

The loss of wildlife diversity wouldn't just be a tragedy for our environment in New Hampshire, but also for our economy that relies on tourism. That is why I am committed to addressing climate change.

House Democrats recently introduced the Climate Action Now Act, which would require the Trump administration to remain in the Paris climate accord and to establish a plan on how we will meet our commitments to reduce carbon pollution.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1644, SAVE THE INTERNET ACT OF 2019; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2021, INVESTING FOR THE PEOPLE ACT OF 2019; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 294 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 294

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1644) to restore the open internet order of the Federal Communications Commission. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Energy and Commerce now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116-10. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only 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 in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 3. House Resolution 293 is hereby adopted.

SEC. 4. On any legislative day during the period from April 11, 2019, through April 26, 2019—

(a) the Journal of the proceedings of the previous day shall be considered as approved; and

(b) the Chair may at any time declare the House adjourned to meet at a date and time, within the limits of clause 4, section 5, article I of the Constitution, to be announced by the Chair in declaring the adjournment.

SEC. 5. The Speaker may appoint Members to perform the duties of the Chair for the duration of the period addressed by section 4 of this resolution as though under clause 8(a) of rule I.

SEC. 6. Each day during the period addressed by section 4 of this resolution shall not constitute a calendar day for purposes of section 7 of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1546).

SEC. 7. Each day during the period addressed by section 4 of this resolution shall not constitute a legislative day for purposes of clause 7 of rule XIII.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BLUMENAUER). The gentleman from New York is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL), my friend, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 294, providing for consideration of H.R. 2021, the Investing for the People Act, under a structured rule. The rule provides 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the Committee on the Budget. The rule makes in order three amendments, each debatable for 10 minutes.

The rule also provides for consideration of H.R. 1644, the Save the Internet Act. The rule provides 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce. The rule makes in order 12 amendments, each debatable for 10 minutes.

Additionally, the rule deems as passed House Resolution 293, which will immediately put in place an enforceable top-line discretionary spending level so that the Appropriations Committee can begin its work.

Finally, the rule provides standard recess instructions through April 26.

Mr. Speaker, the Investing for the People Act is a 2-year budget bill that will raise the defense sequestration caps for defense and nondefense discretionary spending for fiscal year 2020 and 2021.

I believe my colleagues from both sides of the aisle fully understand the devastating effects of sequestration. Across-the-board, mandatory cuts to every Federal program are not a successful path to fiscal responsibility.

Without taking action to lift the caps established by the Budget Control Act, nondefense discretionary funding will be cut by \$54 billion. Such drastic cuts threaten public health, the environment, access to education, job training, and lifesaving social services like food and housing assistance.

Cuts to nondefense discretionary funding would also impact our national security. Nearly one-third of investments in this area fund veterans' programs, homeland security initiatives, diplomatic operations, foreign aid, and Justice Department activities.

If an agreement on lifting the cap is not reached, defense programs also stand to lose \$71 billion. In a dangerous world, those cuts would be, in my view, harmful to national and global security.

Only a few months ago, the American people felt the harsh effects of a government shutdown. It is time to come together to take decisive action to avoid another blow to essential Federal programs that help hardworking Americans in every State. This legislation ensures working families will be able to rely on continued Federal funding for the programs that keep them safe, support their jobs, and invest in their children.

In fiscal year 2020, defense spending would be capped at \$664 billion, with nondefense discretionary spending capped at \$631 billion.

The Investing for the People Act would also provide up to \$8 billion, annually, for nondefense overseas contingency operations, OCO, activities that do not count against the spending caps, while limiting OCO designation of defense spending in 2020 and 2021 to no more than the fiscal year 2019 level of \$69 billion dollars.

In his budget, President Trump proposed continued spending on defense measures but massive cuts to domestic programs like public health research, infrastructure investment, and support for low-income families.

Even as our Nation draws down from our overseas war operations, domestic spending remains at a historic low as a percentage of our economy. H.R. 2021 provides a pathway for improving the lives of Americans in every community and renews our commitment to spending to meet the needs of our communities and invest in our economy.

In addition to protecting Americans from spending cuts, the House will be considering protections for a product all of us here today rely upon to do our jobs and live our lives, just like millions of Americans: the internet. This rule also provides for consideration of essential protections for American consumers who use the internet.

The Save the Internet Act would reinstate the Open Internet Order of 2015 that classifies broadband internet services as common carriers that are prohibited from preferentially treating or discriminating against groups of persons.

An overwhelming 86 percent of Americans opposed the FCC's rollback of net neutrality protections. All this legislation does, Mr. Speaker, is restore those protections.

Fair and reliable internet access is absolutely essential to millions of working families and small business owners. Practices like blocking, throttling, and paid prioritization harm the ability of every American to experience the internet in the same way, regardless of provider or how much money you pay.

The Save the Internet Act includes enhanced transparency protections and enacts specific rules against throttling, blocking, and other violations of net neutrality. The FCC would be empowered to investigate consumer and business complaints and impose necessary fines against internet service providers

for violations of the Communications Act.

The bill also provides pathways to internet access for every American, especially those in rural communities who are being left behind by modern, high-speed internet infrastructure.

The Save the Internet Act would once again allow the FCC to fund rural broadband through the Connect America Fund.

Additionally, this legislation revives the Lifeline program, created under the Reagan administration to subsidize phone service for low-income families. Under this legislation, the FCC would again have authorization to use the Lifeline program to expand access to broadband for low-income Americans, especially seniors, students, veterans, and disabled Americans.

