

I stand with Scott Warren. I stand with all the organizations helping migrant families. I will continue to ask tough questions and fight to hold this administration accountable.

**IN RECOGNITION OF TRANSPORTATION SECURITY OFFICERS AT PHOENIX AIRPORT**

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

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Transportation Security Officers at the Phoenix Sky Harbor Airport for their bravery and dedication to their mission to keep our airports safe.

Last month on June 18, a man rushed a TSA security checkpoint at the Phoenix Airport, injuring and knocking over several TSOs in the process. I would like to thank the following TSOs who showed courage in subduing the attacker, even as he attempted to hurt and push past the officers:

Donna Potts O'Brien, Cynthia Baker, Christopher Cotton, Sandra Thompson, Patricia Miller-Davis, Gladys Recinos, Michael Malloy, Melvin Gorham, Adam Ervin, Kenneth Fetter, Robert Morelos, Michael Wilmoth, and Roberto Lopez.

I am grateful to these heroic officers and commend their actions to keep the Phoenix Airport secure.

**HEALTHCARE NEEDS OF THE UNINSURED**

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

Ms. HOULAHAN. Madam Speaker, last week, I had the opportunity to visit the Community Volunteers in Medicine center in West Chester, Pennsylvania, which works to meet the healthcare needs of the working poor and uninsured in my community.

Giuseppe is a member of my Pennsylvania community and owns a pizza shop with his wife. He has diabetes, hypertension, and major cardiac issues. Combined, they bring in \$2,200 a month, and their prescription drug prices are \$1,790. Without CVIM, the family would be paying 81 percent of their monthly income just for prescription drugs.

The astronomical costs of prescription drugs affect everyone. Neither being a Democrat nor a Republican will get you a discount. We are failing the people of this country by not working together as a Congress to relieve these burdens. For too long, Congress has used people's access to healthcare as a political pawn.

As my mother would say: "We need to knock it off." Please join us in working together and side by side to help people across our country with these issues.

I applaud CVIM for their efforts, and I want Giuseppe and my fellow Penn-

sylvanians to know: I see you, and I will keep fighting for you.

Please join me.

**GUN VIOLENCE IS A PUBLIC HEALTH EMERGENCY**

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

Mr. CLAY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3435, the Local Public Health and Safety Protection Act.

Across this Nation, we are faced with an ugly, obscene, inescapable truth: gun violence is a public health emergency.

My bill would, for the first time via Federal legislation, prohibit any State that wants to compete for grant funding from the Department of Justice from restricting the ability of a local government to enact tougher gun laws. My hope is that we can finally give local governments the freedom to protect innocent citizens and first responders while making our neighborhoods safer, regardless of what their State legislature thinks.

I urge my colleagues to cosponsor and support this vital public safety legislation.

**MILLIONS STAND TO LOSE HEALTHCARE**

(Mrs. LEE of Nevada asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. LEE of Nevada. Madam Speaker, on behalf of the people of Nevada's Third District, I rise today for the 288,000 Nevadans with Medicaid, thanks to the Affordable Care Act;

For the thousands of young Nevadans under the age of 26 who can stay on their parent's health plan, thanks to the Affordable Care Act;

For the nearly 350,000 Nevada seniors on Medicare part D who are now paying less for their prescription drugs, thanks to the Affordable Care Act;

For the 20 million Americans who are scared right now of losing the healthcare they have finally received, thanks to the Affordable Care Act; and

For the 1.2 million Nevadans and 130 million Americans with asthma, high blood pressure, ALS, cancer, cystic fibrosis, depression, HIV, and other diseases, for their preexisting conditions that will not be protected if the Affordable Care Act is dismantled.

Look, it is pretty simple. If the lower court decision in *Texas v. United States* lawsuit stands, millions could lose their health insurance. I stand for every one of those Americans, and we should all stand for them.

**HEALTHCARE FOR AMERICANS**

(Ms. PLASKETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. PLASKETT. Madam Speaker, yesterday the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals heard oral arguments in the lawsuit where Republicans sued to not only strike down protections for people with preexisting conditions, but eliminate every last protection and benefit provided by the Affordable Care Act.

House Democrats have used our vote to send a strong message against this lawsuit, and yesterday, the House general counsel argued in support of people with preexisting conditions and the healthcare of all Americans.

While our Republican colleagues attempt to undermine people with preexisting conditions, House Democrats will do everything in our power to protect the healthcare of the American people.

If the administration's position is supported by the Fifth Circuit, it will destroy the protection for more than 130 million people with preexisting conditions, Medicaid expansion coverage for 15 million Americans, significant savings that our elders receive and seniors receive due to ACA's closing of the doughnut hole in Medicare drug coverage, bans on discriminatory insurance practices that force women to pay more for coverage, and young adults' ability to remain on their parents' insurance until age 26.

Madam Speaker, Democrats will continue to deliver on our For the People agenda and American healthcare.

**COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE**

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, July 10, 2019.

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

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on July 10, 2019, at 11:18 a.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 239.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

CHERYL L. JOHNSON.

□ 1230

**PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2500, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2020, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES**

Mr. McGOVERN. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 476 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 476

*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. 2500) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes. 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 amendments specified in this section and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services. 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 Armed Services now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116-19, modified by the amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as the original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the five-minute rule and shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived.

SEC. 2. (a) No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution and amendments en bloc described in section 3 of this resolution.

(b) Each further amendment printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules shall be considered 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, may be withdrawn by the proponent at any time before action thereon, 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.

(c) All points of order against the further amendments printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules or amendments en bloc described in section 3 of this resolution are waived.

SEC. 3. It shall be in order at any time for the chair of the Committee on Armed Services or his designee to offer amendments en bloc consisting of amendments printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution not earlier disposed of. Amendments en bloc offered pursuant to this section shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services or their designees, 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.

SEC. 4. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such further amendments as may have been adopted. In the case of sundry further amendments reported from the Committee, the question of their adoption shall be put to the House en gros and without division of the question. 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. 5. Clause 7(a)(1) of rule XV shall not apply with respect to H.R. 553.

SEC. 6. It shall be in order at any time on the legislative day of July 11, 2019, or July 12, 2019, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules, as though under clause 1 of rule XV, relating to the bill (H.R. 1327) to extend authorization for the September 11th Victim Compensation Fund of 2001 through fiscal year 2090, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. McGOVERN. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL), 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. McGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McGOVERN. Madam Speaker, on Tuesday, last night, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 476, providing for consideration of H.R. 2500 under a structured rule. One hour of general debate has been provided, controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services.

Madam Speaker, this rule makes more than 430 amendments in order. I think we broke a record. This bill has the most amendments, I think, ever made in order, and I think it is something that we should be proud of.

These amendments include ideas from both sides. I think that is important. But I have got to tell you that I am especially proud that this rule allows a debate on many truly progressive ideas.

One of these amendments would allow transgender troops their rightful chance to serve in our military without roadblocks from this administration. That shouldn't be a radical idea. Gender shouldn't matter on the battlefield.

