

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

There was no objection.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 91

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring).*

**SECTION 1. USE OF EMANCIPATION HALL FOR CEREMONY TO PRESENT CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL TO CHINESE-AMERICAN VETERANS OF WORLD WAR II.**

(a) AUTHORIZATION.—Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center is authorized to be used on April 29, 2020, for a ceremony to present the Congressional Gold Medal collectively to the Chinese-American veterans of World War II, in recognition of their dedicated service during World War II.

(b) PREPARATIONS.—Physical preparations for the conduct of the ceremony described in subsection (a) shall be carried out in accordance with such conditions as the Architect of the Capitol may prescribe.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**AUTHORIZING THE USE OF EMANCIPATION HALL FOR A CEREMONY AS PART OF THE COMMEMORATION OF THE DAYS OF REMEMBRANCE OF VICTIMS OF THE HOLOCAUST**

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on House Administration be discharged from further consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 87, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 87

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring).* That Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center is authorized to be used on April 21, 2020, for a ceremony as part of the commemoration of the days of remembrance of victims of the Holocaust. Physical preparations for the ceremony shall be carried out in accordance with such conditions as the Architect of the Capitol may prescribe.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**RIGHTS FOR TRANSPORTATION SECURITY OFFICERS ACT OF 2020**

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on this measure.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 877 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. 1140.

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

□ 1351

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. 1140) to enhance the security operations of the Transportation Security Administration and stability of the transportation security workforce by applying the personnel system under title 5, United States Code, to employees of the Transportation Security Administration who provide screening of all passengers and property, and for other purposes, with Mr. CUELLAR in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read 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 the ranking minority member of the Committee on Homeland Security.

The gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON) and the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ROGERS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1140, the Rights for Transportation Security Officers Act of 2020.

For well over a decade, Chairwoman NITA LOWEY and I have championed this legislation to provide TSA frontline security workers the basic rights and benefits they deserve.

Today, H.R. 1140 has 242 bipartisan cosponsors and is strongly supported by the American Federation of Government Employees and the Transport Workers Union of America.

When TSA was stood up after the September 11 attacks, Congress gave the agency broad authority to develop a new, more nimble personnel system to address national security issues that threatened our transportation system.

Over the years, TSA's security policies, technologies, and capabilities have evolved to provide a formidable defense against potential terrorist attacks.

Unfortunately, TSA's personnel management system has not evolved with the rest of the agency. The modern, nimble system Congress envisioned was never realized.

Instead, Transportation Security officers, or TSOs, are subject to an antiquated system that does not provide

appropriate pay, regular salary increases, or basic civil service protections.

Further, an employee subject to a disciplinary action does not have the right to appeal to an independent third party, such as the Merit Systems Protection Board. Today, the TSA Administrator serves as judge, jury, and executioner for disciplinary proceedings.

According to a former TSA Deputy Administrator, the lack of due process protections within TSA has bred a culture of retribution and arbitrary personnel practices, leading to misbehavior and a reluctance to report security vulnerabilities.

When TSA leadership has used its special personnel authorities, it has been mostly to benefit senior management, not the frontline workforce.

In one instance, a senior manager received \$90,000 in bonuses in a single year, yet the men and women in the screening workforce make starting salaries of just \$29,000 and are among the lowest paid Federal workers. They are forced to live paycheck to paycheck even as their job responsibilities have grown increasingly complex with changes in threats and technologies.

Today, few TSOs have advanced beyond the bottom levels of TSA's pay bands, even after years of service.

Under the Obama administration, the frontline TSA workforce was, for the first time, granted the ability to unionize. Many of us hoped that this change would lead to TSA abandoning unfair practices.

Disappointingly, TSA limited the range of issues subject to collective bargaining to a narrow set of issues that, over time, have been repeatedly scaled back.

TSA struggles with low morale and high attrition, consistently ranking near the bottom of the annual "Best Places to Work" survey. In fact, this year, TSA ranked 415th out of 415 agency components—dead last—on pay satisfaction.

Low morale and high attrition have had an adverse impact on the agency, crippling TSA's ability to develop a mature workforce. According to the DHS inspector general, over a 2-year span in 2016 and 2017, one in three Transportation Security officers quit.

