise the baby. It is mine. This is my flesh and blood. Give birth to this baby and I will take care of this baby for life. And when the mother says I am the child’s mother, it is even a spiritual act. And I have had that happen close enough to me that I know that to be fact as well, Mr. Speaker.

But in that debate with the head of the Christian Women for Choice in San Diego, she said, “I hardly believe that.” Sometimes when you are tested under fire you get to a place where the principles are tempered to a point where they are no longer negotiable and they are as rock solid as they can be.

Now I stand in auditoriums in schools K through 12, wherever the situation might be, and I will say to them, “One day in your lives you will have this question come up around you, whether it is you asking the question or whether it is a friend of yours, acquaintance, or a relation, and it will be the question of abortion. Here are the two things you need to know”—and I will ask this question first, I will say, “Is life subordinated in all of its forms?” And they look a little bit slightly confused about what does “all of its forms” mean. And I say, “Look at the person next to you. You are sitting next to one of your friends. Is that person’s life sacred?” And they are looking at you. Is your life sacred? And they will nod their heads and say, “Yes, our lives are sacred.” I say, “So if you believe that human life is sacred, then is there any form of human life that is not sacred? How about a one that is a paraplegic, a quadriplegic, someone who is incapable of functioning verbally or getting up and moving in any way; is that person’s life sacred? I say, yes, and so do they. They recognize that we have to have compassion and compassion for all human beings.

And so then once you establish that human life is sacred in all of its forms, then I say to them: Now you only have to ask one other question and that is, at what moment does life begin? Does it begin a week after birth? Does it begin the day after birth? Does it begin the minute after birth? That doesn’t make sense to anybody in that gymnasium. These are young people, but they understand some things that seem to be confused over here some days, Mr. Speaker. I say to them, “What about that baby a minute before the baby is born, is that life?” And some of them might look a little confused, but most of them know it is life. But I will say, But how about the week before? How about the month before? How about if that baby is born by cesarean, when does that life begin? And the moment the mother is opened up by the surgeon in cesarean and that baby is brought forward? How could that be? We take it back to the moment of conception. We say even more accurately, the moment of fertilization, but the moment of conception.

We get to this place where most every young person in that gathering understands human life is sacred in all of its forms. It has to be the highest value that we can recite next to the highest value that we can recite next to be able to live outside the womb. And then we nurture that baby, up on that baby’s feet, we nurture that baby all the way through until that baby is in a condition where they can take care of themselves and can take care of their own parents and their own children. That is life. It is precious.

If you sit around in a household in a family, especially when we go through the holidays that we have gone through, Thanksgiving, Christmas, and New Year’s, where families gather together and you watch with joy as they interact with each other, and you know there might be in some of these homes—you know there are—there is a vacuum in the family because maybe grandpa or grandma has been such a big part of that family, but they still cherish the joy that they have shared. They don’t often lay an empty cradle there in the living room for that baby that was aborted, but that is also the soul and the spirit that is not there to share in that family joy as well.

This Nation has aborted 61-plus million babies. The back of the envelope calculation says that if half of them were girls and you look at the frequency of abortion going back to 1973 in the years that these women would have been babies you can easily get to the place where we are not just missing 61 million—I say that; it sounds odd even as I say it—we are not missing 61 million, as appalling and as ghastly as that is, we are probably missing another 61 million that were never born because their mothers were aborted. Add it up. Call it 120 million. Round it back to 100 million. Here we are in this country, we have aborted a workforce of 100 million. And I hear over here, well, we have to import people into America. We have to have cheap foreign labor because, after all, the total fertility rate is low enough in America. We are not replacing ourselves, and we are not raising enough workers to fill the gap.

I recall in the Iowa Senate there was a bill to require each health insurance policy to cover contraceptives and the Iowa State Senators made this argument—back then we were at a full employment workforce as well, Mr. Speaker, as full as it is right now. Right now we are kind of knocking on the door of the lowest unemployment we have had in Iowa. Well, we had that back in about 1997 or 1998, as well. Some of the State Senators went off to the women’s State legislators gathering, and they came back with this idea that was going to spread all over the country: every health insurance policy has to cover contraceptives.

Here is the argument they made: They said, with this short workforce that we have, this full employment economy we have, we can’t afford to have women missing work because they are pregnant or having babies and taking care of babies. And back then I said, Who is going to do the work in the next generation or two if we don’t have babies being born now? How do you fill that gap? It seemed to me to be a simple equation that I had raised, but yet their agenda worker took it and ran with it.

We need to remember, this Nation has sinned, and this sin of abortion weighs on the conscience of a country, a country that could well have 100 million more American babies born here, raised here, learning our civilization, learning our culture, learning our history, learning our language, sharing and growing an even greater Nation than we are today. And the recovery of that is heavy.

Even when we end this ghastly practice of aborting babies, innocent, unborn human life, we have a long way to go to ever get back to where nature would have had us if we hadn’t interfered with abortion.

It troubles me a great deal. And one of the things I have done is drafted and introduced the Heartbeat Protection Act. That is H.R. 490. What it does is it protects every baby that is heart beating, and that is about 6 weeks ultrasound. If that ultrasound produces a heartbeat, then that is the first certain physical sign of life in the womb, a heartbeat, and that is about 6 weeks into pregnancy. We don’t punish the mother. We do punish the so-called physician, the abortionist. If a heartbeat can be detected, the baby is protected. It is really that simple. And so it requires that if an abortionist is preparing to perform his trade, he must first do an ultrasound. If that ultrasound produces a heartbeat, then that is the first certain physical sign of life in the womb, a heartbeat, and that is about 6 weeks into pregnancy. We don’t punish the mother. We do punish the so-called physician, the abortionist. If a heartbeat can be detected, the baby is protected. It is really that simple.

It protects every baby because it is innocent, unborn human
life. These sacred souls, and I believe that God places a soul in that little baby at the moment of conception. But their sacred, little souls, we protect all of them.

