

The Help Grandfamilies Prevent Child Abuse Act will provide resources to assist grandparents in raising their grandchildren and, most importantly, help prevent these children from entering the foster care system.

This bill ensures grandfamilies and kinship caregivers are eligible for services under the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act, or CAPTA. It also provides support to meet the needs of children who have experienced trauma; for example, those exposed to substance misuse. Lastly, the bill calls for training and resources to assist caregivers in navigating the complicated childcare system.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5583 is a good bill. It is a bipartisan bill, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

#### COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CUELLAR) laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, January 14, 2020.

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 January 14, 2020, at 11:16 a.m.:

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 434.

That the Senate agreed to Relative to the death of the Honorable Jocelyn Burdick former United States Senator for the State of North Dakota S. Res. 468.

With best wishes, I am  
Sincerely,

CHERYL L. JOHNSON.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1230, PROTECTING OLDER WORKERS AGAINST DISCRIMINATION ACT; PROVIDING FOR CON- SIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 76, PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF RULE SUB- MITTED BY DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION RELATING TO "BOR- ROWER DEFENSE INSTITU- TIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY"; AND PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM JAN- UARY 17, 2020, THROUGH JANU- ARY 24, 2020

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 790 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

#### H. RES. 790

*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. 1230) to amend the Age Discrimination in Employment Act

of 1967 and other laws to clarify appropriate standards for Federal employment discrimination and retaliation claims, 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 shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor. 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 Education and Labor now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116-46 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. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such further amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such further amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill, as amended, to the House with such further amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 76) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Education relating to "Borrower Defense Institutional Accountability". All points of order against consideration of the joint resolution are waived. The joint resolution shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the joint resolution are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 3. On any legislative day during the period from January 17, 2020, through January 24, 2020—

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

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

SEC. 4. The Speaker may appoint Members to perform the duties of the Chair for the duration of the period addressed by section 3 of this resolution as though under clause 8(a) of rule I.

SEC. 5. Each day during the period addressed by section 3 of this resolution shall

not constitute a legislative day for purposes of clause 7 of rule XV.

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

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS), 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. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 790, providing for consideration of two measures: H.R. 1230, the Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act, and H.J. Res. 76, providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Education relating to "Borrower Defense Institutional Accountability."

The rule provides for consideration of H.R. 1230 under a structured rule, with 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the Committee on Education and Labor. It makes in order five amendments and provides one motion to recommit.

The rule provides for consideration of H.J. Res. 76 under a closed rule, with 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and the ranking member of the Committee on Education and Labor, and it provides one motion to recommit.

Finally, the rule provides for standard district work period instructions from January 17 through January 24, 2020.

Mr. Speaker, since taking the majority a year ago, Democrats have made it a priority to protect our Nation's students and workers. As a member of the Committee on Education and Labor, I am proud that I have played a role in passing legislation that will provide students and workers the support they need to thrive. We have that opportunity once again this week with these bills, both of which I am proud to co-sponsor.

First, we are taking a stand against the Department of Education's deliberate disregard for students who have been defrauded by institutions. In 2019, student loan debt reached an all-time high in the United States of \$1.41 trillion. Our Nation is truly in a student debt crisis.

Even more significantly impacted by this crisis are students who have been defrauded by predatory for-profit colleges. On top of their crushing debt, they have useless degrees and none of

the job opportunities that they were promised.

In 2016, following the collapse of two major predatory for-profit institutions, President Obama established the borrower defense rule to help students access relief from their student loans. Instead of helping students, Secretary DeVos modified the rule, creating an intentionally complicated process that restricts how much relief defrauded students can receive.

According to The Institute for College Access and Success, the new rule would forgive only about 3 cents on every dollar borrowed. Even in cases where schools clearly violate the law, this new rule denies students relief if they can't prove the school intentionally defrauded them, can't file their claim fast enough, or can't document exactly how much financial harm they have suffered due to fraud.

Although we don't have the full picture because their investments are shrouded in secrecy, Secretary DeVos' connections to the for-profit college industry led me to believe that her siding with the industry is not a coincidence.

The bill we will consider this week would bring us back to the Obama-era rules that put students first and profit second.