As Members of Congress, many of us fly two or three times a week. We probably see and interact with Transportation Security officers more than any other Federal employees. We know them.

How can we ask these brave men and women to protect us from terrorist attacks, yet not provide them with the basic protections most Federal employees receive?

This bill will place TSA under title 5 like most other Federal agencies, granting the workforce better pay and regular salary increases.

Employees would have robust collective bargaining rights like other Federal employees, such as Customs and Border Protection officers in the Department of Homeland Security. And

in instances when an employee feels they have been unfairly disciplined, they could have their case considered by an independent party like other Federal employees.

Importantly, TSA's management would still be able to remove screeners from duty if their presence jeopardizes the mission of the agency, and security procedures would not be subject to collective bargaining.

While investing in the workforce will have an up-front cost, it will pay off in the long run. The DHS inspector general found that, in 2017 alone, TSA spent approximately \$16 million to hire and train nearly 2,000 people who left within months of being hired. That level of turnover is not sustainable.

Enactment of H.R. 1140 will reduce attrition, improve morale, and position TSA to have a more experienced workforce with the proficiency needed to execute TSA's national security mission.

Mr. Chair, I thank my colleagues for their support on this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1400

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 1140.

After the terror attacks of 9/11, Congress recognized that, in order for TSA to successfully carry out its critical mission, it had to accommodate the agency's unique operational needs. That is why, when Congress passed the Aviation and Transportation Security Act, we gave TSA one-of-a-kind authorities to respond to evolving threats.

TSA has used these authorities over time to remain flexible and accountable to the needs of a diverse transportation system where each airport faces a unique threat landscape. These flexibilities are key to keeping the public safe. That is why I am very concerned about the impact this bill will have on the security of our aviation system.

By moving the screener workforce under title V, this bill would eliminate many of those critical flexibilities. For example, current law allows for the immediate termination of employees who intentionally allow guns, knives, or explosives through a checkpoint. Under this bill, that employee could remain on the TSA payroll for months, or even longer.

Current law allows TSA to set new security requirements, such as enhanced passenger screening, when intelligence indicates credible threats. How new security requirements are implemented could be subject to negotiation if the union bill were to become law.

Right now, TSA has the flexibility to move screener checkpoints to alleviate long lines and ensure security. The legislation before us restricts that flexibility.

In addition to the impact on security, I am concerned with how the bill

proposes to transition the screener workforce. I don't think it is fair for Congress to dictate which union gets to represent 45,000 screeners, but that is just what this bill does. The bill sets into law the exclusive bargaining agent for the screeners and requires TSA to immediately negotiate with them.

Under this bill, there is no intervening union election. Screeners never get a chance to exercise their constitutional right to choose their representation. I think that is wrong.

Beyond the consequences for aviation security and the fundamental questions of fairness, this bill does little to improve the pay and working conditions for screeners. In fact, TSA screeners will lose benefits under this proposal.

If this bill becomes law, screeners will lose the ability to trade shifts with one another or donate accrued leave to their fellow workers. Certain pay overtime would be prohibited. Career milestone bonuses would no longer be offered. Many veterans would no longer qualify for hiring preferences.

The Congressional Budget Office estimates that this bill will cost \$1.8 billion over 5 years. That is a 20 percent increase over TSA's current budget. That is a tremendous cost for so little return.

In May 2019, a blue-ribbon panel led by Clinton and Obama administration human capital experts strongly argued against moving screeners under title V as this bill would do. That panel rightly pointed out that, under current law, TSA can pay screeners more than they would make under title V.

That is the real irony with this bill. It purports to improve pay and benefits for screeners, but, under current law, screeners could be paid more and receive better benefits than this bill would allow.

I have long advocated for increased pay for the screener workforce, and I agree with the blue-ribbon panel that TSA should build a pay system superior to that of the GS schedule. The problem has always been funding.

Past administrations have requested funding for increased screener pay, and past Congresses have not provided it. Fortunately, the President's fiscal year 2021 budget requests an increase in funding to provide raises and bonuses for screeners.