There has been some discussion here in this Congress and around the country about exceptions for rape and incest. This bill doesn’t have exceptions for rape and incest. We had the votes to pass it off the floor of the House in the previous Congress a little more than a year ago, and we had the votes to sustain a veto going through the Judiciary Committee in the previous Congress a little more than a year ago. We didn’t get this to the markup in Judiciary. We had a hearing, we didn’t get it to markup, and therefore, we didn’t get it to the floor. I fear that we have failed an opportunity that we could have sent a very strong message over to the Senate, which likely would not have taken it up.

But to the rest of America, that having exceptions for rape or incest says that those babies are not precious. I argue that they are as precious to God as my own grandchildren are precious to me. There cannot be a legal distinction between a baby that is born as a result of conception that comes from rape or that comes from incest. In fact, they are as precious as any others.

In this legislation, H.R. 490, if we were to incorporate exceptions for rape and incest what we would have instead would be exceptions that the Court could look at and say, Just a minute. What about equal protection under the law? If there is going to be equal protections for all persons, whether born or unborn, then if there are exceptions for unborn persons that are the result of the act of rape or incest, then doesn’t the Court look at that and conclude that we are inconsistent and that the equal protection clause really doesn’t apply and that Congress didn’t apply the equal protection clause to all of the unborn?

We must protect all of them, Mr. Speaker.

From a moral standpoint, it is the right thing to do. From a legal and analytical standpoint, and with an anticipation of a court that would one day see this legislation—I would never sue on this, but you know the other side will—we have to make sure that we are consistent and that we are legally sound without exceptions for rape and incest.

Furthermore, if you have incest that is taking place in a family, if you allow abortion, that means that the family member that is perpetrating incest on usually the innocent young girl gets a pass each time there is an abortion because there is not evidence of his crime.

But if you prohibit abortions for the sake of incest, you are likely to uncover the crime of the family member that is abusing, generally, the young lady within the family.

So I am grateful for my colleagues, that they came here and each one of them spoke up with passion for innocent, unborn human life.

We will get there one day. Just like Dr. Martin Luther King said: I may not get there with you, but we are going to get there.

We will be a pro-life nation by law, and we will recognize these lives from the moment they are conceived within the womb.

Mr. Speaker, I will conclude the component of this discussion on the life issue. Again, I thank my colleagues for the work that they do.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to make a short comment here on another circumstance that has taken place in this Congress, and it works out like this, that a year ago last week, an unprecedented action took place in this Congress, and that was I did an interview with The New York Times, and I was misquoted in The New York Times.

That quote, some people would say that, well, it was an organic, spontaneous eruption of social media and print media. I say, instead, no, it was a highly organized effort to set this up and create a railroaded firestorm against me.

I knew that that was going to take place, and I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, why I know that. And that is, even I thought I had a nearly perfect storm created against me in the previous election, and we emerged from that with a victory, after the election and before Christmas of 2018, a very highly placed and respected political operative said to me they are going to try again. They have chosen a messenger to go to the President, and this messenger has the President’s ear.

The messenger is to convince the President to send out a negative tweet which is supposed going to trigger the worst firestorm of media assault on me that could possibly be unleashed, and that they would make that try again in that way.

Well, I preempted that at the White House to the extent I could, and I believe that was successful. In fact, I have no doubt that that was successful.

Then, by January 8 of last year, I was able to get a meeting with that messenger who said, ‘I would never do that to you, Peter’... but that also let the messenger know that I knew what the strategy was and what the attempt would be. I let them know that I am going to blow this thing wide open and tell the public what was going on if they made that effort.

That was on January 8. That sent the message through, perhaps, to any planners and strategists that I knew what was up.

The very next day, a State senator announced that he would challenge me in a primary. That was at 11:23 a.m. He had no media planned. He had no website. He had no activities or any kind of evidence that he was planning to run that was at least on paper. Still, he announced by Twitter that he was going to run against me.

He was also scheduled to swear in to the next General Assembly, the Iowa General Assembly, on the following Monday. That was the most improbable time for anyone to announce they are going to run in a primary against a seated Member of Congress was that day, but he did that that day anyway.

So I made the point here on the floor, that if I had uttered those words, it would have been in repetition to a question he asked me. But I often defend Western civilization. I never have used those words, those two odious ideologies. One of them is on this chart right here.

When I gave the answer that questioned the definition here of what is this, white nationalism, what is it, I said: It might have meant something different 1 or 2 or 3 years ago, but today it implies racist.

Well, what did it mean before that? We went back to the year 2000, LexisNexis, and it was virtually unused. You can see all the way along here.

Mr. Speaker, I will describe it because you can’t actually see it, but I can.

All the way along here, you can see that it is virtually unused until you get to 2016, and then this term was used 10,000-plus times, then 30,000. It is still up at 20,000 times, so 2016, 2017, and 2018.

I could not have been more accurate when I said: It might have meant something different 1, 2, or 3 years ago.

This is in 2018: 1, 2, or 3 years ago. What did it mean here, when nobody was using it? That is a hard definition to come up with because it is not in any definitions place here. You can’t look up two words together and find out what they mean by looking in a dictionary.

That is the annual records, Mr. Speaker. So we looked into 2016 and asked the question: When did this jump? Well, it jumped up big in the month of November and then up there pretty high yet in December 2016.

What happened in November? Two things. Donald Trump was elected President and the Democrats gathered at the Mandarin Occidental Hotel to plan a strategy and what they were going to do to prevent him from being an effective President.
Then we broke the month down, and here is what we have. November 14 and 15, the time that George Soros and the Democratic leaders were in the Mandarin Occidental Hotel planning a strategy. Well, was it a weaponization strategy to go for a long-term white nationalism? You bet, and that is what happened.

That is what happened, Mr. Speaker. So they launched that as a weaponization, and they used it as a weapon against me.

When I state those words here on the floor of the House of Representatives, I said there is a pause between the two odious ideologies and "Western civilization." I made that case, and then I demonstrated that significant pause.

Even though we have the best stenographers, I believe, in the world here, and they have been great for me to work with, it came out with exactly the same mispunctuation that The New York Times did.

So I have introduced the bill called H. Res. 789 to correct the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to at least reflect what the C-SPAN video shows that I said.

Now, it also demonstrates that those who can write, can write with that punctuation, it is pretty easy to explain what happened to The New York Times.