In response to concerns raised by our Republican colleagues, the Save the Internet Act also ensures that the FCC has the power to protect access to the internet but does not have authority to make decisions over internet content or the power to impose taxes and fees for internet access.

This legislation forbears the FCC from applying more than 700 regulations under the Communications Act that are unnecessary to protecting an open internet, such as rate setting.

□ 1230

Internet service providers have long claimed that they were hamstrung by net neutrality protections and that strong consumer protections were preventing them from investing in higher speeds and advanced broadband infrastructure.

In reality, ISPs actually increased speeds and invested huge amounts in improving their broadband during the time when net neutrality protections were enforced by the FCC. Moreover, many of the largest providers have failed to keep their promise of increased investing after the Trump FCC repealed those protections, with investments actually shrinking in recent years.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote for this rule and for both pieces of legislation underlying it, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank my friend from New York for yielding me the customary 30 minutes. And, at the risk of opening this debate like I opened so many others in 2019: Mr. Speaker, we have taken an opportunity to do something very productive and very bipartisan and we have turned it into something that is going to be very partisan and wholly unproductive.

Neither of the bills we are considering in this rule today are going to be moving through the Senate. Neither of the bills we are considering today are going to be signed by the President. But the good foundation in both of those bills could have been, and we have missed yet another opportunity.

Let me start with H.R. 1644, Mr. Speaker, the so-called Save the Inter-

net Act. I can't speak for everyone else's internet, but my internet is still thriving. I haven't seen any nefarious internet shortages or blockages in recent days.

For the millions and millions of Americans trying to livestream C-SPAN right now, they are having no problems whatsoever. It is going right through the pipes the way it always has, Mr. Speaker. And, if it is in need of saving, it is certainly not in need of saving from this institution.

I understand, Mr. Speaker, that my friends on the other side of the aisle are upset with the Trump administration's FCC.

You will recall that the Obama administration and its FCC took the regulations that had governed the internet from its inception through its explosion of productivity and innovation, all the way through 2015, and threw all those rules out entirely, replacing it with a command-and-control government structure.

In its wisdom and with my great support, the Trump administration and the FCC threw those new rules out, taking us back to those rules that provided the foundation for the internet and all of the productivity that it has provided.

It is unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, that so many folks are afraid of internet freedom that we need to try to find a way to clamp down on internet freedom and bend the internet to the will of the government.

I would argue that the Wild West innovation style that has driven the internet and tech companies from day one shouldn't be boxed in by the government and certainly shouldn't be replaced with a 1930s-era, Ma Bell telephone regulatory scheme.

That is what we are talking about here today with this bill, Mr. Speaker, is turning over regulation of the internet to title II of the Communications Act.

If you have not looked at title II recently, Mr. Speaker, it is almost 100 years old. It was created to govern that wonderful emerging technology called the landline telephone and the monopolistic telephone companies that existed at that time.

I don't know how many of your staffers still have landline telephones, Mr. Speaker. I know your grandchildren probably don't even know how to operate one these days.

We certainly should not be relying on those regulations to bring us forward with innovation. The heavy hand of government regulation always takes us backwards.

The good news, Mr. Speaker, is that, if you see legitimate challenges out there, we do have some bipartisan solutions to help address those: Former Chairman WALDEN's H.R. 1101, one such bill that could have been on the floor today; Mr. LATTA's H.R. 1006, another bill that could have been on the floor today; Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS' H.R. 1096 could have been on the floor today, just to name a few.

But none of those bipartisan options were seriously considered. Instead, we are left with a single option, in true government, monopolistic fashion, and that option is to support the Obama administration's failed government takeover of the internet.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose that. I oppose the legislation. I hope my other colleagues will as well.

It did not have to be this way. This could have been a productive partnership discussion about how to take what is obviously a productive and innovative tool fueling, not just urban America, not just suburban America, but rural America, and we could have talked about how to grow it together. But we chose a different path, digging partisan ditches even deeper early in 2019.

If that is not disappointing enough, Mr. Speaker, there is a second bill that this rule makes in order. That is H.R. 2021. That bill comes out of another committee that Mr. MORELLE and I serve on, the House Budget Committee.

I love serving on the House Budget Committee, I have to tell you, Mr. Speaker. It is a wonderful committee on which to serve. Mr. MORELLE and I are both lucky to be on it, and we have two fabulous leaders on that committee: Mr. YARMUTH of Kentucky leading the Democratic side of the aisle and Mr. WOMACK of Arkansas leading the Republican side of the aisle.

If you were going to task two leaders in this institution with crafting the kind of budget that I talked about from the well earlier, Mr. Speaker, a budget that would protect Social Security, protect Medicare, protect Medicaid, a budget that would lay out priorities for America, talk about where it is that we want to see our children and our grandchildren go in the 21st century, those are the two leaders who could have brought us together for the first time in a long time around a unified vision.

But, instead, the order came down from on high, Mr. Speaker. There was to be no budget. I assume that is true. We have considered absolutely no budget in the so-called Budget Committee. We have had no budget markup in the Budget Committee. We have had no discussions of budget in the Budget Committee.

Instead, what we have before us today is a bill that is sometimes referred to as a caps deal. You have heard "caps deal" before, Mr. Speaker.

It is those times in years past where we have taken what are those discretionary caps, those limits on how much Federal money we can spend, and we have adjusted those so that we can invest in some shared priorities on the one hand while reducing spending in some other, lower priority places.