If the majority truly wants to fix the problem, they should work with us on a bill to fund these pay raises and implement the recommendations of the bipartisan blue-ribbon panel. That is the bill we should have on the floor today. Instead, they have, yet again, decided to move a partisan messaging bill that rewards their political supporters. This time it comes at the expense of taxpayers and security.

Like the rest of them, this partisan messaging bill will never become law. The Senate won't take it up. The President said he would veto it. It is a waste of time.

At some point, I hope the majority rejects this partisan approach to legis-

lating and works with us on our Nation's priorities.

Mr. Chair, I urge all Members to vote "no," and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), who has championed this issue from day one.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1140, the Rights for Transportation Security Officers Act of 2020. Chairman THOMPSON and I have worked on this bill for a very long time, and I am glad the House is considering it today.

H.R. 1140 would give TSA's screening workforce the same rights afforded to other Federal workers under title V, like fair pay under the General Schedule pay scale, sick leave according to OPM guidelines, and collective bargaining rights.

Our TSOs have earned these rights. TSOs serve on the front lines of aviation security and protect the traveling public on a daily basis. It is unreasonable to deny these hardworking men and women who keep us safe the basic protections of Federal civil service.

We must pass this bill today to send a clear message to TSA from Congress that a system denying TSOs predictability and consistency is unacceptable. H.R. 1140 would improve the morale and stability of our screening workforce and help ensure safety at our Nation's airports.

I urge a "yes" vote.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO), the chair of the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As a little bit of history, the gentleman from Alabama wasn't here when we created the Transportation Security Administration. It was created in the Aviation Subcommittee of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee. I was the ranking member; John Mica was the chair. The provisions he referenced were not intended to oppress the workforce.

Before 9/11, all of the securities were provided by the airlines, and they never met a low bidder they didn't like. We had people who were felons and people who were in the country illegally who were doing the screening.

By the way, it was the lowest entry-level job in the airport, and we had testimony from the Screener of the Year, once, who said: Hey, you know, people just move through these jobs because they got to go to McDonald's. They'll do better.

Now, we aren't treating these professionals much better than that. They are the lowest paid Federal employees, providing security to the billion people who flew last year. They worked through the shutdown with no pay.

They don't earn much money, so they don't have a lot of savings, but they worked through the shutdown.

These people deserve not only a pay raise, but they also deserve workers' rights and whistleblower protections from abusive management.

The gentleman expressed concern about \$1.8 billion over 10 years. Well, join me on my FASTER bill; that is, this administration is diverting \$2 billion a year in passenger security fees. Passengers pay the fee. It is supposed to provide security. No, it is going into the maw of the Federal Government and being spent somewhere else. Reclaim that money.

Don't worry about the stupid scoring stuff. Oh, it is making the deficit look smaller. Whatever. We are charging passengers for security. Give them the security. Give these workers a pay raise, and give them decent workers' rights and protections.

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

Mr. Chair, I would point out to my colleague from Oregon that the \$1.8 billion was over 5 years, not 10 years. The screening fee that the gentleman was referring to was diverted under the Obama administration to general deficit relief.

But the fact is I agree fully with Chairman THOMPSON that we should be paying our screeners more. It is our fault. Congress has not funded the ability of TSA to raise their pay.

The irony of this bill is it would make it harder to pay them more; it would pay them less. If we would fund the TSA for what they are requesting, current law would allow them to have better incomes and better benefits than this bill would allow. That is the real irony here.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CORREA), chair of the House Homeland Security Committee's Subcommittee on Transportation and Maritime Security.

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 1140, the Rights for Transportation Security Officers Act.

Mr. Chair, I want to thank, again, Chairman THOMPSON for his leadership on this issue and bringing this bipartisan piece of legislation to the floor that I am cosponsoring.

Today, finally, we acknowledge that the TSA workers deserve a pay structure and personnel management system that recognizes their value. These employees have had a higher turnover than the average Federal employee, and, in fact, many went unpaid during the government shutdown.

These hardworking men and women are effectively the thin blue line that stands between us and our families while they are traveling by air and those who would do us harm by smuggling items onto planes through checkpoints. That is what a TSA officer does: protect us and our families.

We need to have professional TSA employees. We need to make sure that they are the best of the best. Our family's safety is worth it.

