



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 166

WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 2020

No. 26

Senate

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Monday, February 10, 2020, at 3 p.m.

House of Representatives

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 2020

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: Heavenly Father, thank You for giving us another day.

We thank You for every day You give us to be here at the seat of participative government. Bless the work of all the men and women who represent the people of the United States. Fill them with wisdom and good will, that they might better work together for the benefit of our Nation.

Bless all the leaders of all the branches of our government at the end of a difficult week when the divisions in our polity and our faith have been on open display for all the world to see.

Father, forgive us and send us Your spirit, that we might indeed heal the divisions and learn to love those with whom we disagree, even our enemies.

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

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON)

come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

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

RECOGNIZING GUN VIOLENCE SURVIVORS WEEK

(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 want to recognize National Gun Violence Survivors Week and the 58 percent of Americans who have experienced gun violence in their lifetimes.

Gun violence kills nearly 40,000 Americans every year; more than half of those deaths are suicide. Another 100,000 people are physically caught wounded in the crossfire.

Entire communities suffer, too—those that may never shake the trauma, fear, anxiety, and sadness of violent tragedy, like my friends Marge Sexton, Jami Amo, Jennifer Lugar, Julia Spoor, gun violence survivors who live with the scars of unimaginable tragedy and yet continue to fight for sensible gun violence prevention legislation.

Our communities should be safe, joyful places. We should not live in fear of gun violence at our public schools, our places of worship, movie theaters, music venues, night clubs, or even in our homes.

This National Gun Violence Survivors Week, let's hold survivors closer in prayer, in love, and in action and promise we will do more and everything we can to end the crisis of gun violence in this Nation.

THE FLANNEL CHECK CHALLENGE

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

Mr. STAUBER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to raise awareness of the need for annual physicals through my participation in the Flannel Check Challenge.

The goal of Flannel Check is simple: Wear flannel; schedule your annual physical screening; and cure diseases early.

Some may ask, why flannel? The answer is that every individual disease has a color to raise awareness, like pink for breast cancer, light blue for prostate cancer, red for heart disease, and so on. Flannel and plaid patterns, which come in countless color combinations, create one identifiable pattern for all diseases.

The unfortunate reality is that disease is all around, and the key to defeating any disease is by catching it early through annual physicals. However, only 20 to 25 percent of males and

□ 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.

H939

60 to 65 percent of females go in for physicals every year.

Madam Speaker, we must work together to raise awareness on this important issue. So I encourage everyone to participate in Flannel Check's challenge by wearing flannel and scheduling an annual physical today.

Together, we can help save lives.

PROVIDING YELE SOWORE WITH DUE PROCESS RIGHTS

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

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. Madam Speaker, this morning, hardworking families across northern New Jersey woke up, made breakfast, and wished each other good-bye before leaving for work or school.

But our thoughts are with one family that was unable to be together this morning, this Sowore family from Haworth in Bergen County. That is because Yele Sowore, a husband, father, and neighbor, remains in Nigeria awaiting the outcome of his pending trial.

For months, members of the New Jersey delegation, including Senator MENENDEZ and Senator BOOKER, have been closely following Mr. Sowore's case and working together with the Haworth community to advocate on behalf of our neighbor and friend.

We were relieved when, in December, after months of detention, Mr. Sowore was finally released on bail. But we continue to urge the Government of Nigeria to follow its own laws and to do the right thing: providing Yele with the due process rights he deserves.

I want to recognize Yele's family, especially his wife, Ope, who has dealt with a trying situation with extraordinary courage and determination.

As Representative of the Fifth Congressional District, I am very proud to stand beside Yele's many friends and neighbors throughout north Jersey whose hope is that he will soon be able to be reunited with his family. We are thinking of him, praying for him, and I will not stop working until he comes home.

HONORING JAMES BLACKBURN

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to remember the life of Mr. James Blackburn, who passed away on January 22 at the age of 94.

Mr. Blackburn dedicated his life to practicing law and using his craft to make the Savannah area a better place to live. He was sworn in to the bar over 70 years ago and worked as the city attorney for the city of Savannah until he was 86. He even continued to legally represent the Savannah Airport Commission until just last year, when he was 93 years old.

But his service to the public went much further than the law. He served in the United States Navy during World War II as a radarman on a tugboat, was a recorder with the Alee Shrine, and was a former president of the Kiwanis Club of Savannah. Through all of his work, he believed in treating all people with fairness, dignity, and compassion.

His family and friends will be in my thoughts and prayers during this most difficult time.

HONORING KEVIN HARDEN

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

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to share the story of my State of the Union guest, Kevin Harden, a West Philly native, a successful attorney, and a gun violence survivor.

When Kevin was in college, he survived five gunshot wounds during an altercation at the Myers Recreation Center in Southwest Philadelphia.

Kevin's life had not been easy. His mother suffered from addiction, and his father juggled several jobs to make ends meet. His neighborhood lacked economic and educational opportunity. In the 2 years after the shooting, he lost both parents to cancer and assumed responsibility as primary caretaker for his younger siblings.

Kevin's turbulent childhood did not diminish his spirit. He was fortunate to find mentors. He graduated from college and decided to pursue law school. He became a successful lawyer and now works in his community to extend a helping hand to others like him.

We know there isn't a one-size-fits-all solution to gun violence, but every day that we fail to act, we fail our children and our country. It has been 345 days with no action or vote from the Senate on commonsense gun safety measures passed by the House.

HONORING THE LIFE OF TROOPER JOSEPH BULLOCK

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

Mr. MAST. Madam Speaker, I speak to honor the life of Trooper Joseph Bullock, whose watch ended on the morning of February 5, 2020, when fatally shot in the line of duty.

Trooper Bullock's life was devoted to protecting those he had never met, in the Air Force and the Florida Highway Patrol for 19 years, and he paid dearly that others would be safe.

There are no words or actions that can repay the debt we each owe heroes like Trooper Bullock. It would be fruitless for me to attempt words to remove grief from his family or fellow troopers.

I can only offer from our Nation the most ardent thanks for sharing him as

a protector and pray to our Father in Heaven that every thought of him is a cherished memory and pride that he was a man who laid down his life for others.

HONORING BOB MARLEY

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

Ms. PLASKETT. Madam Speaker, yesterday was the birthday of Bob Marley.

Born on February 6, 1944, in Jamaica, he became a reggae pioneer. From humble beginnings, Marley went on to sell more than 20 million records and was inducted into the Rock and Roll Hall of Fame in 1994.

His music has served as an inspiration and mantra for social movement. Let's hear some of those words now:

How can you be sitting there
Telling me that you care—
That you care?
When every time I look around,
The people suffer in the suffering
In every way, in everywhere.

And:

Emancipate yourself from mental slavery,
None but ourselves can free our minds.
Have no fear for atomic energy,
'Cause none of them can stop the time.
How long shall they kill our prophets
While we stand aside and look?
Some say it's just a part of it,
We've got to fulfill di book.
Won't you help me sing
These songs of freedom?
'Cause all I ever had,
Redemption songs.

We need redemption.

Happy birthday to Bob Marley.

INDIANA'S EARLY COLLEGE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

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

Mr. PENCE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize seven high schools located in Indiana's Sixth District for their extraordinary Early College Development Program that I observed when I was at Lawrenceburg High School.

Participating in this program are also high schools in Greensburg, Connersville, Richmond, Muncie Central, Delta, and the New Castle Career Center.

The Early College Development Program provides students the ability to earn both a high school diploma and an associate's degree or up to 2 years' college credit towards a bachelor's degree. The Early College Development Program also provides higher learning at a much lower cost, with early college tuition waived for some students.

I am proud to see the Hoosier State being a leader in education, preparing our students for the future, and finding solutions to fight the rising cost of higher education.

□ 0915

CELEBRATING 60TH ANNIVERSARY
OF THE SAN DIEGO VOICE &
VIEWPOINT

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

Mr. VARGAS. Madam Speaker, I rise today with what little voice I have to honor the San Diego Voice & Viewpoint Newspaper in recognition of their 60th anniversary.

San Diego's Voice & Viewpoint is the largest African American newspaper in San Diego and is a core piece of our community. This newspaper's success was the result of a dedicated couple's hard work.

Though the newspaper began in the 1960s, John Warren and his wife, Gerri Warren, took over the publication in 1987. The couple was deeply involved in the African American community and showed their leadership skills in publishing. Their efforts have resulted in a nationally award-winning publication.

The newspaper has highlighted the perspectives of the San Diego African American community and provided a great service to the city. In fact, the publication is in all the zip codes of San Diego and has a readership of over 60,000.

I would like to honor the San Diego Voice & Viewpoint for its dedication and lifelong commitment to the African American community and the San Diego community.

PRAYER AND RELIGIOUS
FREEDOM

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

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Madam Speaker, yesterday's National Prayer Breakfast brought to my mind the quote by President Lincoln: "I have been driven many times upon my knees by the overwhelming conviction that I had nowhere else to go."

I, like Lincoln, feel inadequate to my task at times. I, like Lincoln, seek strength and discernment from prayer. I need prayer.

It is not just Members of Congress that should be allowed to call upon prayer. Students, like my three sons, and millions more, deserve this powerful tool. That is why I thank the administration for their recent decision to protect the right to pray in schools.

The freedom to seek strength from someplace other than ourselves enriches this Nation, just as it enriched President Lincoln.

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL AP-
PROPRIATIONS FOR DISASTER
RELIEF AND PUERTO RICO DIS-
ASTER TAX RELIEF ACT, 2020

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members

have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 5687.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. VARGAS). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 833 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. 5687.

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

□ 0917

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. 5687) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes, with Ms. CASTOR of Florida in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

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

The gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) and the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. GRANGER) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

In recent weeks, thousands of families in Puerto Rico were forced from their homes, schools were flattened, roads and infrastructure were severely damaged as earthquakes racked an island still struggling to recover from the devastation of Hurricanes Maria and Irma.

While President Trump has finally released some of the aid that Congress appropriated for those hurricanes, more support is clearly needed. We must act now on our shared responsibility to assist Americans in need.

This emergency supplemental would provide \$4.67 billion in targeted assistance to help families and communities recover from these devastating earthquakes and put Puerto Rico on a better path to long-term recovery.

It includes: \$3.26 billion in Community Development Block Grant Disaster Recovery funds;

\$1.25 billion for repairs to damaged road systems;

\$100 million to restart school operations;

\$40 million for disaster nutrition assistance in Puerto Rico; and

More than \$20 million to help address the island's energy needs.

In addition, this bill would provide Puerto Rico with flexibility to use this

funding in conjunction with earlier disaster relief resources.

Critically, it also takes swift action against the Trump administration's outrageous withholding of vital aid to Puerto Rico. This bill would require detailed spending plans and mandate that funding be released in a timely manner.

Finally, the bill carries a number of tax-related provisions in the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means that will complement the emergency appropriations and support working families and encourage economic growth.

Madam Chair, our fellow Americans in Puerto Rico need our help. Unless we step up to the plate right now, we further jeopardize their safety and security.

With this bill, we can provide families and communities swift relief and put Puerto Rico on the path to long-term recovery.

I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. GRANGER. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in opposition to H.R. 5687.

While this bill is being sold as an appropriations bill for Puerto Rico, it has more than \$16 billion in unnecessary tax breaks which are largely unrelated to the recent earthquakes that hit the island.

Also included in this bill are more than \$4 billion in new emergency appropriations, much of that for disasters that haven't happened yet.

And finally, this bill is premature, as Puerto Rico has funds from previous bills that have not been used.

Over the last 3 years, we have allocated more than \$40 billion for Puerto Rico disasters, and less than half of that has been spent. And we have all seen recent press reports about warehouses in Puerto Rico full of water, diapers, and food that have not been distributed to residents in need.

As for the recent earthquakes in Puerto Rico, the Federal Government has not completed the required studies and reporting on the extent of the damage.

While I, too, have been frustrated with the amount of time it takes the Federal Government to distribute funds after a disaster, appropriating funds before we know what is truly needed is not the answer.

There are billions in the FEMA Major Disaster Relief Fund that are already available and can be used toward earthquake response and recovery efforts now, while we wait on a full and accurate report on the damage and estimated cost.

When disasters strike, it is our job to ensure that the Federal Government helps those in need. We also have a duty to ensure that taxpayer dollars are used in a fiscally responsible manner.

Unfortunately, including tax breaks related to disaster recovery and funds

for disasters that haven't even occurred yet is not a good use of taxpayer funds.

Again, when funds are needed, we will be there, just as we have been there repeatedly for Puerto Rico for the last several years. But at this time, I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Chair, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), the distinguished chairwoman of the Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, and Related Agencies.

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank our hard-working chair, NITA LOWEY, for yielding me this time.

Madam Chair, I rise in support of H.R. 5687, the Puerto Rico earthquake supplemental funding.

This \$4.67 billion in funding is a vital lifeline for our fellow citizens in Puerto Rico reeling most recently from a series of devastating earthquakes, but also still recovering from the consequential damage of 2017's massive Hurricanes Irma and Maria.

Since late December, a series of quakes rattled Puerto Rico, including another magnitude 5 earthquake just this last Tuesday. Today, this body sends a powerful message to the island community: This House will not let you suffer from inaction by this administration.

Following the most powerful quake in early January, millions were left without power and running water for days. The electric grid struggled to keep up with demand. Anxiety remains high as more than 30 category 5 or higher earthquakes have hit this month. 30. Unbelievable.

As we learned from Hurricane Maria, the aftermath can prove to be even more dangerous and deadly if there is not speedy and effective action. And I want to thank the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and also the Ohio National Guard that has made journeys there, and other defense units that have risen to duty to protect and serve the people of our country in Puerto Rico.

This emergency supplemental will provide these hard-hit, anxiety-ridden fellow Americans and communities with strength, hope, and support to begin moving forward again. A failure to act now is not just unacceptable, it is immoral.

This bill provides the means to address current challenges inflicted on the human condition. It also includes funds to strengthen infrastructure for future mitigation.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mrs. LOWEY. I yield the gentlewoman from Ohio an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. KAPTUR. Within my subcommittee's Energy and Water accounts, the bill provides over \$21 million for the Department of Energy to provide technical assistance help restore and rebuild the electric grid in Puerto Rico

and other U.S. territories. These funds will allow the Department and our National Labs to provide the expertise necessary to begin the repair.

Equally important is the significant financial support to meet the educational needs of island children for disaster nutrition assistance and repair all of the infrastructure.

This Nation must help destroyed communities of our fellow citizens to help them recover from these historic disasters. We never know when it will hit our own backyard.

I urge my colleagues to support this important emergency supplemental.

Ms. GRANGER. Madam Chair, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Puerto Rico (Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN).

Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico. Madam Chair, I thank Ranking Member GRANGER for yielding.

Since December 28, Puerto Rico has experienced more than 2,100 earthquakes that have significantly impacted our southwestern region. Actually, I was on the island on January 6 when a 5.8 earthquake struck us, and then the next day, a 6.4, and then half an hour later another 6.2.

I thank the President for immediately issuing an emergency declaration and, days later, a major disaster declaration, which prompted immediate Federal assistance to the now 29 municipalities that have been hit the most.

However, the seismic activity has not stopped. Every day the infrastructure weakens. More roads and houses are damaged. The anxiety of the people on the island grows; and that is why I stand here today in support of this disaster supplemental package.

I am thankful to Chairwoman LOWEY for introducing this bill. And yet, in order to get this legislation enacted into law, in order to truly get the aid to Puerto Rico and other States and jurisdictions affected by natural disasters, it is imperative to have the input of both sides of the aisles, Senate and House administration, and get this ready to go.

So it is my sincere hope that, as we move forward with this bill, and the negotiations that may begin as a result of it, that we keep in mind that we are dealing with real people's lives and their suffering here.

Every week, every single week, when I go back home, I meet with people who have lost everything due to the earthquakes. And again, we are used to hurricanes, but we are not used to earthquakes, so this is a completely new game in Puerto Rico.

I meet parents who are too frightened to send their kids to schools, and families refusing to return home out of the fear that their houses will collapse.

□ 0930

At one point, over 7,000 people were living in shelters, many establishing campsites on the side of the road, in parks, and in open areas. The devastation, my friends, is real.

It is true that the island has already allocated over \$40 billion, not \$90 billion, in funding to respond to the unprecedented Hurricane Maria. However, we are dealing here with an entirely different disaster. And let me say, of all that money that has been allocated, just \$1.5 billion has been disbursed, so we don't have the cash, and we don't have the funds that Congress already allocated 2 years ago.

The earthquakes are ongoing. The ground has not stopped shaking. While FEMA and the administration officials are onsite, Congress cannot wait until funds are depleted to act.

Madam Chair, I want to highlight also the tax provisions included in this bill for Puerto Rico. Although some may argue that they have no place in a supplemental, these provisions are vital for the long-term recovery of the island and all those efforts.

I thank Chairman NEAL for crafting this package, including legislation that I have previously introduced, such as H.R. 302, to provide families in Puerto Rico with one or more children the same treatment currently given to island families with three or more kids under the child tax credit; H.R. 1786, to make the rum cover-over tax permanent on the island—we managed to include a 5-year extension, but now this will make it permanent; and a provision extended to the earned income tax credit for the island, which is similar to legislation I introduced in H.R. 754.

I will always stand with the people I represent. I am the sole representative of the people of the island, 3.2 million Americans. Yet, we don't have a delegation in the House and in the Senate to support and push for these kinds of bills. That is why I am supporting this bill, and I urge all of my colleagues to do the same.

What has happened in Puerto Rico, we don't know yet how much longer these earthquakes are going to continue to happen. The U.S. Geological Survey is saying that it may be a year, or it may be months.

Every time this happens, the infrastructure weakens. Again, it began with just six towns. Now, we have 29 towns in the disaster declaration.

This is an ongoing emergency. I wish nobody would suffer what we are suffering today without having a complete recovery from the hurricanes.

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, and Science.

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

I rise in strong support of this emergency supplemental, which will help Puerto Rico recover from damage caused by the ongoing earthquakes that have struck the island. It will help an island that is still struggling to recover in the wake of Hurricanes Maria and Irma.

Since December 28, Puerto Rico has experienced thousands of earthquakes,

including numerous powerful ones. These earthquakes have caused significant damage to the island's roads and schools and left many individuals' homes structurally unsound. Many residents are fearful and uncertain of what comes next.

Thousands of Puerto Ricans are in need of assistance to repair the damage to their homes and lives. Many have once again left the island for New York, Florida, and elsewhere, and need help there, also.

This bill provides the island with the support necessary to help repair damaged infrastructure, allow students to continue learning, and assist in its economic recovery. It provides nutrition assistance to the most vulnerable members of Puerto Rican society.

This bill also puts in safeguards to ensure that the administration spends the money as instructed by Congress so the island's recovery is not hindered by a further man-made disaster.

We all know what happened to our fellow citizens of Puerto Rico in the aftermath of Hurricane Maria and how our government's inadequate response hurt the response and recovery efforts. I am thankful that my colleagues here in the House are determined not to let that happen again.

I hope our Republican colleagues in the Senate will act quickly to help Puerto Rico, and I urge strong support for this bill in the House.

I usually do not comment on any comment made by another Member. The person who made these comments is a person I have the utmost respect and admiration for, but our ranking member to the committee said that the bill is premature. How can it be premature to try to help American citizens still recovering from two hurricanes? How can it be premature to help American citizens? It is never premature. The time is right.

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Chair, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), the chairwoman of the Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies.

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Chair, I rise to speak in support of the supplemental bill for Puerto Rico.

The island has been rocked by earthquakes and tremors. Thousands of Americans are left without water or power, facing catastrophic property damage.

In my district, I met with affected families and community members. We discussed the ongoing disaster and the response and recovery needs.

I have staff, people who have family in Puerto Rico who are sleeping outdoors for fear of going back into a home that is badly damaged.

There should be no question about providing the resources necessary to recover. This supplemental package provides \$4.67 billion for educational needs, transportation infrastructure

repairs, and disaster relief activities, including \$100 million for education.

For K–12 programs, it helps schools restart operations, support reenrollment, and pay for the costs of providing education to students who have been displaced by natural disasters, and yes, it addresses the mental health needs of children as they have experienced a traumatic event. Higher education, the funding helps defray the unexpected costs associated with enrolling displaced students and with rebuilding damaged facilities.

This supplemental also extends the child tax credit to all children in Puerto Rico and the U.S. territories. Under the current system, Puerto Rican families are only eligible for the child tax credit for the third or subsequent child. What we need to do is to expand and improve the child tax credit, make it fully refundable, but this is a necessary step in the meantime so that U.S. citizens in the territories are treated exactly like those in the States.

Let me just also assure my colleagues on a final note, that we are working with the administration to determine the costs of our ongoing response to the 2019 novel coronavirus. We have urged the administration to work with the Congress on a bipartisan basis to enact an emergency supplemental for that public health emergency. We stand ready to move forward quickly to protect public health and safety.

On this supplemental for Puerto Rico, let me urge my colleagues to vote “yes,” vote “yes” for Americans who are in dire straits on that island, and it is unconscionable that we would have second thoughts about the kind of support that they need during this crisis. Urge the Senate, urge the President to add their support swiftly. Our fellow Americans and Puerto Rico cannot afford for us to delay any longer.

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Chair, I thank my colleague for yielding, and I am pleased to rise in strong support of this supplemental appropriation.

This bill provides \$4.7 billion for disaster assistance, including \$3.3 billion for HUD's Community Development Block Grant program and \$1.25 billion for emergency highway repairs. This funding will provide substantial help to the people of Puerto Rico, where devastating earthquakes have compounded earlier damage from Hurricanes Maria and Irma, as well as other States and territories still recovering from major disasters.

I would remind colleagues that CDBG money from earlier disasters cannot be used for earthquake relief. We need this bill.

The bill also provides targeted resources for Puerto Rico's school system, as well as nutrition assistance and tax relief for low-income families and small businesses.

When it comes to disaster relief, we should be putting politics aside. There should be widespread consensus that the Federal Government should be there as an active partner in the recovery effort.

Unfortunately, for far too long, the Trump administration has erected arbitrary barriers that have hindered Puerto Rico's recovery. They have contributed to desperate conditions to many places on the island.

For example, HUD refused to provide more than \$16 billion in already appropriated recovery funds for nearly 700 days. HUD officials admitted during a hearing before our subcommittee that they willingly ignored a statutory deadline requiring them to move forward.

Now, HUD is imposing special grant conditions and other requirements on Puerto Rico, which will slow down the recovery effort even further.

While the island has clearly been singled out for disparate treatment, numerous States from Florida to Texas to my home State of North Carolina have also waited longer than they should for HUD to publish Federal Register notices governing the use of disaster recovery funds.

This bill responds to the unacceptable administrative delays by including new accountability measures, new deadlines—actually, not so new deadlines; they were included in legislation already passed by this body—deadlines requiring HUD to publish notices, review and approve action plans, and sign grant agreements within a fixed timeframe. Those provisions were included in the bipartisan Reforming Disaster Recovery Act, which passed the House back in November, but unfortunately, like so much else, it is still languishing in the Senate.

Madam Chairman, enough is enough. We must provide the vital assistance to Puerto Rico and other communities that are struggling to recover, and we need to send a signal to the administration that Congress, not the White House, holds the power of the purse.

I urge all my colleagues to support this emergency disaster supplemental.

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL), the distinguished chairman who came to Congress at the same time I did and is now chair of the Committee on Ways and Means.

(Mr. NEAL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NEAL. Madam Chair, I thank Chairwoman LOWEY for yielding me the time.

I am happy to stand in support of this legislation today. This is a disaster relief package that I worked on

with Chairwoman LOWEY, Congresswoman VELÁZQUEZ, and Resident Commissioner GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN.

In addition to providing supplemental appropriations to respond to the recent natural disasters that affected Puerto Rico and other U.S. territories, H.R. 5687 includes the Puerto Rico Disaster Tax Relief Act. These provisions will help Puerto Rico rebuild its homes and communities and provide much-needed relief to workers and families after these devastating earthquakes.

Specifically, H.R. 5687 provides additional allocations of the low-income housing tax credit, which will allow critical investments in new affordable housing throughout the island. It also makes additional allocations to the new markets tax credit in Puerto Rico, allowing the island to make important investments, like rebuilding community centers and hospitals in low-income neighborhoods.

This legislation helps Puerto Rico and other territories implement the earned income tax credit and the child tax credit, two of the most powerful tools we have to combat poverty.

Last year, the Committee on Ways and Means reported out similar provisions in our consideration of H.R. 3300, the Economic Mobility Act.

□ 0945

Today, many Puerto Rican residents can be taxed into poverty from the U.S. payroll taxes that they pay. With our changes to the tax credit, we are creating long-awaited parity between the residents of Puerto Rico and the residents of the 50 other States.

Additionally, the earned income tax credit is one of the most important work incentives we have in our code. This bill certainly rewards work.

And, Madam Chair, I want to acknowledge BILL PASCRELL from New Jersey, who did much of the good work in helping get to those success stories. We encourage work, we reduce poverty. This is a win-win for the island.

As Puerto Rico and other territories try to recover from natural disasters, it is appropriate that we are taking action to ensure that these territories have access to these critical tools for community development and poverty reduction.

It is impossible to deny the suffering on the ground today on the island of Puerto Rico. It is my hope that Congress will come together, as it has in the past, to help all members of the American family.

We also urge full support on the other side. We took into consideration what they had to say at the committee.

Madam Chair, I want to thank Chairwoman LOWEY for moving this legislation swiftly to the floor today.

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL), a distinguished

member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. PASCRELL. Madam Chair, I thank Chairwoman LOWEY and Ranking Member GRANGER.

I support this supplemental. It is very necessary. The destruction in Puerto Rico from Hurricane Maria and the terrible earthquake last month, with its ongoing aftershocks, make this relief more necessary than ever.

I am thankful that legislation I proposed, H.R. 3307, to provide a Federal supplement to the earned income tax credit in Puerto Rico and the other U.S. territories, was included in the bill.

Unlike Americans in every other State, working Puerto Rican taxpayers are excluded from the Federal EITC to supplement their incomes. This is a deeply unfair restriction. It has tied the commonwealth's hands at the worst possible time as islanders are recovering from disaster and facing high unemployment and dreadful levels of poverty.

The EITC has repeatedly proven a critical tool to alleviating poverty, improving health outcomes, and encouraging labor participation. Why shouldn't our fellow Americans in Puerto Rico—and they are our fellow Americans—be able to earn the same benefit?

With this Federal support, we can provide a very powerful tool for Puerto Ricans to get back on their feet and get a leg up. They deserve that help.

Madam Chair, I ask that we support this legislation.

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ), the distinguished chairwoman of the Committee on Small Business, who has been an eloquent, persistent speaker in favor of this aid because she understands that her homeland, where family still resides, needs this money now, and we have an obligation to provide it now.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Madam Chair, I thank Chairwoman LOWEY and all the members of the Appropriations Committee for working diligently to bring this bill to the floor and for recognizing our moral and legal obligation of this Congress.

Puerto Rico, an island invaded by the United States Armed Forces, a colony—it is our responsibility to take care of our fellow American citizens.

Don't come here and say that we have been there for Puerto Rico.

Yes, we passed a disaster relief package. And this administration has done everything within their power to withhold the money flowing to Puerto Rico.

Don't come here and say that you have been there for Puerto Rico. Don't tell that to the parents of a 13-year-old girl who died in Vieques because they lack a functional hospital while FEMA has been withholding their money.

Just this past Tuesday, Puerto Rico got hit by another 5.0 aftershock. This

is one out of more than 3,000 that have stricken the island since December 2019. In fact, the USGS has estimated that aftershocks from the 6.4 January earthquake will persist in Puerto Rico for years, if not decades.

Imagine, decades of feeling the ground under you shaking, never knowing when or just how bad it will be on any given day.

More than 1,150 houses are destroyed, while another 3,000 homes have suffered some structural damage. Such devastation has left over 4,000 people living in tent shelters, with many more families at risk of losing their homes.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Chair, I yield an addition 1 minute to the gentlewoman.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Madam Chair, I thank the chairwoman for yielding.

Not only are 194,000 children still out of school, countless more live in fear after they have seen their homes destroyed and loved ones battle the anxiety and mental health battles common after natural disasters.

Finally, let me address this administration's recent comments on this bill. Once again, they are misleading the American people about how much money has been spent to aid Puerto Rico. They are using these false numbers as a pretext to oppose assistance following the earthquake.