Meanwhile, there have been only four people in the history of the United States Congress who have been removed from their committees. Three of them are either Federal felons or confessed Federal—they have been convicted of Federal felonies or confessed to Federal felonies, three of them.

And me? There is not even a rule that I violated. It is just simply the will and the whim and the bloodlust of a political lynch mob, and that has been going on for over a year now today. And it is going to end, and I am not going to wait until this next year goes by and have to win another election and make a case.

Furthermore, the term "white nationalist" had never been consciously even uttered on the floor of the House of Representatives since 1789 all the way up until the time that Donald Trump was elected President or George Soros led this situation at the Mandarin Occidental Hotel.

So this resolution, H. Res. 789, is filed and cosponsors are signing on to it.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD an article from POLITICO.

FROM POLITICO, Nov. 14, 2016

Soros BANDS WITH DONORS TO RESIST Trump, ‘TAKE BACK POWER’

By Kenneth P. Vogel

Major liberal funders have regrouped behind closed doors with Hillary, Warren, Ellison, and union bosses to lick wounds, rethink strategy and retrain.

George Soros and other rich liberals who spent tens of dollars of dollars of dollars to elect Hillary Clinton are gathering in Washington for a three-day, closed door meeting to retool the big-money left to fight back against Donald Trump.

The conference, which kicked off Sunday night at Washington’s pricey Mandarin Oriental hotel, is sponsored by the influential Democracy Alliance donor club, and will include appearances by leaders of most leading unions and liberal groups, as well as darlings of the left such as House Judiciary Committee Chair Nancy Pelosi, Sen. Elizabeth Warren and Congressional Progressive Caucus co-chairman Keith Ellison, according to an agenda obtained by POLITICO.

The meeting is the first major gathering of the institutional left since Trump’s shocking victory over Hillary Clinton in last week’s presidential election. The agenda is any indication, liberals plan full-on trench warfare against Trump from Day One. Some sessions deal with gearing up for 2017 and 2018 elections to thwarting President-elect Trump’s 100-day plan, which the agenda calls “a terrifying assault on President Obama’s achievements—and our progressive vision for an equitable and just nation.”

Yet the meeting also comes as many liberals are reassessing their approach to politics—and the role of the Democracy Alliance, or DA, as the club is known in Democratic finance circles. The DA, its donors and beneficiaries, I suppose have had a major hand in shaping the institutions of the left, including by orienting some of its key organizations around Clinton, and by leasing their base in the area that minorities and women constituted a so-called “rising American electorate” that could tip elections to Democrats.

That didn’t work in the presidential election, where Trump won largely on the strength of his support from working-class whites. Additionally, exit polls suggested that issue like climate change and the role of money in politics—which the DA’s beneficiary groups have used to try to turn out voters—didn’t resonate as much with the voters who carried Trump to victory.

“The DA itself should be called into question,” said one Democratic strategist who has been active in the group and is attending the meeting. “You can make a very good case it’s nothing more than a social club for a handful wealthy white donors and labor union officials to drink wine and read memos, as the Democratic Party burns down around them.”

Another liberal operative who has been active in the DA since its founding rejected the notion that the group—or the left, more generally—needed to completely retool its approach to politics and strategy. “We should not learn the wrong lesson from this election,” said the operative, pointing out that Clinton is on track to win the popular vote and that Trump got fewer votes than the last GOP presidential nominee, Mitt Romney. “We need our people to vote in greater numbers. For that to happen, we need candidates who inspire them to go to the polls on Election Day.”

But Gara LaMarche, the president of the DA, on Sunday evening told donors gathered at the Mandarin Occidental Hotel planning a strategy to go for a long-term white nationalism that some reassessment was in order. According to prepared remarks he provided to POLITICO, he said, “You don’t lose an election you were supposed to win and get up and start at stake, without making some big mistakes, in assumptions, strategy and tactics.”

LaMarche’s reassessment “must take place without recrimination and finger-pointing, whatever frustration and anger some of us feel about our own allies in these times. It must be a process we should not rush, even as we gear up to resist the Trump administration.”

LaMarche emailed the donors last week that the conference is in the process of assessing “what steps we will take together to resist the assaults that are coming and take back power, beginning in the states in 2017 and 2018.”

In addition to sessions focusing on protecting Obamacare and other pillars of the progressive legacy, by President-elect Trump, the agenda includes panels on rethinking polling and the left’s approach to winning the vote, as well as sessions stressing the importance of channeling cash to state legislative policy battles and races, where Republicans won big victories last week.

Democrats need to invest more in training officials and developing policies in the states, argued Rep. Ellison (D-Minn.) on a Friday afternoon donor conference call, according to someone on the call. The call was organized by a DA-endorsed group called the State Innovation Exchange (or SIX), which Ellison urged the donors to support.

Ellison, who is scheduled to speak on a Monday afternoon panel at the DA meeting on the challenge Democrats face in winning working-class votes, has been a leading liberal voice for a form of economic populism that Trump at times channeled more than Clinton.

As liberals look to rebuild the post-Clinton Democratic Party on a more aggressively liberal bearing, Ellison has emerged as a top candidate to take the chair from the National Committee, and he figures to be in high demand at the DA meeting. An Ellison spokesman did not immediately respond to a request for comment on Sunday evening.

Raj Goyle, a New York Democratic activist who has run the state legislature and now sits on SIX’s board, argued that many liberal activists and donors are “disconnected from working class voters” because the group is run by elite voters in coastal cities. “And that hurt us this election,” said Goyle, who is involved in the DA, and said its donors would do well to steer more cash to groups on the ground in the states.

“Progressive donors and organizations need to immediately correct the lack of investment in state and local strategies,” Goyle, who is involved in the DA, said.

The Democracy Alliance was launched after the 2004 election by Soros, the late insurance mogul Peter Lewis, and a handful of fellow Democratic mega-donors who had combined to spend tens of millions trying to boost then-Sen. John Kerry’s ultimately unsuccessful challenge to then-President George W. Bush.

The donors’ goal was to seed a set of advocacy groups and think tanks outside the Democratic Party’s traditional political machine and its politicians to the left while also defending them against attack from the right.