As chairman of the Transportation and Maritime Security Subcommittee, I am proud to stand with these men and women of TSA in strong support of this legislation, and I urge all of my colleagues to vote "aye."

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

Mr. Chair, I appreciate my friend and colleague from California's observation, but, again, I emphasize about the union representation.

The gentleman just made the statement and reiterated what the chairman had said in his opening statement, and that is there has been enormous turnover in the TSA over the last decade because of the poor pay, benefits, and working circumstances.

The fact is that very few people who work at TSA today voted for AFGE to be the union. It won by plurality—not a majority—10 years ago, and very few people who were there then are here now.

So, if, in fact, this bill were ever to become law—which it is not—at a minimum, we should allow the workers to decide who they want their representation to be. AFGE may win it, but it is wrong for Congress to dictate to 45,000 employees who they should have for representation.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, just for the record, nothing in H.R. 1140 restricts the workforce's ability to elect union representation. I want to be very clear on that.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Mississippi for yielding.

I want to thank the gentleman from Mississippi for his wisdom in putting forward a bill that is long overdue, and that is H.R. 1140, which is the Rights for Transportation Security Officers Act of 2020.

Let me congratulate the storied organization AFGE. They have a stellar reputation for fairly representing government workers in a way that provides them a better quality of life. I am not sure why they have become the issue on this floor, and our chairman has just indicated that there is no such language that limits any actions by our TSO officers.

Let me be very clear: Starting with the TSO and Homeland Security from the very beginning, this organizing was done for purposes of emergency. So now you have denied, for over 20 years, the rights of these individuals to live a decent life.

I take issue with this one example of an individual who, obviously, was not managed, because we all know that a man does not examine a female pas-

senger, period, or traveler. We know that doesn't happen.

So a bad apple does not reflect on the fact that these workers need better rights, grievances, higher pay, professional development, and to be treated in the civil system such that we will develop a professional workforce that stays, that has a high morale and not a low morale.

□ 1415

Are we doing this to the FBI, the Defense Department, and ATF?

Are we telling them that at any moment they can be fired without due process?

This doesn't make sense. These people have put their life on the line. They have stopped so much that you do not even know protecting the traveling public.

Mr. Chairman, if you take a moment to talk with them, you will find out the massive number of weapons and other types of items that they have to be astute enough and keen enough to know what to do with.

I support the TSA. I support TSOs because I see them every day as the front line for this Nation in providing a safe and secure aviation system.

Yes, their job is difficult and deadly. We lost a gentleman in Los Angeles, and we all surrounded his family, he died in the line of duty.

I believe this is an important legislative initiative. Let us take this and finally give to these workers the decency that they deserve. Let us not make excuses. Let us make it right, and let us stand with them as American workers and defenders of the security and freedom of this Nation. Support H.R. 1140.

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

Mr. Chairman, in response to my friend and colleague from Mississippi, who, in his last statements, emphasized that the employees at TSA would have the right to elect their union representation, I would refer him to page 9, line 24 of his bill, "Exclusive Representative—The labor organization certified by the Federal Labor Relations Authority on June 29, 2011, or successor labor organization shall be treated as the exclusive representative of full- and part-time nonsupervisory TSA personnel carrying out screening functions under section 44901" et cetera, et cetera, et cetera.

This bill does pick winners and losers and, in this case, AFGE is the winner. I am just saying, I don't think that is right.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume to say that I appreciate my colleague next door to me citing the section about Federal Labor Relations Authority because that is my reference.

It says, "or successor labor organization." And it says in the "Sunset Provision—The provisions of this section

shall cease to be effective as of the conversion date."

So there are options available. It is not a closed-door process, and we wouldn't have it that way anyway.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. TITUS).

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank our chairman for bringing this bill and his leadership on this issue.

I have the honor of representing Nevada's First Congressional District in the heart of Las Vegas. Every week, as I travel to and from Las Vegas through McCarran International Airport—just like more than 50 million travelers do each year—I see our TSA employees very hard at work screening passengers, baggage, and cargo. They play a critical role in allowing Las Vegas to be a truly international city with an economy that thrives on tourism and visitors who come to work, hike, and play.

