

With the same spirit as those who fled the shores of Europe to escape religious persecution, we welcome this day as one in which we can come together as a people in gratitude for our freedoms and our prosperity, but also in earnest petition for forgiveness, unity, mercy, guidance, and favor.

The National Day of Prayer is a day for all Americans to reflect on our many blessings and to recognize where our ultimate source of strength and hope comes from—our Creator.

At a time in history where our Nation is more divided than ever, I call for us to commit ourselves to prayer this day, to seek the God which has blessed this Nation for 242 years, and to begin again to live out this year's theme, to love and serve one another.

HONORING JUDGE DAMON KEITH

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

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to give honor to a great public servant, Judge Damon Keith. Judge Damon Keith was a judge of the United States Court of Appeals.

He was born on July 4, 1922, a fitting day for someone who so believed in American democracy.

He attended Howard and was mentored by the future Supreme Court Justice, Thurgood Marshall.

In 1967, he was nominated to a seat on the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan by President Johnson. This nomination came at the suggestion of Michigan Senator Phil Hart, the remarkable namesake of the Hart Senate Office Building.

Judge Keith's career was spent fighting for civil rights and civil liberties, particularly for communities within the 14th District. He stood for transparency in government.

Judge Keith will be sorely missed, but his years of tireless service as a champion for civil rights will never be forgotten.

In 2002, he issued an opinion on the secret hearings for alleged terrorists after the 9/11 attacks. He famously wrote: "Democracies die behind closed doors."

IN HONOR OF RAY ECKSTEIN

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

Mr. COMER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor and remember the entrepreneurial spirit and compassionate philanthropy of Ray Eckstein, who passed away on April 20, 2019, at the age of 93.

After receiving a law degree from Marquette University, Mr. Eckstein founded Wisconsin Barge Line. He later sold the business and formed Marquette Transportation, leading him to relocate to Paducah, Kentucky. His

business had a profound economic impact and brought numerous jobs to the region.

Mr. Eckstein and his wife touched the lives of many through the establishment of the Ray and Kay Eckstein Charitable Trust. The couple's generosity has, no doubt, had a tremendous impact on the local community.

Over the years, they have gifted the area they loved with a hospice care center, regional cancer care center, and heart and vascular institute, all named in their honor.

Mr. Eckstein was widely known for his warm, compassionate spirit and devotion to his family. I join with all those who knew him to express our gratitude for his outstanding contributions to western Kentucky.

May God continue to bless the many members of his family through whom his memory lives on.

VETERAN SUICIDE—A NATIONAL CRISIS

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, as we enter the month of May, many of us will be gathering at the end of the month to honor and recognize those who have fallen.

In mid-month, we will celebrate the mothers of this Nation, many of whom are veterans and who have died in battle.

I rise today to speak about veteran suicide, and to view it as a national crisis. It is told that there are 20 veterans a day committing suicide.

So, as I stand here today, tragically, a man or woman who has worn the uniform, who is willing to sacrifice himself or herself for this Nation, for the freedom of our people, for democracy, is taking their life.

This is such a national crisis that I believe that this should be a major issue for all of us to ensure that we find the resources, including the resources for family members, early counseling, and a helping hand to ensure that those veterans who find themselves lonely or homeless and feel that there is no other way out but to commit suicide—many of them young—that we will find a way to legislate, but also to protect the men and women who stood for us.

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. Madam Speaker, I rise for the purpose of inquiring of the majority leader the schedule for the next week to come.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the majority leader.

□ 1230

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

On Tuesday, Madam Speaker, 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 Wednesday and Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate and 12 p.m. for legislative business.

On Friday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business.

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 also consider H.R. 986, the Protecting Americans with Pre-existing Conditions Act of 2019.

On October 22, 2018, the Trump administration continued the Republican assault on affordable, quality health coverage by issuing new guidance to carry out section 1332 of the Affordable Care Act.

That new guidance, Madam Speaker, undermines patient protections and threatens coverage for Americans with preexisting conditions. H.R. 986 blocks implementation of that guidance so as to preserve preexisting condition protections and ensure that healthcare remains affordable and comprehensive.

In addition, Madam Speaker, the House will consider H.R. 2157, the Supplemental Appropriations Act of 2019.

