



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 166

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 15, 2020

No. 9

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
January 15, 2020.

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. Trag-

ically, 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.

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

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



Printed on recycled paper.

H241

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, A, 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 with farmworker parents in 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 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 off because of Enedina's work. My family and the entire farmworker community of the Coachella Valley, we 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. I want to make sure you know about her contributions to our community and her unrelenting pursuit of justice.

Enedina will be sorely missed, but her presence will be felt and her life, an inspiration for years to come.

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 to for inspiration. 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 majestic 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.

□ 1015

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 celebrate his return 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.

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 PALESTINE 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 backlogged 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.

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. I have watched as our markets took a hard hit and tailspinned down for a couple of days, down the limit awhile back, and slowly creep back in again.

We produce a lot of corn, soybeans, cattle, hogs, eggs, and renewable energy in the Fourth Congressional District of Iowa. In fact, it is the number one egg-producing congressional district in all of America.

We saw a publication on the part of Bloomberg that when the tariffs were put onto Chinese goods coming into the United States by President Trump, the Chinese retaliated with tariffs on products like pork and soybeans. Bloomberg just showed a map of the United States where that hit the hardest and it happened to hit exactly over the red counties in America that produce a lot of corn and soybeans, and you could add to that the other products I mentioned, Mr. Speaker.

The situation that we are dealing with now is that we have gotten a long way through these trade negotiations, and we are coming around to the other side of it with China. In spite of all of this difficulty in all these markets that have been suppressed over this period of time, we found some new trade outlets.

For one thing, instead of having one big pipe going to China, we have got multiple, smaller pipes going to other locations in the world. And today the President signed phase 1 of the trade agreement that will increase by about \$16 billion a year our egg product exports to China. That includes a lot of

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 awfully hard to fix.

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 the door 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 the people's House 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 high fences and wide gates.

Making the 2017 Trump tax cuts permanent for families and small businesses. 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 20/20 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 there is a song that is sung; 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 51 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 step outside of the normal rhetoric that they may have espoused. 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. I believe that 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 there 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 House, 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 presented itself such that it should continue with its current makeup. The people of this country will have the last word.

□ 1030

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, I rise today 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 disastrous 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. agriculture 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 our 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 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 brought 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 will 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 awards ceremony to recognize individuals and organizations for their outstanding service to give back to our communities in the spirit of Dr. King.

I urge all Americans to find ways to help others in communities on Dr. Martin Luther King's birthday. You can find those options at NationalService.gov, a way for us all to give back. Because in the words of Dr. King: "The time is always right to do what is right."

RECOGNIZING NATIONAL SLAVERY AND HUMAN TRAFFICKING PREVENTION MONTH

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today also to recognize National Slavery and Human Trafficking Prevention Month to raise awareness about this atrocity that plagues our Nation and the world.

There are estimated to be more than 40 million victims of trafficking across the planet. It happens in all of our communities here, and because of the geographic location that I represent in California's San Joaquin Valley, my district sees a disproportionately high amount of human trafficking.

The fighting of this atrocity requires all of us to be involved, and we must do more. Every year, I work hard to secure additional funding for the Crime Victims Fund and to strengthen our efforts to stop human trafficking.

We were successful in getting an additional \$2 billion to support investigations and operations to prevent human trafficking and another \$2.6 billion to improve services for these victims in the spending bill that passed just last month. This helps organizations like Breaking the Chains in Fresno, which is crucial to survivors.

We must understand that these trafficking victims are just that; they are victims of crime. We also need to bolster our efforts to prevent this from continuing to occur, from supporting law enforcement efforts to holding perpetrators accountable to educating our children about the dangers, especially in this day and age, when the internet, sadly, is oftentimes a tool for traffickers.

It is estimated that less than 1 percent of the survivors of human trafficking cases are identified. That is an astounding number, I think: less than 1 percent of the survivors of human trafficking are actually identified.

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 sur-

vivors 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 also mentor individual cadets. 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 Mathew, 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 for me was not a slam dunk. 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, 84, 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, Nannette Jordan of Norwalk, Connecticut, and Dorinda Selby of Beaufort, South Carolina. He also had five grandchildren: Ashley Benusa 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 burial 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, I rise today to honor my beloved Monroe County as we enter the 200th year of our county's rich and storied history.

A small rural county in south central Kentucky, Monroe County is home to communities steeped in history and tradition. Whether you are from Tompkinsville, Gamaliel, or Fountain Run, you have a shared Monroe County identity.

If you are a Monroe Countian, you more than likely enjoy our legendary barbecue and probably have countless stories to tell about our county's rich history, especially our political history.

This Sunday, January 19, hundreds of us will gather to celebrate Monroe County's 200th birthday. As we meet at the Tompkinsville National Guard Armory for this proud occasion, I will be

seeing many of the friendly faces that shaped my upbringing and remain good friends to this day.

Monroe County holds a special place in my heart; and now, more than ever, I am proud to serve as a voice for our citizens right here in our Nation's Capitol.

□ 1045

TAKING A STAND AGAINST SANCTUARY CITIES

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my concern about the upturn of sanctuary cities across the United States and push for action to enhance public safety by further cracking down on illegal immigration.

There should be consequences for not following the law. Local governments that choose not to enforce immigration laws recklessly put lives at risk. Senseless deaths occasionally result from crimes committed by criminal illegal aliens who take refuge in sanctuary cities.

Action is needed to prevent more harm from cities refusing to cooperate with Federal immigration officials. Allowing cities to tie the hands of our brave law enforcement officers and ignore the law should not be tolerated. I am calling on Congress to strengthen the safety of our communities by passing legislation banning sanctuary cities.

But while we continue to await action on this important issue, States are stepping up and making this a top priority. I want to commend the leaders in my home State of Kentucky who are taking proactive action to ban sanctuary cities and strengthen public safety. The leadership they are showing on this issue is an important step toward giving law enforcement more tools to go after major problems like drug trafficking and will benefit all Kentuckians.

DELAYED TRANSMISSION OF IMPEACHMENT ARTICLES

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 was 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 distracted 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 abortion was made legal, 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 disagreements 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 even 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 "heavyhanded 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 decades-long human tragedy 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 fraught with controversy 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 Grow Clinic is an outpatient clinic 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 Congress on numerous occasions, 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 against 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 of enriching 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 she will continue to stand up for 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-Cities 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 cleanup at 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.

□ 1100

CENTRAL WASHINGTON FIREFIGHTERS AIDING IN AUSTRALIA

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, over the past month, devastating bushfires have burned over 12.5 million acres of land in Australia. More than 200 American firefighters have been dispatched to Australia to help combat and contain these devastating fires, including two firefighters from central Washington.

In the West, we recognize the catastrophic impact wildfires have on local communities, on ecosystems, and on 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 cosponsor 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 America. It is great day for American agriculture and American manufacturing.

Today, the President signs phase one of the China trade deal. But this news, the most important news of the day, won't be covered much by the national 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 accounts for more than 40 percent of our Kansas State's economy. All this increase in exports only adds to our Nation's GDP.

In the near term, this deal brings an end to the threat of additional tariffs that have caused commodity prices to fluctuate, giving producers more certainty and the ability to better plan for the upcoming growing seasons. Our farmers and ranchers have borne the brunt of the effects of this trade battle, 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 indeed legitimate. Decades of China renegeing 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 include the authority for the President to swiftly reinstate all tariffs and impose new ones, if needed, and thus avoid the long, drawn-out decisions by the WTO.

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 more than 18,000 applicants as some 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 to Zena and congratulate her on her graduation. I thank her for all she has done.

REMEMBERING FRANK MITCHELL

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember Frank Mitchell, a native of Springfield, Illinois, and the first African American House of Representatives page since Reconstruction. As a student at Feitshans High School, Frank was asked to interview for a position as a page for then-Congressman Paul Findley. When the school principal, my good friend, Irv Smith, called to say they had selected Frank, according to articles just recently, Frank said he went out and he bought some suits, got a haircut, and headed for Washington.

After his year-long stint as a House page, Frank graduated from Feitshans in 1967 and went on to work as a newspaper and TV reporter before accepting positions with the Illinois Attorney General's Office and eventually Cook County's Stroger Hospital. He is well-known across the State for his work with the Illinois Fatherhood Initiative.

Congressman Paul Findley's son, Craig, who now chairs the Illinois Prison Review Board, said Frank's appointment to the House as a page was one of his father's proudest accomplishments. Frank brought credit to the page system, Craig said, and I admired him for his service and his friendship for decades.

Almost everyone that knew Frank felt that way. They admired him for his service and his friendship. Frank was a well-loved part of the Springfield community for years. I had the opportunity to meet many of his family members and also those who helped Frank, and who Frank helped through his career in public service when I went to his services in Springfield just a few weeks ago.

For so many, Frank was a role model, he was a mentor, and he is part of the history in this institution that so many of us have had the opportunity to serve in this great Nation in the House of Representatives.

The House of Representatives is a better place because of Frank Mitchell and Washington, D.C., is a better place because of Frank Mitchell. Everybody that knew Frank Mitchell knows that their life has been blessed.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Frank for his service, and he will be missed.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 9 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

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

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 I, the Journal stands approved.

Ms. DEAN. Madam Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, 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 pro-

ceedings 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 of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to 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 Martin Luther King, I rise to recognize a Buffalo, New York, resident born the same year as Dr. King, who continues to serve as a local church, community, and business leader, my good friend, Clifford Bell.

Brother 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 and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, I congratulate General John W. Raymond, who was sworn in yesterday as the first Chief of Space Operations for the newly established U.S. Space Force.

As a senior Member of the House Armed Services Committee, I am grateful to President Donald Trump for General Raymond's confirmation and for being able to attend the National Defense Authorization Act signing which officially established the U.S. Space Force.

General Raymond is a Clemson University alumnus and has over 30 years of military experience. "This establishment is absolutely critical to our national security," he said during his remarks after being sworn in.

I am grateful that the U.S. Space Force is in strong, capable hands.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th, defeating terrorists overseas, in the global war on terrorism with the courageous leadership of President Donald Trump.

ALPHA KAPPA ALPHA FOUNDER'S DAY

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, we should take a moment to honor an outstanding organization, Alpha Kappa Alpha. This is their Founders Day—112 years old.

Isn't it interesting that young women who were in the shadow of the Emancipation Proclamation and the shadow of slavery, in the midst of Jim Crow-ism and on the precipice of World War I, organized at Howard University to be able to give African American women a place for leadership and civic-mindedness?

As we are on the precipice of a great historic moment dealing with protecting the Constitution here in the United States Congress and the United States Senate, I am glad to honor these women that included Ethel Hedgeman, Margaret Flagg Holmes, Marjorie Hill, Lillie Burke, Beulah Elizabeth Burke, Anna Easter Brown, and many other young women who decided to take a stand for what is right in this Nation and the opportunities of diversity and leadership.

Congratulations to our national president, Dr. Glover, and congratulations to all of our Alpha Kappa Alpha members throughout the United States of America. Happy Founders Day 112.

IMPEACHMENT COLLAPSE

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

Mr. BYRNE. Madam Speaker, after a long, embarrassing 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

whistleblower, DNC staffer Alexandra Chalupa, Nellie Ohr with Fusion GPS, and, of course, the two gentlemen pictured to my left, Devon Archer and Hunter Biden.

In reality, the Democrats' entire case depended on hiding the facts. As more facts emerged last year, their case collapsed. Public support for their impeachment fell as the weakness of their case was exposed.

I remind my majority that what is good for the goose is good for the gander. I predict House Democrats will not fare as well blocking these witnesses in MITCH MCCONNELL's United States Senate.

FULL AND FAIR TRIAL REQUIRED IN U.S. SENATE

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

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Madam Speaker, yesterday the House released additional documents and new text messages from Lev Parnas. He is an associate of Donald Trump's personal attorney, Rudy Giuliani. He has also been indicted. These documents and text messages show a chilling picture of surveillance, both physical and electronic, of the U.S. Ambassador to Ukraine. This is all the more reason why we need to have a full and fair trial in the United States Senate.

The House today is going to transmit the Articles of Impeachment to the Senate. Donald Trump was impeached for abusing his power and for soliciting interference in our elections from a foreign government. He will be branded for the rest of his life. It is permanent, it will not go away, and now we need the Senate to act and have a fair trial. That means witnesses and documents. If they do not do that, it will be the equivalent of a coverup.

RECOGNIZING DANIELLE HOUSER

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

Mr. DUNN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize an outstanding member of my staff who is moving on to a career in the defense sector, Danielle Houser.

Danielle graduated from UF in 2015 with a degree in international and global studies. She then moved to D.C. to begin her career on Capitol Hill. In January of 2017 she helped open our D.C. office as my executive assistant, later moving into a legislative role and becoming my legislative aide for military and defense affairs.

After Hurricane Michael devastated the panhandle, DJ played a key role in ensuring Tyndall Air Force Base and all of our bases had the resources they needed to begin recovery. DJ is a force of nature. She is ambitious, disciplined, hardworking, cheerful, and a

joy to work with. She has been an integral part of my office since its inception, and we will miss her greatly.

Madam Speaker, please join me in recognizing Danielle Houser for all that she has done for north Florida and our Nation and wish her luck in all her future endeavors.

THE 19TH AMENDMENT

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

Mr. MORELLE. Madam Speaker, this weekend I will join hundreds of activists and supporters for the Women's March in Seneca Falls, New York, home of the historic 1848 Women's Rights Convention that sparked the suffrage movement.

We will celebrate the incredible strides we have made in the fight for women's rights and the many strong, courageous women who have shattered glass ceilings to achieve progress.

The year 2020 marks the 100th anniversary of the passage of the 19th Amendment, guaranteeing and protecting women's constitutional right to vote. Now more than ever as we face new barriers threatening to roll back the rights of women, we must take up the mantle of Susan B. Anthony and the suffragists who came before us to continue to fight for the full equality that all women deserve. Together we will keep persisting.

CONGRATULATING RICHARD N. REILLY

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

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Richard N. Reilly on a well-deserved retirement after many years of service to the United States of America.

Richard has been a U.S. State Department Pearson Fellow in my Washington, D.C., office over this past year and has provided invaluable guidance and assistance to both my staff and my constituents.

A native of Minnesota, Rich began his service to our Nation as an Army infantryman and then he continued on later with a 20-year career as a naval officer. Following his time in the military, Rich joined the State Department as a Foreign Service officer advocating for America's interests abroad.

On behalf of the Fourth District of Florida and a grateful Nation, I offer my heartfelt thanks to Rich for his many contributions to our country and wish him a relaxing and fulfilling retirement enjoyed with wife, Susan; his children; and their new granddaughter, Peyton.

Congratulations, Rich.

ENOUGH ALREADY: IT IS TIME TO FREE RAIF BADAWI

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I speak today for Raif Badawi, a Saudi Arabian human rights blogger unjustly imprisoned since 2012 for exercising his right to freedom of expression.

His supposed crime?

Criticizing Islam and the religious police.

His sentence?

Ten years in prison, 1,000 lashes, and a huge fine.

Monday, January 13, was Raif's 36th birthday—the eighth he spent in prison away from his wife and three children.

January 9 was the fifth anniversary of the day that Raif endured the first 50 of those 1,000 lashes. That the flogging has not continued is a small mercy, but the prolonged imprisonment and harsh conditions is taking a terrible physical and mental toll.

The Saudi authorities must end this egregious injustice.

Madam Speaker, I again demand the immediate and unconditional release of prisoner of conscience, Raif Badawi.

I renew my call for a halt to all weapons sales and military aid until the Saudi regime cleans up its human rights record which is appalling.

CELEBRATING THE RIGHT TO LIFE

(Ms. FOXX of North Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, life is the most precious gift from God. From conception until natural death and every moment in between, we must recognize, celebrate, and bear witness to the sanctity of life.

Next Friday tens of thousands of people from across the country will come to Washington and participate in the March for Life. This event serves as a clear reminder that preserving and protecting the lives of the most vulnerable is not simply an option, it is a mandate that we all must uphold.

Madam Speaker, I refuse to stand idly by as the unborn are brazenly targeted. Amidst the shroud of rancor and divisiveness that hangs over this House at present, I will continue to fight for their right to life. They deserve nothing less than unwavering advocates.

JUNE PARKINSON REMEMBRANCE

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

Ms. DEAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor my constituent and friend, June Parkinson. June passed away on January 4 at the age of 64.

June was a loving wife, mother, and grandmother, a gifted artist and special education teacher, and a true community leader. She devoted her life in

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.

□ 1215

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 stranded 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 in 1998, 2 million 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 a 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 Oroville, California, this coming Monday, where his legacy 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.)

Mr. DELGADO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor one of my heroes, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., who was born on this day, 91 years ago.

Next Monday, the Nation will pay tribute to this incredible man and his life, as well as his enduring legacy, a legacy rooted in unconditional love.

In these difficult and divided times plagued by the rise of hate, I can't think of a better legacy to reflect upon as we embark upon this year.

The road ahead will be difficult for our Nation, but I am encouraged by and find great hope in the following words once spoke by Dr. King: "We can no longer afford to worship the god of hate or bow before the altar of retaliation. The oceans of history are made turbulent by the ever-rising tides of hate. History is cluttered with the wreckage of nations and individuals that pursued the self-defeating path of hate. . . . Love is the ultimate force that makes for the saving choice of life and good against the damming choice of death and evil. Therefore, the first hope in our inventory must be the hope that love is going to have the last word.'"

STOP IMPEACHMENT AND SUPPORT PRESIDENT TRUMP

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

Mr. BANKS. Madam Speaker, during the President's upcoming State of the Union Address, he has the opportunity to deliver a strong message of unity, peace, and hope to all of those who tune in, both Americans and all who are watching abroad.