Transgender troops have been serving in our military for a very long time. They have willingly put their lives on the line to deploy in combat zones just like all other troops. They have worn the same uniform and have been held to the same standard as everybody else.

But, instead of thanking them, instead of thanking them for their service to our country, this administration wants to prevent them from serving at all.

Out of nowhere, President Trump logged onto Twitter one day and decided to ban transgender people from military service.

This rule will give us a chance to debate an amendment to change that, to reject the President's bigotry.

There is another amendment here that would prevent the President from using the 2001 AUMF to launch an attack on Iran or engage in military hostilities without explicit congressional authorization.

Now, think about this. We were, apparently, moments away from the President launching an attack against Iran—no consultation with Congress at all, no debate on this floor, no thoughtful discussion, not even a vote.

Democrats don't want war with Iran. Most Republicans don't want war with Iran. The American people certainly don't want a war with Iran.

But this President was, apparently, about to use an AUMF passed more than a decade ago to fumble us into another conflict in the Middle East. I am glad the President backed off from bombing Iran, but I am terrified about the lack of thoughtful leadership coming from this Oval Office.

I don't know what kind of mood he will be in when he wakes up tomorrow, whether he will want to go to war with a country or not, but I think we have a constitutional obligation here in Congress to make sure that we play a role as to whether or not we enter into another war as well as preventing another war.

We need to make it clear to this administration that the President cannot use an old AUMF to initiate hostilities against Iran, period. This rule is our chance. There are dozens and dozens of ideas here that many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have tried to get debated for a long time and many on our side of the aisle have tried to get debated for a long time. This rule will finally allow us to do that.

As important as they are, the importance of this rule goes beyond just the amendments. There is suspension authority included in here that would allow us to move quickly this week and pass the reauthorization of the 9/11 Health and Compensation Act.

How could anybody oppose that, Madam Speaker? Recently, we saw 9/11 first responders coming to the Senate and literally begging for Majority Leader McCONNELL to move the bill.

These people are heroes. They should never have to plead with hat in hand for the resources to help them survive.

The Senate is finally showing a willingness to move on this. So, if we pass this rule, this program could be reauthorized within a matter of days.

Passing this rule would also allow us to quickly take action on the first measure placed on the Consensus Calendar, H.R. 553, as part of the underlying bill.

This calendar was created as part of our bipartisan rules package, passed at the start of the Congress. It is a new procedure designed to expedite consideration of measures with broad bipartisan support.

Congressman JOE WILSON and Congressman JOHN YARMUTH's bill to update the Department of Defense's Survivor Benefit Plan has well over 350 co-sponsors.

Clearly, there is a lot of bipartisan support here for this legislation. Let's pass this rule and make sure it gets taken up as quickly as possible this week as part of a must-pass vehicle.

That is what this rule is all about, Madam Speaker: debating ideas and countless progressive amendments—and some amendments, quite frankly, that are very conservative that I am going to fight as hard as I can to defeat.

Moving quickly to reauthorize a program that our 9/11 first responders depend on, I think, is an absolute priority of this majority, and I hope my Republican friends will join with us in supporting this effort.

Allowing an overwhelmingly bipartisan bill to be considered on the floor without delay that benefits widows, I think, is something that hopefully will get broad bipartisan support.

So, if we pass this, we can make sure all of this happens this week.

Madam Speaker, I also want to take a moment and recognize that this underlying NDAA bill would finally confer a service medal honoring the sacrifice of atomic veterans.

It has been a long road getting to this point. The prior three House NDAA bills included similar amendment language, sometimes by near unanimous votes, but it was stripped out of conference every single time. For the life of me, I cannot figure out why.

Radiation-exposed servicemembers risked their lives for our Nation, in secret and at great personal cost. More than three-quarters of atomic veterans have already passed away, many prematurely from health problems directly related to their service.

It is past time to finally recognize their courage and sacrifice, not just with a certificate of recognition but with what they truly deserve: a service medal.

So I hope, by including this language in the base bill, it won't be stripped out as the process continues, and let's give these veterans the recognition that they have earned.

Finally, Madam Speaker, let me just say this: The underlying bill is a good bill, and Chairman SMITH, Ranking Member THORNBERRY, and their staff deserve a lot of credit for this product.

It was a bipartisan process in committee, as we heard last night in the Rules Committee. Many Republican amendments were adopted in the committee process, and I think Chairman SMITH, again, and his staff deserve enormous credit for getting us to the point we are at here today.

I will say that I regret very much that the marching orders coming from the leaders of the Republican Conference are that all Republicans should vote against the NDAA bill, a bill that contains a pay increase for our troops, a bill that includes items that will protect and enhance our national security, a bill that will provide all the other things I have just mentioned.

I am sorry that the Republican leaders have decided to turn this into a partisan exercise, but they can do whatever they want.

Our job is to make sure this gets done and it gets moved forward in a timely fashion, and that is what we intend to do.

Madam Speaker, with that, I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

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

Madam Speaker, I appreciate that admonition. I promise you, you won't have to repeat that again on my time.

I appreciate my friend from Massachusetts yielding the time.

I had a whole wonderful opening statement planned, Madam Speaker. It was going to be our first time down here on the floor together during a rule.

Janet Rossi, on my team, put together all the great stats and statistics, many of which you heard my friend from Massachusetts reference.

And then, as happens to me so often on the Rules Committee, I show up in a good mood, I show up in a great place, and then folks just poke me in that way that gets me going.

For my friend from Massachusetts to close with the Republicans have turned this into a partisan exercise frustrates me to no end.

If there is one thing I have learned in my 9 years in Congress, Madam Speaker, it is that when it comes to American national security, it never gets turned into a partisan exercise.

I don't know how your election went, Madam Speaker, or what it was that your constituents said to you. Mine talked to me a lot about congressional dysfunction.

“Why can't they get anything done, Rob?”

“Why in the world can't you all get together and cooperate?”

And I always respond with the bill that we are looking at today, the National Defense Authorization Act. I say: In six decades of working, depending on who was in the White House, who was leading the House, who was leading the Senate, six decades of working on National Defense Authorization Acts that need to be passed every single year, how many times do you think we have actually successfully gotten that done together?

You know how that conversation goes, Madam Speaker.

“Rob, I think you guys have gotten it done once in 60 years.”

“Rob, I think it has happened 4 times, maybe 12 times.”

Madam Speaker, you know what I know, which is that, over these decades, every single year, without fail—it does not matter who is in the White House; it does not matter who leads the U.S. House; it does not matter who

leads the United States Senate—we come together as a Nation to support our men and women who are standing on the frontlines for us.

So, no, this is not a partisan exercise today, nor should it be from the Republican side of the aisle.

But I am mystified, Madam Speaker, as to why we have taken what should have been this continuation of decade upon decade upon decade of bipartisanship and seemingly gone out of our way, as a new Democratic majority, to make it partisan.

I know the policy isn't. I know the policy isn't. I can go right down the line, man after woman, woman after man, on the Democratic side of the aisle and find patriots who love this country and who will do whatever it takes to defend it. That is the conversation we had in the Rules Committee last night.

