

"will remedy an imbalance in the Bankruptcy Code that disproportionately steers veterans receiving such benefits into Chapter 13 cases because they often fail the Chapter 7 means test."

This bill is supported by the Veterans of Foreign Affairs, the American Legion, and the Disabled American Veterans, the National Conference of Bankruptcy Judges, and the American College of Bankruptcy among others.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 2938 to allow our veterans to have a chance to provide for their families and to live a peaceful lifestyle.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. CEDRIC L. RICHMOND

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 2019

Mr. RICHMOND. Madam Speaker, I was unable to be present for the following votes on Tuesday, July 23. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 497; YEA on Roll Call No. 498; and YEA on Roll Call No. 499.

CONGRATULATING TIMOTHY WEAVERLING

HON. JOHN JOYCE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 2019

Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate 2019 Citizen of the Year, Timothy Weaverling. Mr. Weaverling of Bedford Borough, Bedford County, Pennsylvania, will receive this honor on August 19th from the Rotary Clubs of Bedford and the Bedford Elks Lodge.

Mr. Weaverling has served on the Bedford County Chamber Foundation Board of Trustees, the Chamber Board of Directors and Executive Committee. He is currently serving in the second year of his term as Chair of the Chamber Board. In addition to the Chamber, Mr. Weaverling serves on the Bedford Borough Council as well as leadership of the Bedford Sunrise Rotary.

Mr. Weaverling is a community leader that exemplifies Bedford in commitment, growth, and development. Mr. Weaverling is a role model of citizenship and pride that allows others to engage and empower. I take great pleasure in congratulating Timothy Weaverling for this outstanding accomplishment.

OPPOSING GLOBAL BOYCOTT, DIVESTMENT, AND SANCTIONS MOVEMENT TARGETING ISRAEL

SPEECH OF

HON. GWEN MOORE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 2019

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, the right to participate in boycotts, whether we agree with them or not, is protected by our constitution,

including political expression aimed at Israeli policy. Americans have long used such tactics to influence and pressure our government and other governments. The only difference here is we appear to be striving to carve out and treat differently, even silence, those who disagree with the policies undertaken by our ally Israel.

How can you support the right under the Constitution to political speech including boycotts and then bring this resolution to the floor?

Let me be clear, I oppose anyone (Palestinian, Israeli, American, etc.) who are taking actions inimical to peace. And after nearly three decades, it is fair to say all sides, including the U.S., have done so in some shape or form.

Any effort that has at its heart delegitimizing the State of Israel is doomed to fail. And the BDS movement, just like unilateral actions undertaken by either side, is not going to bring two states living in peace side by side. It was born out of frustration, that we all share, with a moribund peace process that harms both Israelis and Palestinians.

At this time when Congress can be doing so much more to help advance the peace process or even to just revive it, why is the only action we are taking is to bring to the floor a nonbinding resolution that doesn't address where most of the blame for the failures lay: the continuing intransigence and refusal by Israeli and Palestinian political leaders to make the tough decisions and compromises that need to be made for peace.

That refusal continues to feed the status quo. But rather than call out those responsible, including several actions taken by this Administration, for setting back the cause of peace, we have decided that this moment is ripe solely to attack the First Amendment rights of Americans?

Again, rather than pressing the parties to make the tough decision and concessions that will be necessary for peace, Congress has decided that the top focus at the moment is the voluntary decisions by some Americans to exercise political expression? The First Amendment does not threaten Israel's right to exist. Nor does any American exercising that right.

I agree with the editorial by the New York Times which warned that attempting to "silence one side of the debate" is not "in the interests of Israel, the United States, or their shared democratic values."

Rather than attacking the First Amendment right of Americans to criticize the policies of our own government or our allies, how about pushing our own administration to actually say the words "two-state solution" which it refuses to do or to actually act as if its interested in pursuing that longstanding goal that this Congress and past administrations has reaffirmed is the best option for peace between the Israelis and Palestinians.

I am concerned that resolutions such as this one serves no real purpose, certainly not to those of us interested in working as honest brokers to bring this decades long history of simmering tensions, outright war, and hostility to an end, permanently.

I fear that this resolution is just another in a long line of nonbinding resolutions considered by this House that fails to actually advance peace between the two sides, ignores the various and complex factors that have made the prospects for peace in this conflict the worse in a generation including actions by this ad-

ministration that have been roundly rejected by many.

Again, in looking at this resolution, I understand that it is easier to blame a host of outside actors, including those who we disagree with, for the current damaging status quo. The reality however remains that it is the consistent and repeated failure of political leaders in Ramallah, Jerusalem, and at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue to make the tough decisions and concessions that peace requires and which has left us in this damaging status quo.