We have done that in a bipartisan way not once, not twice, but three times. We could have been here today, Mr. Speaker, for a fourth time.

If we are not going to actually do a budget, we still could have been here

on a caps deal. But this is not a caps deal. This is not a caps bill that had input from Republicans in the House. This is not a caps deal that had consultation with the Senate. This is not a caps deal that has been done in bipartisanship with the White House.

This is a caps deal that is just a deal among warring factions of a divided Democratic Caucus, and that bill has come to the floor today—again, a bill that will not be considered in the Senate and a bill that will not be signed by the President.

We can normalize partisan failure in this institution, Mr. Speaker. We can. We can also normalize bipartisan cooperation.

I don't fault the other side for the struggles that are, inevitably, going to happen when a new majority takes over in the U.S. House of Representatives. Leading is a very difficult, difficult thing to do.

But, at the end of the day, the majority is tasked with doing exactly that—leading. The Budget Committee should produce a budget. The United States of America should have a budget.

It is not easy to do. It is not easy to pass this House floor. It is not easy to pass through a committee. But it is what the law requires us to do; it is what we have the right leaders on the Budget Committee to do; and it is what every single Member in this institution knows in their heart that we should do.

Mr. Speaker, I urge defeat of this rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, let me just make a few brief comments, and I always appreciate the passion that Mr. WOODALL, my distinguished friend and colleague, brings to this discussion.

I do want to say what this is. First of all, the rule before the House has both a resolution, which I talked about, which is really the safety net, it establishes the \$1.295 trillion for discretionary spending and, in addition, allows us to do IRS enforcement—\$400 million is in the resolution—and the census 2020, which is upcoming and which will take thousands and thousands of people to conduct the census in the way that the Framers identified it to be.

It also has a budget bill. And I do want to just mention just a few points that relate to what Mr. WOODALL said.

The major components of the budget are in the budget bill. It provides a top line for discretionary spending, provides allocations to the authorizing committees, provides a revenue floor, enforces all these 302 allocations, and sets new caps for discretionary spending, gives allocations to authorizing committees, all of these things which will match the CBO's baseline, I might add, and enforcement through regular Budget Act points of order.

So this does have a budget bill. What we do with the resolution, however, is critically important because it makes sure that we begin this process.

I think the thing that we all want to avoid in the greatest possible way is a shutdown. We saw that happen, and 2018 made history.

Although the House, the Senate, and the White House were all controlled by the same party, we ended Congress for the first time in U.S. history in a government shutdown, an inglorious end to the 115th Congress.

We need to do anything we can. This starts that process, creates a safety net, and jump-starts the budget process. So this is a completely appropriate and, in my view, mandatory way to start this process. And I will perhaps, if I get a moment or two, talk about the budget that the President submitted to us.

I also want to just mention for a moment, if I can, the comments raised by my colleague relative to the net neutrality bill. This, under the current rule, has enormous exposure to consumers and businesses. It does not impede innovation, what we are attempting to do. In fact, in my view, it will spur innovation, and it provides predictably for all users, consumers and businesses alike.

I do note that the rule that we reported out last night ensures that we do everything we can to reaffirm that commitment to fair access.

The rule made in order 12 amendments, both from Democrats and Republicans. It is a structured rule. Some of those amendments I agree with, some of those I disagree with, but every single one is worthy of debate on the floor. I am very proud, and I want to also congratulate the chair of our committee, Mr. McGOVERN, for making sure that we have amendments from both sides to discuss on this floor.

I do want to just mention a couple of them. Several amendments aim to strengthen access to broadband internet in rural and underserved communities. Mr. BRINDISI, for instance, has an amendment which we will take up which requires the GAO to produce a report about the ways the U.S. government can promote the deployment of broadband to rural communities.

Representative WEXTON has an amendment requiring the FCC to submit to Congress a plan on how the Commission would address problems in collecting data on deployment of broadband. By fixing these problems, we can have a better understanding of those communities that are served by broadband and ensure every community has access.

We have an amendment by Representative WATERS asking the Comptroller General to submit a report on how net neutrality helps ethnic and racial minorities and how those rules will help disadvantaged groups, rural populations, individuals with disabilities, and the elderly. Without that full information, we cannot ensure that everyone is receiving the same treatment.

We have an amendment from Representative DAVIDS directing GAO to

submit a report examining the FCC's efforts to assess competition. Colleagues are worried about how net neutrality rules will impact competition, but they have no data to back up their claims, so let's collect the data we need. Good policy is always backed by good evidence.

We also made in order an amendment by Representative MCADAMS which would affirm that ISPs can still block unlawful content, such as child pornography. Some content has no place on the internet, nor anywhere in our homes, and we want to make sure that ISPs block this, as they should, and that nothing in the bill will prevent them from doing so.

There are several other amendments made by Democrats that will be on the floor. I won't go into them any further. But I do want to acknowledge, also, that we have amendments in order submitted by Republican colleagues as well.

Mr. LATTA submitted an amendment requiring the FCC to share the list of 700 rules that will be permanently forborne once this bill becomes law, which makes sense to me. We had this conversation in rules yesterday, to ask the question what those 700 rules are. The FCC has determined them to be unnecessary and burdensome.

Let's look at them and see what they are. Let's see the list. Let's show the American people that the government was not regulating for the sake of regulating and that, when those regulations are no longer appropriate, we will remove them.

Finally, my colleagues on the Rules Committee made Representative BURGESS' amendment in order. It directs the GAO to initiate a study to examine the virtuous cycle of the internet ecosystem and the effect of net neutrality on that ecosystem—again, an amendment which was made in order to make sure that we have bipartisan discussion here on the floor.