The legislation would provide relief and recovery assistance for Americans affected by recent natural disasters. It includes an additional \$3 billion above that which we passed and sent to the Senate some weeks ago to address urgent needs following flooding in the Midwest and tornadoes in the South that have occurred since the House passed its first disaster relief bill in January, which, unfortunately, has languished in the Senate.

Lastly, the bill includes an extension of the National Flood Insurance Program until September 30, 2019.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I would point out that the President's executive order on section 1332 does nothing to change the protections in law for people with preexisting conditions under ObamaCare. As the gentleman knows, the law protects people with preexisting conditions from facing any kind of discrimination, and the section 1332 waivers have nothing to do with that.

What they do is allow some States—and there have been a number of States who have requested—the ability to be more innovative and focus on lowering premiums while protecting preexisting conditions.

Those States that have taken advantage of that waiver have used it to, number one, provide healthcare in different ways, more innovative ways for their Medicaid population.

That is something we should all encourage because Medicaid in many States is the worst form of healthcare. In many cases, doctors don't even take Medicaid policies and don't see Medicaid patients, so they can't get access to care.

These waivers are a way to help open more access to care at lower costs, in many cases, while protecting pre-existing conditions.

With that said, when the gentleman laid out the schedule, I didn't see anything on the President's request for supplemental funding for the border crisis. Specifically, there was a \$4.5 billion request that came down from the White House for additional funding to address this wave of people who are coming into our country illegally.

In many cases, they have run out of detention beds. They are overwhelming the system, and it has been reported very widely. That is why the President made the \$4.5 billion request.

I wanted to ask the gentleman if that might be included in this supplemental for the disasters that we would surely like to be addressed.

I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's comments. I won't respond to his initial comments. Obviously, we have a disagreement on the impact that the administration has had on preexisting conditions and on the section to which we are referring. But we will have a full debate on that next week when we consider the bill.

With respect to the gentleman's question as it relates to the President's proposal for supplemental funding for border security, which, by the way, was sent down yesterday and is now being reviewed, the gentleman knows that we are strong supporters of border security, and we want to make sure that the border is also humane.

The gentleman did not mention, but I want to point out, that in the bill that we adopted to fund the government that was shut down for 35 days, in the bill that we passed, there was \$755 million for construction and technology at ports of entry where most drugs come into the country illegally. We want to make sure those drugs stop.

We want to have border infrastructure that allows for not only security but checking people who are coming into the country to make sure they do not have illicit substances with them, either for their own use or for sale.

In addition to that, we had \$415 million for Border Patrol and Customs agents and for humanitarian relief, which, obviously, was anticipating the problem that currently confronts us and to make sure that people who come across our border are treated humanely and with respect.

In addition, there was \$30.5 million for alternatives to detention and family case management, which we think is important.

In addition to that, there was a half billion dollars, \$563 million, for immigration judges to reduce the backlog of cases.

Lastly, there was a half-billion dollars, \$527 million, to assist Central American countries, which has had a positive effect on reducing crime and

violence, one of the major reasons that people are fleeing those countries, particularly the Northern Triangle countries, and seeking asylum in the United States of America, pursuant to American law.

But we are reviewing. We want to make sure, as I said at the beginning, that our borders are secure and that we are treating people consistent with American law, not separating children from their families.

The President says he wants to perhaps renew that policy. We are vigorously opposed to that policy. We think the President is wrong in citing previous administrations that separated children. They did so in very few instances, almost exclusively when they were concerned about the safety of a child because of a parent's actions toward the child.

I will tell the gentleman that we are going to be reviewing the President's request very carefully. Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, who chairs the committee, and Mr. THOMPSON, who chairs the Homeland Security Committee, both will be looking at it carefully. We will be making recommendations in the near future as to the disposition of that proposal.

Mr. SCALISE. Reclaiming my time, Madam Speaker, at the final end of your spending bill, we got a start on addressing the problem of border security. We had very intense negotiations, and the President laid out the multitude of things that need to be done to get full control over the border, which we do not have.

That was a start. As the gentleman knows, it surely hasn't stopped the flow of people who have been coming across, especially these caravans, these organized caravans, in the thousands per day, which is overwhelming our system. I wish it would stop.