Just in the last few months, we have seen that America is the beacon of hope for the people of Hong Kong and Taipei, who are suffering under pressure from Beijing. We have seen that America is the lifeline for people in Beirut and Tehran who find themselves under the thumb of the Iranian regime.

This is a critical moment in world history. People are looking to the United States and our President for leadership more than ever.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues in the majority party to refrain the impeachment antics and charades. Don't be petty. Rise above your worst impulses and support our President. The world is watching.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

PROVIDE CONSUMER PROTECTIONS FOR STUDENTS

(Mrs. HAYES 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 guts consumer 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 like Corinthian 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 Cope 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 trying circumstances. Preston Cope 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, Mrs. 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 the conduct of the trial, exhibit 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) Sending for 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 that the managers consider 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.

□ 1230

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

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 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 this serious 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 who 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 in 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 inappropriate 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 forever 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 demanded by our oath.

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 obstruction.

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, if not stopped, 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 weakest impeachment in American history crumble.

Instead of sending the Articles of Impeachment to the Senate for trial, Speaker PELOSI held them hostage in a failed play to gain 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 a trial.

Even the Speaker's allies admit the delays undermined their case. Some have gone as far as describing it as a "failed" 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 would not work. 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 intends.

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 I, 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 and, just because of their animosity, demean the process of impeachment.

And by selecting this particular batch of managers, the Speaker has further proven she is not interested in winning minds and hearts or even following the Constitution.

Let's take a look at the first three names Speaker PELOSI announced in her anticipated announcement earlier today:

Chairman SCHIFF, a man who has already taken on the role of judge, jury, and fact witness throughout the entire House impeachment process.

Chairman NADLER, someone who campaigned for the chairmanship of

the Judiciary Committee that is responsible for impeachment, beginning as far back as December 2017, before they were even in the majority, on the notion that he would be the best person to lead the charge on potential impeachment against the President.

You see, you get a chairmanship by your conference voting for you. You campaign for it. You put your best ideas out there as to why you should be the chairman. In 2017, that was the campaign.

Congressman HAKEEM JEFFRIES, a Member who, almost 2 years ago to this date, voted in support of impeachment. That was more than a year before the Ukraine call even took place.

Those are just some of the managers. If you think about the Members, there are people who, on the day they were sworn in to this body, told those who supported them that they were going to impeach him.

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 2½ 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.

□ 1245

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 those that uphold the Constitution would believe in the rule of law, instead of the spite or the dislike of an individual. Like the kangaroo courts on college campuses where an accusation is enough for a conviction.

Even as early as last Sunday in an interview, Speaker PELOSI made that point very clear to all of us. Asked what a Senate acquittal would mean, she said it didn't matter, the President is impeached forever.

Is that what this is all about? Just a personality, just an abuse of power that you have within the House that we all feared this country would never do. You could almost see the Speaker smile as she spoke about this new standard. How incredibly solemn she was.

Madam Speaker, when Americans look back on this sad saga, they will see a rigged process that forever damaged the remedy of impeachment. Speaker PELOSI got nothing from the Senate, but the American people got worse than nothing. They got stuck with the bill for a costly never-ending investigation.

The old saying that you get what you pay for does not apply here. Congress wasted time and millions of dollars on partisan impeachment. In return, taxpayers get nothing. Democrats' misaligned priorities have cost the people solutions that could have improved the quality of their life.

There is no greater contrast than what we are doing right here today than what is happening down Pennsylvania Avenue, the President sitting down with a leader of another country and signing a trade agreement—something people said we could never get done—to make this country stronger, to make the next century in America ours.

But what are we doing here? We are doing what this majority has worked their entire time for. Before they were even sworn in they campaigned for the position of chairman for this moment, for this time, for the millions of dollars that are spent so they could say the President is impeached. That is a lofty history. Those are lofty goals that you now have authored more subpoenas than you have created laws.

Thank God we have got a President in the White House that does not sit back.

Yes, the President got the United States-Mexico-Canada Trade Agreement done with, our top two traders. He is signing a trade agreement with China today, but think about how much stronger his hand would have been had that agreement taken place

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 civics lesson, let's use 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 civics 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. We would 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 are once again reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Madam Speaker, two points.

First, my colleagues 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 on his behalf 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 a trial 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 integ-

rity 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, then the gentleman is not ready to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is incorrect. The gentleman from New York has one remaining speaker who will close.

The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 30 seconds.

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. The gentleman from New York has 1 minute 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 here 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 gentlewoman 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 why 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 the 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 said Article II says 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

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, undermining the Republic 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 considered 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 contained in that Constitution of the United States.

□ 1300

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 to send this over. 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 course 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;

VAL DEMINGS, a member of the 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, hopefully, 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 necessary 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 2(j)(1) of Rule XI 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 process. Co-equal subpoena authority for both the minority and majority has been 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' great caution in undertaking decisions of this 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 power grab. Our Founding Fathers envisioned this scenario during the dawn of our Republic: one chamber of Congress trying to control the other. In our Founders' wisdom, a system of checks and balances was put into place to prevent the coup d'état that House Democrats attempted. Because of these safeguards, House Democrats ultimately failed. I applaud the Senators from both sides 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.

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 have been laser-focused on removing President Trump from office for purely political reasons.

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 767, 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—yeas 228, nays 193, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 18]
YEAS—228

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

Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rose (NY)
Rouda
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan

Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stanton
Stevens
Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano

NAYS—193

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

Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small
(NM)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—9

Clay Kirkpatrick
Crawford Lesko
Gabbard Lewis
Marchant
McClintock
Simpson

□ 1333

Mr. HIGGINS of New York changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

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 I, the Journal stands approved.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NADLER. 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 laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 15, 2020.

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

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on January 15, 2020, at 11:18 a.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 2547.

With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely,

CHERYL L. JOHNSON.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES

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

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 15, 2020.

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

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:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 15, 2020.

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.

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 laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Education and Labor:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 15, 2020.

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.

Semper Fidelis,

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 insert extraneous material on H.R. 1230, the Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act.

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

There was no objection.

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 consideration of the bill, H.R. 1230.

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

□ 1333

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole

House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 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. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read for the first time.

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

The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), and the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) each will control 30 minutes.

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 evaluating 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 antiretaliation 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 promised 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.

□ 1345

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.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. 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 lack of evidence and data 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 this regard.

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 experience and decades of Supreme Court precedent.

However, the flawed process is far from the only issue with this legislation. The committee also has no evidence or data indicating this bill is necessary. In fact, the lone Democrat-invited witness who testified on H.R. 1230 at a committee hearing covering many bills and topics admitted the impact of the Supreme Court's 2009 decision in *Gross v. FBL Financial Services, Inc.* is unknown. She also admitted there is no data indicating workers have been discouraged from filing age discrimination charges with the EEOC or bringing cases.

The data simply does not indicate workers have been discouraged from filing discrimination or retaliation charges with the EEOC. Additionally, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, employment numbers for older workers have trended upwards in recent decades.

In 2018 older workers earned 7 percent more than the median for all workers, a large increase from 20 years ago. For workers age 65 and older, employment tripled from 1988 to 2018, while 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 considering misguided proposals such as H.R. 1230 which furthers government intervention, we ought to be empowering all workers, including older workers, to continue participating and thriving in America's workforce to build upon, not stifle, these impressive trends. Unfortunately, H.R. 1230 does the opposite. This legislation will actually harm older workers while simultaneously enriching trial lawyers.

H.R. 1230 overturns Supreme Court precedent by allowing a plaintiff to argue that age was only a motivating, not decisive, factor that led to an employer's unfavorable employment ac-

tion, and it allows these kinds of mixed-motive claims across four completely different nondiscrimination laws. Moreover, allowing mixed-motive claims in cases alleging retaliation puts employers in an untenable position of trying to prove that a legitimate employment decision was not in response to a prior complaint. The only party who will be paid in nearly all mixed-motive cases is the plaintiffs' attorneys because most employers will be able to demonstrate that they would have taken the same action in the absence of the impermissible motivating factor. So the very people this legislation is intended to help will not receive any monetary damages under H.R. 1230.

H.R. 1230 will also increase frivolous legal claims against businessowners. Such undeserving claims will take valuable resources away from efforts to prevent workplace harassment and discrimination.

Finally, committee Republicans offered amendments to advance important priorities and practical solutions for older workers and highlight fundamental flaws in H.R. 1230. Unfortunately, our commonsense amendments were defeated on a party-line vote in committee.

Mr. Chairman, all workers should be protected from workplace discrimination, but by rushing today's legislation to the House floor in an attempt to make up for an abysmal first year in the majority, Democrats have failed older workers.

I encourage my colleagues to vote "no" on H.R. 1230, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume just to respond to the idea that this has been rushed.

There have been several committee hearings over the last 10 years in the House and one of the Senate, and that information is recorded in the committee report.

I also would like to point out that the burden of but for that the Gross decision has saddled older workers with now requires them to show not only that they have been discriminated against but also that they would have gotten the job or wouldn't have been fired but for the fact that they are old. All the older person knows is that when they applied for the job they were told: We don't hire old people.

Well, that is not enough, because now you also have to show that you would have gotten the job anyway. You don't know who got hired, and you don't know what their qualifications were, and it is an almost impossible burden to prove that not only were you discriminated against but you know the action would not have been taken but for that action.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI), who is the chair of the Subcommittee on Civil Rights and Human Services on the Education and Labor Committee.

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 believe they 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 outcomes 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 SENSENBRENNER in reintroducing the bipartisan Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act to amend the ADEA and our other core civil rights laws: the anti-retaliation 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 SENSENBRENNER 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 Michigan (Mr. WALBERG).

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Chair, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 1230.

Let's be clear. All of us are against workplace discrimination of any kind, and, Mr. Chairman, at my age I am certainly against age discrimination.

All of us want to protect all American workers from discrimination, but contrary to the bill's title, this legislation will end up harming workers. It is a payout to trial lawyers by muddying legal standards under the guise of a nice-sounding bill. Any plaintiff who files a discrimination lawsuit under

this bill is extremely unlikely to receive any monetary awards, but the trial lawyers will still get paid for their time.

Right now we have an economy that is booming. More than 7 million jobs are unfilled across this country—that is 7 million jobs going wanting right now. The pro-growth policies we put in place are working. Our focus should be on protecting workers and encouraging greater workforce participation and not rewarding lawyers through increased opportunities to garner legal fees.

Sadly, this legislation was rushed through the Education and Labor Committee for partisan purposes. It did not receive a thoughtful consideration of bipartisan ideas. We can do better but, once again, we are using precious time to debate political messaging bills instead of solving problems.

Mr. Chairman, protecting our older workers and encouraging appropriate job training are outcomes we can all agree on. But the crux of this bill is designed to help attorneys, not workers.

I urge my colleagues to look beyond the title and vote “no” on this payout to trial lawyers. We can do better, and we can protect all workers, including those of age, from age discrimination.

□ 1400

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN), who is the co-chair of the Bipartisan Disabilities Caucus.

Mr. LANGEVIN. 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 at the office. 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 employers three times 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,

Jan. 15, 2020.

DEAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS: As co-chairs of the Consortium for Citizens with Disabilities (CCD) Rights Task Force, we write to urge you to 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 (CCD) 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 instead 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 CRANE,
*Autistic Self-Advocacy
Network.*

KELLY BUCKLAND,
*National Council on
Independent Living.*

CO-CHAIRS,
*CCD Rights Task
Force.*

MARK RICHERT,
*National Disability In-
stitute.*

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), a distinguished member of the Committee on Education and Labor.

Ms. WILD. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman from Virginia for yielding.

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

Older workers who bring suit for age discrimination are often ostracized at their workplace. They open their lives to invasive probes by defense counsel through written discovery, by deposi-

tion, and, ultimately, testifying at a trial.

These probes are often meant to embarrass rather than seek the truth. When our older workers finally reach the courthouse door, it is often almost closed before they even get to the courtroom.

As a former civil litigator, I have brought and defended multiple age discrimination cases. These are very emotional and difficult claims.

No one likes getting older, but when one has to put one's age in full view of all because of perceived discrimination at work, an older worker then has to experience the scrutiny of lawyers, judges, and juries to prove that he or she was discriminated against because of age.

But worse, our older workers are, again, discriminated against when they seek redress from the courts. That is because the Supreme Court, in the 2009 case of *Gross v. FBL Financial Services*, ruled that an older worker bringing an ADEA claim must prove that age was the "but for" cause, the sole determining cause of an adverse employment decision.

That Supreme Court decision sent a message of impunity to employers looking to discriminate on the basis of age, and it set a precedent for denying justice to older workers across our country. That is not the standard used in other 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 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 one of any number of motivating factors for an 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—19,320.

An EEOC charge is a signed statement asserting employment discrimination. In the 9 years following *Gross*, the EEOC received an average 20,973 charges per year relating to age discrimination, a slight uptick from the previous 9 years.

There is clearly no evidence workers have been discouraged from filing age discrimination charges with the EEOC since the 2009 Supreme Court decision.

We also found that age discrimination charges as a percentage of all charges filed with the EEOC are approximately the same for the 9 years before and after the *Gross* decision, 23.2 percent before and 22.8 percent afterward.

Again, this does not indicate workers are discouraged from filing age discrimination charges. Congress should make fact-based decisions. In this case, the facts do not support what H.R. 1230's proponents have asserted.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY), the co-chair of the Democratic Caucus Task Force on Aging and Families.

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 cofounder and co-chair of the Democratic Caucus Task Force on Aging and Families, I am proud to announce that our Older Americans Bill of Rights, 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 age in place, and 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 misguided court decision.

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, while 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 employees 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. Grandma 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, out of nowhere, your life is shattered. Your bosses say: "You are fired."

They list their reasons. However, you know the truth. You have been let go to make way for a younger employee. Now you are without a salary, without your health insurance. You know your odds of getting a new job are slim when you are competing with 20-year-olds and 30-year-olds who are willing to work for lower wages and fewer benefits.

For too many seniors, Mr. Chair, this is a reality.

Nearly three in five workers have experienced age-based discrimination, not only unfairly depriving the worker

of a paycheck but taking valuable workers out of the workforce.

Now, a Supreme Court decision has made it even harder to prove age discrimination.

Mr. Chair, the Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act would give senior workers the protection they deserve and society the workers that we need.

The poet Robert Browning said: "Grow old with me, the best is yet to be."

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this very, very good bill.

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

Mr. Chair, I really find it puzzling that our colleagues paint such a dismal picture of employers. We hear this over and over and over again from the other side of the aisle.

As my colleague from Michigan said a little while ago, we have 7 million unfilled jobs in the country right now. Every employer I know, before I came to Congress and since I have been in Congress, cherishes his or her employees. They don't dismiss employees out of hand just because of their age. They just don't do that. They value their employees.

□ 1415

But the other side of the aisle has a real distorted picture of what happens in the private sector.

I want to say that H.R. 1230 doesn't achieve the goals espoused by the bill's sponsors, and let me provide much-needed truth in advertising about this bill.

Under the bill as written, most plaintiffs, even if they are successful, will not be entitled to receive any monetary damages, payments, or reinstatement. Here is why.

Generally, a victim of discrimination is entitled to be made whole, to be put in the position the individual would have been in without the discrimination. This can include monetary damages, back pay, reinstatement, attorney's fees, and court costs.

The Supreme Court, in the 2009 Gross case, eliminated the defense that allows an employer to demonstrate it would have taken the same employment action regardless of age. H.R. 1230 restores this employer defense.

An overwhelming majority of employers will be able to make this demonstration to the court, and when they make that demonstration, under H.R. 1230, the plaintiff will not be entitled to receive any monetary damages, payments, or reinstatement, although the plaintiffs' attorneys will be entitled to fees. So the only party who wins in these cases are the trial lawyers.

In addition, H.R. 1230 is specifically written to allow plaintiffs to survive a summary judgment motion that would end their case. But the plaintiff is in for a surprise later when, after going to court, he or she receives no monetary damages, and the only one getting paid

is his or her attorney. To add insult to injury, the employee may have to pay income taxes on the fees that are awarded to his or her attorney.

The bill's sponsors never explain how adding the provisions that include mixed-motive claims and restoring the employer defense allowing employers to demonstrate they would have taken the same action regardless of the impermissible factor, such as age, will benefit employees. In fact, these provisions will only help trial lawyers.

H.R. 1230's title and provisions are yet another case of false advertising and empty promises for older workers.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. STEFANIK), a distinguished member of the Committee on Education and Labor.

Ms. STEFANIK. Mr. Chair, in my district, older Americans are staying in the workforce longer than previous generations, making significant contributions to our growing economy; yet these later years of a worker's career are becoming increasingly unstable.

Over half of the workers over the age of 50 are pushed out of longtime jobs before they are ready to retire.

The consequences of age discrimination are particularly harmful because, once older workers are removed from the workforce, they are more likely to remain unemployed. The economic strain that this can cause for them and their families is significant.

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 to challenge workplace discrimination. We know that a 2018 survey by the AARP showed that three out of five workers age 45 or older had seen or experienced age discrimination in the workplace.

Some of my colleagues contend that this bill was rushed to the floor; however, we must remember that this is a bipartisan proposal that has undergone substantial debate since it was first introduced in 2009. Over the past 10 years, Congress has deliberated on this legislation through four hearings, including two hearings in the Committee on Education and Labor.

Both the House and Senate have introduced and gradually improved this legislation in the 111th, 112th, 113th, 114th, 115th, and the current 116th Congress. It is long overdue.

The Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act is a bipartisan, bicameral solution that restores protections for older workers and ensures that we treat all workers facing discrimination, whether it is on the basis of sex, race, religion, national origin, or age, with consistency and fairness.

I want to thank Congressman SEN-SENBRENNER 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 could prove 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 senior 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. MITCH MCCONNELL,
Majority 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 MCCONNELL, MINORITY LEADER SCHUMER, SPEAKER PELOSI, AND MINORITY LEADER MCCARTHY: The Leadership Council of Aging Organizations (LCAO) 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). The House Education and Labor Committee voted on June 11, 2019 to approve POWADA. Age discrimination is pervasive and stubbornly entrenched. Six in 10 older workers have experienced age discrimination and 90% of them say it is common. It is even more pervasive among older women and African American workers; nearly two thirds of women and three-fourths of African Americans say they have seen or experienced workplace age discrimination.

Courts have not taken age discrimination as seriously as other forms of discrimination and older workers have fewer protections as a result. Ten years ago, in *Gross v. FBL Financial Services Inc.*, the Supreme Court set a higher standard of proof for age discrimination than previously applied and much higher than for other forms of discrimination. Since *Gross*, court decisions have continued to chip away at protections. As a result, plaintiffs now have to prove that age was a determinative, “but-for” cause for their employers' adverse treatment of them. Before the *Gross* case, it was enough for plaintiffs to prove that age was one of the motivating factors. POWADA would restore the standard of proof in age discrimination cases to the pre-2009 level, and treat age discrimination as just as wrong as other forms of employment discrimination. Moreover, because courts have applied *Gross*' higher burden of proof to retaliation charges and to disability discrimination, it would also

amend the Age Discrimination in Employment Act, Title VII's provision on retaliation, the Americans with Disabilities Act, and the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

Please vote to restore fairness for older workers by passing the Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act (S. 485, H.R. 1230).

Sincerely,

The Undersigned Groups of the Leadership Council of Aging Organizations:

AARP; AFL-CIO; AFSCME; Aging Life Care Association; Alliance for Retired Americans; American Association of Service Coordinators; American Society on Aging; AMDA—The Society for Post-Acute and Long-Term Care Medicine; Association of Gerontology and Human Development in Historically Black Colleges and Universities; B'nai B'rith; Consumer Voice; International Association for Indigenous Aging; Justice in Aging; Leading Age; National Adult Protective Services Association; National Asian Pacific Center on Aging (NAPCA); National Association for Hispanic Elderly; National Association of Area Agencies on Aging (n4a).

National Association of Nutrition and Aging Services Programs (NANASP); National Association of Social Workers; National Center and Caucus on Black Aging; National Committee to Preserve Social Security and Medicare; National Council on Aging; National Hispanic Council on Aging; National Senior Corps Association; Pension Rights Center; PHI; Social Security Works; The Gerontological Society of America; The Jewish Federations of North America; Women's Institute for a Secure Retirement (WISER).

JUNE 10, 2019.

Hon. BOBBY SCOTT,
Chairman, Committee on Education and Labor,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. VIRGINIA FOXX,
Ranking Member, Committee on Education and Labor,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SCOTT AND RANKING MEMBER FOXX: On behalf of the undersigned organizations and the millions of workers we represent, we urge all Committee Members to vote to support H.R. 1230, the Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act (POWADA), sponsored by Chairman Scott and Rep. Jim Sensenbrenner (R-WI). POWADA is bipartisan, limited legislation to restore fairness and well-established legal standards on workplace discrimination that were undermined by certain 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.

Yet, 10 years ago this month, 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 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*, older workers must prove that discrimination played a decisive role in the employer's action.

Since the *Gross* decision, the Supreme Court and lower courts have extended this same unreasonably difficult burden of proof to other types of civil rights complaints:

Retaliation—In Title VII cases in which an employer retaliates against a worker who challenges workplace discrimination based on race, sex, or other grounds, the worker

must now prove that retaliation was the decisive 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 much higher standard of causation, but four federal circuit courts of appeal 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 exponentially more difficult for workers who have experienced 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 not as wrong, or as unlawful, as other forms of discrimination.

POWADA 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 bipartisan legislation.

Sincerely,

AARP, American Association of People with Disabilities (AAPD), American Association of University Women (AAUW), American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU), American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees (AFSCME), Bazelon Center for Mental Health Law, Disability Rights Education & Defense Fund (DREDF), Easterseals, Equal Rights Advocates, Justice for Migrant Women, Justice in Aging, Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights.

National Council on Aging, National Disability Institute, National Domestic Workers Alliance, National Education Association (NEA), National Employment Law Project, National Employment Lawyers Association, National Partnership for Women & Families, National Women’s Law Center, NETWORK Lobby for Catholic Social Justice, Paralyzed Veterans of America, The Arc, The Gerontological Society of America, Women Employed, Women’s Institute for a Secure Retirement (WISER).

AARP,
June 10, 2019.

Hon. ROBERT C. SCOTT,
Chairman, Education and Labor Committee,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SCOTT: On behalf of AARP’s nearly 38 million members, including the approximately 91,000 AARP members in Virginia’s Third Congressional District, I extend our sincere thanks for leading efforts to introduce and move the Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act.

Older workers are a valuable asset to their employers and to the nation’s economy. Yet, AARP polling shows that over 60% of older workers believe they have seen or experienced age discrimination in the workplace. Discrimination is especially devastating when workers are terminated from long-time jobs, and face entrenched age bias in hiring.

H.R. 1230 will correct the 2009 Supreme Court decision in *Gross v. FBL Financial Services, Inc.* (and subsequent discrimination cases that followed its reasoning) that made it much more difficult to prove job discrimination, and will clarify that proven discrimination may not play any role in employment decisions. We think the Committee’s May hearing helped to highlight the need for POWADA, and thank you for drawing attention to Jack Gross’ presence there.

We look forward to the June 11th mark-up—as you may know, this will be the first

time that POWADA has been marked up and voted on in committee—and to working with you and your staff to shepherd this legislation through the House of Representatives before the August recess. Thank you again for your leadership and support.

Sincerely,

NANCY LEAMOND,
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 Americans against age discrimination in the workplace. 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, enact protections for older workers because if older workers lose their jobs, they are far more likely to face long-term unemployment. We must guarantee that age discrimination should be treated just as seriously as any other form of workplace discrimination.

This bill amends four laws—the Age Discrimination 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 include mixed-motive claims. This equates to standard 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 debate has expired.

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

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

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

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

H.R. 1230

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

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

SEC. 2. STANDARDS OF PROOF.

(a) *AGE DISCRIMINATION IN EMPLOYMENT ACT OF 1967.—*

(1) *CLARIFYING PROHIBITION AGAINST IMPERMISSIBLE CONSIDERATION OF AGE IN EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES.—Section 4 of the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 (29 U.S.C. 623) is amended by inserting after subsection (f) the following:*

“(g)(1) *Except as otherwise provided in this Act, an unlawful practice is established under this Act when the complaining party demonstrates that age or an activity protected by subsection (d) was a motivating factor for any practice, even though other factors also motivated the practice.*

“(2) *In establishing an unlawful practice under this Act, including under paragraph (1) or by any other method of proof, a complaining party—*

“(A) *may rely on any type or form of admissible evidence and need only produce evidence sufficient for a reasonable trier of fact to find that an unlawful practice occurred under this Act; and*

“(B) *shall not be required to demonstrate that age or an activity protected by subsection (d) was the sole cause of a practice.”.*

(2) *REMEDIES.—Section 7 of such Act (29 U.S.C. 626) is amended—*

(A) *in subsection (b)—*

(i) *in the first sentence, by striking “The” and inserting “(1) The”;*

(ii) *in the third sentence, by striking “Amounts” and inserting the following:*

“(2) *Amounts”;*

(iii) *in the fifth sentence, by striking “Before” and inserting the following:*

“(4) *Before”;* and

(iv) *by inserting before paragraph (4), as designated by clause (iii) of this subparagraph, the following:*

“(3) *On a claim in which an individual demonstrates that age was a motivating factor for any employment practice, under section 4(g)(1), and a respondent demonstrates that the respondent would have taken the same action in the absence of the impermissible motivating factor, the court—*

“(A) *may grant declaratory relief, injunctive relief (except as provided in subparagraph (B)), and attorney’s fees and costs demonstrated to be directly attributable only to the pursuit of a claim under section 4(g)(1); and*

“(B) *shall not award damages or issue an order requiring any admission, reinstatement, hiring, promotion, or payment.”;* and

(B) *in subsection (c)(1), by striking “Any” and inserting “Subject to subsection (b)(3), any”.*

(3) *DEFINITIONS.—Section 11 of such Act (29 U.S.C. 630) is amended by adding at the end the following:*

“(m) *The term ‘demonstrates’ means meets the burdens of production and persuasion.”.*

(4) *FEDERAL EMPLOYEES.—Section 15 of such Act (29 U.S.C. 633a) is amended by adding at the end the following:*

“(h) *Sections 4(g) and 7(b)(3) shall apply to mixed motive claims (involving practices described in section 4(g)(1)) under this section.”.*

(b) *TITLE VII OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964.—*

(1) *CLARIFYING PROHIBITION AGAINST IMPERMISSIBLE CONSIDERATION OF RACE, COLOR, RELIGION, SEX, OR NATIONAL ORIGIN IN EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES.—Section 703 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e-2) is amended by striking subsection (m) and inserting the following:*

“(m) *Except as otherwise provided in this title, an unlawful employment practice is established when the complaining party demonstrates that race, color, religion, sex, or national origin or an activity protected by section 704(a) was a motivating factor for any employment practice, even though other factors also motivated the practice.”.*

(2) *FEDERAL EMPLOYEES.—Section 717 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 2000e-16) is amended by adding at the end the following:*

“(g) *Sections 703(m) and 706(g)(2)(B) shall apply to mixed motive cases (involving practices described in section 703(m)) under this section.”.*

(c) AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT OF 1990.—

(1) DEFINITIONS.—Section 101 of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12111) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(11) DEMONSTRATES.—The term ‘demonstrates’ means meets the burdens of production and persuasion.”.

(2) CLARIFYING PROHIBITION AGAINST IMPERMISSIBLE CONSIDERATION OF DISABILITY IN EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES.—Section 102 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 12112) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(e) PROOF.—

“(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—Except as otherwise provided in this Act, a discriminatory practice is established under this Act when the complaining party demonstrates that disability or an activity protected by subsection (a) or (b) of section 503 was a motivating factor for any employment practice, even though other factors also motivated the practice.

“(2) DEMONSTRATION.—In establishing a discriminatory practice under paragraph (1) or by any other method of proof, a complaining party—

“(A) may rely on any type or form of admissible evidence and need only produce evidence sufficient for a reasonable trier of fact to find that a discriminatory practice occurred under this Act; and

“(B) shall not be required to demonstrate that disability or an activity protected by subsection (a) or (b) of section 503 was the sole cause of an employment practice.”.

(3) CERTAIN ANTI-RETALIATION CLAIMS.—Section 503(c) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 12203(c)) is amended—

(A) by striking “The remedies” and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the remedies”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) CERTAIN ANTI-RETALIATION CLAIMS.—Section 107(c) shall apply to claims under section 102(e)(1) with respect to title I.”.

(4) REMEDIES.—Section 107 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 12117) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(c) DISCRIMINATORY MOTIVATING FACTOR.—On a claim in which an individual demonstrates that disability was a motivating factor for any employment practice, under section 102(e)(1), and a respondent demonstrates that the respondent would have taken the same action in the absence of the impermissible motivating factor, the court—

“(1) may grant declaratory relief, injunctive relief (except as provided in paragraph (2)), and attorney’s fees and costs demonstrated to be directly attributable only to the pursuit of a claim under section 102(e)(1); and

“(2) shall not award damages or issue an order requiring any admission, reinstatement, hiring, promotion, or payment.”.

(d) REHABILITATION ACT OF 1973.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Sections 501(f), 503(d), and 504(d) of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 791(f), 793(d), and 794(d)), are each amended by adding after “title I of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12111 et seq.)” the following: “, including the standards of causation or methods of proof applied under section 102(e) of that Act (42 U.S.C. 12112(e)).”.

(2) FEDERAL EMPLOYEES.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) to section 501(f) shall be construed to apply to all employees covered by section 501.

SEC. 3. APPLICATION.

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.

SEC. 4. SEVERABILITY.

If any provision or portion of a provision of this Act, an amendment or portion of an amend-

ment made by this Act, or the application of any provision or portion thereof or amendment or portion thereof to particular persons or circumstances is held invalid or found to be unconstitutional, the remainder of this Act, the amendments made by this Act, or the application of that provision or portion thereof or amendment or portion thereof to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected.

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 report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. DESAULNIER

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 116-377.

Mr. DESAULNIER. 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 GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE.

Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Government Accountability Office shall submit to the Congress a report analyzing how the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission investigates mixed motive age discrimination claims arising under the Acts amended by this Act, focusing on—

(1) the ability of the Commission to meet the demands of its workload under such Acts;

(2) the plans of the Commission for investigating systemic age discrimination in violation of such Acts;

(3) the plans of the Commission for litigation under such Acts; and

(4) the options for improving the ability of the Commission to respond to allegations of age discrimination in violation of such Acts.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Chair, the American workforce is getting older and working longer than ever before. In fact, by 2024, the Bureau of Labor Statistics estimated that 25 percent of the U.S. workforce will be composed of workers over the age of 55, and a third of those workers will be older than 65.

At the same time, complaints of age discrimination are on the rise. According to enforcement statistics, the EEOC received over 20,000 complaints of age discrimination in 2017, accounting for 23 percent of all discrimination charges filed that year. That is a jump of 4,000 charges of age discrimination since the year 2000 and is likely a severe underestimate, as cases of age discrimination often go unreported.

More so, a 2018 study published by the AARP found that more than 60 per-

cent of workers age 45 and older have seen or experienced age discrimination, and 76 percent say that they consider age discrimination to be a major obstacle to finding a new job.

The Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act would help address this problem by making the burden of proof for age discrimination claims more equitable and more in line with other forms of discrimination.

This has important implications for older workers. Fewer cases could be thrown out or settled before trial, meaning long overdue justice for older Americans. It would also have important implications for the EEOC, ushering in a significant increase to the number of age discrimination claims and, therefore, EEOC’s workload.

My amendment goes one step further and ensures that Congress has a full picture of the scope of age discrimination in the American workforce and a better understanding of existing gaps in the EEOC’s ability to address and prevent workplace age discrimination. This would allow Congress to better support the EEOC in its work, meaningfully address age discrimination in the American workforce, and empower millions of older Americans.

I would like to thank my colleague, Congressman DAVIS, for his bipartisan partnership, and I urge support for this amendment.

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

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

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Chair, as my colleague from California and my colleague from Illinois know, I respect both of them greatly, and I would have thought that they would have come up with an amendment that would have helped us understand this issue before we pass such a bill instead of after we pass it.

As I understand it, this amendment requires the GAO to report on the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission’s ability to investigate and process age discrimination cases after H.R. 1230 unnecessarily reduces the burden of proof in these cases and nullifies decades of Supreme Court precedent.

This amendment is not needed. The EEOC already reports on its workload management and ability to respond to age discrimination charges in the agency’s annual budget request and recurring strategic plans. We should not mandate that GAO waste resources on an unnecessary, redundant report.

□ 1430

In addition, assuming this GAO report discovers new information, such information would be useful before the House votes to expand liability in four employment statutes. The new law will be in place, and the horse will have already left the barn by the time we receive the information.

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, including 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 age was only a motivating, not a decisive 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 that 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, 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 your work on this.

I rise in support of Mr. DESAULNIER's amendment of which I am a cosponsor. This amendment will require the GAO to report on the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission's ability to meet the demands of its workload in terms of the number of cases they receive.

If this important bill is enacted, the EEOC will inevitably be required to review an increasing number of mixed-motive age discrimination claims, which are worthy of review. This amendment is important because to adequately address workplace discrimination that relates to age or any other factor, we must have the resources to address and correct the problem.

Mr. Chairman, I encourage my colleagues to vote "yes" on this amendment.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I simply will say again that I think we should vote "no" on this amendment. I think it is redundant and unnecessary.

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

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the comments by the ranking member, and I hope we will continue our respect and friendship even though we are in disagreement on this.

I urge support of this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. DESAULNIER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. RODNEY DAVIS OF ILLINOIS

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 116-377.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. 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:

At the end, add the following:

SEC. 5. STUDY AND REPORT TO CONGRESS.

Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Labor and the Equal Opportunity Employment Commission shall jointly conduct a study to determine the number of claims pending or filed, in addition to cases closed, by women who may have been adversely impacted by age discrimination as a motivating factor in workplace discrimination or employment termination. The Secretary of Labor and Chairman of the Commission shall jointly submit to the Congress, and make available to the public, a report that contains the results of the study, including recommendations for best practices to prevent and to combat gender and age discrimination as it relates to women in the workplace.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of my bipartisan amendment to H.R. 1230, the Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act.

I would like to thank my friends on both sides of the aisle for their cosponsorship of my amendment, including Representatives CHELLIE PINGREE, ELISE STEFANIK, HALEY STEVENS, JENNIFER GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN, MARCY KAPTUR, ABIGAIL SPANBERGER, BETTY MCCOLLUM, MARK DESAULNIER, DAVID TRONE, CHRIS SMITH, PETE STAUBER, WILL HURD, and my colleague from the great State of Illinois, MIKE BOST. I also thank Chairman SCOTT for his support for this amendment.