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

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond to my friend from New York, but I just have too many speakers who have come down to the House floor today to speak about this.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE), a member of the Rules Committee, our ranking member on the Rules Committee, a member of the Appropriations Committee, and one of the most thoughtful Members of the Republican Conference.

□ 1245

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my good friend, a member of the Budget Committee, for yielding, and my colleague on the Rules Committee.

I rise to oppose the rule and oppose the underlying legislation. Now, I oppose the rule because it is not really a rule at all. It is really legislation masking as a rule.

Buried in this rule is a measure that will, what we call self-execute, but

deem what the budget is going to be. In other words, our friends are telling us: We may not have the votes, even though we have a substantial majority, to pass our own caps bill. But just in case, the rule vote, which is a partisan vote, we are going to put it in here.

Now, that doesn't speak to a high degree of confidence that my friends will have the votes, which they should have, on their caps deal. I would argue it is technically legal, but it is not a very seemly practice to actually express your distrust of your own majority that directly.

Second, let's talk a little bit about the underlying legislation. There is a lot here I don't agree with, but I want to focus on one thing in particular, Mr. Speaker, and that is the "budget" itself, because it is not a budget. It is a caps bill.

It is not even a caps deal. It hasn't been negotiated with the Senate. It hasn't been negotiated with the administration. It is an arbitrary number. It has no chance of becoming law. There is no way a Republican Senate will have double the amount of increase for domestic programs as it has for defense. It is just not going to happen.

So, now, the Appropriations Committee—and I am always happy to have numbers as an appropriator—will now move on down with a set of numbers that we know will not survive negotiations with the Senate or with the President. So we are going to mark up a lot of bills, but they are going to be the numbers that are a fantasy.

Finally, in this caps deal, we ought to point out, our own rules require the majority to present a budget. We couldn't even get a budget out of the Democratic Budget Committee. Now, that is a failure to govern.

The Speaker, herself, said on one occasion: Show me your budget, and I will show you your values.

It suggests that you don't want to show the American people your values, because you certainly aren't showing us a budget in this legislation.

So the rule, frankly, is a backdoor way to enact some sort of caps legislation, caps legislation that will not be accepted by the Senate, that will not be accepted by the President of the United States.

The underlying legislation doesn't have a budget, which our own rules require that it have. It has a mere statement of spending levels that, again, are not going to be accepted by the other Chamber or by the President of the United States.

And, finally, our friends have abdicated their most important responsibility, which is showing the American people their view and their vision of what the budget ought to shape.

The rule ought to be rejected; the underlying legislation ought to be rejected; and our friends ought to challenge themselves to bring us a budget that they can support, that they can put in front of the American people.

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I appreciate my good friend, the gentleman from Oklahoma's comments.

Those on the other side may say this is messy, but do you know what is messier? Another government shutdown.

We just endured, earlier this year, a 35-day government shutdown, the longest shutdown in our history. In this committee, we are committed to doing everything in our power to prevent that from happening again.

We want to make sure we can move forward with appropriations legislation, and this provision is a safety net to assure that process can begin. Whenever a budget bill comes up, whenever we begin that appropriations process, we will have a path forward.

My good friend raised the question of the President. I have to admit I am new here, haven't been here very long. I have been involved in the budget process in the State of New York for many years.

Frankly, watching the budget and looking at the budget submitted by the President, I would be embarrassed. I think it is no wonder that my friends on the other side of the aisle didn't submit, as an amendment, the President's budget.

The President's budget is devastating. I look to how it would devastate the people in my home State of New York: repeals the Affordable Care Act, eliminates health insurance for 2.2 million New Yorkers, abolishes protections for people with preexisting conditions, substantially increases premiums for older Americans.

If the budget that Donald Trump submitted became law, a 60-year-old living in New York making \$25,000 a year could see their healthcare premiums increase by up to \$5,000 annually, from \$1,600 to \$6,300 in 2020, a quarter of their income.

It cuts funding for New York's Medicaid program by \$159 billion over the next 10 years. Nationally, the Trump budget proposes to cut Medicaid by \$1.5 trillion over the next 10 years, 36 percent in 2029 alone.

College would be more expensive for 179,000 New Yorkers by completely eliminating the Direct Subsidized Loan Program and taking away grants for 108,000 students by abolishing the Supplemental Education Opportunity Grant program. At a time when people need to have knowledge more than at any other time in human history to safeguard their economic future and those of their families, to cut college programs is reprehensible.

But I don't care just about New Yorkers, Mr. Speaker. My friend from Georgia, I have a brother who lives in Georgia. His children live in Georgia. I care a great deal about the people in Georgia as well.

The Trump budget:

Eliminates after-school programs for 41,000 Georgia students by zeroing out the 21st Century Community Learning Centers program;

Takes away high-quality childcare and early education for 4,200 low-income Georgia children by cutting Head

Start by 17 percent in the final year of this budget;

Eliminates nutrition assistance for up to 395,000 Georgians, 90 percent of whom live in households with at least one child, elderly person, or a person with a disability, by cutting the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program by \$220 billion, nationally, over 10 years;

Takes the food out of the mouths of 4,000 pregnant women, new moms, babies, and toddlers in Georgia by cutting the Women, Infants and Children program by 18 percent in the final year of this budget.

