



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 166

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MARCH 5, 2020

No. 44

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. KIM).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
March 5, 2020.

I hereby appoint the Honorable ANDY KIM to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

Reverend Kevin F. O'Brien, S.J., Santa Clara University, Santa Clara, California, offered the following prayer:

Loving God, creator of all, we thank You for the gift of another day, to live and to learn, to love and to serve.

As our Nation faces the impact of the coronavirus, we pray for the health of our people. Bless and inspire our medical professionals, our public health officials, and researchers in their fight against the virus. We pray for those who have died and those who are sick.

Bless the people of this House, those elected and those who support their work. Give them Your discerning wisdom as they go about their labors. Bless them with courage and determination to do the hard work of justice-building and peacemaking. Gift them with a spirit of solidarity and understanding to collaborate across differences to serve the common good. And help them to always listen to the most vulnerable and voiceless in our land.

May every prayer and work of ours today begin from You, dear Lord, and through You be happily ended.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. STANTON) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. STANTON 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.

WELCOMING REVEREND KEVIN F. O'BRIEN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, it is my great honor to note that Father Kevin O'Brien of the Society of Jesus was our guest this morning to deliver this morning's opening prayer for this House.

Father O'Brien joined our Silicon Valley community 4 years ago, and just last year he was named president of Santa Clara University. As an alum of Santa Clara University Law School myself, I am glad to see Father O'Brien focusing his presidency on college affordability and access, as well as fostering a culture of respect on campus.

Now a religious leader in Silicon Valley, Father O'Brien speaks of how disruption can lift people up instead of dividing people. Father O'Brien is dedicated to serving something larger than himself, which is a trait we deeply admire and value as Americans.

I am personally grateful to him for the leadership he has shown to standing up for Dreamers and those who are vulnerable in our community and across America.

It is my pleasure to welcome Father O'Brien to our Nation's Capital today and to thank him for his service to our community, our country, and to the University of Santa Clara.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

URGING THE SENATE TO ACT

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

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, over 275 bipartisan bills are piled up on MITCH MCCONNELL's desk because he refuses to bring them to the Senate floor for a vote.

Three of those bills are my bills, each of which passed the House with over 400 votes from Democrats and Republicans alike.

H.R. 95, the Homeless Veterans Families Act, will keep veterans and their families together and off the streets in safe and adequate housing.

H.R. 840, the Veterans' Access to Child Care Act, will ensure veterans have access to childcare to attend critical medical appointments.

And H.R. 3224, the Deborah Sampson Act, aims to address the inequities and barriers that women veterans face when accessing VA care and benefits.

I urge Majority Leader MCCONNELL to allow the Senate to vote so our veterans will have the support and care they have earned and deserve.

□ 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.

H1507

RECOGNIZING A WINNING WEEK-END IN SOUTH CAROLINA BASKETBALL

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, this was a winning weekend for basketball in South Carolina.

On Saturday, both the boys and girls Cardinal Newman High School basketball teams won their State titles, and this past Sunday, the University of South Carolina women's basketball team won the Southeastern Conference Championship. Both Cardinal Newman teams fought until the end to accomplish these impressive wins.

Congratulations to girls' coach Molly Moore and boys coach Philip Deter on their successful leadership. The Cardinal Newman girls won over Northwood, and the boys won against Trinity-Byrnes.

Congratulations to the University of South Carolina Women's Basketball Head Coach of the Year, Dawn Staley, on leading number one South Carolina to its program-record 23rd straight win. USC women have a perfect record of 16-0 in the Southeastern Conference this season.

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

Mark Levin is correct. Senator SCHUMER should be reprimanded for threatening bodily harm to Supreme Court Justices.

CONGRESS MUST LIFT UP LOCAL HEALTH OFFICIALS

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

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the House fulfilled a critical duty. We passed an emergency funding bill to address the coronavirus to make sure that we give public health officials across America the tools to help keep Americans healthy.

My State, Arizona, had the fifth confirmed case of COVID-19 and recently has another presumptive positive case.

Since the first U.S. case was identified, State and local public health officials have had to carry the heavy burden of responding to this outbreak and preventing it from getting worse.

Our local communities should not take this on alone. The spread of the deadly coronavirus demands a coordinated, comprehensive, government-wide response. In our emergency funding package, we specifically allocated almost \$1 billion to go directly to State and local communities.

In Arizona, our public health officials and our Governor have indicated a need for upwards of \$13 million to effectively meet the demand that the coronavirus outbreak merits. It is time we get our State and local agencies the support they need.

Congress must always do all that we can to lift up our local health officials, and our funding bill does exactly that.

CONGRESS MUST HONOR THEIR COMMITMENT TO VETERANS

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

Mr. COX of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Brain Injury Awareness Month.

Since 2014, over 470,000 veterans have been diagnosed with a TBI, a traumatic brain injury.

Last year, through appropriations, I submitted an amendment requesting a \$10 million increase to the Defense Health Program to fund research for all servicepersons returning home with a TBI. I am happy to report this amendment was passed into law.

In February of this year, the GAO released a report entitled "Veterans' Use of Long-Term Care is Increasing, and VA Faces Challenges in Meeting the Demand."

The brave people who serve this country should never find difficulty in locating a facility or a program that fits their needs.

This year, I ask my colleagues to support my request for further investment into research so the VA can develop TBI long-term care programs, so we can honor our commitment to those who have sacrificed so much for our country.

HONORING THE WOMEN OF THE UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

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

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the women of the United States House of Representatives for Women's History Month.

This Women's History Month marks the 100th year of women's suffrage in the United States.

While the first Congresswoman joined the House in 1917, the first woman of color didn't join our Chamber until Hawaii sent Patsy Mink to Washington in 1965. And the first African American Congresswoman didn't arrive until the unbossed and unbought Shirley Chisholm joined us in 1969.

Our colleague, NANCY PELOSI, became the first and only woman Speaker of the House in 2007.

In 2014, I will never forget, I was honored to be elected by the people of North Carolina's 12th District to serve as the 100th woman in the 113th Congress.

In 2018, a record 127 women were elected to Congress, with over 100 women in the House alone.

However, there is still work to be done. 127 out of 535 is just 24 percent, and that is not what our country looks like.

We need more women Members because, despite the fact that women have had the vote for 100 years, we still don't have equal justice under the law.

To this day, we are still paid less for our work, face workplace harassment, and are discriminated against simply because of being who we are. Women work full time, year-round still only making 82 cents on the dollar for the earnings men make.

Fighting against these disparities and ensuring our Federal Government and policies are reflective of the whole country is why having women in Congress is so important.

So, as we honor women's history, let's remember that all of us have not only the ability, but also the obligation to make history.

RECOGNIZING BARRIO STATION'S 50TH ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. VARGAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Barrio Station in recognition of the 50th anniversary of their creation.

Barrio Station is a community-based organization in the Barrio Logan community of San Diego, California. It was established in 1970 by Ms. Rachael Ortiz to provide underserved youths and their families with resources that they need to succeed.

This organization has continuously provided youth with access to individual counseling, referrals to vocational and higher education, and exposure to scholarships.

Barrio Station has worked toward revitalizing the community by pushing for the development of low-income housing and opportunities there.

Families and senior citizens are assisted with completing forms which give them access to the benefits that they have earned.

For over 50 years, Barrio Station has provided resources to approximately 3,500 youths, families, and seniors every year.

I thank Barrio Station and, especially, Director Rachael Ortiz, for their exceptional dedication to the youth and families of the 51st Congressional District and all of California.

RIGHTS FOR TRANSPORTATION SECURITY OFFICERS ACT OF 2020

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 further consideration of the bill, H.R. 1140.

Will the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BROWN) kindly take the chair.

□ 0915

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the

further consideration of the bill (H.R. 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. BROWN of Maryland (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, March 4, 2020, all time for general debate had expired.

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

The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Homeland Security, printed in the bill, shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as an original bill for purpose of further amendment under the 5-minute rule and shall be considered as read.

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

H.R. 1140

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 "Rights for Transportation Security Officers Act of 2020".

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

For purposes of this Act—

(1) the term "adjusted basic pay" means—

(A) the rate of pay fixed by law or administrative action for the position held by a covered employee before any deductions; and

(B) any regular, fixed supplemental payment for non-overtime hours of work creditable as basic pay for retirement purposes, including any applicable locality payment and any special rate supplement;

(2) the term "Administrator" means the Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration;

(3) the term "covered employee" means an employee who holds a covered position;

(4) the term "covered position" means a position within the Transportation Security Administration;

(5) the term "conversion date" means the date as of which paragraphs (1) through (4) of section 3(c) take effect;

(6) the term "2019 Determination" means the publication, entitled "Determination on Transportation Security Officers and Collective Bargaining", issued on July 13, 2019, by Administrator David P. Pekoske;

(7) the term "employee" has the meaning given such term by section 2105 of title 5, United States Code;

(8) the term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Homeland Security; and

(9) the term "TSA personnel management system" means any personnel management system established or modified under—

(A) section 111(d) of the Aviation and Transportation Security Act (49 U.S.C. 44935 note); or

(B) section 114(n) of title 49, United States Code.

SEC. 3. CONVERSION OF TSA PERSONNEL.

(a) RESTRICTIONS ON CERTAIN PERSONNEL AUTHORITIES.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, effective as of the date of the enactment of this Act—

(1) any TSA personnel management system in use for covered employees and covered positions

on the day before such date of enactment, and any TSA personnel management policy, letters, guideline, or directive in effect on such day may not be modified;

(2) no TSA personnel management policy, letter, guideline, or directive that was not established before such date issued pursuant to section 111(d) of the Aviation and Transportation Security Act (49 U.S.C. 44935 note) or section 114(n) of title 49, United States Code, may be established; and

(3) any authority to establish or adjust a human resources management system under chapter 97 of title 5, United States Code, shall terminate with respect to covered employees and covered positions.

(b) PERSONNEL AUTHORITIES DURING TRANSITION PERIOD.—Any TSA personnel management system in use for covered employees and covered positions on the day before the date of enactment of this Act and any TSA personnel management policy, letter, guideline, or directive in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act shall remain in effect until the effective date under subsection (c).

(c) TRANSITION TO GENERAL PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT SYSTEM APPLICABLE TO CIVIL SERVICE EMPLOYEES.—Effective as of the date determined by the Secretary, but in no event later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act—

(1) each provision of law cited in section 2(9) is repealed;

(2) any TSA personnel management policy, letter, guideline, and directive, including the 2019 Determination, shall cease to be effective;

(3) any human resources management system established or adjusted under chapter 97 of title 5, United States Code, with respect to covered employees or covered positions shall cease to be effective; and

(4) covered employees and covered positions shall be subject to the provisions of title 5, United States Code.

(d) SAFEGUARDS ON GRIEVANCES.—In carrying out this Act, the Secretary shall take such actions as are necessary to provide an opportunity to each covered employee with a grievance or disciplinary action (including an adverse action) pending within TSA on the date of enactment of this Act or at any time during the transition period described in subsection (c) to have such grievance removed to proceedings pursuant to title 5, United States Code, or continued within TSA.

SEC. 4. TRANSITION RULES.

(a) NONREDUCTION IN PAY AND COMPENSATION.—Under pay conversion rules as the Secretary may prescribe to carry out this Act, a covered employee converted from a TSA personnel management system to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, pursuant to section 2(c)(4) shall not be subject to any reduction in the rate of adjusted basic pay payable, or total compensation provided, to such covered employee.

(b) PRESERVATION OF OTHER RIGHTS.—In the case of each covered employee as of the conversion date, the Secretary shall take any actions necessary to ensure that—

(1) any annual leave, sick leave, or other paid leave accrued, accumulated, or otherwise available to a covered employee immediately before the conversion date shall remain available to the employee until used; and

(2) the Government share of any premiums or other periodic charges under chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code, governing group health insurance shall remain at least the same as was the case immediately before the conversion date.

SEC. 5. CONSULTATION REQUIREMENT.

(a) 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 non-supervisory TSA personnel carrying out screen-

ing functions under section 44901 of title 49, United States Code, and shall be the exclusive representative for such personnel under chapter 71 of title 5, United States Code, with full rights under such chapter. Any collective bargaining agreement covering such personnel on the date of enactment of this Act shall remain in effect, consistent with subsection (d).

(b) CONSULTATION RIGHTS.—Not later than 7 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall consult with the exclusive representative for the personnel described in subsection (a) under chapter 71 of title 5, United States Code, on the formulation of plans and deadlines to carry out the conversion of covered employees and covered positions under this Act. Prior to the conversion date, the Secretary shall provide (in writing) to such exclusive representative the plans for how the Secretary intends to carry out the conversion of covered employees and covered positions under this Act, including with respect to such matters as—

(1) the anticipated conversion date; and

(2) measures to ensure compliance with sections 3 and 4.

(c) REQUIRED AGENCY RESPONSE.—If any views or recommendations are presented under subsection (b) by the exclusive representative, the Secretary shall consider the views or recommendations before taking final action on any matter with respect to which the views or recommendations are presented and provide the exclusive representative a written statement of the reasons for the final actions to be taken.

(d) SUNSET PROVISION.—The provisions of this section shall cease to be effective as of the conversion date.

SEC. 6. NO RIGHT TO STRIKE.

Nothing in this Act shall be considered—

(1) to repeal or otherwise affect—

(A) section 1918 of title 18, United States Code (relating to disloyalty and asserting the right to strike against the Government); or

(B) section 7311 of title 5, United States Code (relating to loyalty and striking); or

(2) to otherwise authorize any activity which is not permitted under either provision of law cited in paragraph (1).

The Acting CHAIR. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in House Report 116-411.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF ALABAMA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 116-411.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, as the designee of the gentlewoman from Puerto Rico (Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN), I rise to offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of section 4, add the following:

(c) GAO STUDY ON TSA PAY RATES.—Not later than the date that is 9 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit a report to Congress on the differences in rates of pay, classified by pay system, between Transportation Security Administration employees—

(1) with duty stations in the contiguous 48 States; and

(2) with duty stations outside of such States, including those employees located in any territory or possession of the United States.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 877, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ROGERS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama.

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

This amendment is a sensible requirement to examine the pay equity for screeners in all parts of the United States.

Mr. Chair, I thank the gentlewoman from Puerto Rico (Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN) for her amendment and for her leadership on this issue.

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

Mr. ROSE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, even though I am not opposed to it.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSE of New York. Mr. Chair, this measure improves the underlying bill by requiring GAO to study differences between pay rates for TSA employees working in Alaska, Hawaii, and the territories and those working in the contiguous 48 States.

We know that pay satisfaction is very low within TSA. In fact, in a recent governmentwide survey, TSA's workforce reported being the least satisfied with pay than Federal workers at 414 other Federal agencies.

I commend Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN for recognizing that, under the current system, there are disparities in pay within TSA that have implications for workers outside the contiguous 48 States.

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

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. ROSE OF NEW YORK

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 116-411.

Mr. ROSE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. 7. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN CRIMES RELATING TO TERRORISM.

Nothing in this Act may be construed to contradict chapter 113B of title 18, United States Code, including with respect to—

(1) section 2332b (relating to acts of terrorism transcending national boundaries);

(2) section 2339 (relating to harboring or concealing terrorists); and

(3) section 2339A (relating to providing material support to terrorists).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 877, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROSE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROSE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Before I begin, I would like to thank Chairman THOMPSON for his leadership in bringing this important bill to the floor today. I am proud to be a cosponsor of this bill.

On 9/11, we all watched in horror as the events of that day played out in real time.

As a native New Yorker growing up in the shadows of the World Trade Center, I saw firsthand the impact that terrorism can have.

Since that fateful day, we have seen our Nation take many important steps to prevent terrorist attacks from happening. For example, Congress created the Transportation Security Administration and passed several laws strengthening our Nation's transportation systems.

While I applaud these efforts and those of others, we must continue to remain vigilant in light of current world events.

My amendment, in this light, is simple. It reaffirms our Nation's commitment to prevent terrorism and ensures our national security agencies can continue to prosecute and prevent terrorist activities from occurring in our homeland.

Mr. Chair, I say to my colleagues, let us all take a simple but important step to reaffirm our commitment to prevent terrorism. I urge all Members to vote "yes" on this amendment.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Alabama is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, as we have discussed, this bill makes it more difficult for TSA to protect the traveling public from terrorism. The gentleman's amendment does nothing to fix that.

In fact, the gentleman's amendment does nothing at all, but it certainly is reassuring to hear that some in the majority still support our counterterrorism laws.

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

Mr. ROSE of New York. Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support my amendment to continue protecting our Nation from terrorism, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROSE).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair understands that amendment No. 3 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. PETERS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 116-411.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end the following:

SEC. 7. REPORT BY GAO REGARDING TSA RECRUITMENT.

Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report on the efforts of the Transportation Security Administration regarding recruitment, including recruitment efforts relating to veterans and the dependents of veterans and members of the Armed Forces and the dependents of such members. Such report shall also include recommendations regarding how the Administration may improve such recruitment efforts.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 877, the gentleman from California (Mr. PETERS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of my amendment to H.R. 1140, the Rights for Transportation Security Officers Act.

Mr. Chair, I thank Chairman THOMPSON for his work on this important bill to help get our Transportation Security officers, or TSOs, onto the General Schedule scale and give them needed workplace protections that other Federal workers receive.

Every week, other Members of Congress and I see the vital role Transportation Security officers perform in keeping our country safe. They are essential to national security.

Unfortunately, there is a serious employee recruitment and retention problem at the Transportation Security Administration.

In 2017, the TSA spent \$75 million just on recruitment, hiring, and training costs. Over 1,900 TSOs quit that year, at a cost of \$16 million to the taxpayer.

Putting these employees on the GS scale will help with these retention issues.

Additionally, Congress needs to ensure we recruit the most qualified individuals to combat terrorism and keep travelers safe. In order to do that, we need to know how the TSA is recruiting top candidates, including military veterans.

My amendment requires a GAO study on how the TSA recruits workers and, specifically, TSA's efforts to recruit veterans and military spouses.

In San Diego, where we have the third largest veteran population in the country, we often see vets continuing to serve their country through Federal employment. Security jobs like those in the TSA demand a competency often found in military veterans. Hiring vets is an asset to the TSA, but we have heard from TSOs in my district that job dissatisfaction prompts many of them to leave the TSA in favor of working elsewhere.

The GAO study I am proposing will also provide recommendations for improvement, enabling the TSA to continue cultivating a workforce that complements the goals of the agency and responsibly spends our tax dollars.

Many Members of this Chamber, on both sides of the aisle, have stood on this floor and championed the cause of hiring vets and military spouses. It is a policy that we have incentivized private corporations to implement, and we have criticized employers for not doing or doing improperly.

Mr. Chair, I ask that my colleagues support this amendment so that we can ensure TSA is effectively recruiting the most qualified candidates and spending our taxpayer dollars wisely.

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

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

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. CISNEROS). Without objection, the gentleman from Alabama is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, this amendment calls for a study on how TSA can recruit more veterans.

I find that ironic, given that the underlying bill actually eliminates the existing hiring preferences for veterans, but the study is a good idea. Maybe it will come back and tell Congress that they ought to restore the hiring preferences for veterans that we currently have. That would be a good way to recruit veterans.

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

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON), my colleague and the chair of the committee.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding time.

Mr. Chair, we have worked long and hard on crafting a bill that I am convinced would be in the best interests of those TSO employees who work diligently to keep us safe, making sure that all is well when we fly in and out of Washington as Members of Congress, as well as the 450 airports all around the United States.

They do a good job, but they are not treated fairly.

We want to make sure, in this instance, with the amendment, that we improve on the bill. So I rise in support of the amendment offered by my colleague, Mr. PETERS from California.

TSA takes pride in hiring veterans and reports that a quarter of its workforce is comprised of veterans. That is a good thing.

Still, there are questions about the way TSA uses its personnel flexibilities when it comes to recruiting and hiring veterans.

The Peters amendment would require the Government Accountability Office to conduct a study of TSA's recruitment process, including its recruitment of veterans. This amendment will improve the underlying bill by ensuring that, as TSA moves forward under title 5, it does so in a way that recruits and retains veterans.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I can't overstate this: The real irony of this amendment is the underlying bill eliminates the hiring preferences for veterans.

We all want to give preference to veterans for their service to our country. The best thing we can do to make that happen is to leave current law in place.

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

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chair, I appreciate the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ROGERS) not opposing this particular amendment, understanding his reservations about the underlying bill.

I think what we are trying to do in good faith is to address some of the issues that he has raised about what some of the best procedures are to pursue going forward.

Mr. Chair, I ask my colleagues for their support, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 0930

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. BROWN OF MARYLAND

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 116-411.

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end the following:

SEC. 7. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that the Transportation Security Administration's personnel system provides insufficient benefits and workplace protections to the workforce that secures the nation's transportation systems and that the Transportation Security Administration's workforce should be provided protections and benefits under title 5, United States Code.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 877, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BROWN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

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

Mr. Chair, I want to recognize the hard work of Chairman BENNIE THOMPSON on the underlying bill, and the entire Homeland Security Committee.

My district, Maryland's Fourth Congressional District, has the fifth largest number of Federal employees in the country. These public servants go to work every day to make the country safer and a better place to live for our families.