The folly of the current situation was encapsulated by the Trump administration's recent Bahrain conference which neither the Palestinians or Israelis attended.

Finally, I am concerned that this resolution is a slippery slope to actually taking up binding legislation affecting cherished First Amendment rights such as the bill that passed the Senate earlier this year which was derided in media reports as a "political stunt." Israeli's and Palestinians alike have had enough of political stunts.

Opportunities for progress and for peace are growing fewer and farther apart as the damaging status quo and divides only harden, waiting for the next explosion of violence. And are we surprised that without prospects for peace, extremists seem to be gaining ground?

I would be far more constructive if this Congress would focus on finding viable solutions to the Israel-Palestinian conflict rather than promoting legislation that raises free speech concerns. For example, H.Res. 326 which was marked up in committee at the same time as this resolution but is curiously absent from this week's calendar.

I firmly believe it is our responsibility as a Congress to keep working towards peace despite pessimism and pessimists.

Clearly right now, what the Middle East needs is more solutions, not more meaningless resolutions. I said this a few years ago and I will repeat it again now: both peoples would gladly trade empty resolutions from the U.S. Congress for real progress on the ground and a sincere path forward.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. KELLY ARMSTRONG

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 2019

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Madam Speaker, I got delayed travelling back to D.C. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 497.

HONORING NATHANIEL "NAT" WASHINGTON, SR. AND HIS SON NAT JR.

HON. DAN NEWHOUSE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 2019

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Nathaniel "Nat" Washington, Sr. and his son, Nat Jr. Their public service transformed the Columbia Basin, Washington state, and the entire Pacific Northwest by securing hydropower as the foundation of the region's power system.

The Grand Coulee Dam is the largest power station in the nation. With a 6,809-megawatt generating capacity, the Dam supplies an average of 21 billion kilowatt hours of clean, affordable, and reliable electricity to 11 States and Canada each year. Reservoirs from the Dam are the backbone of the Columbia Basin Project, which supplies irrigation to 10,000 farms on 671,000 acres of farmland in the Columbia Basin.

While residents throughout the Pacific Northwest reap these benefits, many are unaware of how the Dam came to be or how the work of a father and son changed Central Washington, our state, and the region forever.

In 1908, Nat Washington, Sr., a decedent of President George Washington's family, left his home in Virginia and established a homestead along the Columbia River, not far from where the Grand Coulee Dam sits today. Shortly after arriving in Washington, Nat Sr. was elected as Grant County Prosecutor and the first president of the Columbia River Dam, Irrigation, and Power District. In this role, Nat Sr. played a key role in the conception, approval, and construction of the Grand Coulee Dam.

Nat Jr. shared his father's passion for public service. After earning his law degree from the University of Washington, Nat Washington, Jr. also served as Grant County Prosecutor and later in the Washington State Legislature for 30 years. During this time, Nat Jr. was instrumental in the development of several hydro-power projects across the region, including the Columbia Basin Project, which is the largest water reclamation project in the United States, providing nearly \$2 billion in economic benefits to the region each year.

With these immeasurable contributions to Central Washington in mind, I rise to introduce legislation to rename the Third Power Plant at the Grand Coulee Dam as the Nathaniel "Nat" Washington" Power Plant in honor of Nat Jr. and Sr. I urge my colleagues to join me in recognizing the contributions of these pioneers of Northwest hydropower.

RAISE THE WAGE ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. ROBERT C. "BOBBY" SCOTT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 18, 2019

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the following letter in support of H.R. 582, the Raise the Wage Act.

OXFAM,
July 16, 2019.

MEMBERS OF THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Ms. EUNICE IKENE,

Labor Policy Advisor at House Committee on Education and the Workforce.

DEAR MS. IKENE AND MEMBERS OF CONGRESS: On behalf of Oxfam America, I urge you to vote for the Raise the Wage Act (H.R. 582) and vote against any amendments that would weaken the bill.

Oxfam America is an international development and relief agency committed to working for lasting solutions to poverty, hunger and social injustice in over 90 countries, including the United States. Oxfam has carried out development and humanitarian programs across the globe.

Within the United States, we have focused our efforts to elevating the rights and life

opportunities for historically disadvantaged workers in low-wage sectors. With a federal minimum wage of \$7.25 an hour, a full-time worker may only make \$15,080 a year, a salary that is almost \$4,000 below the poverty line for a family of three.

The Raise the Wage Act of 2019 would benefit over a quarter of the workforce: nearly 40 million workers and their families. The act would raise the federal minimum wage to \$8.55 this year and increase it over the next five years until it reaches \$15 in 2024, then adjust it each year to keep pace with the typical worker's wages.