I could go on and on, Mr. Speaker, but I will spare my colleagues a long dissertation on the Trump budget, other than recognize that this House is moving forward. We are beginning this process. We have established a safety net.

This is what Americans want. They don't want another shutdown. And we are going to do everything in our power—together, I hope, in a bipartisan way—to make sure that we continue to move forward in the years to come.

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

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds just to say that my friend's criticisms of the Trump budget are perfectly legitimate. What he failed to mention, though, is the reason he can make those criticisms is because the law required the administration to offer a budget, and it did. The law also requires this House to offer a budget, and we have not.

We are better than that. This is not an Article II responsibility. This is an Article I responsibility, and we will rue the day that we decided that we would rather talk about what Article II was doing instead of doing the work ourselves here at Article I.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MEUSER), a new Member of this institution and a member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. MEUSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this rule and to H.R. 1644, also known as the government-controlled internet act.

Once again, House Democrats are putting Federal Government control over freedom and bringing to the floor yet another partisan, central command government bill.

H.R. 1644, or the government-controlled internet act, which, fortunately, has no chance of being signed into law, goes against everything that made the internet what it is today.

There is a reason the United States is home to the top internet companies in the world. This doesn't happen by accident. It is because of the laissez faire approach that allows for an environment of economic growth, competition, and innovation.

Instead of building on the pro-innovation approach that has revolutionized how we communicate, work, and stay connected, this legislation would

impose heavy-handed, top-down regulations that would box the internet into outdated rules written in the 1930s.

Why is the Democratic majority supporting a bill that will take the internet backwards?

This bill is the quintessential solution in search of a problem. If we want to protect constituents, promote investment, and encourage innovation, H.R. 1644 is not the solution.

If my colleagues across the aisle are serious about protecting consumers and ensuring access to a free and open internet, then we need to find bipartisan consensus on net neutrality principles that address blocking, throttling, and paid prioritization. We need a modern framework that allows for continued American innovation and investment, not another Federal Government regulatory takeover.

H.R. 1644 is not a serious solution to protecting our constituents and advancing American ingenuity. I urge my colleagues to oppose this effort and send a clear message that we need to move the internet forward, not backward. I hope they will oppose this rule and the underlying legislation.

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS), a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee and the Rules Committee.

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

As you know, the difficulty is, when we take away the managing of a business operation from that underlying business, the incentive to innovate and to serve consumers is likely to dissipate.

The internet, for decades, has thrived because it was not under the heavy hand of government. Because of this freedom, we are now on the brink of accessing the fifth generation of broadband technology that, when fully implemented, will eliminate the need for net neutrality regulations because latency for all content will be almost zero.

I don't think you find any disagreement that blocking, throttling, and paid prioritization are not practices that anyone wants as a part of the open internet. But classifying broadband internet as a telecommunications service under title II of the Telecommunication Act of 1934 will limit the ability of service providers to respond to consumer demands and potentially result in disruptions due to content neutrality requirements.

Republicans have introduced three proposals to preserve a free and open internet. I hope we can work together, going forward, to achieve that laudable goal.

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I do note for my friend, Mr. BURGESS, whom I serve on the Rules Committee with, that we, in an effort to enhance

bipartisanship, made his amendment in order. I believe it is the first amendment in order, and I certainly expect that it will get broad consideration on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from over 120 businesses and startups urging Congress to support net neutrality. This letter says: "Passing H.R. 1644 will provide certainty for businesses and startups and would ensure critical consumer protections for all internet users."

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

Hon. KEVIN McCARTHY,
*Republican Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.*

DEAR SPEAKER PELOSI AND LEADER McCARTHY: We are writing in support of H.R. 1644, the Save the Internet Act, to fully restore the strong net neutrality protections for Internet users that were adopted through the FCC's 2015 Open Internet Order but later repealed.

Net neutrality is fundamental to guaranteeing that every American has unencumbered access to the Internet. This access is also essential to a competitive, free market for the technology economy to thrive as well as entrepreneurship in this country. The benefits of these protections are not confined to technology companies and startups. Main Street businesses across numerous sectors increasingly rely on unfettered Internet access to run their operations and to reach customers.

Net neutrality has been critical to the Internet's explosive growth, creating an open platform on which companies large and small can grow. We urge members of Congress to stand on the side of consumers and Internet users to quickly pass a clean, unamended version of H.R. 1644. This bill would restore strong rules prohibiting blocking, throttling, and paid-prioritization while reinstating ex-ante enforcement and oversight by the FCC to prevent net neutrality-related harms from happening in the first place.

Passing H.R. 1644 will provide certainty for businesses and startups and would ensure critical consumer protections for all Internet users.

Sincerely,

1Huddle, Ad Hoc Labs (dba Burner), Adaptive Energy, AlleyWatch, Applemon, Attentive, Inc, BetaDefense, Binary Formations, LLC, Bitly, Bloomers Island, Blue Ocean Technology, Bluebell Advisors, Inc/Gilbane Advisor, BusBot Incorporated, CapSen Robotics, Chartbeat, CitiQuants Corporation, Cogent Communications, Cole House LLC, Concourse Markets, Contextly.

Creative Action Network (CAN), CredSimple, D3FY.COM, Darling, Inc., DART Technologies, Digital4Startups Inc., DLT Education, EarnedCard, Educareations, Elud, Etsy, Inc, Expa, Fan Guru, Filament, FinToolbox (Screener.co), FluentStream, Founder Academy, Foursquare, Friends, G. A. Hensley Company Inc.