For years, transportation security officers have not had basic workplace protections, such as collective bargaining rights, whistleblower protections, and paid leave. Since 2011, transportation security officers, who make up 70 percent of TSA's workforce, have had labor union representation but, because of limitations imposed by TSA, have been denied full collective bargaining rights.

TSOs were most severely impacted during the last government shutdown. During the shutdown, more than 50,000 TSA officers were deemed essential Federal employees, meaning they had to work without pay. Due to financial strain, officers called out in record numbers, which led to low morale and high turnover among its workforce.

Staffing shortages prompted officials to consolidate checkpoints, creating long lines at some of the country's busiest airports, including Miami, Atlanta, and in my backyard at BWI Thurgood Marshall and Reagan National Airport, where my constituents felt the most strain.

Federal workers who protect our country should not have to work in such strenuous conditions. Transportation security officers are vital safeguards for our Nation's transportation system. They should be afforded the same rights and benefits as other Federal employees.

My amendment reaffirms the importance of TSA's workforce and recognizes that TSOs should be provided the same protections and benefits as other Federal employees under title V.

In addition to collective bargaining rights, the transition to title V would increase salaries for most TSA employees and provide opportunities for regular pay raises for those meeting performance standards.

TSA employees and TSOs are essential to our national security and safety. It is time we treat them with the respect they deserve. I strongly encourage my colleagues to support this amendment and the underlying legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is a sense of Congress articulating support for the underlying bill, an underlying bill which I

have made clear over the last 2 days would reduce pay and benefits for our TSOs. That is unacceptable. We should be trying to increase their pay and benefits and their flexibility rather than trying to cap it by moving into title V.

I can't support this amendment because I don't support the underlying bill. There are many of us who feel that way, who care very deeply about TSOs being compensated better and given better benefits, so, for that reason, I oppose the bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON), my friend and chairman of the committee.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Chair, I appreciate the gentleman yielding me the time.

Let me be clear. This bill enhances opportunities for TSOs. It increases the possibility of them getting employment by putting them on the GS schedule for Federal employees, so I am somewhat mystified that a bill that is designed to bring a group of employees into a system that all other Federal employees are in is somehow penalizing those employees.

The very intent of this bill is to level the playing field for TSOs, who, everybody agrees, are doing a wonderful job, so I continue to be somewhat baffled by the arguments against it.

I support the gentleman from Maryland's amendment. This amendment adds additional language to the bill to reiterate Congress' intent that TSA employees should have the same protections and benefits as the rest of the Federal workforce.

This current system that we have is not working for TSA employees. All you have to do is talk to them. When you go through the airports, just ask them: "Are you happy with how you are being treated and paid right now?" Without a doubt, they will tell you: "No." So this is to fix it.

I compliment the gentleman from Maryland's strengthening of the intent of this legislation. But, more importantly, the bargaining unit that represents the employees, the American Federation of Government Employees, which represents all the TSOs, all 46,000, they are in support of it.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, my friend and colleague from Mississippi is right about part of what he said, that is that if you talk to TSOs throughout this country, they are grossly dissatisfied with their pay, and rightfully so. We have not done our job in Congress to adequately fund the TSA to pay them better.

The TSA wants to increase their pay. Under current law, they have a lot more capacity to raise their pay. If we move them to title V, that pay is capped.

My friend from Maryland is absolutely right in his desire to want to

help the TSOs. This underlying bill doesn't do it. We need to get with our appropriating brothers and sisters and urge them to fund the President's 2021 budget which does provide the money that would allow TSOs to be properly paid and not capped.

I remind everybody that it was the Obama human capital experts who had a blue-ribbon study that recommended that we not move the TSA employees back to title V because it would, in fact, cut their pay and limit many of their benefits.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. KIM

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in House Report 116-411.

Mr. KIM. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end the following:

SEC. 7. ASSISTANCE FOR FEDERAL AIR MARSHAL SERVICE.

The Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration shall engage and consult with public and private entities associated with the Federal Air Marshal Service to address concerns regarding Federal Air Marshals related to the following:

- (1) Mental health.
- (2) Suicide rates.
- (3) Morale and recruitment.
- (4) Any other personnel issues the Administrator determines appropriate.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 877, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. KIM) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. KIM. Mr. Chair, I rise today to introduce this simple amendment that addresses a complex and tragic problem.

The U.S. Federal Air Marshal Service, men and women tasked with protecting the thousands of airline passengers and crew who fly across the United States and globally every day, is in a state of crisis.

The public servants who are committed to our safety are subject to high-stress work environments that have led to a drastic increase in health issues, turnover in staff, and even a number of highly disturbing murders and suicides. In a story published by ABC News last year, Sonya Hightower LaBosco, the president of the Air Marshal National Council, a union which represents thousands of air marshals, said: "The crisis is here—it's an epidemic."

My amendment addresses that epidemic by requiring that the TSA consult with the Federal Air Marshal Service and the bodies who represent its members to address concerns that

have led to this crisis. It provides a path to finding solutions on mental health and suicide, while improving morale, recruitment, and retention.

The cost of inaction is simply too high. We see the cost of inaction in the story of Mario Vanetta. Mario was a New Jersey air marshal who fatally shot his wife and himself in a murder-suicide last October. Mario left behind three children, and his tragic story is one we cannot ignore or forget.

When our neighbors answer the call to service, they deserve our full support. Members of the Federal Air Marshal Service serve our country every day under incredible stress and difficult conditions. We have seen what those conditions do and the lives they impact. The time is now to act, to honor their service, and to put an end to this epidemic before it takes more American lives.

Mr. Chair, I hope you will join me in passing this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, although I am not opposed to it.

The Acting Chair (Mr. BROWN of Maryland). Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Chair, we have consistently seen reporting and data highlighting the unique health and well-being challenges of Federal air marshals. This amendment is a commendable effort to examine the issue, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

Mr. KIM. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON).

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. KIM).

Federal air marshals are an essential component of the layered aviation security system that was created in the wake of the September 11 attacks. Every day, these quiet heroes keep the flying public safe.

As Representative KIM's amendment recognizes, there are some major personnel changes within FAMS that need timely attention. I commend the gentleman from New Jersey for introducing this amendment to direct TSA to aggressively take on the mental health and morale challenges within this subset of the TSA workforce.

Again, I compliment the gentleman for his amendment and urge support.

Mr. KIM. Mr. Chair, I would like to remind my colleagues that this bill isn't just a matter of national security; it is a matter of life and death for the men and women we depend on to keep our airline passengers and crews safe every day.

Mr. Chair, I urge everyone to join me in standing up for them and to put an end to this crisis, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. KIM).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. CISNEROS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in House Report 116-411.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end the following:

SEC. 7. VETERANS HIRING.

The Secretary shall prioritize the hiring of veterans, including disabled veterans, and other preference eligible individuals, including widows and widowers of veterans, as defined in section 2108 of title 5, United States Code, for covered positions.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 877, the gentleman from California (Mr. CISNEROS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. CISNEROS. Mr. Chair, I want to thank my colleague, Mr. THOMPSON, for his steadfast leadership on this critical issue and for working with me to ensure that this amendment be made in order.

Mr. Chair, I rise to offer an amendment which would require the Secretary of Homeland Security to prioritize the hiring of veterans and related preference-eligible individuals, including disabled veterans and widows or widowers of veterans, for positions within the Transportation Security Administration.

Mr. Chair, I rise as a supporter and cosponsor of H.R. 1140 because I believe we must do what we can to ensure our public servants have fair pay and adequate protections. This is especially true for the Federal workforce charged with preserving our national security and protecting our Nation.

As the threats against our Nation continue to evolve in complexity, TSA employees are tasked with adapting just the same. They deserve the ability to negotiate compensation equitable to the service they provide.

□ 0945

I rise to offer this amendment to ensure that our TSA workforce includes the fortitude of our Nation's heroes, veterans who are already mission-driven, molded in integrity, national-security minded, and, above all, driven by a proven track record of service to the mission. I have heard firsthand testimony of servicemen and -women, many returning with service-connected disabilities, but many who still yearn to serve and protect our Nation.

What better way than with the Transportation Security Administration, a crucial necessity to the safe-keeping of our Nation's citizens?

My amendment would direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to prioritize our Nation's heroes first when hiring to support TSA's workforce. This includes veteran-related-preference-eligible individuals such as disabled veterans and widows or widowers of veterans. As a Navy veteran and member of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee and the House Armed Services Committee, the hiring of our servicemembers and veterans is one of my top priorities.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this amendment to ensure we do not overlook veterans who would strengthen the TSA workforce.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

Here is another example of a messaging amendment that doesn't fix the veterans' hiring problem in the underlying bill. All this does is restate the veterans preference language in title 5. It does not restore the full veterans preference that exist under current law.

I don't understand why the majority keeps restating this instead of fixing the underlying bill and allowing the veterans preference—which is broader—to remain in place without the impediment imposed by this underlying bill.

So, Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CISNEROS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON).

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. CISNEROS).

Let me be clear. We want to do all we can for our veterans. They have done a tremendous job defending us all over the world. The least we can do is when they return, or, unfortunately, when they don't return through tragedy, we take care of the families by offering them employment.

This is a simple, commonsense amendment that I would hope there would be no disagreement on. All this does is provide the same language that we use for all other title 5 employees, which the intent of the overall bill is to bring everybody under the same system.

So, I rise in support of the gentleman from California's amendment and ask for its approval.

Mr. CISNEROS. Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to close.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to reiterate this is a simple amendment in support of our Nation's veterans. I urge my colleagues to adopt the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I want to restate that the underlying bill restricts the veterans pref-

erence in the hiring that exists now. Under current law, all veterans are given preference in hiring at the TSA. Under the underlying bill, it would be restricted to those veterans who had a rank of O3 or less. Only they would get preferences. I don't think this is where this Congress wants to go.

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

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

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MS.

SPANBERGER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 8 printed in House Report 116-411.

Ms. SPANBERGER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end the following:

SEC. 7. PROHIBITION ON CERTAIN SOCIAL MEDIA APPLICATION.

Beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, covered employees may not use or have installed on United States Government-issued mobile devices the social media video application known as "TikTok" or any successor application.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 877, the gentlewoman from Virginia (Ms. SPANBERGER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Virginia.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to begin by thanking Chairman THOMPSON for his leadership on this important legislation and for his commitment to the men and women who keep our airports and travelers safe.

I am proud to cosponsor this bipartisan bill because I share the chairman's commitment to ensuring that the TSA workforce receives the rights that they have earned.

I am also proud to lead this amendment, which would codify the administration's ban on TSA employees using or installing the app TikTok on their government-issued phones.

While to some TikTok may seem like a harmless app, TikTok presents a significant counterintelligence threat. Our intelligence experts are rightly concerned about the use of the TikTok app, especially on U.S. Government-issued devices.

As many of my colleagues know, TikTok, like other Chinese companies,

is required under Chinese law to share information with the government and its institutions. There are real concerns that this app could also collect information on users in the United States to advance Chinese counter-intelligence efforts. And because it could become a tool for surveilling U.S. citizens or Federal personnel, TikTok has no business being on U.S. Government-issued devices.

While entrusted with keeping Americans safe, our security personnel should not use apps that could compromise Federal Government data. There is always a threat that TikTok could be used to compromise government devices, including those used in our airports and among our airport personnel. That is why this amendment is so important and why we should pass it without delay.

Recently, the TSA announced a prohibition on employees using or downloading TikTok on their government-issued work phones, and my amendment would make this ban law. Other government agencies and departments have instituted a prohibition on the use of TikTok on government-issued phones including the U.S. Army, the State Department, and the Department of Homeland Security.

TSA is right to institute this policy, especially as TikTok refuses to provide more transparency into some of its more controversial practices and use.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on my amendment to keep our government devices and our airports safe from potential foreign surveillance, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the bill, although I am not opposed to the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, as the gentlewoman from Virginia has just stated, the administration has already taken some proactive steps to deal with this threat; however, we need to remain vigilant when it comes to dealing with counterintelligence threats and concerns in the Federal workforce. I think this amendment does that.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support it, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SPANBERGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON).

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I compliment the gentlewoman from Virginia in offering this amendment.

Recently, the intelligence community raised national security concerns about the TikTok app and its ties to China. As we always and have been continuously informed, the Chinese are trying to get information on what we are doing every day of the week, every

month, all the year. In response to this, TSA banned the use of TikTok by TSA employees on government-provided devices.

Representative SPANBERGER's amendment is to be commended for recognizing that national security concerns about this app and successor apps will not go away over time and for authorizing this amendment to be codified in law.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Ms. SPANBERGER. Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and to continue protecting our Nation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Virginia (Ms. SPANBERGER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MS. MUCARSEL-POWELL

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 9 printed in House Report 116-411.

Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise as the designee of Ms. SCHRIER, and I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end the following:

SEC. 7. PREVENTION AND PROTECTION AGAINST CERTAIN ILLNESS.

The Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration, in coordination with the Director of Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and the Director of the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases, shall ensure that covered employees are provided proper guidance regarding prevention and protections against coronavirus, including appropriate resources.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 877, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida.

Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL. Mr. Chairman, this amendment will ensure that the TSA Administrator works in coordination with the Directors of the Centers for Disease Control and the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases to ensure that TSA employees are provided the proper guidance regarding prevention and protections against coronavirus, including appropriate resources.

TSA employees are on the front lines of strengthening the safety of our transportation systems while ensuring the freedom of movement for people and commerce, which is why this underlying legislation is so important.

As part of their mission, TSA employees constantly come in close contact with countless people every day

from across the country and from around the world. This means that their potential risk and exposure to the virus is heightened.

Our TSA employees work every day to protect us as we travel. In turn, we must do all we can to protect them while they are on the job.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support of this amendment and underlying bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, although I am not opposed to it.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, this amendment recognizes that the coronavirus is a serious public health threat and that the TSA has a responsibility to educate its personnel as to how they should protect themselves. I can't imagine why anybody would oppose it.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes," and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I am in agreement. I urge the support of this agreement, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL).

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

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

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL) having assumed the chair, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, 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. 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.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 57 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I rise to speak in strong support of H.R. 1140, the Rights for Transportation Security Officers Act of 2020, which will create civil service protections for TSA employees that are long overdue.

H.R. 1140, mandates the conversion of all covered employees and positions within the Transportation Security Administration (TSA) to the provisions of title 5, United States Code.

The bill represents a longstanding priority for Chairman THOMPSON, the bill's author, and my own as a former chair of the Homeland Security Committee's Subcommittee on Transportation Security to extend the rights and protections afford to all federal government employees to TSA personnel.

Several versions of the bill have been introduced over the past decade, but this Congress is the first time the bill has received overwhelming, bipartisan support, with 236 co-sponsors including 10 Republicans.

The legislation curtails TSA's broad authorities to create and control its personnel systems, instead requiring TSA to abide by the provisions of title 5 which regulate personnel systems for most Federal agencies.

The bill would provide TSA employees with the workforce protections and benefits available to most other Federal workers.

The bill sets forth transition rules to protect the rate of pay and other rights of TSA employees during a transition to title 5.

The bill also requires the Secretary of Homeland Security to consult with the appropriate labor organizations to carry out the transition.

This bill does not affect prohibitions against disloyalty and asserting the right to strike against the federal government.

The bill also extends the timeline for the transition from 60 days to a more realistic 180 days, and it contains language to protect employees with grievances or disciplinary actions pending during the transition.

On the morning of September 11, 2001, nearly 3,000 people were killed in a series of coordinated terrorist attacks in New York, Pennsylvania and Virginia.

The attacks resulted in the creation of the Transportation Security Administration, which was designed to prevent similar attacks in the future by removing the responsibility for transportation security from private entities.

The Aviation and Transportation Security Act, passed by the 107th Congress and signed on November 19, 2001, established TSA just 2 months following the September 11, 2001 attacks.

The urgent need to provide a response to the available security threat was facing meant that much of the work to provide administrative structure and integration measures that would have woven in the civil service protections now been added did not occur at that time.

The TSA's mission is to protect the nation's transportation systems to ensure freedom of movement for people and commerce.

The work of the TSA is a frontline Department of Homeland Security and it is not easy—it can in fact be very dangerous.

Like many of my colleagues, I recall the shooting incident at LAX that killed Gerardo Hernandez, who became the first TSA officer killed in the line of duty; and the machete attack at the Louis Armstrong New Orleans

International Airport that resulted in injuries to Senior Transportation Security Officer Carol Richel.

These incidents only highlight the difficult work that the men and women of the TSA must perform each day to keep our nation's airports and flights safe.

The Department of Homeland Security (DHS) supports several key parts of the U.S. coronavirus response.

The TSA is responsible for: enforcing the travel restrictions for all flights that are carrying individuals who have recently traveled from China, notifying passengers and travelers of risks of contracting the virus, and coordinating with air carriers and airports to discuss government actions and seek input (TSA).

Allegations about mismanagement, wasteful procedures, retaliation against whistleblowers, low morale, and security gaps within the Agency are causes for concern.

TSA has consistently struggled with low morale across the workforce, ranking 303 out of 305 government agencies in 2016.

Low morale has a nexus to the high turnover rate within the ranks of Transportation Security Officers (TSOs).

TSOs represent 70 percent of the TSA workforce, yet have been denied full collective bargaining rights, whistleblower protections, and opportunities to effectively raise issues in dispute to an independent third party, such as the Merit Systems Protection Board.

Additionally, TSOs are subject to a pay and performance system that does not track with the General Services (GS) wage system, the primary wage system for Federal workers.

It is past time to make the changes provided by H.R. 1140, so the TSA workforce is treated equally to other federal employees with the power to advance and expand their opportunities as government employees.

Finally I am excited to support the Mucarsel-Powell amendment regarding infectious disease preparation and protection for TSOs, and the Cisneros Amendment that is very important which requires the DHS to prioritize hiring veterans including disabled veterans and others associated with veterans.

I ask my colleagues to join me in voting for H.R. 1140.

□ 1015

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BROWN of Maryland) at 10 o'clock and 15 minutes a.m.

RIGHTS FOR TRANSPORTATION SECURITY OFFICERS ACT OF 2020

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 further consideration of the bill, H.R. 1140.

Will the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. NEGUSE) kindly take the chair.

□ 1015

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the

further consideration of the bill (H.R. 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. NEGUSE (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, amendment No. 9, printed in House Report 116-411 offered by the gentleman from Florida (Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL) had been postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 116-411 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 7 by Mr. CISNEROS of California.