I wish we would address all the interior security problems and magnet laws, like catch and release and the asylum loopholes, that are encouraging people to come here illegally, in many cases overwhelming our own system.

As the gentleman reviews that supplemental, hopefully, we can come to an agreement on how to, at least in the interim, address the problem. But ultimately, long term, we need a solution. We will continue to work on that.

I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

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

The point of reciting the dollars that were included just some weeks ago to the administration is to point out that they had clearly significant sums with which to operate now, and we will see what funds they need in the future. But I wanted to point out that we have not been negligent or sleeping, with respect to both border security and the humanitarian treatment of those who come across our border seeking asylum.

As I said, we will review it and see what determination needs to be made on what further resources are necessary.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, that debate will go on. Hopefully, we can start addressing some of the long-term problems.

Madam Speaker, I wanted to ask the gentleman, finally, about legislation to confront this BDS movement, a major threat to our ally Israel. It attempts to undermine its economy. There is legislation, and of course, there is a bipartisan resolution, the Schneider-Zeldin legislation, which I strongly support, that at least calls out the BDS movement.

As we have also seen, we need teeth. We need real tools that we can provide to not just our friend Israel, but also States, many States that are also trying to confront this problem and push back against the BDS movement. The McCaul bill addresses that, similar to a Senate bill that passed with over 70 votes—very bipartisan.

In fact, I believe there are amendments being put together to make the McCaul bill identical to the Senate bill. Then the question is, can we get some kind of commitment—and I know we have talked about this before—to bring that bill to the floor so that we can finally, truly confront this growing problem of the BDS movement across not only the world but within our country, and do it with real teeth, like the bipartisan McCaul bill?

I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, as the gentleman knows, and I thank him for his observation, the bill to which he refers has essentially four parts, including a provision with reference to the MOU for Israel's assistance package, which we strongly support. We strongly support the levels of that. That was not controversial.

Also, the Syria sanctions bill—of course, we have passed the Syria sanctions bill, and we are working on other bills that relate to that.

Unfortunately, they are being held up in the Senate by some Republican Senators. The Syria sanctions bill has not been moved in the Senate. It also has the Jordan MOU, which is non-controversial. It has Syria, Jordan, and the MOU. Those are the three factors. One is controversial.

It is controversial because of whether or not it comports with the law. There have been a substantial number of State cases that have been ruled on, State actions taken on this issue that have been held not to be consistent with law and the Constitution.

We are concerned about that because I share the gentleman's view. I am an opponent of the BDS movement. I think it harms one of our most important allies, and it is inconsistent with, I think, the welfare of the people in Israel and, frankly, the Palestinians in the West Bank.

Having said that, we are strong supporters of the resolution. That resolution has bipartisan support, I think, and if it comes to the floor, it will have bipartisan support. The gentleman indicated that.

We intend to come forward with that, but we are trying to work to make sure that other suggestions are consistent with law, and we may move with those as well.

We haven't made that determination yet.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I appreciate it. I understand that there hasn't been any determination yet, but there is a growing frustration that this needs to be addressed by the Congress. There is a move to initiate a discharge petition to get that bill brought to the floor, so those discussions will continue.

Hopefully, we can address the problem of BDS not only in a resolution but also in legislation that has teeth in law to help those States that want to confront it and also to help, in a bigger way, our ally Israel.

My final point is on the process that we have seen. Of course, this week, there was only one bill that came under a rule. As far as amendments go, we have seen a growing trend toward shutting out Republican amendments.

If I can just go through it with the gentleman, as we have looked in this Congress, of the amendments that have come out of the Rules Committee, 74 percent of those amendments were Democratic amendments; 14 percent were Republican amendments; and 12 percent were bipartisan.

If I can compare it to the last Congress when we were in the majority, there were, in fact, more Democratic amendments than Republican amendments allowed. Forty-five percent of the amendments were Democratic; 38 percent were Republican in our Republican majority; and 17 percent were bipartisan.

When you compare last Congress when we were in the majority, we let more Democratic amendments to the floor than Republican amendments.

So far, we have seen a complete reversal of that, where our amendments have been shut out at a very high level, again, 74 percent to 14 percent.

I would ask if the gentleman can look at addressing this problem and try to bring some parity to the floor process as it relates to that disparity, and I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Of course, what the gentleman didn't say is that the last Congress had the most closed rules of any Congress in which I have served, the most closed Congress that we have served in, according to outside observers.