The group requires its members—a group that now numbers more than 100 and includes finance titans like Soros, Tom Steyer and Donald Sussman, as well as major labor unions and liberal foundations—to contribute a total of at least $200,000 a year to recommended groups. Members also pay annual dues of $30,000 to fund the DA staff and its meetings, which include catered meals and entertainment, and most of the recommended donors were treated to a VIP tour of the recently opened National Museum of African American History and Culture.

Since its inception in 2005, the DA has steered upward of $500 million to a range of groups, including pillars of the political left such as the Center for American Progress and the data firm Catalist—all of which are run by Clinton allies who are expected to send representatives to the DA meeting.

The degree to which those groups will be able to adapt to the post-Clinton Democratic Party remains to be seen, but some of the key DA donors have given generously to them for years.
That includes Soros, who, after stepping back a bit from campaign-related giving in recent years, had committed or donated $25 million to boosting Clinton and other Democratic candidates and causes in 2016. During the presidential primaries, Soros had argued that "Trump and his GOP rival Ted Cruz were "doing the work of ISIS.'"

A Soros spokesman declined to comment for this story.

But, given that the billionaire financier only periodically attends DA meetings and is seldom a part of the formal proceedings, as a speaker suggests that he's committed to investing in opposing President Trump. The agenda item for a Tuesday morning "conversation with George Soros" invokes Soros' personal experience living through the Holocaust and Soviet communism in the context of preparing for a Trump presidency. The agenda notes that the billionaire currency trader, who grew up in Hungary, "has lived through Nazism and Communism, and has devoted his foundations to protecting the kinds of open societies around the world that are now threatened in the United States itself."

LaMarche, who for years worked for Soros's Open Society foundations, told POLITICO that the references to Nazism and Communism are "part of his standard bio."

LaMarche, who is set to moderate the discussion with Soros, said the donor "does not plan to compare whatever we face under Trump to Nazism, I can tell you that." LaMarche also added, "I don't think there is anyone who has looked at Trump, including many respected conservatives, who doesn't think the experience of authoritarian states would not be important to learn from here. And to the extent that Soros and his foundations have experience with xenophobia in Europe, Brexit, etc., we want to learn from that as well."

The Soros conversation was added to the agenda after Election Day. It was just one of many changes made on the fly to adjust for last week's jarring result and the stark new reality facing liberals, who went from discussing ways to push an incoming President Trump to instead discussing how to do the work of ISIS, "doing the work of ISIS.'"

Soros's personal experience living through the Holocaust and Soviet Communism, and has lived through Nazism and Communism, and has devoted his foundations to protecting the kinds of open societies around the world that are now threatened in the United States itself."

In his post-election emails to donors and operatives, LaMarche acknowledged the group had to "scrap many of the original plans for the conference," explaining "while we made no explicit assumptions about the outcome, the conference we planned, and the agenda you have seen, made more sense in the event of a Hillary Clinton victory."

Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. Speaker, I will conclude my remarks, and I yield back the balance of my time.

PUBLICACION OF BUDGETARY MATERIAL

STATUS REPORT ON CURRENT LEVELS OF ON-BUDGET SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FY 2020

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: To facilitate application of sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, because the point of order under that section equally applies to measures that would breach the applicable section 302(b) sub-allocation. The table also provides supplemental information on spending authorized in excess of the base discretionary spending limits under section 251(b) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

Table 4 displays the current level of advance appropriations in fiscal year 2020 appropriations bills. The table is needed to enforce a rule against appropriations bills containing advance appropriations that: (i) are not identified in the statement of the Chair published in the Congressional Record on March 5, 2019 or (ii) would cause the aggregate amount of such appropriations to exceed the level specified in section 2 of H. Res. 293.

In addition, a letter from the Congressional Budget Office is attached that summarizes and compares the budget impact of legislation enacted after the adoption of the budget resolution against the budget resolution aggregate in force.

If you have any questions, please contact Jennifer Wheelock or Raquell Spencer.

Sincerely,

John Yarmuth
Chairman

Table 2 compares the current levels of budget authority and outlays for legislative action completed by each authorizing committee with the limits filed in the Congressional Record on May 3, 2019, for fiscal year 2020, and for the 10-year period of fiscal years 2020 through 2029. These comparisons are needed to enforce the point of order under section 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, which prohibits the consideration of measures that would breach the section 302(a) allocation of new budget authority for the committee that reported the measure. It is also needed to implement section 311(c), which provides an exception for committees that comply with their allocations from the point of order under section 311(a).

Table 3 compares the current status of discretionery appropriations for fiscal year 2020 with the section 302(b) suballocations of discretionery budget authority and outlays among Appropriations subcommittees. The comparison is needed to enforce section 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 because the point of order under that section equally applies to measures that would breach the applicable section 302(b) sub-allocation. The table also provides supplemental information on spending authorized in excess of the base discretionary spending limits under section 251(b) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

Table 4 displays the current level of advance appropriations in fiscal year 2020 appropriations bills. This table is needed to enforce a rule against appropriations bills containing advance appropriations that: (i) are not identified in the statement of the Chair published in the Congressional Record on March 5, 2019 or (ii) would cause the aggregate amount of such appropriations to exceed the level specified in section 2 of H. Res. 293.

In addition, a letter from the Congressional Budget Office is attached that summarizes and compares the budget impact of legislation enacted after the adoption of the budget resolution against the budget resolution aggregate in force.

If you have any questions, please contact Jennifer Wheelock or Raquell Spencer.

Sincerely,

John Yarmuth
Chairman

---

TABLE 1.—REPORT TO THE SPEAKER FROM THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET, STATUS OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2020, AND 2020–2029 CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET, REFLECTING ACTION COMPLETED AS OF JANUARY 3, 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>Fiscal Year 2020–2029</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appropriable Level: Budget Authority</td>
<td>3,806,162</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outlays</td>
<td>3,722,823</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td>2,706,090</td>
<td>34,461,163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Level: Budget Authority</td>
<td>3,823,390</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outlays</td>
<td>3,767,522</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td>2,706,090</td>
<td>34,461,163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriable Level over (+) / under (−)</td>
<td>77,063</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriable Level: Budget Authority</td>
<td>17,228</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outlays</td>
<td>3,499</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td>34,443</td>
<td>386,352</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Includes all emergencies.