I was proud to cosponsor this bill, which provides an important fix caused by the 2009 Gross v. FBL Financial Services, Inc. Supreme Court decision. This bill will ensure that older workers can seek the justice they deserve when they face age discrimination in the workplace on a level playing field.

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.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. 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 more opportunities available to them, and yet we often hear about constituents who struggle to find and keep work that supports themselves 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. Compounded by the real effects 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, resumes from older women got substantially fewer call backs 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.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois has 3 minutes 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-COLÓN), my good friend.

Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN. Mr. Chairman, I thank Congressman DAVIS for yielding to allow 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 in 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.

What kind of thanks are we giving 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 thoughtfulness, 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, dealing with 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.

This is an important initiative to equalize the playing field, to value those older Americans with experience who are ready to work, who have been giving their best, and who are ready to be the kind of experienced mentors in the workplace that really make America great.

I rise to support this legislation. It is vital to both impact and correct a very bad decision by the United States Supreme Court, and I believe that this will give the kind of affirmation to the value of all Americans, and particularly our older Americans.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I urge a "yes" vote on this bipartisan amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I want to thank the gentleman for his amendment and hope it passes.

I yield back the balance of my time. The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. ALLEN

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 116-377.

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. 5. 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 the 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 such subsection and 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.

□ 1445

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Chair, 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, deserved 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

several topics and bills, acknowledged 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.

This witness also acknowledged that when we might have expected a drop in charges due to Gross-inspired discouragement from employment attorneys, there was a sizeable jump in the number of ADEA charges filed at EEOC.

EEOC data shows that the rate of EEOC age discrimination charges as a percentage of all charges filed is approximately the same for the 9 years before and after the Gross decision.

There has been a slight uptick in Title VII of the Civil Rights Act retaliation charges as a percentage of all charges filed in the 4 years following the Nassar decision, which does not indicate individuals have been discouraged from filing these charges.

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 House should look before it leaps, and Members should vote in favor of this amendment to ensure this happens.

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

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to speak in opposition to Mr. ALLEN's amendment to delay the effects of this bill.

We do not need a study to tell us that a substantially higher burden of proof for some forms of discrimination makes it far more difficult for workers to get their day in court and to prevail. People may be winning cases, but they are not going to court in the first place in huge numbers.

When cases become materially more difficult to win, attorneys become much less willing and able to represent workers in those cases.

We have already had a 10-year delay in restoring justice. No more delays are necessary or warranted.

Age discrimination in the workplace is disturbingly pervasive. According to an AARP study released last year, three in five older workers report that they have seen or experienced age discrimination on the job. That is 60 percent.

Nearly two-thirds of women and more than three-fourths of African American workers age 45 and older say they have seen or experienced age dis-

crimination in the workplace. Three-fourths of workers age 45 and older blame age discrimination for their own lack of confidence in finding a job.

Mr. Chairman, I ran the workforce system in the State of Michigan for 4 years. Over and over again, I met workers who had lost their jobs because of age discrimination. Most of them weren't even contemplating taking legal action. They were just seeking help to find a new job.

I remember a gentleman from Bay City in Michigan who had been in college years earlier when his dad died of a heart attack suddenly. His mom said to him: "Sorry, son. You know everybody has to help keep the family afloat." So he dropped out of college, and he went to work in retail.

I met him 30 years later. He had been a manager at a sporting goods store, and the corporation looked at him and said: "We can get somebody way younger than that to run this store for half the money," and they fired him.

Thankfully, we had the No Worker Left Behind program in the State of Michigan, and he was able to go back and finish his bachelor's degree. But he wasn't even contemplating taking legal action under this statute.

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

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Chairman, again I repeat, the lone witness, a Democratic witness at the Committee of Education and Labor's hearing in May on H.R. 1230, acknowledged that it is difficult to quantify the impact that the Gross

decision had on the number of older workers who bring cases and the numbers of those who win them.

This witness also acknowledged that we might have expected a drop in charges due to the Gross-inspired discouragement from employment attorneys, but that there was a sizeable jump in ADEA charges filed with the EEOC.

I merely present this amendment to make sure that the committee and this House look at the data before we have some law here that is going to create, really, fewer opportunities for people to file these charges.

Mr. Chair, I urge a "yes" vote on my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I remind everybody that this is a bipartisan proposal, and it has undergone substantial debate since it was first introduced over a decade ago.

Over the past 10 years, Congress has deliberated on this bill through four legislative hearings, including two hearings in the Education and Labor Committee. Both the House and the Senate have introduced and gradually improved this legislation in the 111th, 112th, 113th, 114th, 115th, and now the 116th Congress. It is long overdue that we take action.

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

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN).

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. BROWN OF MARYLAND

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 116-377.

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. 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. REPORTS.

For the 5-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Chairman of Equal Employment Opportunity Commission shall submit to the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate a report at 1-year intervals on the number of age discrimination in employment claims brought under this Act with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission in the period for which such report is submitted.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

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 Committee 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 16,000 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 an 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 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 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*.

□ 1500

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 on whether H.R. 1230 is needed would have been 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 containing an analysis 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) other related information the Commission determines to be appropriate.

(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 appreciate the chairman's help in allowing me 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 data on 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 to vote 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 purported problem, neglects the experience 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 gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. TLAIB).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, 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, had come to no resolution thereon.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 11 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1602

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.

□ 1602

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. 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.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 163, noes 257, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 19]

AYES—163

Abraham	Bost	Conaway
Aderholt	Brady	Cook
Allen	Brooks (AL)	Crenshaw
Amodei	Buck	Curtis
Armstrong	Bucshon	DesJarlais
Arrington	Budd	Diaz-Balart
Babin	Burchett	Duncan
Bacon	Burgess	Dunn
Baird	Carter (GA)	Emmer
Balderson	Carter (TX)	Estes
Banks	Chabot	Ferguson
Barr	Cheney	Fleischmann
Bergman	Cline	Flores
Biggs	Cloud	Fortenberry
Bilirakis	Cole	Foxx (NC)
Bishop (NC)	Collins (GA)	Fulcher
Bishop (UT)	Comer	Gaetz

Gallagher LaMalfa Rutherford
 Gianforte Lamborn Scalise
 Gibbs Latta Schweikert
 Gohmert Long Scott, Austin
 Gonzalez (OH) Lucas Shimkus
 González-Colón Luetkemeyer Smith (MO)
 (PR) Marshall Smith (NE)
 Gooden Massie Smucker
 Gosar McCaul Spano
 Granger McHenry Steil
 Graves (GA) McKinley Steube
 Graves (LA) Meuser Stewart
 Graves (MO) Miller Stivers
 Green (TN) Mitchell Taylor
 Guest Moolenaar Thompson (PA)
 Guthrie Mooney (WV) Thornberry
 Hagedorn Mullin Timmons
 Harris Murphy (NC) Tipton
 Hartzler Newhouse Wagner
 Hern, Kevin Norman Walberg
 Herrera Beutler Nunes Walker
 Hice (GA) Olson Walorski
 Higgins (LA) Palazzo Waltz
 Hill (AR) Palmer Watkins
 Holding Pence Weber (TX)
 Hudson Posey Webster (FL)
 Huizenga Ratcliffe Wenstrup
 Johnson (LA) Reschenthaler Westerman
 Johnson (OH) Rice (SC) Williams
 Johnson (SD) Riggelman Wilson (SC)
 Jordan Roby Wittman
 Joyce (PA) Rodgers (WA) Womack
 Keller Roe, David P. Woodall
 Kelly (MS) Rogers (AL) Wright
 Kelly (PA) Rogers (KY) Yoho
 King (IA) Rooney (FL) Young
 Kustoff (TN) Rose, John W. Zeldin
 LaHood Rouzer

Payne Scanlon Thompson (MS)
 Perlmutter Schakowsky Titus
 Perry Schiff Tlaib
 Peters Schneider Tonko
 Peterson Schrader Torres (CA)
 Phillips Schrier Torres Small
 Pingree Scott (VA) (NM)
 Plaskett Scott, David Trahan
 Pocan Sensenbrenner Trone
 Porter Serrano Turner
 Pressley Sewell (AL) Underwood
 Price (NC) Shalala Upton
 Quigley Sherman Van Drew
 Raskin Sherrill Vargas
 Reed Sires Veasey
 Rice (NY) Slotkin Vela
 Richmond Smith (NJ) Velázquez
 Rose (NY) Smith (WA) Visclosky
 Rouda Soto Walden
 Roy Spanberger Wasserman
 Roybal-Allard Speier Schultz
 Ruiz Stanton Waters
 Ruppertsberger Stauber Watson Coleman
 Rush Stefanik Welch
 Ryan Stevens Wexton
 Sablan Suozzi Wild
 San Nicolas Swallow (CA) Yarmuth
 Sánchez Takano
 Sarbanes Thompson (CA)

NOT VOTING—15

Byrne Kirkpatrick McCarthy
 Calvert Lesko McClintock
 Clay Lewis Radewagen
 Crawford Loudermilk Simpson
 Gabbard Marchant Wilson (FL)

□ 1631

Ms. DEAN, Messrs. HECK, CUNNINGHAM, Ms. BASS, Mr. ROY, Ms. DELAURO, Messrs. GROTHMAN, MEADOWS, WALDEN, SUOZZI, PAYNE, and NADLER changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CUELLAR) having assumed the chair, Mr. CICILLINE, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 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, he 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.

Is a separate vote demanded on any further amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. SMUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. SMUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I am in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Smucker moves to recommit the bill (H.R. 1230) to the Committee on Education and Labor, with instructions to report the bill back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. . . . RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this Act shall be construed to alter the status of a truck driver as 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, this motion to recommit 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.

Mr. Speaker, Democrats in Congress and in State legislatures across the country are currently working to enact an unnecessary, backward-looking, and confusing 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 heart-wrenching stories from workers whose livelihoods have been turned upside down because Democrats have pushed through a radical leftwing policy.

Interestingly, California Democrats carved out some of their favorite friends, but truck drivers were not exempted, despite their opposition, despite their rally at the State Capitol, which included blaring their truck horns and all.

Fortunately for truck drivers, a district court has recently issued a temporary restraining order blocking enforcement of the law against independent truck drivers in the State.

But it doesn’t end there. Democrats right here in Congress continue this assault on independent contractors.

Mr. Speaker, 215 House Democrats have cosponsored the PRO Act, legislation that would take the text of California’s anti-independent contractor law and make it Federal law, with no exemptions for truck drivers, or any one else, for that matter.

NOES—257

Adams DelBene Kilmer
 Aguilar Delgado Kim
 Allred Demings Kind
 Amash DeSaulnier King (NY)
 Axne Deutch Kinzinger
 Barragán Dingell Krishnamoorthi
 Bass Doggett Kuster (NH)
 Beatty Doyle, Michael Lamb
 Bera F. Langevin
 Beyer Engel Larsen (WA)
 Bishop (GA) Escobar Larson (CT)
 Blumenauer Eshoo Lawrence
 Blunt Rochester Espaillat Lawson (FL)
 Bonamici Evans Lee (CA)
 Boyle, Brendan Finkenauer Lee (NV)
 Fitzpatrick Levin (CA)
 Brindisi Fletcher Levin (MI)
 Brooks (IN) Foster Lieu, Ted
 Brown (MD) Frankel Lipinski
 Brownley (CA) Fudge Loebsack
 Buchanan Gallego Lofgren
 Bustos Garamendi Lowenthal
 Butterfield Garcia (IL) Lowey
 Carbajal Luján Luján
 Cárdenas Golden Luria
 Carson (IN) Gomez Lynch
 Cartwright Gonzalez (TX) Malinowski
 Case Gottheimer Maloney,
 Casten (IL) Green, Al (TX) Carolyn B.
 Castor (FL) Griffith Maloney, Sean
 Castro (TX) Grijalva Mast
 Chu, Judy Grothman Matsui
 Cicilline Haaland McAdams
 Cisneros Harder (CA) McBath
 Clark (MA) Hastings McCollum
 Clarke (NY) Hayes McEachin
 Cleaver Heck McGovern
 Clyburn Higgins (NY) McNeerney
 Cohen Himes Meadows
 Connolly Hollingsworth Meeks
 Cooper Horn, Kendra S. Meng
 Correa Horsford Moore
 Costa Houlihan Morelle
 Courtney Hoyer Moulton
 Cox (CA) Huffman Mucarsel-Powell
 Craig Hurd (TX) Murphy (FL)
 Crist Jackson Lee Nadler
 Crow Jayapal Napolitano
 Cuellar Jeffries Neal
 Cunningham Johnson (GA) Neguse
 Davids (KS) Johnson (TX) Norcross
 Davidson (OH) Joyce (OH) Norton
 Davis (CA) Kaptur O’Halloran
 Davis, Danny K. Katko Ocasio-Cortez
 Davis, Rodney Keating Omar
 Dean Kelly (IL) Pallone
 DeFazio Kennedy Panetta
 DeGette Khanna Pappas
 DeLauro Kildee Pascrell

Let me say this again. The Democrats' legislation pending in the House, on which, by the way, the majority leader promised a vote by President's Day, would impose California's anti-independent contractor law on every business in America.

Independent contracting today allows millions of American families the opportunity to live their own American Dream.

I started my own career as an independent contractor operating my own drywall company at the age of 17. The flexibility this status offered allowed me to grow the business, building a team of hundreds of employees with family-sustaining jobs over the course of 25 years.

Independent truck drivers specifically are able to invest in their own careers and work for themselves on their own schedules while powering the American economy across the country.

Mr. Speaker, according to the Owner-Operator Independent Drivers Association, there are over 350,000 owner-operator independent truck drivers in the United States. Their average net income in 2018 was well over \$50,000, more than their professional employee-driver counterparts.

Last August, I participated in a ride with my constituent Randy Martin, who is owner-operator of Peachey Transport in Denver, Pennsylvania. Randy has grown a successful business hauling premier Lancaster County farm products.

He has been driving trucks since 1984 and shared with me that this career has allowed him to provide for his family while becoming a successful entrepreneur. It has allowed him and his family to achieve their own American Dream.

Randy isn't the only one. In 2017, a company collected stories from drivers on why they love trucking. One driver, Susan Couch, said:

I never knew a trucking job would become a passion and how much this career would change my life. It has allowed me to be independent and support my son alone. It has given me strength I never knew I had.

Tu Ngo told the San Francisco Chronicle that owning his own truck allows him to pursue the American Dream he was seeking when he fled Vietnam in 1982.

Eduardo Rangel values the flexibility he has to attend his young son's soccer games.

The stories are endless.

Independent truck driving provides a steady, stable, rewarding, and prosperous livelihood for thousands of American workers.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support these American workers. I urge them to support this motion to recommit. A "yes" vote is a vote to support prosperity and to support free enterprise.

Don't let hardworking Americans become victims of a misguided labor scheme cooked up by socialist Democrats in California and right here in

the U.S. Congress. Rather, vote "yes" to allow workers all across the country to prosper and to live their own American Dream.

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

Ms. WILD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WILD. Mr. Speaker, I am not sure that my colleague and friend from Pennsylvania has read the same bill that I did that we are voting on tonight.

This bill, the Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act, has nothing to do with truck drivers, and it has nothing to do with independent contractors.

This motion to recommit is nothing more than a distraction from the very important legislation that is embodied in this bill. This MTR has nothing to do with discrimination against older workers, which is what we are seeking to protect against.

Why do my friends and colleagues across the aisle want to hurt older working Americans? This legislation, H.R. 1230, was drawn up to fix the damage that has been done by the Supreme Court decision in Gross v. FBL in 2009, which severely weakened age discrimination protections.

Since that decision was made, both the Supreme Court and the lower courts have relied on it and applied the Gross reasoning to the other civil rights laws so that it doesn't just hurt older working Americans who are the focus of this legislation, but other people who suffer from employment discrimination.

The bill we are considering today is the bare bones of what is needed to rectify the damage caused by that decision. This bill represents a bipartisan, bicameral effort that has been 10 years in the making.

H.R. 1230 amends the Nation's core civil rights laws to expressly allow for mixed-motive claims, meaning, when an employer claims multiple motives for terminating an employee, one of which is age discrimination, that that will not be permitted.

Since the Gross decision in 2009, age discrimination continues to be a significant barrier to job opportunities. When older workers lose their jobs, they are far more likely than other workers to join the ranks of the long-term or permanent unemployed.

Significantly, approximately 61 percent of older workers have either seen or experienced age discrimination in the workplace.

In 2018, the EEOC received nearly 17,000 age discrimination complaints, accounting for more than 20 percent of all discrimination charges filed. While most older workers say they have seen or experienced age discrimination, only 3 percent report having made a formal complaint. These trends have a profound impact on the economic security of older workers and their families.

This law has nothing to do with truckers and nothing to do with independent contractors. This 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 is, as my colleague has indicated, 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 workers against discrimination.