But I will take you back to my freshman year in Congress, Madam Speaker. I came in with that rabid class of freshman Republicans, that largest freshman class in American history. You would think, if we were going to find partisanship, we would find it in that class.

We all came in on that big Tea Party wave, folks wanting to shake things up, change things. Do you know what the National Defense Authorization Act looked like coming out of committee that year?

It passed 60–1, Republicans and Democrats standing together. The year after that, 56–5. That is what my freshman year looked like: 60–1, 56–5, Republicans and Democrats standing together on behalf of national security.

I don't know if you have looked at the vote from the Armed Services Committee, Madam Speaker. I know you are familiar. It was 33–24, straight party-line vote, coming out of committee this year.

In the Rules Committee last night up on the third floor, Madam Speaker, we finished up about midnight. I had the chairman and the ranking member of the Armed Services Committee there talking about all the things that they agree on as it comes to national security, yet, to my friend from Massachusetts' point, the marching orders came down from somewhere that prevented them from doing what we have always done, and that is report a bill in a bipartisan fashion.

It has nothing to do with who leads this Congress, Madam Speaker.

About 12 years ago now, when the very first woman to ever hold the Speaker's chair took over—that would be 2007, Madam Speaker—we didn't bring the bill to the floor under a rule in a partisan fashion. We brought the bill to the floor under suspension.

□ 1245

Madam Speaker, that very first bill that was passed in the Pelosi Speakership passed 369–46 on the floor of the House; 369–46. Most of the no votes were Democrats voting against the new

Democratic Speaker of the House and the national security bill; 369–46.

The year after that, the last year of the new Speakership, the year right before I came, it passed 341–48.

Madam Speaker, I go through these big numbers to make the point that it didn't have to be this way. We went out of our way, it seems, as an institution, to divide on national security. I will just give you a few of those examples.

There are 439 amendments made in order, as my friend from Massachusetts pointed out, and I think we should celebrate that. But again, there were 683 amendments offered, so 250 Members were shut out.

Madam Speaker, we had an opportunity, under the new Consensus Calendar that my friend from Massachusetts referenced, to bring bipartisan legislation to the floor.

For folks who haven't been following that, the only way to get to the House floor is to have a committee report your bill. If committees don't report your bill, you can't get to the House floor unless you end up on the suspension calendar.

This new majority, this new Democratic majority, changed the rules in what I think is an amazingly positive and productive way. What they said is, if you bring together enough Democrats and Republicans to support your bill, we are going to have to give you a special pathway to the House floor for those consensus ideas that we want to celebrate together as an institution.

Madam Speaker, my friend, JOE WILSON from South Carolina has such a bill. It is a bill to support the widows and widowers of our fallen servicemen and women. He has worked this bill with my friend from Kentucky, Mr. YARMUTH, and this is the very first bill to have achieved, again, this new level of excellence that the new majority laid out. If you can bring people together we will give you a special pathway to the House floor. You get a vote on your bill.

I might point out that my friend from California, Ms. LOFGREN, did this very same thing. She did it on a piece of immigration legislation that I am a cosponsor of. She put together the requisite number of Republicans and Democrats, and her bill is coming to the floor, too.

Now, her bill is coming to the floor today on suspension, stand-alone, up-or-down vote to allow Republicans and Democrats to come together and support that idea.

My friend, Mr. WILSON's bill, without his knowledge, without his consultation, without his input, has been tucked into this rule, this partisan rule, this passed-by-party-line-vote rule, to be self-enacted into the underlying legislation.

I expressed my frustration to the chairman last night; that so often we fail in ways that meet the very low expectations of our constituents. This was a wonderful, positive change that Speaker PELOSI and the new Demo-

cratic majority brought to this institution. Madam Speaker, it is a change that I hope will be a lasting change. It is a change that I hope will persist no matter who sits in the Speaker's chair over the next decade upon decade.

But our very first opportunity to use it, we moved it from its design, which was to be an opportunity to celebrate those things that bring us together, those hard nuts that we figured out a way to crack together, and we have turned it into yet another exercise in "gotcha" partisan politics.

The men and women who will be served by this legislation deserve better than that. The men and women who serve in this institution deserve better than that. And when the new Democratic majority was sworn in on the first day of this Congress, they promised the American people better than that.

Madam Speaker, today won't be the last word on this issue; but it is the first word, and it is an unfortunate one.

I hope that my colleagues will be cognizant of this mistake that they have made, and I hope that they will correct it before it is too late.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Let me just take issue with the gentleman from Georgia when he talks about this as being a partisan process. From what I understand, in the Armed Services Committee, 142 Republican amendments were accepted, 142.

And the gentleman's facts are a little bit wrong when he says it was a straight party-line vote reporting the bill to the floor, unless Ms. STEFANIK and Mr. BACON have changed parties—I hope they did—because they voted to advance it. Everybody in that committee should have voted to advance it, but they did, and they deserve credit for that.

Notwithstanding the fact that the Republican leadership is telling all their Members, vote "no" on the final passage of the bill, and vote "no" on the rule, unlike my colleagues on the Republican side when they were in charge, who would routinely ask Democrats who came before the Rules Committee and offered amendments and they would say, if we make your amendment in order, will you vote for the bill?

Well, we didn't ask a single Republican that question last night. And we made 62 Republican amendments in order. There are 94 bipartisan amendments in order, and so we didn't do that.

If this ends up being a partisan vote on the rule, that is the choice of my colleagues on the Republican side. I think there is lots and lots of stuff in here that everybody should support.

Let me just say one other thing about the Consensus Calendar. My friend from Georgia is just beside himself that we are moving forward a bi-

partisan idea that has over 300 cosponsors, overwhelmingly bipartisan. Oh, it is terrible that you are putting it in the rule. It is terrible, terrible, terrible.

Well, let me say, what happened when they were in charge in the last Congress. Mr. WILSON and Mr. YARMUTH introduced a bill. I think there were 290-plus cosponsors on the bill. My Republican friends couldn't even be bothered last session with giving the bill a hearing. They didn't bring it to the floor for a vote. They could have brought it under suspension. They could have had it as an amendment to something. They could have put it in a rule if they wanted to. They didn't do anything.

And now that we are moving forward an idea that has broad bipartisan support, they can't handle it. They are having a meltdown on the other side of the aisle.

Well, you are obsessed with the process when you should be obsessed with the widows who would benefit from the enactment of this bill. But that is fine. That is fine.

The whole point of the Consensus Calendar was to be able to bring bipartisan ideas that had overwhelming support to move those ideas forward, and we praise Mr. WILSON and praise Mr. YARMUTH for their leadership on this.

But to carry on about that it is on a rule, and not at all be concerned about it becoming law really kind of shows the difference in our priorities.

Let me tell you that one of the reasons why we think it is important to put it on the NDAA bill is because we think is a must-pass piece of legislation. This will go to the Senate. I mean, obviously, there will be a conference report, and there will be back and forth and there will be changes and additions and it will come back. But we know that this bill, if it passes the House is going over to the Senate, whether you like it or not. It is going to the Senate.