Amendment No. 9 by Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL of Florida.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. CISNEROS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. CISNEROS) 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 Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 399, noes 1, not voting 35, as follows:

[Roll No. 87]

AYES—399

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

Cunningham	Katko	Phillips	Waltz	Wenstrup	Womack	Byrne	Granger	McEachin
Curtis	Keating	Pingree	Wasserman	Westerman	Woodall	Calvert	Graves (GA)	McGovern
Davidson (KS)	Keller	Plaskett	Schultz	Weston	Wright	Carbajal	Graves (LA)	McHenry
Davidson (OH)	Kelly (IL)	Pocan	Watkins	Wild	Yarmuth	Cárdenas	Graves (MO)	McKinley
Davis (CA)	Kelly (MS)	Porter	Watson Coleman	Williams	Yoho	Carson (IN)	Green, Al (TX)	McNerney
Davis, Danny K.	Kelly (PA)	Posey	Weber (TX)	Wilson (FL)	Young	Carter (GA)	Griffith	Meadows
Dean	Kennedy	Pressley	Webster (FL)	Wilson (SC)	Zeldin	Carter (TX)	Guest	Meeks
DeFazio	Khanna	Price (NC)	Welch	Wittman		Cartwright	Guthrie	Meng
DeGette	Kildee	Quigley				Case	Hagedorn	Meuser
DeLauro	Kim	Radewagen				Casten (IL)	Harder (CA)	Miller
Delgado	Kind	Raskin				Castor (FL)	Harris	Mitchell
Demings	King (IA)	Ratcliffe				Castro (TX)	Hartzler	Moolenaar
DeSaulnier	King (NY)	Reed				Chabot	Hastings	Mooney (WV)
DesJarlais	Kinzinger	Reschenthaler	Bera	Herrera Beutler	Newhouse	Ciциlline	Hayes	Moore
Deutsch	Kirkpatrick	Rice (NY)	Beyer	Jackson Lee	Rodgers (WA)	Cisneros	Heck	Morelle
Diaz-Balart	Krishnamoorthi	Rice (SC)	Bishop (GA)	Jayapal	Rooney (FL)	Clark (MA)	Hern, Kevin	Moulton
Dingell	Kuster (NH)	Richmond	Cárdenas	Johnson (TX)	Rose, John W.	Clarke (NY)	Hice (GA)	Mucarsel-Powell
Doggett	Kustoff (TN)	Riggleman	Cheney	Kilmer	Roy	Clay	Higgins (LA)	Murphy (FL)
Doyle, Michael	LaHood	Roby	Davis, Rodney	LaMalfa	Schrier	Cleaver	Higgins (NY)	Murphy (NC)
F.	Lamb	Roe, David P.	DelBene	Larsen (WA)	Scott, David	Cline	Hill (AR)	Nadler
Duncan	Lamborn	Rogers (AL)	González-Colón	Lawrence	Sires	Cloud	Himes	Napolitano
Dunn	Langevin	Rogers (KY)	(PR)	Lewis	Smith (WA)	Clyburn	Holding	Neal
Emmer	Larson (CT)	Rose (NY)	Green (TN)	Lucas	Timmons	Cohen	Hollingsworth	Neguse
Engel	Latta	Rouda	Grijalva	Marchant	Veasey	Cole	Horn, Kendra S.	Norcross
Escobar	Lawson (FL)	Rouzer	Hayes	Mullin	Waters	Collins (GA)	Horsford	Norman
Eshoo	Lee (CA)	Roybal-Allard				Comer	Houlahan	Norton
Espallat	Lee (NV)	Ruiz				Conaway	Hoyer	Nunes
Estes	Lesko	Ruppersberger				Connolly	Hudson	O'Halleran
Evans	Levin (CA)	Rush				Cook	Huffman	Ocasio-Cortez
Ferguson	Levin (MI)	Rutherford				Cooper	Huizenga	Olson
Finkenauer	Lieu, Ted	Ryan				Correa	Hurd (TX)	Omar
Fitzpatrick	Lipinski	Sablan				Costa	Jackson Lee	Palazzo
Fleischmann	Loeb sack	San Nicolas				Courtney	Jeffries	Pallone
Fletcher	Lofgren	Sánchez				Cox (CA)	Johnson (GA)	Palmer
Flores	Long	Sarbanes				Craig	Johnson (LA)	Panetta
Fortenberry	Loudermilk	Scalise				Crawford	Johnson (OH)	Pappas
Foster	Lowenthal	Scanlon				Crenshaw	Johnson (SD)	Pascarell
Fox (NC)	Lowey	Schakowsky				Crist	Jordan	Payne
Frankel	Luetkemeyer	Schiff				Crow	Joyce (OH)	Pence
Fudge	Luján	Schneider				Cuellar	Joyce (PA)	Perlmutter
Fulcher	Luria	Schrader				Cunningham	Kaptur	Perry
Gabbard	Lynch	Schweikert				Curtis	Katko	Peters
Gaetz	Malinowski	Scott (VA)				Davidson (KS)	Keating	Peterson
Gallagher	Maloney,	Scott, Austin				Davidson (OH)	Keller	Phillips
Gallego	Carolyn B.	Sensenbrenner				Davis (CA)	Kelly (IL)	Pingree
Garamendi	Maloney, Sean	Serrano				Davis, Danny K.	Kelly (MS)	Plaskett
Garcia (IL)	Marshall	Sewell (AL)				Davis, Rodney	Kelly (PA)	Pocan
Garcia (TX)	Massie	Shalala				Dean	Kennedy	Porter
Gianforte	Mast	Sherman				DeFazio	Khanna	Posey
Gibbs	Matsui	Sherrill				DeGette	Kildee	Pressley
Gohmert	McAdams	Shimkus				DeLauro	Kim	Price (NC)
Golden	McBath	Simpson				Delgado	Kind	Quigley
Gomez	McCarthy	Slotkin				Demings	King (IA)	Radewagen
Gonzalez (OH)	McCauley	Smith (MO)				DeSaulnier	King (NY)	Raskin
Gonzalez (TX)	McClintock	Smith (NE)				DesJarlais	Kinzinger	Reed
Gooden	McCollum	Smith (NJ)				Deutsch	Kirkpatrick	Reschenthaler
Gosar	McEachin	Smucker				Diaz-Balart	Krishnamoorthi	Rice (NY)
Gottheimer	McGovern	Soto				Dingell	Kuster (NH)	Rice (SC)
Granger	McHenry	Spanberger				Doggett	Kustoff (TN)	Richmond
Graves (GA)	McKinley	Spano				Doggett	LaHood	Riggleman
Graves (LA)	McNerney	Speier				Doyle, Michael	LaMalfa	Roby
Graves (MO)	Meadows	Stanton				F.	Lamb	Roe, David P.
Green, Al (TX)	Meeks	Stauber				Duncan	Lamborn	Rogers (AL)
Griffith	Meng	Stefanik				Dunn	Langevin	Rogers (KY)
Grothman	Meuser	Steil				Emmer	Larson (CT)	Rose (NY)
Guest	Miller	Steube				Engel	Latta	Rouda
Guthrie	Mitchell	Stevens				Escobar	Lawson (FL)	Rouzer
Haaland	Moolenaar	Stewart				Eshoo	Lee (CA)	Roybal-Allard
Hagedorn	Mooney (WV)	Stivers				Espallat	Lee (NV)	Ruiz
Harder (CA)	Moore	Suozi				Estes	Lesko	Ruppersberger
Harris	Morelle	Swalwell (CA)				Evans	Levin (CA)	Rush
Hartzler	Moulton	Takano				Ferguson	Levin (MI)	Rutherford
Hastings	Mucarsel-Powell	Taylor				Finkenauer	Lieu, Ted	Ryan
Heck	Murphy (FL)	Thompson (CA)				Fitzpatrick	Lipinski	Sablan
Hern, Kevin	Murphy (NC)	Thompson (MS)				Fleischmann	Loeb sack	San Nicolas
Hice (GA)	Nadler	Thompson (PA)				Fletcher	Lofgren	Sánchez
Higgins (LA)	Napolitano	Thornberry				Flores	Long	Sarbanes
Higgins (NY)	Neguse	Tipton				Fortenberry	Loudermilk	Scalise
Hill (AR)	Norcross	Titus				Foster	Lowenthal	Scanlon
Himes	Norman	Tlaib				Fox (NC)	Lowey	Schakowsky
Holding	Norton	Tonko				Frankel	Lucas	Schiff
Hollingsworth	Nunes	Torres (CA)				Fudge	Luetkemeyer	Schneider
Horn, Kendra S.	O'Halleran	Torres Small				Fulcher	Luján	Schrader
Horsford	Ocasio-Cortez	(NM)				Gabbard	Luria	Schweikert
Houlahan	Olson	Trahan				Gaetz	Lynch	Scott (VA)
Hoyer	Omar	Trone				Gallego	Malinowski	Scott, Austin
Hudson	Palazzo	Turner				Garamendi	Maloney,	Sensenbrenner
Huffman	Pallone	Underwood				Garcia (IL)	Carolyn B.	Sewell (AL)
Huizenga	Pallone	Upton				Garcia (TX)	Maloney, Sean	Shalala
Hurd (TX)	Palmer	Van Drew				Gianforte	Marshall	Sherman
Jeffries	Panetta	Vargas				Gibbs	Massie	Sherrill
Johnson (GA)	Pappas	Vela				Gohmert	Mast	Shimkus
Johnson (LA)	Pascarell	Velázquez				Golden	Matsui	Simpson
Johnson (OH)	Payne	Visclosky				Gomez	McAdams	Slotkin
Johnson (SD)	Pence	Wagner				Gonzalez (OH)	McBath	Smith (MO)
Jordan	Perlmutter	Walberg				Gonzalez (TX)	McCarthy	Smith (NE)
Joyce (OH)	Perry	Walden				Gooden	McCauley	Smith (NJ)
Joyce (PA)	Peters	Walker				Gosar	McClintock	Smucker
Kaptur	Peterson	Walorski				Gottheimer	McCollum	Soto

NOES—1

Amash

NOT VOTING—35

□ 1044

Messrs. OLSON, DUNCAN, and Mrs. LESKO changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mrs. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 87.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chair, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 87.

Mr. BERA. Mr. Chair, I missed the following vote due to a committee hearing. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 87.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MS. MUCARSEL-POWELL

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL) 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 Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 403, noes 0, not voting 32, as follows:

[Roll No. 88]

AYES—403

Abraham	Barr	Boyle, Brendan
Adams	Barragán	F.
Aderholt	Bass	Brady
Aguilar	Beatty	Brindisi
Allen	Bera	Brooks (AL)
Allred	Bergman	Brooks (IN)
Amash	Beyer	Brown (MD)
Amodei	Biggs	Brownley (CA)
Armstrong	Bilirakis	Buchanan
Arrington	Bishop (GA)	Buck
Axne	Bishop (NC)	Bucshon
Babin	Bishop (UT)	Budd
Bacon	Blumenauer	Burchett
Baird	Blunt Rochester	Burgess
Balderson	Bonamici	Bustos
Banks	Bost	Butterfield

Spanberger	Tlaib	Wasserman
Spano	Tonko	Schultz
Speier	Torres (CA)	Watkins
Stanton	Torres Small	Watson Coleman
Staubert	(NM)	Weber (TX)
Stefanik	Trahan	Webster (FL)
Steil	Trone	Welch
Steube	Turner	Wenstrup
Stevens	Underwood	Westerman
Stewart	Upton	Wexton
Stivers	Van Drew	Wild
Suozzi	Vargas	Williams
Swalwell (CA)	Vela	Wilson (SC)
Takano	Velázquez	Wittman
Taylor	Visclosky	Womack
Thompson (CA)	Wagner	Woodall
Thompson (MS)	Walberg	Wright
Thompson (PA)	Walden	Yarmuth
Thornberry	Walker	Yoho
Tipton	Walorski	Young
Titus	Waltz	Zeldin

NOT VOTING—32

Cheney	Johnson (TX)	Rose, John W.
Chu, Judy	Kilmer	Roy
DelBene	Larsen (WA)	Schrier
González-Colón	Lawrence	Scott, David
(PR)	Lewis	Serrano
Green (TN)	Marchant	Sires
Grijalva	Mullin	Smith (WA)
Grothman	Newhouse	Timmons
Haaland	Ratcliffe	Veasey
Herrera Beutler	Rodgers (WA)	Waters
Jayapal	Rooney (FL)	Wilson (FL)

□ 1058

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Mr. Chair, had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 88.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Chair, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 88.

The Acting CHAIR. There being no further amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. NEGUSE) having assumed the chair, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, 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. 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, and, pursuant to House Resolution 877, he reported the bill, as amended by that resolution, back to the House with sundry further amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

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

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

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

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

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

Mrs. LESKO. I am in its current form.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mrs. Lesko moves to recommit the bill H.R. 1140 to the Committee on Homeland Security with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Add at the end of section 4 the following:

(c) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—During the transition period and after the conversion date, the Secretary shall ensure that the Transportation Security Administration continues to prevent the hiring of individuals who have been convicted of a sex crime, an offense involving a minor, a crime of violence, or terrorism.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes in support of her motion.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, I first want to say that the vast majority of TSA officers are good, hardworking professionals, but there are some bad actors.

On February 6, 2020, the State of California announced the arrest and prosecution of a former TSA screener, resulting from an FBI investigation. According to the criminal complaint, the TSA screener used "fraud or deceit to falsely imprison a woman going through security" while stationed as a travel document checker at Los Angeles International Airport in June 2019.

The screener insisted that the woman passenger needed extra screening in a private elevator, where he told the passenger to reveal her "full breasts" and to "lift her pants and underwear." The victim in the case stated that she complied with the TSO's instructions out of fear.

Fortunately, this offender was immediately fired by the TSA. However, under this bill, H.R. 1140, if it passed, this predator could be on the Federal payroll for months or even years.

But this is not an isolated incident. In addition to the sexual predator at LAX, in the last 5 years alone, a screener in Boston was caught luring teenage girls into posing for nude photos; a screener at LaGuardia molested a female college student in the airport bathroom; and two screeners in Denver plotted to grope attractive men.

My amendment is simple. It would enhance aviation security and protect the flying public by preventing the TSA from hiring any candidate with a history of sexual misconduct, offenses involving minors, or terrorism.

This amendment is identical to an amendment offered by my Democratic colleague, Ms. UNDERWOOD, which was not offered here today. The Underwood amendment was made in order by the Rules Committee. The rule was sup-

ported by every Democrat in the House.

Republicans strongly support the Underwood amendment. We were disappointed we did not have an opportunity to vote on it earlier.

The Underwood amendment preserves the authority TSA currently has to prevent the hiring of candidates with a history of sexual misconduct, offenses involving minors, or terrorism.

The Underwood amendment is so important because current law bars a litany of criminals from working in sensitive roles at airports. The amendment simply ensures that current safeguards remain in place.

There is no reason that someone with a conviction for sexual assault or terrorism should be a TSA employee. To be clear, the Underwood amendment, my amendment, would prevent the hiring of sexual predators like Harvey Weinstein.

We have two options today: adopt the Underwood amendment and keep sexual predators off the Federal payroll, or reject it and reward sexual predators with a paycheck from the taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support the motion to recommit, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. DEMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this motion to recommit.

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

Mrs. DEMINGS. Mr. Speaker, 47,000 Transportation Security officers just heard the comments of my colleague, Mrs. LESKO, and many of them we will see today as we cast our votes and fly home to our districts. I am sure many people on this House floor will say, "Thank you for your service," to the 47,000 men and women who do the jobs to keep the flying public safe every day.

The behavior that Mrs. LESKO cited from LAX, that is offensive to, I am sure, everyone in this room. But let me be clear: There is nothing in this bill that will allow the TSA to hire individuals who have been convicted of sex crimes or offenses against a minor, a crime of violence, or terrorism.

And let me be clear. In the example, also, that she cited, there is nothing that would have precluded this person from being hired in the first place. The behavior took place after the person was hired.

This is a red herring. We decided not to offer this amendment because it simply isn't necessary.

TSA conducts rigorous background checks and will continue to do so.

Now, let me say this: I was assigned to the Orlando International Airport as a police captain during 9/11, and I did not come today to play political games, and neither did the 242 cosponsors of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, let me make this clear. A vote for this motion to recommit is a vote against the Transportation Security officers. They are the frontline

workers who worked through a government shutdown, without being paid, to keep America safe. They are still showing up today, each of them interacting with thousands of passengers even as we face a public health crisis.

Today, you have a choice: move this bill forward and provide TSOs the basic rights and benefits they deserve, or deny them those rights. It is just that simple.

Mr. Speaker, today, we have a bipartisan solution that will allow us to ensure that the workforce gets the same compensation, benefits, and protections as are available to most other Federal employees. It is about time that the TSA Federal workforce be treated like Federal employees.

This is the time not to just say, “We appreciate you,” but to show them how much we appreciate them.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote against this motion and in support of the bill on final passage.

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

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

There was no objection.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 227, nays 175, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 89]

YEAS—227

Abraham	Cline	Gianforte
Aderholt	Cloud	Gibbs
Allen	Cole	Gohmert
Amodei	Collins (GA)	Golden
Armstrong	Comer	Gonzalez (OH)
Arrington	Conaway	Gooden
Axne	Cook	Gosar
Babin	Cox (CA)	Gottheimer
Bacon	Craig	Granger
Baird	Crawford	Graves (GA)
Balderson	Crenshaw	Graves (LA)
Banks	Crist	Graves (MO)
Barr	Crow	Griffith
Bergman	Cunningham	Grothman
Biggs	Curtis	Guest
Bilirakis	Davidson (OH)	Guthrie
Bishop (NC)	Davis, Rodney	Hagedorn
Bishop (UT)	Delgado	Harder (CA)
Bost	DesJarlais	Harris
Brady	Deutch	Hartzer
Brindisi	Diaz-Balart	Hern, Kevin
Brooks (AL)	Duncan	Hice (GA)
Brooks (IN)	Dunn	Higgins (LA)
Buchanan	Emmer	Hill (AR)
Buck	Estes	Holding
Bucshon	Ferguson	Hollingsworth
Budd	Finkenauer	Horn, Kendra S.
Burchett	Fitzpatrick	Houlihan
Burgess	Fleischmann	Hudson
Bustos	Flores	Huizenga
Byrne	Fortenberry	Hurd (TX)
Calvert	Fox (NC)	Johnson (LA)
Carter (GA)	Frankel	Johnson (OH)
Carter (TX)	Fulcher	Johnson (SD)
Chabot	Gaetz	Jordan
Cisneros	Gallagher	Joyce (OH)

Joyce (PA)	Moulton	Smucker
Katko	Mucarsel-Powell	Spanberger
Keller	Murphy (FL)	Spano
Kelly (MS)	Murphy (NC)	Staubert
Kelly (PA)	Norman	Stefanik
Kim	Nunes	Steil
King (IA)	Olson	Steube
King (NY)	Palazzo	Stewart
Kinzinger	Palmer	Stivers
Kuster (NH)	Pence	Taylor
Kustoff (TN)	Perry	Thompson (PA)
LaHood	Peters	Thornberry
LaMalfa	Peterson	Tipton
Lamb	Phillips	Torres Small
Lamborn	Porter	(NM)
Latta	Posey	Turner
Lee (NV)	Reed	Underwood
Lesko	Reschenthaler	Upton
Lipinski	Rice (SC)	Van Drew
Long	Riggleman	Wagner
Loudermilk	Roby	Walberg
Lucas	Roe, David P.	Walden
Luetkemeyer	Rogers (AL)	Walker
Luria	Rogers (KY)	Walorski
Marshall	Rose (NY)	Waltz
Massie	Rouda	Watkins
Mast	Rouzer	Weber (TX)
McAdams	Rutherford	Webster (FL)
McBath	Scalise	Wenstrup
McCarthy	Schradner	Westerman
McCaul	Schweikert	Wild
McClintock	Scott, Austin	Williams
McHenry	Sensenbrenner	Wilson (SC)
McKinley	Sherrill	Wittman
Meadows	Shimkus	Womack
Meuser	Simpson	Woodall
Miller	Slotkin	Wright
Mitchell	Smith (MO)	Yoho
Moolenaar	Smith (NE)	Young
Mooney (WV)	Smith (NJ)	Zeldin

NAYS—175

Adams	Evans	Moore
Aguilar	Fletcher	Morelle
Allred	Foster	Nadler
Amash	Fudge	Napolitano
Barragán	Gabbard	Neal
Bass	Gallego	Neguse
Beatty	Garamendi	Norcross
Bera	Garcia (IL)	O'Halleran
Beyer	Garcia (TX)	Ocasio-Cortez
Bishop (GA)	Gomez	Omar
Blumenauer	Gonzalez (TX)	Pallone
Blunt Rochester	Green, Al (TX)	Panetta
Bonamici	Haaland	Pappas
Boyle, Brendan	Hastings	Pascarell
F.	Hayes	Payne
Brown (MD)	Heck	Perlmutter
Brownley (CA)	Higgins (NY)	Pingree
Butterfield	Himes	Pocan
Carbajal	Horsford	Pressley
Cárdenas	Hoyer	Price (NC)
Carson (IN)	Huffman	Quigley
Cartwright	Jackson Lee	Raskin
Case	Jeffries	Rice (NY)
Casten (IL)	Johnson (GA)	Richmond
Castor (FL)	Kaptur	Roybal-Allard
Castro (TX)	Keating	Ruiz
Chu, Judy	Kelly (IL)	Ruppersberger
Cicilline	Kennedy	Rush
Clark (MA)	Khanna	Ryan
Clarke (NY)	Kildee	Sánchez
Clay	Kind	Sarbanes
Cleaver	Kirkpatrick	Scanlon
Clyburn	Krishnamoorthi	Schakowsky
Cohen	Langevin	Schiff
Connolly	Larson (CT)	Schneider
Cooper	Lawson (FL)	Scott (VA)
Correa	Lee (CA)	Serrano
Costa	Levin (CA)	Sewell (AL)
Courtney	Levin (MI)	Shalala
Cuellar	Lieu, Ted	Sherman
Davids (KS)	Loebbeck	Soto
Davis (CA)	Lofgren	Speler
Davis, Danny K.	Lowenthal	Stanton
Dean	Lowe	Stevens
DeFazio	Luján	Suozzi
DeGette	Lynch	Swalwell (CA)
DeLauro	Malinowski	Takano
Demings	Maloney,	Thompson (CA)
DeSaulnier	Carolyn B.	Thompson (MS)
Dingell	Maloney, Sean	
Doggett	Matsui	
Doyle, Michael	McCollum	
F.	McEachin	
Engel	McGovern	
Escobar	McNerney	
Eshoo	Meeks	
Espallat	Meng	

Velázquez	Wasserman	Welch
Visclosky	Schultz	Wexton
	Watson Coleman	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—27

Cheney	Lawrence	Roy
DelBene	Lewis	Schrier
Green (TN)	Marchant	Scott, David
Grijalva	Mullin	Sires
Herrera Beutler	Newhouse	Smith (WA)
Jayapal	Ratcliffe	Timmons
Johnson (TX)	Rodgers (WA)	Veasey
Kilmer	Rooney (FL)	Waters
Larsen (WA)	Rose, John W.	Wilson (FL)

□ 1119

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

Mr. DEUTCH and Ms. FRANKEL changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to recommit was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the instructions of the House in the motion to recommit, I report the bill, H.R. 1140, back to the House with an amendment.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

Add at the end of section 4 the following:

(c) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—During the transition period and after the conversion date, the Secretary shall ensure that the Transportation Security Administration continues to prevent the hiring of individuals who have been convicted of a sex crime, an offense involving a minor, a crime of violence, or terrorism.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

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

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

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 230, nays 171, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 90]