There were 30 amendments available to this bill. I am not sure how many were asked on the Democratic side or the Republican side, frankly. But having said that, there were Republican amendments made in order. Mr. McGOVERN, the chairman of the Rules Committee, has said he intends to have as many amendments made in order as they believe consistent with getting our work done.

□ 1245

So I would say to the gentleman, unlike the last Congress, I think you will see closed rules be very much the exception while, frankly, they were very much the rule in the last Congress. But I take the gentleman's point, and I will have discussions with Mr. McGOVERN. But as you know and I know he is one of the fairest Members in this House, and we will be trying to accommodate Members.

I will also say that the gentleman's statistics include the appropriations process, where there were a lot of amendments on both sides of the aisle. We have not gotten to the appropriations process. As you know, it is my intention that we get to the appropriations process and, frankly, try to conclude the appropriations process next month, and I am sure there are going to be a lot of amendments coming from both sides.

Mr. SCALISE. I hope when we get to that appropriations process that there would be open rules, as we did.

And I guess the gentleman doesn't have to worry about his majority breaking the record of closed rules, because this week we only had one rule, and, in fact, again, a modified rule, where over 30 of our amendments were shut out. Hopefully, more legislation starts moving through the process.

When we look at last Congress, we passed over 50 rules last Congress. So far, this Congress, only 34 rules. We actually had 30 bills signed into law at this point in the last Congress, 30 bills signed into law under our majority, only 16 signed into law here. Hopefully, we see more productivity as well as more openness in that process.

I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

I think the viewers and the Members of Congress are probably glazed over right now with these numbers, but I will tell the gentleman, there was not a single open rule in the House that was presided over by Paul Ryan, not one—not one. Check your record.

But as I say, Mr. McGOVERN has clearly said that we want to have amendments made in order so that both sides can get a fair hearing, and I think he has been doing that, and I think he will continue to do it.

Mr. SCALISE. Well, as eyes are glazing over, for clarity, there were many rules where every single Democrat amendment was included. So if you want to call it a modified rule, closed rule—for people watching, when Republicans and Democrats go to the Rules Committee to try to amend a bill, when every single Democrat amendment is allowed in, that is an open process.

Today, for example, the only rule today, over 30 Republican amendments were shut out—over 30 were shut out. So, many times we had rules where every single Democrat amendment was allowed. In the last Congress, more

Democrat amendments were allowed than Republican amendments.

But this, hopefully, can get addressed and corrected, and maybe when we get to an appropriations process, it will be more fair in that regard.

With that, I look forward to next week, hopefully get some of those things done.

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

ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, we had an interesting debate and interesting vote today regarding the Paris climate change agreement that is a treaty. It hasn't been properly treated like a treaty, just like the Iran treaty was a treaty.

No matter whether the House or the Senate agreed to violate the Constitution and treat the Iran treaty in exactly the opposite format as required by the Constitution, it doesn't matter. It was treaty. It was never properly ratified.

It doesn't matter whether it was a Republican or a Democrat who came up with the bill. A Republican Senator or House Member cannot come up with a bill that changes the Constitution and say: Do you know what? We are going to take this treaty and act like you have to have two-thirds to vote it down instead of two-thirds to ratify it.

But that is what they did, so the President did exactly the right thing. It was time to stop giving billions of dollars in both direct money aid to the largest sponsor of terrorism, Iran.

It was also time to reimpose the sanctions that had basically brought Iran to its knees begging for help. Well, the Obama administration helped them in two ways: number one, allowing them to pursue nuclear capabilities, just doing it privately.

I am one of three people who met with the two main inspectors from the IAEA over in Europe, and they would issue the statement each time that they had seen no evidence that Iran was developing nukes. They were asked the question: Did you see the military facilities that they keep so hidden in secret and where their nuclear development would be occurring?

In response, they said: No. Gee, they gave us a video that they said came from there, but we had never been allowed to examine the facilities.

So the IAEA was not allowed to examine the facilities where nuclear weapons would have been developed, probably were being developed.

From Iran's standpoint, based on how ridiculous the agreement was and knowing their mentality of cheating, certainly they would have been pursuing nuclear weapons, whether or not