Let me just say, and let me be clear, we will not be deterred. The 1.3 million Puerto Ricans who live in Florida will not be deterred. The thousands and hundreds of thousands who live in Ohio, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, New York, and in every part of this country will not be deterred.

We will pass this bill.

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA), the chairman of the Committee on Natural Resources.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chair, let me thank Chair LOWEY and the Speaker for responding with urgency in bringing this legislation that I support, H.R. 5687, to the floor to help the families of Puerto Rico who are enduring, once again, another natural disaster.

Beginning on December 28, seismic activity began in Puerto Rico and continued to escalate, including a 6.4 earthquake. These quakes and ongoing quakes have destroyed homes, infrastructure, affected power generation, and triggered blackouts across the island.

Close to 7,500 people have left their homes out of fear that they may collapse, seeking shelter wherever they can find it.

Staff from the Natural Resources Committee investigated the damage caused by the earthquakes on the southern coast of Puerto Rico. In a committee report, we recommended high-priority actions, including emergency funding, which H.R. 5687 represents.

The administration's recent statement opposing H.R. 5687 shows total disdain for the people of Puerto Rico. President Trump continues to lie to the American people about the amount of Federal funding spent to address natural disasters on the island.

The President and his administration have a responsibility to ensure the people of Puerto Rico are treated as full Americans and not colonized subjects. I hope that, at the National Prayer Breakfast, there was some echo of understanding regarding the teachings of the Good Samaritan, the compassion that we must have for other people, and that those will motivate the House today to pass this bill and move it forward. The disaster recovery funds that have been appropriated for Puerto Rico need to be disbursed.

The people of Puerto Rico deserve much more. Our fellow Americans on the island deserve to be treated as we have treated all Americans, from Katrina to Sandy, with the same concern, the same support.

Madam Chair, I urge passage of the legislation.

The CHAIR. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

Ms. GRANGER. Madam Chair, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. RICE), a member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. Madam Chair, I am not here to cast aspersions on disaster relief. I live in a coastal area in South Carolina that has been hit by three storms in the last 5 years: Joaquin, then Matthew, then Florence.

I was a tax lawyer before I got here. I didn't know that much about disaster relief, and, unfortunately, I have had to learn way more than I ever wanted to. But one thing that concerns me, and concerns me greatly, is the haphazard way in which disaster relief is granted.

And just to understand the order of magnitude that we are talking about here in relief for Puerto Rico, the request of the Governor in Puerto Rico amounts to, just for the two hurricanes—I don't even know what it is for the earthquake; I don't know if they have made an official request yet—but for the two hurricanes, Maria and the other one, amounts to \$94 billion. They have been awarded \$39 billion, allocated or announced, and they have received, obligated, \$20 billion.

Now, there were 476,000 applicants approved by FEMA in Puerto Rico. So, if you look at the amount that the Governor requested, \$94 billion, that amounts to \$200,000 per FEMA applicant, \$200,000, roughly. The amount that has been allocated or announced, \$40 billion, divided out, it is just under \$100,000 per FEMA applicant. And then the amount that has actually been paid works out to—and I have got that exact number here—\$41,816 per FEMA applicant for these two storms.

And there is, remaining, a tremendous amount of money that has al-

ready been allocated that hasn't been paid out yet. And there was disaster money that was made available in the appropriations bill in December for storms that occurred last year plus any storms that occurred within 60 days thereafter, and so these earthquakes are also allowed to access that money.

So I don't know that we really need to be rushing in to allocate another \$5 billion in aid when there is so much money that is already available to be used for this disaster. I hesitate to do this, but I want to point this out just to show you the order of magnitude.

After Hurricane Florence, the Governor of South Carolina requested \$1 billion. Puerto Rico has requested \$94 billion.

The most affected counties in my district were Marion, Dillon, Marlboro, and Chesterfield. Marion, Dillon, and Marlboro are three of the poorest counties in the State. Marion County is 57 percent African American; Dillon County is 51 percent African American; and Marlboro County is 51 percent African American. The average number of people in poverty is 30 percent. The average household income is around \$30,000—just so you know the quality of life of these folks.

There were 14,000 houses flooded, water inside the house. Five thousand of those, for some reason, were approved by FEMA. Even though they excluded two-thirds of the people who were damaged in this storm, we were still only awarded \$14,000 per FEMA applicant.

Puerto Rico, right now, stands at \$41,816 per FEMA applicant before this \$5 billion that they are talking about adding in here—and keeping in mind that we already did an appropriations bill in December for disaster allocation for last year that this earthquake is already allowed to access.

□ 1000

So that is what I wanted to say about the disaster, the total amounts that are asked to be allocated here. But I want to talk also a little bit about these tax benefits.

In addition to the \$4.7 billion in additional money that is being asked to be allocated here, over the \$40 billion that has already been allocated, there are several tax provisions in this bill that have never been considered by the Ways and Means Committee. Tax bills should arise in the Ways and Means Committee. Tax bills should be debated thoroughly.

I have heard over and over again, you shouldn't legislate an appropriations bill. This appropriations bill, this disaster bill, contains a number of very significant changes to the Tax Code. Now, some of these were a part of a bigger bill that was marked up with no debate and with no hearings 6 months ago or a year ago, but they have never been debated. There has never been a hearing on any of this in the Ways and Means Committee.

The two biggest things are, we are extending here to residents of Puerto

Rico, the child tax credit as it exists under the United States Tax Code and the earned income tax credit. Now, people don't know what that means. But, basically, that amounts to about \$4,400 per family. And that is not a one-time thing like this disaster allocation is. That is forever. It goes on forever.

The really interesting thing about extending this credit to residents of Puerto Rico, is that residents of Puerto Rico don't pay U.S. income tax. They don't file U.S. income tax returns unless they work for the U.S. Government, or unless their income comes from outside Puerto Rico, which is a small number of people. They don't pay U.S. income tax.

So what we are talking about doing here is the U.S. Treasury will pay the child tax credit and the earned income tax credit to residents of Puerto Rico, credits against tax they don't owe and will never owe because they simply don't pay income tax.

What this is, is a basically \$400 a month entitlement forever to the residents of Puerto Rico and it makes no sense. It is not related to the disaster in any way. It is simply a pork barrel earmark is what it is that lasts forever going to Puerto Rico. Those are the big things: the earned income tax credit and the child tax credit. But let me go further.

In addition, this bill would provide New Markets Tax Credits of \$500 million to Puerto Rico. Now, the New Markets Tax Credit is a wonderful thing. Again, it is something under the United States Tax Code. Puerto Ricans don't pay taxes under the United States Tax Code, but this would extend that credit. I guess, if people invest in Puerto Rico, they would get a credit on their U.S. tax return, \$500 million.

Just to put that in perspective, it is designed to get people to invest in run-down areas, in needy areas, and it is a good thing. But last year, the total amount for the whole country that we allocated, that we made available for the whole country, was \$3.5 billion. This would give \$500 million of that to Puerto Rico which would amount to one-seventh of what was granted to the entire country last year. \$500 million.

I just want to step back and just look at and consider carefully these tax provisions, in particular, before we move forward with them. In my opinion, again, they are not related to the disaster in any way. They are simply a method of creating a new entitlement in Puerto Rico, credits against U.S. tax for people who pay no U.S. tax.

But if we are going to do this, certainly, it should be debated fully on this floor, and, certainly, before it ever gets to this floor, it should be debated fully in every committee—particularly, the Ways and Means Committee—which has any possible jurisdiction.

So let me go back and end where I started. And that is, that I am not here to cast aspersions on disaster relief. My poor rural counties in South Carolina have been terribly affected, have

requested disaster relief, and have received disaster relief. Now they have received far less than we are talking about here in Puerto Rico.

Probably, if you looked at all of this, maybe a sixth of what my poor families, my poor African American families, who had nothing to begin with—right in Marion County and Dillon County and Marlboro County—are receiving about a third of what the people in Puerto Rico are going to receive with this disaster bill.

We really need to consider the order of magnitude, number one, and when I say these numbers, I am not even counting these tax credits. These tax credits need to be pulled out of this bill and they need to be fully debated.

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I would like to remind the gentleman from South Carolina, who is on his way out, that this bill has \$25.7 million for South Carolina to deal with the destruction and the needs.

I would also urge the gentleman, because he did give a thoughtful analysis, to perhaps visit Puerto Rico as many of us have. See the tarps on the homes, people without roofs, kids that are not in school, homes that don't have water, and don't have heat.

I would be happy to work with the gentleman to analyze, visit Puerto Rico, see the needs, and I am happy to come to South Carolina if there are unmet needs that have not been provided for. We are happy to work together. But again, in this bill, there is \$25.7 million for South Carolina.

Madam Chairwoman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Ms. PLASKETT).

Ms. PLASKETT. Madam Chair, I thank the gentlewoman for the time.

I was actually going to discuss some of the issues and specifics that were in the bill, this incredible bill that is so helpful, but I think the last comments caused me to have to take pause.

First of all, I don't know why we have to single out African Americans in South Carolina, as if they are in more need than anybody else for funding or for underfunding when they are more affected by disasters. But the reason that these things are happening in the territories is because of the underfunding of this body to the territories in ways that do not happen in States throughout this country.

There is no cap on Medicaid in South Carolina. There is no arbitrary amount of percentage that the Federal Government is paying as opposed to a local government is paying in South Carolina like there is in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands where Congress arbitrarily said: We will only pay 55 percent. You pay 45 percent, based on a number that has nothing to do with your population or its demographics.

There is no cap on highways and us being removed from Federal formulas that the rest of the States have. So when we have a disaster, yes, we need

more money because we have underfunding and our infrastructure is a lot more fragile than the rest of this country because this body hasn't done its job.

The gentleman talks about taxes. Why doesn't the Virgin Islands pay taxes in the same way? Because almost 100 years ago, when we asked this government to be treated in the same way as the others, this government said: You know what, we will let you keep your Federal taxes and then we won't have to give you the same amounts of money that we give the rest of the States, when, in fact, at that time, maybe 100 people met the criteria of income to pay Federal taxes.

So it is a sham and it is an okeydoke what this country did to the rest of us. And then everyone wants to hold us to the same standards and make sure that we are not supposed to get money the same way. It is just ridiculous.

I think this is an incredible bill. I think it is long overdue. This does not even put us on the same footing as the States in terms of what should happen, and I urge all of my colleagues to support it.

Ms. GRANGER. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES).

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Madam Chair, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Texas for yielding me the time.

Madam Chair, we are in a situation where we absolutely have needs in terms of disaster victims, whether it is Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Texas, South Carolina, North Carolina, Louisiana, and other States that have been impacted by disasters.

We have had hundreds of billions of dollars in damages in those States in just the last 4 years. It is extraordinary. I had the chance to travel to many of those States and territories to see firsthand the impacts, and I wanted to be very clear. Virtually what everyone said on both sides of the aisle, they are right in terms of what the disaster victims are going through.

But I do not agree in what folks are prescribing the strategy to be. We don't need to stand here and see who can out-Puerto Rico the other. It is not a money problem. I have been through this with millions and millions of people. We have policy problems. There are literally tens of billions of dollars in the bank today that we are unable to get to disaster victims.

Dumping more money on top of the existing more than \$40 billion in the Disaster Relief Fund, and the billions and billions of dollars available today for Puerto Rico under the Community Development Block Grant Disaster Recovery Program, that doesn't solve the problem.

There is an amendment coming up later today by our Members from Texas to put more money into a fund because some of the agencies have had trouble even getting law changes interpreted out.

This isn't the solution. I want to thank everybody for coming here and trying to solve the problem for disaster victims. But when you investigate this, I assure you, every single one of you will come back and understand that this is a capacity problem. Getting the bureaucracy in both the territories, the States, and also at the Federal level, getting the dollars to the disaster victims, that is why we are having problems today.

I want to say this again. There are tens of billions of dollars available. President Trump approved individual and public assistance for disaster victims of the earthquakes in Puerto Rico. We have got to make sure that the money is actually getting to the right people.

Dumping additional money on top of the tens of billions of dollars doesn't solve the problem. We need to focus on real solutions and not stand here and practice politics with one another.

I urge rejection to this bill. Let's take a step back and fix the policy problems.

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Chair, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY), chairwoman of the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Chair, I rise in strong support of H.R. 5687. When Hurricane Maria hit Puerto Rico, its entire electrical grid was destroyed and millions of its citizens were without power. It took years to rebuild a lot of that infrastructure and just when it was getting repaired, it was struck by another natural disaster, another huge earthquake on January 7. That led to yet another round of power outages and even more suffering and deaths in Puerto Rico.

This bill will provide desperately needed disaster relief that will allow the island to rebuild its infrastructure and revitalize its economy. Puerto Rico is home to 3.2 million U.S. citizens, and when disaster strikes, Congress has a duty to step up and provide all the support our fellow Americans need.

I want to thank Chairwomen VELÁZQUEZ and Lowey for their passionate work on this bill and their help for Puerto Rico. I urge a "yes" vote on this bill. It is desperately needed.

Ms. GRANGER. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Puerto Rico (Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN).

Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico. Madam Chairwoman, I thank the ranking member for yielding again.

I think we have not understood the magnitude of this event. Yes, we do have \$40 billion in approved funds for Puerto Rico, but of that, just \$1.5 billion has been disbursed to the island. The rest of the funds go through a different process.

Actually, in February of last year, there was the publication of the guidelines to access \$8.7 billion. Of that, just 1.7 got a grant agreement in January of

this year. So, again, in order to get the funds, it will be several months before we have it.

□ 1015

That is the reason one of the concerns is that FEMA is getting the emergency disaster individual assistance as we speak, the same thing as the other Federal agencies that are doing the job on the ground.

But at the same time, we did have a power plant on the island that is completely shut down, so we lost the power for a few days. Right now, we don't have 500 megawatts reserved. Actually, if we do have another earthquake or any other replicas, we may run out, again, of power because our power plants were affected as well.

I do believe that roads and pipelines were affected. Government buildings were affected as well. We haven't seen yet the amount of destruction.

Again, you will see a lot of Puerto Ricans leaving the island. It is happening already. It happened with Hurricane Maria. They flew to Florida. We are depleting, basically, our island because of these kinds of things.

Yes, we do need the money. We do need to help our people in this stress. The tax provisions are good in this bill. Let me say, they are not an invention from me. This House and Senate did a report in 2016 recommending the child tax credit, the earned income tax credit, and many other amendments that treat Puerto Rico and the territories differently. That is the reason we don't have enough resources to face a lot of these challenges.

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ).

Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. Madam Chair, I thank the chairwoman for the generous introduction and time on this bill.

Madam Chair, the fact of the matter is that innocent children, families, and the elderly in Puerto Rico are dying. They are breathing poisoned air, and they are now enduring the psychological trauma of ongoing earthquakes.

My own grandmother is oxygen dependent, and every day when the Earth shakes below her, we don't know if she will have the power to continue her equipment that is medically necessary.

While everyone here is arguing over money and over the administration of a colonial state, we have to take a look at the actual reality on the ground. Ninety-five percent of schools in Puerto Rico are not up to code. They are leaving thousands of Puerto Rican children vulnerable to the effects of natural disasters. Many have lost all their belongings, and many more live with psychological trauma.

But this administration is not releasing any of these funds that are supposed to be duly allocated for recovery. For that, we have to make sure that we support this bill, and I strongly support H.R. 5687.

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands (Mr. SABLAN).

Mr. SABLAN. Madam Chair, I thank the chairwoman for yielding.

Madam Chair, I cannot imagine. I come from a district where we are the typhoon alley. A little over a year ago, the second largest storm since 1935 that hit the United States hit my island, and that was subsequent to another typhoon that hit my island just a year before that.

But for Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands, for Puerto Rico in particular, two major storms hit the islands, and before the people even had a chance to truly get their lives back in order, earthquakes. Those homes that were not destroyed by the storms are now destroyed by the earthquakes.

Madam Chair, in a previous administration, I was a Special Assistant for Management and Budget, and we did an analysis of what it would be like to apply the U.S. Internal Revenue Code fully to the Marianas. We would lose more money if we change Federal taxes than if we don't. So I support the bill, and I ask for its passage.

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Madam Chair, this emergency supplemental is critical to help Puerto Rico get back on its feet and build a better future.

In a demonstration of unprecedented hostility to Puerto Ricans, President Trump has turned his back on the island. This Congress must not do the same.

With this legislation, Madam Chair, we can feed the hungry, repair damage, rebuild roads, restart schools, and keep the lights on.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote for this critical assistance. It is absolutely essential. I do wish more of my colleagues had visited the island, seen the tarps on the homes instead of roofs, tried to get back through those roads that are so slushy, walking through, driving through, and talking to the people. It is essential that we pass this critical assistance.

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

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

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

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5687

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

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Emergency Supplemental Appropriations for Disaster Relief and Puerto Rico Disaster Tax Relief Act, 2020".

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SEC. 2. The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

DIVISION A—EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR DISASTER RELIEF ACT, 2020

DIVISION B—PUERTO RICO DISASTER TAX RELIEF ACT OF 2020

DIVISION C—BUDGETARY EFFECTS

REFERENCES

SEC. 3. Except as expressly provided otherwise, any reference to "this Act" contained in any division of this Act shall be treated as referring only to the provisions of that division.

DIVISION A—EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR DISASTER RELIEF ACT, 2020

That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I
DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

ENERGY PROGRAMS
CYBERSECURITY, ENERGY SECURITY, AND
EMERGENCY RESPONSE

For an additional amount for "Cybersecurity, Energy Security, and Emergency Response", \$6,750,000, to remain available until expended, for necessary expenses related to providing technical assistance related to natural disasters in U.S. territories, including technical assistance related to electric grids: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

ELECTRICITY

For an additional amount for "Electricity", \$15,000,000, to remain available until expended, for necessary expenses related to providing technical assistance related to natural disasters in U.S. territories, including technical assistance related to electric grids: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

TITLE II
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
HURRICANE EDUCATION RECOVERY
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for "Hurricane Education Recovery" for necessary expenses related to the consequences of earthquakes occurring in calendar years 2019 and 2020 as of the date of enactment of this Act in those areas for which a major disaster or emergency has been declared under section 401 or 501 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5170 and 5191) (referred to under this heading as "covered disaster or emergency"), \$100,000,000, to remain available through September 30, 2022, for assisting in meeting the educational needs of individuals affected by a covered disaster or emergency: *Provided*, That such assistance shall be provided through any of the programs authorized under this heading in title VIII of subdivision 1 of division B of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018 (Public Law 115-123; 132 Stat. 95), as amended by section 201 of this Act, as determined by the Secretary of Education, and subject to the terms and conditions that applied to those programs, except that references to dates and school years in such Act shall be deemed to be the corresponding dates and school years for the covered disaster or emergency: *Provided further*, That

the Secretary of Education may determine the amounts to be used for each such program and shall notify the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate of these amounts not later than 7 days prior to obligation: *Provided further*, That \$1,000,000 of the funds made available under this heading, to remain available until expended, shall be transferred to the Office of the Inspector General of the Department of Education for oversight of activities supported with funds appropriated under this heading, and up to \$500,000 of the funds made available under this heading shall be for program administration: *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—THIS TITLE

SEC. 201. (a) The second proviso under the heading “Department of Education—Hurricane Education Recovery” under title VIII of subdivision 1 of division B of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018 (Public Law 115–123; 132 Stat. 95) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in subparagraph (I), by striking “and” after the semicolon;

(B) in subparagraph (J) by inserting “and” at the end; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(K) assistance provided to an eligible entity under paragraph (1)(A) that was affected by Hurricane Maria or earthquakes occurring in calendar years 2019 and 2020 as of the date of enactment of the ‘Emergency Supplemental Appropriations for Disaster Relief Act, 2020’, to assist with restarting school operations, including assistance provided to an eligible entity before the date of enactment of the ‘Emergency Supplemental Appropriations for Disaster Relief Act, 2020’, may be used by the eligible entity to pay the non-Federal share of a project described in section 406 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster and Relief Emergency Act (42 U.S.C. 5172), notwithstanding section 102(e)(3)(A) of title IV of division B of Public Law 109–148 (119 Stat. 2794);”;

(2) in paragraph (9), by striking “and” after the semicolon;

(3) by redesignating paragraph (10) as paragraph (11); and

(4) by inserting after paragraph (9) the following:

“(10) if the amount available under paragraph (3) is insufficient to meet the need for such assistance as demonstrated by applications submitted by eligible entities, the Secretary may use additional funds available under this heading to fully fund approved applications; and”.

(b) Amounts repurposed pursuant to the amendments made by subsection (a) that were previously designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 are designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

SEC. 202. (a) Amounts previously made available for activities authorized under “Department of Education—Hurricane Education Recovery” in title VIII of subdivision 1 of division B of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018 (Public Law 115–123; 132 Stat. 95) may be used to address unmet needs, as determined by the Secretary, for that heading in this Act and in the Additional Supplemental Appropriations for Disaster Relief Act, 2019 (Public Law 116–20; 133 Stat. 890). In addition, any funds provided under the heading “Department of Education—Hurricane Edu-

cation Recovery” in this Act that are allocated in response to a covered disaster or emergency may be used interchangeably and without limitation for the same activities related to Hurricanes Maria and Irma.

(b) Amounts repurposed pursuant to this section that were previously designated by the Congress, respectively, as an emergency requirement or as being for disaster relief pursuant to the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act are designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 or as being for disaster relief pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

SEC. 203. Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Education shall provide a detailed spend plan of anticipated uses of funds made available in this title, including estimated personnel and administrative costs, to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate: *Provided*, That such plan shall be updated and submitted to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate every 60 days until all funds are expended or expire.

SEC. 204. Section 392 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1068a) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(d) WAIVER AUTHORITY WITH RESPECT TO INSTITUTIONS LOCATED IN AN AREA AFFECTED BY HURRICANE MARIA.—

“(1) WAIVER AUTHORITY.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, unless enacted with specific reference to this section, for any affected institution that was receiving assistance under this title at the time of a covered hurricane disaster, the Secretary shall, for each of the fiscal years 2020 through 2022 (and may, for each of the fiscal years 2023 and 2024)—

“(A) waive—

“(i) the eligibility data requirements set forth in section 391(d);

“(ii) the wait-out period set forth in section 313(d);

“(iii) the allotment requirements under section 324; and

“(iv) the use of the funding formula developed pursuant to section 326(f)(3);

“(B) waive or modify any statutory or regulatory provision to ensure that affected institutions that were receiving assistance under this title at the time of a covered hurricane disaster are not adversely affected by any formula calculation for fiscal year 2020 or for any of the four succeeding fiscal years, as necessary; and

“(C) make available to each affected institution an amount that is not less than the amount made available to such institution under this title for fiscal year 2017, except that for any fiscal year for which the funds appropriated for payments under this title are less than the appropriated level for fiscal year 2017, the amount made available to such institutions shall be ratably reduced among the institutions receiving funds under this title.

“(2) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

“(A) AFFECTED INSTITUTION.—The term ‘affected institution’ means an institution of higher education that—

“(i) is—

“(I) a part A institution (which term shall have the meaning given the term ‘eligible institution’ under section 312(b)); or

“(II) a part B institution, as such term is defined in section 322(2), or as identified in section 326(e);

“(ii) is located in a covered area affected by a hurricane disaster; and

“(iii) is able to demonstrate that, as a result of the impact of a covered hurricane disaster, the institution—

“(I) incurred physical damage;

“(II) has pursued collateral source compensation from insurance, the Federal Emergency Management Agency, and the Small Business Administration, as appropriate; and

“(III) was not able to fully reopen its existing facilities or to fully reopen to the pre-hurricane enrollment levels during the 30-day period beginning on September 7, 2017.

“(B) COVERED AREA AFFECTED BY A HURRICANE DISASTER.—The term ‘covered area affected by a hurricane disaster’ means an area for which the President declared a major disaster under section 401 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5170) as a result of Hurricane Maria.

“(C) COVERED HURRICANE DISASTER.—The term ‘covered hurricane disaster’ means a major disaster that the President declared to exist, in accordance with section 401 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5170), and that was caused by Hurricane Maria or Hurricane Irma.”.

TITLE III

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION

EMERGENCY RELIEF PROGRAM

For an additional amount for the Emergency Relief Program as authorized under section 125 of title 23, United States Code, \$1,250,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

COMMUNITY PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for “Community Development Fund”, \$2,000,000,000, to remain available until expended, for necessary expenses for activities authorized under title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5301 et seq.) related to disaster relief, long-term recovery, restoration of infrastructure and housing, economic revitalization, and mitigation in the most impacted and distressed areas resulting from an emergency declaration relating to earthquakes that occurred in 2020 or a declaration of a major disaster that occurred in 2020 pursuant to the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.): *Provided*, That funds shall be awarded directly to the State, unit of general local government, or Indian tribe (as such term is defined in section 102 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974) at the discretion of the Secretary: *Provided further*, That in determining the amount allocated under this heading for any grantee, the Secretary shall include an additional amount for mitigation that is not less than 45 percent of the amount allocated for such grantee for unmet needs: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall allocate for grantees, based on the best available data, funds provided for assistance under this heading no later than 60 days after the date the disaster occurs, or the date of enactment of this Act, whichever is later: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may extend the deadline in the preceding proviso by an additional 30 days if the Secretary jointly certifies with the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency for each such extension, that the Federal Emergency

Management Agency has not made sufficient information available to the Secretary regarding relevant unmet recovery needs to make allocations in accordance with such deadlines: *Provided further*, That not later than 5 days after making any such certification, the Secretary shall transmit to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate, and publish in the Federal Register such certification: *Provided further*, That not later than 90 days after the allocation of funds made to a grantee under this heading and before the Secretary obligates any of such funds for a grantee, the grantee shall submit a plan to the Secretary for approval detailing the proposed use of all funds, including criteria for eligibility and how the use of these funds will address long-term recovery and restoration of infrastructure and housing, economic revitalization, and mitigation in the most impacted and distressed areas: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall approve or disapprove such plan not later than 60 days after submission of the plan to the Secretary, and shall immediately notify the applicant of the Secretary's decision: *Provided further*, That if the Secretary disapproves a plan, not later than 3 days after such disapproval the Secretary shall inform the applicant in writing of (A) the reasons for disapproval, and (B) actions that the applicant could take to meet the criteria for approval: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall, for a period of not less than 45 days following the date of disapproval, permit amendments to, or the resubmission of, any plan that is disapproved: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall approve or disapprove a plan amendment not later than 30 days after receipt of such amendments or resubmission: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall ensure that all grant agreements necessary for prompt disbursement of funds allocated to a grantee are executed no later than 60 days after the date of approval of a grantee's plan: *Provided further*, That prior to making any grant of funds provided under this heading the Secretary, (1) must receive from the grantee information that allows the Secretary to certify that such grantee has in place proficient financial controls and procurement processes and has established adequate procedures to prevent any duplication of benefits as defined by section 312 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5155), to ensure timely expenditure of funds, to maintain comprehensive websites regarding all disaster recovery activities assisted with these funds, and to detect and prevent waste, fraud, and abuse of funds, and (2) shall certify in advance that such grantee has in place such controls, processes and procedure: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall not prohibit the use of funds made available under this heading for non-Federal share as authorized by section 105(a)(9) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5305(a)(9)): *Provided further*, That with the amounts made available under this heading, grantees may establish grant programs to assist small businesses for working capital purposes to aid in recovery: *Provided further*, That with respect to any such duplication of benefits, the Secretary shall act in accordance with section 1210 of the Disaster Recovery Reform Act of 2018 (division D of Public Law 115-254; 132 Stat. 3442) and section 312 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5155): *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall require grantees to maintain on a public website information containing common reporting criteria established by the Department that permits individuals and entities awaiting assistance and the general public to see how all grant funds are used,

including copies of all relevant procurement documents, grantee administrative contracts and details of ongoing procurement processes, as determined by the Secretary: *Provided further*, That such funds may not be used for activities reimbursable by, or for which funds have been made available by, the Federal Emergency Management Agency or the Army Corps of Engineers: *Provided further*, That funds allocated under this heading shall not be considered relevant to the non-disaster formula allocations made pursuant to section 106 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5306): *Provided further*, That a State, unit of general local government, or Indian tribe may use up to 5 percent of its allocation for administrative costs: *Provided further*, That in administering the funds under this heading, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development may waive, or specify alternative requirements for, any provision of any statute or regulation that the Secretary administers in connection with the obligation by the Secretary or the use by the recipient of these funds (except for any requirements related to fair housing, nondiscrimination, labor standards, the environment, and any timelines specified under this heading), if the Secretary finds that good cause exists for the waiver or alternative requirement and such waiver or alternative requirement would not be inconsistent with the overall purpose of title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding the preceding proviso, recipients of funds provided under this heading that use such funds to supplement Federal assistance provided under section 402, 403, 404, 406, 407, 408(c)(4), or 502 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.) may adopt, without review or public comment, any environmental review, approval, or permit performed by a Federal agency, and such adoption shall satisfy the responsibilities of the recipient with respect to such environmental review, approval or permit: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding section 104(g)(2) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5304(g)(2)), the Secretary may, upon receipt of a request for release of funds and certification, immediately approve the release of funds for an activity or project assisted under this heading if the recipient has adopted an environmental review, approval or permit under the preceding proviso or the activity or project is categorically excluded from review under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.): *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall publish via notice in the Federal Register any waiver, or alternative requirement, to any statute or regulation that the Secretary administers pursuant to title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 no later than 5 days before the effective date of such waiver or alternative requirement: *Provided further*, That of the amounts made available under this heading, up to \$5,000,000 shall be made available for capacity building and technical assistance, including assistance on contracting and procurement processes, to support States, units of general local government, or Indian tribes (and their subrecipients) that receive allocations pursuant to this heading, or may receive similar allocations for disaster recovery in future appropriations Acts: *Provided further*, That of the amounts made available under this heading, up to \$2,500,000 shall be transferred, in aggregate, to "Department of Housing and Urban Development—Program Office Salaries and Expenses—Community Planning and Development" for necessary costs, including information technology costs, of administering and overseeing the obligation and expendi-

ture of amounts under this heading: *Provided further*, That the amount specified in the preceding proviso shall be combined with funds appropriated under the same heading in prior appropriations Acts without limitation: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall transmit each certification made under the authorities provided in this Act to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate no later than 3 days after making any such certification: *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985: *Provided further*, That amounts repurposed under this heading that were previously designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act are designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—THIS TITLE