YEAS—230

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

Cunningham King (NY)
 Davids (KS) Kirkpatrick
 Davis (CA) Krishnamoorthi
 Davis, Danny K. Kuster (NH)
 Davis, Rodney Lamb
 Dean Langevin
 DeFazio Larson (CT)
 DeGette Lawson (FL)
 DeLauro Lee (CA)
 Delgado Lee (NV)
 Demings Levin (CA)
 DeSaulnier Levin (MI)
 Deutch Lieu, Ted
 Dingell Lipinski
 Doggett Loebach
 Doyle, Michael Lofgren
 F. Lowenthal
 Engel Lowey
 Escobar Lujan
 Eshoo Luria
 Espallat Lynch
 Evans Malinowski
 Finkenauer Maloney
 Fitzpatrick Carolyn B.
 Fletcher Maloney, Sean
 Foster Mast
 Frankel Matsui
 Fudge McAdams
 Gabbard McBath
 Gallego McCollum
 Garamendi McEachin
 Garcia (IL) McGovern
 Garcia (TX) McKinley
 Golden McNerney
 Gomez Meeks
 Gonzalez (OH) Meng
 Gonzalez (TX) Moore
 Gottheimer Morelle
 Green, Al (TX) Moulton
 Haaland Mucarsel-Powell
 Harder (CA) Murphy (FL)
 Hastings Nadler
 Hayes Napolitano
 Heck Neal
 Higgins (NY) Neguse
 Himes Norcross
 Horn, Kendra S. O'Halleran
 Horsford Ocasio-Cortez
 Houlahan Omar
 Hoyer Pallone
 Huffman Panetta
 Jackson Lee Pappas
 Jeffries Pascrell
 Johnson (GA) Payne
 Joyce (OH) Perlmutter
 Kaptur Peters
 Keating Peterson
 Kelly (IL) Phillips
 Kennedy Pingree
 Khanna Pocan
 Kildee Porter
 Kim Pressley
 Kind Price (NC)

NAYS—171

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

Quigley
 Raskin
 Reed
 Rice (NY)
 Richmond
 Rose (NY)
 Rouda
 Roybal-Allard
 Ruiz
 Ruppersberger
 Rush
 Ryan
 Sanchez
 Sarbanes
 Scanlon
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Schneider
 Schrader
 Scott (VA)
 Serrano
 Sewell (AL)
 Shalala
 Sherman
 Sherrill
 Slotkin
 Smith (NJ)
 Soto
 Spanberger
 Speier
 Stanton
 Stauber
 Stevens
 Suozzi
 Swailwell (CA)
 Takano
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Titus
 Tlaib
 Tonko
 Torres (CA)
 Torres Small
 (NM)
 Trahan
 Trone
 Underwood
 Van Drew
 Vargas
 Vela
 Velázquez
 Visclosky
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Watson Coleman
 Welch
 Wexton
 Wild
 Yarmuth
 Young
 Zeldin

Luetkemeyer
 Marshall
 Massie
 McCarthy
 McCaul
 McClintock
 McHenry
 Meadows
 Meuser
 Miller
 Mitchell
 Moolenaar
 Mooney (WV)
 Murphy (NC)
 Norman
 Nunes
 Olson
 Palazzo
 Palmer
 Pence
 Posey
 Reschenthaler
 Rice (SC)

Cheney
 DelBene
 Green (TN)
 Grijalva
 Herrera Beutler
 Jayapal
 Johnson (TX)
 Kilmer
 Larsen (WA)
 Lawrence

Riggleman
 Roby
 Roe, David P.
 Rogers (AL)
 Rogers (KY)
 Rouzer
 Rutherford
 Scalise
 Schweikert
 Scott, Austin
 Sensenbrenner
 Shimkus
 Simpson
 Smith (MO)
 Smith (NE)
 Smucker
 Spano
 Stefanik
 Steil
 Steube
 Stewart
 Stivers
 Taylor

NOT VOTING—28

Lewis
 Marchant
 Mullin
 Newhouse
 Perry
 Ratcliffe
 Rodgers (WA)
 Rooney (FL)
 Rose, John W.
 Roy

□ 1131

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, on March 5, 2020, I was not able to cast my votes during the vote series due to a family emergency. Had I been in attendance, I would have voted:

1. YES on Amendment No. 7, CISNEROS (D-CA)—Requires the Secretary of Homeland Security to prioritize the hiring of veterans and related preference eligible individuals, including disabled veterans and widows or widowers of veterans, for positions within the Transportation Security Administration;

2. YES on Amendment No. 9, MUCARSEL-POWELL (D-FL) [on behalf of SCHRIER (D-WA)]—Would ensure the Administrator of TSA in coordination with the Director of CDC and NIAID shall ensure that TSA employees are provided the proper guidance regarding prevention and protections against coronavirus, including guidance and resources;

3. NO on Republican Motion to Recommit; and

4. YES on Final Passage of H.R. 1140—Rights for Transportation Security Officers Act of 2020.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to vote due to extenuating circumstances. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 87, “yea” on rollcall No. 88, “nay” on rollcall No. 89, and “yea” on rollcall No. 90.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I was not present at votes on Thursday, March 5, as I was travelling back to Washington state to meet with coronavirus response leaders. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on Roll Call No. 87 (Cisneros Amendment), “yea” on Roll Call No. 88 (Mucarsel-Powell/Schrier Amendment), “nay” on Roll Call No. 89 (Motion to Recommit), and “yea” on Roll Call No. 90 (Final passage of H.R. 1140) be-

cause the bill strengthens workplace rights for Transportation Security Officers, improving job conditions, and enhancing the security of the traveling public.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, from Monday, March 2, to Thursday, March 5, I was not able to make the recorded votes below. Had I been present, I would have voted: “yea” on rollcall No. 90, “yea” on rollcall No. 89, “yea” on rollcall No. 88, “yea” on rollcall No. 87, “yea” on rollcall No. 86, “yea” on rollcall No. 85, “yea” on rollcall No. 84, “yea” on rollcall No. 83, “yea” on rollcall No. 82, “yea” on rollcall No. 81, “yea” on rollcall No. 80, and “yea” on rollcall No. 79.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to indicate I was unavoidably detained in a committee hearing and unable to register my vote for the Cisneros amendment protecting veterans and having a focus of hiring veterans under the legislation H.R. 1140, Rights for Transportation Security Officers Act of 2020, I ask that my vote of “aye” be placed in the RECORD at the appropriate place.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Miss Kaitlyn Roberts, one of his secretaries.

ADJOURNMENT FROM THURSDAY, MARCH 5, 2020, TO MONDAY, MARCH 9, 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 my friend, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), who is the majority leader of the House, for the purpose of inquiring about the schedule for next week.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, 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 Tuesday and Wednesday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate and 12 p.m. for legislative business.

On Thursday, Mr. Speaker, 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 suspension bills will be announced by the close of business tomorrow.

The House will consider H.R. 2214, the NO BAN Act. This bill would repeal the President's Muslim travel ban and prevent the administration from putting in place other discriminatory travel bans.

In addition, the House will consider H.R. 5581, Access to Counsel Act. This legislation would make certain that those held or detained while attempting to enter the United States are guaranteed access to legal counsel. That legal counsel, Mr. Speaker, would not be paid for by the government.

The current FISA authorization expires March 15, requiring action in this House. Conversations are ongoing, and I hope to bring legislation to the floor next week.

Lastly, following Senate passage of Senator KAINE's bipartisan War Powers resolution, it is possible that the House could also consider the resolution as early as next week.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

In relation to the NO BAN Act, I understand there was a disagreement over whether or not the gentleman supported the President's ability to restrict travel from certain countries based, not on whether they were a Muslim country, but based on whether or not they were a country that was not in compliance with our Department of Homeland Security requirements and criteria to ensure that they are properly vetting people who come to our country for national security purposes and, specifically, to ensure that people who are known terrorists and people who have other known criminal backgrounds are not able to come into our country.

Most countries around the world, including a number of Muslim countries, are in compliance and, in fact, have a very good cooperative travel agreement between the United States and those countries, but there were a limited number of countries back in 2017 that the President ultimately determined, working through the Department of Homeland Security, were not in compliance.

He listed those countries. He added a few more to it later. I know a number of people on the majority side were in disagreement with that. Some took that to court. It ultimately went all the way to the U.S. Supreme Court. The Supreme Court upheld this travel ban.

But I would want to point out to the gentleman that the Department of Homeland Security has been very clear to these countries that if they comply with the basic reporting requirements—again, that every other country in the world that has that same travel agreement with the United States has—if they were to come into compliance, then they would be removed from the list.

In fact, Chad is one of the countries that was originally listed. Chad worked with us—as every country should—and said: We are going to comply. We want to make sure that we are properly sharing information so that people who are coming to the United States from Chad now are properly vetted for terrorism and other criminal activities.

They got removed from the list.

The other countries, by the way, have been invited to do that. They have chosen not to. Why they have chosen not to is a good question they should be asked. We should not criticize the President for using his executive authority to keep this country safe and to keep terrorists from coming into this country and ensuring that those nations that send people to the United States—as we send them to their countries—are in compliance with the requirements of the Department of Homeland Security.

So why would a bill like that be brought up, especially at this time when now with this coronavirus there are a number of countries that we have seen, starting with China, that have a serious outbreak that we are trying to prevent from coming into our country?

Under this bill that would be coming forward, not only does it limit the President's ability to protect us from having countries be able to send terrorists into our Nation, now it would limit the President's ability to respond to a health crisis like the coronavirus where there are some countries that are listed, like China and Iran, that have to be screened or can't send people from those countries if they have been in those countries in the last 14 days, it would tie the President's hands from even responding to that crisis.

We have seen just today the Governor of California—probably not somebody who is philosophically aligned with the President too often—just sent a cruise ship back into the Pacific Ocean and said the cruise ship can't come into San Francisco. And that is the Governor's power and authority to provide for the health and safety of his State.

Why would we want to tie the hands of the President of the United States when he wants to ensure the health and safety of the people of this country?

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I will give a relatively short answer. First of all, there is nobody in this House on either side of the aisle—certainly none of the proponents of this legislation—who want to in any way limit the President's ability to protect America, whether it is from terrorists, whether it is from the coronavirus or some other threat that manifestly presents itself to the safety and well-being of the American people.

□ 1145

What the bill attempts to do is simply to preclude violating, in effect, the

Constitution of the United States in either making a religious test for admission to the United States of America, which, very frankly, a number of statements of the President would indicate that, in the past, that was what he intended to do and, in fact, was manifest in the very broad reach, unrelated to whether somebody was a terrorist but related to what their religion was or some other distinction unrelated.

Now, obviously, both the health and safety of the American people would not preclude the President from acting to protect that. I think we would all agree on that. But, clearly, we believe the President has, in fact, gone far beyond specific ways and means to protect the American people and simply preclude people, as I said, of a particular religion, a particular nationality, or some other broad base unrelated to the specific items to which you referred, with which I think most of us agree.

Of course, we will debate that next week.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, clearly, we will debate that because the Supreme Court has already addressed the constitutionality upholding it, but it has no genesis in religious tests. It has a genesis in the security of this country.

Again, if you go look at the nations that are listed in the ban, Chad went and did the things that the Department of Homeland Security said you needed to do to be in compliance, and they got removed from the list.

Every other country on that list has also been invited to go and just do basic sharing of information to ensure that the people coming from those countries are not terrorists, are not criminals, are not going to provide a security threat to our Nation.

It is a clear test. Every other country in the world already does it.

Why does Libya choose not to comply? I don't know, but they haven't.

Why does North Korea choose not to comply? I don't know, but they haven't.

Like Chad, go and address these deficiencies, and then you can be removed from the list. Chad has already done that. Every other country can.

We will debate it, but it does put additional red tape in front of the President that would preclude him in the health arena from responding to the nations that have a threat of the coronavirus, like the President was quickly able to do with China, quickly able to do with Iran. He would not be able to quickly respond in the future under the bill that is proposed.

Clearly, we will heavily debate that next week.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I want to assure the gentleman that it is our view that nothing in this legislation will preclude the President of the United States from acting, either on the basis of national security or the security of our people, either from threats of terrorism or from health, or

for some other identifiable threat to the American people.

This simply says that he cannot act based upon the generalization that somebody is a Muslim, somebody is from this country, somebody is from a different nationality or different religion, or some other arbitrary distinction. He has to focus on specific reasons.

In China's case, for instance, we know that China has a very large outbreak of coronavirus and that it poses a proximate threat to the health not only of the American people but of people around the world and that we need to take steps to ensure that that is contained.

So, we will debate that next week, but we certainly don't accept the premise that the gentleman has just stated, that somehow we will limit the President from protecting the American people for legitimate and necessary reasons.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, clearly, we do have disagreements on that. Hopefully, we can work through those in the debate next week.

There is another bill that is going to be, hopefully, coming up that we can get agreement on, and that deals with the renewal of components of the FISA law.

I know the Committee on the Judiciary earlier this week had a markup that they ultimately pulled back on. There are negotiations ongoing between Republicans and Democrats to try to come to an agreement on not only how to renew the FISA law, but also how to make the reforms that are critical and necessary to the FISA law, to address the abuses that we know happen.

I would ask the gentleman first if his side is in a position of identifying some of the areas we can find agreement on, on reforms, because I believe Ranking Member NUNES had submitted a number of specific reforms, and the gentleman's side is reviewing those.

Has the gentleman had a chance to review them? Does he have an alternative proposal? Because the reforms are critical to the renewal.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman to answer that.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to tell the gentleman that, this morning or late last night, we sent a response to your offer, and the committees now have that in their possession. I see they are shaking their heads that they may not think that we did it, but we did. We have already sent a response to your offer, with reference to the reforms.

As the gentleman knows, we have agreed on a number of items as, frankly, the person that dealt with the person who had your job previously, ROY BLUNT and I, with Senator Bond, also from Missouri, as is now-Senator BLUNT but then-Minority Whip BLUNT, and Jay Rockefeller from West Virginia. We worked on the reauthorization of FISA in 2008, and we received

broad bipartisan support. I am hopeful that we can do that.

This bill, as the gentleman knows, the authorization for section 215 expires on March 15. The Attorney General, as the gentleman knows, recommended that we pass a clean reauthorization.

Obviously, both sides felt that there were some things they wanted to deal with, and we are doing that now. Hopefully, we can get this done.

Mr. Speaker, I will assure the gentleman that, once we have agreement, I will bring that bill to the floor.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that the gentleman talked about a response. I haven't seen that response yet, but I look forward to working with our folks who are heavily involved in these negotiations to see if we can reach agreement because, in the past, the program has had many supporters, Republican and Democrat, but clearly some detractors on both sides as well.

It is a very critical tool in our national security. The FISA courts have been used to stop terrorist activity, to prevent other terrorist attacks, but there is clearly other weighing that goes back and forth on civil liberties and ensuring that the rights of Americans are protected.

It is a balance that was tested, frankly, in 2016, when we saw clear abuses of the FISA court. The first time we had seen those kinds of identified abuses, they were limited, but they were blatant. It is a dangerous affront to our Nation's national security if you have people at intelligence agencies who abuse their power.

In fact, the Horowitz report was very specific in outlining 17 different exact abuses of the FISA court. Some of this is still being investigated through the Durham investigation, which will, hopefully, yield a list of specific people.

I will just read from parts of the Horowitz report.

"As more fully described in Chapter 5, based upon the information known to the FBI in October 2016, the first application contained the following seven significant inaccuracies and omissions."

He goes on in this report: "In addition to repeating the seven significant errors contained in the first FISA application and outlined above, we identified 10 additional significant errors and three renewal applications, based upon information known to the FBI after the first application and before the renewals," where abuses of this FISA law occurred.

Now, I think, on both sides, we would agree that if somebody in a position of national security abuses their power deliberately, they need to be held accountable. One of the concerns we have is that the law does not allow strong enough penalties.

I am hopeful that, when the Durham report comes out, the people who were identified as abusing their power in 2016 ought to be held accountable and,

in fact, ought to go to jail for what they did because what they did not only undermined our electoral process, but it jeopardizes a law that has bipartisan support but has bipartisan opposition as well.

If somebody abused their power to taint that process, the FISA court, it undermines the integrity of the FISA court. We all need to work together to ensure that anyone who abuses their power is held fully accountable, not only to hold them accountable, but to ensure it doesn't happen again. No Republican, no Democrat candidate for President ought to be concerned that people in intelligence agencies are abusing their power to try to undermine an election.

If it happened, as we know it did—and the Horowitz report is very specific. Hopefully, the Durham investigation names names. Hopefully, those people are held accountable and go to jail so that nobody else does it again.

But as we know, there is the possibility for that to happen under current law. That is why it is so important that we get this agreement to make necessary critical reforms, to put guardrails in place; to keep the process available to our national security experts so that they can continue to stop future terrorist attacks; but to also ensure that if somebody abuses the process, it makes it harder for them to do it; but if they still cross the line, that there are strong criminal penalties in place for those who would violate that law.

I know we have laid those out. I am glad to know you have come back with a response. Hopefully, we can get that agreement in the next few days before this law expires. Clearly, there is strong support, hopefully, on both sides, for putting real reforms in place that fix and address the abuses that occurred in 2016, as identified by the Horowitz report.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman for anything else on that.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, somewhat like the recitation of the Mueller report that has been quoted—the Mueller report, of course, found substantial reason to believe that there was wrongdoing. It was projected by the Attorney General and others that the Mueller report was a conclusion that the President or others had not done something wrong. That was not the fact.

In any event, with respect to the gentleman's comments, with respect to what was done by the FBI, it should not have been done, obviously.

But the gentleman didn't read this very important sentence from the inspector general's report regarding the court's decision: "We did not find documentary or testimonial evidence that political bias or improper motivation influenced his decision," meaning the court's decision, the judge's decision.

The bill that we are talking about is reauthorizing section 215. None of this deals with section 215. It deals with metadata on which the parties have an

agreement. It also deals with business records and issues of lone wolves, who are not necessarily associated with a terrorist organization but present a danger to the United States.

There are reforms that we can pursue to ensure that the FISA court gets all the information that it needs and, in fact, has a representative who makes sure that they get that and who is not associated with, necessarily, the law enforcement officers or intelligence officers who are presenting information to the FISA court.

Unfortunately, and I want to say candidly, Mr. Speaker, the President's focus on the Page case and distracting from the issues that we are dealing with—Attorney General Barr recommended that we reauthorize the FISA section 215 as is. That is what the Attorney General recommended. I don't know what his present position is because he was criticized by the President in a tweet, so heaven knows what he did in response to the tweet.

But the fact of the matter is, the issues which the gentleman raises, we all want appropriate, honest disclosure from individuals who present to the FISA court. That is not an issue, and we ought to pursue reforms that lead to that end. But in this case, the focus on an issue unrelated to section 215, which we are really talking about, is slowing up this process. And I would hope that in the coming days, because the 15th is upon us, we come to an agreement.

As I said, we sent an offer back, Mr. Whip. Hopefully, we will hear back from you and, hopefully, reach agreement in the near term because this is an important thing to pass, to reauthorize for the security of our people.

The gentleman was talking about security before. We need to make sure that we act in a bipartisan way to ensure that the FISA process is working and working properly.

□ 1200

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, clearly, the gentleman from Maryland and I both agree that this FISA law has a strong role to play in our national security, but there is also acknowledgment that there were abuses that happened. Not only was there the Horowitz investigation, but now you do have the Durham investigation that will, hopefully, conclude and identify where those abuses took place and that those people would be held accountable.

We have had talks with the Attorney General, who recognizes, yes, he also agrees that this FISA law is critically important, wants to have this section renewed, but he does recognize that reforms can be made.

How exactly we can come to an agreement—just like with your side, we are having those negotiations. And so, if people do acknowledge that abuses occurred, I think it would be in all of our best interest, as we are addressing this law that has had detractors on both sides, that we strengthen

the integrity of the law, because it has been exposed now. It has been exposed that there were problems that occurred.

The other sections where those problems occurred are permanent law. This is not. This is coming up for renewal, but it is part of the FISA law. And, clearly, as we debate the FISA law, all of this becomes part of that debate, and, hopefully, all of it can get resolved within the debate on the components that expire March 15.

I am confident we can get this done because I have seen the bipartisan interest. We just need to make sure that what we bring to the floor addresses the problems that occurred so that it, hopefully, never happens again.

I will be happy to yield if the gentleman had anything else on that.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I don't have anything further to say.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I look forward to seeing the gentleman next week, and I yield back the balance of my time.

BIPARTISAN CORONAVIRUS LEGISLATION

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to praise my House colleagues for their swift and decisive action to attack the corona threat yesterday.

Members of both parties recognized that this disease is a national and public health crisis, that it will affect all Americans, regardless of political party. We came together to approve \$7.8 billion to protect the safety and well-being of all Americans. The Founding Fathers created this Chamber for exactly that reason.

In the spirit of bipartisan cooperation, I would like to discuss the Affordable Care Act. Like our coronavirus bill yesterday, the ACA attacked a public health crisis. It improved the health and security of millions of Americans, especially those with pre-existing conditions. It has saved money for American workers, and it has helped millions of American families provide care for their children.

If these attacks on the ACA are successful, at least 25 million Americans will be uninsured. We do not want them to avoid screenings for coronavirus or future viruses because they cannot afford it.