---

TABLE 2.—DIRECT SPENDING LEGISLATION, COMPARISON OF AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE LEGISLATIVE ACTION WITH 302(A) ALLOCATIONS FOR BUDGET CHANGES, REFLECTING ACTION COMPLETED AS OF JANUARY 3, 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Years, in millions of dollars</th>
<th>House Committee</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2020–2029 Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appropriations</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>Outlays</td>
<td>BA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albion</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>410</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 2.—DIRECT SPENDING LEGISLATION, COMPARISON OF AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE LEGISLATIVE ACTION WITH 302(a) ALLOCATIONS FOR BUDGET CHANGES, REFLECTING ACTION COMPLETED AS OF JANUARY 3, 2020—Continued

(Fiscal Years, in millions of dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appropriations Subcommittees</th>
<th>House Committee</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2020-2029 Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>Outlays</td>
<td>BA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Armed Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Level</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4,701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Energy and Commerce</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Level</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>4,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Foreign Affairs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Level</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Homeland Security</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Level</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Labor, Health and Human Services, Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Level</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>National Resources</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Level</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Science, Space, and Technology</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Level</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Small Business</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Level</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation and Infrastructure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Level</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 3.—DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2020—COMPARISON OF CURRENT LEVEL WITH Appropriations Committee 302(a) Allocation and Appropriations Subcommittee 302(b) Suballocations

(Uniform budget amounts, in millions of dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appropriations Subcommittees</th>
<th>House Committee</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2020-2029 Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>Outlays</td>
<td>BA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agriculture, Rural Development, FDA</strong></td>
<td>24,310</td>
<td>22,900</td>
<td>23,493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commerce, Justice, Science</strong></td>
<td>66,195</td>
<td>70,675</td>
<td>74,133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Defense</strong></td>
<td>627,062</td>
<td>627,591</td>
<td>638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Energy and Water Development</strong></td>
<td>46,413</td>
<td>48,363</td>
<td>45,065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Financial Services and General Government</strong></td>
<td>24,550</td>
<td>24,200</td>
<td>14,714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Homeland Security</strong></td>
<td>49,796</td>
<td>49,796</td>
<td>49,796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interior, Environment</strong></td>
<td>37,277</td>
<td>35,650</td>
<td>34,839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Labor, Health and Human Services, Education</strong></td>
<td>199,877</td>
<td>198,625</td>
<td>196,025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Legislative Branch</strong></td>
<td>5,010</td>
<td>5,037</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Military Construction, Veterans Affairs</strong></td>
<td>105,317</td>
<td>105,486</td>
<td>106,754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State, Foreign Operations</strong></td>
<td>48,581</td>
<td>48,705</td>
<td>48,079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation, Housing &amp; Urban Development</strong></td>
<td>75,773</td>
<td>74,777</td>
<td>74,777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal, 302(b) Allocations</strong></td>
<td>1,299,018</td>
<td>1,289,000</td>
<td>1,355,810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unallocated portion of Section 302(a) Allocation</strong></td>
<td>7,018</td>
<td>7,018</td>
<td>-2,595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, 302(a) Allocations</strong></td>
<td>1,298,018</td>
<td>1,297,085</td>
<td>1,355,315</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Memorandum:**
- Overseas Contingency Operations: 79,500 | 42,791 | 79,500 | 42,791
- Program Integrity: 1,842 | 1,842 | 1,842 | 1,842 |
- Disaster Relief: 17,503 | 984 | 17,503 | 984 |
- Censuses: 2,500 | 1,800 | 2,500 | 1,800 |
- Wildlife Suppression: 2,250 | 2,250 | 2,250 | 2,250 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section 251(b) Designated Categories (Cap Adjustments)</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2020-2029 Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>Outlays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal, 302(a) Allocations as of December 17, 2019</strong></td>
<td>103,959</td>
<td>49,306</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 The House Committee on Appropriations provided 302(b) suballocations consistent with committee-reported legislation.
TABLE 4.—ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS PURSUANT TO SECTION 2 OF H. RES. 293 AS OF JANUARY 3, 2020
(Budget authority in millions of dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For 2021</th>
<th>For 2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations</strong></td>
<td><strong>Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Appropriate Level</strong></td>
<td><strong>Appropriate Level</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enacted advances</td>
<td>Enacted advances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts identified for advances:</td>
<td>Accounts identified for advances:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment and Training Administration</td>
<td>Education for the Disadvantaged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,772</td>
<td>10,841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Improvement</td>
<td>Career, Technical, and Adult Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,681</td>
<td>701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>Tenant-based Rental Assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9,283</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project-based Rental Assistance</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal, enacted advances</strong></td>
<td><strong>Subtotal, enacted advances</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87,637</td>
<td>87,637</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Veterans Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations** | **Veterans Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations** |
| **Appropriate Level** | **Appropriate Level** |
| Enacted advances | Enacted advances |
| Veterans accounts identified for advances: | Veterans accounts identified for advances: |
| Veterans Medical Services | Veterans Medical Support and Compliance |
| 56,158 | 7,914 |
| Veterans Medical Facilities | Veterans Medical Community Care |
| 6,433 | 17,131 |
| **Subtotal, enacted advances** | **Subtotal, enacted advances** |
| 87,637 | 87,637 |

| **Total House Resolution** | **Total House Resolution** |
| **Enacted Legislation** | **Enacted Legislation** |
| 32 | 35 |
| 17,228 | 3,499 |
| Women’s Suffrage Centennial Commemorative Coin Act (P.L. 116–71) | Women’s Suffrage Centennial Commemorative Coin Act (P.L. 116–71) |
| n.a. | 34,443 |
| **Total, previously Enacted** | **Total, previously Enacted** |
| 1,447,700 | 1,948,905 |

| **Offsetting receipts** | **Offsetting receipts** |
| 1,771 | 914 |
| 2,740,533 | 2,740,533 |