SEC. 301. For an additional amount for "Department of Housing and Urban Development—Community Planning and Development—Community Development Fund", \$1,260,000,000, to remain available until expended, which amounts shall be allocated and used under the same authority and conditions as the additional appropriations under the heading "Department of Housing and Urban Development—Community Planning and Development—Community Development Fund" of title XI of the Additional Supplemental Appropriations for Disaster Relief Act, 2019 (Public Law 116-20; 133 Stat. 896): *Provided*, That not less than \$1,530,000,000 of the funds made available in this section and under the heading "Department of Housing and Urban Development—Community Planning and Development—Community Development Fund" of title XI of the Additional Supplemental Appropriations for Disaster Relief Act, 2019 (Public Law 116-20) shall be allocated to grantees, no later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, for mitigation activities in the most impacted and distressed areas resulting from a major disaster that occurred in 2018 or 2019: *Provided further*, That such allocations shall be made in the same proportion that the amount of funds each grantee received under this section, under the heading "Department of Housing and Urban Development—Community Planning and Development—Community Development Fund" of title XI of the Additional Supplemental Appropriations for Disaster Relief Act, 2019 (Public Law 116-20), and under the same heading in division I of Public Law 115-254 bears to the amount of all funds provided to all grantees that received allocations for disasters that occurred in 2018 or 2019: *Provided further*, That none of the funds made available under this section or under the heading "Department of Housing and Urban Development—Community Planning and Development—Community Development Fund" of title XI of the Additional Supplemental Appropriations for Disaster Relief Act, 2019 (Public Law 116-20) may be used for any part of a major disaster that was declared in 2020: *Provided further*, That in administering funds made available under this section and title XI of the Additional Supplemental Appropriations for Disaster Relief Act, 2019 (Public Law 116-20), the fourth proviso under the heading "Department of Housing and Urban Development—Community Planning and Development—Community Development Fund" in Public Law 116-20 and the first proviso of section 1102 of such Public Law shall have no force or effect: *Provided further*, That such

amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985: *Provided further*, That amounts repurposed by this section that were previously designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement or as being for disaster relief pursuant to the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act are designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 or as being for disaster relief pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

SEC. 302. (a) Amounts previously made available for activities authorized under title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5301 et seq.) related to disaster relief, long-term recovery, restoration of infrastructure and housing, economic revitalization, and mitigation in the most impacted and distressed areas resulting from a major disaster, including funds provided under the heading “Department of Housing and Urban Development—Community Planning and Development—Community Development Fund” in prior appropriations Acts, that were allocated in response to Hurricanes Irma and Maria, may be used interchangeably and without limitation for the same activities funded under the heading “Department of Housing and Urban Development—Community Planning and Development—Community Development Fund” in this Act. In addition, any funds provided under the heading “Department of Housing and Urban Development—Community Planning and Development—Community Development Fund” in this Act may be used interchangeably and without limitation for the same activities in the most impacted and distressed areas related to Hurricanes Irma and Maria.

(b)(1) Until the date on which the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development publishes a Federal Register Notice implementing this provision—

(A) grantees may submit for approval by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development revised plans for the use of funds related to Hurricanes Irma and Maria that expand the eligible beneficiaries of existing programs contained in such previously approved plans to include those activities funded under the heading “Department of Housing and Urban Development—Community Planning and Development—Community Development Fund” in this Act; and

(B) approval of any such revised plans shall include the execution of revised grant terms and conditions as necessary.

(2) Beginning on the date of the publication of the implementing Notice, any plan revisions shall follow the requirements contained in such Notice.

(c) Amounts repurposed by this section that were previously designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement or as being for disaster relief pursuant to the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act are designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 or as being for disaster relief pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

SEC. 303. For funds appropriated under the heading “Department of Housing and Urban Development—Community Planning and Development—Community Development Fund” in subdivision 1 of division B of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018 (Public Law 115-123) or the Additional Supplemental Appropriations for Disaster Relief Act, 2019 (Public

Law 116-20), the Secretary shall execute all grant agreements for disbursement of funds allocated to a grantee no later than 60 days after the date of approval of a grantee’s plan for the use of funds: *Provided*, That amounts repurposed by this section that were previously designated as an emergency requirement or as being for disaster relief pursuant to the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 are designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 or as being for disaster relief pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

SEC. 304. (a) The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, the Secretary of Energy, the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, and other Federal partners, shall complete the inter-agency consultation and coordination of Federal investments necessary for the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to develop administrative requirements for funds provided for enhanced or improved electrical power systems under the heading “Department of Housing and Urban Development—Community Planning and Development—Community Development Fund” in title XI of subdivision 1 of division B of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018 (Public Law 115-123) no later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) With respect to amounts made available for enhanced or improved electrical power systems under the heading “Department of Housing and Urban Development—Community Planning and Development—Community Development Fund” in title XI of subdivision 1 of division B of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018 (Public Law 115-123), the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall publish in the Federal Register the allocations to all eligible grantees, and the necessary administrative requirements applicable to such allocations no later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(c) Amounts repurposed pursuant to this section that were previously designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement or as being for disaster relief pursuant to the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 are designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 or as being for disaster relief pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

TITLE IV—GENERAL PROVISIONS—THIS ACT

SEC. 401. In addition to other amounts made available by section 309 of division A of the Additional Supplemental Appropriations for Disaster Relief Requirements Act, 2017 (Public Law 115-72; 131 Stat. 1229), and by section 104 of title I of the Additional Supplemental Appropriations for Disaster Relief Act, 2019 (Public Law 116-20; 133 Stat. 874), there is appropriated to the Secretary, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, \$40,000,000 to provide a grant to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico for disaster nutrition assistance in response to a major earthquake disaster or emergency designated by the President under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.): *Provided*, That the funds made available to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico under this section shall remain available for obligation by the Commonwealth until September 30, 2021, and

shall be in addition to funds otherwise made available: *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

SEC. 402. (a) Section 20601 of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018 (Public Law 115-123) is amended by striking “and DR-4335-USVT” and inserting “DR-4335-USVI, and for all major disasters declared under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Recovery Act (42 U.S.C. 5122) for Puerto Rico or the United States Virgin Islands during calendar year 2020”.

(b) Subsection (a) shall be applied as if it were in effect beginning on January 1, 2020.

(c) Amounts repurposed by this section and the amendments made by this section that were previously designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement or as being for disaster relief pursuant to the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 are designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 or as being for disaster relief pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

SEC. 403. Each amount appropriated or made available by this Act is in addition to amounts otherwise appropriated for the fiscal year involved.

SEC. 404. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

SEC. 405. Unless otherwise provided for by this Act, the additional amounts appropriated by this Act to appropriations accounts shall be available under the authorities and conditions applicable to such appropriations accounts for fiscal year 2020.

SEC. 406. Each amount designated in this Act by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 shall be available (or rescinded or transferred, if applicable) only if the President subsequently so designates all such amounts and transmits such designations to the Congress.

SEC. 407. Any amount appropriated by this Act, designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 and subsequently so designated by the President, and transferred pursuant to transfer authorities provided by this Act shall retain such designation.

This division may be cited as the “Emergency Supplemental Appropriations for Disaster Relief Act, 2020”.

DIVISION B—PUERTO RICO DISASTER TAX RELIEF ACT OF 2020

SHORT TITLE

SEC. 101.

This division may be cited as the “Puerto Rico Disaster Tax Relief Act of 2020”.

QUALIFIED PUERTO RICO DISASTER ZONE DEFINED

SEC. 102.

For purposes of this division, the term “qualified Puerto Rico disaster zone” means any area—

(1) with respect to which a major disaster was declared by the President under section 401 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act by reason of the earthquakes occurring in or near Puerto Rico beginning on December 28, 2019, and ending on the date which is 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and

(2) which was determined by the President to warrant individual or individual and public assistance from the Federal Government under such Act by reason of such earthquakes.

CHILD TAX CREDIT FOR PUERTO RICO AND OTHER POSSESSIONS OF THE UNITED STATES

SEC. 103.

(a) PUERTO RICO.—

(1) SAME TREATMENT OF FAMILIES IN PUERTO RICO WITH ONE CHILD OR TWO CHILDREN THAT IS CURRENTLY PROVIDED TO FAMILIES IN PUERTO RICO WITH THREE OR MORE CHILDREN.—Section 24(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(4) RESIDENTS OF PUERTO RICO.—In the case of an individual who is a bona fide resident of Puerto Rico (within the meaning of section 937(a)) for the taxable year, paragraph (1)(B)(ii) shall be applied by substituting ‘1 or more qualifying children’ for ‘3 or more qualifying children’.”.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2019.

(b) MIRROR CODE POSSESSIONS.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to each possession of the United States with a mirror code tax system amounts equal to the loss to that possession by reason of the application of section 24 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 with respect to taxable years beginning after 2019. Such amounts shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury based on information provided by the government of the respective possession.

(c) AMERICAN SAMOA.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to American Samoa amounts estimated by the Secretary of the Treasury as being equal to the aggregate benefits that would have been provided to the residents of American Samoa by reason of the application of section 24 of such Code for taxable years beginning after 2019 if the provisions of such section had been in effect in American Samoa. The preceding sentence shall not apply unless American Samoa has a plan, which has been approved by the Secretary of the Treasury, under which American Samoa will promptly distribute such payments to the residents of American Samoa in a manner which replicates to the greatest degree practicable the benefits that would have been so provided to each such resident.

(d) DEFINITIONS AND SPECIAL RULES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—No credit shall be allowed against United States income taxes for any taxable year under section 24 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to any person—

(A) to whom a credit is allowed against taxes imposed by a possession with a mirror code tax system by reason of the application of section 24 of such Code in such possession for such taxable year, or

(B) who is eligible for a payment under a plan described in subsection (c) with respect to such taxable year.

(2) MIRROR CODE TAX SYSTEM.—For purposes of this section, the term “mirror code tax system” means, with respect to any possession of the United States, the income tax system of such possession if the income tax liability of the residents of such possession under such system is determined by reference to the income tax laws of the United States as if such possession were the United States.

(3) TREATMENT OF PAYMENTS.—For purposes of section 1324(b)(2) of title 31, United States Code, the payments under subsections (b) and (c) shall be treated in the same manner as a refund due from the credit allowed under section 24 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

APPLICATION OF EARNED INCOME TAX CREDIT IN POSSESSIONS OF THE UNITED STATES

SEC. 104.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 77 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“SEC. 7529. APPLICATION OF EARNED INCOME TAX CREDIT TO POSSESSIONS OF THE UNITED STATES.

“(a) PUERTO RICO.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—With respect to calendar year 2021 and each calendar year thereafter, the Secretary shall, except as otherwise provided in this subsection, make payments to Puerto Rico equal to—

“(A) the specified matching amount for such calendar year, plus

“(B) in the case of calendar years 2021 through 2025, the lesser of—

“(i) the expenditures made by Puerto Rico during such calendar year for education efforts with respect to individual taxpayers and tax return preparers relating to the earned income tax credit, or

“(ii) \$1,000,000.

“(2) REQUIREMENT TO REFORM EARNED INCOME TAX CREDIT.—The Secretary shall not make any payments under paragraph (1) with respect to any calendar year unless Puerto Rico has in effect an earned income tax credit for taxable years beginning in or with such calendar year which (relative to the earned income tax credit which was in effect for taxable years beginning in or with calendar year 2019) increases the percentage of earned income which is allowed as a credit for each group of individuals with respect to which such percentage is separately stated or determined in a manner designed to substantially increase workforce participation.

“(3) SPECIFIED MATCHING AMOUNT.—For purposes of this subsection—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘specified matching amount’ means, with respect to any calendar year, the lesser of—

“(i) the excess (if any) of—

“(I) the cost to Puerto Rico of the earned income tax credit for taxable years beginning in or with such calendar year, over

“(II) the base amount for such calendar year, or

“(ii) the product of 3, multiplied by the base amount for such calendar year.

“(B) BASE AMOUNT.—

“(i) BASE AMOUNT FOR 2021.—In the case of calendar year 2021, the term ‘base amount’ means the greater of—

“(I) the cost to Puerto Rico of the earned income tax credit for taxable years beginning in or with calendar year 2019 (rounded to the nearest multiple of \$1,000,000), or

“(II) \$200,000,000.

“(ii) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.—In the case of any calendar year after 2021, the term ‘base amount’ means the dollar amount determined under clause (i) increased by an amount equal to—

“(I) such dollar amount, multiplied by—

“(II) the cost-of-living adjustment determined under section 1(f)(3) for such calendar year, determined by substituting ‘calendar year 2020’ for ‘calendar year 2016’ in subparagraph (A)(ii) thereof.

Any amount determined under this clause shall be rounded to the nearest multiple of \$1,000,000.

“(4) RULES RELATED TO PAYMENTS AND REPORTS.—

“(A) TIMING OF PAYMENTS.—The Secretary shall make payments under paragraph (1) for any calendar year—

“(i) after receipt of the report described in subparagraph (B) for such calendar year, and

“(ii) except as provided in clause (i), within a reasonable period of time before the due date for individual income tax returns (as determined under the laws of Puerto Rico) for

taxable years which began on the first day of such calendar year.

“(B) ANNUAL REPORTS.—With respect to calendar year 2021 and each calendar year thereafter, Puerto Rico shall provide to the Secretary a report which shall include—

“(i) an estimate of the costs described in paragraphs (1)(B)(i) and (3)(A)(i)(I) with respect to such calendar year, and

“(ii) a statement of such costs with respect to the preceding calendar year.

“(C) ADJUSTMENTS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—In the event that any estimate of an amount is more or less than the actual amount as later determined and any payment under paragraph (1) was determined on the basis of such estimate, proper payment shall be made by, or to, the Secretary (as the case may be) as soon as practicable after the determination that such estimate was inaccurate. Proper adjustment shall be made in the amount of any subsequent payments made under paragraph (1) to the extent that proper payment is not made under the preceding sentence before such subsequent payments.

“(ii) ADDITIONAL REPORTS.—The Secretary may require such additional periodic reports of the information described in subparagraph (B) as the Secretary determines appropriate to facilitate timely adjustments under clause (i).

“(D) DETERMINATION OF COST OF EARNED INCOME TAX CREDIT.—For purposes of this subsection, the cost to Puerto Rico of the earned income tax credit shall be determined by the Secretary on the basis of the laws of Puerto Rico and shall include reductions in revenues received by Puerto Rico by reason of such credit and refunds attributable to such credit, but shall not include any administrative costs with respect to such credit.

“(b) POSSESSIONS WITH MIRROR CODE TAX SYSTEMS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—With respect to calendar year 2021 and each calendar year thereafter, the Secretary shall, except as otherwise provided in this subsection, make payments to the Virgin Islands, Guam, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands equal to—

“(A) 75 percent of the cost to such possession of the earned income tax credit for taxable years beginning in or with such calendar year, plus

“(B) in the case of calendar years 2021 through 2025, the lesser of—

“(i) the expenditures made by such possession during such calendar year for education efforts with respect to individual taxpayers and tax return preparers relating to such earned income tax credit, or

“(ii) \$50,000.

“(2) APPLICATION OF CERTAIN RULES.—Rules similar to the rules of subparagraphs (A), (B), (C), and (D) of subsection (a)(4) shall apply for purposes of this subsection.

“(c) AMERICAN SAMOA.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—With respect to calendar year 2021 and each calendar year thereafter, the Secretary shall, except as otherwise provided in this subsection, make payments to American Samoa equal to—

“(A) the lesser of—

“(i) 75 percent of the cost to American Samoa of the earned income tax credit for taxable years beginning in or with such calendar year, or

“(ii) \$12,000,000, plus

“(B) in the case of calendar years 2021 through 2025, the lesser of—

“(i) the expenditures made by American Samoa during such calendar year for education efforts with respect to individual taxpayers and tax return preparers relating to such earned income tax credit, or

“(ii) \$50,000.

“(2) REQUIREMENT TO ENACT AND MAINTAIN AN EARNED INCOME TAX CREDIT.—The Secretary shall not make any payments under paragraph (1) with respect to any calendar year unless American Samoa has in effect an earned income tax credit for taxable years beginning in or with such calendar year which allows a refundable tax credit to individuals on the basis of the taxpayer’s earned income which is designed to substantially increase workforce participation.

“(3) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.—In the case of any calendar year after 2021, the \$12,000,000 amount in paragraph (1)(A)(ii) shall be increased by an amount equal to—

“(A) such dollar amount, multiplied by—

“(B) the cost-of-living adjustment determined under section 1(f)(3) for such calendar year, determined by substituting ‘calendar year 2020’ for ‘calendar year 2016’ in subparagraph (A)(ii) thereof.

Any increase determined under this clause shall be rounded to the nearest multiple of \$100,000.

“(4) APPLICATION OF CERTAIN RULES.—Rules similar to the rules of subparagraphs (A), (B), (C), and (D) of subsection (a)(4) shall apply for purposes of this subsection.

“(d) TREATMENT OF PAYMENTS.—For purposes of section 1324 of title 31, United States Code, the payments under this section shall be treated in the same manner as a refund due from a credit provision referred to in subsection (b)(2) of such section.”

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 77 of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“Sec. 7529. Application of earned income tax credit to possessions of the United States.”

LOW-INCOME HOUSING CREDIT ALLOCATIONS FOR PUERTO RICO

SEC. 105.

(a) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of section 42 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, the State housing credit ceiling for Puerto Rico for calendar year 2020 shall be increased by \$50,000,000.

(b) QUALIFIED PUERTO RICO DISASTER ZONES TREATED AS DIFFICULT DEVELOPMENT AREAS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of section 42 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, in the case of a qualified building placed in service in a qualified Puerto Rico disaster zone (as defined in section 102), such area shall be treated as a difficult development area under subclause (I) of section 42(d)(5)(B)(iii) but shall not be taken into account for purposes of applying the limitation under subclause (II) of such section.

(2) QUALIFIED BUILDING.—For purposes of this subsection, the term “qualified building” means any building which is allocated a housing credit dollar amount during calendar year 2020 or 2021.

(3) OTHER DEFINITIONS.—Terms used in this section which are also used in section 42 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 shall have the same meaning when used in this section as when used in such section 42.

NEW MARKETS TAX CREDIT ALLOCATIONS FOR PUERTO RICO

SEC. 106.

(a) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of section 45D of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986—

(1) the new markets tax credit limitation otherwise determined under subsection (f)(1) thereof for each of 2020 and 2021 shall be increased by \$500,000,000, to be allocated among specified community development entities to make qualified low-income community investments in Puerto Rico, and

(2) section 45D(f)(3) shall be applied—

(A) separately with respect to the amounts of the increases under paragraph (1), and

(B) solely with respect to the amounts of the increases described in subparagraph (A), the last sentence of such section shall not prevent such amounts from being carried to calendar year 2026.

(b) SPECIFIED COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT ENTITIES.—For purposes of this section, the term “specified community development entity” means any qualified community development entity if such entity has a history of making qualified low-income community investments in federally declared disaster areas or Puerto Rico.

(c) OTHER DEFINITIONS.—Terms used in this section which are also used in section 45D of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 shall have the same meaning when used in this section as when used in such section 45D.

COVER OVER OF DISTILLED SPIRITS TAXES

SEC. 107.

(a) REPEAL OF LIMITATION ON COVER OVER OF DISTILLED SPIRITS TAXES TO PUERTO RICO AND VIRGIN ISLANDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 7652 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking subsection (f) and by redesignating subsections (g) and (h) as subsections (f) and (g), respectively.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 7652(f)(1) of such Code, as redesignated by paragraph (1), is amended by—

(A) striking subparagraph (B), and

(B) by striking “as if—” and all that follows through “the use and tax” and inserting “as if the use and tax”.

(3) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this subsection shall apply to distilled spirits brought into the United States after December 31, 2019.

(b) TRANSFER TO PUERTO RICO CONSERVATION TRUST FUND OF PORTION OF PUERTO RICO RUM COVER OVER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 7652(e) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by redesignating paragraphs (3), (4), and (5) as paragraphs (4), (5), and (6), respectively, and by inserting after paragraph (2) the following new paragraph:

“(2) TRANSFER TO PUERTO RICO CONSERVATION TRUST FUND OF PORTION OF RUM COVER OVER.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—From any amount otherwise required to be covered over to the treasury of Puerto Rico under this section with respect to taxes collected on rum under section 5001(a)(1) or subsection (a) of this section, the Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer to the Puerto Rico Conservation Trust Fund an amount equal to \$0.46 per proof gallon of rum to which such cover over is attributable. Any amount transferred under the preceding sentence shall be treated for purposes of this section (other than this paragraph) as having been covered over to the treasury of Puerto Rico.

“(B) PUERTO RICO CONSERVATION TRUST FUND.—For purposes of this section, the term ‘Puerto Rico Conservation Trust Fund’ means the fund established pursuant to a Memorandum of Understanding between the United States Department of the Interior and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, dated December 24, 1968.”

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to rum brought into the United States after December 31, 2019.

(c) COVER OVER DETERMINED WITHOUT REGARD TO CERTAIN RATE REDUCTIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 7652 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended by subsection (a)(1), is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(h) COVER OVER DETERMINED WITHOUT REGARD TO CERTAIN RATE REDUCTIONS.—For purposes of subsections (a)(3), (b)(3), and (e), the amount of taxes imposed and collected

under section 5001(a)(1) shall be determined without regard to section 5001(c).”

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 7652(e) of such Code, as amended by subsection (b)(1), is amended by striking paragraph (6).

(3) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this subsection shall take effect as if included in section 13807 of Public Law 115-97.

EMPLOYEE RETENTION CREDIT WITH RESPECT TO INDIVIDUALS EMPLOYED IN THE QUALIFIED PUERTO RICO DISASTER ZONE

SEC. 108.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to Puerto Rico the amount determined under subsection (b) for the purpose of providing an employee retention credit with respect to individuals employed in a qualified Puerto Rico disaster zone (as defined in section 102). The preceding sentence shall not apply unless Puerto Rico has a plan for implementing such employee retention credit—

(1) which is similar to the plan approved under section 504(d)(1)(B) of the Disaster Tax Relief and Airport and Airway Extension Act of 2017,

(2) under which Puerto Rico will promptly distribute such payments to its residents, and

(3) which has been approved by the Secretary of the Treasury for purposes of this section.

(b) DETERMINATION OF PAYMENT AMOUNT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amount determined under this subsection is the product of—

(A) the aggregate amount of payments made under section 504(d)(1)(B) of the Disaster Tax Relief and Airport and Airway Extension Act of 2017, multiplied by

(B) the population adjustment ratio.

(2) POPULATION ADJUSTMENT RATIO.—For purposes of this subsection, the term population adjustment ratio means the ratio of—

(A) the number of individuals estimated by the Secretary of the Treasury to have been present in the qualified Puerto Rico disaster zone (as defined in section 102), over

(B) the number of individuals estimated by the Secretary of the Treasury to have been present in the Hurricane Maria disaster zone (as defined in section 501(c) of the Disaster Tax Relief and Airport and Airway Extension Act of 2017).

(c) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 90 days after substantially all of the employee retention credits under this section have been paid or allowed to taxpayers in Puerto Rico, the Secretary of the Treasury of Puerto Rico shall submit a written report to Congress documenting the implementation of such credits.

DIVISION C—BUDGETARY EFFECTS

BUDGETARY EFFECTS

SEC. 101. (a) IN GENERAL.—The budgetary effects of division B and each succeeding division shall not be entered on either PAYGO scorecard maintained pursuant to section 4(d) of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010.

(b) SENATE PAYGO SCORECARDS.—The budgetary effects of division B and each succeeding division shall not be entered on any PAYGO scorecard maintained for purposes of section 4106 of H. Con. Res. 71 (115th Congress).

(c) CLASSIFICATION OF BUDGETARY EFFECTS.—Notwithstanding Rule 3 of the Budget Scorekeeping Guidelines set forth in the joint explanatory statement of the committee of conference accompanying Conference Report 105-217 and section 250(c)(8) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, the budgetary effects of division B and each succeeding division shall not be estimated—

(1) for purposes of section 251 of such Act; and

(2) for purposes of paragraph (4)(C) of section 3 of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 as being included in an appropriation Act.

The CHAIR. No amendment to the bill is in order except those printed in part C of House Report 116-392. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MS. SHALALA

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part C of House Report 116-392.

Ms. SHALALA. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 3, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$1,000,000)”.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 833, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. SHALALA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida.

Ms. SHALALA. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, our fellow Americans in Puerto Rico have suffered greatly in the last few years, from fiscal calamity to a monster hurricane to the Earth shaking and continuing to shake.

I have seen the suffering personally. These disasters have resulted in many Puerto Ricans leaving the island, and many are children or young adults who are still in school.

This amendment increases funding to conduct a study on the impacts that these young people face when they have to disrupt their education.

The truth is, we don't know the best way to help children who have to leave their homes to pursue their education in another State or have to miss weeks of school because their school building is structurally unsound after an earthquake. But we need to. We need to know the best way to make sure that all children can reach their full potential and are able to cope with whatever trauma they may have faced.

Ultimately, this amendment will save us money because we will have future natural disasters where children will have to move away from their schools or pause their education. Unfortunately, there will be more Marias and more Katrinas, and there will be more wildfires.

We need to make sure that we are serving both children and the taxpayers. We should spend our money in the most impactful way possible. The study will guide us on the most effective policies and the most effective

way we can use disaster funds to help our children.

I thank my distinguished colleague, Congresswoman GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN, for her work and her support on this amendment, as well as Congresswoman STEPHANIE MURPHY, Congressman ALCEE HASTINGS, and Chairman JIM MCGOVERN.

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

Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition, although I am going to be in favor of the amendment.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentlewoman from Puerto Rico is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico. Madam Chair, first, I want to thank Congresswoman SHALALA. I thank the gentlewoman for visiting the island several weeks ago with Congressman POSEY and Congresswoman MURPHY.

Madam Chair, let me tell you what this amendment is about. This will provide \$1 million to conduct a study on the impacts of educational attainment, long-term economic opportunities, as well as the well-being of students from Puerto Rico who have had to disrupt or change their educational path due to a natural disaster.

Although the full extent of the damage is still being assessed, it is evident that the ongoing earthquakes impacting Puerto Rico have been particularly harmful for our students and educational system.

Following the collapse of this public school in Guanica—thank God it was 4:24 in the morning, and there were no students and teachers in that school. It completely collapsed. The Department of Education delayed the start of the semester across the island in order to conduct structural inspections of all public schools. To this day, 69 schools have already been deemed unsafe and thus unable to reopen. Another 234 have been classified as partially adequate, which means that only some parts of the school's buildings are safe.

In fact, although inspections are ongoing, the Puerto Rico Department of Education is projecting that 25 percent of the island's public schools will be unable to be reopened during this semester.