CONGRATULATING LINDSEY BORDAS

(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, I rise today to recognize Lindsey Bordas, a senior at Philipsburg-Osceola High School.

Recently, Lindsey accepted a fully qualified appointment to the United

States Military Academy in West Point, New York. Lindsey is a leader in the classroom and in her community. She is her senior class salutatorian and class president.

Lindsey is also an active member of her school's fly-fishing club and her church youth group. Her determination and drive will make her an excellent addition to the military academy, and I am confident she will rise to the occasion and excel during her education and in her service to our country.

I would like to thank Lindsey for her commitment and her willingness to serve, and I wish her all the best in this exciting new chapter.

RECOGNIZING BILL BALLEZA

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

Ms. GARCIA of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today I recognize Bill Balleza, a KPRC 2 anchor, who, for nearly 50 years, has been a reliable source of daily news for our community.

Bill has been seen on TV screens across our city for years, where he reported on thousands of stories, did a weekly child segment from 1985 to 1995, and earned an Emmy Award for his reporting.

Not only has he served our community as a distinguished journalist and anchor, but he is also a proud Vietnam veteran. He is a common sight at the Veteran's Day celebration and parade every year.

We thank Bill for his service. In the days of fake news and attacks on the media, he has always been above the fray and a trusted source. We will miss seeing him on the TV screen when we tune into KPRC 2 for the daily news.

For now, he should enjoy his retirement. He has earned it. And God bless.

JOHN WESLEY UNITED METHODIST CHURCH CELEBRATES 180TH AN- NIVERSARY

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

Mr. VAN DREW. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize the John Wesley United Methodist Church in Cape May Courthouse in south Jersey on their 180th anniversary celebration this year.

John Wesley United Methodist Church is the oldest African American church in all of Cape May County. John Wesley founded the church in 1840 after escaping slavery in North Carolina in 1823.

The church also is home to a cemetery, where there are veterans from the Civil War all the way to the Vietnam war.

I was proud to attend the celebration event on Saturday, February 29. In addition to the celebration, the congregation is planning to hold an African

American cemetery tour in April of this year, which should be extremely enlightening and interesting.

John Wesley's mission statement is that they will promote unity and diversity within our church and our community.

I thank them for their commitment to this community. I thank them and congratulate them on 180 years. May God's blessing be upon them.

HONORING NELLA LARSEN

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

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, this is Women's History Month. I rise to recognize Nella Larsen, who was born in Chicago in 1891. Her mother was a Danish immigrant and her father an immigrant from the Danish West Indies, what is now known as the U.S. Virgin Islands.

Larsen attended school in all-White environments in Chicago until she moved to Nashville to attend high school. She later practiced nursing, served as a librarian in the New York Public Library, and, after resigning from that position, she began a literary career.

Her first novel, "Quicksand," won her a Harmon Foundation bronze medal. After the publication of her second novel, "Passing," in 1929, Larsen was awarded a Guggenheim Fellowship, a first for an African American woman, establishing her as a premier novelist of the Harlem Renaissance.

She died in New York in 1964.

Her work explored the complex issues of racial identity and identification in her fiction. Though critics remain conflicted about her novels, "Quicksand" and "Passing," there can be no question that they are significant, groundbreaking American literary texts. She received a number of awards for her writing.

Along with her contemporary, novelist Zora Neale Hurston, Larsen is considered to be one of the most important female voices in the Harlem Renaissance. We remember her voice now.

HONORING VIRGINIA MILITARY INSTITUTE FULBRIGHT SCHOLARS

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

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Speaker, Virginia Military Institute is world renowned for many achievements, but I rise today to recognize VMI for producing one of the highest numbers of Fulbright Scholars, nationally, for the 2019–2020 academic year. This world-renowned program seeks to improve cultural relationships through the exchange of students, faculty, and ideas.

The three bright individuals to receive this prestigious honor are Second Lieutenant Annika Tice, Colonel Howard Sanborn, and Colonel Geoff Jensen.

One of only 2,200 students who received a scholarship last year, Second Lieutenant Tice used her Fulbright to educate others and taught English in the Ivory Coast.

Colonel Sanborn, a professor of international studies and political science, used this opportunity to study legislative politics in Hong Kong.

Colonel Jensen, a professor of history, will conduct research in Madrid this coming summer.

Sanborn and Jensen were among only 470 faculty to receive a Fulbright distinction this year.

With more colleges and universities than nearly any other district in the country, I am proud that these three individuals exemplify the talent that the Sixth District attracts.

Congratulations to VMI on this noteworthy accomplishment.

RECOGNIZING THE WOUNDED WARRIOR PROGRAM

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the Wounded Warrior Program, which is a bipartisan initiative that provides opportunities for injured veterans and servicemembers to continue their service to our country by working right here in the United States Congress.

I am proud to have passed legislation, supported by Republicans and Democrats, to expand the Wounded Warrior Program. By investing in these paid fellowships, we can expand job opportunities for veterans and bring, importantly, their critical insight to the work that we do right here in Congress.

For the past 2 years, I have had the distinct privilege of having a Wounded Warrior fellow, Danielle Stevens, in my office. Throughout her time in my office, she has served my district by advising me on important legislation and, very importantly, being an advocate for veterans in casework that she has been involved in, including veterans who lost earned benefits, had them taken away from them due to clerical errors. Danielle Stevens was able to work to get those benefits restored, changing the lives of those families.

Later this week, she will be leaving my office to continue her public service at the U.S. Marshals Service. I thank her for her service to our country. This is an example of the success of this program.

REMEMBERING COLONEL (RETIRED) RONALD LORD

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

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with great sadness over the passing of Colonel Ronald Lord from Goodyear, Arizona, a loving husband to Mayor Georgia Lord of the city of Goodyear, which is in my district. He

was a caring and kind father, grandfather, and great-grandfather, and he was loved by many.

While serving as a fighter pilot in the United States Air Force during the Vietnam war, he bravely fought against hostile North Vietnamese forces. Ron was an American hero, and we are eternally grateful for his service.

On behalf of the Arizona Eighth Congressional District, I extend my deepest condolences to Ron's family and loved ones as they mourn their loss.

CONGRATULATING SHAKOPEE HIGH SCHOOL WRESTLING TEAM

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

Ms. CRAIG. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to congratulate the Shakopee High School wrestling team, who repeated as class 3A State champions for the second year in a row.

Congratulations to the wrestlers for the hard work that went into preparing for this perfect season. The dedication they have demonstrated is unparalleled, and their success is well deserved.

Also, thank you to the parents, the coaches, the teachers, and the mentors who dedicate their time, because they are equally committed to the team's success and future.

Congratulations to the team, and may they enjoy this moment. They have earned it.

JUNE MEDICAL SERVICES V. RUSSO

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

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to remind my colleagues of what is at stake at the Supreme Court in coming weeks.

Yesterday, the Court began to hear arguments in a major abortion rights case, June Medical Services v. Russo.

If the Louisiana law in question goes into effect, only one clinic remains in the entire State. Only one physician would continue to provide abortion services to the 10,000 women who seek them every year. That outcome would deny thousands of women in Louisiana their constitutional protection: the protected right to access abortion care.

In 2016, the Court already decided that an identical case was unconstitutional. But since President Trump has added two conservative Justices to the Supreme Court, it is more important than ever for us to speak out about what is at stake, and I am proud to do that today.

The Court should not uphold the Louisiana law and should overturn it.

□ 1215

RECOGNIZING BILL GAERTNER

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

Mr. TRONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Bill Gaertner for receiving the distinguished St. Dismas Award for his work through the Gatekeepers Re-Entry Program in Hagerstown, Maryland.

Gatekeepers is a program that addresses one of the top needs in our criminal justice system: support for returning citizens.

Today, 90 percent of incarcerated people get released into their own communities, but many struggle to find the resources and support to thrive.

A returning citizen himself, Bill was 70 years old when he was released from prison. He started the Gatekeepers organization when he realized the challenges those released from prison face as they reenter society.

Gatekeepers aims to provide a connection to resources so folks could be successful as they transition back into their communities.

We should all be working toward a more just criminal justice system.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Bill Gaertner on this much-deserved award for his work to support justice-impacted communities.

RECOGNIZING HEROISM OF ROBERT TARLETON AND EDWARD RYER

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

Mr. MALINOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the heroism of two New Jersey State troopers, Trooper Robert Tarleton and State Police Lieutenant Edward Ryer.

On March 2, Trooper Tarleton was stopped and talking with a driver on I-287 in Bridgewater, New Jersey, when a tractor-trailer ran off the road, hit a structure, and burst into flames.

Trooper Tarleton immediately ran toward the scene, where he met Lieutenant Ryer, who was off-duty but had stopped to help.

With no thought to their personal safety, they grabbed the incapacitated driver from the wreckage, dragging him to safety seconds before the truck exploded.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Trooper Tarleton and Lieutenant Ryer for their selfless actions that saved a man's life.

I also want to take a moment to recognize the everyday acts of heroism by our law enforcement officers that may not make the news or be captured on a body cam, as this one was.

We call them when we need help, and no matter how dangerous the situation, they always come. We are grateful.

TIME TO RAISE ENDOMETRIOSIS AWARENESS AND FUNDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MALINOWSKI). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentlewoman from Iowa (Ms. FINKENAUER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. FINKENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on my Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Ms. FINKENAUER. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to represent the great State of Iowa and the First Congressional District.

We have been getting a lot of great things done here in the House, working across the aisle and moving a lot of bipartisan bills forward since I got sworn in over a year ago. It has been an honor to get to represent my district and have its back every day.

In the middle of all of this, I happen to have gotten engaged a couple of months ago to my very kind and supportive fiancé, who is sitting up there in the gallery right now. He has been there through so much of it, and I am grateful every day.

You see, we are very much looking forward to one day starting our life together and are talking about raising a family and doing it in Iowa and how much that means to us.

So it would surprise most folks to know that just about 4 weeks ago, on a Friday after votes, I was back where I stay in D.C., sitting on my bed, doubled over in pain, googling hysterectomies.

It was a pain familiar to me, stabbing in my lower left abdomen, and a tight pain like two fists clenched together in a vise grip in my lower back.

I know this pain well because I have been experiencing it intermittently for over the past decade because I have a condition called endometriosis. I have had this most of my adult life.

I was diagnosed at a young age, luckily, at the early age of 18. See, a lot of women don't get an accurate diagnosis until much later in life.

Endometriosis is a very painful condition where the tissue that normally lines the uterus grows outside and can even attach to organs and nerves. Endometriosis is also the number one cause of hysterectomies for women ages 30 to 35.

I have already had two surgeries, laparoscopies, where they went in and cut off or burnt off the tissue. I have white-knuckled my way through more flights, events, and days knocking on doors than I can count.

There are so many women out there who have been told that the stabbing pain in your lower left abdomen is nor-

mal, or they are told that the tightness in their lower back that they are doubled over with in their beds is normal, but none of that is normal.

On this particular day, 4 weeks ago, I felt like I had enough. So I sat there, frustrated at the prospect of more delays in the airport in severe pain. I was looking at some of the most extreme options that are out there that would mean I couldn't even have children.

And to be honest with you, I just got frustrated because it shouldn't be this hard. It should be more well known, and there should be more options for treatment.

As I was looking up hysterectomies, I came across a place called the Endometriosis Foundation of America, and their website was full of information, some that I didn't even know as somebody who has been living with this for over 10 years, like the fact that endometriosis affects 1 in 10 women worldwide and an estimated 7 to 10 million in the United States alone, or that it is the leading cause of infertility, but there is no known cure.

You see, when I was looking up hysterectomies, the reason there are not more options, or options are slow to come by is because it is also one of the least-funded diseases and conditions by Congress, by the National Institutes of Health.

So once I decided to start talking about this, the number of people, whether it is their staff who has it, or their sister who has it, or possibly somebody they work with every day, or people they have met on the campaign, I mean, it just goes on and on, the number of people this touched, the women who have it and the men and women who love them.

I was also reminded, as I decided to look into this, how lucky I am. You see, I am lucky that I had a mom who believed me, who believed my pain, and good health insurance from my dad's union, where we could go to doctor after doctor after doctor until finally somebody said: "Hey, she might have this. We better take a look at it." That is when, again, I was able to be diagnosed.

I am lucky to have great support from my staff and others. But there are so many women across the United States who don't have that support.

When I decided to talk about this just a few weeks ago, I was actually getting my hair trimmed, and my hairdresser heard me say the word "endometriosis." She looked at me, and she said: Do you have it?

I said: Yes, I have it.

And she said: Well, right now, I am feeling like I am being stabbed in my lower left abdomen.

I said: Yes, I know that pain.

She was working three jobs, and she is dealing with it every day. It is something where she doesn't have the luxury to not show up. Many women don't. You just push through it, and you get through that pain day in and day out.

□ 1230

ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. STEVENS). 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. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the tribute of my colleague a few moments ago for law enforcement.

One of the things that arose out of the evil hatred that brought about 9/11's attacks was people began to appreciate our military again and began to appreciate our first responders again. That was a very welcome development. And it seems that in recent years so much of that respect and admiration has been clouded by false allegations against some law enforcement. So it is great to hear other colleagues talk about the importance of our law enforcement and the role they play.

Unfortunately, what many consider to be the greatest law enforcement agency or department in the world has been badly clouded by bad actors within the Federal Bureau of Investigation. I know U.S. Attorney Durham is investigating. We haven't seen any results come from that at this point. We have just seen terribly inappropriate if not criminal conduct from FBI agents in recent years that resulted in no punishment.

We had Christopher Wray, the director of the FBI, before our committee recently. I questioned him about the FBI agent who falsified information to submit to the FISA court, in essence, changing the information that said Carter Page did work for our intelligence agency to saying he did not, and instead of the director punishing him, he was allowed to resign. That is not hardly cleaning up criminal conduct.

The people that swore to applications and affidavits before the FISA court in order to get warrants to spy upon Carter Page—Papadopoulos—the Trump campaign was obviously the goal. We haven't seen people punished, but the reputation of the FBI and those good FBI agents who do enforce and follow and properly investigate the law, they suffered. It is going to take, obviously, a different director of the FBI in order to clean up the FBI and get their reputation back.

Simply allowing people to resign or retire when from all appearances they have engaged in criminal conduct when they are supposed to be investigating criminals, that is not enough. To deny and to turn the other cheek when you find out about improprieties within your department, that is not enough.

As Christians, we believe in what Jesus taught about turning the other cheek or loving your enemy, but there is a different role for Christians when they are in government, and that does not mean ignoring criminal improprieties; it means, like Romans 13 talks

about, if you do evil, you are supposed to be afraid because the government was not given the sword in vain. It is supposed to punish evildoers. And that is one of the roles.

We are supposed to have good oversight in Congress, and the FBI had been allowed to devolve into great problems here in Washington, and not just in Washington, but even working for the District of Columbia. The agent, possibly agents, that helped cover up for the Awan brothers further cast great clouds over the reputation of the FBI, but here again, that is in Washington.

Across the country, around the world we have good FBI agents. But when my very dear friend, brother, Philip Haney was found with a gunshot wound to his chest out in California, I wish I were comforted when we got word that FBI agents were being sent to assist Amador County in the investigation. I don't know which agents were sent. I don't know if they were good FBI or FBI like Strzok and Page and McCabe and others who had no problem being political and being dishonest in their jobs.

I know Inspector General Horowitz has come out with more information about another investigation, but the manner in which he did a great job of finding so many improprieties and then came to conclusions completely opposite of what the fact findings were is a bit disturbing.

We need the FBI cleaned up. We need the reputation back. But it needs to come back not through cover-ups like it appears to me has been going on in recent years, but from actually cleaning out those who have been abusing their authority.

We are supposed to be taking up the issue of a couple of provisions. The PATRIOT Act section 215 is coming up, fortunately, for sunset. We should be taking up the issue of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act court, the FISA court. But when we address that, when it has come up, when we have had private discussions with Federal authorities, those of us on the Judiciary Committee in the past, going back to my first year here, 2005, we have been assured, this is FISA, this is the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act. The purpose is to help us go after foreigners who are known terrorists or are foreigners who have relationships with known terrorist organizations. That is who we are going after.

The only time we were assured years ago that we may pick up an American citizen is if they are in contact with known foreign terrorists or known foreign terrorist organizations, otherwise, we don't even pick them up. And we find out now years later, those were lies. The "F" in FISA stands for foreign, but what we have come to find out through the FBI dishonesty in pursuing the Trump campaign was that actually they go after American citizens on a regular basis. It is a regular thing. They use the FISA court to spy

I know there are so many women hearing this today who may be hearing their pain described for the very first time, and that is why I want to make sure that I give a voice to them today and say that it is okay to talk about this. That is why I decided to do what I am doing today.

See, I am in this position with a platform as a Member of Congress, and I can talk about this important issue that touches so many women across the U.S.

To be honest with you, I didn't say anything for years because I was afraid that people would think I was weak, that I couldn't do my job, but that is not true. I show up every day; I have done it for the last decade. I have represented my State and my District well, and it is not weak to talk about it.

In fact, the women who are living with it every day, they are strong as heck. It is time that people across the country know about what this is.

Every day, women are pushing through their pain and living their lives. They are not weak; they are strong.

And I am not standing here alone because once I started talking about this with my colleagues, I found out how many other Members of Congress are touched by this or know people who have this.

Again, we found out about sisters, comms directors they work with. In fact, even just this morning, after I started talking about it, there was another Congressman who came up to me and said his wife has it. As I talked about it more in my personal life, I have also met more women who struggle with endometriosis.

So I am standing here today with them and in support of them and their pain. And today, at the beginning of this Endometriosis Awareness Month, we are launching the very first Endometriosis Caucus.

Through this caucus, this bipartisan caucus, we are going to raise awareness with the public and in Congress to get more funding and the kind of support that this disease deserves. We need to end the stigma around endometriosis and bring more attention to this condition affecting millions of women, their families, and their friends.

Today, I ask my colleagues in Congress, and everyone watching, to join me in this movement, to join this caucus. We have to up endo funding, up endo research, and up endo awareness.

It is too important, and there are too many women across the United States and worldwide who deal with this every day to be ignored for far too long.

Madam Speaker, thank you for the opportunity to speak here today about this important issue.

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

on Americans, to spy on the Trump campaign, but even more than that, to constantly be grabbing up Americans' phone records. And there was a time when they could say with a straight face, look, all we are getting is the metadata. We don't know who these phone numbers are. They are just metadata that we can run algorithms and see if there are any terrorist numbers in there. Well, we know that is not what has been going on.

Maybe that has, but what additionally has been going on, and we saw this with Chairman SCHIFF, he was able to gather information about people in his own committee, phone numbers, people they had called because the days of being able to say, well, it is metadata, we don't know what all those numbers are; no, nowadays you can know very quickly whose number is where and what metadata. And they are spying on Americans.

So I have said before, unless there was a dramatic cleanup, and we have seen no indication from the FISA judges themselves that they have enough pride in their position that they would be offended by fraud upon their courts—I don't have a problem with the FISA courts going away. I mean, we succeeded in winning World War II when we had important national secrets, and we went through Korea, went through the Cold War, the worst of the Cold War years, without having FISA courts. They came into being in the 1970s. And now over 40 years or so later, we find out that the use of the FISA court has devolved into abuse of the FISA courts so that American citizens are routinely spied upon. And they are not foreign. They are American citizens.

I would love to see, and I really appreciated—we disagree on lots of things, but ZOE LOFGREN from California, most of us would say she is much more liberal, but she has always been concerned about American civil rights. In talking with her yesterday, I am still impressed, she is still concerned about America's civil rights, and we should not have Americans spied on. So I know Congresswoman LOFGREN has been working on ways to try to actually clean up the FISA court and make some reforms that would help clean things up.

But I am to the point with so many abuses that we have found that we could either do away with the FISA court and go back to the days—and, I mean, as a judge I have handled so many warrants, applications, affidavits for warrants, signed warrants—you had to have probable cause that a crime was committed, probable cause that this person probably committed the crime, and then you had to describe with particularity, that is a requirement of the Fourth Amendment, you have to describe with particularity the thing to be searched and the thing to be searched for. And it is often the case that none of those things are found in FISA applications, affidavits, and war-

rants, at least from the things that we have seen.

So the solution in prior days when there was no FISA court, you would file a motion with the court and ask for an in-camera review, ask that documents be sealed for national security purposes. There was normally a time limit, from the ones I am aware of, a time limit on how long they were sealed. And that was to protect national security, if it involved national secrets, national security secrets. But at least it would seem, and I certainly hope that if we are going to reform the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Courts that we have an amendment that says, you know, since the "F" in FISA stands for foreign, then the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act Courts are not going to be granting warrants against American citizens.

If someone in Federal law enforcement, especially the FBI, wants to spy on an American citizen, they can go to an Article III Federal District Court to get their warrant. You shouldn't be able to go to this secret star chamber court to spy on American citizens. That was never, ever anticipated as one of the jobs of the FISA courts when they were created back in the 1970s. If we are going clean it up, and the FBI has shown no propensity to be able to clean it up themselves and to police themselves, and the FISA courts themselves have not shown that ability or propensity, and, in fact, many have been advocating since we found out about such widespread abuse in the FISA courts, some have advocated, well, maybe if we just allow or require the FISA courts to appoint an amicus, a friend of the Court to stand in for the interests of the person against whom a warrant is being sought, that should be an adequate reform.