| **Source:** Congressional Budget Office. |
| n.a. = not applicable; P.L. = public law. |
| **Sections 101–104 of the 21st Century Cures Act (P.L. 114–255) require that certain funding provided for 2017 through 2026 to the Department of Health and Human Services—in particular the Food and Drug Administration and the National Institutes of Health—be included from estimates for the purposes of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act 1985 (Deficit Control Act) and the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (Congressional Budget Act). Therefore, the amounts shown in this report do not include $57 million in budget authority and $78 million in estimated outlays.** |
| **For purposes of enforcing section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act in the House, the resolution, as approved by the House of Representatives, does not include budget authority, outlays, or revenues for off-budget amounts. As a result, amounts in this current level report do not include these items.** |
| **In the House of Representatives, and pursuant to section 314(d) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, amounts designated as an emergency requirement shall not count for purposes of title III and title IV of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, and are excluded from current level totals. In addition, emergency funding that was not designated pursuant to the Deficit Control Act does not count for certain budgetary enforcement purposes. Those amounts, which are not included in the current level totals, are as follows:**

| **Discriminatory Emergency Requirements:** |
| 8 | 0 |
| 4,951 | 1,390 |
| 0 | 0 |
| 1,771 | 1,771 |
| 914 | 914 |
| 6,764 | 6,764 |
### Original Aggregates Printed on May 3, 2019:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revision</th>
<th>Original Aggregate</th>
<th>Revised Aggregate</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjustments for P.L. 116-37, Bipartisan Budget Act of 2019</td>
<td>3,709,585</td>
<td>3,676,452</td>
<td>33,133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustment for H.R. 583, To amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide for enhanced penalties</td>
<td>3,428</td>
<td>1,278</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustment for H.R. 2745, Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2020</td>
<td>14,079</td>
<td>14,079</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustment for H.R. 3052, Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2020</td>
<td>14,373</td>
<td>14,373</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustment for H.R. 2968, Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2020</td>
<td>3,812</td>
<td>3,812</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Revised House Resolution:

January 15, 2020

### SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

**S. 2547.** An act to state the policy of the United States with respect to the expansion of cooperation with allies and partners in the Indo-Pacific region and Europe regarding the People's Republic of China; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

### BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Cheryl L. Johnson, Clerk of the House, reported that on January 14, 2020, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills:

**H.R. 2476.** To amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to provide funding to secure nonprofit facilities from terrorist attacks, and for other purposes.

**H.R. 583.** To amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide for enhanced penalties for pirate radio, and for other purposes.

### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 9 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, January 16, 2020, 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:

**3569.** A letter from the Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the “Annual Report to the Congress on the Presidential $1 Coin Program”, December 2019, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 5122(p)(y)(B); Public Law 97-258 (as amended by Public Law 109-145, Sec. 104) (119 Stat. 2670); to the Committee on Financial Services.


**3571.** A letter from the Director, Regulations Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule — Extreme Area Submittal Requirements, Coachella Valley NONAttainment Area; California Ozone [EPA-R09-OAR-2019-0240; FRL-100003-15-Region 6] received January 13, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

**3572.** A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule — Air Plan Approval; New Mexico; City of Albuquerque-Bernalillo County; New Mexico; County; New Source Review Preconstruction Permitting Program [EPA-HQ-OPP-2018-0560; FRL-100022-17; FRL-100003-44-Region 6] received January 13, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

**3573.** A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule — Air Plan Approval; Washington; Update to the Adoption by Reference, Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council [EPA-R69-RCRA-2019-0568; FRL-100005-85-Region 10] received January 13, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

**3574.** A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule — Air Plan Approval; Missouri; Sampling Methods for Air Pollution Sources [EPA-HQ-OAR-2019-0656; FRL-100003-44-Region 6] received January 13, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

**3575.** A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Montana; State Implementation Plan Revisions for Open Burning [EPA-R69-RCRA-2019-0163; FRL-100003-37-Region 8] received January 13, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

**3576.** A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule — Federal Peal and Promulgation of State Air Quality Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants; New Mexico and Albuquerque-Bernalillo County, New Mexico [EPA-R69-RCRA-2019-0162; FRL-100005-11-Region 6] received January 13, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

AT51) received January 13, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3593. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting a detailed report justifying the reasons for the extension of locality-based comparability pay authority for certain executive positions.

3595. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office’s report titled “Federal Student Loan Repayment Program” for Fiscal Year 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 5379(h); Public Law 107-248, Sec. 2(a)(1) (as amended by Public Law 108-335, Sec. 1121(b)); (112 Stat. 3807); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

3597. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office’s Federal Equal Opportunity Recruitment Program Report for Fiscal Year 2017; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

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. HORSFORD (for himself, Ms. TITUS, Mr. AMODEI, and Mrs. LEE of Nevada):

H.R. 5606. A bill to extend the withdrawal and reservation of certain public land in the State of Nevada for the continued use of the Nevada test and training range, to designate certain land in the Desert National Wildlife Refuge as wilderness, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition, to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. PINGREE (for herself, Mr. NEWHOUSE, and Ms. BONAMICI):

H.R. 5607. A bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to require the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out a grant program to make grants to eligible local educational agencies to carry out food waste reduction programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SCHNEIDER (for himself, Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. KIM, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. ROUDA, Mr. WELCH, Mr. CARBAJAL, and Mr. CARSON):

H.R. 5608. A bill to assist communities affected by stranded nuclear waste, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HARDER of California:

H.R. 5609. A bill to authorize the President to declare a homelessness emergency, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, and Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HARDER of California (for himself and Mr. STAUBER):

H.R. 5610. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to expand the list of diseases presumed to have a service connection to exposure to certain herbicide agents; to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs.

By Mr. DEZALUINIER (for himself and Mr. STAUBER):

H.R. 5611. A bill to promote State requirements for locally grown and public elementary and secondary schools relating to the prevention and treatment of concussions suffered by students; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. GABBARD:

H.R. 5612. A bill to amend the Federal Home Loan Bank Act to allow for advances to certain community development financial institutions and credit unions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. GALLEGO (for himself, Mr. SWALWELL of California, and Ms. HAALAND):

H.R. 5613. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to allow qualified entrepreneurs to temporarily defer Federal student loan payments after starting a new business; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas (for himself, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. GOODEN, and Mr. RUIZ):

H.R. 5614. A bill to exempt small seller financiers from certain licensing requirements; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. MATSUI (for herself, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Ms. MELISSA HERNANDEZ, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. BARRAGÁN, and Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER):

H.R. 5615. A bill to establish a grant program to assist retail power providers with the establishment and operation of energy conservation programs using targeted residential tree-planting, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MCKINLEY (for himself, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. RHSENCHELTER, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, and Mrs. MULCREECE):

H.R. 5616. A bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to submit to Congress reports on patient quality and safety at medical centers of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs.