In Guanica, this town, there are six schools. All of them are closed. As we speak, tents are being installed as outdoor classrooms to ensure students don't lose their semester, specifically seniors going off to college.

The disruptive nature of the event cannot be overstated. Puerto Rico will need to identify alternative and/or temporary sites to open schools and relocate misplaced students. Many will probably leave the island altogether, the way it happened with Maria. The provision of counseling and mental health services will be crucial to ad-

dress the fear and similar challenges among the impacted student population and their families.

Therefore, I support the \$100 million included in the supplemental to help us meet the educational needs of those affected by disasters.

The study funded by this amendment will provide us with vital information to help address challenges faced by students impacted by earthquakes, mitigate additional impacts on their educational attainment, and better prepare them for future disasters.

I want to conclude by thanking Ranking Member GRANGER for allowing me the time and Congresswoman SHALALA for her hard work in working together on behalf of the people of Puerto Rico.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SHALALA. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Chair, I rise in support of this amendment. It is \$1 million that provides funds for a study on the impacts of natural disasters on the well-being and educational paths of affected students and children in Puerto Rico.

The children in Puerto Rico have been struggling from the trauma of multiple natural disasters. It has been resulting in unbelievable disruptions to their lives at home and at school.

After Hurricane Maria, Congresswoman GRACE MENG from New York and I went to Puerto Rico. We visited the schools, and the teachers told us that the children were not coming to school. Why? We asked the question: Why?

They were scared that if they went to school and they returned home, they would not find their families, their home, or anything else that gave them their strength and the hope with their families, so they weren't going. They also couldn't go because the power was out, and the heat was too much for them to be there.

What is it that you can't understand? What is it that this administration doesn't understand about what is happening to children, American children, in Puerto Rico?

□ 1030

We included \$3 million in the 2019 Labor-HHS appropriations bill to provide behavioral health services and counseling to children in Puerto Rico. These services are being provided through the National Child Traumatic Stress Network, which is a national network of grantees that provide services for children and adolescents exposed to traumatic events.

Schools are the center of our communities. They offer students stable schedules, warm meals, and support from teachers and school professionals. They are the center of learning. We need to act with urgency to support the school recovery and restore this stability for the children in Puerto Rico,

but we must take a careful look at the long-term impacts of these disasters on student well-being and educational access and success.

Madam Chair, this amendment provides those resources. I support it, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Miss GONZALEZ-COLON of Puerto Rico. Madam Chair, may I inquire how much time is remaining.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Puerto Rico has 2 minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from Florida has 1 minute remaining.

Miss GONZALEZ-COLON of Puerto Rico. Madam Chair, the school that I am showing you here is one from Guanica. Maybe many people here will not know that the schools in Puerto Rico are used for shelters during hurricanes, so this is having the place for shelters being destroyed and many of them not compliant right now and during the assessment.

Let me give you an example. When we had the first earthquake, 6.4, and then the replica, the government of Puerto Rico has to do an assessment of the infrastructure in all schools. But weeks later, we got more aftershocks of 5, 5.4, 4.9. So that assessment continued to happen, and it is an ongoing situation every week in order to have our kids and teachers safe.

So right now, I told you already the number of schools that are deemed unsafe to return to classes. But if we do have another replica of 5 or 4.9 during these next days, and we are having between 8 and 12 tremors a day, that may be that many more schools can be included.

Actually, originally, there were just six towns included in the mayor's declaration of disaster. Right now, it is 29, because the infrastructure gets weakened with all the tremors, and that is the reason I do support this amendment.

The mental health issue for students, for parents, for kids is a real situation on the island. We don't want to lose more kids. We don't want kids to lose their semester. So I think this amendment would provide that much-needed help.

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

Ms. SHALALA. Madam Chair, this amendment is simply about helping American children, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Madam Chair, I yield to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), the chair of Committee on Appropriations.

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Chair, I am pleased to support this excellent amendment.

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

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. SHALALA).

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MISS GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN OF PUERTO RICO

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part C of House Report 116-392.

Miss GONZALEZ-COLON of Puerto Rico. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 27, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$170,000,000)".

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 833, the gentlewoman from Puerto Rico (Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Puerto Rico.

Miss GONZALEZ-COLON of Puerto Rico. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, today, I rise in support of this amendment. It is a bipartisan amendment to increase the amount of disaster nutrition assistance for Puerto Rico to \$210 million.

The island has been experiencing constant seismic activity since December 28 of last year, and thousands of Puerto Ricans have lost their homes and all their belongings. This challenges their safety and job security, as well as their ability to provide food for themselves and their family members.

Puerto Rico does not participate in the national Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, or SNAP, as do our counterparts in the mainland; Washington, D.C.; Guam; and the Virgin Islands. Instead, Puerto Rico has the Nutrition Assistance Program, or NAP, which receives significantly less funding.

Excluding us from SNAP—and that is another issue that this House addressed and we are making a study in that sense. Excluding us from SNAP also excludes us from the disaster portion of this program, known as D-SNAP. This means that every time there is a natural disaster like the one we are experiencing now, Congress needs to step up and appropriate Federal funding for disaster nutrition.

We saw that after Hurricane Irma and Maria. And now, we are facing another emergency, and that is the reason Congress needs to approve funds for this food nutrition assistance. This amendment will help support beneficiaries of the program and allow an increase in enrollment, ensuring that those impacted by disasters were supported in their effort to maintain food security.

The earthquakes have caused widespread infrastructure damage. Over 15,000 residents have reported damage in their homes. Of those, more than 1,000 are damaged to a point of being unlivable or destroyed.

This is a wide infrastructure issue that has impacted private homes, public buildings, and private businesses, including supermarkets, pharmacies, and stores in that region.

Since the seismic activity is ongoing, we expect the infrastructure problems to worsen. Some structures have survived seismic movements thus far, but there is no telling us when or if they will be destroyed or affected by future aftershocks.

People are living in fear; people are living in desperation—especially in the southwestern region of the island. At one point, over 7,000 people were living in shelters without a clear idea of when they will be able to return to their homes.

I have experienced these tremors myself, and I can firmly state that fear during these times is more than justified.

The unpredictability of earthquakes challenges any forecast capabilities. According to the U.S. Geological Survey, there is no telling when the earthquakes will stop. However, one thing we do know is that the island needs help, and we need it now.

Madam Chair, this is why I am supporting the underlying bill and why I am offering this amendment. There are close to 397,000 NAP beneficiaries in the affected municipalities, of which over 92,000 are children. These numbers may grow, contingent on more municipalities being affected and more residents joining the program.

Madam Chair, food security is a critical part of any recovery effort. My amendment will ensure earthquake victims can count on disaster nutritional funds to get them through this difficult time.

I thank Congresswoman DELAURO, Congresswoman VELÁZQUEZ, Congressmen SOTO and JOSE SERRANO for sponsoring this important amendment for the people of Puerto Rico.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor. And, again, I cannot vote for the bill. I cannot have Members in the House and in the Senate representing Puerto Rico, but I can, with all of you, vote for Puerto Rico in this amendment.

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

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Chair, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition, although I am not opposed to the amendment.

The CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Chair, I look forward to the day when my colleague, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLON from Puerto Rico, can vote in this House of Representatives.

I also want to add one thing.

A colleague from South Carolina said earlier that folks in Puerto Rico do not pay taxes. They pay payroll taxes. We

all understand payroll taxes; and, quite frankly, that is the basis on which the child tax credit is determined. So they are paying taxes.

Madam Chair, I rise in support of this amendment. I am honored to colead it with my colleague JENNIFFER GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN, with Congresswoman NYDIA VELÁZQUEZ, and Congressmen SERRANO and SOTO. It increases funding for Puerto Rico's Nutrition Assistance Program to \$210 million.

The \$40 million in the underlying bill provides a strong foundation on which to build; and, in light of a new analysis from leading nutrition experts which has shown how great the need is, the amendment increases the resources to what the experts are now calling for.

Thousands have been left without food, water, or power. We cannot turn our backs on the people of Puerto Rico. We need to meet basic needs so that they can rebuild. It is not only a responsibility, but it is a moral responsibility.

And why is this necessary? Because Puerto Rico receives a block grant for nutrition assistance. It is known as the Nutrition Assistance Program, or NAP. Because the value of the block grant is fixed, their nutrition assistance is unable to meet the heightened needs of children and families in times of disaster. It is fundamentally different from how food stamps work for the millions of other Americans elsewhere in our country.

But we know where this administration falls on the food stamp program. They are willing to deny 3 million people access to food stamps, take 2 million kids off of the School Lunch Program.

Folks here are in need, but the people in Puerto Rico, the children in Puerto Rico are in need. An island ravished by earthquakes and tremors—Wednesday saw a 5.0 magnitude earthquake.

In her request to the Congress, Puerto Rico's Governor warned: "Puerto Ricans are currently suffering economic and job loss, displacement and interruption of essential services, and thousands of refugees currently located in camps are children and the elderly."

We offer a bipartisan amendment today to build on the underlying bill. I commend the committee chair, Congresswoman LOWEY, and the subcommittee chair, Congressman BISHOP, for their hard work on this fast-moving matter.

To my colleagues: Have a sense of what food means to people. We live in a land of plenty. We should not be about the business of denying food and nutrition help to others, and especially American children and American families from Puerto Rico, the nutrition assistance, the food that they need in order to survive.

Madam Chair, no one should go to bed hungry in this country or in those countries where we have American citizens, and that is Puerto Rico.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues, please—please—deal with what our

moral responsibility is in this body. We have the power to make this happen. Let's make it happen today.

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

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Puerto Rico (Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MS. PLASKETT

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part C of House Report 116–392.

Ms. PLASKETT. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 3, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$3,000,000)".

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 833, the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Ms. PLASKETT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands.

Ms. PLASKETT. Madam Chair, I rise in support of my amendment. This amendment would increase the Department of Energy technical assistance for electrical grid recovery in the U.S. territories by \$3 million.

High energy costs have bedeviled the U.S. insular territories for many years, harming consumers, limiting development, and draining capital from our islands' economies. The average price of electricity paid by U.S. Virgin Islands residents in mid-2019 was about three times higher than the average power price in the mainland United States.

These islands have suffered at least one tropical cyclone, typhoon, or hurricane in the last 3 years, storms made stronger by warming oceans.

As a result of unprecedented recent disasters and the impact of enormous physical damage, the Virgin Islands are currently going through an energy crisis. Hurricanes Irma and Maria damaged approximately 80 to 90 percent of the electrical transmission and distribution systems in the territory. Rolling blackouts persist to this day.

□ 1045

Successfully incorporating resiliency measures into the electrical system recovery effort, including by building microgrid systems, and adding renewable generation capacity to the system does require significant technical assistance from the Department of Energy.

I am pleased that the House, through this bill, will be taking action to make appropriations for technical assistance with rebuilding electric systems in the insular areas. However, given the current state of the islands, including Puerto Rico, which has had the unique challenge of natural disasters reoccurring over the past several months, I am concerned that the amount of \$15 million may not be enough to adequately

address the urgent needs for assistance to improve grid resiliency and to lower the cost of electricity.

That is why I requested this modest uptick of \$3 million. It is to see that utilities in the smaller territories like my district can get the technical assistance they need to solve energy problems that are unlike any other in the United States.

Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), who is the majority leader.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Chair, I thank the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Ms. PLASKETT) for yielding. I lament that, as Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN pointed out, she will not be able to vote on the final passage of this bill.

I lament that Puerto Rico is not a State. If it were a State or if the Virgin Islands were a State, they would have already been addressed and helped, consistent with what we have done for States.

Madam Chair, history will remember this generation of Puerto Ricans for their perseverance, their courage, and their strength. Having endured two devastating hurricanes in 2017, they have had to cope with their heart-breaking aftermath, characterized by the Trump administration's failure to allocate resources properly, fairly, effectively, and timely.

Now a series of powerful earthquakes have struck the island, causing additional damage and, sadly, loss of life. We have heard reports that, while much of the power transmission infrastructure that was rebuilt stronger after the hurricanes were able to hold up, the aging power plants they serve sustained substantial damage.

Madam Chair, I will remind my colleagues that the people of Puerto Rico are our fellow American citizens. They are our brothers and our sisters, our fellow Americans. Their well-being is our concern. Their capacity to rebuild, and rebuild stronger, is our responsibility as the representatives of the American people—of all the American people. That is what we do after natural disasters: We help our fellow Americans in need.

Madam Chair, I and several of my colleagues will be traveling to Puerto Rico over the President's Day district work period next weekend. We will be visiting communities in the south of the island that have been hardest hit by the earthquakes. Many of the same communities are still trying to rebuild from Irma and Maria.

I was there in 2017, in Puerto Rico, and in the Virgin Islands with Representative PLASKETT. I was there with the Republican leader, Mr. MCCARTHY. We visited with families who lost their homes, who lost loved ones, and who asked us to come back here to Washington and help.

We worked together, Republicans and Democrats, to pass emergency funding and partnered on an effort to amend the Stafford Act to promote resilience

by ensuring that structures are built to 21st century standards.

Madam Chair, when I return to the island later this month, I want to tell the people I meet that Congress has not and will not forget them, that their brothers and sisters on the mainland are with them. I want to tell them that we took action to provide the additional funding the island needs to recover from this most recent disaster.

I want to tell them that the Congress came together to approve the necessary funds to help communities on the island restore critical infrastructure and rebuild schools and housing. I want to tell them that we came through with assistance for repairing the energy grid and making it more resilient.

I also want to be able to share with them that Congress made key tax reforms to give low-income Puerto Ricans some help with childcare and affordable housing as they rebuild, as we do for people here on the mainland.

Madam Chair, that is why I am asking my colleagues to join me in passing this bill and making all of those things possible. When I go down to Puerto Rico in just over a week, I want to be able to tell the people there that this House did its job.

Sadly, we have seen the administration's veto threat, which was little more than a denigration of our fellow Americans, accusing Puerto Ricans of corruption and being untrustworthy of receiving emergency aid. Ironic that his administration would make such a charge. Shame on them for making that allegation, and shame on them even more if they veto disaster aid to Puerto Rico under such a spurious and hateful belief.

House Democrats will continue to conduct oversight in order to ensure that the administration does not continue to withhold critical, congressionally appropriated disaster aid from the people of Puerto Rico who need it to rebuild. The stronger they are, the stronger our Nation will be.

Madam Chair, I want to thank the chairwoman of the Appropriations Committee, Mrs. LOWEY, as well as the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. NEAL, along with members of their committees for their hard work on this package.

Madam Chair, I want to thank Representatives VELÁZQUEZ, SERRANO, SOTO, OCASIO-CORTEZ, and, yes, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN, as well, for advocating for Puerto Ricans in Congress.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote "yes" on this package. Keep faith with our fellow citizens wherever they might live, in the East, in the West, in the South, or in Puerto Rico, all Americans worthy of having confidence that we will stand with them in hours of distress.

Vote "yes."

Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico. I would like to claim the time in opposition, and although I am claiming

the time in opposition, I am in favor of the amendment presented by Ms. PLASKETT.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentlewoman from Puerto Rico is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico. Madam Chair, I think it is important to understand that living on an island puts us in a different mode than the rest of the States where you can receive and manage electricity at the power plants differently.

Our infrastructure is weakened by hurricanes, and by many years of hurricanes in our case. So I do believe that this allocation of funds for technical assistance from the Department of Energy will help us to get through this situation and allow the U.S. Virgin Islands, and Puerto Rico as well, to figure out what is going to be the kind of energy we are going to be using.

We approved \$1.9 billion for technical assistance in CDBG funds for the electrical grid on the island of Puerto Rico, but the guidelines have not been published yet. So that means we don't have access to those funds, even though the Department of Energy has been doing the assessments on the islands of Puerto Rico and U.S. Virgin Islands. Because of that, I do support the amendment.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. PLASKETT. Madam Chair, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN).

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Madam Chair, I am greatly honored to support this piece of legislation, especially honored that Chairwoman LOWEY has put language in there that will streamline the process that Mr. HOYER helped to develop.

I would just like to add this. I know what it is like to live in harm's way. In Houston, Texas, we have billion-dollar floods that take lives, and these are supposed to be 100-year floods. Unfortunately, they are happening all too often, and sometimes on a yearly basis.

So I stand here today to say thank you to all involved, especially to Mrs. LOWEY for what she has done to streamline this process. It will be helpful to persons in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, but, also, in the long run, it will be helpful to the people of Houston, Texas.

Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. PLASKETT. Madam Chair, I urge adoption of this amendment. This is important to the territories.

As you heard from my colleague from Puerto Rico, islands are very fragile, and we do not have the scale that others have, nor do we have grids that can be attached to other areas. So this is really important to us, and the technical assistance of this Nation, from the Department of Energy, would go a long way in supporting a more resilient grid.

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

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Ms. PLASKETT).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. CRENSHAW

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in part C of House Report 116-392.

Mr. CRENSHAW. I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 20, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$45,000,000)".

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 833, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CRENSHAW) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

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

Madam Chair, I rise today to support the people from the great State of Texas.

It has been 2½ years since Hurricane Harvey. Many of my constituents are still struggling to finance their rebuilding. And it is not as if Texans simply waited on Federal aid. We passed a local bond for \$2.5 billion to address recovery and future prevention. Additionally, many took out SBA loans, a low-cost loan to get themselves back on their own feet.

Here is the problem: My constituents never thought that taking out an SBA loan, a loan that they would be paying back, would prevent them from also receiving other Federal aid.

This problem of dual benefits was addressed in law recently by my friend Representative GARRET GRAVES from Louisiana, but the fix came too late for some. Many victims of disasters who would be eligible for Federal aid such as CDBG-DR are not able to access that aid.

This amendment will not be able to provide the estimated nearly \$3 billion that the Texas General Land Office believes would be needed to help all of those affected, but my amendment will solve this problem for some of the most vulnerable people who unfairly fell through the bureaucratic cracks.

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

Mrs. FLETCHER. Madam Chair, I ask unanimous consent to claim time in opposition, although I do not oppose the amendment.

The CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Texas (Mrs. FLETCHER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. FLETCHER. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, I rise today to offer this bipartisan amendment with my colleague and neighbor, Mr. CRENSHAW, to help families who, through no fault of their own, were denied disaster recovery funding—in our case, for our constituents affected by Hurricane Harvey.

As Members of this body will recall, Hurricane Harvey landed on the Texas Gulf Coast in August of 2017. It was the second costliest hurricane in United States history. It took 68 lives, it dropped more than 60 inches of rain, and it caused nearly \$125 billion in damages.

Our community came together to help, and we showed each other and the Nation how much we can accomplish when we work together to help our neighbors in need.

This body worked, too, appropriating funds quickly to help those affected for immediate assistance and for long-term rebuilding.

But the needs were great and the funds, though well-intentioned, were slow. So many of our constituents took out loans from the Small Business Administration, where they could get low-interest loans to begin the necessary and immediate work of rebuilding.

When they applied for the SBA loans, they were told that taking out a loan would not disqualify them from other disaster aid. Unfortunately, they were, in fact, disqualified from other forms of Federal aid because they had taken out an SBA loan.

□ 1100

If they had taken out a loan from a friend or a bank, they would not have been in this situation. They would still be eligible for the Federal aid.

But because they chose to take out an SBA loan in the midst of an unprecedented disaster, they were disqualified from receiving further Federal assistance.

Of course, that is inconsistent with the program, it is inconsistent with the intent of this body to punish people for seeking help from the agencies that are there to help them in their times of need.

I have heard from so many constituents who have been left behind by what, by all accounts, was a mistaken interpretation of the intent and the rules that need to be corrected. We simply cannot leave them behind.

We now have the opportunity to correct this error here and to bring meaningful relief to disaster victims. This amendment will fund \$45 million to those in Texas who were wrongfully denied assistance because they took out SBA disaster recovery loans. We have a chance today to right this wrong and to deliver the help that our neighbors have been waiting on for years.

During Harvey, our community demonstrated that we are at our best when we are working together to solve problems, and this amendment does the same.

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

Mr. CRENSHAW. Madam Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES).

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CRENSHAW) for fighting for the disaster victims of the awful hurricanes that his constituents and others have gone through in Texas, Florida, North Carolina, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

And I want to thank Congresswoman FLETCHER for her co-sponsorship of this amendment and efforts to get this wrong fixed.

Madam Chair, I want to very simply explain what is happening here. So you have people that have experienced disasters; that have been through some type of flood or other disaster. The immediate assistance that is available to those disaster victims, and this is for homeowners, for renters, not for businesses—but the Small Business Administration offers loans, disaster loans, to individuals. They offer it to businesses, too, but they offer loans to individuals.

And that is the only money that is largely available in the immediate aftermath. There may be a small grant available from FEMA, but it is the only money. So if you want to be proactive, if you want to lean forward, those are the resources that are available. You apply for a loan. So that is one of your options.

The other option that you have is that you can sit back in a FEMA-supplied hotel room, or you can sit back in a FEMA-supplied trailer. The trailers, by the way, cost about \$150,000 a piece, under FEMA's ridiculous process.

So you can have one option where your thousands and thousands of dollars of taxpayer funds are paying for your hotel room. You can have another option where \$150,000 is going toward a trailer to house you temporarily, while you sit back and wait.

The other option is you lean forward, you get the loan, and you help to rebuild. You help to get your community back on its feet. You help to get the tax base.

Under our ridiculous Federal policies, the people that were proactive are penalized.

The gentleman from Texas, the gentlewoman from Texas, they are exactly right. The people are penalized that are trying to get recovered faster; that are trying to get their community recovered faster; that are trying to not spend more taxpayer funds on hotel rooms or trailers.

Yet, our Federal policy penalizes them for it; tells them that when grants are available, grants that you don't have to pay back; that they are ineligible. We are rewarding the wrong type of behavior.

So, with the help of many people in this room, we changed the law. The Disaster Recovery Reform Act of 2018 changes, section 1210(a). We fixed this.

The problem is, it took HUD over a year to write guidance, and they totally missed it. They invented criteria that is not in the law. They totally missed it. They introduced discriminatory criteria and make it virtually impossible for many people to get assistance.

So what this amendment does, it is adding money to help fix a wrong. It shouldn't have to be done.

I urge adoption of this amendment. But most importantly, Madam Chair, we have got to fix these policies that are causing the Federal Government to re-victimize disaster victims. That is not why we are here. That is not representing.

I will say it again; I urge adoption of this amendment. I want to thank my friends from Texas for their work on this. We need to move forward and fix this long-term.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mrs. FLETCHER. Madam Chair, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE), the chairman of the Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies Subcommittee.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment.

I know the amendment doesn't fully address the Member's concerns, but it addresses them substantially, and I look forward to working with them further to engage both HUD and the Texas Land Office to work toward a solution for this issue.

So I thank both of my colleagues for putting this constructive amendment forward, and their effort to highlight this issue that is of great importance. I am happy to offer my support.

Mrs. FLETCHER. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the distinguished Speaker of the House.

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Chair, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding, and I thank her and Mr. CRENSHAW for this very wise amendment to this important legislation. I thank them for their leadership. The experience that they had in Texas is one that is shared in the rest of the country as well.

I urge an "aye" vote on that important Crenshaw/Fletcher amendment.

Madam Chair, many of us remember that nearly 2½ years ago, Hurricanes Maria and Irma tore through Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands and left a trail of heartbreak and devastation in their wake. Thousands of Americans, all Americans citizens, tragically lost their lives.

Following the hurricanes, many Members traveled to the islands. We saw firsthand the homes that were destroyed, the communities that were ravaged, and the businesses and schools left in ruin. And we saw that the incompetence and indifference of many from here compounded this terrible humanitarian crisis.

It is unacceptable that the administration illegally withheld for a full

year the assistance that Congress appropriated and that Puerto Rico needs, both to recover from Maria, and to prepare for future disasters in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.

In recent weeks, tragedy has once again hit Puerto Rico as more than 1,000 earthquakes—1,000 earthquakes have rocked the island since December 28. Schools have crumbled, hospitals are in disarray, and houses have been destroyed. Thousands of people are staying in shelters or sleeping outside out of fear that their homes could collapse as they sleep.

And tragically, two Americans have lost their lives, including a 13-year-old girl in Vieques, where too many are still waiting for the Federal assistance needed to modernize hospitals and improve access to care.

Madam Chair, as Members of Congress, our most important responsibility is to keep the American people safe. Two weeks after devastating earthquakes struck Puerto Rico, our fellow Americans on the island still face serious challenges to their safety, health, and well-being.

Every family that is sleeping outside, every child who no longer has a school to go to because of seismic dangers, every person who dies because they can't access a hospital, each is a challenge to the conscience of our country.

Today, with this strong supplemental assistance package, the Democratic House and, hopefully, with strong bipartisan support, is showing the people of Puerto Rico that we are there for them now, and throughout the road to recovery.

I salute Chairwoman NYDIA VELÁZQUEZ, our fearless, persistent champion of Puerto Rico in the Congress, born there, family there. Thanks also to the members of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus for raising a relentless drumbeat on behalf of the families on the island.

Today, I also salute the distinguished chair of the Appropriations Committee for working right away, as soon as we came back into session in January, to provide assistance to Puerto Rico, the best route there. That guidance was led by our distinguished chair of the subcommittee of jurisdiction, Mr. PRICE. So I thank Chairwoman LOWEY and Chairman PRICE. Thank you for bringing us to the floor today on this important legislation.

This supplemental assistance package provides the relief that is urgently needed to help Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands rebuild and recover today. And it invests billions in efforts to prevent damage and loss of life in the future.

Although the earthquake was in Puerto Rico, the ramifications are in that region.

The package, as has been noted, provides more than \$3 billion for disaster relief and long-term recovery; \$1.25 billion for highway emergency relief, which will also go to disaster-struck States on the mainland; hundreds of

millions for critical investments in education, nutrition assistance, electric grid recovery, and strong tax relief for Puerto Rico and other territories, including permanent changes to the Earned Income Tax Credit and the Child Tax Credit, and new investments to boost local economies and create good-paying jobs on the island.

I thank our distinguished chair of the Ways and Means Committee, RICHIE NEAL, for his leadership in having this part of the package.

Sadly, there are some who have some obstacles to sending this emergency money to Puerto Rico following the earthquake. As Members of Congress, we have a responsibility to act because our fellow Americans deserve to know that their government will be there for them without question or hesitation in this dark hour.

Might I say, I am reminded, so many people in our country don't realize Puerto Ricans are American citizens. Many of them, if you visit there, you will visit veterans' centers where so many of them come together. They are American patriots who help our country. We are so proud of them, and we salute them; and in this time of need we want to help them.

I urge a strong vote to provide help, healing, and hope for Puerto Rico.

Mrs. FLETCHER. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank my colleagues for their collaboration on this bill. I thank Mr. CRENSHAW for working with me on this important effort for our community and for communities across our State and, of course, our country.

I thank everyone for their collaboration and support in this effort, and for the eloquent statements and important statements made this morning in support of this amendment on the floor.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this amendment. And I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CRENSHAW).

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 part C of House Report 116-392.

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 16, line 11, insert after "information" the following: "ensuring meaningful access for individuals with limited English proficiency in accordance with the Final Guidance issued by the Department of Housing and Urban Development on January 22, 2007 (72 Fed. Reg. 2732)."

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 833, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. TLAIB) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Michigan.

Ms. TLAIB. Madam Chair, I would like to begin by thanking Congresswoman LOWEY, our Subcommittee Chairman PRICE, and their staff for working with me on this amendment and for their critical leadership on this bill.

I would also like to thank my sisters in service, Congresswoman VELÁZQUEZ and Congresswoman OCASIO-CORTEZ, for leading this amendment with me. I am so proud to partner with them to make our government more accessible, especially in times of disaster.

This amendment ensures meaningful access to fellow Americans with limited English abilities to the public information maintained by grantees of the Department of Housing and Urban Development's Community Development Fund.

The amendment rests on two principles, Madam Chair. First, the Puerto Rican people have a right to know how this relief money is being spent in their own communities.

Second, no one is in a better position to hold officials and grant recipients accountable and to ensure that the money we allocate today is used in the best interests of the community than the people of Puerto Rico themselves.

That is why it is critical that we ensure that any information made available is easily accessible to all people, regardless of what language they speak.

I cannot overstate how important it is that we pass this bill. The people of Puerto Rico are struggling and persevering through some of the most difficult circumstances that any of us have ever experienced.