If we brought it up here under a suspension, it would die in MITCH McCANNELL's graveyard, like everything else dies over in the Senate. He doesn't give a damn about this; if he did, he would have done something about it.

So I appreciate the gentleman's concerns, but, quite frankly, I think that they are unfounded; and I think that, quite frankly, this is a rule that deserves the support of not just Democrats but Republicans as well.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. TRAHAN). Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward Members of the Senate.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. YARMUTH. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 476, the rule allowing for consideration of the National Defense Authorization Act, including my amendment to, once and

for all, repeal the SBP-DIC offset, commonly known as the widow's tax.

I would like to thank Chairman SMITH and Chairman McGOVERN for their work to include my amendment in this bill. I also want to thank the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON) for his continued stalwart leadership on the issue.

I got involved in this issue several years ago when I was contacted by a constituent of mine named Ellen. She emailed me to tell me about the unfair burden being placed on an estimated 64,000 surviving spouses and families of the men and women of our military, forcing them to forfeit all or part of an annuity purchased by their beloved fallen heroes.

In the final paragraph of Ellen's email, she mentioned a First Sergeant in the U.S. Army who suffered a heart attack during his required physical training in 2002. That First Sergeant was her husband.

It became clear to me that Congress' mistake more than 4 decades ago was now negatively impacting one of my constituents, a constituent who was already grieving the loss of her husband. And while I am heartbroken by the reason Ellen was forced to become an advocate on this issue, to this day I am very thankful she contacted me.

Including this provision to ax the widow's tax in must-pass NDAA legislation is likely our only shot in this Congress to end the unfair offset once and for all. I want to urge my colleagues to support this rule and final passage of this bill. We have tried for years to get this right and now we finally can.

Stand up for Gold Star families and support this rule and the underlying legislation. The spouses and children of our fallen heroes have sacrificed enough.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I thank you for that second admonition. I did say you wouldn't have to use it again on my side of the aisle. I can commit to you that you still will not have to issue one on our side of the aisle.

I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE), the ranking member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the rule and the underlying legislation. This is actually a very sad occasion, I think, for the House; it certainly is for me personally. I have never voted against a national defense authorization in my 17 years in Congress. As a matter of fact, most of our Members have never done that for the last 58 years, so it is pretty unusual for us to be here and we, personally, regret that a great deal.

My concerns with the substance of the bill are many, although there are, as my good friend from Massachusetts said, lots of good things in there, and there was lots of bipartisanship in writing it.

But the top line number is \$15 billion less than the President requests and

the Senate has already enacted in their NDAA bill. We think that hurts readiness. We have concerns with the reversal of some decisions, both slowing down the modernization of our nuclear forces, and moving us away from low-yield nuclear weapons, which we think we need to counter Russia and its current aggressive posture.

We are disappointed the bill doesn't include longstanding prohibition against transferring detainees from Guantanamo Bay to the United States. Those provisions were put in by a Democratic Congress in 2010. We are sorry our friends seem to reverse a decision that they believed in a decade ago.

And it includes a lot of restrictive policies and prohibitions on securing the southern border, including prohibitions on funding a border wall, fence, physical barriers. I understand there are differences there, but I would hope we could give the executive flexibility in that area.

Mr. Speaker, as concerned as I am about the substance of the bill, I am very concerned about the process. I grant my friend's point that a lot of amendments have been made in order. We could have made more. We actually offered an open rule last night that would have made everybody's amendments in order. It wouldn't have taken away any of the amendments my friends wanted to put out there, but it would have allowed everybody's amendments to come to the floor for full and robust debate.

Now, the amendments that were made in order, 67 percent of them, are Democratic amendments; 14 percent are Republican. We don't think that is a fair, remotely fair ratio.

And frankly, the en bloc arrangements in which we are going to bring many of these to the floor are even more imbalanced; basically 63 percent of those will be on Democratic initiatives; I think two are on Republican initiatives. So we are very concerned about that. I think if we don't stop this process, we are about to make the mistake that we made 2 weeks ago.

Now, the Senate has given us, as it did 2 weeks ago, a different example. They have passed a national defense authorization by a vote of 86–8, so overwhelmingly bipartisan. The President has said he would sign their bill. The President sent us a message that the partisan bill that we are embarking on and about to pass he will not sign; so we are headed for a confrontation. It is a confrontation where we will produce a partisan bill that the President won't sign. The Senate will produce a bipartisan bill that the President will sign, and I think we know how that story ends.

□ 1300

So we are dangerously close to repeating the mistake we made only 2 weeks ago, and I would hope that we stop, because if we proceed down this path, we will find ourselves in precisely

the same situation we found ourselves in with the border wall.

Now, I also want to take issue with my friend a little bit about the 9/11 issue and our friend Mr. WILSON's bill and my good friend in the chair's bill, as well. I just want to say, putting a bill, those things that are bipartisan, in a rule, it just literally means that our side is not going to vote for it. It would be the same if it were your side. You can say all you want. It was going to pass no matter what. So we don't think this was necessary.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. YARMUTH). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE).

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for the additional time, and I will be brief.

So it is with a great deal of sorrow—not sorrow that I oppose the rule, because I think the rule needs to be much more open, much more inclusive, but I hope that we can get back, Mr. Speaker—and by rejecting this rule and rejecting the underlying legislation, we can—to a bipartisan process where we produce a bipartisan National Defense Authorization Act.

Mr. Speaker, I urge rejection of the rule and rejection of the underlying legislation.

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

I understand the frustration on the Republican side. They lost an election, and so they are not getting everything they want in terms of policy. Well, elections have consequences, and I will give you an example.

I oppose low-yield nuclear weapons, and I hope that that remains the policy, but we made an amendment in order that would allow them to reverse what was in the bill. I am going to fight to defeat it, but there will be a vote on that, and we will have to live with whatever the outcome is.

The bottom line is that, if it doesn't turn out your way, it doesn't mean the process is somehow partisan. That is what happens when you win elections. You don't win on every policy debate that you decide to engage in.

And let me just say one thing about the process and the procedure, because I think it is important for my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to have a little bit of a fact check here.

Our friends like to point out the ratio of amendments, but that is a cherry-picked statistic that doesn't tell the whole story. To date, we have made in order more amendments, overall, than my Republican friends did when they were in charge. We have even made in order more minority amendments, to date, than the Republicans did last Congress.

By this time in the 115th Congress, a total of only 140 amendments were made in order. Of those, 89 were minority amendments. This year, we have made a total of 1,280 amendments in

order. That is nine times as many amendments as my Republican friends made in order at the same point in the last Congress. And we have made in order 256 minority amendments this year, which is more than double the number of minority amendments the Republicans made in order at this point in the 115th Congress.

You want to look at the statistics, there they are. And the bill that we are about to debate, we are making in order the most amendments, ever, of any bill brought to the floor.

Now, I guess we could do better than that, but the bottom line is the most amendments, ever, are being made in order on this NDAA bill—and, by the way, on any bill; not just NDAA, on any bill.