Here are six reasons why raising the wage makes sense.

1. It is long overdue.

In the decade since it was last raised, the minimum wage has failed to keep up with inflation, failed to keep up with average wages, and—most dramatically—failed to keep up with incomes of the top 1 percent and CEOs, contributing to America's growing inequality.

Low-wage workers are not benefiting from economic growth and productivity. If the minimum wage had kept pace with productivity increases, it would be around \$20.

Just 30 years ago, the average pay gap between CEOs and workers was 59 to 1; last year, it soared to 361 to 1. The average CEO makes \$13,940,000, while a minimum wage worker makes \$15,080: a gap of 924 to 1.

2. It would address longstanding racial and gender inequities.

Historically marginalized people do more than their fair share of low-wage work, and would stand to benefit disproportionately from the bump.

While 27 percent of the total workforce would benefit from the raise:

39 percent of Black and Latina women would benefit (vs. 18 percent of white men),

38 percent of African American workers would benefit,

33 percent of Latino workers would benefit,

32 percent of women workers would benefit (vs 22 percent of men).

3. It would reduce poverty.

The bump from \$290 a week to \$600 a week would lift millions of family out of poverty. Two-thirds of all working people in poverty (67.3 percent) would see a raise in wages.

4. It would fuel economic growth.

The roughly \$120 billion extra paid to workers would be pumped back into the economy for necessities such as rent, food, clothes.

Economists have long recognized that boosting purchasing power by putting money in people's pockets for consumer spending has positive ripple effects on the entire economy.

In one recent poll, 67 percent of small business owners support the minimum wage increase to \$15 an hour. They say it would spark consumer demand, which would enable them to retain or hire new employees.

And raising the wage doesn't seem to compel employers to cut jobs. As states and cities across the country have raised wages, research has found no statistically significant effect on employment.

5. It would save taxpayers money and reduce use of government programs.

When employers don't pay people enough to survive, those workers are compelled to seek government assistance, meaning taxpayers are essentially subsidizing the corporations.

In 2016, EPI found that, among recipients of public assistance, most work or have a family member who works; and they are concentrated at the bottom of the pay scale. Raising wages for low-wage workers would "unambiguously reduce net spending on public assistance, particularly among workers likely to be affected by a federal minimum wage increase."

6. It's what the vast majority of Americans want.

Vast majorities (up to three quarters, including a majority across party lines) support raising the wage. Even in a poll sponsored by the National Restaurant Association (which has worked to block state minimum wage increases and preempt local sick day laws), 71 percent of Americans indicated support for raising the wage, "even if it also increases the cost of food and service to customers."

In fact, over half the states have raised their minimum wages to restore basic fairness to the workforce.

CONCLUSION

Raising the minimum wage offers benefits to workers, children, taxpayers, and the economy as a whole. It increases buying power and reduces the daily struggle for people to pay their basic expenses. It enables people to save for and invest in their future. It contributes toward building a work force that is healthier, more stable, better educated, and more productive.

Raising the minimum wage will require members of Congress of both parties to be willing to overcome the divide: to be open to the debate, to consider the needs of hard-working constituents and taxpayers, to consider the wide range of benefits—and ultimately, to give a raise to the people who need it the most.

We strongly urge every member of Congress to vote for the Raise the Wage Act and enact this important piece of legislation as quickly as possible.

Sincerely,

MINOR SINCLAIR,
Director, US Domestic Program,
Oxfam America.

RETIREMENT OF MR. MICHAEL J. SULLIVAN, GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE

HON. JOE COURTNEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 2019

Mr. COURTNEY. Madam Speaker, I rise today, on behalf of myself and the members of the House Committee on Armed Services, to congratulate and celebrate Mr. Michael J. Sullivan, the Director of Defense Weapon System Acquisitions for the Government Accountability Office (GAO), on the occasion of his retirement after 34 years of distinguished federal service.

Mr. Sullivan's dedication to his profession, his selfless public service, and his role helping GAO meet its mission have exceeded everyone's expectations. During his time at GAO, Mr. Sullivan has been an effective thought-leader, most notably in GAO's work to expertly identify and apply best acquisition practices for product development, production, testing, and fielding for many of DOD's most complex, expensive, and critical weapon system acquisitions. Over the years, Mr. Sullivan's efforts resulted in numerous modifications and alterations to DOD's acquisition policies, processes and implementation. Mr. Sullivan significantly contributed to the development and enactment of the Weapon System Acquisition Reform Act of 2009 (P.L. 111-23), which lead to improved acquisition outcomes and effective returns on investment of billions of dollars on behalf of the Congress and the American taxpayer.

Mr. Sullivan testified numerous times before the House Armed Services Committee,