The bill provides over \$4 billion in critical disaster relief and long-term recovery assistance, and funds programs and grants to get kids back in fully-functioning schools, repairing damages to infrastructure and roads, and to rebuild the island's electrical grid that has been damaged because of disasters and so forth, and ensure that no one else is affected, or that children don't go to sleep hungry.

It is time—it is time to release these funds.

To hold the money that can save lives is not only inhumane and immoral, but it is, more dangerously, a form of oppression. The disconnection to human suffering that we cause by doing nothing is what will continue to fail the American people.

Passing this bill fulfills the central promise of our democracy governed "of the people, by the people, and for the people."

□ 1115

Passing this amendment in this bill ensures that some of the most vulnerable people have full access to democracy, regardless of who they are, where they are from, and what language they speak.

I urge my colleagues to please support this amendment.

Madam Chair, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman

from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE), my distinguished fellow colleague and chairman of the Subcommittee on Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Chair, I thank my colleague for yielding.

I am happy to rise in support of this amendment. It is a very well-considered amendment, one that is an important addition to this bill.

Access to linguistically appropriate materials, understandable materials, in the CDBG-DR program is vitally important. Meaningful access to program materials is essential for transparency, for public input, and for knowledge on how you take advantage of these benefits and these programs and what is available under the disaster assistance programs.

While HUD currently requires all grantees to provide meaningful access, this puts a finer point on it, and we need to do that. It is important to underscore HUD's responsibility and the grantee's responsibility to provide access in dispensing this aid.

I thank my colleagues for this amendment.

Ms. TLAIB. Madam Chair, I want to reiterate the importance of this amendment. As a person who was born and raised in this country and who didn't speak English when I started school, and who is now a Member of this Chamber, I can tell my colleagues personally how critical this is to our democracy and to protecting all of us.

I thank my colleagues again for their tremendous support, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. LEVIN OF MICHIGAN

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in part C of House Report 116-392.

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 12, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$1,000,000)(increased by \$1,000,000)".

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 833, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Madam Chairwoman, I thank Chairwoman LOWEY and subcommittee Chairman PRICE for their leadership and for bringing this much-needed package to the floor today.

I am pleased to see that this bill includes funding for the long-term recovery of territories impacted by recent

disasters, including continued support for the electric grid's recovery.

After Hurricane Maria hit Puerto Rico in 2017, it took an entire year to restore power to the whole island. Then last month, back-to-back earthquakes damaged Puerto Rico's main power plants and caused yet another major blackout.

The people of Puerto Rico—and all Americans, for that matter—cannot be forced to grapple with blackout after blackout, especially when climate change has made catastrophic storms all too frequent. As we think about what is needed to ensure the long-term recovery of these areas, it is absolutely essential that renewable resources be part of that conversation.

That is why I have introduced this simple amendment to prioritize funding for renewable energy projects, like wind and solar power, that will enhance the long-term resiliency of Puerto Rico's infrastructure.

We have already seen what renewable energy can do in the aftermath of a disaster. During the blackout that followed Hurricane Maria, Puerto Rican homeowners, businesses, and hospitals waiting for repair crews actually installed their own solar panels and batteries to get their power back faster. Last year, Puerto Rico passed a law setting a timeline to power the island entirely by renewable energy by 2050. That is a great step, but it is not nearly enough, and Puerto Rico needs our Nation's help.

We have to ensure renewables are prioritized for Puerto Rico's recovery, for the sake of their ability to survive disasters like Hurricane Maria and for the sake of our planet. Power generation from fossil fuels is a major source of the greenhouse gas emissions that are making climate change worse.

We have to make major changes fast. Shifting to renewables is one change that will help combat climate change and help the American people cope in the aftermath of major disasters.

Again, I thank Chairwoman LOWEY for her work on this bill, and I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE), the subcommittee chairman and my dear colleague.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Chairman, I thank my colleague for yielding.

I am happy to rise in support of this amendment. This amendment highlights the importance of prioritizing funding for renewable energy projects that will enhance the long-term resiliency of Puerto Rico's infrastructure.

A reliable and resilient power grid is critical to Puerto Rico's ability to withstand and quickly recover from future disasters.

Madam Chairwoman, if I might, I want to take just a moment also to highlight section 304 of the bill. Section 304 requires HUD and other Federal partners to finish the consultation on the \$2 billion provided in the Bipartisan Budget Act for electrical grid im-

provements in Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands within 30 days and for HUD to issue a notice in 60 days.

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Madam Chairwoman, I will close by saying that I really appreciate our ability to take this small step, but I think we ought to all dream big for this beautiful part of our country.

Puerto Rico has been subject to misfortunes, and we can think about a different future for Puerto Rico where it moves very quickly not just to renewable energy but to localized renewable energy, so that each community has solar, microgrids, and battery storage, so that they really aren't subject to these disasters in the same way at all.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MS. SHALALA

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, the unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment No. 1 printed in part C of House Report 116-392 offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. SHALALA) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes 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 257, noes 149, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 52]

AYES—257

Adams	Clay	Fitzpatrick
Aguilar	Clyburn	Fletcher
Allred	Cohen	Poster
Axne	Connolly	Frankel
Bacon	Cooper	Fudge
Barragán	Correa	Gallego
Bass	Costa	Garamendi
Beatty	Courtney	García (IL)
Bera	Craig	García (TX)
Beyer	Crist	Gianforte
Bishop (GA)	Crow	Golden
Blumenauer	Cuellar	Gomez
Blunt Rochester	Cunningham	Gonzalez (OH)
Bonamici	Curtis	Gonzalez (TX)
Bost	Davids (KS)	González-Colón
Boyle, Brendan	Davis (CA)	(PR)
F.	Davis, Danny K.	Gottheimer
Brindisi	Davis, Rodney	Graves (LA)
Brooks (IN)	Dean	Green, Al (TX)
Brown (MD)	DeFazio	Grijalva
Brownley (CA)	DeGette	Haaland
Buchanan	DeLauro	Harder (CA)
Bucshon	DelBene	Hastings
Bustos	Delgado	Hayes
Butterfield	Demings	Heck
Carbajal	DeSaulnier	Herrera Beutler
Cárdenas	Deutch	Higgins (NY)
Carson (IN)	Diaz-Balart	Himes
Cartwright	Dingell	Horn, Kendra S.
Case	Doggett	Horsford
Casten (IL)	Doyle, Michael	Houlahan
Castor (FL)	F.	Hoyer
Castro (TX)	Engel	Huffman
Chu, Judy	Escobar	Hurd (TX)
Cicilline	Eshoo	Jackson Lee
Cisneros	Españillat	Jayapal
Clark (MA)	Evans	Jeffries
Clarke (NY)	Finkenaue	Johnson (GA)

Johnson (TX)	Mucarsel-Powell	Shalala
Joyce (OH)	Murphy (FL)	Sherman
Kaptur	Nadler	Sherrill
Katko	Napolitano	Sires
Keating	Neal	Slotkin
Kelly (IL)	Neguse	Smith (NJ)
Kennedy	Norcross	Smith (WA)
Khanna	Norton	Soto
Kildee	O'Halleran	Spanberger
Kilmer	Ocasio-Cortez	Speier
Kim	Omar	Stanton
Kind	Pallone	Stauber
King (NY)	Panetta	Stefanik
Krishnamoorthi	Pappas	Stevens
Kuster (NH)	Pascrell	Suozi
Lamb	Payne	Swalwell (CA)
Langevin	Perlmutter	Takano
Larsen (WA)	Peters	Thompson (CA)
Larson (CT)	Peterson	Thompson (MS)
Lawrence	Phillips	Titus
Lawson (FL)	Pingree	Tlaib
Lee (CA)	Plaskett	Tonko
Lee (NV)	Pocan	Torres (CA)
Levin (CA)	Porter	Torres Small
Levin (MI)	Posey	(NM)
Lieu, Ted	Pressley	Trahan
Lipinski	Price (NC)	Trone
Loeb	Quigley	Turner
Lowenthal	Raskin	Underwood
Lowey	Richmond	Upton
Luján	Rose (NY)	Van Drew
Luria	Rouda	Vargas
Lynch	Roybal-Allard	Veasey
Malinowski	Ruiz	Vela
Maloney,	Ruppersberger	Velázquez
Carolyn B.	Rush	Visclosky
Maloney, Sean	Ryan	Walden
Matsui	Sablan	Waltz
McAdams	San Nicolas	Wasserman
McBath	Sánchez	Schultz
McCaul	Sarbanes	Waters
McCollum	Scanlon	Watson Coleman
McEachin	Schakowsky	Welch
McGovern	Schiff	Wexton
McNerney	Schneider	Wild
Meeks	Schrader	Wilson (FL)
Meng	Schrier	Woodall
Meuser	Scott (VA)	Yarmuth
Moore	Scott, David	Young
Moulton	Serrano	

NOES—149

Abraham	Gibbs	Mitchell
Aderholt	Gohmert	Moolenaar
Allen	Gooden	Mooney (WV)
Amash	Gosar	Mullin
Amodei	Granger	Newhouse
Armstrong	Graves (GA)	Nunes
Arrington	Graves (MO)	Olson
Babin	Green (TN)	Palazzo
Baird	Griffith	Palmer
Balderson	Grothman	Pence
Banks	Guest	Perry
Barr	Guthrie	Ratcliffe
Bergman	Hagedorn	Reschenthaler
Biggs	Harris	Rice (SC)
Billirakis	Hartzler	Riggleman
Bishop (UT)	Hern, Kevin	Rodgers (WA)
Brady	Hice (GA)	Roe, David P.
Brooks (AL)	Higgins (LA)	Rogers (AL)
Buck	Hill (AR)	Rogers (KY)
Burchett	Holding	Rooney (FL)
Burgess	Hollingsworth	Rose, John W.
Calvert	Huizenga	Rouzer
Carter (GA)	Johnson (LA)	Roy
Carter (TX)	Johnson (OH)	Rutherford
Chabot	Johnson (SD)	Scalise
Cheney	Jordan	Schweikert
Cline	Joyce (PA)	Scott, Austin
Cloud	Keller	Sensenbrenner
Cole	Kelly (MS)	Shimkus
Collins (GA)	Kelly (PA)	Simpson
Comer	King (IA)	Smith (MO)
Conaway	Kinzinger	Smith (NE)
Cook	LaHood	Smucker
Crawford	Lamborn	Spano
Crenshaw	Latta	Steil
Davidson (OH)	Lesko	Steube
DesJarlais	Long	Stewart
Duncan	Loudermilk	Stivers
Dunn	Lucas	Taylor
Emmer	Luetkemeyer	Thompson (PA)
Estes	Marshall	Thornberry
Ferguson	Massie	Tipton
Fleischmann	Mast	Wagner
Flores	McCarthy	Walberg
Fortenberry	McClintock	Walorski
Fulcher	McKinley	Watkins
Gallagher	Miller	Weber (TX)

Wenstrup	Wittman	Yoho
Westerman	Womack	Zeldin
Williams	Wright	

NOT VOTING—29

Bishop (NC)	Kustoff (TN)	Radewagen
Budd	LaMalfa	Reed
Byrne	Lewis	Rice (NY)
Cleaver	Lofgren	Roby
Cox (CA)	Marchant	Sewell (AL)
Foxx (NC)	McHenry	Timmons
Gabbard	Meadows	Walker
Gaetz	Morelle	Webster (FL)
Hudson	Murphy (NC)	Wilson (SC)
Kirkpatrick	Norman	

□ 1149

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. CASTOR of Florida) having assumed the chair, Mr. HORSFORD, 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. 5687) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 833, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry 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 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. COLE. Madam Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

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

Mr. COLE. Madam 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. Cole moves to recommit the bill H.R. 5687 to the Committee on Appropriations.

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

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I rise in reluctant opposition to this bill. Long before I was privileged to come to this House, I was Secretary of State in Oklahoma at the time of the Oklahoma City bombing, and I was tasked by the Governor to work with my friend, our colleague Mr. LUCAS, to work with the Congress to see that we received timely assistance for a disaster that was clearly not of our own making. We got that assistance, and I am forever grateful to

this body and the people in it that worked with us at that particular time.

Madam Speaker, since I arrived in Congress, I never forgot the help that we received from the Congress of the United States. So I routinely voted for almost every supplemental that related to disaster relief. I was one of 49 Republicans who voted for Sandy relief, and I have no doubt that our fellow Americans in Puerto Rico are in dire need and certainly need help at this particular time.

I was very proud, as I know many Members were in the last Congress, to vote for over \$40 billion of relief to Puerto Rico. It needed that money. There was no question about it.

Madam Speaker, we are moving prematurely here. That money, that \$40 billion, roughly half has yet to be expended. It is available for immediate use right now.

We still have \$42 billion in the Disaster Relief Fund. That money is available for immediate use right now.

There is an ongoing FEMA investigation to determine the precise needs of Puerto Rico. That has yet to be completed and reported to Congress. We should wait for that disaster relief, not because it may tell us that we need less, but it might actually tell us that we need more. We should not act without appropriate information.

So, Madam Speaker, I think the appropriate thing to do is to send this back to the committee and wait for the information to move. If we move now, precipitously, it is almost certain that the United States Senate will not pick up this relief, and the President will probably not sign this bill if it got to his desk.

If we wait for the appropriate information, use the available funds that we have right now to help people in Puerto Rico, we have a much better chance of getting our fellow Americans the help they need, when they need it, in the right amounts, and in the right way.

There is no doubt in my mind that this Congress will respond appropriately to an emergency. I have seen us do it time and time again on a bipartisan basis. I know we will do it again at the appropriate time.

So Congress will respond, if necessary. Frankly, Madam Speaker, I simply move that we recommit the current legislation to the Appropriations Committee, wait on the information, and then act in the interests of our fellow Americans.

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

Mr. SOTO. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SOTO. Madam Speaker, the gentleman from Oklahoma talked about timely assistance for his State. I think that is important because that is what we are asking for for Puerto Rico here today.

We talked about the \$42 billion for hurricanes. We all know that less than

half that money has still gotten to the island already, and we are talking now about earthquakes, a totally different disaster in the southwestern portions of the island, unique in character.

These funds may not even cover some of these other issues happening. When you look at the schools, in particular, that are all across the island, this is unique because they were made to withstand hurricanes, not earthquakes.

I agree, if we need more funds, we can always supplement with another bill. Why are we waiting? Why would we wait today when the people of Puerto Rico, our fellow Americans, need our help?

That is why we are here today. Imagine a thousand earthquakes since December and imagine those thousand earthquakes happening after Hurricane Maria—nearly a hurricane five—hits and destroys most of your island.

My guest was Jessica Carrillo who left the island and had to come to central Florida because she was weary from sleeping in her car or sleeping on her porch, day in and day out for over a month.

I had the opportunity to go firsthand to Puerto Rico and see that damage as the grounds shifted below our feet. We talked about the schools. We talked about the folks who were in the disaster relief camps, and the Costa Sur Power Plant, which is closed, that now puts them in a tough position.

So I ask: Let's put together and pass this bill that will provide \$4.67 billion in disaster relief and vote against the motion to recommit because we can't wait any longer.

I ask you to vote "yes" on the ultimate package, to rise above the politics of disaster relief because but for the grace of God go you and your families, your districts, and your States.

We rose together for Hurricane Michael in my State of Florida and for Hurricane Harvey in Texas.

I ask this House to get the job done here today. Vote "no" on the motion to recommit and vote "yes" on this very good bill to help Americans in Puerto Rico.

Madam 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. COLE. Madam 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 passage of the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 178, noes 223, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 53]

AYES—178

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

NOES—223

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

Kennedy	Murphy (FL)	Scott, David
Khanna	Nadler	Serrano
Kildee	Napolitano	Shalala
Kilmer	Neal	Sherman
Kim	Neguse	Sherrill
Kind	Norcross	Sires
Krishnamoorthi	O'Halleran	Slotkin
Kuster (NH)	Ocasio-Cortez	Smith (WA)
Lamb	Omar	Soto
Langevin	Pallone	Spanberger
Larsen (WA)	Panetta	Speier
Larson (CT)	Pappas	Stanton
Lawrence	Pascrell	Stevens
Lawson (FL)	Payne	Suozzi
Lee (CA)	Perlmutter	Swalwell (CA)
Lee (NV)	Peters	Takano
Levin (CA)	Peterson	Thompson (CA)
Levin (MI)	Phillips	Thompson (MS)
Lieu, Ted	Pingree	Titus
Lipinski	Pocan	Tlaib
Loeb sack	Porter	Tonko
Lowenthal	Pressley	Torres (CA)
Lowey	Price (NC)	Torres Small (NM)
Luján	Quigley	Trahan
Luria	Raskin	Trone
Lynch	Richmond	Underwood
Malinowski	Rose (NY)	Van Drew
Maloney,	Rouda	Vargas
Carolyn B.	Roybal-Allard	Veasey
Maloney, Sean	Ruiz	Vela
Matsui	Ruppersberger	Velázquez
McAdams	Rush	Visclosky
McBath	Ryan	Wasserman
McCollum	Sánchez	Schultz
McEachin	Sarbanes	Waters
McGovern	Scanlon	Watson Coleman
McNerney	Schakowsky	Welch
Meeks	Schiff	Wexton
Meng	Schneider	Wild
Moore	Schrader	Wilson (FL)
Moulton	Schrier	Yarmuth
Mucarsel-Powell	Scott (VA)	

NOT VOTING—28

Bishop (NC)	Kustoff (TN)	Reed
Budd	LaMalfa	Rice (NY)
Byrne	Lewis	Roby
Cleaver	Wofgren	Sewell (AL)
Cox (CA)	Marchant	Timmons
Foxx (NC)	McHenry	Walker
Gabbard	Meadows	Webster (FL)
Gaetz	Morelle	Wilson (SC)
Hudson	Murphy (NC)	
Kirkpatrick	Norman	

□ 1204

Mr. O'HALLERAN changed his vote from "present" to "no."

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.

Pursuant to clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 237, nays 161, not voting 31, as follows:

[Roll No. 54]

YEAS—237

Adams	Bustos	Costa
Aguilar	Butterfield	Courtney
Allred	Carbajal	Craig
Amodei	Cárdenas	Crist
Axne	Carson (IN)	Crow
Barragán	Cartwright	Cuellar
Bass	Case	Cunningham
Beatty	Casten (IL)	Davis (KS)
Bera	Castor (FL)	Davis (CA)
Beyer	Castro (TX)	Davis, Danny K.
Bishop (GA)	Chu, Judy	Davis, Rodney
Bishop (UT)	Cicilline	Dean
Blumenauer	Cisneros	DeFazio
Bonamici	Clark (MA)	DeGette
Boyle, Brendan F.	Clarke (NY)	DeLauro
Brindisi	Clay	DelBene
Brooks (IN)	Clyburn	Delgado
Brown (MD)	Cohen	Demings
Brownley (CA)	Cannolly	DeSaulnier
Bucshon	Cooper	Deutch
	Correa	Diaz-Balart

Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Espallat
Evans
Finkenauer
Fitzpatrick
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel
Fudge
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Haaland
Harder (CA)
Hastings
Hayes
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Horn, Kendra S.
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Hurd (TX)
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim
Kind
King (NY)
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)

Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MD)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsock
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCaul
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Posey
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Richmond
Rose (NY)
Rouda

Roibal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schradler
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stanton
Stefanik
Stevens
Suozi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small
(NM)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Van Drew
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Waltz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth
Young

Perry
Ratcliffe
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Riggleman
Rodgers (WA)
Roe, David P.
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rooney (FL)
Rose, John W.
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin

Sensenbrenner
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smucker
Spano
Stauber
Stell
Steube
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Turner

Upton
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Watkins
Weber (TX)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Wright
Yoho
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—31

Bishop (NC)
Blunt Rochester
Budd
Byrne
Cleaver
Cox (CA)
Crenshaw
Fox (NC)
Gabbard
Gaetz
Hudson

Kirkpatrick
Kustoff (TN)
LaMalfa
Lewis
Lofgren
Marchant
McHenry
Meadows
Morelle
Murphy (NC)
Norman

Reed
Rice (NY)
Roby
Sanchez
Sewell (AL)
Timmons
Walker
Webster (FL)
Wilson (SC)

□ 1212

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

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. CRENSHAW. Madam Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and missed the vote. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 54.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. KIRKPATRICK. Madam Speaker, I was absent today due to a medical emergency. Had I been present, I would have voted: “yea” on rollcall No. 52, “no” on rollcall No. 53, and “yea” on rollcall No. 54.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, on February 7, I was unavoidably absent. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 52, “nay” on rollcall No. 53, and “yea” on rollcall No. 54.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MORELLE. Madam Speaker, I regretfully missed rollcall votes 38 through 54 on February 6th and 7th of 2020. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 38, “yea” on rollcall No. 39, “yea” on rollcall No. 40, “aye” on rollcall No. 41, “no” on rollcall No. 42, “no” on rollcall No. 43, “aye” on rollcall No. 44, “no” on rollcall No. 45, “no” on rollcall No. 46, “aye” on rollcall No. 47, “aye” on rollcall No. 48, “no” on rollcall No. 49, “yea on rollcall No. 50, “yea” on rollcall No. 51, “aye” on rollcall No. 52, “no” on rollcall No. 53, and “yea” on rollcall No. 54.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BUDD. Madam Speaker, I had to miss votes today because I am attending an event in Charlotte, NC, with the President of the United States. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 52 (Shalala amendment), “yea” on rollcall No. 53 (Motion to recommit), and “nay” on rollcall No. 54 (H.R. 5687).

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Miss RICE of New York. Madam Speaker, I was necessarily absent from votes on Friday, February 7, 2020. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 52, “nay” on rollcall No. 53, and “yea” on rollcall No. 54.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HUDSON. Madam Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 52, “yea” on rollcall No. 53, and “nay” on rollcall No. 54.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN EN-GROSSMENT OF H.R. 5687, EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR DISASTER RELIEF AND PUERTO RICO DISASTER TAX RELIEF ACT, 2020

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, in the engrossment of the bill, H.R. 5687, the Clerk be authorized to make technical corrections and conforming changes to the bill, including the change I have placed at the desk.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 27, line 25, strike “Recovery Act” and all that follows through “U.S.C. 5122)” on page 28, line 1, and insert “Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.)”.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1215

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. SCHRADER. Mr. Speaker, last night during Roll Call No. 51, I was inadvertently recorded as voting “no” on H. Res. 826, Expressing Disapproval of the Trump Administration’s Actions Towards Medicaid, when it was my intention to vote “yes.” I respectfully request this be officially reflected in the RECORD, and ask my full written statement be entered in the RECORD as well.

Madam Speaker, last night during a long series of votes, I was inadvertently recorded as voting “no” when it was my intention to vote “yes” on rollcall No. 51. H. Res. 826, a resolution “Expressing disapproval of the Trump Administration’s harmful actions towards Medicaid.” I rise today to correct the record and make it clear to my constituents and colleagues that I unequivocally oppose the Trump Administration’s proposal to block grant Medicaid and gutting a critically important piece of the Affordable Care Act.

The Trump Administration’s proposal which will cap federal funding and cut coverage and benefits, is exactly the opposite of what I’ve championed during my time in congress. The proposal will harm low-income parents and children, people with disabilities, and many older Americans. It would make it more difficult for states to finance their Medicaid programs which would ultimately and inevitably lead to reductions in benefits for our most vulnerable citizens.

The administration’s proposal also turns its back on the commitment Congress and the federal government made to states to cover 90 percent of the cost of Medicaid if those states agreed to expanding the program. As a steadfast supporter and defender of the Affordable Care Act, it is undeniable that the expansion of Medicaid under that law has provided us the greatest opportunity to provide

NAYS—161

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bost
Brady
Brooks (AL)
Buchanan
Buck
Burchett
Burgess
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Cole
Collins (GA)
Comer
Conaway
Cook
Crawford
Curtis
Davidson (OH)

DesJarlais
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Estes
Ferguson
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Fulcher
Gallagher
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gonzalez (OH)
Gooden
Gosar
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harris
Hartzler
Hern, Kevin
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill (AR)
Holding
Hollingsworth
Huizenga

Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
Kinzinger
LaHood
Lamborn
Latta
Lesko
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McClintock
McKinley
Meuser
Miller
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Newhouse
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Pence

tens of millions of uninsured Americans health coverage. This expansion has resulted in the lowest uninsured rate in our country's history leading to better coverage, access, and quality of care and I would never do anything to undermine this important law.

Thank you, Madam Speaker, for the opportunity to address the House and make clear my opposition to the Trump Administration's attacks on our critically important Medicaid programs.

ADJOURNMENT FROM FRIDAY,
FEBRUARY 7, 2020, TO MONDAY,
FEBRUARY 10, 2020

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

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

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), my friend, the majority leader, for the purpose of inquiring about the schedule for the House next week.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the minority whip for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I will say that the House will meet at 12 p.m. for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business, with votes postponed until 6:30 p.m. on Monday next.

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

Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business, with last votes of the week expected no later than 3 p.m. We will consider several bills under suspension of the rules. The complete list of suspensions will be announced by the close of business today.

Mr. Speaker, the House will consider H.R. 2546, Protecting America's Wilderness Act. This bill is a package of lands bill out of the Committee on Natural Resources and would designate 1.3 million acres as wilderness or potential wilderness areas, preserving these public lands for the benefit of current and future generations.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, the House will consider H.J. Res. 79, Removing the Deadline for the Ratification of the Equal Rights Amendment. This bill would remove the deadline to ratify the ERA, paving the way for it to be added to the Constitution and taking a historic step forward for women's equality.

Mr. Speaker, I would add this is not an adoption of an assumption, that, in

fact, the 38 States who have ratified to date have not ratified within the framework of the Constitution, and, therefore, that amendment should in fact be judged to have been adopted.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding back and for going through those items that are going to be up on the House floor next week.

I would like to ask the majority leader with respect to some of the things that were discussed at the State of the Union—and I am sure we are going to be talking about a few things that happened during the State of the Union.

The President identified a number of items where he challenged us in Congress to work with him on addressing some of the challenges that are facing our country. And he identified some items by executive order that he is working on, but he also identified some items from infrastructure—where I noticed there was applause on both sides of the aisle—to some areas on educational opportunities, school choice—where unfortunately, the remarks weren't received as equally as maybe they should have been—but it also provides us some opportunities to find some areas where we can work and achieve some things that would benefit people all across this country.

I would ask the gentleman, first, starting with infrastructure, there is tremendous interest that I have heard from Members on both sides to try to work on a package that we can get agreement on.

I haven't seen the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure tasked directly with doing that, but I have heard there is interest from Chairman DEFAZIO and from Ranking Member SAM GRAVES in trying to reach that common ground.

Is there an emphasis that is placed from the leadership of the majority on tasking the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure with actually going and working and going and finding that common ground, which we know is there, to try to put together an infrastructure package in these next few months?

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, the answer to the gentleman's question is yes. And indeed—as I think the gentleman probably knows—the leaders of the relevant committees, Mr. NEAL and Mr. DEFAZIO—Mr. NEAL on the funding side, Mr. DEFAZIO on the substantive side of the policy with respect to infrastructure and transportation and other items that we think need to be included in infrastructure.

We met with the President of the United States in April. Mr. Speaker, I will tell the gentleman, it is probably the most positive meeting that I have had with the President and that other members in the group had. This was Democrats and then the Secretary of Transportation was also there, Ms. Chao.

And we talked about our joint commitment to infrastructure investment. We had suggested, as the President suggested during his campaign, that our target be \$1 trillion over 10 years. In other words, a \$100 billion a year, or on average, investment in infrastructure so that we will not only create a lot of American jobs, but also assure ourselves of being competitive with our competitors around the world in the 21st century.

The President responded that he thought \$1 trillion was too little and suggested a \$2 trillion investment, i.e., doubling the \$100 billion to \$200 billion on average per year over 10 years. And we had discussion about that. We indicated that we agreed with the President that such an investment would be warranted, and productive and, frankly, grow the economy and therefore be an investment and not simply an expenditure.

Mr. NEAL made the point, Mr. Speaker, that the President—if we would give him some direction on what he could support in terms of funding that investment. And I made the observation, I said to him, “Mr. President, neither in the Senate nor the House will Republicans or Democrats support that big of an investment if you are not leading. To which he responded to me, Mr. Whip, “Steny, I agree with you.”

We then scheduled a meeting to be held—we thought—3 weeks, but it was some 5 or 6 weeks later. And unfortunately, for whatever reason—both sides have their thoughts as to why—the President came to the meeting and said he was not prepared to meet. And we have not had that meeting since.