Then that was proved to be totally bogus back in December when—after this FISA judge who had apparently insufficient pride in her court to punish people who committed a fraud upon the court—an amicus was appointed who happened to be the person who had been lying for quite some time in saying that DEVIN NUNES was lying when it turned out DEVIN was exactly right in the things that he put in his report and that the amicus that the FISA court appointed was the one who had been either lying or just completely ignorant. That is the lawyer that was appointed as the friend of the court.

□ 1245

Clearly, the FISA courts are not capable of cleaning up their own messes. They enjoy, apparently, having fraud committed upon them and their courts as long as they get to keep signing warrants against American citizens without the American citizens having the right to come in and contest it.

I would love to see, especially if we are going to leave the FISA courts, at least let's have an amendment. And I surely hope that this will become a very bipartisan effort to say it is a For-

eign Intelligence Surveillance Act, so we are not going to allow a Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act court to grant warrants against American citizens. If somebody wants those, go to an Article III court.

For those not familiar with the Constitution—I realize that there are more and more these days since more schools are having to teach to the federally mandated test, and there are no civics questions I am aware of that are compelled to be asked in the mandated Federal test. We don't have as many high school students, graduates from high school, who know about Article I, II, and III of the Constitution.

A recent survey, in recent years at least, indicated that, as I recall, more young people 25 and under can identify the Three Stooges than can identify the three branches of the Federal Government: executive, legislative, and judicial.

So Article III is the article dealing with the courts. As my old constitutional law professor, David Guinn, used to say, there is only one court created in the Constitution, and that is the Supreme Court. All other Federal courts owe their existence and their jurisdiction to the United States Congress. In other words, Congress brought them into the world, and Congress can take them out of the world.

So I would hope that if we don't eliminate the FISA court because of such broad abuses that would allow, encourage, and not respond to abuses when one administration is seeking to spy on and participate in a coup against another party's candidate, then it is time to eliminate the court, and if not eliminate the court, at least eliminate the ability of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court to grant warrants against American citizens.

American citizens are supposed to be able to have those civil rights, and they have been taken away by the creation and abuse of the FISA courts. It is time that this Congress, in a bipartisan method, came together and said enough of the abuses.

Let's face it: President Trump has been getting Federal judges appointed and confirmed in record numbers. I think, from what I can tell, Attorney General Barr is doing what he can to clean up the Justice Department, and I am sure he would defend Christopher Wray. I just happen to disagree with the job that the Director of the FBI currently is doing.

But there are going to be some people who are interested in justice who replace those who have been extremely partisan, as we have seen.

I would encourage my friends across the aisle who have seen how helpful the FBI was to a Democratic administration politically just to keep in mind there are changes being made, and it is not going to be so helpful to one party over another in the future.

I would hope that colleagues on both sides of the aisle would come together to say: You know what? This really is

the time. We have to stand up for American rights.

It is one thing under the Constitution to have writs of habeas corpus suspended in a time of war, but it is quite another to prevent writs of habeas corpus, because American citizens don't even know that they are being spied upon by their own government and cases are being made against them through spying by their own government without probable cause, without proper warrants.

It is time to fix that, and I hope this will be the Congress that does so.

So, we have this article from *The Washington Times*, Jeff Mordock, yesterday. It says: "FBI missed chances to stop domestic terror attacks because of lack of follow-up," according to the Horowitz report, apparently.

In this article, it points out that the IG investigation revealed "lapses in the Bureau's assessments allowed perpetrators of some of the most deadly attacks in recent history to fall through the cracks."

That is understandable since the FBI was trying to help prevent Donald Trump from being elected President and then trying to participate in what certainly appeared to be an attempted coup, that, gee, they were just too busy to actually prevent some of these terrorist attacks, according to the article and the IG report: "Omar Mateen, who killed 49 people at the Pulse nightclub in Orlando, Florida, in 2016; Tamerlan Tsarnaev, who killed three people at the Boston Marathon in 2013; Nidal Hasan, who massacred 13 people at Fort Hood, Texas, in 2009; Esteban Santiago, who killed five people in a 2017 attack at the Fort Lauderdale-Hollywood International Airport."

"The FBI has acknowledged that various weaknesses related to its assessment process may have impacted its ability to fully investigate certain counterterrorism assessment subjects, who later committed terrorist acts in the United States," Mr. Horowitz wrote.

The article says: "The inspector general's report is the latest black eye for the Bureau," that is the FBI, of course, "which has been besieged by allegations of political taint and questions of competence."

"Anytime there is criticism, of course, it undermines the public faith in the Bureau, and that can never be good because the FBI depends on the public trust," said Lewis Schiliro, a former head of the FBI's New York field office.

But further down, it says: "Even after the FBI discovered lapses in its assessment of potential terrorist threats, field office managers failed to properly implement changes or conduct consistent oversight of counterterrorism investigations, the report said."

"Roughly 40 percent of the FBI's counterterrorism assessments went unaddressed for 18 months, even after Bureau officials discovered investigative lapses, Mr. Horowitz wrote."

"The FBI first investigated Mateen in 2013, 3 years before he carried out the deadly Pulse shooting. Agents closed the case months later and did not properly address Mateen's history of mental illness, the report said."

"Agents investigated Tsarnaev ahead of the Boston Marathon bombing. Even after an internal Bureau database flagged Tsarnaev, agents closed the probe after concluding he had 'no nexus to terrorism.'"

That was interesting, the Tsarnaev investigation. I had the opportunity to question an FBI Director named Mueller about that because Tsarnaev was identified by the Russians. He had been over in an area where some Muslims had been radicalized, making them, as radicals, a threat to non-radicalized Muslims, both Christians, non-radicalized Muslims, Jews, others who were not radicalized Muslims.

In fact, Russia had notified the FBI. To the FBI's credit, apparently, from what we found, they did send an agent out to question Tamerlan Tsarnaev. It sounded like basically they asked him if he was a terrorist, and he assured them he wasn't. They went above and beyond and questioned his mother, and she assured them that Tamerlan was a good boy, that he wasn't a terrorist.

As I put to Director Mueller: You didn't even go out to the mosque where they were attending and find out information that would have revealed whether they had been radicalized or not.

About all Mueller could come back with was that they did go out to that mosque, not to investigate Tsarnaev, but to actually just have part of their community outreach program.

And I said: You probably didn't even know who founded that mosque.

And he didn't. He didn't know, but it was founded by a man who was doing 23 years in Federal prison for supporting terrorism.

But before Mueller came in and purged the FBI of training materials that would allow FBI agents to identify who were the peace-loving Muslims and the small group that had been radicalized that wanted to kill non-radicalized Muslims, he purged them, as I have said before. One of our agents said: He blinded us of our ability to see who was a threat.

Thank you very much, Director Mueller.

He purged the training materials. There was an advanced course for FBI—I think 700 pages of training—and Mueller ordered all of that eliminated. Fortunately, after he left—and after we had more attacks and more Americans died—eventually, the training was brought back for some FBI agents. But it still needs work.

But these FBI agents, they didn't know what to look for because Mueller had eliminated the training materials that would have helped them know what to look for in radicalized attacks.

Of course, my friend, Philip Haney, who was found dead with a bullet hole

in his chest, he was investigating a group called Tablighi Jamaat. It is interesting that some of the training Tablighi Jamaat did, including for the killers in San Diego, there was certain training that they undergo that I am not going to get into, but if someone is undergoing that training, it should send up red flags, certain parts of that training, at least, that this person may be on the road to radicalization.

It is just very unfortunate that our most powerful investigating body had been so purged of people who could recognize radicalization that it put Americans at risk, and Americans died as a result of that effort by Director Mueller and others within the FBI.

This article goes on and points out that: "The inspector general said the Bureau bungled the case of Elton Simpson, who tried to ambush a Garland, Texas, art exhibit featuring cartoon images of the prophet Muhammad, the central figure of Islam. Although agents received information related to Simpson, they determined he was not a significant threat."

"Mr. Horowitz said that even after the FBI sought to address the problem, it failed to conduct the necessary oversight to implement the recommended changes."

I would humbly submit that when Comey took over from Mueller, he did not improve matters at the FBI when it came to identifying threats against American citizens.

□ 1300

Mr. Speaker, I would like to address the issue of the coronavirus.

We have heard allegations that our President is just totally out of it, totally uninformed, and totally unprepared to deal with the coronavirus. Sometimes the best way to analyze whether or not a leader is, not out of it, but actually has taken bold steps to protect Americans is helped along by comparing to a prior administration, for example.

There is an article by ABC News, Dr. Angela Baldwin: "How Novel Coronavirus Compares to SARS, MERS and Other Recent Viral Outbreaks."

Dr. Baldwin points out that: "MERS, Middle Eastern respiratory syndrome, was first reported in Saudi Arabia in 2012. Of the 27 countries affected globally, 10 countries are in or near the Arabian Peninsula and 17 countries are outside of the Arabian Peninsula. Only two patients in the U.S. ever tested positive for MERS."

"To date, there have been nearly 2,500 laboratory-confirmed cases of MERS, with a death rate of about 34 percent."

"Influenza is another contagious respiratory illness with symptoms that are similar to SARS, MERS, and COVID-19. It is caused by the influenza A and influenza B viruses. Different strains of influenza are responsible for the flu season that occurs every year. The CDC estimates that there have been 18,000 to 46,000 flu deaths so far this season."

"The swine flu, or influenza A," which was the H1N1 virus, "caused the 2009 global pandemic. An estimated 151,000 to 575,000 people, worldwide, died from the H1N1 virus in 2009. Of those, there were an estimated 12,400 deaths in the U.S. . . . This strain continues to circulate as a seasonal flu virus each year"

But 12,400 American deaths from the H1N1 virus? I was shocked to read that. I didn't remember reading or hearing that, during the Obama administration, there was such a weak response to the H1N1 virus that we had 12,400 Americans die from the H1N1 virus.

So it is interesting. President Trump reacted immediately to the information of a virus of the nature of the coronavirus, or COVID-19, coming from China. He reacted by restricting travel from those areas.

And thank goodness he reacted so quickly, even though he was condemned by some Democrats for being racist and for being a xenophobe. All he was trying to do was protect Americans from this virus.

So he suffers the indignities, the slings and arrows, being called a racist and a xenophobe, but he didn't care because he was protecting the American people. Had he not reacted so quickly, there is no doubt we would have had many more Americans infected with the virus.

He also reacted with regard to our southern border that has been so porous, despite his best efforts. We, no doubt, have been saved from many more cases of COVID-19 arising here in the United States by the efforts of our Border Patrol and the Trump administration.

This article points out: "In comparison," talking about in comparison to the H1N1 virus, "COVID-19 has spread to more than 50 countries and infected more than 85,000 people, worldwide, since January of this year. In the United States, there have been about 70 cases"

I think there may be more than 100 now, but this article, dated March 2, says, "two people have died." But I believe there are more than that, maybe as many as 10 who have died here in the United States.

I wish that we were getting a report out that these are normally our senior citizens who have some preexisting health condition. So we should be encouraging senior citizens and retirement homes, they all should be very careful, because it seems that our seniors are most at risk here and around the world.

"While COVID-19 seems to spread easily, the symptoms tend to be mild, particularly for people who are relatively young and healthy. The SARS and MERS outbreaks had significantly higher death rates. Meanwhile, seasonal influenza remains an important cause of respiratory illness that can cause hospitalization and death"

"As Dr. Robert Glatter, emergency physician at New York City's Lenox

Hill Hospital noted: 'Make sure you get a flu shot. It's much more likely to contract the flu than the new coronavirus infection.'

"He also warns: 'Older persons should also make sure they get vaccinated against pneumonia and shingles, since these are more likely if they develop a viral infection such as the coronavirus.'"

But every one of those Americans who has died, 10 or so—I am sure the number will grow—it is a tragedy. It is devastating to the loved ones, and I am just surprised we didn't hear a whole lot about the 12,400 Americans during the Obama administration who died from the H1N1 virus.

So, obviously, the media gets much more up in arms over 10 Americans dying from the coronavirus than they did over the 12,400 that may have died in 1 year in America from the H1N1 virus.

I was concerned earlier here, an hour or so ago, to hear Majority Leader HOYER saying, as I understood him to say, next week, the majority here wants to prevent President Trump's travel bans.

We are finding out that, because of President Trump's travel bans, lives have been saved. The coronavirus has not spread, as it surely would have, and so the answer next week will be to restrict President Trump's abilities to save American lives by preventing people from coming into this country from areas where the coronavirus is found to be widespread, people coming in without adequate ability to make sure they are not infected. I was very sorry to hear that that is something that we, apparently, are going to take up next week.

There is an article here from PJ Media, by Victoria Taft, February 28, 2020, and the headline says: "Fact-Check: Obama Waited Until 'Millions' Were Infected and 1,000 Dead in U.S. Before Declaring H1N1 Emergency."

That is the virus we were just talking about. Anyway, that is a rather interesting article pointing out the difference between President Obama's response to the H1N1 and the thousands that died as a result of—actually, the other article talked about the 12,400.

There is an article here from the Centers for Disease Control, June 25 of 2012: "First Global Estimates of 2009 H1N1 Pandemic Mortality Released by CDC-Led Collaboration."

But it points out the "improved modeling approach which resulted in an estimated range of deaths from between 151,700 and 575,400 people who perished worldwide from 2009 H1N1 virus infection during the first year the virus circulated. . . ."

I don't really have information on how many Americans died. Apparently, that 12,400 was just in the first year, so no telling how many died during the 8 years of the Obama administration.

So we have got more work to do, but I don't think it is helpful to blame President Trump for trying to protect

American citizens from being exposed more and more to the coronavirus, or COVID-19.

On another note, we have heard about the Afghanistan peace agreement. My concerns have been hearing, during the Bush administration, that they took a great deal of advice from former Ambassador Khalilzad, and it sure sounds like he made a mess of the Bush foreign policy with regard to Afghanistan when discussions were being held—what kind of government should we give Afghanistan—and that troubles me.

We shouldn't be asking that question. That should have been a question for the Afghans. And though Khalilzad may have been an Afghan, he is an American; and he was listened to, as I understand, during the Obama administration, which explains some of their problems with getting out, as President Obama wanted to do. He said he was going to. He was sure trying, but problems kept arising.

I would think if somebody gives advice that didn't help the Bush administration and didn't help the Obama administration, then I deeply regret that anybody in the current administration would be taking advice from that same individual.

The Taliban were our enemies. They have never indicated that they want to stop killing Americans. As our allies who fought and successfully defeated the Taliban within 6 months of 9/11, by the end of February 2002, after the Taliban had been identified as our enemy, helping al-Qaida with the attacks on the United States on 9/11, we—well, I say "we," but, actually, it was our allies who defeated the Taliban. By the end of February, there was no real organized Taliban in Afghanistan. The groups had been devastated.

We provided aerial support. We had about 300 special ops people in there embedded with General Dostum's Northern Alliance groups, different tribal groups that we supported, and they outed the Taliban. Some fled to Pakistan, but there was no organized Taliban left.

And then the mistake occurred: What kind of government should we give them, and let's occupy Afghanistan for a while. Occupiers have never done well in Afghanistan, and that still remains true.

But the biggest problem I have was the advice. I could be corrected, but I am told by people who were around back in the second Bush term that Khalilzad was one of those saying: We need to give them a strong central government. You don't want to have a federalist government like we have in America where States have so much power, States and local government. Let's just have a strong President.

And we gave them a constitution that we basically forced on them that made the President all powerful, nearly.

□ 1315

The President of Afghanistan appoints the governors, he appoints the

mayors, and he appoints the police chiefs. What I hear from some of our Afghan friends is he will often, whether it was Karzai—Ghani is not as bad as Karzai was, Ghani seems to be trying to do better—but sometimes they would appoint people who didn't even live in the province or the city to come in and rule over it.

What our allies, who fought with us and for us in initially defeating the Taliban, had begged for is for our help to get Afghanistan to amend their constitution so they get to elect their governors, they would get to elect their mayors, and they would get to select their own police chiefs because the constitution that we gave them is a formula for corruption.

Who pays off the president to become the governor or the mayor?

That is a formula for corruption. It is easy to see when we gave them that constitution that is where it was headed.

As some of our former allies, the former Northern Alliance, have told me:

Look, if we could elect our own governors, elect our own mayors like you do in America, and pick our own police chiefs, then, yes, we know—they have been saying this for years—we know you are going to have to pull out at some time. We understand. That is fine. You don't want to be an occupier, and we don't want you to be. But if you leave the president as all powerful and he picks the governors, mayors, and police chiefs, then all the Taliban have got to do when you leave is either knock him off or corrupt him, and then they will control the whole country, and there is nothing we can do about it.

In fact, all of us who fought with you Americans and helped defeat the Taliban—actually they defeated the Taliban initially—they are all going to be dead. We are going to all be dead, so that when the Taliban gets strong enough again, they attack you again and you come to Afghanistan looking for allies, we are going to all be dead, and nobody is going to want to be your ally because you allowed us all to die when you allowed the Taliban to take back over.

So, I would hope something that we will work toward is helping the Afghans.

I said: Well, what makes you think we could help you amend your own constitution?

I was told: Well, you guys pay most of our budget. If you say you are not going to pay the budget anymore, then we will amend our constitution. If you force us to do that, we will amend our constitution, and we will get to elect our governors like you do, elect our mayors like you do, and pick our own police chiefs like you do; and we won't have people brought in through corruption or favoritism, and we will be capable.

As Massoud said:

Look, when you leave, if we get to elect our own governors and mayors and pick our own police chiefs, yeah, the Taliban may be able to take over one or two provinces, but the rest of us will band together again, as we did in 2001 and 2002, and we will kick them out again. But if you leave us where the Taliban can take over complete control and where all the control is in the president of

Afghanistan, we are all going to be killed, and you won't have any allies to fight with you and for you when the Taliban hits you again.

So, I hope we will quit taking advice from a person, no matter how well-meaning or not, who just proved to be totally wrong in administration after administration. I think that we can do as the President truly wants to do, get out of Afghanistan and save American lives.

Mr. Speaker, I want to address one other thing, and that is the comments of the minority leader of the Senate made at the Supreme Court rally.

There is an article here from FOX News, Edmund DeMarche, which says:

"The American Bar Association said on Wednesday that it is 'deeply troubled' by a comment made by Senate Minority Leader Chuck Schumer, Democrat, New York, outside the Supreme Court that many said was a direct threat to two sitting Justices.

"Schumer was at a rally over a high-profile abortion case while the case played out inside. Schumer named Associate Justices Neil Gorsuch and Brett Kavanaugh and, in an impassioned speech, said: 'You have released the whirlwind, and you will pay the price. You will not know what hit you if you go forward with these awful decisions.'

"Justin Goodman, a Schumer spokesman, responded after Chief Justice John Roberts issued a statement on what he called 'threatening' comments. Goodman said that Schumer was addressing Republican lawmakers when he said a 'price' would be paid."

Now, I think it is very important to note the difference between a threat and total agreement with Supreme Court Justices. President Trump has disagreed with things the Supreme Court has done or comments that have been made. That is the American way. We can disagree whenever we want to. People in this body, including me, have been very disagreeable with some of the things the Supreme Court has done, and it is very helpful to voice that.

As Natan Sharansky points out in his book, "The Case for Democracy", he says, there are basically two societies, a fear society and a free society. In a free society he suggests an appropriate test is if you can go into the town square and say anything you want to as long as it is not a criminal statement, but otherwise you say whatever you want to, and if you don't have to worry about arrest or being harmed, that is a free society.

A fear society is one where you have to constantly be afraid because the government may decide to swoop you up or people may come beat you up for saying what you say.

For many years this country has been a free country, but even in a free country where you can say whatever you want, it crosses the line when you threaten individuals who are in government.

I understand this Goodman speaking for Minority Leader SCHUMER as saying, no, no, he was talking about Republican lawmakers. But if you look back at the quote, there is no mistake about what Senator SCHUMER said. He said: "You have released the whirlwind, and you will pay the price."

This is after he has called out Kavanaugh and Gorsuch, "and you will pay the price," and if there is any question at all about whom the threat was intended to go to, he said: "You will not know what hit you if you go forward with these awful decisions."

Now, these are not awful decisions he is threatening over by Republican lawmakers because the Republican lawmakers have nothing to do with the Supreme Court decisions. And he says "decisions."

This was a threat to two of our Supreme Court Justices, and that crosses the line from disagreement—as all of us probably in this body have done from time to time and should because the Supreme Court is not perfect. They make mistakes. Dred Scott was, I think, probably the worst mistake the Supreme Court has ever made, but they have certainly made many more since then, not to that level.

It is fine in America to disagree with the Supreme Court. It is fine for Senator SCHUMER to do that, but not when he threatens and says: "You will not know what hit you—" of course, the term "hit" is an assaultive reference—"you will not know what hit you if you go forward with these awful decisions."

Now, he could be speaking of this assaultive term figuratively, but regardless of whether it is figurative or literal, it is a threat upon two of our Supreme Court Justices.