So I know it is frustrating to be in the minority. I was there not too long ago. I know it is frustrating not to win on every vote and to be able to rig every vote as my friends did when they were in charge, but the bottom line is, in this place, the majority, whoever has the most votes, wins. So in terms of the process, I think my friends protest too much.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Mrs. TRAHAN), a member of the Armed Services Committee.

Mrs. TRAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this year's National Defense Authorization Act. This bill addresses many critical components of our national defense, including the urgent need to tackle sexual assault across the United States military.

Recent years have seen significant progress towards reforming how sexual assault claims are handled. Now it is time for Congress to confront the conditions that allow sexual assault to happen in the first place.

We have an obligation to protect and safeguard those who answer the call to service and wear the uniform of the United States. It is not good enough merely to have the best training and equipment on the battlefield; we must also protect our soldiers on base or wherever they are.

This NDAA includes an amendment I coauthored that does just that by directing the Secretary of Defense to create a civilian advisory committee on sexual assault prevention in the military. This committee would be comprised of civilians with expertise in campus sexual assault prevention, suicide prevention, public health, and perhaps, most importantly, culture change of large organizations.

We absolutely can make more meaningful progress to make military sexual assault a thing of the past. I am glad that opportunity is reflected in the NDAA before us now. I urge support of this bill.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I have become accustomed to your gentle gavel in the Budget Committee, and I appreciate its gentleness here on the floor, as well.

I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON),

whose bill you have been so instrumental in, as well.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding this time. I appreciate his leadership.

H.R. 553, the Military Surviving Spouses Equity Act, is a bipartisan bill with over 365 cosponsors. In fact, it is rare that a bill garners this many cosponsors and was amongst the first to reach the new threshold for mandatory consideration under the Consensus Calendar. I am grateful that colleagues on both sides of the aisle support this legislation to repeal the "widow's tax."

Thank you to all of the surviving spouses and advocates who have worked diligently and tirelessly on this legislation. The bill would have been eligible for a vote this Friday.

Instead, Democratic leadership has decided to specifically bar this bill from independent consideration and include it in the flawed, partisan NDAA. In fact, the rule for the NDAA specifically states:

Rule XV of the Consensus Calendar shall not apply with respect to H.R. 553.

Democratic leadership has essentially said, if the NDAA does not pass, the widow's tax doesn't pass.

Further, leadership has put this bill at risk of the conference with the Senate. Democratic leadership knows that it is not included in the Senate's version of the NDAA, and I am disappointed with the other side.

I even offered a bipartisan amendment with Chairman JOHN YARMUTH to have this legislation be included in the NDAA, but they did not make that amendment in order. Instead, Democrats placed their own amendment in a partisan rule and are forcing the stand-alone bill to be barred from the Consensus Calendar.

This is partisan politics at its worst. This is heartbreaking for the 65,000 military widows who have worked tirelessly and very effectively to mobilize support behind the bill.

At the peak of their hopes that this bill would pass the United States House of Representatives this week, leadership now has put the bill in jeopardy. Instead of supporting our military and the military families, including those who have died and sacrificed for this country, the majority has chosen to violate their own rules and put the bill in jeopardy. This tactic cheapens the efforts of these military widows by turning their real-world plight into a partisan tactic.

A stand-alone bill in the Senate with over 365 House cosponsors would have had a better chance of passing and sent a clear and overwhelming message of support to these widows. Instead, we will be sending this over in a partisan bill, almost ensuring its demise in the Senate. This is a disservice to the widows who deserve better.

I am grateful for Ranking Member TOM COLE, who argued against making H.R. 553 as part of this self-executing rule. He is right that this shortens the process and is politics at its worse.

Our team followed the rules the Democrats set forth to have this overwhelmingly bipartisan piece of legislation set for a vote, and they decided to play partisan politics and remove it. Further, the Rules Committee failed to notify my staff and even failed to notify the community that would be most directly impacted by their actions: the widows who have worked tirelessly to generate support for H.R. 553.

The community, inspired by veterans service organizations, gave all, and this Congress can't even follow its own rules. It is sad how the majority has undermined this important bill in the manner they have done.

Barring this bill from independent consideration is outright wrong, and I ask that each of my Democratic and Republican colleagues think long and hard about the implications of this parliamentary gimmick.

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

I regret very much that the gentleman is going to vote against a measure to repeal the widow's tax, and I will just remind him again that, when his party was in control of the Congress, they did nothing on this—noting—no hearing last session, not a thing.

We had, in our rules package, this item called the Consensus Calendar that said that, when there are measures that have 290 cosponsors or more, where there is broad bipartisan support, that the Speaker will move the bill forward, and in this case, any way she wants to with moving it forward.

The gentleman should be really happy, quite frankly, that it is attached to the NDAA bill because this is a must-pass piece of legislation. It will go to the Senate, and there will be a conference.

I hope my Republican friends have some sway with the Republican leader over there, MITCH MCCONNELL, and would urge him not to try to gut this provision from the final version of the bill. But it will go to conference, and the Senate will have to deal with it.

The reason why I know this is a must-pass bill is because one of the amendments that is in order here is an amendment that was a request to the Rules Committee from Minority Leader McCARTHY, an amendment to authorize funding to assist military installations recovering from earthquakes and other natural disasters. I don't think he would be wasting his time trying to put that in a bill that he thinks is going nowhere.

This bill is going to the Senate, and then it is going to be up to my friends on the other side of the aisle to try to help join with us in convincing the Republican leadership in the Senate to stand with the House position on this.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCANLON), a distinguished member of the Rules Committee.

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding, and I rise today in

strong support of the rule and underlying bill. I also want to thank Chairman SMITH for his leadership on the bill and all the members of the Armed Services Committee for the work they put in to ensure that we have an NDAA that fully addresses the modern challenges facing our country.

This bill takes steps to address the threat of climate change, long identified by the DOD as a threat to national security, by requiring the Department to plan around climate vulnerabilities in future projects.

This bill also protects military families. In addition to the widow's tax issue, it protects low-income service-members by bridging the gap for those who need SNAP assistance. It upgrades military housing and provides support for childcare and education for military families.

It also promotes diversity in our Armed Forces by requiring DOD to issue a new diversity and inclusion strategy and address existing inequities.

This NDAA goes further to ensure that our Armed Forces are fully ready for the threats we face today and prepared for the threats we will face in the future.

Of particular concern to my district is the CH-47 aircraft, better known as the Chinook. Like the residents of my district who proudly build these machines, the Chinook is a workhorse that can always be relied upon to get the job done, even in the toughest and most unforgiving of conditions. This bill makes it clear that Congress has no intention of abandoning this vital program.

On top of being one of the most versatile and crucial aircraft in our Armed Forces, the Chinook program supports more than 20,000 jobs and 200 suppliers in 38 States. I am pleased that this program is in the bill, and I look forward to supporting its passage.

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

You see the challenges that we are confronted with here. My friend from Massachusetts is telling my friend from South Carolina how my friend from South Carolina should get his bill to the United States Senate. There is no one who has worked harder on this issue than Mr. WILSON has. There is no one whose heart is in this issue more than Mr. WILSON's is.