But I will emphatically say to the gentleman, we want to work on infrastructure. We think it is critically important. The President said during the campaign he thought it was critically important. I think your side, both here and on the Senate side, believes infrastructure is important.

So certainly, as I said, yes, we want to see if we could work together to adopt a significant infrastructure package, which we think would be good for the country.

Secondly, let me say that the President also mentioned two other things—one of which was prescription drugs. We had passed a prescription drug bill, H.R. 3. The President sent down a message that he would veto it if it were passed as it was.

What I would suggest, following the regular order, the Senate ought to take it up, change it, amend it—do whatever they feel is appropriate to do—pass it, if they can, and then let us have a conference. Because we have all said that we want to bring down the prescription drug prices.

In fact, the President says he wants to negotiate. We included in H.R. 3 negotiation. The President said he wanted to key prices to our global competitors. In particular, we put six large nations, which are similar to ours, including Australia, Great Britain, Germany, Canada, France—and one other

nation—in that calculation. And that we would, in our bill, cap the prices at 120 percent of the average price across those six nations. That was something the President wanted to do.

And he responded to a question about negotiation, saying “I want to negotiate like crazy.” He is a businessman. He is a realtor. He knows a lot about negotiation and price. And so I think we have component parts in common.

And my suggestion would be, again, that they take up H.R. 3, which is the prescription drug bill, do what the Senate’s will is to do, that we go to conference, and that we discuss differences, harmonize the bills, and pass a bill and send it to the President.

So there is certainly, in my experience of a long time here, that is the way we should get that done. I think that would be positive for the country and I think we could reach consensus, hopefully from the administration, from your party, my party, and pass those two bills to the benefit of the American people.

The last thing I would discuss is the President said he was against pre-existing conditions being precluded from getting insurance. We share that view. We have passed a bill over to the Senate that affects that end. The Senate could take that bill up. Again, work on it, do whatever the will of the Senate is to do, go to conference. And assuming that we follow the President’s stricture of wanting to ensure that preexisting conditions do not prohibit anybody from getting insurance, we could pass that bill.

So my response is that we pass three bills—or two bills and then infrastructure, which were four—and those are positive items we can work on, and we are prepared to do so.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. On those fronts, clearly there is an ability to find common ground as we talk about infrastructure. There has been a lot of discussion over what that number would be, what the amount would be, because ultimately, it would have to be a number that we could both get an agreement amongst Republicans and Democrats that would be paid for.

And I think both sides acknowledge, it has got to be paid for. That has usually been the sticking point with infrastructure. But within that, whether it is \$200 billion or \$2 trillion, there is an understanding that we need to do more work to try to find out how we can get agreement on how to pay for it. And I do think the ability is there to find that agreement. The amount would be variable.

But also, it is something the President has talked about, as well as a number of Members of Congress have, making reforms to the way we build major projects: roads, bridges. The infrastructure delays so often are caused by red tape that is unnecessary.

I have heard from Governors, both Republican and Democrat, that would like to see Congress not only send

money—obviously, the States would like to see more Federal money come—but also, to see less strings attached so that a project that right now might take maybe 10 years to do, because of so many overlapping delays in red tape, that should maybe take 2 years at most. In many cases, that delay alone is what prohibits the project from being done because it drives the cost up so much. Because a project that might take 10 years, in many cases is going to be deemed unaffordable and it just gets scrapped as opposed to if we address not just the financing, but also the bureaucracy and eliminating red tape so that we can get more projects done quickly. I think that would be another area where there is a lot of mutual interest in seeing if we can come together.

And the President is very interested in doing that, when I have had talks with him. It is not just the amount that we are able to get agreement upon, but it is also the reforms to the red tape so that we can move projects quicker. And in many cases, do projects that are unaffordable because of those delays that are unnecessary. And I know that is something we can work on. Hopefully, we can get everybody together a few more times to get closer to finding that agreement on infrastructure.

As it relates to healthcare, there has definitely been a divide between our sides, if you look at H.R. 3. I think the gentleman recognizes it was a very bipartisan bill. The vote reflects that.

The Senate—however our agreement might be on how the Senate does business, clearly, they do business differently than the House—but traditionally, they have been reluctant to take up hyper-partisan bills when they are moving things through. They will go more to a bill that has got more broad support. USMCA is a real good example of that. It is probably the best template for how both sides can work together to do something big. Something very bipartisan, something very good for our country and something that we were able to get moved through both sides.

□ 1230

If you look at H.R. 19, for example, I would suggest to the gentleman that whatever the bill number is, it is not really the number of the bill. It is what is ultimately in it that we can get bipartisan agreement upon.

H.R. 19 was an approach that we took to say let’s go find not the partisan approaches to healthcare, but areas where we had broad bipartisan support, including the package of bills that came out of the House Energy and Commerce Committee unanimously.

Most people across the country are shocked when they hear that Congress actually did work together.

Republicans and Democrats came together to put together a package of bills that would lower drug prices that the President would sign that could be

in law today where prescription drugs, generic drugs, would be on the market quicker so people could be paying a lower cost.

That package of bills came out of committee unanimously. Every Democrat, every Republican worked for months. It took a long time to put that agreement together, but, ultimately, both sides did come together.

If we could look at those approaches. And, again, H.R. 19 includes only bills that were bipartisan. People had worked together on various elements of improving healthcare, from lowering prescription drugs, protecting pre-existing conditions, but not in a partisan way, in a bipartisan way that could actually get signed into law.

One way or another, we are going to find some issues where we can move, both Republican and Democrat coming together, bills over to the Senate. Those would clearly have a much higher likelihood of not only getting taken up by the Senate, but actually getting signed into law.

So I would suggest, when you look at some of those approaches, the bipartisan approach where you don’t have a Presidential veto, but you also have a strong ability to get Senators on both sides to want to take that up as well.

And then, finally, on school choice, the Education Freedom Scholarship and Opportunity Act, this is something that President Trump cited in the State of the Union specifically, and you can see it in isolated cases.

I come from a city, New Orleans. I was born in the city of New Orleans. I was on the board of Teach for America in New Orleans, and we had a dramatic overhaul of our public school system where we created a charter school movement.

It was actually a Democrat Governor, Kathleen Blanco, who, unfortunately, passed away recently, who signed that bill, Republicans and Democrats working together, that has transformed some of the worst failed public school systems in the country.

New Orleans’ public school system—prior to our reforms, considered by most as the most failed public school system in the country—now has a very healthy charter school movement where children have real opportunities. Parents have real opportunities. Schools are competing for students, and it is working for the student. This is in a large urban system where it was failed, and now it is very successful.

Clearly, no system is perfect, but there are many more options there. There are many more options for parents.

Congressman BYRNE has a bill—there are other bills that are out there—to try to give at least some additional options to families so that, if they are in a failing school, they can have a better place to go, and, ultimately, the system would be working better for the students.

So, on all of those fronts, I would hope that we could find those areas of

common ground and start there, build that, and work with the Senators and with the President, who wants to address these issues, like we were able to address USMCA, which was signed into law last week.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comment.

First, let me talk about the prescription drug bill. We did pass a bill that was a compilation of six bills that had five Republican supporters when we voted on it. So there was a bipartisan bill.

Let me suggest we ought not to dismiss however the Senate operates, the way the regular order operates is we pass a bill. Yes, we are in charge, and, like you, we pass bills that we think are important. When you were in the majority, you did the same thing. Some had Democratic votes, some did not. But the Senate had an opportunity to send us back bills.

We have 275 bills that we have done. We think they are all on substantive matters that deal with items that are good for the people, for the American people, and the Senate has not acted on them.

The way the system ought to work is we send our ideas over there; if they have different ideas, they send them back to us, and we go to conference and resolve it. I agree with the gentleman, that is what we ought to do, and I am hopeful that we could do that.

But the bill that we did pass, as I say, was a compilation of seven bills and had five Republicans. But, as you do, five Republicans makes it a bipartisan piece of legislation, and the Senate could send it back with something we don't agree on and try to resolve it because we want to reach that end.

The other bill the gentleman talks about, H.R. 3, the bill that we brought out had improvements to the ACA to make it work for the American people.

Your side, of course, wants to repeal the Affordable Care Act. Our side differs and believes that, in fact, millions of people, not only those who avail themselves of ACA—and, in the short term, it didn't bring down premiums, but it is now starting to bring down premiums, as we thought it would.

The constant assaults on the ACA by people who want to see it repealed have obviously hurt that because it has undermined certainty, which means that the insurers are not certain what the rules are going to be, and, therefore, our view is the premiums are still inflated.

But, again, I would urge the whip to talk to Mr. MCCONNELL and say: Look, we have a lot of bills over there. Pass your version of the bill, send it back and let us work on it, and let's see if we can get to an agreement.

That is how we have done for hundreds of years, and that is the way we ought to continue to do it.

I realize that Mr. MCCONNELL, as any majority leader the Senate has, has

challenges in doing that; and what I think, frankly, he does not want to do is get to a bipartisan agreement which will allow passage through the Senate.

We don't have that here, as you know. Your side could pass bills on a partisan basis when you were in charge; we can do the same.

As I say, we had five Republicans agree with us on the bill to which you referred, but I would hope you would urge Senator MCCONNELL to pass our bills.

Senator BRAUN from Indiana was on TV with Chuck Todd on "Face the Nation" talking about impeachment. He said: Let's get through this impeachment and get to the people's business.

I think that was a reasonable proposition. The problem is the Senate is not getting to the people's business. They are not passing their own bills, and they are not passing our bills. In fact, they are spending all their time confirming judges.

We think that has a purpose of making sure that, for the long term, whether they are in the majority or not, they will have an influence on what happens in the United States. I understand that political motivation, but it is impeding us doing the people's business.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. SCALISE and I try to work together. I would hope that the Senate would work together so that they could send us back bills of their choice, we can go to conference, and we can make things happen.

This House, last year, passed over 400 pieces of legislation. I don't have the exact number that the Senate has passed of significant bills as opposed to naming post offices or something like that, but it is in the tens, not the hundreds.

Mr. SCALISE. Clearly, we have got a lot of agreement on our disagreement with the Senate's way of doing business. Of course, one of their impediments that I know I have encouraged a change in that they haven't taken up is the 60-vote rule just to bring up a bill.

So many of the bills, when we were in the majority, that would go over to the Senate that we felt strongly about that would not be brought up, it was a majority Republican Senate, but because they have a 60-vote requirement, the minority could and would, on occasion, prevent many of those bills from coming up.

But that is why I suggested to the gentleman, what we found is, of the issues we would like to tackle that we really do feel confident we can get an agreement with the President on, the Senate has shown a higher likelihood of taking up a bill if it has got that broad support.

And so in the example of H.R. 3—and, for the record, there were only two Republicans who voted for it—while that could be called bipartisan, there was a separate package of bills that came out of committee unanimously.

So, if you have one approach that still is viewed as very partisan, with just two Republicans voting for it, to

address healthcare issues, if there is a different way to approach it where every Republican and every Democrat on the committee of jurisdiction passed those bills that would lower drug prices and the President said he would like to sign it, I would think the gentleman would agree, if those two bills are put side by side, which one do you think would have a higher likelihood of making it through the Senate to the President's desk? It is very clear that the one that was unanimous would have a higher likelihood.

And that is why I just suggested H.R. 19, because that was a bill that, while we would have liked to have included a number of other issues that maybe just our side might support, we put those on the side for now to say let's find those areas in healthcare where we have very broad support amongst Republicans and Democrats, and that is reflected in H.R. 19. You want to put a different package together.

If the approach is let's address this in a bipartisan way, we have a very high likelihood of getting not just the President's support, but also the Senate's support at moving that through.

I don't know if the gentleman has any more comments on that.

Mr. HOYER. I would simply say, if we reach a consensus in the Congress—we are a coequal, separate branch of government—and whether Obama was President or whether Mr. Trump is President, I am for the Congress acting on that which it agrees.

Is it helpful to have agreement with the President? It is. But if we can't reach agreement with the President, our responsibility as a Congress, the Senate and the House, is to move policies that we believe are advantageous for the people.

If the President disagrees, then we have the option of overriding that veto. It is doubtful that we would do that, I understand. But that is the process that I think is most productive and most expected by the American people.

I would again reiterate, on the bill that you keep saying could have unanimous support, in my opinion, what it would not have in terms of healthcare is support for doing what we so fervently believe needs to be done, and that is to make sure the ACA works as it was intended to do.

If there is an alternative, we should consider that. But, very frankly, neither the President nor your side of the aisle has had agreement on an alternative.

Senator McCain, as you know, was the deciding Republican vote on the last health bill that you sent to the Senate, and you sent that when you were in the majority. It didn't pass, notwithstanding the fact that you also had the majority in the Senate.

Two weeks after you had the celebration at the White House, I was astounded to hear that the President effectively called that a mean bill.

So we do have substantial disagreements. That does not mean that, given

the fact that we have a Democratic House, that is, that we are in the majority, and a Republican Senate with the Republicans in the majority—now, I understand the gentleman's concern that it is necessary to get bipartisan agreement in the Senate in order to get that 60-vote threshold. And you and I may agree on the 60-vote threshold of getting bills on the floor. It is one thing to pass something or not.

But, in any event, I would urge the gentleman to urge Mr. MCCONNELL to pass their prescription bill. And if it is what you say and it can be done unanimously, send it over here and we will have a conference. Because both of us have articulated that we are for making sure that prescription drug costs do not price people out of being healthy. So I would urge you to do that.

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

And now that the Senate has a little more free time, maybe we can get them to take up some of that legislation. I surely hope that we, on both sides, will continue working toward those, because there are areas of common ground that many have found and many have worked for months to find.

I do want to shift gears and talk about the decorum the night of the State of the Union.

The President talked about many things, as in any State of the Union, and I have attended 10 now. We have had Republican and Democrat Presidents, and there are things that I agree with in certain States of the Union, and you can stand, you can sit, you can applaud. But I think we all saw something that goes way beyond and, in fact, violates the rules of decorum in the House, and that is when the Speaker ripped up the speech.

Clearly, it was a premeditated move. I have seen actual video of her practicing or starting to rip it prior to the end of the speech.

But when you go through the speech—and, again, the President's theme was “the great American comeback,” and he talked about things that are working well in our country, working well for everybody, where every segment of society is benefiting, and, of course, as every President since Ronald Reagan has done, highlighting some of those great things that are happening in our country by bringing people into the gallery to show the real face on some of these great things that our country does.

Again, if part of a policy that created that great visual is something that one side disagrees with, some people stand up, some people don't. But to suggest that it didn't happen or that it is a lie—as some in the leadership of your majority actually said, the whole speech was a lie—I would ask: Was General Charles McGee's recognition as a Tuskegee Airman a lie? I think that was something great that people enjoyed celebrating.

Kayla Mueller, the humanitarian worker who was brutally murdered by

al-Baghdadi—it happened. Her family was here. And al-Baghdadi was taken out by American troops, which I think was the right thing to do. That is not a lie. That is something that we ought to recognize and respect.

□ 1245

When Staff Sergeant Christopher Hake was killed serving a tour of duty in Iraq by a roadside bomb that was generated from an Iranian terrorist, which was led by General Soleimani. And now Soleimani is gone because the President took action to take him out. That happened. It is not a lie.

In fact, the fact that Soleimani is gone is something we should all celebrate, just as we celebrated when President Obama gave the order to take out Osama Bin Laden.

I think for most people there wasn't a dry eye in the House. I know I have heard from friends all across the country who were tearing up when they saw First Class Sergeant Townsend Williams, who had been on his fourth tour in the Middle East, and here was his wife and young children, and the President surprised surely her, and all of us, by bringing him back home. What a special moment that was, just to see that family reunited.

And, again, tears, I think, were not a partisan issue at that moment. But it clearly did happen, and is not a lie, and it is something, again, we should all celebrate.

But again, for decorum of the House, for the Speaker to do that, I think most would agree, was not appropriate. At a minimum, an apology should have happened. There wasn't.

We brought legislation yesterday to rebuke the Speaker to make it clear that that is something not becoming of any Member of the House, let alone the Speaker of the House. Unfortunately, it was tabled on the roll call vote yesterday.

But I would hope that we could recognize, when that happens again, that we won't tolerate that kind of activity from our Members, let alone our leader.

If the gentleman has anything to say about that, I will yield.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, starting a State of the Union with a shout of “four more years” reminds me more of a rally than a State of the Union.

Clearly, neither the Speaker, nor any of us in any way diminished people that he introduced; some of whom I severely disagree with and thought that the actions taken with respect to that individual were totally inappropriate in a State of the Union because it served further to divide and to undermine any ability to work together.

Having said that, “four more years” was disrespectful to this institution.

The recitation in the gentleman's resolution of the honoring of individuals he just reflected had nothing to do with the State of the Union, but had everything to do with honoring people who had done great things, experienced

great hardship, who ought to be empathized with; no one was saying those were a lie.

One can interpret the speech for what each believed it was and can say something about it and reflect to the American people what they think of the substance of the representation of the State of the Union.

It had nothing to do with the people who were honored, whether we agreed with them being honored or not. Certainly, I agreed with almost every one of them, save one.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's comments, but those names were part of that document that was ripped, and I am sure many of them were as offended as we are that it happened. I just would hope it wouldn't happen again. I wish we would all speak out equally against that.

I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, none of those individuals should take anything that was done personally. In fact, almost every one of those individuals was honored by people on this side of the aisle and that side of the aisle acknowledging them and honoring them with appropriate action.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman making that statement, and I would share that. I wish the person who took the action would make that statement to those people because many were offended. But that will be left to discuss later.

But for now, I look forward to working with the gentleman on all of these issues that we discussed that the President offered the olive branch for us to work with him on and, I think, are very achievable if we do roll up our sleeves and tackle it together.

I think there is, again, a template for how to do it. USMCA is clearly one, and there are many others. 21st Century Cures is another example when we were in the majority with a Democrat President and worked very closely to achieve something that will be a milestone in curing major diseases for years to come; and, hopefully, we can deliver more of those kinds of wins for the American people that we all represent.

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

GUN VIOLENCE SURVIVORS WEEK

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

Mr. HORSFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate Gun Violence Survivors Week.

Every Nevadan was affected by the October 1 shooting that claimed 59 lives, injured more than 800, and shattered the lives of countless more. Gun violence has touched too many of our lives, both on that day, 2 years ago, and daily. In Nevada, someone is killed by gun violence every 19 hours.

I personally lost my father to gun violence when I was 19 years of age. And these deaths are preventable.

My bill, H.R. 4836, the Break the Cycle of Violence Act, is an important step forward to get ahead of the senseless violence.

I am also proud that nearly a year ago, the House passed H.R. 8 for meaningful gun background checks.

I know the cruelty of suffering a loss at the hands of a gun; knowing your loved one won't come home because someone was armed with a weapon they should not have had access to.

I urge my colleagues in the Senate to vote on H.R. 8, and for this body to take up H.R. 4836.

MERRILL'S MARAUDERS

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week, I had the honor of meeting Gilbert Howland and Bob Passanisi at a reception honoring Merrill's Marauders of World War II.

During the war, Gilbert and Bob volunteered for a mission that was described as only dangerous and hazardous. These brave men, and approximately 3,000 others, answered the call of duty and were deployed to Northern Burma to fight behind enemy lines.

Only nine of these selfless volunteers are still alive today, and they deserve to be honored for their bravery, their sacrifice, and their love of country.

Pennsylvania had more Marauder volunteers than any other State, and one volunteer, Russell Hamler, from Pittsburgh, is still with us today.

I am proud to cosponsor H.R. 906, the Merrill's Marauders Congressional Gold Medal Act, introduced by Representative PETE KING of New York. I would like to encourage my colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation and honor the legacy of Merrill's Marauders.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF GALLAUDET UNIVERSITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 4303, and the order of the House of January 3, 2019, of the following Member on the part of the House to the Board of Trustees of Gallaudet University:

Mr. BUCSHON, Indiana

ISSUES OF THE WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, under the new rules of this Congress, since

the rules have been changed that only allow one Special Order per week, and despite for years my having encouraged members of our conference to sign up for Special Orders, it is our chance to get messages out that we feel need to be out.

As I have said for years to our conference, you need to sign up for the Special Orders because you don't want my face to be the face of the party. And I am very encouraged, we have got more people signing up now.

But under the Speaker's new rules, as of this Congress, only one per week per person, so I am pleased, Mr. Speaker, to be here for my one Special Order of the week.

And what a week it was. Wow. The impeachment proceedings came to the conclusion that most everybody who had studied the situation knew that they would; no matter how long it got drug out, it was going to be this conclusion.

The State of the Union address Tuesday night; most people, or at least around here, most people know the Constitution requires a State of the Union report or address, but it doesn't require that it be done orally. And originally, the very first were provided in writing.

But it is an opportunity for us to come together, even though it has not been quite as homogenous a body as it has been at times when it comes to the State of the Union.

It has just been interesting. You know, some call it Trump Derangement Syndrome, some call it PTSD, President Trump Stress Disorder. But apparently, he causes stress, in some cases derangement, so people that normally think straight just have trouble reaching the same wise conclusions that they used to. So that has been an interesting thing to observe.

But here we are, end of the week of impeachment, end of the week after a State of the Union address.

I was honored to have my friend, Nigel Farage, who has been fighting for about a decade, actually, to make the point that President Trump has been making here in America; that unless our country is strong, we cannot take care of other countries' disasters and problems or assaults on freedom around the world. We can't. We have to make sure we are strong first.

And the example that has been given before of being on a jet plane, and the instructions, for good reason, say that the adult must put the mask on in the event of a loss of cabin pressure, which means there will be a loss of oxygen. So put your mask on first, so that you will be conscious and helpful to your children and others who are not able to put the mask on themselves.

If we are not strong, if we don't take care of the United States of America, as our oath should require us to do, then we are not able to be that shining light on a hill. We are not able to be that hope for freedom.

There are a lot of countries around the world that don't care for the

United States. Some of it is simple jealousy.

But some call the United States imperialist pigs, which is no reflection on the United States. It is a reflection on their ignorance of what imperialism means, as well as exactly what the history of the United States is.

We have gone and fought and sacrificed our greatest treasure, American lives—you are hard-pressed to find any place in history where a country sacrificed that precious treasure, in our case, American lives—for other people's freedom. And we don't require that they learn our language; that they begin to get permission from our government here in order to conduct affairs in their own country.

We are not imperialists. We are not seeking a hegemony. That is not the case at all. We are about freedom.

□ 1300

We have so many friends in France. We have, of course, a painting over here. It is the only painting in the whole Capitol full length of a foreigner, and here it is. It has been here in the House for so many decades, a friend of George Washington that is over here on my right, Lafayette.

We have had great help from the French. In fact, they helped ensure the final victory at Yorktown with their ships and their military. The French military was there at the surrender, where Cornwallis cowardly said he was ill and couldn't come out and surrender, so he sent out a subordinate. We owe the French people a great deal.

Historians have wrestled with how, after the American Revolution, we came about having freedom without the thousands of heads being separated from bodies, as occurred after the French Revolution that began 10 or so years after we got our Constitution. The French Revolution ended up ultimately resulting in an Emperor named Napoleon. Before Napoleon even took charge, so many people were killed, so much bloodshed.

Historians have wrestled with that. How did the American Revolution result in freedom without the tremendous beheadings and hangings that occurred in other places like after the French Revolution? What made the difference? I believe those who point to the First Great Awakening around the 1730s and 1740s, a recognition of Biblical principles and of just who Almighty God was and is and this desire for freedom that our Creator has provided.

Some say, well, if we are endowed with it, why doesn't everyone have freedom around the world? Well, like anything you inherit, if you are not willing to fight for it, there will be evil people who will take it from you, and you won't have it. Thank God for all of those who have served in our military and fought for freedom.

Some historians say the big difference, they believe, between the results of the American Revolution and

the French Revolution was that the American Revolution was about liberty, and the French Revolution was about revenge. As long as this country has been about liberty, it has soared, and people have done well.

Of course, in the second century of our country, there was another great awakening in the decades before the Civil War, and some would indicate actually the second great awakening, an awakening of something Daniel Webster, John Quincy Adams, of course, Frederick Douglass knew better than anybody. But how can you be a Christian and follow the teachings of Jesus and at the same time put brothers and sisters in chains and bondage? They are inconsistent. They are incongruent. You can't have those two things working together. Sure, slavery is talked about in the Bible, and it has always been around, and it grieves me greatly.

We heard a year ago, at the National Prayer Breakfast, there are now more slaves in the world than there have ever been at any time in the world's history. Tragic. Some say, well, that points to our own disgusting history here in the United States, like Columbus coming over and establishing slavery. Again, a lot of people don't know their history, but there were Indian tribes that had captured and enslaved other Indian tribes. I used to say Native Americans, but we have had so many Native Americans testify before our committee, and they normally say I am an Indian from the such and such Indian Tribe, so that has been a revelation.

Nonetheless, slavery has existed since the fall of man. It is an evil that exists in this world, and I am glad we were rid of it in the United States. It is tragic that it took a Civil War and the loss of a half-million lives, but, again, it took a second great awakening. And that was about liberty; it wasn't about revenge.

We get to the 20th century, helped in two world wars. We haven't had a great awakening in over 100 years. I think it shows in the activity here in this body, and I think it shows in activities across the country. I think it is something that would serve us well and help refine the country if we were to have a third great awakening. Instead, we see tremendous partisanship.

I really appreciated the majority leader explaining for our Speaker what she really meant by things she had said. Of course, she had said that the State of the Union Address had no connection with reality. She said the speech was a pack of lies. She said the President was selling a bill of goods, like a snake oil salesman. And I appreciated our minority whip, my friend STEVE SCALISE, asking about that. It certainly appears there were a lot of truthful things.

Just to highlight some of the President's guests, this should have been a feel-good event across the aisle. And I wasn't a personal fan of President Obama, but when he would tell a story

that touched the heart, as there were so many of those stories in the State of the Union, how could you not be moved? How could you not applaud and stand and cheer for some of those heroic situations? So I thought it was like a good movie. You laugh, you cry, you cheer. And there were those events.

I have run into this myself. One lady told me she was so sensitive to the Holy Spirit after she finished saying some really nasty things about me. She said, when you came up, the Holy Spirit left, and I realized she was completely consumed with hate. So, yes, you can't be consumed with that kind of hate and still feel the presence, as you say you have, of the Holy Spirit. If you can set those kinds of feelings of hate aside long enough, then it is easier to find areas of mutual agreement.

Stephanie and Janiyah Davis from Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, she was the fourth grade student who loves art and math. For too long, she has been assigned to low-performing schools. Her mom, Stephanie, is a hardworking, single mom who tried to apply for a tax credit scholarship. But since the Governor had vetoed the school choice legislation, Janiyah remained among the estimated 50,000 students on a wait list.

As was announced here in this body—I was sitting right up there—she was getting a scholarship. How could we not all cheer this child with so much promise having the chance to pursue her dreams and get the best education, just like children of Presidents of both parties have here in Washington as they send their child or children to private schools? Why not give a poor minority a chance that the President's children have?

Juan Guaido from Caracas, Venezuela, of course, he was the interim President of Venezuela. I thought it was inspirational to have him here and allow us to pay tribute to whom many of us believe is the actual, legitimate Venezuelan President. But as the President pointed out, the U.S. is supporting the Venezuelan people in their struggle for freedom and democracy.

Kelli and Gage Hake from Stillwater, Oklahoma, Kelli was at home with her 1-year-old son, Gage, when she learned that her husband, Army Staff Sergeant Christopher, had been killed while serving his second tour of duty in Iraq. He was killed by the explosive devices designed and produced under the auspices of a guy named Soleimani, whom President Trump had ordered taken out. Such an irony, too, he was killed.

It shouldn't have been a partisan thing over someone being killed by a drone strike because I am not aware of any of my friends across the aisle who expressed any concern when President Obama had a father and son, two American citizens, killed without arrest or trial with a drone strike. I don't remember anybody on the other side of the aisle being upset or expressing that outrage that President Obama had father and son killed—the son, appar-

ently, a minor—had them both taken out by a drone strike. But I could understand why President Obama would do that. This al-Awlaki, he was an American citizen.

As I pointed out before, it is a flaw that has occurred in our citizenship system, where there was no act of Congress. We can't find that there was even an executive order. But somewhere along the way, despite the language during debate of the 14th Amendment that made clear, no, they were not anticipating that if you were—and they didn't say alien. They said foreigner or a diplomat here. Well, of course, your children are not going to be American citizens, and they weren't for years. But somewhere, in the decades following the adoption, the ratification of the 14th Amendment—and like I say, I can't even find an executive order—some bureaucrats apparently in the State Department, I guess, just decided it would be easier to start bestowing citizenship on children of people who were here illegally, or as the ratifiers of the 14th Amendment called them, foreigners. They didn't even care if they were legally here or illegally here. They certainly did not anticipate that children of foreigners here would be American citizens.