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 SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SMUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 5-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by a 5-minute vote on the passage of the bill, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 196, noes 220, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 20]

AYES—196

Abraham	Brooks (IN)	Costa
Allen	Buchanan	Crenshaw
Amodel	Buck	Cunningham
Armstrong	Bucshon	Curtis
Arrington	Budd	Davidson (OH)
Babin	Burchett	Davis, Rodney
Bacon	Burgess	DesJarlais
Baird	Calvert	Diaz-Balart
Balderson	Carter (GA)	Duncan
Banks	Carter (TX)	Dunn
Barr	Chabot	Emmer
Bergman	Cheney	Estes
Biggs	Cline	Ferguson
Billirakis	Cloud	Fitzpatrick
Bishop (NC)	Cole	Fleischmann
Bishop (UT)	Collins (GA)	Flores
Bost	Comer	Fortenberry
Brindisi	Conaway	Fox (NC)
Brooks (AL)	Cook	Fulcher

Gaetz	Lamborn	Scalise	Omar	Sánchez	Thompson (CA)	Johnson (TX)	Morelle	Serrano
Gallagher	Latta	Schrader	Pallone	Sarbanes	Thompson (MS)	Joyce (OH)	Moulton	Sewell (AL)
Gianforte	Long	Schweikert	Panetta	Scanlon	Titus	Kaptur	Mucarsel-Powell	Shalala
Gibbs	Lucas	Scott, Austin	Pappas	Schakowsky	Tlaib	Katko	Murphy (FL)	Sherman
Gohmert	Luetkemeyer	Sensenbrenner	Pascrell	Schiff	Tonko	Keating	Nadler	Sherrill
Gonzalez (OH)	Marshall	Shimkus	Payne	Schneider	Torres (CA)	Kelly (IL)	Napolitano	Sires
Gooden	Massie	Perlmutter	Perlmutter	Schrier	Torres Small	Kennedy	Neal	Slotkin
Gosar	Mast	Smith (MO)	Peters	Scott (VA)	(NM)	Khanna	Neguse	Smith (NJ)
Granger	McAdams	Smith (NE)	Phillips	Scott, David	Trahan	Kildee	Norcross	Smith (WA)
Graves (GA)	McCarthy	Smith (NJ)	Pingree	Serrano	Trone	Kilmer	O'Halleran	Soto
Graves (LA)	McCaul	Smucker	Pocan	Sewell (AL)	Underwood	Kim	Ocasio-Cortez	Spanberger
Graves (MO)	McHenry	Spano	Porter	Shalala	Vargas	Kind	Omar	Speier
Green (TN)	McKinley	Stauber	Pressley	Sherman	Veasey	King (NY)	Pallone	Stanton
Griffith	Meadows	Stefanik	Price (NC)	Sherrill	Vela	Kinzinger	Panetta	Staubert
Grothman	Meuser	Steil	Quigley	Sires	Velázquez	Krishnamoorthi	Pappas	Staubert
Guest	Miller	Steube	Raskin	Slotkin	Visclosky	Kuster (NH)	Pascrell	Stefanik
Guthrie	Mitchell	Stewart	Rice (NY)	Smith (WA)	Wasserman	Lamb	Payne	Stevens
Hagedorn	Moolenaar	Stivers	Richmond	Soto	Schultz	Langevin	Perlmutter	Suozi
Harris	Mooney (WV)	Taylor	Rose (NY)	Spanberger	Swalwell (CA)	Larsen (WA)	Peters	Swalwell (CA)
Hartzler	Mullin	Thompson (PA)	Rouda	Speier	Takano	Larson (CT)	Peterson	Takano
Hern, Kevin	Murphy (FL)	Thornberry	Roybal-Allard	Stanton	Welch	Lawrence	Phillips	Thompson (CA)
Herrera Beutler	Murphy (NC)	Timmons	Ruiz	Stevens	Wexton	Lawson (FL)	Pingree	Thompson (MS)
Hice (GA)	Newhouse	Tipton	Ruppersberger	Suozi	Wild	Lee (CA)	Pocan	Titus
Higgins (LA)	Norman	Turner	Rush	Swalwell (CA)	Wilson (FL)	Lee (NV)	Porter	Tlaib
Hill (AR)	Nunes	Upton	Ryan	Takano	Yarmuth	Levin (CA)	Posey	Tonko
Holding	Olson	Van Drew				Levin (MI)	Torres (CA)	Torres (CA)
Hollingsworth	Palazzo	Wagner				Lieu, Ted	Pressley	Torres Small
Horn, Kendra S.	Palmer	Walberg	Aderholt	Gabbard	Marchant	Lipinski	Price (NC)	(NM)
Hudson	Pence	Walden	Brady	Kirkpatrick	McClintock	Raskin	Quigley	Trahan
Huizenga	Perry	Walker	Byrne	Lesko	Simpson	Reed	Rush	Trone
Hurd (TX)	Peterson	Walorski	Clay	Lewis		Rice (NY)	Rice (SC)	Turner
Johnson (LA)	Posey	Waltz	Crawford	Loudermilk		Rice (SC)	Underwood	Underwood
Johnson (OH)	Ratcliffe	Watkins				Richmond	Upton	Upton
Johnson (SD)	Reed	Weber (TX)				Rose (NY)	Van Drew	Van Drew
Jordan	Reschenthaler	Webster (FL)				Rouda	Vargas	Vargas
Joyce (OH)	Rice (SC)	Wenstrup				Roybal-Allard	Veasey	Veasey
Joyce (PA)	Riggleman	Westerman				Ruiz	Vela	Vela
Katko	Roby	Williams				Ruppersberger	Velázquez	Visclosky
Keller	Rodgers (WA)	Wilson (SC)				Rush	Wagner	Wagner
Kelly (MS)	Roe, David P.	Wittman				Ryan	Walden	Walden
Kelly (PA)	Rogers (AL)	Womack				Sánchez	Wasserman	Wasserman
King (IA)	Rogers (KY)	Woodall				Sarbanes	Schultz	Schultz
King (NY)	Rooney (FL)	Wright				Scanlon	Waters	Waters
Kinzinger	Rose, John W.	Yoho				McCaul	Watson Coleman	Watson Coleman
Kustoff (TN)	Rouzer	Young				McCollum	Welch	Welch
LaHood	Roy	Zeldin				McEachin	Wild	Wild
LaMalfa	Rutherford					McGovern	Schneider	Schneider
						McNerney	Schrader	Schrader
						Meeks	Schrier	Schrier
						Meng	Scott (VA)	Scott (VA)
						Moore	Scott, David	Scott, David
							Sensenbrenner	Sensenbrenner

NOT VOTING—13

□ 1654

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 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—ayes 261, noes 155, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 21]

AYES—261

Adams	DeGette	Kennedy	Adams	Clarke (NY)	Evans	Abraham	Gallagher	McKinley
Aguilar	DeLauro	Khanna	Aguilar	Cleaver	Finkenauer	Allen	Gianforte	Meadows
Allred	DelBene	Kildee	Allred	Clyburn	Fitzpatrick	Amash	Amodei	Gibbs
Amash	Delgado	Kilmer	Axne	Cohen	Fletcher	Armstrong	Arrington	Gohmert
Axne	Demings	Kim	Bacon	Connolly	Fortenberry	Babin	Baird	Gonzalez (OH)
Barragán	DeSaulnier	Kind	Balderson	Cook	Foster	Baird	Banks	Gooden
Bass	Deutch	Krishnamoorthi	Barragán	Cooper	Frankel	Baird	Barr	Gosar
Beatty	Dingell	Kuster (NH)	Bass	Correa	Fudge	Baird	Bergman	Granger
Bera	Doggett	Lamb	Beatty	Costa	Gallego	Baird	Biggs	Graves (GA)
Beyer	Doyle, Michael	Langevin	Bera	Courtney	Garamendi	Baird	Bishop (NC)	Graves (LA)
Bishop (GA)	F.	Larsen (WA)	Beyer	Cox (CA)	Garcia (IL)	Baird	Bishop (UT)	Graves (MO)
Blumenauer	Engel	Larson (CT)	Bilirakis	Craig	Garcia (TX)	Baird	Brady	Green (TN)
Blunt Rochester	Escobar	Lawrence	Lieu, Ted	Crist	Golden	Baird	Brooks (AL)	Griffith
Bonamici	Eshoo	Lawson (FL)	Lipinski	Crow	Gomez	Baird	Brooks (AL)	Guest
Boyle, Brendan	Españillat	Lee (CA)	Loebsack	Cueellar	Gonzalez (TX)	Baird	Buck	Guthrie
F.	Evans	Lee (NV)	Bonamici	Cunningham	Green (TX)	Baird	Bucshon	Hagedorn
Brown (MD)	Finkenauer	Levin (CA)	Bost	Davids (KS)	Green, Al (TX)	Baird	Budd	Harris
Brownley (CA)	Fletcher	Levin (MI)	Bonamici	Davis (CA)	Grijalva	Baird	Burchett	Hartzler
Bustos	Foster	Lieu, Ted	Bonamici	Davis (CA)	Grothman	Baird	Burgess	Hern, Kevin
Butterfield	Frankel	Lipinski	Bonamici	Davis, Danny K.	Haaland	Baird	Calvert	Hice (GA)
Carbajal	Fudge	Loebsack	Bonamici	Davis, Rodney	Harder (CA)	Baird	Carter (GA)	Higgins (LA)
Cárdenas	Gallego	Logren	Bonamici	Dean	Hastings	Baird	Carter (TX)	Hill (AR)
Carson (IN)	Garamendi	Lowenthal	Bonamici	DeFazio	Hayes	Baird	Chabot	Holding
Cartwright	Garcia (IL)	Lujan	Bonamici	DeGette	Heck	Baird	Cheney	Holding
Case	Garcia (TX)	Luria	Bonamici	DeLauro	Herrera Beutler	Baird	Cline	Holding
Casten (IL)	Golden	Lynch	Bonamici	DelBene	Higgins (NY)	Baird	Cloud	Holding
Castor (FL)	Gomez	Malinowski	Bonamici	Delgado	Himes	Baird	Cole	Holding
Castro (TX)	Gonzalez (TX)	Maloney,	Bonamici	Demings	Hollingsworth	Baird	Collins (GA)	Holding
Chu, Judy	Gottheimer	Carolyn B.	Bonamici	Demings	Horn, Kendra S.	Baird	Comer	Holding
Cicilline	Green, Al (TX)	Maloney, Sean	Bonamici	Demings	Horsford	Baird	Conaway	Holding
Cisneros	Grijalva	Matsui	Bonamici	Demings	Houlihan	Baird	Crenshaw	Holding
Clark (MA)	Haaland	McBath	Bonamici	Demings	Hoyer	Baird	Curtis	Holding
Clarke (NY)	Harder (CA)	McCollum	Bonamici	Demings	Huffman	Baird	Davidson (OH)	Holding
Cleaver	Hastings	McEachin	Bonamici	Demings	Hurd (TX)	Baird	DesJarlais	Holding
Clyburn	Hayes	McGovern	Bonamici	Demings	Jeffries	Baird	Duncan	Holding
Cohen	Heck	McNerney	Bonamici	Demings	Jackson Lee	Baird	Dunn	Holding
Connolly	Higgins (NY)	Meeks	Bonamici	Demings	Jayapal	Baird	Emmer	Holding
Cooper	Himes	Meng	Bonamici	Demings	Jeffries	Baird	Estes	Holding
Correa	Horsford	Moore	Bonamici	Demings	Johnson (GA)	Baird	Ferguson	Holding
Courtney	Houlihan	Moore	Bonamici	Demings	Johnson (GA)	Baird	Fleischmann	Holding
Cox (CA)	Hoyer	Moultin	Bonamici	Demings	Johnson (GA)	Baird	Flores	Holding
Craig	Huffman	Mucarsel-Powell	Bonamici	Demings	Johnson (GA)	Baird	Fox (NC)	Holding
Crist	Jackson Lee	Nadler	Bonamici	Demings	Johnson (GA)	Baird	Fulcher	Holding
Crow	Jayapal	Napolitano	Bonamici	Demings	Johnson (GA)	Baird	Gaetz	Holding
Cuellar	Jeffries	Neal	Bonamici	Demings	Johnson (GA)	Baird	McCarthy	Holding
Davids (KS)	Johnson (GA)	Neguse	Bonamici	Demings	Johnson (GA)	Baird	McHenry	Holding
Davis (CA)	Johnson (TX)	Norcross	Bonamici	Demings	Johnson (GA)	Baird	McHenry	Holding
Davis, Danny K.	Kaptur	O'Halleran	Bonamici	Demings	Johnson (GA)	Baird	McHenry	Holding
Dean	Keating	Ocasio-Cortez	Bonamici	Demings	Johnson (GA)	Baird	McHenry	Holding
DeFazio	Kelly (IL)		Bonamici	Demings	Johnson (GA)	Baird	McHenry	Holding

NOES—220

NOES—155

Walberg	Webster (FL)	Womack
Walker	Wenstrup	Woodall
Walorski	Westerman	Wright
Waltz	Williams	Yoho
Watkins	Wilson (SC)	Zeldin
Weber (TX)	Wittman	

NOT VOTING—13

Aderholt	Kirkpatrick	McClintock
Byrne	Lesko	Roy
Clay	Lewis	Simpson
Crawford	Loudermilk	
Gabbard	Marchant	

□ 1701

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I was absent today due to a medical emergency. Had I been present, I would have voted: "yea" on rollcall No. 18, "no" on rollcall No. 19, "no" on rollcall No. 20, and "yea" on rollcall No. 21.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PHILLIPS) laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Joint Economic Committee:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 8, 2020.

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

DEAR SPEAKER PELOSI: I am writing to submit my formal resignation as Vice Chair of the Joint Economic Committee, effective immediately. It has been an honor to serve in this position and I look forward to my new role as Chair of the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

With my deepest appreciation,
CAROLYN B. MALONEY,
Member of Congress.

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

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

HONORING BRICK CITY LIONS

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a national champion from my district, the Brick City Lions. Brick City is the nickname of Newark, New Jersey, and the football team, the Brick City Lions, beat the Arizona Far West Jets 34–24 to win the 2019 Pop Warner Division I Junior Varsity national championship last month.

Lions coach Nasir Gains should be very proud of the work of his team. He

founded the Lions, also known as the Newark Youth Athletic Foundation, in 2012. In that short time, his teams have succeeded at every level.

But Coach Gains wants them to excel in the classroom as well. He provides reading and math tutors plus standardized test classes to all his players. He wants to build teams with character, confidence, comradery, and brotherhood. Clearly, he is succeeding on and off the field and deserves this recognition.

Coach Gains and his teams represent the best of Newark, and they are a point of pride in our community.

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, Joi, 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 steering committee of numerous Gubernatorial and Presidential campaigns in California and managed campaigns for city coun-

cil, county supervisor, and State assembly candidates.

After retiring, Harold enjoyed cheering on his Oklahoma Sooner football team, Friday night dinners with his close-knit family, afternoons with his granddaughter, 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 California's 23rd Congressional District, Judy and I extend our deepest condolences to the Meek family, and we join them in honoring the life of Harold Meek.

KEEPING ROE V. WADE THE LAW OF THE LAND

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

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Speaker, on January 22, 1973, the Supreme Court ruled, 7–2, that women have the right to make their own healthcare decisions and to legally access abortion care. Forty-seven years later, our country has seen significant social and economic progress since Roe v. Wade.

Seventy-three percent of Americans support keeping Roe v. Wade the law of the land. They agree we can't go back. And yet, nearly 50 years after Roe became settled law, abortion is still under attack by extreme politicians who believe the government should dictate whether and when to have a child.

From 2011 to 2018, States across our country enacted 424 separate restrictions on abortion. In 2016, Donald Trump campaigned on a promise of appointing Justices who will overturn Roe v. Wade, and he has appointed more than one-quarter of all active judges to date.

His administration has pushed a domestic gag rule to prohibit doctors from telling women about their legal right to access abortion and slashed access to family planning funding in the process.

As we honor the anniversary of Roe v. Wade, we must expand abortion access for women across the country and stand up to the senseless attacks on women's health.

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 of North Carolina. 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 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 resettlement of those fleeing violence and religious persecution. This isn't what we stand for 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.

□ 1715

IRAN 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 Ira-

nian Government responsible for the history of brutality against its own citizens and the world.

They are marching in the streets for the 1,500 Iranians killed by the Islamic Revolutionary Guard in December of 2019. 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, B.B. King, 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 128-8. They have lost only eight games 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 Language. 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, disinvestment, 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 this debacle, 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 went 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 unwilling to watch us enter 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, each event he 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.

□ 1730

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE), my colleague and good friend.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for organizing this Special Order on this really important topic.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday, we held a hearing in the House Committee on Foreign Affairs on the administration's actions in Iran. Over the past few weeks, the United States and Iran have come closer to outright war than any time in our history. However, despite the seriousness of the situation, Secretary of State Mike Pompeo refused to appear.

The Framers of the Constitution gave the power to declare war solely to the Congress of the United States, the elected representatives of the people. The reason they did that is they wanted to prevent a President from making the decision to take the country to war without the support of the American people.

As we think about the President's decision, the only lens through which we

should view it is 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's actions 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 back 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 to engage in military action.

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 would 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 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 to war 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 here today, 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 bluster 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 to 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 pro-

moting 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.

A 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 at 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 program in Iran, 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. And it was working. There 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 is 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 thing we could 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 in support of that legislation.

We don'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 is going to make those decisions, and to do it now.

Ms. TLAIIB. 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 TLAIIB. 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. It has been quite remarkable 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. I thank her 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 PRAMILA 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 as 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 repeal 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.

First, with regard to 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.

□ 1745

It was a blank check, however, for endless war. It was a 60-word authorization. It was totally open-ended.

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 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 Weed, Specialist in Foreign 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 to 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 2001 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.—That the President is authorized to use all necessary and appropriate force against those nations, organizations, or persons he determines planned, authorized, committed, or aided the terrorist attacks 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 congressional reporting requirement, but states that the authorization is not intended to supersede any requirement of the War Powers Resolution, which does require congressional reporting for initial and continuing deployments of U.S. armed forces into imminent or ongoing hostilities.

EXECUTIVE BRANCH POLICY CONCERNING UTILIZATION OF 2001 AUMF 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 against specific individual targets rather than general military action against enemy forces.