□ 1315

I hope you listened carefully to his heartfelt words, because the key point that he made is that this really wonderful, bipartisan creation of the new Democratic majority, this Consensus Calendar, if we pass the rule today will be specifically turned off specifically for Mr. WILSON's bill.

The new majority can play whatever partisan games they want to, I wish they wouldn't, but they can, with the underlying bill by stuffing in self-enacting amendments, by adding amend-

ments after the fact, all the games that majorities sometimes play, but the new rules that you voted for, Madam Speaker, that my friend from Massachusetts brags about on his website, rightfully so, because there were important changes in those rules, the very first time we have an opportunity to utilize those rules, Mr. WILSON's bill was ripened for consideration before the House this week, it is not simply that folks have stolen his language and tucked it into this partisan underlying piece of legislation, they have specifically in the rule today prohibited him from availing himself, and by himself, I mean hundreds of our colleagues and thousands of widows that they represent, from availing themselves of the new tool created by the new House majority this year.

I do not value the new majority's use of partisan tools in the NDAA, but I understand that is the right of a new majority.

My friend from Massachusetts is exactly right. When you lose elections, losing elections has consequences, but when you pass rules, passing rules has consequences, too.

I am going to be fascinated by what happens here in about an hour and a half when the members of the new majority are confronted with an opportunity to turn off the new bipartisan reforms they just codified in the House rules 6 months ago.

This should have been a day of celebrating a positive new change from a new administration, and instead, it is a day of playing politics with families that have already given much too much to the United States of America.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McGOVERN. Madam Speaker, let me say for the RECORD, the widows were deprived in the last Congress when my Republican friends were in control. They did nothing.

Madam Speaker, I commend Mr. WILSON and Mr. YARMUTH for their efforts on this and getting broad bipartisan support, but quite frankly, the Republican leadership failed in the last Congress. They didn't do anything, period.

We are going to do something, and we are going to make the widows proud and we are going to move this legislation forward. I hope when we do, that we can all come together and join in a bipartisan moment where we can actually point to something concrete that will help these widows.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

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

Madam Speaker, this rule makes in order an amendment that is of great consequence and urgency, and that amendment would require that before the President initiated any military action against Iran, he has to come to Congress and get approval through an Authorization for Use of Military Force.

And make no mistake about it. That amendment is essential for our security.

What the President did on May 8 was that he tore up the Iran nuclear agreement, with no alternative in place. He says now his objective is a nonnuclear Iran.

That is what we had. Our intelligence agencies confirmed that Iran was in compliance with that agreement.

Instead, he has embarked on a policy that is bellicose in rhetoric and ineffective in outcome.

He has torn up the agreement that was supported, not just by this Congress, but it was supported by our allies, including our frenemies Russia and China, and our good friends Britain, Germany, and France. Instead, he substituted it with the maximum pressure that has met maximum resistance, and what we see now is an enormous escalation in danger and in rhetoric.

Madam Speaker, the most important decision that a President can make is to recommend whether we use the awesome force of our military, and the most important decision that Congress can make is whether to authorize the use of military force.

Regrettably, we are operating on a stale authorization from 2001 that has nothing to do with present circumstances.

It is on Congress if we, as Republicans and Democrats, given that awesome power, fail to be accountable by having that vote "yes" or "no" on the authorization.

The President's policy right now is escalating the likelihood of military confrontation with Iran. We must make certain that that cannot be done without a vote of this Congress and every Member in it.

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

Madam Speaker, my friend from Massachusetts is right. We have made a lot of amendments in order in this bill today, but in the absence of an open rule, we are never able to consider all of the ideas.

One of the ideas we have not had a chance to consider is whether or not we should be doing business through the Department of Defense with companies that have a direct or indirect subsidiary company that is under the control of the Chinese Government or the Communist Party.

The ranking member of the Armed Services Committee, Mr. THORNBERRY, has such an amendment. If we defeat the previous question, Madam Speaker, I will offer that amendment, which does exactly that. It prohibits the Department of Defense from contracting with any company that is a direct or indirect subsidiary of a company in which the Chinese Government or the Chinese Communist Party has a controlling interest.

Now, on the list of things I would put on the common bipartisan list of ideas,

not doing business with communist China would be one. We have seen that over and over again. We are in the midst right now of ripping out security cameras all across this country manufactured by the Chinese as a result of a prohibition in last year's National Defense Authorization Act.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment be included immediately prior to the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY).

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his extraordinary leadership.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of this rule, which when passed will include my bill, the Federal Employee Paid Leave Act, into the NDAA.

We are long overdue to guarantee Federal workers, 2 million working people, 12 weeks of annual paid leave to care for themselves and their families in time of need. This builds on the Family Medical Leave Act that had 12 weeks of unpaid leave. This provides 12 weeks of paid leave; which families desperately need.

I painfully remember the birth of my first child and inquiring about family leave. I was told, "There is no leave. Women just leave."

I said, "I don't intend to leave. I have to work."

They said, "We have no leave policy. You will be the first one to ever come back. Women are supposed to leave."

Well, this realizes that it takes two workers usually in a family just to make ends meet.

It is well past time that our Nation truly honors families by offering this basic benefit for Federal workers.

Additionally, this rule brings us one step closer to honoring our heroic first responders who risked their lives on 9/11 by allowing this Chamber to move forward with the passage of the Never Forget the Heroes Act, which fully funds and permanently reauthorizes the 9/11 Victims Compensation Fund.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD a listing of well over 54 organizations, women's groups, and unions that are strongly in support of the Family Medical Leave Act.

JULY 9, 2019.

DEAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS: We, the undersigned organizations, urge you to co-sponsor the Federal Employee Paid Leave Act (H.R. 1534), and cosponsor and vote for the Federal Employee Paid Leave Act amendment to the National Defense Authorization Act (Amendment 363 to H.R. 2500). The Federal Employee Paid Leave Act would: provide 12 weeks of paid leave for the birth, adoption or foster placement of a new child; to care for a spouse, child or parent; for particular military caregiving and leave purposes; and for personal health reasons to federal workers

who are eligible for job protected, unpaid leave under the Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA).

With more than 2 million employees, the federal government is the nation's largest employer, yet provides no paid family and medical leave. This leaves federal workers forced to choose between a paycheck and caring for a loved one, a newborn or themselves. The Federal Employee Paid Leave Act would not provide employees with additional leave time; it would simply ensure that federal employees can receive full pay during their 12 weeks of FMLA leave.

Paid leave would help not just federal employees, but the entire federal government. With access to paid leave, many individuals can remain in the workforce when they face caregiving responsibilities. Women who take paid leave are more likely to be working within a year after giving birth than those who take no leave. Paid leave helps reduce turnover, which is estimated to cost between 16 and 200 percent of a worker's annual salary.

Providing paid leave to federal workers will help the federal government retain key employees and attract the best workers. The federal workforce is aging, creating a retention and recruiting crisis. In 2017, the number of full-time federal employees older than 50 years old was nearly eight times the number under 30. An increase in satisfaction with family-friendly policies has been shown to reduce turnover intention by 37.5 percent in federal agencies. Further, paid family and medical leave is key to the federal government's competitiveness as more top companies introduce new or expanded paid leave policies.