Like I say, I have been trying to find out who made that decision to start giving citizenship to people who are born here. Our friend Judge Andrew Napolitano, I have heard him say on FOX News before that, basically, people need to get over it. It doesn't matter who you are. If you are born here, you are an American citizen.

But he was just ignorant of the fact that if you are a diplomat's child born here, you are not an American citizen. So those were the two areas. If you are a foreigner's child, a diplomat's child, you weren't to be an American citizen.

□ 1315

But it would be very interesting if we could ever find out who made that call and how do we go about curing it now.

But I think the President is right. If that was done by just some bureaucrat's decision, no act of Congress, no executive order, just somebody just started giving out American citizenship to people who were born here to foreigners, then you should be able to retract it with a President's executive order overruling whatever desk jockey or bureaucrat decided it was too difficult to assess whether somebody was here legally or not, and so just start giving out American citizenship.

But the name al-Awlaki, he is one of many people that we know—at one point, I only knew a couple. I wasn't willing to give those names out because they were given to me in a personal request not to give them out until others were known so that that person's identity wasn't in jeopardy of being learned.

But al-Awlaki, his parents came over on a student visa. He was born here.

They take him back to Yemen. They teach him to hate America.

Apparently, there may have been people in the Bush administration; certainly there were in the Obama administration. They apparently thought he was being a double agent and helping the U.S., when, actually, he was fomenting violence against Americans here and abroad.

So it is understandable that President Obama or people in his administration who had tried to work with al-Awlaki, they wouldn't want him coming back and having a big trial where he revealed the different people he had worked with in different administrations, so the answer is take him out with a drone strike. Never mind his minor son is in there. We don't know if he was guilty of fomenting violence or not, but he was a juvenile, as I understand it.

We hear all these allegations about President Trump but not so much about the murders ordered by President Obama, whether we call them murders or killings. I don't think they actually meet the criminal requirements of being murder because they were people normally that he took out by order of a strike. They were enemy combatants who were killing Americans.

So I didn't have a problem with him protecting American interests in doing what President Obama did, nor do I have a problem with President Trump protecting our country doing the same thing.

Again, I appreciate the majority leader saying: No. No. When the Speaker was talking about all the lies, just the whole speech was a pack of lies. He was selling a bill of goods like a snake oil salesman. The whole speech had no connection with reality.

He was explaining that she actually wasn't talking about all these people who were introduced. I look forward to the Speaker pointing that out.

Jody Jones from Farmersville, California: On December 17, 2018, Jody's brother, Rocky Jones, was shot and killed by an illegal immigrant in California. The criminal alien who had committed this brutal murder was previously arrested for violent crimes and twice deported.

The criminal alien was arrested in December 2018 for the sixth time, but because of California's sanctuary State policy, he was released from jail. A few days later, he went on a 24-hour reign of terror, injuring several people, robbing a gas station, leading law enforcement on a high-speed chase, and killing 51-year-old Rocky, who was known as a kind and gentle soul. He left behind a precious daughter and four brothers.

I don't see anything in any of these that should have been considered lies. These are touching stories.

I realize we have a disagreement here, as many do across the country. I think there is a bill proposed with a new way forward where we even provide airfare to people who have been

deported to bring them to the United States.

I think the Trump administration is doing a good job getting rid of people who are criminal threats to this country, and I applaud those efforts. I think it is part of our keeping our oath to our Constitution that we take here.

Our devotion is not to citizens of the world. It is like President Trump has pointed out: We can't help the world if we are not strong as a nation.

That is what Nigel Farage has been successful in promoting, a removal of the U.K. from the European Union. You have got some bureaucrats making decisions who are not residents of England, and yet they are making decisions that have adversely affected the lives of the British people, and I can understand them being upset.

Yes, there are those who say, if we had a one-world government, then there is no need for war, the same argument that was made for the European Union: Look, if we are all one country, then we can't have another world war started between Germany and France or anybody else because we are all one government.

Orwell would probably acknowledge that as a great basis for creating Big Brother that watched over everybody, which seems to be where we continue to move in this country, into a great socialist, communist, progressive society.

As Whittaker Chambers quoted Dostoevsky:

The problem with communism is not economic. The problem with communism is atheism.

I will never forget, before the fall of the Soviet Union, going into the only authorized seminary, Christian seminary in the whole Soviet Union at a place called Zagorsk. As you turned in the gate, there was a big building there, and the building had a picture of Lenin's face, and it said, in Russian: "Lenin is with us."

The message was clear: You may be going into this Christian seminary, but just understand, this is a communist country—or a socialist country, as they called themselves—and here, it isn't Christianity that is good. It is important you know Lenin is the one who is with us.

It was interesting visiting Lenin's tomb in those days. The rumor was that his ear had deteriorated to the point that they replaced it with a rubber one. I never knew if that was true or not, but his ear didn't really look real.

But, nonetheless, that was their message: This dead Lenin is with us and not some God you Christians think you should worship.

But we are moving toward a time in this country, unless it is interrupted—and I think the election of President Trump helped interrupt it—where Christians are really the only identifiable group in America where it is politically correct to condemn them, to belittle them, to persecute them. And we are still seeing that grow.

It is interesting that it grows at a time when anti-Semitism continues to grow here, as in Europe.

We had, from Scottsdale, Arizona, Iain Lanphier. I didn't realize his great-grandfather was going to be right there and that he was a 100-year-old Tuskegee Airman, one of those heroic airmen who were segregated but had incredible courage, incredible ability, and they flew missions that were just incredible. They showed such courage in helping protect freedom even though they were fighting segregation, or had to deal with it back then. What a heroic group.

This young man is the great-grandson of Tuskegee Airman Charles McGee. Of course, Iain wanted to be, and still wants to be, a member of the United States Space Force.

Those were all inspirational.

Now, I know, and I think the majority leader referred to it, they disagreed with Rush Limbaugh being recognized.

He is an incredible man, an extraordinary man. I recall back when I was on the bench as a judge in Texas seeing that the Republican majority elected in November of 1994 recognized Rush as an honorary member of their class. They paid tribute. Without him, they didn't think Republicans, for the first time in 40 years, would have gotten the majority back.

Of course, Newt Gingrich was leading that charge from a congressional standpoint.

But he is an amazing guy. Even when I get really frustrated and depressed about some of the things going on here, I can listen to Rush, and he has such an amazing sense of humor. So it has been interesting.

As his producer—Bo Snerdley is his radio name—can verify, as he has to me many times—I love the guy—he can personally testify that Rush Limbaugh is not a racist. James can verify that, has verified that.

Anyway, I know Rush. I just think the world of Rush and what he has tried to do. I thought now that he has been diagnosed with stage IV cancer, it was a great tribute.

We see it here in this body. We have people in this body who have made arguments staunchly against the things we really believe in, and we find out they have got cancer. In our Thursday morning Prayer Breakfast, we pray for each other. It doesn't matter about party.

Sometimes in that Prayer Breakfast you hear testimonials from people and you had no idea the things they have gone through, but we set aside the political things to pray for each other and care about each other.

So I have been a bit burdened to see people so angry about Rush Limbaugh's recognition for the things that he has been amazing and done. I think the slurs about him being a racist, they are absolutely absurd. Talk to James.

Rush did not hire James because he was Black. He hired him because he is

an amazing guy, and he has been helpful to Rush. But, like I say, I love James. He is just great guy.

I am so pleased the President recognized Rush. I got up to the gallery up there, Rush was there, and it meant a lot to me to hug Rush Limbaugh and encourage him, and I will continue to pray for him as well.

I am just sorry that people can't take a step back when somebody is going through what Rush is and at least drop some of the outrageous slander.

We also had retired Brigadier General Charles McGee. He is the great-grandfather of Iain Lanphier.

I know comments were made that the whole speech was a pack of lies, but these were extraordinary people. As their stories were told, there was cheering. There were tears. It was just a feel-good time.

It should have been for all Americans, when we could see the things that brought us together and made us strong, and yet there were people who were not about to stand up and acknowledge and applaud some of these folks.

□ 1330

That is really tragic. And it wasn't just Rush Limbaugh.

Paul Morrow, a United States Army veteran, but he started a successful contracting business. Today he is building a new concrete plant in an opportunity zone in Montgomery.

Carl and Marsha Mueller from Prescott, Arizona, as far as I know, no relationship to Bob who cost us \$30 million or so when he knew immediately that his investigation was a sham. There was no collusion or conspiracy between the Trump campaign and Russia, even though there are people who continue, after 2 years and 30 or so million dollars, establishing no conspiracy or collusion between the Trump campaign and Russia, people still keep wanting to bring up that as if the lie is truth.

But Bob Mueller—I regret the damage that he has done to the name "Mueller." These folks were wonderful.

Kayla was a devoted humanitarian aid worker. I knew the story. My heart broke for these people. It is just horrendous to think about what al-Baghdadi did to their daughter, a loving, caring, dedicated person of faith trying to help others, and al-Baghdadi repeatedly raped her. It is more than a parent should ever have to deal with to think about.

But we also heard those stories about Boko Haram after they attacked a Christian school. I was invited over there. We didn't have people from the Obama administration that appeared to want to help initially, even though there was a hashtag, #bringbackourgirls. That didn't bring back anybody.

But then I secretly met with dozens of the mothers of girls who were kidnapped and were enslaved and being raped, that was a very emotional evening. But I asked their pastor pri-

vately, I said: "Where are all of the fathers?"

And he said: "That is part of all of this tragedy. The fathers know their daughters are being raped daily. They don't feel like they should be sleeping in a bed comfortable when they were not able to protect their daughters." So they have gone to the bush, jungle, rainforest, whatever you want to call it, and they are living out there and many have already died out there.

There was a quote from a Catholic bishop and I was told when I was over there: "Yeah, the Obama administration is saying that if you want some real help with Boko Haram"—not just a hashtag—"but you want some real help that will make a difference and stop Boko Haram, you have got to do a couple of things. You have got to legalize same-sex marriage, and you have got to start funding abortions, and then we will be able to be of more help to you."

Of course, that kind of reminds you of asking Ukraine to help with the investigations into corruption.

But, anyway, President Obama obviously wasn't impeached and nor did anybody that I am aware of think we should have tried to impeach him because he wasn't helping these Christian girls the way we could have by helping take out Boko Haram, even with drone strikes, or more.

I understand there was some intelligence provided to the Nigerians, but according to the people I met with, they weren't getting the help because they weren't going to change their laws to adopt same-sex marriage or legalize abortion.

But what a tragedy. And I don't know, maybe people, some of the ones that didn't stand and applaud for that couple that has endured so much, maybe it was that they didn't want to applaud because al-Baghdadi was killed, even though he was responsible for the killing of so many Americans, so many Christians, so many Jews, and actually, Muslims as well.

Maybe they did not approve of a terrorist thug like al-Baghdadi being killed. And I know President Obama had said that ISIS is not true Islam. Well, it was a radical form of Islam. Al-Baghdadi had a Ph.D. in Islam, so I always kind of felt like he at least knew something about Islam, perhaps more than people who did not have a Ph.D. in Islamic studies.

I was very grateful that President Trump took the actions he did to eliminate the person who could do the kind of things that he did to Carl and Marsha Mueller's daughter. But, again, I would have thought that we could have celebrated the taking out of just a thug, an enemy combatant, a person who wanted to see America destroyed, that we might have had more community, or camaraderie in relieving the world of somebody that did so much damage to people in it.

We had Deputy Chief Raul Ortiz. I mean, the guy is a hero. I have met

him before. It was good to see him here. He is with the U.S. Border Patrol. He joined them in 1991. He had served in the United States Army, and he has got a lot of responsibility down on the border trying to protect our country, because there are people trying to come in with drugs, that are killing Americans, they are enslaving Americans, or people who don't like us.

Fortunately, the majority of people coming in, they do like America and want to live here, but we can't know who wants to help and who wants to hurt unless we have a secure border and can control who comes in.

Tony Rankins from Cincinnati, Ohio, had suffered from PTSD, post-traumatic stress disorder. He had become addicted to drugs. Anyway, Tony's story kind of reminded me of a friend from Texas, Curtis Brown, who is a Christian and who has been able to conquer some of these same demons, is doing great in helping others.

So I have great appreciation for Tony Rankins and what he has overcome. And now the company he started, R Investments, today he is working in an opportunity zone in Cincinnati, but the new job has helped him overcome his drug addiction.

But there is more that has to be done to keep someone from falling back into drugs. It is a daily battle, and people should be applauded for being able to do that. I regret that we didn't have more stimulating applause and recognition.

Robin and Ellie Schneider—Ellie was the one born at 21 weeks and 6 days, one of the youngest babies to survive in America at the time. It is an amazing story. How could you not applaud that little child in her mother's arms. It was very touching, very moving.

It wasn't a lie. These weren't lies. These were real American stories that, again, should have made us all laugh, all cry, and all cheer over the good things.

Ivan Simonovis from Caracas, Venezuela, he was the chief of police there in Venezuela's capital city. He was esteemed as the nation's top cop. But he was imprisoned in 2004 for protecting protesters. He was held in captivity for nearly 15 years by Chavez and the Maduro regimes, but he escaped in 2019, got to Fort Lauderdale, Florida, and was welcomed in the United States.

That ought to be a story we could all cheer for on both sides of the aisle. That is a good thing.

I regret we were not even more laudatory for a guy who had overcome all of that. I guess for some people, if you applaud his escaping Venezuela in the Chavez and Maduro era, maybe it was thought that applauding that might be some recognition of just how brutal socialism, progressivism, and communism becomes.

Natan Sharansky, it was my privilege to have a long conversation with him and Sheldon and Miriam Adelson years ago. The guy is brilliant. He served 12 years, though, in a Russian

gulag because he wanted freedom of speech.

As Natan points out, you have fear societies and you have free societies, and you can test which you are in. Are you free to say absolutely anything you want to in the town square without fear of harm or arrest? If you are able to do that, you are in a free society.

And, unfortunately, for Natan, he was in a fear society. And that is where communist systems go. They don't feel they can allow widespread Christianity. They suppress. They keep people in fear.

It is amazing, too, as I have traveled around the United States, it seems like some of our best citizens who understand the threats against America, they are from the former Soviet bloc countries, and they say: We are hearing all of this great stuff about socialism. We heard all of that before, and we know that it leads to a loss of freedom. It leads to our lives being dictated by people above. It leads to the loss of parental rights because the government is going to tell you what you are allowed to talk to your children about.

I was shocked to find out years ago that in the Soviet Union, they made very clear—I heard the presentation—that these children do not belong to the parents. The parents are temporary caretakers. And if they ever found out that a parent has ever said anything negative about the Soviet Union, the Soviet Government, those children will be removed and they will be put in the hands of other temporary caretakers who the government likes and who will not say anything negative about their government.

That is, as Sharansky would say, a fear society. And I fear we have moved in that direction dramatically.

Joshua Smith from Paducah, Kentucky was up here. His 16-year-old brother, Channing, committed suicide last September in Tennessee. He had suffered from cyber assault on social media by students in his high school. Joshua described Channing as “the sweetest kid on Earth” who loved playing musical instruments. But he was bullied, cyberbullied.

The Williams family from Fort Bragg, that was so touching. And I was surprised. How could you not cheer this father coming back into the lives of his wife and two children? I mean, most of us were moved to tears. Some were not. I don't really understand how everybody was not totally moved by what went on there.

Anyway, I was pleased that the majority leader clarified the Speaker's comments about those being, as she said, no connection with reality, a pack of lies, selling a bill of goods like a snake oil salesman.

I was glad he clarified that she wasn't really talking about all of those human-interest stories, and things that should have brought us together. But unfortunately, they didn't, as they should have.

□ 1345

For those who love justice, I am hopeful that now that this 3-year pursuit of impeachment is behind us, now we are told: Oh, that is just the beginning. We are not stopping impeachment. We are going to keep going forward.

A court was told: Oh, yeah, we are going to keep going forward with impeachment. We are not done. We are going to keep trying to find something.

Really, this kind of sounds like basically, since it has been made very clear as of this week the Senate is not going to buy into some bogus group of allegations that are not impeachable offenses, which makes clear, then, you are pursuing it, apparently using taxpayer dollars, to try to besmirch a candidate for November 2020, to try to defeat him by using taxpayer dollars to make all kinds of allegations that you know will not result in removal from office but you are hoping will result in his defeat in November.

It is amazing the effect President Trump has on people. You can call it Trump derangement syndrome or whatever, but for so long as we have had deep state people, they felt like, as unelected bureaucrats, they were supposed to be in charge. It appeared pretty clear to me Lieutenant Colonel Vindman was offended. You could tell by his body language and the things he said. He was really bothered that President Trump didn't do exactly what he told him to do in his talking points.

How dare the elected President of the United States who embodies foreign policy—President Obama, agree or disagree, when he was President, as he had said before, elections have consequences. So many of us disagreed with his foreign policy. He was President. He could have whatever foreign policy he cared to pursue.

But you have people like Lieutenant Colonel Vindman who didn't think that President Trump should do what he felt appropriate. He felt he should do what Lieutenant Colonel Vindman thought was appropriate. After all, he saw himself as the be-all and end-all resource on all things to do with Ukraine. From the things we found out he said to the Ukrainian leaders, it struck me from his testimony, my gosh, he is being more loyal to Ukraine and the Ukrainian President than he is to his own oath of office and his own Commander in Chief. He is advising them not to listen to his Commander in Chief, which is totally consistent with his activity in Moscow, apparently, when he was overheard belittling America and doing so to Russians.

Anyway, hopefully, he won't be there much longer. But just think about it: If we hadn't gone through impeachment, then we wouldn't have known about all these people who are unelected bureaucrats who thought they ought to be in charge of everything.

So looking for a silver lining, I think there is a great silver lining because these people have now raised their

heads and made themselves known that they think, as bureaucrats, they should run everything, and they will do everything they can to undermine the President of the United States. Now we know who they are so we can start getting rid of those people. That will be a good thing for the country.

We had Christopher Wray, the Director of the FBI, before our Judiciary Committee this week. I was hoping when he was appointed Director of the FBI that he would come in and would clean house here in Washington, and he would help restore the FBI's sterling reputation that it had built over time. It seemed that he had a habit, though, if you pointed out problems in the Washington FBI office, he would defend by saying: You are basically casting aspersions on these 37,000 fine employees of the FBI.

That is why I had to make clear to him this week that we are not casting any aspersions on anybody around the country who are part of the FBI because I have known too many FBI agents. I still do. I know, as a felony judge, they would never have come and lied to me in seeking a warrant. They would never have created an untruthful document by changing information, like we are told Clinesmith did. I still have some concern they may make him the one fall guy.

In my opinion, if you seek to get a warrant to spy on a Presidential campaign that you don't want to win, Mr. Speaker, and you take information that says that Carter Page was an agent for our intelligence sources and spying on Russia, and you change that to say he was not so it helps you get a warrant to spy on a campaign you don't like, to me, he ought to be in jail for committing a fraud upon the FISA court. I think he ought to be in jail for any other crimes that were committed in the process of seeking to provide false information to violate American citizens' civil rights. I hope Carter Page is very successful in his legal efforts.

Instead, we find out, the one guy I thought, oh, well, they will make him the fall guy, when there are a lot of people who probably should be going to jail.

But under Christopher Wray's leadership, what have they done to Mr. Clinesmith? They let him resign, retire early, go get employment elsewhere, and make a good living somewhere else. Really?

As I said to Christopher Wray: You are in law enforcement. You have to know how important deterrence is, and when somebody does acts like he did, in essence, there is no punishment.

It is just one of many things that seems to indicate to me that Christopher Wray thinks the way to get the FBI's reputation back is to cover up much of the problem, not punish people. They need to be punished publicly so that it is a deterrence to any other FBI agents who might be tempted to act similarly as Clinesmith or Comey

or McCabe or Strzok. These are people who ought to be required to answer for their wrongdoing.

Yes, I still have significant problems with Inspector General Horowitz. He did a lot of investigation, but it is very clear that Strzok and Page had tremendous bias.

His original report, in effect, said there is no indication that it affected the outcomes. How about the fact that every outcome was consistent with their bias? Not one single outcome was inconsistent with their bias for Hillary Clinton and their hatred for Donald Trump. When it is 100 percent consistent, then it means it is time to do something. Christopher Wray needs to go, too.

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

MODERNIZING ENTITLEMENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, my family accuses me of being incapable of speaking without moving my hands or without displays, so we are going to see if we can do a little bit of both that we are good at.

Mr. Speaker, about every week, I try to take a block of time and come here to walk through both what I see happening math-wise and what I see happening demographic-wise. I know as soon as I use those words, most anyone who is watching this is now falling asleep. But the math is important.

I put this board up because I am a believer that there is a way to save the country from being buried in debt. There is a way that the next 30, 40 years can be incredibly prosperous, but we need to invest in this magic device, which is called a calculator, because much of what we do here is rhetorical.

We do policy by feelings, and we engage in just absolute absurdity in our unwillingness to talk about the reality of what is going on.

So, first, a bit of premise, and then we will do a little bit of what happened in today's job report to demonstrate there is a path, but that path doesn't exist until we start to be honest with each other.

So just a top-line understanding, the next 5 years, just the growth in Social Security and Medicare—it is mostly Medicare—and healthcare entitlements, just the growth equals the entire Defense Department.

Mr. Speaker, you have to understand what is happening. It is not Republican or Democrat. It is demographics. There are 74 million of us who are baby boomers, and we are moving into our retirement years. We have earned benefits, and there is no money in the bank. It is all going to be borrowed.

So think of that: Over the next 10 years, just the growth of Social Security, Medicare, and healthcare entitle-

ments is the entire discretionary budget. Everything else is on autopilot.

Yet how many of our brothers and sisters who are elected, and who have this incredible opportunity and responsibility to come tell the truth, are comfortable coming behind this microphone and saying: Hey, it turns out that we are getting old very fast as a society. We have stunning numbers of promises that we have an obligation to keep. And we are unwilling to have the honesty of the discussion of what we are about to do to our kids in crushing them.

I have a 4-year-old daughter. Doesn't she deserve to have the same opportunities we all have had?

It turns out there is a path, but we need to stop delusional thinking. Forgive me when my brothers and sisters on the Republican side say, "Well, if we just got rid of waste and fraud," it is a rounding error. It is important, and we need to do it.

"We just have to tax rich people more." It is delusional. It is fractions of a percent, and you could take all their wealth, Mr. Speaker.

We don't seem to have our heads around the scale of this math and the number of zeros that go with it.

Let's sort of walk through this. In the last couple of years, we have been trying to pitch a concept. You can't just do one thing, Mr. Speaker. You can't just change entitlements and think you are going to accomplish anything. You can't just tax people more and think you are going to get anywhere. You have to do everything.

It is sort of the wholistic—I prefer the term "unified"—theory that we have to get the economics working. We have to maximize economic growth, and we have to maximize labor force participation. We need to adopt revolutionary and disruptive technology to crash the price of healthcare because, as I was just sharing with you, Mr. Speaker, healthcare is what drives the deficit.

I was here last week, and I was showing slides that 90 percent of the future debt is substantially Social Security but mostly Medicare, yet the only calls I get when I show that slide is I get people angry: Stop telling us that. That doesn't fit the folklore I bathe in.

But the fact of the matter is, there are technology disruptions coming right now that could crash the price of healthcare and be amazing in changing our debt curve. The problem is a bunch of that technology is actually illegal because it uses algorithms, sensors, and things that our current legal framework and reimbursement framework isn't ready for. We need to modernize.

□ 1400

Employment, we are going to talk about some of the remarkable things that came out in today's unemployment numbers that should be incredibly hopeful to both those on the left and the right of what is happening,

where our brothers and sisters—what we refer to as marginally detached—are coming back into the labor force. This is a good thing. It makes remarkable differences.

You are going to start to see: Do we add incentives in the earned and even unearned benefits? Remember, in our society, the vast majority of our spending, 70-plus percent, is on autopilot. It is what we call entitlements.

You earned your Social Security. You earned your Medicare. You earned your VA. You earned these things. There are other benefits you get because you fell below a certain income. You are part of a certain Tribal population—those things. These are treaty obligations. They are societal obligations we have made decisions on.

Are there things we can do to add a spiff? Saying: Yes, you may be 70 years old, you have your earned entitlement, but could we give you a little spiff? Are you healthy? Do you want to continue to work? Do you want to stay in the labor force?

Because it turns out to be really good for society. It turns out to be really important.

We still have a problem with millennial men, which is a different speech, and one day, we will figure out why they are underparticipating.

Population stability, a really uncomfortable part of the conversation to have, but the math is the math. Our birthrates have collapsed. We are looking at data right now that says half of millennials, more than 50 percent of millennials, will never marry. It doesn't mean they won't be in long-term committed relationships, but are there incentives we can produce as a government, as a society, that those stable relationships bring another generation? Because it is an honest math problem. We are collapsing population-wise.

Immigration, how do you design an immigration system that is open, welcoming, but is talent-based? Because the reality of it is, we are about to hit such a demographic headwind if we do not have brothers and sisters becoming Americans who have certain skill sets.

In many ways, it is a more elegant system. I don't care about your race, your religion, who you cuddle with, all of these things. I do care that you add velocity to our society, to our economy.

Then, there are other things: tax policies, regulatory policy, smart technology, things we can do to maximize economic growth.

Look, our pitch is: If we can make these things work—and you can't do one or two of them; you have to do all of them—we have a model that says, at the peak of the baby boom, so about 15 years from now, or less than that, we kiss up to 95 percent of debt-to-GDP, but we can hold it. Then, it fades back to something normal.

If we don't do this, there are charts out there that show a couple hundred percent of debt-to-GDP. We blow up the

society. We basically become anemic, slow-growth. We raise taxes like crazy on young people to make them pay our benefits. We become a country that has crushed any excitement and hope.

Let's talk about the good things, because there is starting to be some proof that when you get tax policy correct, regulatory policy correct, some of these incentives, good things happen. I know in today's rage-based politics, we sit there and attack everything, but there are good things happening.

How do we figure out what makes them happen and do more of it? And the things that aren't working, let's do less of them. It is not that complicated.

Look, today, we got the jobs report. The jobs report we get about January is really important because they also give us a sense—it is not the final number but the sense of what was happening in 2019 and those last 4 months.

Every smart economist we work with—I am the senior Republican on the House side on something called the Joint Economic Committee. It is basically for all the kids in your high school who were president of your math club. If you love the data—and I happen to be blessed to have a couple of economists who work for me in that capacity—we were all expecting revisions and some ugly numbers.

Turns out, a few hours ago, we found out that there were 55,000 added in November and December, the ending parts of last year. The economy turns out to have been healthier. The employment opportunities were healthier.

You all saw the number for January, 225,000 jobs, far beyond even the most optimistic predictions. There should have been joy in this room. Those are people who are working, who are coming back in the labor force, who are changing their lives. But this place is incapable of joy anymore.

These are really, really good things. But there is something even more remarkable underlying in that data, and it is important. I know it is not exciting, but it is really important if you care about people.

First, we work on the premise that growth is moral. You are going to see some numbers here where our brothers and sisters who had basically quit, they had stopped trying to find employment. They had dropped out. We called them the marginally detached. Those people who might have a small part-time job, but they are unhappy. They are basically the working poor.

All of a sudden, we are seeing, in the last 24 months, remarkable movement in their wages and even more remarkable movement in their job opportunities. There is something working out there.

Remember, the first slide we were talking about how we have a healthy enough economy, a healthy enough economics in our society so we can keep our promises. This is one of the charts that is really important.

If you all remember your high school economics class, what are the two com-

ponents that make wages go up, the two things we focus on? Well, one is productivity, and the other is inflation.

When your wages go up, well, inflation is up, so we are going to pay you more, even though you have no improvement in your purchasing power. And inflation-driven wage growth, you are typically falling behind.

The other side—and that is what this chart talks about—is productivity. The company invested in a new piece of equipment, new software, new methodologies, or new supply chains, but it requires capital investments. But we have gotten more productive, meaning we can pay our workers more.

We were panic-stricken, functionally, at the end of 2016. Productivity had collapsed. Lots of the smart people were saying: Well, you have had the tax reform. People did their investing, this and that. It is going away.