More broadly, Transportation Security officers have the immense responsibility of making sure passengers from all over the world, on hundreds of flights a day, make it safely to their destinations, wherever they may be. Yet, Federal law prohibits them from collectively bargaining for better pay, better benefits, and better working conditions. This shortcoming has led to a high level of turnover at TSA which threatens our security.

It is time for that to change. That is why I strongly support this long overdue piece of legislation that will improve TSA agents' pay and boost their collective bargaining power, not to mention their morale.

So let's come together today to give them the rights that other Federal employees have and that they so rightly deserve. Let's respect them and give them this privilege so they can do what they do and keep us all safe. It is the least we can do to recognize that sacrifice.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly support this bill, and I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of it.

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

I would say to my friend from Nevada that the irony with this bill is they are moving TSA under a 70-year-old personnel management system widely panned by good government organizations as unable to meet the needs of the 21st century workforce.

So which system really is outdated?

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I think, for the record, we want our TSOs to be treated just like all other Federal employees. If it is good enough for everybody else except TSA, then it should be good for TSA too.

Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN).

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding to me, and I want to thank him for this leadership on this very important issue.

I join him in calling for support and passage of the Transportation Security Officers Act. We rely on Transportation Security officers to keep us safe. They work hard, including going without pay for more than 5 weeks during the last government shutdown. Yet these TSOs have none of the rights or the protections we have set for the rest of the Federal workforce, and that is what this bill would finally correct.

H.R. 1140 offers TSOs the ability to organize themselves and fight for better pay through collective bargaining and puts them on the Federal general schedule pay scale, ensuring they see the same regular step increases as the rest of the Federal workers who keep our government running.

It would ensure TSOs can appeal personnel decisions to a neutral third party—something their managers and others within TSA can already do. It would give these workers the paid family leave and medical leave that all other Federal workers now have, ensuring they can care for an ailing parent, be home with a new baby, or deal with a new diagnosis.

H.R. 1140 finally gives TSOs equal footing, recognizing that they are equally valued members of the Federal workforce—people we rely upon daily to keep our skies safe.

I am grateful to our chairman, Mr. THOMPSON, for his work to bring this bill through committee and for his tireless efforts of workplace rights and protections for TSOs.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the passage of this bill.

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

Mr. Chairman, the fact is, if we do treat the TSA officers the same as other employees by putting them in title 5, they will actually lose benefits. I talked about that in my opening statement.

Right now, they already get the same benefits like paid family leave, but they are going to lose the ability to have bonuses, get certain overtime pay, and trade shifts. Those are things that are valuable.

But the biggest problem I have is that we, as a Congress, have not funded the pay system they have now which would allow greater pay than title 5. I just think we need to stop shirking our duty and recognize it is our responsibility to pay these employees fairly. We have not been doing that, and this bill will accommodate that.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE).

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, first, let me commend the chairman of the Homeland Security Committee for this

timely piece of legislation, this long-time coming piece of legislation.

As has been stated, we fly home every week, and us being in Homeland Security, we interact with the TSOs on a regular basis. I don't know what is going on in the gentleman from Alabama's airports, but these officers are really first responders who stand in the gap of whether we fly or travel safely every single day.

They check thousands of bags for weapons that could be used to harm people flying or the pilots or the staff on airplanes, and we can't give them a dignified wage, a living wage?

I talk to them. Some of them have two jobs.

Why should someone with such an important duty to keep our airways safe from terrorists and harm have to leave there and go work at Burger King?

It is not right. I commend the gentleman from Mississippi once again for this.

These people need to be given the dignity that they deserve. They stand in the gap every single day, and not to pay them a commensurate salary with their job is criminal.

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

Mr. Chairman, my colleague from New Jersey is a great member of the Homeland Security Committee, and his heart is obviously in the right place. Everything he said I agree with about our TSA workforce. I travel through airports every week just like all the Members of this House.

The fact is, it pains me to know we are not treating them better. These are the people who came to work in the last government shutdown without pay throughout that shutdown to make sure that we remained safe as we flew back and forth.