General Assembly Space, Inc., GitHub, Inc., Globig Inc., goTenna, Grey Horse Communications, Gusto, Haute Huab, High Fidelity hobbyDB, HOGARU, Hoola Hoop LLC, InnovateEDU, Inwage LLC, JOOR, JustFix.nyc, Karavan App, Karma+, Laconia Capital Group, Launch Pad.

Loxo, LR, Makeo Company LLC, Mapbox, Market Mic LLC, Martech, Mavatar Technology Inc., Medium, Meta, LLC, MetaProp.vc, Minibar Delivery, Mozilla Corporation, Music to, Neighborland, Neta Collab, Netsyms Technologies, Onfido, Onfleet, Inc., Outdoor Project, Patreon, Inc.

Postmates, Promogogo, Rainmakers, Reddit, Inc., Rentify, Rex Ag Labs, Routific, Sandwich.Net, LLC, Shotwell Labs, Inc., Shutterstock, Inc., Simply Made Apps, SlidesUp, Snaps Media Inc., Spoonful, SpotHero, Starsky Robotics, Stealth Communications, Stripe, Stylaquin, Svaha LLC, Tampa Bay Wave.

Tenpin, textile.io, Tinybeans USA Ltd, Tostie Productions, LLC, Troops.ai, TrueAbility, Tunesync, Twitter, Uncork Capital, Venrock, Via, Vimeo, Inc., WayUp, Wellthy, White Lioness Coaching®, Women 2.0, WorkHound, Yapp, You Got Listings, Inc., Zyper.

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

My friend from New York is right: They did make a number of amendments in order, but not enough amendments to solve some underlying problems.

One amendment they didn't make in order was an amendment to provide disaster funding to so many of our communities that have been waiting on disaster funding—not for a day, not for a week, not for a month, but, now, into the new year.

If we defeat the previous question today, we can correct that injustice, and I will bring up an amendment to the rule to make this disaster funding possible. It is critically important.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT) to talk about that, one of the greatest advocates for that language here in the House.

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question so the House can immediately bring up meaningful disaster relief.

I want to thank my friends and colleagues from across the aisle, Representative WOODALL, obviously, Chairman McGOVERN, Ranking Member COLE, and others on the Rules Committee, for allowing me to speak last night on behalf of the amendment. I also want to thank them for their help in previously passing very similar legislation.

My amendment is quite simple. The text contained the same dollar-for-dollar amounts from H.R. 268, the House-passed disaster assistance bill.

This bill was a work of compromise and work that many of us representing districts that have been hit by disasters in 2018 worked on. It includes a bipartisan amendment that I and many others sponsored, which raised the crop and livestock loss assistance to \$3 billion, from approximately \$1 billion. That is included in the final text.

Unfortunately, my amendment was not made in order; but, if we defeat the previous question, it will be included in an amendment, along with other important provisions, to help those affected by the natural disasters of 2018.

Disaster relief has never been a partisan issue in the United States of America, and it should not be a partisan issue today. I urge my colleagues

and I ask every Member in this body to defeat the previous question so that we can immediately bring up legislation to deliver on our promise of passing disaster assistance prior to leaving for the Easter break.

□ 1300

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the sentiments of the gentleman. We certainly agree.

The House has passed disaster relief. We await Senate conferees, so we can move that process forward. But what strikes me is how troubling it is to have this conversation.

The reality is that the President of the United States has chosen which Americans to provide aid to. The island of Puerto Rico, American citizens, has suffered disasters, calamities, as a result of Hurricane Maria, yet the President shows no indication that he understands the plight of the people on Puerto Rico. That is why it is necessary for the House and Senate to come together to provide relief, because the President, frankly, has chosen not to do it.

We welcome the comments by the gentleman. We look forward to the Senate establishing members of a conference committee, so we can work out differences that we may have and move this forward. We continue to hope for that day and hope that the President will gain some enlightenment about how we help and protect all American citizens.

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

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, as we have heard so often on the House floor, hopeful wishes are not enough for our constituents. We need to deliver results.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DUNN), who has been working hard in that direction.

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to demand that critical natural disaster relief be voted upon.

Tomorrow will be the 6-month anniversary of Hurricane Michael, 6 months with absolutely no disaster supplemental funding, no serious action on the part of Congress except the political farce in the House and two failed cloture votes in the Senate.

Both Chambers have refused to extend even routine tax relief to ensure that people have access to their money when they need it most. With tax day just around the corner, this is unacceptable.

Floridians are tough, but they need help and deserve help.

Six months ago, Hurricane Michael devastated the South, damaging more than 90 percent of the structures on Tyndall Air Force Base, decimating our agricultural industry, and destroying entire communities. Yet, here we are with only 1 day left in the legislative calendar before Easter and no tax relief in sight.

If the previous question is defeated, it will be a first step in making some meaningful progress for victims of all the 2018 disasters. It will bring the Disaster Tax Relief Act of 2019 to the floor. I am a proud cosponsor of that bill with TOM RICE and AUSTIN SCOTT.

This bill includes a set of common, routine tax breaks victims of virtually every disaster over the last decade have been entitled to, things like access to retirement savings without penalty, a tax credit for employers who continue to pay employees while shut down, suspending tax limitations on charitable contributions for relief efforts, and allowing hardworking families to use earned income from the previous year to calculate their earned income tax credits and child tax credits.

It is a shame that we have to resort to a procedural trick to ask for a vote on this very bipartisan, commonsense legislation that we have passed many times before.