By Mr. PANETTA (for himself, Ms. VEILÁCQUEZ, Mr. ROSE of New York, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. MING, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. ENDELSON of California, and Mr. ESPIRITUAL, Mr. NADLER, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. KING of New York, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, and Ms. KAPEN of California):

H.R. 5617. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude discharges of indebtedness on taxi medallions from gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 5618. A bill to make supplemental appropriations to provide additional funds to Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. STEWART (for himself and Ms. TSUJI):

H.R. 5619. A bill to authorize a pilot program to expand and intensify surveillance of self-harm in partnership with State and local public health departments, to establish a grant program to provide self-harm and suicide prevention services in hospital emergency departments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. TRONE (for himself, Mr. RASKIN, and Mr. SARBANES):

H.R. 5620. A bill to provide for a Federal partnership to ensure educational equity and quality; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WALTZ (for himself and Mr. O’NEIL):

H.R. 5621. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to exempt certain State, municipal, and recreation privileges to protective civilian employees; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. NEWHOUSE:

H. Res. 798. A resolution appointing and authorizing managers for the impeachment trial of Donald John Trump, President of the United States; considered and agreed to, considered and agreed to.

By Mr. ROUDA (for himself, Mr. BUD, Mr. LOVENTHAL, Ms. POTTER, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. DAVIS of California, and Ms. LOWEN):

H. Res. 799. A resolution supporting efforts to preserve Vietnamese and Vietnamese-American heritage and history and recognizing the accomplishments and contributions of Vietnamese Americans; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana (for himself, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, and Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana):

H. Res. 800. A resolution commending the Louisiana State University Tigers football team for winning the 2019 College Football Playoff Championship; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 5622. A bill for the relief of Igor Klyuchenko; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 5623. A bill for the relief of Tetyana Klyuchenko; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 5624. A bill for the relief of Melynka Ruslana and Gnyatak Mykhaylo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
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. HORSEFORD:
H.R. 5606. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
- Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution

By Ms. PINGREE:
H.R. 5607. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
- Clause 1 of Section 8 of the US Constitution

By Mr. SCHNEIDER:
H.R. 5608. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
- Article I, Section 8

By Mr. HARDER of California:
H.R. 5609. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
- Article I, Section 8

By Mr. DeSALVATORI:
H.R. 5611. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
- U.S. Const. art. 1, sec. 8

By Ms. DeSALVATORI:
H.R. 5612. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
- The U.S. Constitution including Article I, Section 8

By Mr. GALLAGHER:
H.R. 5613. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
- Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. GONZÁLEZ of Texas:
H.R. 5614. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
- According to Section 8 of Article I, Clause 3 of the Constitution

By Ms. MATSUI:
H.R. 5615. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
- Article I, Section 8

By Mr. MCKINLEY:
H.R. 5616. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
- Article I, Section 8

By Mr. MEEKS:
H.R. 5617. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
- Article I, Section 8

By Mr. NORTON:
H.R. 5618. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
- Clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution

By Mr. STEWART:
H.R. 5619. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. TRONE:
H.R. 5620. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. WALTZ:
H.R. 5621. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois:
H.R. 5622. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois:
H.R. 5623. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois:
H.R. 5624. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois:
H.R. 5625. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Ms. STIVERS:
H.R. 613: Mr. Stivers.
H.R. 619: Mrs. Wagner, Mr. McCaul, Mr. Danny K. Davis of Illinois, Mr. Horseford, and Mr. Suozzi.
H.R. 712: Mr. Morelle.
H.R. 779: Mr. Curtis and Mr. Byrne.
H.R. 808: Mrs. Walorski.
H.R. 856: Mr. Green of Tennessee.
H.R. 906: Mrs. Axne, Mr. Costa, Mr. Gartz, Mr. McKinley, and Mr. Murphy of North Carolina.
H.R. 945: Mr. O’Halleran, Mr. Gooden, and Ms. Wild.
H.R. 1043: Ms. Sánchez.
H.R. 1049: Mr. Sherman and Ms. Garcia of Texas.
H.R. 1126: Mr. Ryan.
H.R. 1151: Mrs. Schakowsky.
H.R. 1166: Mr. Morelle.
H.R. 1174: Mr. Courtney, Mr. Ruppersberger, Mr. Plummer, Mr. Neuse, and Mr. Stanton.
H.R. 1191: Mr. Stauber.
H.R. 1227: Mr. Calvert.
H.R. 1298: Mr. Sherrill, Mr. Barragán, Ms. Pischke, Ms. Rose, and Mr. McNerney.
H.R. 1345: Mr. Perlmutter.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 217: Mr. Balderson.
H.R. 219: Mr. Keller.
H.R. 256: Mr. John W. Rose of Tennessee.
H.R. 372: Mr. Heck.
H.R. 485: Mr. Michael F. Doyle of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 613: Mr. Stivers.
H.R. 619: Mrs. Wagner, Mr. McCaul, Mr. Danny K. Davis of Illinois, Mr. Horseford, and Mr. Suozzi.
H.R. 712: Mr. Morelle.
H.R. 779: Mr. Curtis and Mr. Byrne.
H.R. 808: Mrs. Walorski.
H.R. 856: Mr. Green of Tennessee.
H.R. 906: Mrs. Axne, Mr. Costa, Mr. Gartz, Mr. McKinley, and Mr. Murphy of North Carolina.
H.R. 945: Mr. O’Halleran, Mr. Gooden, and Ms. Wild.
H.R. 1043: Ms. Sánchez.
H.R. 1049: Mr. Sherman and Ms. Garcia of Texas.
H.R. 1126: Mr. Ryan.
H.R. 1151: Mrs. Schakowsky.
H.R. 1166: Mr. Morelle.
H.R. 1174: Mr. Courtney, Mr. Ruppersberger, Mr. Plummer, Mr. Neuse, and Mr. Stanton.
H.R. 1191: Mr. Stauber.
H.R. 1227: Mr. Calvert.
H.R. 1298: Mr. Sherrill, Mr. Barragán, Ms. Pischke, Ms. Rose, and Mr. McNerney.
H.R. 1345: Mr. Perlmutter.
H.R. 4078: Ms. Fudge, Ms. Frankel, Ms. Castor of Florida, Mrs. Demings, Mrs. Davis of California, Mr. Fleischmann, Ms. Bass, Ms. Haaland, Mr. Morelle, Ms. Clark of Massachusetts, and Mrs. Axne.