We ought to be treating them better, and this bill doesn't do it. If we want to treat these people the way they should be treated, we should use current law and properly fund it and give them pay and benefits better than anything this bill would ever accommodate.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I have no more speakers, and I am prepared to close after the gentleman from Alabama closes.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I want to make Mr. THOMPSON aware that I have no further speakers and I am prepared to close.

Mr. Chairman, I want to close by thanking the men and women of TSA. The debate we are having today does not impact the sincere appreciation we have for the tremendous job they do each and every day. While we may disagree on the best way forward, I think we all share the same goal of improving screener pay and morale. We understand how important it is to the workforce and to our security.

Unfortunately, this bill would do little more than undermine the goal that we seek to achieve.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to oppose the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the arguments my colleagues have made in favor of this bill as well as the amendments offered to improve it. This is ultimately a simple bill with a simple but critical goal.

Following the September 11 attack, Congress determined that the need to ensure the security of our Nation's transportation systems required the creation of a new Federal agency, the TSA.

Yet, in standing up this critical national security agency, Congress mistakenly gave TSA broad personnel authority that has resulted in the workforce lagging far behind other Federal workers with respect to pay, benefits, and rights. By passing this bill, we will finish the job we started and make TSA a Federal agency that follows the laws Congress had constructed over many decades to govern treatment of Federal employees.

This is the right thing to do for the frontline workers, the right thing to do for the traveling public, and the right thing to do for our national security.

Mr. Chair, I thank my colleagues for their support, I urge passage of H.R. 1140, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Chair, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PAYNE) having assumed the chair, Mr. CUELLAR, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1140) to enhance the security operations of the Transportation Security Administration and stability of the transportation security workforce by applying the personnel system under title 5, United States Code, to employees of the Transportation Security Administration who provide screening of all passengers and property, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

#### CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO ZIMBABWE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 116-104)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days before the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13288 of March 6, 2003, with respect to the actions and policies of certain members of the Government of Zimbabwe and other persons to undermine Zimbabwe's democratic processes or institutions is to continue in effect beyond March 6, 2020.

In the wake of the resignation of former President Robert Mugabe in November 2017, Zimbabwe's national elections in July 2018, and President Mugabe's subsequent death in September 2019, Zimbabwe has had ample opportunity to implement reforms that could set the country on a constructive path, stabilize the southern African region, and open the door to greater cooperation with the United States. Unfortunately, President Emmerson Mnangagwa's administration has yet to signal credible political will to implement such reforms. Indeed, the Zimbabwean government has arguably accelerated its persecution of critics and economic mismanagement in the past year, during which security forces have conducted extrajudicial killings, rapes, and alleged abductions of numerous dissidents.

These actions and policies by certain members of the Government of Zimbabwe and other persons to undermine Zimbabwe's democratic processes or institutions continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the foreign policy of the United States. Therefore, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13288 with respect to Zimbabwe.

DONALD J. TRUMP.

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 4, 2020.

□ 1430

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. SCHRIER). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on the motion to suspend the rules if a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or if the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

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

#### CORONAVIRUS PREPAREDNESS AND RESPONSE SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2020

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 6074) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 6074

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

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Coronavirus Preparedness and Response Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2020".

#### SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

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—CORONAVIRUS PREPAREDNESS AND RESPONSE SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2020

The following sums are hereby 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 HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

##### FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and Expenses", \$61,000,000, to remain available until expended, to prevent, prepare for, and respond to coronavirus, domestically or internationally, including the development of necessary medical countermeasures and vaccines, advanced manufacturing for medical products, the monitoring of medical product supply chains, and related administrative activities: *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

##### SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

##### DISASTER LOANS PROGRAM ACCOUNT (INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for the "Disaster Loans Program Account" for administrative expenses to carry out the disaster loan program authorized by section 7(b) of the Small Business Act, \$20,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That such amounts may be transferred to and merged with "Small Business Administration—Salaries and Expenses": *Provided further*, That for purposes of section 7(b)(2)(D) of the Small Business Act, coronavirus shall be deemed to be a disaster and amounts available under "Disaster Loans Program Account" for the cost of direct loans in any fiscal year may be used to make economic injury disaster loans under such section in response to the coronavirus: *Provided further*, That none of the funds provided under this heading in this Act may be used for indirect administrative expenses: *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