Because the 2001 AUMF authorizes U.S. involvement in an international armed 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 overall 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 U.S. military action to meet U.S. counterterrorism objectives might be interpreted to fall under different authorities, of which the 2001 AUMF is just one, albeit important, example.

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 justification for the United States' ongoing use of military force against the Islamic State, which according to the Report has taken place in the form of airstrikes, military advising and training of Iraqi security forces and Syrian rebel groups, and military activities of U.S. special operations forces in Iraq, Syria, and Libya. The Report asserts that such use of force is authorized by the 2001 AUMF, arguing certain factors as determinative:

1. The 2001 AUMF authorizes the President to use military force "in order to prevent any future acts of international terrorism against the United States by such nations, organizations, or persons" who perpetrated or harbored those who perpetrated the September 11, 2001 terror attacks against the United States.

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 conflicts as “associated forces.”

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 after AQI changed 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 REPORTING TO CONGRESS REFERENCE THE 2001 AUMF

Since 2001, Presidents George W. Bush, Barack Obama, and Donald Trump have referenced in public notifications the 2001 AUMF in connection with initiating 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 counter Al Qaeda, the Taliban, and violent extremist and terrorist groups designated as associated with those two organizations. The 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 changed over time, making it difficult to aggregate such information.

NOTIFICATIONS OF DEPLOYING U.S. ARMED FORCES AND/OR USING MILITARY FORCE INVOLVING REFERENCE 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 force and other 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 all times, both Presidents have relied primarily on their constitutional Article II powers as Commander in Chief and Chief Executive. In many instances, reference to 2001 AUMF authority has been supplementary and indirect; in only a few cases has a President relied directly on 2001 AUMF authority as justification for a military operation, deployment, or other action.

Below are provided several tables of information concerning presidential notifications and records of other executive action referencing the 2001 AUMF. Each table provides:

a date of each notification or record; the relevant military activity, location, and/or purpose of such activities, as available;

the constitutional and statutory authority provided in the notification or record as provided; and

the reference to applicable reporting requirements precipitating each respective notification or record.

For Tables 1-8, each set out in its own section with accompanying analysis, each table includes a group of notifications that are similar in composition and content. Each subsequent table and section, therefore, denotes a change in composition of the notifications referencing the 2001 AUMF in some way.

INITIAL REPORTING IN THE AFTERMATH OF THE SEPTEMBER 11, 2001 ATTACKS

President Bush’s reports to Congress concerning military deployments in the weeks following the September 11, 2001 terror attacks were relatively concise, focusing on the need to address the terrorist threat in the immediate aftermath of the attacks, and the deployments and actions taken in response to such threat. The first notification on September 24, 2001 references deployments to “a number of foreign nations” in the “Central and Pacific Command areas of operations.” Major military operations in Afghanistan had not yet commenced. The second notification on October 9, 2001 includes similar information but also notifies Congress of the commencement of combat against Al Qaeda and the Taliban in Afghanistan. In these two notifications, President Bush stated that he had taken the actions described pursuant to his constitutional authority as Commander in Chief and Chief Executive. In both notifications, he referred to the 2001 AUMF as evidencing the continuing support of Congress, but did not specifically state he had taken such action pursuant to 2001 AUMF authority. The President stated in 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 ambassadors 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, mostly, 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 have stood here so many times to 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 at how to develop a nuclear 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 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 that they 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 took that out of the NDAA. 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 intended, 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 on the books, and that isn't even being used in any current military operations, and it shouldn't be used.

In 2 weeks, we will take up Congressman KHANNA's bill, which I am proud to cosponsor, to prohibit funds from being used for a war with Iran absent explicit congressional authorization. We must do our job.

Mr. Speaker, we have known for years that there is no military solution in the Middle East, and it is past time to return to a diplomatic strategy with our allies.

We cannot allow this President's irresponsible and irrational decision-making to drag us into an unnecessary and catastrophic war in the Middle East. We must protect our national security, our brave troops, our allies, people in the region, Iraqis, Iranians, everyone who lives in the midst of harm's way, and we must protect the American people.

So we ask the question each and every day now: Are we safer or less safe than before this assassination and military strike? I suggest that we are less safe, and we need to repeal the 2002 authorization to use force.

We need to pass Congressman KHANNA's resolution, and we also need to look at a strategy and insist that this administration come to Congress if, in fact, they intend to use force anywhere in the world.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Congresswoman TLAIB for her leadership and for this Special Order.

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentlewoman's courtesy in permitting me to speak on this and bringing us together, and I have enjoyed listening to my colleagues walk us down memory lane.

BARBARA LEE, JAN SCHAKOWSKY, these are painful memories, but we were here when the United States made the single biggest foreign policy blunder in our history, costing hundreds of thousands of lives in the Middle East—not just thousands of Americans—costing trillions of dollars.

We are watching every day in America the price being paid by men and women who come back with injuries, both visible and those that aren't: PTSD, missing limbs, lost opportunities, and troubled families.

Three days ago, there was a quotation describing what was going on with Boeing's design of the 737 MAX, where one of their engineers said it was designed by clowns and supervised by monkeys. I think that act, sadly, is what we are looking at, the clown act that is going on now, trying to sort out a rationale for another rash act that has, in fact, left us less safe.

Now, Donald Trump campaigned taping into the antiwar sentiment and professed to be against endless wars. He professed to have been against the war in Iraq. Of course, an examination of his record finds out, like most things, he is on both sides of that question.

But he has taken a step that puts us in harm's way again. It recalls the Beirut tragedy, where there was the largest loss of life since World War II in a single day, October 23, 1983. 241 marines were lost in that car bombing in the barracks in Beirut.

But that was preceded by what some, at this point, would, I think, fairly assess reckless action on behalf of the United States in terms of heavy shelling of Hezbollah positions in Lebanon, things that we could have done many times before but cooler heads prevailed because of some of the potential backlash. That was, indeed, a serious backlash, and we ended up not only having the loss of Marine lives; we had to withdraw and further unsettle that troubled area of the country.

Well, what we have seen now is that, with one reckless act—the execution, the assassination of General Soleimani is something that we could have done. Prior Presidents knew his location. They could have assassinated him, and they certainly had no love lost for a truly reprehensible human being. But they knew that they needed to exercise restraint because the consequences could be grave.

The one act of assassination has been fascinating to watch because what we have seen now is that the Iraqis, in their Parliament, have disinvited us, told us to leave.

We have watched in Iran where just weeks before there were violent dem-

onstrations that were put down by that repressive regime against their own people. People were demonstrating at great personal peril as the forces for reform were bubbling up.

But wasn't it interesting. Immediately after that assassination by the United States in Iraq, not only did it consolidate Iraqis wanting us to leave, but it—at least, temporarily—united the Iranian people against us.

But for the tragedy of shooting down a civilian airliner which was mistaken for an American bomber, there would have been—that has generated more hostility toward the regime, and it was their own ineptness that did that, no thanks to this administration.

Watch what has been happening lately. We had a series of briefings that were scheduled to finally give information to some of the committees. I am under no illusion that they would be detailed, but at least they would have gone through the motions.

They have been canceled, a series of them, with no good reason, after they had been scheduled, and people were looking forward to that conversation.

□ 1800

Perhaps it is because this administration can't get its act together, can't get its stories straight. For the last 10 days, we have watched late night comedians use film clips of the Secretary of Defense, of the Secretary of State, of Donald Trump dissembling, tripping over themselves in not just fractured rhetoric and syntax but contradicting what, in fact, was their rationale, why, when, and where. It makes for good comedy, but unfortunately, this is serious. We are talking about a very fragile state in the Middle East.

I was in the White House being briefed by Secretary of State Condi Rice and George Tenet, head of the CIA, telling us about an imminent danger then, but at least we had White House briefings, at least they went through the pretext. They were wrong, and they didn't persuade me or a number of my colleagues, some of whom you have heard from tonight, who voted against their authorization, voted against their reckless efforts. We have seen this movie before. I hope it doesn't spiral out of control again.

It is important, Mr. Speaker, that Americans understand the stakes that are involved. It is important for Congress to finally reassert itself. I think knowing what we know now, those of us who opposed the Iraq war would have been overwhelmingly supported, and we would have rejected it. But we have had the benefit of history to be able to hopefully learn from our mistakes.

We have legislation coming forward when we return to Washington in 2 weeks. H.R. 5543, the No War Against Iran Act sponsored by Representative RO KHANNA, a number of us are original cosponsors, agitating for this moving forward. It would prevent any funds from being used for military force

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 that 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 am proud to co-sponsor and support 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 in the House.

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 one of the worst votes they ever cast. We have an opportunity to unwind some of that now when we come back by approving those two pieces of legislation.

I deeply appreciate my colleague organizing this conversation tonight. For some people it may seem like it is beating a dead horse. I think not. These are lessons that we learn too slowly. These are lessons that we have paid for in blood, in treasure, in upset in our communities, in pain and suffering in the United States and around the world. I hope that Congresswoman TLAIB will continue in her effort at being such a strong voice for peace and rationality, because we have to continue to amplify this message for the American people.

I thank the congresswoman again for allowing me to participate in this conversation this evening.

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his incredible leadership. It is a blessing here.

This administration's rogue attempt to start a war with Iran has endangered countless lives around the world. We are farther away from global peace and bringing our troops home.

Just as the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan have been disastrous, resulting in

deaths of millions of people and costing trillions of dollars, a war with Iran and Iraqi Shia militias would destabilize the region and cause untold human suffering.

Congress must act swiftly to reclaim our authority over declarations of war and uphold the will of the American people who loudly say no to war with Iran.

Our residents want us focused on ensuring everyone in America has the opportunity to thrive. Trillions of dollars have been spent on death and destruction instead of on education and healthcare that communities like Michigan's 13th District Strong so desperately need. Instead we have wars now that have become political campaign moves.

I represent the third poorest congressional district in the country. My residents don't want more endless wars in the Middle East. They want good jobs, affordable healthcare, and good schools for their children.

We must reclaim our government from those who pushed the war, and we must dismantle the military industrial complex once and for all.

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 changes across the globe. Fueled 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 so much 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 those hungry for war, 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 with diplomacy, not missiles. 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 in this Chamber.

I thank my good colleagues from the Congressional Progressive Caucus for their amazing and incredible courage to stand up and tell the truth that is sometimes lacking in this Chamber. We must do that. And sometimes staying silent or not asking those tough questions is the same as lying.

Mr. Speaker, 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 utmost respect, love, and protection from the violence of abortion.

Sadly, Mr. Speaker, since 1973 over 61 million unborn babies have been killed by either dismemberment, a procedure where the child is decapitated and torn apart arms, legs, and torso or by chemical poisoning. The loss of children's lives in America is staggering, a death toll that equates with the entire population of Italy.

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 stop marching 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 champions like Cathie 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 capitol 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. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his eloquent comments and reminding us of the great progress being made at the State level where so many laws and policies have been enacted, and we are trying to do that on the Federal level.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama, MARTHA ROBY, a member of the Appropriations Committee and the Judiciary Committee.

□ 1815

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative SMITH for leading this Special Order.

The topic that we are here to discuss tonight is one of the utmost importance. Of course, next week, we approach the 47th anniversary of the infamous *Roe v. Wade* decision. With this single ruling by the Supreme Court, abortion was legalized across the country.

While many abortion activists celebrate this time as a victory for so-

called women's health, it represents a somber occasion for those of us who advocate for life.

It is no secret that I am unapologetically pro-life. I believe life begins at conception, and I am opposed to abortion at any stage.

While not everyone in this body shares my convictions about life or on certain policies surrounding the rights of unborn children, our pro-life agenda has momentum, and it is strong.

Next week, thousands of Americans will gather in our Nation's Capital to participate in this year's March for Life. This is an annual event where the pro-life community joins together to advocate for the protection of unborn children.

I know that some pro-life supporters will be traveling from Alabama's Second District, almost 900 miles, to defend the unborn.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to send a message to the thousands of marchers who are gathering to show their support for the pro-life movement: Thank you. Thank you for your dedication to this most worthy cause, and know that you are not alone in this fight. As you continue to stand up for those who cannot stand up for themselves, remember that my pro-life colleagues and I stand with you.

I promise to use this platform here in Congress, and beyond, to be a vocal advocate for the unborn. I will not stop fighting until our laws and policies protect life at every stage, and I hope you won't either.

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, the co-chair of the Pro-Life Caucus, for the work he has done over the decades to protect unborn life.

Next week, I am going to have a birthday, but 61 million Americans aren't. Now, let that thought sink in for a second because that is the population of California and Florida together. That is the number of Americans who didn't get a chance to be born since *Roe v. Wade* was passed.

I have spent over 30 years as an anesthesiologist on the labor and delivery suite. I was in charge of the labor and delivery anesthesia at Hopkins for decades, seeing the birth of literally thousands of babies, not even beginning to comprehend the magnitude of the 61 million lives that never had that opportunity to be born.

Next week, we are going to have the March for Life. Mr. Speaker, I urge all Americans who are watching to tune in to one of those channels that shows that March for Life because what you

will be struck by are the number of young people who have not believed the lie about abortion, the lie that it is a blob of tissue, that it is not a human life, that somehow that human life does not have the right to life.

I believe there are a lot of young people who march because this is the generation that knows that it was legal for them to be aborted. I think they appreciate the fact that they weren't.

Like Mrs. ROBY, I am on the Appropriations Committee, and I am glad to have fought to get Planned Parenthood defunded by tax dollars because Planned Parenthood is the largest abortion provider in the United States. That means it is responsible for the taking of tens of millions of lives over the years. Not only that but they actually promote using American tax dollars to provide abortions overseas as well.

I am proud of our President because our President reestablished what we call the Mexico City policy, which is very simple, Mr. Speaker. It says that American tax dollars, hardworking American taxpayer dollars, should not be spent on providing abortions in foreign countries.

Oh, my gosh. It is bad enough that we still fund Planned Parenthood here in this country, but, my gosh, spending tax dollars to pay for abortions in foreign countries? Thank goodness our President stands firmly pro-life, some people suggest the most pro-life President we have ever had, and at such a good time to be the most pro-life President.

As the death toll climbs to over 60 million, it is rapidly approaching the time to say enough is enough. This is the largest and most important human rights issue we face. This country has faced human rights issues before. We have to face this challenge, and we have to turn back the legalization of the killing of millions of Americans before they are even born.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank Dr. HARRIS so very much for his comments.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN), a distinguished Member. He is also the sponsor of the Ensuring Accurate and Complete Data Reporting Act.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman SMITH for his hard work and for what he does on a daily basis to protect the lives of the unborn.

Mr. Speaker, I solemnly stand before you today on the 47th anniversary of *Roe v. Wade*, a decision that has corrupted the very foundation of our unalienable right to life as citizens of this great country.

Life is a precious gift from our creator, from conception to natural death. I have been dedicated to protecting the rights of the unborn since the day I was sworn into Congress. It is a fight that I vow to continue until the last day that I serve in this body.

As a proud grandfather of 17 beautiful grandchildren, the sanctity of life

is cherished and personal. Let me give an example.

Just a few months ago, September 25, our 17th grandchild was born 3 months premature. His name is Warren, and we were unsure if he would survive. But it is by the grace of God, the love and support of family and friends, and the heroic work of the great doctors and nurses that Warren is still with us today.

After more than 100 days in the neonatal intensive care unit, Warren was finally able to leave the hospital last week. Each moment we spend with him is a true miracle that I will never take for granted.

Warren was, to give an example, 1 pound, 15 ounces when he was born. You could see the elements of his personality from the very beginning. He was a fighter.

It is a daily reminder that the lives of millions of other children, the same size as Warren when he was born, have been allowed to be cut short due to the ruling of *Roe v. Wade*. It is truly unfathomable to think that the rule of law in this great country permits the intentional killing of the most vulnerable population.

While most Americans agree it is morally wrong to end an unborn human life by abortion, it is also morally wrong to take taxpayer dollars to promote abortion at home or abroad, as has been stated. Yet in their recently released annual report, Planned Parenthood boasts spending \$617 million on the mass murder of over 345,000 children in this country in just 1 year. That is roughly 947 premeditated killings each day by the billion-dollar abortion business.

These statistics are not only alarming but, quite frankly, they are grotesque. They are among the many reasons why I will not only continue to support commonsense pro-life legislation, such as the bipartisan Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, but will also march in solidarity with millions of Americans nationwide and hundreds of South Carolinians from the district I serve in honor of those who weren't given that chance that so many of us have been given.

On this dark anniversary, let us unite and rededicate ourselves to protecting the unborn.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for sharing that beautiful story of his grandchild. What a tenacious spirit, and our prayers are with him as he prospers and thrives.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BABIN), my good friend and colleague.

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank very, very much my friend and colleague from New Jersey, CHRIS SMITH, for having this Special Order, which is so very important. There is no greater champion for life than our colleague CHRIS SMITH.

Mr. Speaker, I also thank every one of my colleagues who are surrounding

me tonight or are here speaking for those who are voiceless.

I rise solemnly today, Mr. Speaker, in memory of the Supreme Court's tragic decision in *Roe v. Wade* 47 years ago, this appalling decision. Since that time, more than 60 million innocent human beings have been killed in the name of abortion and convenience.

Throughout our history, Americans have been the very first to protect the defenseless around the world repeatedly through the centuries, yet here at home, we have allowed our very most vulnerable to come under vicious attack.

As the father of five children and the grandfather of 16 beautiful grandchildren, I have no more important duty personally than to protect the lives of all Americans.