Then, unfortunately, Senator SCHUMER has doubled down by his coming after Chief Justice John Roberts. I have certainly disagreed with him plenty of times, but he did the appropriate thing here in defending two of his Justices who were attacked or threatened. He doesn't need to defend them when they are verbally attacked as so often happens in the Senate or the House, but certainly when they are threatened he needed to step up and he did so.

For those who wonder, 18 U.S.C. section 115 of the U.S. Code says: That whoever threatens to assault, kidnap, or murder a U.S. official, a U.S. judge, a Federal law enforcement officer or an official whose killing would be a crime under such section—then it goes on and says—that person has committed a crime can be arrested.

So it is a crime just to threaten. I am not sure the term "hit" would be adequate to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that an assault was threatened, but something was threatened because they would not know what hit them, and that goes beyond the pale. As I understand it, people have been disbarred for making threats of that nature.

But we will see what happens. I certainly hope that there will be an apology by Senator SCHUMER because we

ought to disagree with the Supreme Court when they are wrong or when we think they are wrong, but no threats.

This should be the last bastion of civility where we can come, we can disagree, we can fuss at each other, we can complain, and we can expose ignorance, but not threaten. There is no place for that in the House or in the Senate.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MALINOWSKI). Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward Members of the Senate.

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO VENEZUELA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 116-105)

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 13692 of March 8, 2015, with respect to the situation in Venezuela is to continue in effect beyond March 8, 2020.

The situation in Venezuela continues to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. For this reason, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13692 with respect to the situation in Venezuela.

DONALD J. TRUMP.

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 5, 2020.

A THREAT TO TWO OF OUR SUPREME COURT JUSTICES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) for 30 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the privilege to be recognized to address you here on the floor of the House of Representatives.

Having listened to the gentleman ahead of me, Mr. LOUIE GOHMERT and some of the discussion that he had, I would pick up with the beginning here,

Mr. Speaker, with one of the places where he left off, and that is what happened before the United States Supreme Court yesterday and the statements that were made by the minority leader of the United States Senate.

I may have a bit of a different perspective than some in this House or Senate or across this land, but here is the language that was deemed offensive from Senator SCHUMER. I watched the video, and he was pointing. He pointed at the United States Supreme Court, and he used the names of two Supreme Court Justices. He said this: "I want to tell you, Gorsuch, I want to tell you, Kavanaugh, you have released the whirlwind, and you will pay the price. You won't know what hit you if you go forward with these awful decisions."

□ 1330

That was stunning. It was stunning to hear two Justices called out in that fashion before the Supreme Court. And I know that there was a crowd over there that was happy to hear those words. But as a constitutionalist and former chairman of the Constitution Subcommittee in the House of Representatives, I am troubled by the effort to try to sway judges through what appears to be verbal intimidation before the Supreme Court.

I have stood on those same steps and delivered any number of speeches, but I always confine them to the constitutional principles that were involved. I wanted the Justices to hear my speech. I didn't want them to ever hear it as a threat. I wanted them to hear it as a rational approach in a way as if I were actually arguing before that Supreme Court, before that Bench.

They are all well-learned and very, very capable people who are deeply steeped in our Constitution and in case law. They have their different philosophies, and that is clear. We often see a 5-4 decision on the Court.

Mr. Speaker, I thought when I first arrived in this town a number of years ago, I looked forward to going over to the Supreme Court to hear what I expected to be the profound constitutional arguments before that Bench. So I began going over there for some of the important cases, with that expectation. I recall sitting there, listening to an argument before the Court, and I understood—actually, this would be the Kelo decision before the Supreme Court. The Kelo decision is the decision that I believe amended the Constitution by the Supreme Court decision.

It was this. Let's see, New London, Connecticut. There was property there that was owned and utilized by owners who didn't want to sell that property to the developers. The local government wanted that property in the hands of the developers because they would develop that property into, I believe, a shopping mall, and then the taxes would be the revenue going into local governments. So local governments had an incentive in encouraging the development of the property, but

the property owners sat there with a constitutional guarantee in the Fifth Amendment of the Constitution that says: "nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation."

That was the guarantee that, first of all, only governments could confiscate property. They needed to maintain that within their own possession, and it has to be for a public use. It can't be for a private use. It was a private business that they handed that property over to in New London, Connecticut.

Mr. Speaker, when I listened to the argument, I expected the argument would go back to the very language of the Fifth Amendment, and that would be argued, perhaps, certainly, on both sides. And I come down on the side of: The Constitution means what it says, and it means what it was understood to mean at the time of ratification by the people who voted to ratify it.

We can't go back and assign different definitions to words or simply say that it is a living, breathing Constitution that can adapt itself to changing times. If that were the case, there wouldn't be a provision to amend this Constitution provided by our Founding Fathers. The Constitution is an intergenerational, contractual guarantee between one generation of Americans to the next generation of Americans.

So, I hoped to hear those—in fact, expected to hear—those arguments before the United States Supreme Court. What I heard instead were arguments that were made to Justice O'Connor, and I think they considered her to be the swing vote. And she came down on, I believe, the constitutional side of it in the end. But there were just little tweaks that had to do with her background.

She was raised on a ranch. I think it is a B&B ranch down in southern Arizona, and I think it goes across into New Mexico, as I recall. I read her books years ago. And some of the ranch land that she grew up on was part of the Gadsden Purchase that came in right at the end of the U.S. and Mexican war.

But growing up on a ranch, property values matter, and property rights matter, and water rights matter in that part of the country. And her book is replete with those kinds of narratives. It is a really interesting way to get some insight into Justice O'Connor. But she understood this case in a way I didn't know until later.

But I came down here to the floor, and we brought a resolution in the House of Representatives, a resolution of disapproval to what was called the Kelo decision. In that Kelo decision, it upheld the decision of local government in New London, Connecticut, to confiscate private property, houses and residences that had a deed, and to take that land and compensate them for what they deemed the value was—condemnation—and hand them over to the private investors so they can take that

land, develop it, and make money with it. That is completely contrary to the reason that we have that guarantee within our Fifth Amendment.

As I listened to those oral arguments and saw how they were focused on Justice O'Connor, I understood what was going on. And that is, they weren't profound constitutional arguments; they were personalized arguments that were designed to get to the psyche of the swing Justice who was there. Of course, it wasn't Justice O'Connor, as it turned out.

By the way, I have been critical of some of her decisions—not on this one.

Mr. Speaker, I want to put this narrative in the RECORD because I think she is worthy of some significantly positive comments. And one of the decisions that she had made—a different one, obviously, I was railing away on my disagreement with the rationale that Justice O'Connor had come down with. And so someone in the room said: You shouldn't criticize her until you walk a mile in her shoes.

And I said: I would be happy to walk a mile in her shoes. I will walk a thousand miles in her shoes. Appoint me to the Supreme Court, and I will walk with her. And I bet you I can convince her.

I made some remark like that. And then, as I was talking, I said: You know what? If I can't do that, why don't I just invite her to dinner?

So I followed through. I gave my word I would do that, and I went back to my desk in my office and sat down and wrote a letter to Justice O'Connor that invited her to a dinner, just to sit down, have a conversation, get to know each other, be civil with each other, and listen to each other's philosophical discussion.

I sent the letter over there, not expecting to get an affirmative response. But what I did get was an invitation to come to her chambers and do a lunch there. I don't remember the year, but I know the date was March 18 of whatever year it was, in the earlier part of the previous decade.

So, I went over at that time, and she had a lunch all prepared. She had baked a pie that was, I presume, for me because it was fresh. It was cut and served right there in her chambers. And we had a delightful discussion.

She took me from each of the portraits of the Chief Justices and walked me through the history of the Courts, from the beginning all the way up to what was current at the time.

When I left that gracious dinner with Justice O'Connor, I decided she has a good judgment on her; she has a good set of character; she has a compassionate heart, a deep understanding of history and law. And disagreeing with her, that is all it is, just disagreeing with the rationale.

But I am forever grateful that I took the trouble, and I am really grateful that she accepted the request that I made and then invited me over there to dinner.

So, I wanted to put that in, that our Justices are human. And when they get threatened, those threats sometimes cut deep, and the family feels that.

These threats that were delivered yesterday in front of the United States Supreme Court were threats that, might I say, intimidate judges. The judicial branch of government, the American Bar Association, everybody involved in that feels that. And they pride themselves in their independence.

But I better conclude the Kelo decision before I get too far from it. In any case, the Kelo decision came down, and they allowed for the confiscation of private property handed over to other private interests in order to generate tax revenue for local government.

That case still stands. But I was furious that they would do such damage to the Constitution in a 5-4 decision. By the way, Justice Scalia has said that he believes that case will be overturned one day.

But we brought a resolution of disapproval to the floor. It is the only time that I know we have done that and spoken out in that fashion on a Supreme Court decision. I noticed that at that time the gentleman from Massachusetts, Barney Frank, came down to give his speech. I was queued up next.

Mr. Speaker, I sat right here with my notepad ready to take notes because I expected to get up and rebut most everything that I heard Mr. Frank say. We found ourselves in disagreement on issue after issue, so it was my full expectation that when he was finished talking, I would have a page full of things to stand up and rebut. That has been my style, and we had had many debates like that.

But as I listened to Mr. Frank that day, I realized he had exactly the same opinion that I had. He expressed it a little bit differently, but he came down in support of the resolution of disapproval and in support of the Constitution and in support of the property rights that are there in the Fifth Amendment.

Mr. Speaker, when I stepped up here to this particular podium, my speech really was to reject the decision made by the Supreme Court. And when I spoke that in the RECORD, I said effectively what they have done is they have pulled the words out of the Fifth Amendment "for public use."

"Nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation," and the effect of it was to pull the "for public use" out of there. Now, the effect of the Fifth Amendment after the Kelo decision just says "nor shall private property be taken, without just compensation," which means the government can't come in and take your property away from you, unless they write you a check, but they can give it to anybody they want to in the private sector.

Whatever their motive might be, it was approved by the Supreme Court with the Kelo decision. And I think that will be abused at some point and

a more reasonable Court may be seated at that time and restore the Constitution on the Kelo decision.

But my real point here is that we can't be seeking to intimidate the Court. They are human. Justice O'Connor—a gracious heart and a nice lady. And we used to have receptions over there with the Committee on the Judiciary and members of the bench just to take some of the temperature down between the natural disagreements that exist between the legislative branch and the judicial branch of government.

Mr. Speaker, when you have the minority leader, the most powerful, highest ranking Democrat in the United States Senate, go stand before the Supreme Court, point his finger at that building that was behind him and say, "I want to tell you, Gorsuch; I want to tell you, Kavanaugh: You have released the whirlwind, and you will pay the price. You won't know what hit you if you go forward with these awful decisions."

Going forward with an awful decision means CHUCK SCHUMER has already decided what he thinks the Court decision is going to be on the requirements that are part of the, I will say, the abortion laws that are coming out of Louisiana. And I have been one of the lead voices on pro-life issues here in this United States House of Representatives.

There is on my lapel a heart that represents the heartbeat bill. It is a bill that I introduced in the previous Congress, and that bill protects unborn babies. It essentially says this: If a heartbeat can be detected, the baby is protected.

And we know that the heartbeat is the first, certain sign of life. When that heart starts to beat, you know that there is a live baby there. You can't call it anything else. It is a live baby.

And this little baby has all the components of a growing human being. It just needs to develop them out to full size and to full term.

And anybody who has picked up and held—especially a loved one—a newborn baby and gazed with awe at the miracle in their hands has to know that that baby's life didn't begin at the moment of birth or at the moment of first breath and that that baby's life began well before a minute before the baby was born.

Mr. Speaker, I know when I held my firstborn son, I looked at him in awe. There was an aura about him. The miracle was in my hands. And I thought: How can anybody take his life now? He is a few minutes old. How can anybody take his life now? How could they take his life a minute before he was born, or an hour before, or a day, or a week, or a month before he was born? Or a trimester or three trimesters before he was born? At what moment did his life begin? Because human life is sacred in all its forms.

□ 1345

And we only have to choose when did life begin. It is not that hard a question. Because it is a continuum; it is a

gradual growing continuum from the moment of conception on.

But that heartbeat says this is a live baby here. And when that heart stops, we call that death. When the heart starts, we know that is life. Even though life began at the moment of conception, medically, we can't pinpoint that precisely enough, but I am willing to go there if we can get there.

Right now, we are at heartbeat. And in the last Congress, I was able to get 174 cosponsors, and those 174 cosponsors all signed on with an expectation that we would protect all babies. When a heartbeat could be detected, the baby is protected.

We didn't make exceptions for rape or incest or any other provisions. These babies are sacred. If there was a crime committed that resulted in conception, that is on the rapist; that is not on the baby. And those babies are as precious to God as my own grandchildren are to God; and, of course, my grandchildren are extraordinarily precious to me.

So I hope one day we get to that and that question.

But as we move on, with this super-aggressive utilization of freedom of speech and Senator SCHUMER, I look back at some of this discussion. And Chief Justice Roberts had a response, which is exceptionally rare, to have a statement come out of the Supreme Court. But out of the Chief Justice, he said, and I quote: "Threatening statements of this sort, from the highest levels of government, are not only inappropriate, they are dangerous." And Justices, quote, "will continue to do their job, without fear or favor, from whatever quarter."—Chief Justice John Roberts.

I appreciate that language that the Justices will "continue to do their job, without fear or favor, from whatever quarter." That language will live a long time in the way that that is adeptly put together, and that is how it needs to be.

If we want to convince the Supreme Court to take a new look at things, we need to make the constitutional arguments, Mr. Speaker, not the threatening arguments. And where I come from, when somebody threatens you, that means that you are done doing business with that person, and they are very unlikely to get cooperation.

But there is another part of this that, even though there would be a measure of justice involved if the decisions made in the Supreme Court went against the interests of Senator SCHUMER, I would like to reiterate here into this CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I hope it echoes across this land, that, if you think you are going to get even with somebody, the result in this business, whether it is in the legislative, the executive, or the judicial branch of government, if you think you are going to get even with somebody, you invariably hurt the wrong people.

And so that is not an avenue that has merit, and I hope that and I expect

that that wisdom exists within all of our Justices, all nine of them over there, that payback to SCHUMER can't be in the cards from any decision that would come down from the Court, it has got to be balanced and objective, as described by Chief Justice Roberts, and that they "continue to do their job, without fear or favor, from whatever quarter."

I believe the Justices will stick to that, and I am hopeful that Senator SCHUMER will learn not to utilize those tactics anymore.

This is the American Bar Association, the ABA. Their comments came down to this. They said they are "deeply troubled" by SCHUMER's remarks, that "there is no place for threats—whether real or allegorical."

And then the ABA, American Bar Association, continued with this: "Personal attacks on judges by any elected officials, including the President, are simply inappropriate. Such comments challenge the . . . independence of the judiciary and the personal safety of judicial officers. . . ."

Well, Mr. Speaker, I know that is true. I know that when you turn up the dialogue and you hear this radical rhetoric coming out of elected officials in particular, things do happen out in our society. And the Chief Justice is concerned that there could be acts of potential violence that could be stimulated by that kind of dialogue.

And I am hopeful that—Senator SCHUMER seemed to dial it down on the floor of the Senate today. That is good. I didn't notice that he had called upon people to refrain from violence and refrain from threats. He did say that he is from the Bronx and they talk a little more clearly there than other places. I don't doubt that. But this language went to the world, and the world saw it today, Mr. Speaker.

And so I am hopeful that Senator SCHUMER will call upon his supporters to calm down, be logical, make constitutional arguments, and refrain from that kind of rhetoric.

And here are the consequences. I had some serious rhetoric applied against me over the last 1½ years, and each of those situations that were—a good number of them were manufactured firestorms that were fired at me.

But also, we saw Members of this House of Representatives that went forward and said, when people go into a restaurant, when they stop to get gas and you see them there, if they happen to be—I am not sure exactly how they defined it, but if they happen to be conservatives, go confront them, make their lives miserable. That kind of discussion was delivered from people who sit over on this side of the aisle, and it had its physical results.

It had its physical results, at least in my case, where I sat down in a restaurant last April, and from completely outside my peripheral vision, I was assaulted. That individual has been convicted of assaulting a Federal officer, or a United States Congressman. There is a provision for that.

And, by the way, today, he goes before a Federal judge in Sioux City for sentencing.

So I won't comment any more on that, because I don't want to be accused of seeking to influence a decision that may or may not have been made, but it is ironic that I am here today having this discussion on Senator SCHUMER while there is an individual being sentenced for assaulting me back in Iowa, which I believe is a clear result of this kind of radical rhetoric that was poured out.

And it wasn't based on truth, in my case, when they attacked me. It was planned. It was orchestrated. It was ginned up. And then you have people out there that take that seriously.

And so that is what happened that day, and the sentencing is taking place today. I will trust the judge to make an objective decision. I have written my opinion in longhand and sent that to the court for their consideration. That is where I will leave that recommendation. I have had my chance to weigh in.

But let's take this a little further, Mr. Speaker, and that is on this concept of freedom of speech. Now, there are those that want to censure Senator SCHUMER, and it sounds like Senator HAWLEY is going to introduce a censoring motion tomorrow in the Senate.

I am of the opinion that the most important freedom we have is a robust freedom of speech and that, if we let that be diminished by intimidation tactics, let alone by any kind of laws that would perhaps be found unconstitutional—but watching the Kelo decision, maybe not be found unconstitutional.

I want the body to understand this, Mr. Speaker, that freedom of speech is a precious, precious right, and our Founding Fathers understood that if you can't speak, if you can't speak freely, then you can't convey your ideas at all. And then when you can't convey your ideas, they never get tested against anybody else's ideas or embellished or supported by other people's ideas, and that means, then, that human knowledge would diminish, it would atrophy, and it would essentially stop forming around us.

Our Founding Fathers envisioned a robust nation that would be regularly and constantly engaged in discussions of public policy, like we are in Iowa as the first-in-the-Nation caucus, like New Hampshire is, and let's just say South Carolina is among those States, too, where there is an intense focus on politics, free discussion.

I have spent time in Cuba and learned that they don't have that freedom. They are afraid—even among their families sitting around the table, they are afraid to speak to each other because there might be an informant among them that has been hired by the, at that time, Castro administration. So they don't speak to each other about those things. They don't criticize. They accept what government serves up to them.

That is what King George wanted to happen in this country. And if our predecessors here, the revolutionary Founding Fathers, had accepted the edict from King George, we would have never developed this great Nation that we are. We would be stuck back in the mud somewhere back there, because our ideas wouldn't have been brought forward. They wouldn't have been tested against each other, then creating other new ideas.

And, you know, we are the Nation that produces more patents, more creativity, than any other nation in the world by far. We are so good at this and we create so much with our intellectual freedoms that we have that are tied into freedom of speech that the Chinese look to us and they steal a half a trillion dollars worth of American intellectual property every year—a half a trillion dollars. And that doesn't include what they steal through cyber. That is called IP piracy.

I have been over to China. Years ago, I wrote a bill from Beijing that called upon the U.S. Trade Representative to conduct a study to determine the value of U.S. intellectual property that is stolen by the Chinese, apply a duty on all products coming to the United States from China in an amount equal to that loss, and then collect that and distribute it to the rightful property rights holders. That was a bill then. It is still a good idea today, but they have accelerated their piracy.

Mr. Speaker, to give you an example of how this works, we know a little bit about how freedom of speech, thought, and expression works in the United States because we see—actually, in the past, we have seen a more robust freedom of speech on our campuses. Today, they are diminishing freedom of speech on the campuses. They are defining things as hate speech and trigger words and safe places. We don't need that. We have got to be strong enough to face language and let it flow and then accommodate ourselves in a way that we are not influenced if it isn't logical or rational.

The Greeks, for example, in their city-states, would banish a demagogue for 7 years from the city-state because they didn't like what he had to say, and that wasn't constructive.

But what is constructive is our freedom of speech, our young people sitting in college, sitting up all night long discussing metaphysics till the Sun comes up, new ideas: What is the limitation on what we can do with science? with math? with space travel? All of those things that have made America the leader in the world, they are all tied back to freedom of speech.

If you can't speak, you can't express your thoughts. You can't just hold your thoughts in your head and think you are going to do something good with them. If we had taken Albert Einstein and sat him into a phone booth and said, "We will let you out when you write the theory of relativity," first of all, it never would have been

created; second of all, nobody could have understood it. You have got to have the interactivity of minds.

And people will say: We have the Second Amendment; therefore, we are never going to lose our freedom of speech. I don't see anybody using the Second Amendment to defend their freedom of speech, and I don't recommend that they do. We have to utilize our freedom of speech and push back when it is diminished.

So I am not calling for a sanction on Senator SCHUMER. I am saying this:

Senator SCHUMER, you know what you said. You know whether it is right or wrong. You have to operate in an arena over there and get reelected by the people in your district. Let we, the people, decide. Not a leader here in the Senate, not a leader here in the House, but let we, the people, decide.

And, in fact, as a former chairman of the Constitution Committee, the three branches of government, there are tensions between each of those. Our Founding Fathers didn't envision that they would be equal. They believed the judicial branch would be the weakest of the three. But they knew there would be tension as that territory got marked out, and there is always going to be a gray area where there is a little bit of a tug-of-war over who has what territory.