Mr. Speaker, it is time we take action to help those suffering from the 2018 disasters. For this reason, I urge a “no” vote on the previous question.

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would just reiterate what I said earlier, which is that all Americans need help in times of disaster.

Despite the fact that some would try to ignore the fact that climate change exists and has created natural disasters that we could not have predicted years ago, the fact is that those disasters continue to happen.

All Americans—I don’t care whether you live in New York or Alabama, Florida, Puerto Rico, the U.S. Virgin Islands—all Americans need help.

One of the first bills we passed under a structured rule in this Congress was to provide that relief, yet it sits in the Senate because they seek to choose which Americans get benefited by the Federal Government’s relief efforts and which do not.

We are going to stand firmly in the corner of all Americans getting the support from the Federal Government that they deserve. We are not going to pick and choose.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly hope that my colleagues here across the aisle are going to march across to the other Chamber and insist to the United States Senate that it takes up that bill, that we establish a conference committee, and that we send this to the White House.

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

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time, and I would say to my friend from New York, we do not have any further speakers remaining, so if he would like to get this show on the road, I am prepared to close if he is.

Mr. Speaker, I have great respect for my friend from New York on the Rules Committee, and I really do enjoy serving with him on the Budget Committee.

It is neat to be on the Budget Committee as a freshman because you are working with the biggest issues that we have in this country. We all care about healthcare and how it gets implemented, but we can't implement it if we can't pay for it, so the Budget Committee grapples with those issues.

We all want our seniors to be protected. They have been paying into Medicare and Social Security their entire lives, but we know those programs are headed toward bankruptcy. We can't solve those problems except in the overarching look of a Federal budget process. It is what the law requires.

We get to talk about those big ideas. We get to think those big thoughts. We get to come together to make big and, yes, Mr. Speaker, difficult decisions.

President Trump, in his budget, made difficult decisions. I dare say I could go Member to Member in this Chamber and find 435 people out of 435 who would find at least one flaw in the President's budget. I bet I could.

It is hard to write a budget for the United States of America, but the law requires that we do it. More importantly, even if the law didn't require that we do it, Mr. Speaker, we know that we should. We know the Constitution lays out that responsibility, the power of the purse, for the House. We have constituted an entire committee called the Budget Committee.

I don't want to wow you, Mr. Speaker, with my eloquence, but do you know what the responsibility of the Budget Committee is? It only has one: write the budget.

For years, there was a time when the Senate was not taking up budgets in its Budget Committee. I wondered why they didn't disband the Budget Committee because the only job the Budget Committee has is to write the budget.

We know we need to do that together. We know we do, but we are not.

The second bill this rule makes in order is the government takeover of the internet bill. Again, if you think the internet is broken and the benevolent hand of government can fix it, this is the bill for you. If you think the internet is not broken and perhaps government ought to stay where government is, and the freedom of the internet should continue, this is not the bill for you.

We need to defeat both of these bills, and we need to defeat the rule.

I do want to point out, for the Rules Committee, we were working just beyond those doors last night, Mr. Speaker, and I think the Rules Committee did the best it could with the material that it had to work with. I see the staff director of the Rules Committee sitting over there. He has a tough job.

I think the chairman did the best he could. You cannot solve the problem of a flawed, partisan committee process with the inclusion of amendments in the Rules Committee. You just can't do it. But they tried as hard as they possibly could, making in order as many amendments as they could to try to satisfy as many concerns as they could.

The problem is not the Rules Committee, Mr. Speaker. That is not why we need to defeat the rules today. The problem is the leadership decision that has been made to bring up these two flawed products that were created in a partisan way when we could have brought to the floor two positive products created in a collaborative way.

We have to make a decision in this Chamber. Either we are in the business of making a point or we are in the business of making a difference. So far, the first 4 months of this year, we have been great at making a point, but we have been struggling to make a difference.

Like it or not, we have a Senate that has to pass this legislation and a President who has to sign it if we are to make it the law of the land. The two products today fail that test.

Let's not waste another moment on them, Mr. Speaker, not another moment. Let's reject this rule. Let's not bring these two pieces of legislation to the floor. Let's go back to the drawing board collaboratively, as we know we can. Lock any bipartisan group of Members into a room together, Mr. Speaker, and they will craft a better solution. We have the right leaders in this Chamber for this time. We just need to free them up to lead.

Defeat this rule. Defeat the previous question.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I always appreciate the passion that Mr. WOODALL brings to conversations, both here on the floor as well as in the two committees on which we are privileged to serve. I thank him for that and thank him for his concerns about how we move forward.

I believe this is moving forward. Today, we are moving forward. We set the tone of how we move forward. We establish our discretionary amount. We end the sequestration caps. We begin to move forward, and I think that is what we want to do.

It is fascinating. I note that Mr. WOODALL, in his comments, mentioned you can't get all 435 Members to agree. I certainly understand that, and I appreciate it. We couldn't get one Member to offer the President's budget as an amendment.

The truth is that there is a failure of leadership here. This is a process that is new to me, but I certainly expected that the President would provide greater leadership on how to move forward. We have seen none from the White House, which I find troubling and I find puts us at a considerable disadvantage.

We need to move forward, nonetheless, Mr. Speaker, and that is what we are doing today.

I do know that, for me, the amount of discretionary investments we make will say a great deal about where we are going as a country and what our priorities are.