Paid leave supports the health and well-being of employees and their families. New mothers who take paid leave are more likely to take the amount of time away from work recommended by doctors, and their children are more likely to be breastfed, receive medical check-ups and get critical immunizations. When children are seriously ill, the presence of a parent shortens a child's hospital stay by 31 percent; active parental involvement in a child's hospital care may head off future health problems, especially for children with chronic health conditions, and thus reduce costs. Paid leave also lets people help older family members recover from serious illnesses, fulfill treatment plans, and avoid complications and hospital readmissions. Paid leave is not just good human resource management; it sends a message about the value we place on family.

There is a growing consensus across the country that paid leave is a necessity. Seven states and the District of Columbia have passed comprehensive paid family and medical leave programs and dozens of municipalities across the country guarantee paid leave to their employees. Millions of workers have filed claims in the four states that have implemented paid leave programs, and evidence shows that paid leave benefits both employees and employers and has high levels of public support—84 percent of voters support a comprehensive paid family and medical leave policy that covers all people who work.

The Federal Employee Paid Leave Act would provide critical support to federal employees when they need time to care—whether for themselves, their families, or a new child. We urge you to stand with the more than two million federal workers and their families by cosponsoring the Federal Employee Paid Leave Act, and cosponsoring and voting for the Federal Employee Paid Leave Act amendment in the National Defense Authorization Act.

Sincerely,

1,000 Days, All-Options, American Association of University Women (AAUW), Ameri-

can Civil Liberties Union (ACLU), American Federation of Government Employees (AFGE), American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME), American Foreign Service Association, American Psychiatric Association Women's Caucus, The Arc of the United States, Baby Café USA, Chicago Foundation for Women, Coalition of Labor Union Women, Early Childhood Alliance, EMC Strategies, FAA Managers Association, Family Voices, Federal Managers Association (FMA).

First Focus Campaign for Children, Food Chain Workers Alliance, FreeFrom, Indiana Chapter of the American Academy of Pediatrics, Indiana Institute for Working Families, International Association of Fire Fighters, Justice in Aging, Kansas Breastfeeding Coalition, Laundry Workers Center, Main Street Alliance, Marion County Commission on Youth, Inc., NARAL Pro-Choice America, National Active and Retired Federal Employees Association (NARFE), National Council of Jewish Women, National Federation of Federal Employees (NFFE), National Health Law Program, National Institute for Reproductive Health (NIRH).

National LGBTQ Task Force Action Fund, National Military Family Association, National Network of Abortion Funds, National Partnership for Women & Families, National Treasury Employees Union (NTEU), National Women's Health Network, National Women's Law Center, Planned Parenthood Federation of America, Senior Executives Association (SEA), Sexuality Information and Education Council of the United States (SIECUS), Sargent Shriver National Center on Poverty Law, Street Vendors Association of Chicago, Union for Reform Judaism, Voices for Progress, Women of Reform Judaism, Women's Fund of Rhode Island, Women's Law Project, YWCA USA, ZERO TO THREE.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, we have a chance today not just to ensure a vital and talented Federal workforce going into the future, to make public service economically viable to a new generation, but also to ensure that we can set the standards for all workers across America.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to please vote today for this rule and the underlying bill.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. HOULAHAN).

Ms. HOULAHAN. Madam Speaker, I rise to support the NDAA and the rule and the bipartisan work that went into it.

Part of the reason I separated from the Air Force was from a lack of sufficient childcare options.

People across our country are often forced to decide between building their careers and building their families, and, frankly, this is bad for our economy and for our country.

We need to be working to ensure that we attract and retain the best possible talent for any and every job. Eighty-two percent of Americans believe our country should be providing this, and only 16 percent of us have it. And this should start at the top, at the Federal level.

I cannot fathom a world where any person, regardless of party, would hesitate to understand the importance of

having the best and brightest people working in our government.

Our legislation addresses this core issue. No one should have to choose between their family and career. The government should be leading by example, and today, this legislation allows us to effectively send a successful message to all workers: paid family leave is an investment in all of our families.

For me, it is inspiring, and it is an inspiring moment when we see legislation being born from unlikely bedfellows: a concern for securing our supply chain of rare earths help fund the need for us to provide paid family leave to all Federal workers. This is the type of legislation my community in Pennsylvania expects from Congress, and I am very proud to introduce it today.

Madam Speaker, I urge the support of the NDAA. I am very, very grateful for the support and work of Congresswoman MALONEY in leading me to this and leading us to this.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I am holding the Rules of the House here that say in rule XV, clause 7, paragraph (c), “After a measure has maintained at least 290 cosponsors for a cumulative period of 25 legislative days after the presentation of a motion under paragraph (b)(1), the measure shall be placed on the Consensus Calendar. Such measure shall remain on the Consensus Calendar until it is” either “considered in the House; or” . . . “reported by the committee of primary jurisdiction.”

Does tucking a measure into the underlying bill, as the self-enacting amendment does today, satisfy the (c)(1) requirement that it be considered in the House?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will not respond to a hypothetical question or interpret the pending resolution.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, if the gentleman would yield to me, I am happy to respond to him.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, the gentleman has only yielded me 30 minutes, but I would be happy to reserve so that the gentleman can respond.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 20 seconds.

Madam Speaker, I wrote the rule on this, and we intentionally left open how the process would proceed.

We are considering this bill and, therefore, we don't need to consider it twice or three times or four times, and that is why we are shutting the process off.

So we are complying with our rule. That was the intention when we wrote it, and we are keeping our word. We are breaking nothing. We are doing what we promised.

So we are bringing this bipartisan bill to the floor, and, hopefully, it will go to the Senate and become law.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I would say to my friend from Massachusetts, I don't believe I have any further speakers remaining.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I have no additional speakers.

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

Madam Speaker, I have enjoyed serving on the gentleman from Massachusetts' Rules Committee; I confess, not as much as I enjoyed serving on the gentleman from Texas' Rules Committee, but it is because when you are on the Rules Committee, there are nine members in the majority and four members in the minority.

Now, we have talked a lot of math, a lot of votes, a lot of numbers today, but you don't have to be a rocket scientist to figure out what happens when you serve on a committee where there are nine majority members and four minority members, and the answer is, what happens is you lose, and you lose a lot.

That is the privilege of being in the majority. When the American people send a new Speaker and a new majority here, that new majority gets to craft the process however they want to.

When we crafted the process when I was in the majority, we gave the minority more amendments than we gave the majority, and we did that because majorities have powers as committee chairmen. They don't have to put everything on the amendment calendar. They can tuck it into a bill.

□ 1330

As the roles have been reversed, again my friend from Massachusetts is making in order a record number of amendments today. He is making in order five times more Democratic amendments, folks who already have all the tools of power, than he is minority Republican amendments.

Again, it is the power of the majority. They get to do that if they want to do that. Is it fair? Well, we didn't think so. That is why we did it differently. But if that is what the gentleman wants to do, he can do it.