But in the end, if you analyze it—I can make your argument for the legislature, even the House and the Senate. I can make it for the executive branch. I can make it for the judicial branch. But in the end, if any branch of government gets out of whack, that means out of sync with the American people, we, the people, solve that problem in the election box.

Sometimes it takes time. But that is the best solution is for we, the people, to make that decision, not a decision that sanctions freedom of speech, or intimidates people so that they don't utilize their freedom of speech, because we have got to remain the most creative society in the history of the world, and in doing so, we will be the most successful people also in the history of the world.

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

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 58 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, March 9, 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:

4037. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health

Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Lacey Act Implementation Plan: De Minimis Exception [Docket No.: APHIS-2013-0055] (RIN: 0579-AD44) received March 3, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4038. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting Transmittal No. 20-09, proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance, pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4039. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 23-228, "Closing of a Portion of 4th Street, N.E., and a Public Alley in Square 3765, S.O. 18-41561, Act of 2020", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

4040. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 23-243, "Direct Support Professional Payment Rate Act of 2020", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

4041. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 23-219, "Housing Conversion and Eviction Clarification Amendment Act of 2020", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

4042. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 23-227, "Student Access to Treatment Amendment Act of 2020", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

4043. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 23-226, "Urban Farming Land Lease Amendment Act of 2020", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

4044. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 23-220, "Tingey Square Designation Act of 2020", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

4045. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 23-225, "Abandonment of the Highway Plan for Eastern and Anacostia Avenues, N.E., S.O. 19-47912, Act of 2020", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

4046. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 23-221, "Alethia Tanner Park Designation Act of 2020", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

4047. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 23-224, "Abandonment of the Highway Plan for a Portion of 39th Street, N.W., S.O. 18-41885, Act of 2020", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

4048. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 23-223, "Polystyrene Food Service Product and Packaging Prohibition Amendment Act of 2020", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

4049. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 23-222, "Accounting Clarification for Real Estate Professionals Amendment Act of 2020", pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A);

Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

4050. A letter from the Acting Chief, Regulations and Standards Branch, Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Oil and Gas and Sulfur Operations on the Outer Continental Shelf — Civil Penalty Inflation Adjustment [Docket ID: BSEE-2020-0001; 20E1700DX ET1SF0000.EAQ000 EEEE500000] (RIN: 1014-AA47) received March 4, 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.

4051. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc., Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2019-0720; Product Identifier 2019-NM-117-AD; Amendment 39-19831; AD 2020-02-19] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 28, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4052. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2019-0525; Product Identifier 2019-NM-076-AD; Amendment 39-19824; AD 2020-01-18] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 28, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4053. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Leonardo S.p.A. Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2020-0150; Product Identifier 2019-SW-063-AD; Amendment 39-21028; AD 2020-03-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 28, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4054. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's Major final rule — Pilot Professional Development [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0504; Amdt. Nos.: 61-144; 91-356; 121-382; and 135-142] (RIN: 2120-AJ87) received February 28, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4055. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2020-0093; Product Identifier 2020-NM-026-AD; Amendment 39-19837; AD 2020-03-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 28, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4056. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc., Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2019-0720; Product Identifier 2019-NM-117-AD; Amendment 39-19831; AD 2020-02-19] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 28, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4057. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of

Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc., Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2020-0100; Product Identifier 2020-NM-016-AD; Amendment 39-19845; AD 2020-03-21] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 28, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4058. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2016-6143; Product Identifier 2015-NM-028-AD; Amendment 39-19821; AD 2020-01-15] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 28, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4059. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bell Helicopter Textron Inc. Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0052; Product Identifier 2016-SW-081-AD; Amendment 39-21024; AD 2020-02-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 28, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4060. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2020-0125; Product Identifier 2019-SW-104-AD; Amendment 39-21027; AD 2020-02-23] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 28, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4061. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Sikorsky Aircraft Corporation Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2019-0663; Product Identifier 2018-SW-057-AD; Amendment 39-21025; AD 2020-02-17] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 28, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4062. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — 2020 Calendar Year Resident Population Figures (Notice 2020-10) received March 3, 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.

4063. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Exemption from Section 6048 Reporting With Respect to Certain Tax-Favored Foreign Retirement and Non-Retirement Savings Trusts (Rev. Proc. 2020-17) received March 3, 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.

4064. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Beginning of Construction for the Credit for Carbon Oxide Sequestration under Section 45Q (Notice 2020-12) received March 3, 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.

4065. A letter from the Regulations Writer, Office of Regulations and Reports Clearance,

Social Security Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Extension of Expiration Dates for Three Body System Listings [Docket NO.: SSA-2020-0001] (RIN: 0960-A146) received March 3, 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.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. NADLER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5581. A bill to clarify the rights of all persons who are held or detained at a port of entry or at any detention facility overseen by U.S. Customs and Border Protection or U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement; with an amendment (Rept. 116-412, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. NADLER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2214. A bill to transfer and limit Executive Branch authority to suspend or restrict the entry of a class of aliens; with an amendment (Rept. 116-413, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committees on Foreign Affairs, Homeland Security, and Intelligence (Permanent Select) discharged from further consideration. H.R. 2214 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on Homeland Security discharged from further consideration. H.R. 5581 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. DUNN (for himself and Mr. CUNNINGHAM):

H.R. 6092. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish a national clinical pathway for prostate cancer, access to life-saving extending precision clinical trials and research, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DUNN:

H.R. 6093. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend the authority of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to continue to pay educational assistance or subsistence allowances to eligible persons when educational institutions are closed; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself, Mr. MCCAUL, Ms. BASS, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. KILDEE, and Ms. LEE of California):

H.R. 6094. A bill to support a civilian-led democratic transition, promote accountability for human rights abuses, and encourage fiscal transparency in Sudan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, and Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KING of Iowa:

H.R. 6095. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 214 Jackson Street in Sioux City, Iowa, as the "General George 'Bud' Day Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. MCNERNEY (for himself, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. OLSON, and Ms. GABBARD):

H.R. 6096. A bill to improve oversight by the Federal Communications Commission of the wireless and broadcast emergency alert systems; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LAMB (for himself and Mr. NEWHOUSE):

H.R. 6097. A bill to provide for a program of nuclear energy research, development, demonstration, and commercialization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Ms. BARRAGAN:

H.R. 6098. A bill to amend title XXI of the Social Security Act to allow States to expand income eligibility standards under the Children's Health Insurance Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BUDD (for himself, Mr. LATTA, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina, Mr. LAMBORN, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. BABIN, Mr. BANKS, Mr. HICE of Georgia, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. CLINE, Mr. CLOUD, and Mr. ABRAHAM):

H.R. 6099. A bill to ensure equal treatment of faith-based organizations participating in programs of the Department of Health and Human Services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Education and Labor, and Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE (for herself and Mr. BACON):

H.R. 6100. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to clarify the criminalization of female genital mutilation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LAMB (for himself and Mr. HECK):

H.R. 6101. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to prohibit Amtrak from including mandatory arbitration clauses in contracts of carriage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. DEGETTE (for herself and Mr. BUCSHON):

H.R. 6102. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to provide for the regulation of in vitro clinical tests, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. CRAIG:

H.R. 6103. A bill to amend the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974 to update the fire prevention and control guidelines to require the mandatory installation of carbon monoxide alarms in all places of public accommodation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, 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. BOST (for himself and Ms. CRAIG):

H.R. 6104. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Transportation to set aside certain funds to provide parking for commercial motor vehicles on the Federal-aid highway system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. CÁRDENAS (for himself and Ms. SCHRIER):

H.R. 6105. A bill to ban certain small, high-powered magnets, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. JUDY CHU of California (for herself, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 6106. A bill to strengthen student achievement and graduation rates and prepare children and youth for college, careers, and citizenship through innovative partnerships that meet the comprehensive needs of children and youth; to the Committee on Education and Labor, 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. COHEN:

H.R. 6107. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to improve diversity in accelerated student learning programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CONNOLLY (for himself, Mr. SARBANES, and Ms. WEXTON):

H.R. 6108. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to improve Federal agency teleworking programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. COX of California (for himself, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. RYAN, Mr. NADLER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Ms. MENG, Ms. SCHRIER, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. TONKO, and Mr. CUELLAR):

H.R. 6109. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 by establishing a program to support the modernization, renovation, or repair of career and technical education facilities, to enable schools serving grades 6 through 12 that are located in rural areas or that serve Native American students to remodel or build new facilities to provide STEM classrooms and laboratories and support high-speed internet, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. DINGELL:

H.R. 6110. A bill to amend the consumer product safety laws to repeal of exclusion of pistols, revolvers, and other firearms from the definition of consumer product under such laws; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. EMMER:

H.R. 6111. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 2014 to allow certain dairy operations to make a 1-time election to recalculate production history for purposes of dairy margin coverage; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HUFFMAN (for himself, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Ms. BARRAGAN):

H.R. 6112. A bill to require operators of oil and gas production facilities to take certain measures to protect drinking water, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provi-

sions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KATKO (for himself and Mr. KILDEE):

H.R. 6113. A bill to establish an Advanced Research Projects Agency-Water, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. KHANNA:

H.R. 6114. A bill to amend chapter 37 of title 18, United States Code, to authorize appropriate disclosure of classified information, to appropriately limit the scope of the offense of disclosing classified information, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LATTA (for himself, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. STEWART, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. REED):

H.R. 6115. A bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to establish performance measures regarding the Credentialing Opportunities On-Line programs of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER (for himself, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. POSEY, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. STIVERS, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. BARR, Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. TIP-TON, Mr. TIMMONS, Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee, Mr. BUDD, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. EMMER, Mr. GOODEN, Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH, Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio, Mr. JOHN W. ROSE of Tennessee, Mr. STEIL, Mr. RIGGLEMAN, Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. HILL of Arkansas, and Mr. WILLIAMS):

H.R. 6116. A bill to amend the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 to make the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection an independent Consumer Financial Protection Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. MCCAUL (for himself, Mrs. WAGNER, Ms. HOULAHAN, and Ms. FRANKEL):

H.R. 6117. A bill to promote the empowerment, development, and prosperity of women globally, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. MENG (for herself, Mr. COHEN, Mr. COSTA, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. NADLER, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. BEYER, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. SHALALA, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. CASE):

H.R. 6118. A bill to amend the Peace Corps Act to ensure access to menstrual hygiene products for Peace Corps volunteers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. NEGUSE (for himself and Ms. SPANBERGER):

H.R. 6119. A bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to submit to Congress a report on the national security implications of climate change; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. POCAN (for himself, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. GARCIA of Illinois, Ms. HAALAND, Mrs. HAYES, Ms. NORTON, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. OMAR, Mr. RASKIN,

Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. TONKO, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. TRONE, and Ms. WATERS):

H.R. 6120. A bill to require fair pay for workers employed by companies who provide meat, meat food products, poultry, poultry food products, and processed food to the Federal Government; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. POCAN (for himself, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. RYAN):

H.R. 6121. A bill to provide incentives for businesses to keep jobs in America, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Education and Labor, Armed Services, 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. ROSE of New York:

H.R. 6122. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against tax for bridge tolls; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SABLAN:

H.R. 6123. A bill to provide funds for general government operations of the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations, 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. SCHNEIDER (for himself, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mr. COOPER):

H.R. 6124. A bill to amend the Trade Act of 1974 to provide adjustment assistance to firms adversely affected by reduced exports resulting from tariffs imposed as retaliation for United States tariff increases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. SPEIER (for herself, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. COHEN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 6125. A bill to direct the Secretaries of Defense and Veterans Affairs to coordinate support for survivors of sexual trauma; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. STEUBE (for himself, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. MARSHALL, and Mr. WATKINS):

H.R. 6126. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the transfer of a silencer after the end of the 90-day period beginning with the application for such transfer; to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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 Mrs. WAGNER (for herself and Mr. FOSTER):

H.R. 6127. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 with respect to risk-based examinations of Nationally Recognized Statistical Rating Organizations; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. TIMMONS (for himself and Mr. PHILLIPS):

H.J. Res. 86. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to limit the number of con-

secutive terms that a Member of Congress may serve; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIGGS:

H. Res. 886. A resolution condemning Charles "Chuck" Schumer, Senator of New York; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POSEY:

H. Res. 887. A resolution recognizing a Space Coast Symbol of Kindness and urging acts of kindness throughout our Nation; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

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. DUNN:

H.R. 6092.

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

Article 1 Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. DUNN:

H.R. 6093.

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

Article 1 Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. ENGEL:

H.R. 6094.

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

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. KING of Iowa:

H.R. 6095.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 7

By Mr. McNERNEY:

H.R. 6096.

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

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States grants Congress the authority to enact this bill.

By Mr. LAMB:

H.R. 6097.

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

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

By Ms. BARRAGÁN:

H.R. 6098.

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

Article 1 Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BUDD:

H.R. 6099.

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

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

[Page H1338]

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 6100.

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, Clauses 3 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. LAMB:

H.R. 6101.

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

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Ms. DEGETTE:

H.R. 6102.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Ms. CRAIG:

H.R. 6103.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. BOST:

H.R. 6104.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. CARDENAS:

H.R. 6105.

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. JUDY CHU of California:

H.R. 6106.

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

Art. 1, Sec. 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.

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 6107.

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

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. CONNOLLY:

H.R. 6108.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any department or officer thereof.

By Mr. COX of California:

H.R. 6109.

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

Article 1 Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mrs. DINGELL:

H.R. 6110.

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

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. EMMER:

H.R. 6111.

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

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. HUFFMAN:

H.R. 6112.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

and

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2: The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States;

By Mr. KATKO:

H.R. 6113.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1—"The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States"

By Mr. KHANNA:

H.R. 6114.

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

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution gives Congress the power to make laws that are necessary and proper to carry out its enumerated powers.

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 6115.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1:

The Congress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States.

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18:

The Congress shall have Power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Executive the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER:

H.R. 6116.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. McCAUL:

H.R. 6117.

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

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. MENG:

H.R. 6118.

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

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

[Page H10170]

By Mr. NEGUSE:

H.R. 6119.

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

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. POCAN:

H.R. 6120.

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

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. POCAN:

H.R. 6121.

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

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. ROSE of New York:

H.R. 6122.

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

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

By Mr. SABLAN:

H.R. 6123.

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

Under Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. SCHNEIDER:

H.R. 6124.

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

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. SPEIER:

H.R. 6125.

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

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. STEUBE:

H.R. 6126.

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

Article 1, Section 8

The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

To borrow money on the credit of the United States;

To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;

To establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization, and uniform Laws on the subject of Bankruptcies throughout the United States;

To coin Money, regulate the Value thereof, and of foreign Coin, and fix the Standard of Weights and Measures;

To provide for the Punishment of counterfeiting the Securities and current Coin of the United States;

To establish Post Offices and Post Roads;

To promote the Progress of Science and useful Arts, by securing for limited Times to Authors and Inventors the exclusive Right to their respective Writings and Discoveries;

To constitute Tribunals inferior to the supreme Court;

and Offenses against the Law of Nations;

To declare War, grant Letters of Marque and Reprisal, and make Rules concerning Captures on Land and Water;

To raise and support Armies, but no Appropriation of Money to that Use shall be for a longer Term than two Years;

To provide and maintain a Navy;

To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces;

To provide for calling forth the Militia to execute the Laws of the Union, suppress Insurrections and repel Invasions;

To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining, the Militia, and for governing such Part of them as may be employed in the Service of the United States, reserving to the States respectively, the Appointment of the Officers, and the Authority of training the Militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress;

To exercise exclusive Legislation in all Cases whatsoever, over such District (not exceeding ten Miles square) as may, by Cession of particular States, and the acceptance of Congress, become the Seat of the Government of the United States, and to exercise like Authority over all Places purchased by the Consent of the Legislature of the State in which the Same shall be, for the Erection of Forts, Magazines, Arsenals, dock-Yards, and other needful Buildings; And

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

By Mrs. WAGNER:

H.R. 6127.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. TIMMONS:

H.J. Res. 86.

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

Article V of the Constitution: The Congress, whenever two thirds of both houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose amendments to this Constitution, or, on the application of the legislatures of two thirds of the several states, shall call a convention for proposing amendments, which, in either case, shall be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of this Constitution, when ratified by the legislatures of three fourths of the several states, or by conventions in three fourths thereof, as the one or the other mode of ratification may be proposed by the Congress; provided that no amendment which may be made prior to the year one thousand eight hundred and eight shall in any manner affect the first and fourth clauses in the ninth section of the first article; and that no state, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 99: Mr. WILLIAMS.

H.R. 584: Mr. PANETTA and Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.

H.R. 587: Mr. MEUSER and Mr. VAN DREW.

H.R. 660: Mr. BIGGS and Mr. RUTHERFORD.

H.R. 770: Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 1137: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 1549: Mr. COOK.

H.R. 1556: Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. SPANO, Mr. LONG, Ms. SHALALA, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. MAST, Mr. TIPTON, and Mr. WILLIAMS.

H.R. 1673: Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. RIGGLEMAN.

H.R. 1749: Mr. STEIL.

H.R. 1754: Mr. COMER.

H.R. 1763: Ms. SCHRIER, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mrs. MCBATH, and Mrs. MURPHY of Florida.

H.R. 1766: Mr. SPANO, Mr. COHEN, Ms. UNDERWOOD, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. YARMUTH, and Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 1846: Ms. GABBARD.

H.R. 2166: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.

H.R. 2214: Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 2283: Mrs. LEE of Nevada.

H.R. 2350: Mr. MEUSER and Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H.R. 2453: Mr. DUNN.

H.R. 2457: Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. RUSH, Ms. BASS, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. RICHMOND, and Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 2501: Mr. GOTTHEIMER and Mr. LEVIN of California.

H.R. 2653: Mr. TRONE.

H.R. 2901: Ms. BASS, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. OMAR, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. RICHMOND, and Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 2986: Mr. STEIL.

H.R. 3107: Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. BALDERSON, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, and Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 3121: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 3266: Mr. RUSH and Mr. KELLY of Mississippi.

H.R. 3349: Mr. ALLRED.

H.R. 3378: Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 3497: Mr. GIBBS.

H.R. 3657: Mr. SCHNEIDER and Ms. FUDGE.

H.R. 3663: Mrs. MURPHY of Florida.

H.R. 3711: Ms. MATSUI.

H.R. 3797: Mr. CURTIS.

- H.R. 3801: Mr. TRONE and Ms. PINGREE.
H.R. 3990: Mr. BILIRAKIS.
H.R. 4141: Mrs. DINGELL and Ms. KELLY of Illinois.
H.R. 4189: Ms. CLARKE of New York.
H.R. 4348: Ms. CLARKE of New York.
H.R. 4451: Mr. COLE.
H.R. 4495: Mr. HARDER of California.
H.R. 4524: Mr. DEFazio.
H.R. 4574: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. TIPTON, and Mrs. BEATTY.
H.R. 4708: Ms. BASS and Mr. COURTNEY.
H.R. 4709: Ms. BASS and Mr. COURTNEY.
H.R. 4820: Mr. MEUSER.
H.R. 4861: Ms. GABBARD.
H.R. 4867: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. WALKER, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina, Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania, Mr. RIGGLEMAN, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. STAUBER, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. TIMMONS, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. HILL of Arkansas, Mr. ALLEN, Ms. CHENEY, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. BANKS, Mr. DUNN, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. CLOUD, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. COHEN, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. MOOLENAAR.
H.R. 4906: Ms. SCHRIER, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mrs. AXNE, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. SOTO, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. PINGREE, and Mrs. LEE of Nevada.
H.R. 4951: Mr. BUDD.
H.R. 4963: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 4974: Mr. ENGEL and Mrs. AXNE.
H.R. 5234: Mr. LAMBORN.
H.R. 5319: Ms. JAYAPAL.
H.R. 5413: Ms. PORTER.
H.R. 5434: Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana and Mr. KIND.
H.R. 5435: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 5448: Ms. HAALAND.
H.R. 5544: Ms. ESCOBAR and Mr. MCCAUL.
H.R. 5568: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 5587: Mr. GROTHMAN.
H.R. 5602: Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. CARBAJAL, Ms. SPEIER, and Mr. VARGAS.
H.R. 5630: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.
H.R. 5694: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 5741: Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. HOLDING, and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
H.R. 5761: Mrs. AXNE and Mr. COOK.
H.R. 5797: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 5808: Mr. BABIN and Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.
H.R. 5840: Mr. GALLAGHER.
H.R. 5845: Ms. DELBENE and Mr. KILDEE.
H.R. 5861: Ms. LEE of California, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RYAN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. RASKIN, and Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.
H.R. 5875: Mr. CRENSHAW.
H.R. 5876: Ms. WILD.
H.R. 5913: Mr. WILLIAMS.
H.R. 5915: Mr. KENNEDY.
H.R. 5935: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.
H.R. 5983: Mr. LOWENTHAL and Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 6047: Mr. HAGEDORN.
H.R. 6082: Mrs. DAVIS of California.
H. Res. 643: Mr. GALLEGRO.
H. Res. 742: Ms. BASS and Mr. SHERMAN.
H. Res. 809: Ms. SPANBERGER.
H. Res. 861: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER and Mr. YOUNG.
H. Res. 882: Mr. HUIZENGA.
H. Res. 884: Mr. RASKIN and Mr. COSTA.