I think we need to make greater investments in education and in public health, highways and transit, veterans healthcare, agricultural research, workplace safety, K-12 education support, national parks, housing assistance and mortgage insurance, small business assistance, Head Start, food safety, scientific research and space exploration—God knows, as a percentage of GDP, we need to continue to invest dramatically in those—embassy security, Pell grants for higher education students, hazardous waste cleanup, waterway maintenance for commerce and recreation, weather forecasting, hurricane-proofing communities, forest and wildlife habitat management, conservation resources, patents and trademarks, consumer protections, and aviation safety.

The list goes on and on for the kind of investments we need to make to continue to make sure that America leads in the 21st century. That is what this does today. That is what this rule will do. That is what the resolution budget process starts today.

Mr. Speaker, I thank all my colleagues for their words of support for H.R. 2021, the Investing for the People Act. I especially thank Chairman YARMUTH and Ranking Member WOMACK for their work on our Nation's budget.

I also thank Chairman PALLONE and Ranking Member WALDEN and all those who have worked on H.R. 1644, the Save the Internet Act.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote on the rule, and I urge a "yes" vote on the previous question.

The material previously referred to by Mr. WOODALL is as follows:

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 8. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2145) to provide disaster relief. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. No amendment shall be in order except the amendments specified in section 9 of this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order specified, may be offered only by the Member designated, shall be considered as read, and shall be debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent. All points of order against such amendments are waived. After the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and

report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 9. The amendments referred to in section 8 of this resolution are as follows:

(1) A proper amendment, if offered by the chair of the Committee on Ways and Means or his designee; and

(2) A proper amendment, if offered by the ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means or his designee.

SEC. 10. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 2145.

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

□ 1315

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or votes objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

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

BUILDING ON REEMPLOYMENT IMPROVEMENTS TO DELIVER GOOD EMPLOYMENT FOR WORKERS ACT

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1759) to amend title III of the Social Security Act to extend reemployment services and eligibility assessments to all claimants for unemployment compensation, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1759

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 “Building on Reemployment Improvements to Deliver Good Employment for Workers Act” or the “BRIDGE for Workers Act”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) The Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018 (Public Law 115-123) improved program accountability for effectively serving unemployed workers and made a significant new investment in reemployment services.

(2) Research shows the longer workers are out of work, the harder it can be to maintain their skills, professional network, and stable home life.

(3) Reemployment services give workers who might otherwise struggle to find new jobs the tools that they need to get back to work—such as individualized career counseling and job search help as well as local labor market information—and they can serve as an entry point to the workforce development system.

(4) Reemployment services have been demonstrated to reduce the number of weeks that program participants receive unemployment benefits by improving their employment outcomes, including earnings.

(5) Unemployment benefits replace less than half of working income, on average, so workers who find new jobs quickly suffer less financial hardship.

(6) Combining targeted reemployment services with unemployment benefits helps keep people attached to the labor force who might otherwise become discouraged and drop out.

(7) The Congressional Budget Office estimates that, over time, investments in reemployment services create savings for taxpayers and unemployment trust funds by reducing spending on unemployment benefits.

(8) Many different types of workers can benefit from reemployment services. Reemployment services should be used to shorten the duration of unemployment for workers even if they are not projected to fully exhaust their unemployment benefits.

SEC. 3. ELIGIBILITY FOR REEMPLOYMENT SERVICES.

Section 306(a) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 506(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking “individuals referred to reemployment services as described in section 303(j)” and inserting “claimants for unemployment compensation, including claimants referred to reemployment services as described in section 303(j).”; and

(2) by striking “such individuals” and inserting “such claimants”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS) and the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. WALORSKI) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1759, the BRIDGE for Workers Act, continues our committee’s bipartisan work to help Americans who are receiving earned unemployment insurance benefits to get back to work faster.

Unemployment benefits are a vital lifeline for Americans who have lost their jobs, helping them keep the lights on and pay the rent while they search for work. But unemployment benefits replace less than half of a worker’s paycheck, on average. Especially for lower paid workers, who may not have any savings to fall back on, the best outcome is to find a new job as quickly as possible.

When you lose your job, it can be difficult to find a new one, especially if you are older, haven’t looked for a job in a long time, or have made mistakes in the past. Reemployment services give people looking for help the personal help they need to overcome those barriers.

For instance, States might provide assistance targeted to a claimant’s needs, things like customized career and labor market information, help with application materials, or allowing them to practice for tough job interviews.

Last year, we passed important legislation to improve reemployment services and eligibility assessment grants, or RESEAs. Our legislation added important worker protections, gave States incentives to improve the quality of the services being provided for workers, and ensured that sufficient funding is available in every State and territory.

When I asked how RESEA grants were being used in my home State of Illinois, they told me about Tara, who struggled to find a new job after she was laid off, both because her skills weren’t up to date for the current labor market and because she had a criminal record. The Illinois RESEA helped her upgrade her job skills and find a job with an employer willing to take a chance, a chance on someone who had made mistakes. She is now working and going to school to get an associate’s degree in welding, so she will have better pay and benefits in the future.

The BRIDGE for Workers Act would add important and needed flexibility to allow States to serve all workers who could benefit from reemployment services, not just those who are expected to run out of benefits before finding work.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from the National Association of State Workforce Agencies endorsing the BRIDGE for Workers Act.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE WORKFORCE AGENCIES,
Washington, DC, March 13, 2019.

Hon. STEPHANIE MURPHY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. JACKIE WALORSKI,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. KOCHITL TORRES SMALL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. DARIN LAHOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVES MURPHY, WALORSKI, TORRES SMALL AND LAHOOD: We are writing on behalf of the National Association of State Workforce Agencies