Turns out, they were absolutely wrong. Look at the last bar. That is 2019. We have had a spike. Now, I still don't think it is enough, but we are up to what we call 1.7 productivity growth. For an economy our size, that is remarkable. We can do better, but it is going the right way.

If we are going to pay our brothers and sisters more, if the working poor are going to have an opportunity, this is crucial. Can we fixate on the things that are working in our economy? Because there is something working now, so how do we do more of it?

This next chart is impossible to read, but it is really important. You have three layers in here. These are for wages, so those folks who are at the low end of the scale, middle end of the scale, and those folks who are making lots of money.

The remarkable thing that has happened since tax reform—I know this is really hard to see. It turns out, it is the working poor, that lowest quartile, that is having the most growth in their wages, that bottom 10 percent of our brothers and sisters that we were writing off as a society.

I have been on the Joint Economic Committee now for years, and just 3 or 4 years ago, we brought in these fancy, very well-credentialed, really smart economists who basically said that Americans who didn't finish high school, Americans with moderate skills, they are part of the permanent underclass. Start thinking of ways to provide them subsidies, welfare, housing, because they are going to stay there.

The velocity, the concept that you can start out poor today, learn a skill, work hard, and move up, they basically said was over. They are wrong. And this isn't Republican or Democrat. This is hope. This is what America is supposed to be about, that those folks come back.

You may not have had the opportunity to have great skill training. Maybe something horrible happened in your life, you dropped out of high school. Three years ago, we were writ-

ing you off. Today, you have double, more than double, the wage growth of everyone else and the mean in this society.

I know this is geeky, but it is really important. These numbers are millions and millions and millions of our brothers and sisters out there who had a really crappy decade. All of a sudden, something is happening out there where their wages are growing. The job stability, the value of their labor, it may be the most elegant way to say it—and some of this is complex. And this is an uncomfortable part of the conversation. Forgive me if I am not as eloquent on this as I would like to be.

For low-skilled populations, it is a combination of a robust enough economy to have a need for those skills or lack of skills. But there is a need for that labor. The other side is, you are not flooding your society with a type of immigration that puts so much low-skilled population in the society that you crush the working poor.

So think of a little bit of a seesaw. You have to do both to get the value of that working poor population, to make their labor valuable. It is happening. That should be joyful. Now, we should figure out how to do more of it, how to keep this going, because it is working.

Now, here is the one where I may take us a little bit to a level of complexity in the thinking, but it is really important. When we did tax reform a couple of years ago, the Joint Committee on Taxation folks—they are all freaky smart. There is like 50 of them. A number have Ph.D.'s in econometrics and all these things.

They came to us and said: David, there are two fragilities in tax reform for the economy to grow. It is capital stock, available cash to be lent for businesses, for organizations, for things to grow, to buy that new piece of equipment for that labor productivity. The other thing was labor itself.

We are getting old very fast as a society. There are some charts out there that say, within the decade, we functionally have two workers for one person in retirement. It is not Republican or Democrat. It is those of us who are baby boomers. It is what it is.

Something has started to happen in the last 2 years, and we saw a pop of it in this January data. Think about this. This over here is sort of that 2008, 2009, and we were at 67 percent labor force participation. Now, labor force participation basically means everyone in society less those people who are under 16. So those who are eligible to work, up and to, I believe, being much older.

Now, this number was always supposed to crash because we are getting older as a society. But it was supposed to continue to just dive down because we are only halfway through the retirement of the baby boomers.

All a sudden, in the last couple years, we have broken the trendline. All of a sudden, today, we saw we are up to 63.4 percent labor force participation. Most people glaze over and go: What the hell does that mean?

Well, it means it is a number that those smart economists a couple years ago were telling us we would never get to, but somehow it has happened. We are functionally living in a time when we are going to be rewriting textbooks.

But what is also remarkable—and you are going to see this in one of the other charts here—is those who are coming back, they are starting to look for unemployment.

So how do you have this weird number today? There are 225,000 people who moved into the labor force, or took jobs in January, but unemployment actually ticked up one-tenth of a point. But the labor force participation, the number in the labor force, also goes up two-tenths of a point. That is actually wonderful.

What it means is that people who had given up, who weren't looking, hadn't looked in the last 4 weeks, in the last year, they had functionally given up, almost a couple hundred thousand, maybe 170,000 or so, came back and started looking, coming back into our society's labor force.

This is really important because there is just that societal concept of you are less likely to be using bad things if you are working. You are more likely to be able to start having a functioning family, maybe even family formation, if you are working. Your future, your optimism, your health are better if you are working.

All of a sudden, we are starting to see populations that those fancy economists were writing off just a couple years ago. They are coming back.

□ 1415

This is moral, but it is also really good. Why does it become partisan, saying: Well, it is not as good as it should be? It is a remarkable break of every trend line we had.

You would think we would have this honorable conversation, saying: Let's understand what is working and do more of it because, if we can do this for a few more years, another decade, that economic trend line starts to change remarkably.

And I will try to make that make sense.

So last August, CBO did debt projections. We just got another one last week. Did anyone come behind these microphones—well, I did—and say: Hey, did anyone notice that the 10-year window of debt actually went down \$705 billion?

It turns out, if you dive into that, some of that was payrolls. There are a lot more people working. They are paying a lot more payroll tax. That is wonderful.

There is another thing that is actually a little more complex to get your head around: interest rates. We expect the cost of financing the deficits of the U.S. Government to also come down about \$400 billion.

But there is an argument that the tax reform—remember how we said what were the two fragilities, labor and

capital stock? It turns out that thing called capital stock is remarkably better than anyone had modeled.

We did something in the tax reform to stop businesses from moving their domiciles overseas, taking their profits and booking them overseas, keeping that capital overseas. We changed that.

We have had a remarkable amount of that, billions and billions, I mean, a few hundred billion dollars come crashing back to the United States, where they have to pay some taxes here on it, but that cash is now in our society.

It turns out also savings rates have turned out to be much better than we modeled.

So just that and the fact that more people are working is about a \$705 billion reduction in the deficit. In that one period between August and last week when we got the CBO report—and remember, the cost of tax reform we thought would be about \$1.4 trillion. We just covered about half of it. So it is just an interesting thought on what is going on.

This is the remarkable chart. This is the one we need to get our heads around. So think about this.

It is January 2009, January 2010. How many of you remember people getting behind microphones and talking about the real unemployment rate? Do you remember the real unemployment rate? It is not these people who are out looking. It is all the people. It is the worn-out workers. Those people have quit. We had numbers where it was approaching 17.6, 17.5 percent of our Nation was part of the real unemployment.

Take a look at what has happened. This is remarkable. We are now starting to see numbers that were 6.7 percent of the—this is people who are looking, not looking, who have worn out, who have given up. It has been cut substantially, more than half.

And we are at this point where we have been having this amazing academic debate, conversation: What is real unemployment? Not only that, what is full employment? How much—and I was told never to use this word behind the microphone—but this concept of elasticity. How many of our brothers and sisters are actually available to come back into the labor force?

It turns out there is a miracle happening out there. Every month, we will tell you: Oh, 150,000 or, in this case, 225,000 took jobs, because it is not part of the way they calculate. We are not telling you: Hey, there may have been another couple hundred thousand who moved back into the labor force who weren't even looking, so we don't count them.

They deserve to be counted, and they are counted in this data here. They are what they call the U-6 unemployment.

If we could keep this going for a few more years, we are already breaking the rules in almost every textbook, but this becomes remarkably important.

For my brothers and sisters on the left, my brothers and sisters on the

right, we get elected to do our best to make people's lives better and protect the Constitution, defend the Constitution. If you don't see this as making Americans' lives better, you don't understand, you don't own a calculator, or you don't have a heart.

I get behind here and I talk about the math, but this math is people. It is families. It is folks who are being crushed in the last decade who now actually have hope.

Why isn't there some joy? Why do we have to live in a time where rage is the commodity of politics and not joy for the success we are having for so many people who are part of the working poor that now have hope, now have futures? It is working.

And the other thing that is also somewhat joyful, you see the red bar, that is real GDP.

You have got to understand, if we were going back to around '16, even when we calculated the year '17, how much of our GDP was also being dragged along, helped, assisted by the rest of the world? Now, when you look at what is going on, we have had a remarkable level of stability, but we are dragging the rest of the world with us because the rest of the world is basically an anemic mess right now.

And, yes, next month I expect some ugly things in some of the numbers because of the virus and what it has done to trade. There may be an upside in an odd way where many manufacturers, businesses, will consider moving their supply chains, making them less fragile, less concentrated, which will be great for us as a country because we have just now had USMCA, the NAFTA replacement, pass, so now, all of a sudden will you think about moving part of your manufacturing back to North America.

But this is actually a really interesting chart to understand. Even in a time where the rest of the world's economic growth has been collapsing, we are still doing remarkably well.

And I was going to come up here and show you the formulas of, hey, a point of GDP in the EU means this much to us. But just understand, we had some help 3 or 4 years ago. Now we are the ones helping the rest of the world.

Now, back to that being remarkable, and this is sort of the closing on the concept that growth is moral. But there also should be joy.

Those who come behind these microphones and say, "We care about people," "We care about the workers," "We care about the working poor," "We want society to continue to expand and be healthy," take a look at the chart on my side. If you see blue, it is the previous 8 years. If you see the red, it is a function of the last 3 years.

Do you know which bar is the highest and has the biggest separation? Who has had the biggest growth in earnings on this chart? Turns out it is the bottom workers in our country.

If you care about our brothers and sisters who have been struggling for so

many years, this should be joyful, because something amazing is happening out there.

Now everyone is doing better—well, except high-wage managers. They are basically static. If you come over here and actually look at the top income, they are doing fine, but the bottom is the remarkable change.

This is really important, because for so many years, I would listen to my friends on the left come behind these microphones and talk about income inequality. It is a real thing. But what happens when you have made more progress, particularly in the last 12 months, of closing that gap of income inequality not because you have crushed those with high skills, those with high wages, but because you have brought up so much of our society, you have grown their wages remarkably?

This needs to be our goal. Our goal as a society must be to lift everyone up, not figure out that one quartile you have identified as the enemy and go out and decide you are going to crush them. That is what our modern politics has become.

Back to the first slide again.

Over the next 30 years, if you look at the math of what is coming at us, if you actually strip Social Security and Medicare out of the next 30 years and say, “What do we look like 30 years from now?”—so my little girl, when she is 34 years old, what does the Federal budget look like as we see it today? It is about \$23 trillion. If we don’t add Social Security and Medicare into the number, it is about \$23 trillion cash in the bank. Now, that is not inflation adjusted, but \$23 trillion cash in the bank.

If we put Social Security and Medicare back into that 30-year window, my little girl and every other young person, every other person who thinks they are still going to be around in 30 years, we are \$103 trillion in debt.

It doesn’t have to be that way, but we have got to crush the price of healthcare with technology. We have got to have people in the economy who are helping it grow. We need the productivity. We can have a remarkable future.

But the intellectual capacity of the debates we are having around here, we have functionally gone a year and done nothing, nothing that actually helps America, but we have done some great messaging bills and great politics and great grandstanding and pretty good speeches.

We can do better, and there is a path.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for your patience. I yield back the balance of my time.

CORRECTION TO THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD OF THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 6, 2020 AT PAGE H868

Ms. GRANGER. Madam Speaker, I rise to offer a question of the privileges of the House previously noticed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. DEGETTE). The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 832

Whereas, on December 20, 2019, Speaker Pelosi extended an invitation for President Trump to address a joint session of Congress on February 4, 2020;

Whereas, on February 4, 2020, President Trump delivered his State of the Union address, in which he honored the sacrifice of the following American heroes and their families:

General Charles McGee, one of the last surviving Tuskegee Airmen, who served in World War II, the Korean War, and the Vietnam War;

Kayla Mueller, a humanitarian aid worker who was caring for suffering civilians in Syria when she was kidnapped, tortured and enslaved by ISIS for over 500 days before being murdered by ISIS leader Abu Bakr al-Baghdadi;

Anny Staff Sergeant Christopher Hake, who was killed while serving his second tour of duty in Iraq by a roadside bomb supplied by Iranian terrorist leader Qasern Soleimani; and

Sergeant First Class Townsend Williams, who is currently serving his fourth deployment in the Middle East and his wife Amy, who works full time for the Army and devotes hundreds of hours helping military families;

Whereas immediately following the address, while still presiding over the joint session, Speaker Pelosi ripped up an official copy of the President’s remarks, which contained the names and stories of these patriots who sacrificed so much for our country; and

Whereas the conduct of Speaker Pelosi was a breach of decorum and degraded the proceedings of the joint session, to the discredit of the House: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives disapproves of the behavior of Speaker Pelosi during the joint session of Congress held on February 4, 2020.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The resolution qualifies.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. LEWIS (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o’clock and 26 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, February 10, 2020, at noon for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker’s table and referred as follows:

3749. A letter from the Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation’s final rule — Removal of Transferred OTS Regulations Regarding Accounting Requirements for State Savings Associations (RIN: 3064-AF15) received February 5, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law

104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3750. A letter from the Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation’s final rule — Removal of Transferred OTS Regulations Regarding Regulatory Reporting Requirements, Reports and Audits of State Savings Associations (RIN: 3064-AF13) received February 5, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3751. A letter from the Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation’s final rule — Removal of Transferred OTS Regulations Regarding Certain Regulations for the Operations of State Savings Associations and Conforming Amendments to Other Regulations (RIN: 3064-AF14) received February 5, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3752. A letter from the Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation’s final rule — Standardized Approach for Calculating the Exposure Amount of Derivative Contracts (RIN: 3064-AE80) received February 5, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3753. A letter from the Acting Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Office of Community Planning and Development, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Conforming the Acceptable Separation Distance (ASD) Standards for Residential Propane Tanks to Industry Standards [Docket No.: FR-6054-F-02] (RIN: 2506-AC45) received February 5, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3754. A letter from the Senior Legal Advisor for Regulatory Affairs, Office of Investment Security, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department’s Major final rule — Provisions Pertaining to Certain Transactions by Foreign Persons Involving Real Estate in the United States (RIN: 1505-AC63) received February 5, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3755. A letter from the Deputy Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation’s final rule — Benefits Payable in Terminated Single Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Paying Benefits received February 5, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

3756. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Commission’s final rule — Adjustments to Civil Penalty Amounts received February 5, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3757. A letter from the Director, Regulations and Disclosure Law Division, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Import Restrictions Imposed on Archaeological Material from Jordan [CBP Dec. 20-02] (RIN: 1515-AE51) received February 5, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

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. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania (for himself and Mr. PETERSON):

H.R. 5799. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act with respect to normal farming activities and to require the Corps of Engineers and the Environmental Protection Agency to apply certain decisions of the Secretary of Agriculture when enforcing such Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia (for himself and Ms. FOXX of North Carolina):

H.R. 5800. A bill to end surprise medical billing and increase transparency in health coverage; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Education and Labor, Ways and Means, and Oversight and Reform, 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. JOHNSON of Georgia (for himself, Mr. NADLER, Ms. DEAN, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. COHEN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RUSH, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, and Mr. ESPAILLAT):

H.R. 5801. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to establish a procedure for remand of a civil action that has been removed before service on a forum defendant, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORREA (for himself and Mr. KATKO):

H.R. 5802. A bill to require an assessment of the policies, procedures, and practices of the Transportation Security Administration regarding Administration personnel who are parents or guardians of a dependent minor with child care needs or who are expectant parents or guardians of a dependent minor with child care needs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 5803. A bill to provide for the admission of the State of Washington, D.C. into the Union; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform, and in addition to the Committees on Rules, Armed Services, the Judiciary, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CRENSHAW (for himself, Mrs. DEMINGS, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, and Mr. ROGERS of Alabama):

H.R. 5804. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to enhance the Blue Campaign of the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security, 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. COSTA (for himself, Mr. COX of California, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. SOTO, Mr. CRIST, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. CORREA, and Mr. GARAMENDI):

H.R. 5805. A bill to reauthorize the high-speed rail corridor development program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. LEWIS (for himself, Ms. LEE of California, and Ms. WILSON of Florida):

H.R. 5806. A bill to amend title VII of the Public Health Service Act to provide for a loan repayment program for the HIV clinical and dental workforce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut (for himself and Mr. WENSTRUP):

H.R. 5807. A bill to amend title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act, the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, and title XI of the Social Security Act to improve the availability and accuracy of provider directory information made available by group health plans and health insurance issuers offering group or individuals health insurance coverage; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ARRINGTON (for himself and Mr. CUELLAR):

H.R. 5808. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage of rural emergency medical access services under the Medicare program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BEYER (for himself and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 5809. A bill to amend title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act, the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, and the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to require group health plans and health insurance issuers to include certain information on any health insurance membership card issued by such plan or issuer; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself, Mr. COLE, Ms. SCHRIER, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. HIMES, and Ms. STEFANIK):

H.R. 5810. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to improve the American History for Freedom grant program; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KATKO (for himself and Mr. CORREA):

H.R. 5811. A bill to require the Transportation Security Administration to provide nursing facilities and paid parental leave for Administration personnel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. LARSEN of Washington (for himself, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. KILMER, Ms. JAYAPAL, and Ms. SCHRIER):

H.R. 5812. A bill to require the Secretary of Transportation to set aside certain amounts provided under the BUILD program for rural areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. MENG (for herself, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Mr. LOWENTHAL):

H.R. 5813. A bill to provide direct appropriations for certain housing programs, and

for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Ms. MENG (for herself, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. COX of California, Ms. OMAR, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. COSTA, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 5814. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to repeal the public charge ground of deportability, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. MENG:

H.R. 5815. A bill to adjust the amount of monthly old-age, survivors, and disability insurance payments under title II of the Social Security Act based on locality-based comparability payment rates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. MOORE (for herself and Mr. SCHWEIKERT):

H.R. 5816. A bill to amend title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act, the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, and title XI of the Social Security Act to require group health plans and health insurance issuers to provide for certain coverage in the case of a change in a provider's network status, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. NUNES (for himself and Mr. PASCRELL):

H.R. 5817. A bill to amend title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act, the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, and the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to require health plans to provide to participants, beneficiaries, and enrollees an advanced explanation of benefits with respect to items and services scheduled to be received from providers and facilities and to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to require health care providers and health care facilities to provide good faith estimates of the expected charges for furnishing such items and services; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PERLMUTTER (for himself and Mr. LONG):

H.R. 5818. A bill to provide clarification regarding the common or usual name for bison and compliance with section 403 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. POCAN, Mr. RUPERSBERGER, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. MCNERNEY):

H.R. 5819. A bill to amend title IV of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to require the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, in the case of airline pilots who are required by regulation to retire at age 60, to compute the actuarial value of monthly benefits in the form of a life annuity commencing at age 60; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SAN NICOLAS (for himself and Mr. SABLAN):

H.R. 5820. A bill to permit the territories of the United States to provide and furnish

statues for placement in the national statutory hall; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. COURTNEY (for himself, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. HIMES, and Mrs. HAYES):

H. Res. 838. A resolution commemorating the 10th anniversary of the Kleen Energy Systems natural gas explosion; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. SHERRILL (for herself and Mr. MARSHALL):

H. Res. 839. A resolution recognizing the 150th anniversary of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's National Weather Service; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. CARSON of Indiana (for himself, Mr. HUDSON, Mrs. AXNE, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. MALINOWSKI, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. VISCLOSKEY):

H. Res. 840. A resolution expressing support for the designation of the last day of February each year as "Rare Disease Day"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PANETTA (for himself, Mr. BACON, Mr. CISNEROS, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. HUDSON, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. MALINOWSKI, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. POSEY, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. SUOZZI, and Mr. SWALWELL of California):

H. Res. 841. A resolution supporting the recognition and observation of April as "International Parental Child Abduction Month" to raise awareness of, and opposition to, international parental child abduction; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

159. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Michigan, relative to House Resolution No. 157, to memorialize the President and Congress of the United States to increase funding for the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative to \$475 million per year; which was referred to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

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. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania:
H.R. 5799.

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

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution which gives Congress the power "to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several states, and within the Indian Tribes."

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia:

H.R. 5800.

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

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

By Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia:

H.R. 5801.

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

Article One, Section Eight

By Mr. CORREA:

H.R. 5802.

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

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

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 5803.

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

clause I of section 3 of article IV of the Constitution; clause 17 of section 8 of article I.

By Mr. CRENSHAW:

H.R. 5804.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: "To regulate Commerce . . . among the several States"

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: "To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers"

By Mr. COSTA:

H.R. 5805.

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

under Article I Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. LEWIS:

H.R. 5806.

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

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut:

H.R. 5807.

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

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution and Amendment XVI of the United States Constitution."

By Mr. ARRINGTON:

H.R. 5808.

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

Article I Section 8

"Congress shall have power to . . . provide for the general welfare of the United States"

By Mr. BEYER:

H.R. 5809.

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

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 5810.

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

Article II, Section 8

By Mr. KATKO:

H.R. 5811.

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

Article 1 Section 8—The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States

By Mr. LARSEN of Washington:

H.R. 5812.

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

Article 1, Section 1, All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

By Ms. MENG:

H.R. 5813.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution

By Ms. MENG:

H.R. 5814.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution

By Ms. MENG:

H.R. 5815.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution

By Ms. MOORE:

H.R. 5816.

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

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution and Amendment XVI of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. NUNES:

H. R. 5817.

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

Clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. PERLMUTTER:

H.R. 5818.

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

Article 1 Section 8

By Mr. PETERS:

H.R. 5819.

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

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. SAN NICOLAS:

H.R. 5820.

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

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the Constitution, Congress's authority to make rules and regulations respecting the Territories and possessions.

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution, Congress's authority to make laws necessary and proper for carrying into execution all other powers vested

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 141: Mr. DELGADO.

H.R. 372: Mrs. DINGELL.

H.R. 444: Mr. VELA.

H.R. 566: Mr. HARDER of California.

H.R. 686: Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 865: Mr. VAN DREW.

H.R. 906: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. TIPTON, and Mr. TED LIEU of California.

H.R. 969: Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. TIMMONS, and Mr. LUCAS.

H.R. 1043: Mr. HAGEDORN and Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.

H.R. 1097: Mr. NEGUSE.

H.R. 1139: Mr. MCADAMS.

H.R. 1337: Ms. BARRAGAN and Ms. SÁNCHEZ.

H.R. 1379: Mr. DOGGETT.

H.R. 1400: Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. SWALWELL of California, and Mr. LAMB.

H.R. 1444: Ms. STEFANIK.

H.R. 1521: Mr. COSTA, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. JAYAPAL, and Ms. ESCOBAR.

H.R. 1530: Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana.

H.R. 1533: Mr. MEEKS and Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 1692: Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 1705: Mr. TED LIEU of California.

- H.R. 1711: Mr. MOULTON.
H.R. 1715: Mr. SUOZZI.
H.R. 1766: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.
H.R. 2150: Mr. HAGEDORN.
H.R. 2166: Mr. HECK, Mr. HARDER of California, and Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.
H.R. 2201: Mr. KIND.
H.R. 2214: Mr. LYNCH.
H.R. 2279: Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. WALTZ, and Mr. PAPPAS.
H.R. 2350: Mrs. MILLER.
H.R. 2420: Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. COOK, Mr. STEWART, and Mr. RUTHERFORD.
H.R. 2477: Mr. KILMER, Mr. RUPPERS-BERGER, and Mr. PAPPAS.
H.R. 2498: Mr. CASTEN of Illinois.
H.R. 2571: Mr. BYRNE.
H.R. 2581: Mr. LEVIN of Michigan.
H.R. 2633: Mr. CASE.
H.R. 2639: Mr. TAKANO, Mr. ALLRED, Mr. MORELLE, and Ms. UNDERWOOD.
H.R. 2678: Mr. DEFazio.
H.R. 2694: Mrs. RODGERS of Washington.
H.R. 2697: Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H.R. 2708: Ms. JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 2720: Ms. BASS.
H.R. 2747: Mr. STANTON.
H.R. 2815: Mr. KILMER, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas.
H.R. 2847: Mr. HECK.
H.R. 2851: Ms. WILD.
H.R. 3107: Mr. WOMACK and Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 3114: Mr. MALINOWSKI and Mrs. TORRES of California.
H.R. 3252: Ms. WEXTON and Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 3473: Mr. CLEAVER.
H.R. 3553: Ms. TITUS.
H.R. 3570: Mr. STANTON.
H.R. 3598: Mr. TIPTON.
H.R. 3668: Mrs. MURPHY of Florida.
H.R. 3714: Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 3771: Mr. HAGEDORN.
H.R. 3794: Mr. RUTHERFORD.
H.R. 3798: Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ.
H.R. 3879: Mr. TIPTON.
H.R. 3964: Mr. HICE of Georgia, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. NORMAN, and Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania.
- H.R. 3969: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 4019: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 4059: Mr. COOK.
H.R. 4117: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.
H.R. 4138: Mr. CURTIS and Mr. NEWHOUSE.
H.R. 4140: Mr. VEASEY, Ms. MOORE, and Mr. HURD of Texas.
H.R. 4145: Mr. MALINOWSKI.
H.R. 4180: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. TIPTON, and Mr. DIAZ-BALART.
H.R. 4189: Mrs. RODGERS of Washington and Mr. HECK.
H.R. 4220: Mr. HASTINGS.
H.R. 4339: Mr. CROW.
H.R. 4348: Ms. PINGREE.
H.R. 4555: Mrs. DINGELL.
H.R. 4574: Ms. LOFGREN and Ms. CRAIG.
H.R. 4701: Ms. OMAR.
H.R. 4729: Ms. KAPTUR and Ms. GARCIA of Texas.
H.R. 4764: Mr. CASTEN of Illinois.
H.R. 4801: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. YARMUTH, and Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 4974: Mr. COX of California.
H.R. 4985: Ms. DEAN.
H.R. 5002: Mr. TAYLOR and Mr. RATCLIFFE.
H.R. 5164: Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. TAKANO, and Mr. KHANNA.
H.R. 5187: Mr. CLAY, Ms. PRESSLEY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. NADLER, Ms. SCANLON, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.
H.R. 5204: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.
H.R. 5212: Mr. LAHOOD.
H.R. 5229: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 5248: Mr. CARSON of Indiana and Mr. RIGGLEMAN.
H.R. 5297: Mr. NEWHOUSE and Ms. FINKENAUER.
H.R. 5319: Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma.
H.R. 5351: Mr. BACON.
H.R. 5405: Mr. GALLEGO and Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 5426: Mr. PAYNE and Mr. MALINOWSKI.
H.R. 5435: Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois and Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 5491: Mr. BANKS.
H.R. 5507: Mr. UPTON.
H.R. 5531: Mr. GRIJALVA.
- H.R. 5536: Mr. MARSHALL.
H.R. 5549: Mr. HECK and Mrs. DAVIS of California.
H.R. 5554: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Mr. KENNEDY.
H.R. 5581: Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 5596: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. KELLER, and Mr. RIGGLEMAN.
H.R. 5602: Mr. KILMER, Ms. CRAIG, Mr. ROUDA, and Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 5605: Mr. KELLER.
H.R. 5610: Mrs. BUSTOS and Ms. WILD.
H.R. 5628: Mr. SOTO and Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.
H.R. 5697: Mr. MALINOWSKI.
H.R. 5700: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 5702: Mr. LAMALFA and Mr. MEADOWS.
H.R. 5703: Mrs. DINGELL.
H.R. 5707: Mr. LATTA, Mr. EMMER, and Mrs. WAGNER.
H.R. 5751: Mr. KENNEDY.
H.R. 5755: Mr. LEVIN of California.
H.R. 5767: Mr. TRONE.
H.R. 5778: Ms. PRESSLEY.
H.J. Res. 48: Mr. NADLER and Ms. WATERS.
H. Con. Res. 10: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.
H. Con. Res. 52: Mrs. LAWRENCE.
H. Res. 374: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. LAMBORN, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, and Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H. Res. 454: Mr. VELA.
H. Res. 495: Mr. PASCRELL.
H. Res. 641: Ms. MENG.
H. Res. 672: Mr. MALINOWSKI.
H. Res. 751: Mr. RUSH, Ms. MOORE, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. COSTA, Mr. COLE, Ms. NORTON, Ms. LEE of California, and Ms. OMAR.
H. Res. 791: Mr. CRENSHAW.
H. Res. 815: Mr. COSTA and Mr. BACON.
H. Res. 822: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H. Res. 825: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H. Res. 830: Mr. CLAY, Mr. ESTES, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. WATKINS, and Mrs. WAGNER.
H. Res. 836: Mr. OLSON, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, and Mrs. HARTZLER.