As Members of Congress, we have that same duty to protect all Americans, especially the ones who have no voice.

I have been very proud to support the steps taken by President Trump and his administration, who is the most pro-life President in the history of this country, in his fight to save innocent lives from abortion. We are so very grateful for his bold executive efforts to protect the lives of the unborn, which have been so very, very effective.

As thousands of Americans gather once again here in Washington, D.C., next week to stand up for life, let us be renewed in our purpose to end abortion.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for his comments tonight.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GREEN).

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, for almost half a century, we have watched our Nation dehumanize an entire group of people based on their age with the *Roe* decision allowing the killing of 60 million unborn children. This is the largest human rights violation of our time.

As Martin Luther King, Jr., said: "There is no graded scale of essential worth" among people.

This truth is something the evil organization Planned Parenthood deliberately chooses not to see, ending lives and selling baby parts for the sake of science. As America's largest abortion provider, it performs over 320,000 every single year, all in the name of freedom. But there is quite obviously absolutely no such thing as a right or freedom to end someone else's life.

As Ronald Reagan said, isn't it interesting that all who support abortion have already been born?

□ 1830

We must defend the equal right to life for everyone. If we can't do that, what are we even doing here?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BAIRD), a Bronze Star winner and a Purple Heart recipient. I thank him for his service and thank him for his witness for life.

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 see so many of my fellow Members of Congress join me in continuing the fight for the unborn. Whether it be by signing the discharge petition to bring the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act to the floor for a vote, or by cosponsoring legislation to prohibit the use of taxpayer funding in abortions, my House colleagues and I will continue to fight to protect life.

Just a couple of weeks ago, I was proud to join 206 of my congressional colleagues in signing an amicus brief filed with the U.S. Supreme Court concerning the Louisiana case of *June Medical Services v. Gee*.

I look forward to seeing the court review this case and others in hopes that they may issue a decision that reflects the will of the majority of Americans to protect the unborn.

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 in 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 everything we can up to that point until, ultimately, the court makes that decision.

We have a responsibility, I believe, to protect the most vulnerable among us, and that is 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 committee and did successfully pass the Born-Alive Infants Protection Act which saved babies that they were literally finding in soiled utility closets.

We had nurses who had formerly worked in abortion clinics and they came and told terrible stories of what had happened. That is now no longer the law, but we need to go beyond that.

After that, we went on to pass probably what is the most significant pro-life legislation since *Roe v. Wade* and that is the ban on partial-birth abortion, which I offered along with many other Members.

We fought for 8 years—STEVE KING and so many other folks—and went all the way to the U.S. Supreme Court twice.

I remember when that decision came down. I was in the Judiciary Committee when we all heard about it and we were so excited. We don't know exactly how 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 want to thank 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 worthy 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 for his leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. HICE).

Mr. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, CHRIS SMITH, for leading this Special Order as we memorialize countless lives that have been lost in the last 47 years to the *Roe v. Wade* decision.

The gentleman and all of my colleagues here are champions for life, and I want to thank them for their commitment and their resolve to address this issue.

The March for Life is a unique event in American culture. It is the only

march where 100 percent of the participants are marching on behalf of someone else; marching on behalf of the most vulnerable among us, as has already been mentioned, those who have not yet had the opportunity to take their first breath of life.

This Special Order annually commemorating the March for Life stands as a memorial to those lives who have been lost to abortion. And it is time for this Chamber to mark that dreadful decision of the Supreme Court and to mourn the results of that decision.

This is a time for us to carefully consider the choices of our Nation and the realization that those choices have dire consequences.

This is our time to learn from those past decisions and to, with fresh determination, do all we can to make sure that we don't repeat the mistakes of the past.

It is for that reason that I introduced H. Res. 50, which would memorialize the unborn by lowering the flag of the United States to half-staff on the 22nd of every January. It would be known as a day of tears, memorializing the ocean of tears that have been lost and shed for the millions, countless children who have never had a chance to live.

Mr. Speaker, I believe every human life is sacred. I believe that life begins at conception, and if we don't stand on behalf of the unborn, who will? That is the question.

So it is on their behalf that each of us here, we will never waiver, we will never quit. We will continue fighting with everything we have for life. No matter how long the battle is, no matter how intense it may become, we will not cease our effort until every child is given the gift of life that only God gives.

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 selflessness 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 postabortive who now speak out on behalf of their lost child. And they admonish and encourage others not to make that same terrible, irreversible mistake.

I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY), my good friend and colleague.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. 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 dignity. The gentleman is authentically the conscience of this Congress, and I am so grateful for his leadership and deep friendship.

Mr. Speaker, as you walk down this aisle 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. They express the deepest, noble senti-

ments of what it means to be an American: 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 struggling with our narrative as a nation, particularly politically. But something beautiful is happening.

There is a new momentum among this new generation that is coming up 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 authentic freedom, liberty?

Tolerance creates the space for protection of that sacred space of conscience, of deliberation that we have in this body that is built upon a fundamental foundation of life: the protection of the ideals of life.

We cannot say that we are going to include everybody and celebrate diversity except for them, the littlest ones, the smallest ones, the most vulnerable ones, the unborn child and the mothers that carried them in their womb. 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 come here next week—and a number of them are from my home State of Nebraska, 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 sentiments; 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 Nation: 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 enough, big enough, and we certainly have resources enough to be a community that cares and loves and helps no matter how difficult the circumstances.

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 always 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 that as well.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, tonight, 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 colleague from New Jersey, and my colleagues here tonight all know that I dedicated my professional life to delivering babies. Every day, every other

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 recurrent miscarriages. 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 trying to make some 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 is 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 succinctly what has been known 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."

□ 1845

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 means 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. Our value is inherent, because, as our Founders acknowledged, it is given to us by our creator.

Roe v. Wade tragically defied that American creed, and it has resulted, as we said, in the murder of more than 60 million innocent American children.

How can we stand by and allow this to happen? We can't, and we will not.

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, we will continue to litigate, and we will continue to march and stand for women and children and the sanctity of every single human life until 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 my bill, 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 thank the gentleman from Ohio for his leadership on that bill and all of the other pro-life pieces of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. JOHN W. ROSE).

Mr. JOHN W. 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 ignominy of *Roe v. Wade*.

As recently as yesterday, in committee, I heard abortion defended as a "woman's constitutional right to choose what is 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 and diminished.

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 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 stated: "The 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 help 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, as they call them; whereas, 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 is 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 are children of color. Think about the misogyny and the racism of those genocidal 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 protect life.

I am also proud to have joined 206 other pro-life Members of Congress in signing a recent amicus brief to the Supreme Court. If successful and this so-called right to abortion, as outlined in *Roe v. Wade*, is considered unworkable by the courts, then it is time to overturn that tragic decision.

Mr. Speaker, I close with this: Millions of Americans believe that life begins at conception and must be protected. I stand with those Americans to fight for the lives that may be snuffed out before they have even begun. We must continue to fight for those who have been denied the opportunity to grow, to flourish, and to make an impact on our world.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN).

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to mark, with sadness, the 47th anniversary of *Roe v. Wade*. This tragic Supreme Court decision has resulted in the loss of over 60 million unborn babies' lives. This surpasses the number killed by Stalin and Hitler, combined.

In a country, today, where so many social and technological advancements have been achieved, how is it that we still fail to value the most fundamental part of human society—a human life?

The repercussions of *Roe* have been disastrous. Over 60 million children have lost their lives because of *Roe*.

I am dismayed by the arguments I hear coming from those who call themselves pro-choice. Those 60 million unborn were not given a choice.

I have two wonderful and lovely daughters-in-law who are expecting babies as we speak right now. I am so glad that these two principled women and their husbands value life.

Now, our choice is to be the voice for the voiceless. I am proud to stand here with my colleagues in Congress for the cause of life.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time we have left.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 14 minutes remaining.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I have 4 children and 13 grandchildren, and I can't imagine life without them and the love that we have for each other. In fact, every human life from the moment of conception is precious, worthy of dignity and respect.

The right to life should not be a political debate.

□ 1900

As a society, we should be united in the understanding that killing another

human being, a baby, an unborn child, is immoral and unconstitutional. But in 1973 the Supreme Court ruled to make abortion available throughout pregnancy for nearly any reason.

Mr. Speaker, there are only five countries in the world that allow abortion after the first 5 months, 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 lowering 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 their own future in this blessed 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 I will 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. SMITH from New Jersey for taking such courageous leadership on this very important issue. We as a body 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 Planned 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 God's mercy on this Nation. And 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 Congressman SMITH for his incredible leadership on the life 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 Abortion 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 the 47 years 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.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin controls the time.

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 following an abortion or attempted abortion. With over 191 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.

□ 1915

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 unborn children's 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 of their babies 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 medicine make clear 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 freedom fighters 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 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 about the 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 Unborn Child Protection 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. Even 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 Ramona Trevino 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 on to college, and eventually, 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 miss 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. Your mom 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 your parents.

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 leg. 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 an 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 ought to be 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, D.C., 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 mother of Ohio State running back J.K. Dobbins, who chose life courageously.

Next week is different. We celebrate a different vision, a hopeful, optimistic vision. The youth will rise up, and by the grace of God, I will be there with them to say: It is time to end the abortion culture in America and defend the right to life.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, in a Florida abortion clinic, Sycoria Williams delivered a live baby girl at 23 weeks. The clinic owner took the baby, who was gasping for air, cut her umbilical cord, threw her into a biohazard bag, and put the bag in the trash. Heartbroken, Sycoria later had a funeral for her baby girl, who she named Shanice.

In Sycoria's home State of Florida, in just 1 year, in 2017, 11 babies were

born alive during abortions. Shockingly, only 6 States—Florida, Arizona, Michigan, Minnesota, Oklahoma, and Texas—currently require reporting of children born alive who survive abortion.

Why the coverup? Dr. Willard Cates, 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 to be hushed 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 described 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 back of 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 anything but human, 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 I feel bad it is a week 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, felt that when our forefathers put together the Constitution, they felt that it, of necessity, made abortion legal in this country. I am sure they were not talking about it at all at the time, and throughout much of our history, abortion has been legal in the vast majority of States.

At the time that *Roe v. Wade* came down, I believe abortion was illegal in

48 of the 50 States. If not, it was almost 48 States, and it was just an outlandish decision.

Since the decision has come down, we have had over 45 million lives cut short because of abortion in this country. When you think about 45 million, think how large that is. If they were alive today, it would be something on the order of about one-seventh of the current population of this country. But our people have voluntarily snuffed out that many lives.

I remember when ultrasounds came out and became common. I had assumed that when people began to look at ultrasounds, they would see what they were dealing with here and abortion would have quickly become illegal.

□ 1930

It says something about the callousness of our country and the ineffectiveness of our clergy that, despite the gift of ultrasound—so, unlike 60 years ago, we all know exactly what is going on—our country continues to allow this slaughter to continue.

Even worse, America, which I do believe should be a shining light on the hill, is one of only seven countries which allow late-term abortions: ourselves, Singapore, Canada, Holland, Red China, Vietnam, and North Korea—largely, a pretty embarrassing set of countries to be with.

I hope all Americans stop and ponder how America still winds up on such a ridiculous list, particularly such a wealthy country and a country in which so many people have access to see exactly what is going on.

As a matter of fact, recently, things have even 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 to allow 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.

KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS

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, in part of 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 talk 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, almost exclusive to 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 or helping out at youth 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 Members around here 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 up here, 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 decide 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 can 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 to get to 450 miles 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 are cross.

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.

I 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, CHRIS SMITH 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—America is becoming a more and more pro-life country. And as we watch the transition that is taking place in this country, that has to do with the March for Life that comes out here every year, when thousands of people, many, many young people ride from my neighborhood about 18 or 20 hours on a 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 may 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 agenda that was driven.

And Norma McCorvey regretted that she happened to be Jane Roe. So she actually didn't get an abortion, and she became pro-life in her later years and became a pro-life activist.

So it didn't serve her, and it surely didn't serve America. But some number of over 61 million American babies have been aborted since that period of time.

And there have been struggles in this city. There have been women that come to this city and march for abortion, and so many women who come and march for life.

But here is what I see. In 1976, Mr. Speaker, our firstborn child came into the world; and, of course I anticipated that with eager and nervous anticipation.

But when that little boy—actually, not so little. He was almost 9 pounds. When he went into my hands and my arms and I looked at him and I held him in awe at the miracle that he was and is today, it was just stunning to me that, from my wife, Marilyn, and I came this little baby, this miracle.

To look at him, to look in his eyes, to see his dark hair, and he turned out to be a blue-eyed, dark-haired little guy, and he had a lot of hair on his head, and it was just such a miracle to see and count the fingers and toes and look how perfectly they were formed.

□ 1945

As he lay in his crib, I would sit and look at him, and there was an aura about that little baby boy. There was an aura about him. And you could have convinced me that he was the second coming of Jesus Christ, that is how strong that was to me, that little boy miracle.

As I looked at that, I thought this little guy here, how could anybody take his life now in these first minutes of his life or how could someone take his life the minute before he was born or the hour before or the day before he was born or the week or the month or the trimester, the first, second, or third trimester?

And I just thought that through as I held that little miracle in my hands, and I knew that this life was precious and a miracle the moment that I could hold him and touch him and see him and feel that warmth and smell that fresh baby smell on him. And within minutes I went back through this process of development of this miracle from the moment of conception until birth.

And at that moment I knew that you couldn't take that little baby's life at any point in this stage. I knew that his life began at the moment of conception. And from that moment on this miracle and millions and millions of other miracles needed to be protected from that moment on, that life begins at the moment of conception. That was 1976.

Twenty years later I went out to San Diego to the Republican National Convention, and certainly I had all of my colors on and all the things that are 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 scripture would be quoted to me 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, stage 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—there was as many as 15,000 press 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 bark some things at me, too.

Mr. Speaker, I was far enough 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 they need to 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 pay the child support. 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 what I didn't hear anybody say here in this pro-life discussion that we had is the pain that a father goes through when the mother decides to abort the baby. I know people who have gone through that pain and that agony, 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 no, sometimes it is even a spiteful 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 Christian Women for Choice in San Diego in 1996 two things came out of 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 human life sacred 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 someone 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 passion 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 gym-

nasium. 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 baby become alive? Is it 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 have, and that it begins at a moment and the only moment that exists is the moment of conception. From there on out it is a matter of continuum and continual growth and continual cell division, continual metabolism getting to the point where that baby is in a condition 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 eventually 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 grandpa's empty chair over in the corner, he is gone now. He is missed. There is a vacancy in the chair and 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 be having 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 of the babies 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 female 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 and 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 worked opposite 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 any baby with a heartbeat. In fact, it says this: 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. And in the last Congress we took it to 174 cosponsors.

Mr. Speaker, 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 it 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?

□ 2000

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 abortions for incest, 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.

CORRECT THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

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 an 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 though there was 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 on me, and that negative tweet is supposedly 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, Steve," 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, about 4 days later. 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.

I let the messenger know I knew what was up. The next day, I get a primary opponent. The following day, The New York Times story came out, and the rest is history, Mr. Speaker, The New York Times with the misquote in it.

There is no tape. It is his word against mine. He has notes, he says. He admits there is no tape. He has notes, he says, but he won't divulge even the question that he would say that he asked me.

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 uttered 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 this big dictionary over 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 up? Well, it jumped up right here 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 of the term “white nationalism”? You bet, right there.

That is what happened, Mr. Speaker. So they launched that as a weaponization, and they used it as a weapon against me.

When I stated 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 had.

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 if these excellent people here can end up 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 HUDDLE BEHIND CLOSED DOORS WITH PELOSI, WARREN, ELLISON, AND UNION BOSSES TO LICK WOUNDS, RETRENCH.

George Soros and other rich liberals who spent tens of millions of dollars trying 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 Ori-

ental 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 Democratic leader Nancy Pelosi, Sen. Elizabeth Warren and Congressional Progressive Caucus co-chairman Keith Ellison, according to an agenda and other documents 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, and, if 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, while others focus on 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 beneficiary groups over the last decade have had a major hand in shaping the institutions of the left, including by orienting some of its key organizations around Clinton, and by basing their strategy around the idea that minorities and women constituted a so-called “rising American electorate” that could tip elections to Democrats.

That didn’t happen in the presidential election, where Trump won largely on the strength of his support from working-class whites. Additionally, exit polls suggested that issues like fighting 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.

“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 for a welcome dinner 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, with so much at stake, without making some big mistakes, in assumptions, strategy and tactics.”

LaMarche added that the reassessment “must take place without recrimination and fingerpointing, whatever frustration and anger some of us feel about our own allies in these efforts,” and he said “It is a process we should not rush, even as we gear up to resist the Trump administration.”

LaMarche emailed the donors last week that the meeting would begin 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 Obama’s legacy against dismantling by President-elect Trump, the agenda includes panels on rethinking polling and the left’s approach to winning the working-class 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 over the Democratic 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. Nor did a Trump spokesman.

Raj Goyle, a New York Democratic activist who previously served in the Kansas state legislature and now sits on SiX’s board, argued that many liberal activists and donors are “disconnected from working class voters’ concerns” because they’re cluster 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 landlocked states. “Progressive donors and organizations need to immediately correct the lack of investment in state and local strategies.”

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 that could push the party 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 (on Sunday, interested 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 watchdog group Media Matters, the policy advocacy outfit 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 is not entirely clear, though 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, his scheduled Tuesday morning appearance 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 he also said, “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 Clinton leftward, to instead discussing how to play defense.