But to tuck a bipartisan measure—and I don't mean “bipartisan” because one Member signed onto it or two Members signed onto it; I mean “bipartisan” because hundreds of Members signed onto it—into a measure that intentionally lifts one party up while putting its foot on the throat of amendments of the other party does not constitute bipartisanship by any stretch of the imagination.

When my friend from Massachusetts was talking about the rules package—and he is the author of the rules package. I stipulate, no one knows more about the rules package than he does.

His heart was in the right place when he added this new Consensus Calendar.

He said this: “It unrigs the rules so the people's House actually works for the people again. Americans demanded a new direction, and this rules package will immediately usher in a new era for this Congress.”

We are 6 months later, Madam Speaker, and we heard from the author of the bill that is the subject of contention today. We heard from the author, the one who has gone out to do all the heavy lifting, do all the work to build all the bipartisanship—again, not one Member or two Members, but hundreds of Members. He said he wanted to avail himself of the Consensus Calendar to get a vote on the floor of the House, an unbiased, unrigged vote because, as my friend from Massachusetts said, the new rules package “unrigs the rules.”

Yet, before we have considered anything else on the Consensus Calendar this entire year—Mr. WILSON's bill is number one on that Consensus Calendar—we are confronted with a rule today that turns off the very provision that my friend from Massachusetts inserted in the House rules package to unrig the process.

I don't question the motives of any Member of this institution, Madam Speaker, and partisan motives are fair game around here. We all wish that they weren't, but occasionally, they are.

When my friend from Massachusetts says that he has done this, this unprecedented use of the Consensus Calendar and turning it off, he says he is doing it so that the bill has the best chance of passage in the Senate and becoming law by being signed on the President's desk. I take him at his word that he means exactly that.

But I ask you, Madam Speaker, when the author of the bill, the one who has done all the work, not just for a week, not for a month, but for years to get this bill to a place where it can be considered by the Senate, why in the world would we not honor his request, his wish, his desire? Even if they are going to tuck it into this provision, why not allow the Consensus Calendar to take its course and get him the vote that he has worked so hard in a bipartisan way to achieve? If this isn't about partisan politics, why not give us two bites at making this the law of the land instead of just one?

If my friend from Massachusetts is right, and when we take a separate vote on this bill on Friday, it just disappears into the ethos, then no harm, no foul. But if my friend is wrong and the partisan game that is being played today exacts a toll—and it is not a toll on us as Members of Congress, but it is a toll on the widows of the members of our Armed Forces—then we all know that is a game that has gone too far.

I urge rejection of this rule. Defeat the previous question, allow our amendment, reject this rule, and allow the bipartisanship that this new majority offered and then enacted to come to fruition for the very first time.

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

Mr. McGOVERN. Madam Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 3½ minutes remaining.

Mr. McGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, we are bringing forward legislation to repeal the widow's tax precisely because we have this rules change, this Consensus Calendar. We are bringing it forward, and it is going to be voted on.

The Republicans, who have been in charge for 8 years previously, had done nothing in the last Congress to even hold a hearing, and we are being scolded that we are bringing forward this bill? Give me a break.

In terms of amendments, we have made nine times as many amendments as my Republican friends made in order at the same point last Congress. We have made more minority amendments in order than they did in the same period in the last Congress. In fact, we have more than doubled the number of minority amendments.

So, please, spare me the crocodile tears on the process.

They ran this place in the most closed way possible. We are doing things differently, and we are proud of that.

Madam Speaker, we have already made 439 amendments in order. That is the most for any bill ever. But Christmas is coming early this year, and we have two more. In a moment, I will be offering an amendment to the rule to make in order two additional amendments, one by Representative DINGELL and one by Representative JAYAPAL.

They will bring our total amendments to the bill to 441. That is a new record. We believe this is the most amendments ever made in order to a single bill.

While this isn't technically an open rule, it is a pretty open rule.

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. McGOVERN

Mr. McGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 7. The amendments specified in Rules Committee Print 116-23 shall be considered as though printed in part B of House Report 116-143.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. McGOVERN. Madam Speaker, despite the fact that the gentleman refused to yield to me earlier, I am happy to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL) to respond to this.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding. I

am a little confused about what has happened, Madam Speaker. Are we about to begin a new hour of debate on a new amendment after we just finished the hour of debate on the underlying rule?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has been recognized under the hour rule.

Mr. WOODALL. Under the new hour, Madam Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has been recognized under the hour rule on his amendment.

Mr. WOODALL. Well, then I would ask my friend from Massachusetts—I only had 6 minutes to yield before, and I confess I did not yield any of them to my friend. The gentleman now has 60 minutes—could I ask for more than a minute of his time, the customary 30 minutes?

Mr. McGOVERN. I reclaim my time, Madam Speaker. Enough.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment. We are making the most amendments ever in order for any bill that has been brought to this House floor. This is a good process. The underlying bill—the National Defense Authorization Bill—increases pay for our troops, and, as I mentioned earlier, will help repeal the widow's tax. The 9/11 bill is also a part of this package. There is no reason, other than just pure partisanship, to want to oppose this, and if my friends want to oppose it, they can.

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

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 7. Notwithstanding any other provision of this resolution, the amendment printed in section 8 shall be in order as though printed as the last amendment in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution if offered by Representative Thornberry of Texas or a designee. That amendment shall be debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent.

SEC. 8. The amendment referred to in section 7 is as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title VIII, add the following new section:

#### SEC. 8. PROHIBITION ON CONTRACTS WITH COMPANIES INFLUENCED BY THE GOVERNMENT OF CHINA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense may not enter into a contract with a company that is a direct or indirect subsidiary of a company in which the Government of China or the Chinese Communist Party has a controlling interest to acquire critical United States technologies.

(b) EXISTING CONTRACTS.—If the Secretary of Defense has been notified that a contractor for an existing contract of the Department of Defense is a direct or indirect subsidiary of a company in which the Government of China or the Chinese Communist Party has a controlling interest to acquire critical United States technologies, the Secretary shall seek to take action, as practicable, to terminate the contract.

Mr. McGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the amendment and 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 ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam 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.

#### RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 38 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

#### □ 1451

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PAYNE) at 2 o'clock and 51 minutes p.m.

#### 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.

#### FAIRNESS FOR HIGH-SKILLED IMMIGRANTS ACT OF 2019

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1044) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to eliminate the per-country numerical limitation for employment-based immigrants, to increase the per-country numerical limitation for family-sponsored immigrants, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

#### H.R. 1044

*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 “Fairness for High-Skilled Immigrants Act of 2019”.

#### SEC. 2. NUMERICAL LIMITATION TO ANY SINGLE FOREIGN STATE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 202(a)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1152(a)(2)) is amended—

(1) in the paragraph heading, by striking “AND EMPLOYMENT-BASED”;

(2) by striking “(3), (4), and (5),” and inserting “(3) and (4);”

(3) by striking “subsections (a) and (b) of section 203” and inserting “section 203(a);”

(4) by striking “7” and inserting “15”; and

(5) by striking “such subsections” and inserting “such section”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 202 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1152) is amended—