H.R. 4132: Mr. Pocan.

H.R. 4138: Mr. Stewart and Ms. Meng.

H.R. 4148: Mr. Richmond and Mr. Smith of Washington.

H.R. 4296: Mr. Tonko.

H.R. 4346: Mr. Kennedy.

H.R. 4347: Mrs. Axne.

H.R. 4370: Mr. Byrne.

H.R. 4436: Mrs. Watson Coleman.

H.R. 4469: Mr. Morelle.

H.R. 4508: Mrs. Hayes.

H.R. 4540: Mr. McNerney, Ms. Meng, Mr. Sires, Mr. Heck, Ms. Kuster of New Hampshire, and Mr. Clay.

H.R. 4555: Ms. Schakowsky.

H.R. 4588: Mr. Morelle.

H.R. 4631: Mrs. Hayes.

H.R. 4644: Mr. Kinzinger.

H.R. 4697: Mr. K Hanna, Mr. Correa, and Mr. Panetta.

H.R. 4723: Ms. Bonamici, Mr. Cartwright, and Ms. Jayapal.

H.R. 4738: Mr. Taylor.

H.R. 4823: Mr. Morelle.

H.R. 4897: Mr. Bost.

H.R. 4945: Mr. Stivers and Mr. Morelle.

H.R. 4980: Mrs. Beatty.

H.R. 4996: Mr. McGovern, Ms. Kendra S. Horn of Oklahoma, Ms. Finkenauer, Mrs. Axne, and Ms. Shalala.

H.R. 5028: Mr. Morelle.

H.R. 5046: Mr. Ryan.

H.R. 5064: Mr. Crawford, Mr. Marshall, Mr. Baird, and Mr. Kelly of Mississippi.

H.R. 5092: Ms. Craig.

H.R. 5117: Mr. Pascrell.

H.R. 5141: Mr. Kennedy and Mr. Connolly.

H.R. 5169: Mr. Gianforte.

H.R. 5191: Mr. Peters, Ms. Meng, Mr. Welch, and Mr. Smith of Washington.

H.R. 5210: Ms. Eshoo.

H.R. 5268: Mr. Cole.

H.R. 5297: Mrs. Watson Coleman.

H.R. 5319: Mr. Gallagher.

H.R. 5349: Mr. Morelle, Mr. Raskin, Mr. Smith of Washington, and Ms. Titus.

H.R. 5415: Mr. Pocan.

H.R. 5424: Mr. Grijalva.

H.R. 5434: Mr. Calvert, Mrs. Torres of California, Mr. Barr, and Mr. Mitchell.

H.R. 5447: Mr. Pocan.

H.R. 5453: Mr. Smith of Nebraska and Mr. Olson.

H.R. 5491: Mr. Brown of Maryland.

H.R. 5516: Mr. Stuffle, Mr. Rose of New York, and Mr. Ryan.

H.R. 5517: Mr. Costa, Mr. Danny K. Davis of Illinois, and Mr. Bishop of Georgia.

H.R. 5554: Mr. Cole, Mrs. Axne, and Mr. Cisneros.

H.R. 5543: Ms. Schakowsky, Mr. Perlmutter, Ms. Pingree, Ms. Lofgren, and Mrs. Napolitano.

H.R. 5560: Ms. Norton and Mr. Cohen.

H.R. 5570: Mr. Joyce of Ohio and Mr. Byrne.

H.R. 5577: Mr. Allen.

H.R. 5581: Ms. Eshoo and Mr. Larsen of Washington.

H.R. 5582: Mr. Chabot.

H.R. 5589: Mr. Levin of California and Ms. Barragan.


H.R. 5602: Mr. Sherman.

H.J. Res. 76: Mr. Sean Patrick Maloney of New York, Ms. Wasserman Schultz, Miss Rice of New York, Mr. Kind, Mr. Green of Texas, Mr. Roua, Mr. Kim, Mr. Cardenas, Mr. Payne, and Mr. Butterfield.

H.J. Res. 81: Mr. Costa and Mr. Kind.

H. Con. Res. 52: Mr. Correa.

H. Res. 50: Mr. Chabot, Mr. Stewart, Mr. Olson, and Mr. Kelly of Pennsylvania.

H. Res. 399: Mr. Grijalva and Mrs. Murphy of Florida.

H. Res. 672: Mr. Ryan.

H. Res. 694: Mr. Neuzil, Ms. Eshoo, Ms. Schakowsky, Ms. Adams, Mr. Garcia of Illinois, Ms. Omar, Mr. David Scott of Georgia, Mr. Delgado, Mr. Allred, and Mrs. McBath.

H. Res. 745: Mr. Van Dren.

H. Res. 786: Mr. Wright.

H. Res. 774: Ms. Shalala.

H. Res. 785: Mr. Kelly of Pennsylvania and Mr. Cook.

H. Res. 787: Mr. Kildeer, Ms. Bass, Mr. Yarmuth, Mrs. Beatty, Mr. Bacon, Mr. Larsen of Washington, Mr. Schiff, Mr. Bilirakis, and Mr. Hastings.

H. Res. 791: Mr. Rooney of Florida, Mr. Staubler, Mr. Gonzalez of Ohio, Ms. Foxx of North Carolina, Mr. Fulcher, Mr. Bishop of North Carolina, Mr. Timmons, Mr. Armstrong, Mr. Banks, and Mr. Johnson of Louisiana.

H. Res. 792: Ms. Roybal-Allard.