A pre-election working draft of the DA’s agenda, obtained by POLITICO, featured a session on Clinton’s first 100 days and another on “moving a progressive national policy agenda in 2017.” Those sessions were re-

branded so that the first instead will examine “what happened” on the “cataclysm of Election Day,” while the second will focus on “combating the massive threats from Trump and Congress in 2017.”

A session that before the election had been titled “Can Our Elections Be Hacked,” after the election was renamed “Was the 2016 Election Hacked”—a theory that has percolated without evidence on the left to explain the surprising result.

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.

PUBLICATION OF BUDGETARY MATERIAL

STATUS REPORT ON CURRENT LEVELS OF ON-BUDGET SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FY 2020
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,
Washington, DC, January 15, 2020.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: To facilitate application of sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, I am transmitting an updated status report on the current levels of on-budget spending and revenues for fiscal year 2020. This status report is current through January 3, 2020, the end of the first session of the 116th Congress. The term “current level” refers to the amounts of spending and revenues estimated for each fiscal year based on laws enacted or awaiting the President’s signature.

Table 1 compares the current levels of total budget authority, outlays, and revenues to the overall limits filed in the Congressional Record on May 3, 2019, as adjusted, for fiscal year 2020 and for the 10-year period of fiscal years 2020 through 2029. These comparisons are needed to implement section 311(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, which establishes a rule enforceable with a point of order against measures that would breach the budget resolution’s aggregate levels. The table does not show budget authority and outlays for years after fiscal year 2020 because appropriations for those years have not yet been completed.

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(f) 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 discretionary appropriations for fiscal year 2020 with the section 302(b) suballocations of discretionary budget authority and outlays among Appropriations subcommittees. The comparison is needed to enforce section 302(f) 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) suballocation. The table also provides supplementary 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 Chairman published in the Congressional Record on May 3, 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 Raquel 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

[On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars]

	Fiscal Year 2020	Fiscal Years 2020–2029
Appropriate Level:		
Budget Authority	3,806,162	n.a.
Outlays	3,722,823	n.a.
Revenues	2,740,533	34,847,515
Current Level:		
Budget Authority	3,823,390	n.a.
Outlays	3,726,322	n.a.
Revenues	2,706,090	34,461,163
Current Level over (+) / under (–)		
Appropriate Level:		
Budget Authority	17,228	n.a.
Outlays	3,499	n.a.
Revenues	–34,443	–386,352

n.a. = Not applicable because annual appropriations acts for fiscal years 2021 through 2029 will not be considered until future sessions of Congress.
Note: Excludes 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

[Fiscal Years, in millions of dollars]

House Committee	2020		2020–2029 Total	
	BA	Outlays	BA	Outlays
Agriculture				
Allocation	0	0	0	0
Current Level	150	150	410	410

2 Current level excludes amounts designated as emergency requirements.
3 The Financial Services and General Government subcommittee received a cap adjustment for program integrity amounts pursuant to the deeming resolution (H. Res. 293).
4 The Homeland Security subcommittee received a cap adjustment for disaster relief requirements.
5 Amounts include 302(a) adjustments for the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2019 (P.L. 116-37), as well as cap adjustments included in the final enacted appropriations, that have not been adjusted in the 302(b) suballocations.

TABLE 4.—ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS PURSUANT TO SECTION 2 OF H. RES. 293 AS OF JANUARY 3, 2020 [Budget authority in millions of dollars]

Table with 2 columns: Description and Amount. Rows include: For 2021, Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations, Enacted advances, Subtotal, enacted advances, Enacted Advances vs. Section 2 limit, Veterans Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations, etc.

TABLE 4.—ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS PURSUANT TO SECTION 2 OF H. RES. 293 AS OF JANUARY 3, 2020—Continued [Budget authority in millions of dollars]

Table with 2 columns: Description and Amount. Rows include: For 2022, Enacted advances, Accounts identified for advances, Other, Subtotal, enacted advances.

U.S. CONGRESS, CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE, Washington, DC, January 15, 2020. Hon. JOHN YARMUTH, Chairman, Committee on the Budget, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The enclosed report shows the effects of Congressional action on the fiscal year 2020 budget and is current through January 3, 2020. This report is submitted under section 308(b) and in aid of section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended.

The estimates of budget authority, outlays, and revenues are consistent with the

allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels printed in the Congressional Record on May 3, 2019, as adjusted, pursuant to sections 1 and 2 of House Resolution 293 of the 116th Congress.

Since our last letter dated October 15, 2019, the Congress has cleared and the President has signed the following legislation that has significant effects on budget authority and outlays in fiscal year 2020:

Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2020, and Further Health Extenders Act of 2019 (Public Law 116-69);

Women's Suffrage Centennial Commemorative Coin Act (Public Law 116-71);

Fostering Undergraduate Talent by Unlocking Resources for Education Act (Public Law 116-91);

National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2020 (Public Law 116-92);

Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2020 (Public Law 116-93); and

Further Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2020 (Public Law 116-94)

Sincerely, PHILLIP L. SWAGEL.

Enclosure.

FISCAL YEAR 2020 HOUSE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT THROUGH JANUARY 3, 2020 [In millions of dollars]

Large table with 4 columns: Description, Budget Authority, Outlays, Revenues. Rows include: Previously Enacted, Enacted Legislation, Appropriation Legislation, Current Level Over House Resolution, Revenues, 2020-2029, Discretionary Emergency Requirements.

Source: Congressional Budget Office. n.a. = not applicable; P.L. = public law. Sections 1001-1004 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... be excluded from estimates for the purposes of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (Deficit Control Act) and the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (Congressional Budget Act).

Table with 4 columns: Description, Budget Authority, Outlays, Revenues. Rows include: Discretionary Emergency Requirements, Additional Supplemental Appropriations for Disaster Relief Act, 2019, Emergency Supplemental Appropriations for Humanitarian Assistance and Security at the Southern Border Act, 2019, Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2020, Further Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2020.

	Budget Authority	Outlays	Revenues
Total, Discretionary Emergency Requirements	8,543	8,870	0
<small> ^aSection 124 of the Continuing Appropriations Act, 2020 (division A of P.L. 116-59), appropriated funding for the Ukraine Security Assistance Initiative (within the jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Defense) and designated those amounts as funding for overseas contingency operations. That provision took effect upon enactment on September 27, 2019. ^bOn May 3, 2019 the Chair of the House Committee on the Budget published the aggregate spending and revenue levels for fiscal year 2020 pursuant to H. Res. 293. In accordance with section 314 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, section 251(b) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, and section 1 of H. Res. 293 the Chair of the House Committee on the Budget may revise the budgetary aggregates. Revisions to date are listed below. </small>			
	Budget Authority	Outlays	Revenues
Original Aggregates Printed on May 3, 2019:	3,709,585	3,676,452	2,740,533
Revisions:			
Adjustment for H.R. 2740, Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2020	1,842	1,481	n.a.
Adjustment for H.R. 2745, Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2020	921	7	n.a.
Adjustment for H.R. 2839, Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 2020	8,000	2,174	0
Adjustment for H.R. 2968, Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2020	68,079	38,227	0
Adjustment for H.R. 3052, Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2020	2,250	2,250	0
Adjustment for H.R. 3055, Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2020	7,500	5,400	0
Adjustment for H.R. 3351, Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Act, 2020	400	338	0
Adjustment for H.R. 3931, Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2020	14,075	704	0
Adjustment for P.L. 116-37, Bipartisan Budget Act of 2019	-9,918	-5,488	0
Adjustment for H.R. 1158, Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2020, and H.R. 1865, Further Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2020	3,428	1,278	0
Revised House Resolution	3,806,162	3,722,823	2,740,533

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. 5112(p)(3)(B); Public Law 97-258 (as amended by Public Law 109-145, Sec. 104); (119 Stat. 2670); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3570. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — California: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revisions [EPA-R09-RCRA-2019-0491; FRL-10003-98-Region 9] received Janu-

ary 13, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3571. A letter from the Director, Regulations Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Extreme Area Submission Requirements, Coachella Valley Nonattainment Area; California Ozone [EPA-R09-OAR-2019-0240; FRL-10003-97-Region 9] received January 13, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3572. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Fenhexamid; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2018-0560; FRL-10002-21] received January 13, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3573. 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 Source Review Preconstruction Permitting Program [EPA-R06-OAR-2018-0177; FRL-10003-44-Region 6] received January 13, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3574. 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-R10-OAR-2019-0568; FRL-10003-85-Region 10] received January 13, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

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-R08-OAR-2019-0163; FRL-10003-37-Region 8] received January 13, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3576. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Approval and Promulgation of State Air Quality Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants; New Mexico and Albuquerque-Bernalillo County, New Mexico; Control of Emissions From Existing Other Solid Waste Incineration Units [EPA-R06-OAR-2011-0513; FRL-10003-60-Region 6] received January 13, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3577. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; California; Northern Sierra Air Quality Management District; Reasonably Available Control Technology [EPA-R09-OAR-2019-0528; FRL-10003-96-Region 9] received January 13, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3578. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; GA; Nonattainment New Source Review [EPA-R04-OAR-2018-0710; FRL-10004-19-Region 4] received January 13, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3579. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Air Plan Approval; Illinois; Emissions Statement Rule Certification for the 2015 Ozone Standard [EPA-R05-OAR-2019-0311; FRL-10004-21-Region 5] received January 13, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3580. 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-R07-2019-0656; FRL-10004-15-Region 1] received January 13, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3581. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Renewable Fuel Standard Program: Standards for 2020 and Biomass-Based Diesel Volume for 2021 and Other Changes [EPA-HQ-OAR-2019-0136; FRL-10003-79-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AU42) received January 13, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3582. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants: Surface Coating of Metal Cans and Surface Coating of Metal Coil Residual Risk and Technology Reviews [EPA-HQ-OAR-2017-0684, EPA-HQ-OAR-2017-0685; FRL-10003-81-OAR] (RIN: 2060-

AT51) received January 13, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3583. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser, Office of Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report concerning international agreements other than treaties entered into by the United States to be transmitted to the Congress within the sixty-day period specified in the Case-Zablocki Act, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); Public Law 92-403, Sec. 1(a) (as amended by Public Law 108-458, Sec. 7121(b)); (118 Stat. 3807); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3584. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting a detailed report justifying the reasons for the extension of locality-based comparability payments to non-General Schedule categories of positions that are in more than one executive agency, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 5304(h)(2)(C); Public Law 89-554, Sec. 5304(h) (as added by Public Law 102-378, Sec. 2(26)(E)(ii)); (106 Stat. 1349); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

3585. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's report titled "Federal Student Loan Repayment Program" for Calendar Year 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 5379(h)(2); Public Law 101-510, Sec. 1206(b)(1) (as added by Public Law 106-398, Sec. 1122(a)); (114 Stat. 1654A-316); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

3586. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting Department's FY 2019 Agency Financial Report, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3515(a)(1); Public Law 101-576, Sec. 303(a)(1) (as amended by Public Law 107-289, Sec. 2(a)); (116 Stat. 2049); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

3587. 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. AMODEL, 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. KIND, and Mr. CARBAJAL):

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 Committees 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 for other purposes; to the Committee on the Budget, 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. DESAULNIER (for himself and Mr. STAUBER):

H.R. 5611. A bill to promote State requirements for local educational agencies 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. GALLEGGO (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. BARR):

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. HAALAND, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. BARRAGAN, and Ms. BLUNT ROCH-ESTER):

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. RESCHENTHALER, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, and Mrs. MILLER):

H.R. 5616. A bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to submit to Congress reports on patient safety and quality of care at medical centers of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MEEKS (for himself, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. ROSE of New York, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. MENG, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. NADLER, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. KING of New York, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, and Miss RICE of New York):

H.R. 5617. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude discharges of in-

debtedness on taxi medallions from gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. MORRISON:

H.R. 5618. A bill to make supplemental appropriations to provide additional funds to Americorps for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. STEWART (for himself and Ms. MATSUI):

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. CISNEROS):

H.R. 5621. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to extend certain morale, welfare, and recreation privileges to protective services civilian employees; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. NADLER:

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. BUDD, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. PORTER, Mr. VARGAS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Ms. LOFGREN):

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 Zvarychuk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 5624. A bill for the relief of Melnyk Ruslana and Gnatyuk 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. HORSFORD:

H.R. 5606.

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

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

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 1, Section 8

By Mr. HARDER of California:

H.R. 5610.

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

U.S. Const. art. 1, sec. 8

By Mr. DESAULNIER:

H.R. 5611.

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

Article 1, Section 8.

By Ms. GABBARD:

H.R. 5612.

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

The U.S. Constitution including Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. GALLEGRO:

H.R. 5613.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. GONZALEZ 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 1, Section 8

By Mr. MCKINLEY:

H.R. 5616.

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

Article 1 Section 8

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

By Mr. MEEKS:

H.R. 5617.

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

Article I

By Ms. 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:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. TRONE:

H.R. 5620.

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

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

By Mr. WALTZ:

H.R. 5621.

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

Article I, Section 8, which provides Congress the power "to provide for the common Defence" and "to make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces".

By Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 5622.

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

Article I of the Constitution and its subsequent amendments and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 5623.

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

Article I of the Constitution and its subsequent amendments and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 5624.

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

Article I of the Constitution and its subsequent amendments and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

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. HORSFORD, 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. GAETZ, Mr. MCKINLEY, and Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina.

H.R. 919: Ms. JAYAPAL.

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: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 1166: Mr. MORELLE.

H.R. 1174: Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. NEGUSE, and Mr. STANTON.

H.R. 1191: Mr. STAUBER.

H.R. 1227: Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 1266: Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. PINGREE, and Mr. ROUDA.

H.R. 1289: Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 1345: Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 1366: Mr. BALDERSON.

H.R. 1374: Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 1379: Mrs. MCBATH, Mr. SWALWELL of California, and Ms. JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 1400: Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 1407: Mr. DESAULNIER and Mr. CONNOLLY.

H.R. 1461: Mr. HURD of Texas.

H.R. 1554: Mr. O'HALLERAN.

H.R. 1679: Mr. HURD of Texas.

H.R. 1713: Ms. WATERS and Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 1754: Mr. KENNEDY and Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 1786: Mr. BEYER.

H.R. 1834: Mrs. RADEWAGEN.

H.R. 1872: Mr. BACON.

H.R. 1878: Ms. SÁNCHEZ and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 1897: Ms. BONAMICI and Ms. TLAIB.

H.R. 1925: Mr. REDD, Miss RICE of New York, and Mr. JEFFRIES.

H.R. 1987: Mr. MCKINLEY.

H.R. 2075: Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 2079: Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 2146: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 2168: Mr. MORELLE.

H.R. 2179: Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 2208: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 2214: Mr. HECK and Mr. LANGEVIN.

H.R. 2271: Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H.R. 2339: Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 2419: Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 2420: Ms. GABBARD.

H.R. 2435: Mr. LAMB and Mr. YARMUTH.

H.R. 2456: Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. CROW, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. RYAN, Mr. PHILLIPS,

Mr. PALLONE, Mr. KIND, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. COHEN, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 2468: Mrs. AXNE.

H.R. 2616: Mr. NEGUSE.

H.R. 2634: Ms. DEGETTE.

H.R. 2653: Mr. STEWART and Ms. TITUS.

H.R. 2662: Mr. PANETTA and Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 2669: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 2694: Mr. LAMB, Mr. COSTA, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. LUJÁN, and

Mrs. AXNE.

H.R. 2708: Ms. CRAIG.

H.R. 2720: Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 2746: Mr. FORTENBERRY.

H.R. 2775: Mr. CLEAVER.

H.R. 2777: Ms. FUDGE, Ms. FRANKEL, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. BASS, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. MORELLE, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, and

Mrs. AXNE.

H.R. 2896: Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 2897: Mr. WALTZ.

H.R. 2912: Ms. HAALAND.

H.R. 2929: Mr. WOMACK.

H.R. 2999: Mr. GALLEGRO and Mr. LAMALFA.

H.R. 3036: Mr. MORELLE.

H.R. 3077: Ms. FUDGE, Mr. COSTA, and Mrs. AXNE.

H.R. 3120: Ms. JAYAPAL.

H.R. 3225: Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 3241: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK and Mr. STEUBE.

H.R. 3250: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.

H.R. 3266: Mr. MOULTON and Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico.

H.R. 3374: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire and Ms. DELBENE.

H.R. 3446: Ms. STEVENS.

H.R. 3463: Mrs. MURPHY of Florida.

H.R. 3553: Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 3565: Mr. FORTENBERRY.

H.R. 3598: Ms. SÁNCHEZ.

H.R. 3623: Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois.

H.R. 3657: Mr. ZELDIN and Ms. SPEIER.

H.R. 3663: Mr. MORELLE.

H.R. 3735: Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 3797: Mr. CARTER of Georgia.

H.R. 3874: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 3884: Ms. MENG.

H.R. 3969: Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 3975: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois and Mrs. AXNE.

- 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. SMITH of Missouri.
H.R. 4508: Mrs. HARTZLER and Ms. SPANBERGER.
H.R. 4540: Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. MENG, Mr. SIREN, 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. KHANNA, 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. GALLEGGO.
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. STEUBE, 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. 5534: Mr. COLE, Mrs. AXNE, and Mr. CISNEROS.
H.R. 5543: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 5565: 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. 5599: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.
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. ROUDA, Mr. KIM, Mr. CÁRDENAS, 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. NEGUSE, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Ms. OMAR, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. DELGADO, Mr. ALLRED, and Mrs. MCBATH.
H. Res. 745: Mr. VAN DREW.
H. Res. 768: Mr. WRIGHT.
H. Res. 774: Ms. SHALALA.
H. Res. 785: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania and Mr. COOK.
H. Res. 787: Mr. KILDEE, 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. STAUBER, 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.