Second, we will bring to the floor the Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act. One in four adults age 65 and older are part of the workforce, and that number is still growing. While some of the reasons behind this shift in the labor force are positive, like better health and job satisfaction, many older Americans must keep working because they are not financially prepared for retirement.

Sadly, aging American adults have a median savings of just over \$150,000 for retirement. If a person is fortunate enough to live a long, healthy life and has 30 years of retirement, that would leave them with just \$5,000 a year, a sum no one could retire on anywhere in this country.

Unfortunately, older workers suffer disproportionately from long-term unemployment and age discrimination in the workforce. Six out of 10 older workers have experienced age discrimination, but a 2009 Supreme Court ruling has made it harder for them to prove it. The decision upended decades of precedent, making it more difficult for older workers to get justice through the courts.

This legislation restores workplace protections for older Americans, paving the way for a more inclusive and diverse workforce.

Taken together, these bills honor our commitment to students and workers and offer us the opportunity to reverse two misguided and harmful policies.

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. DESAULNIER) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, today's rule provides for consideration of two measures, a bill that seeks to protect older Americans from discrimination in the workplace and a Congressional Review Act resolution to overturn a Department of Education rule on borrower defense to repayment. While both pieces of legislation appear to protect vulnerable Americans, they likely have no chance of becoming law.

First, H.R. 1230, the Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act, adds a section to the Age Discrimination in Employment Act that shifts the burden of proof in age discrimination cases to allow a plaintiff to show that any practice by the employer for which age may be an involved factor, not the sole factor, is covered by the act.

□ 1230

This changes congressional intent and disregards case law.

In 1967, Congress enacted the Age Discrimination in Employment Act to protect applicants and employees over 40 years of age from discrimination on the basis of age in employment matters. It is enforced by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

In 2009, the Supreme Court held that, in the case of *Gross v. FBL Financial Services, Inc.*, the standard of proof for a claim under the Age Discrimination in Employment Act requires that age stand alone as the cause of the adverse employment action rather than in conjunction with other factors.

In 2013, the Supreme Court also ruled in the *University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center v. Dr. Naeel Nassar* that the plaintiff must prove that a retaliatory motive was the decisive cause of adverse employment action.

H.R. 1230 would reverse these Supreme Court decisions by allowing mixed-motive claims in Age Discrimination in Employment Act cases, clarifying that age need only be a motivating factor for discrimination, even though other factors also motivated the action unfavorable to the employee. This would actually make it more difficult to prove discrimination because an employer would simply have to show that they would have taken the same action in the absence of age as a motivating factor, which will be more easy to show under the mixed-motive legal framework.

Congress previously rejected amendments to add age discrimination to the Civil Rights Act, resulting in the passage of the Age Discrimination in Employment Act using a different legal procedure. Lowering the standard would apply the legal procedure of the Civil Rights Act to the Age Discrimination in Employment Act. In addition, a lower standard is likely to lead to increased litigation that, in fact, only benefits the plaintiffs' bar.

Other provisions of H.R. 1230 prohibit a court from awarding damages or requiring any employment activity other than injunctive relief. This means that

discriminated parties are precluded from actually receiving monetary relief, and the only true beneficiaries of this law will be trial lawyers.

The Supreme Court stated in the *Nassar* case that "lessening the causation standard could . . . contribute to the filing of frivolous claims, which would siphon resources from efforts by employers, administrative agencies, and courts to combat workplace harassment."

Republicans are committed to eliminating discrimination in the workplace, including for older Americans. Discrimination of any kind is already against the law.

Let me rephrase that. Discrimination of any kind is already against the law through the Age Discrimination in Employment Act, the Americans with Disabilities Act, the Rehabilitation Act, and the Civil Rights Act.

Now, the second measure included in this rule is the Congressional Review Act resolution to overturn a 2019 Department of Education rule called Borrower Defense Institutional Accountability.

In 1994, the Department of Education issued the Borrower Defense to Repayment regulation. In 2015, the Department of Education began considering borrower defense claims prior to default or collection proceedings, prompting a significant increase in applications for loan relief.

On November 1, 2016, the Department of Education published a Borrower Defense to Repayment regulation that did not distinguish between intentional fraud and a simple mistake by an institution of higher education. These regulations went after institutions rather than working to help students. Offending institutions suffered significant financial penalties, resulting in a taxpayer cost of \$42 billion and the loss of access to higher education for millions of students.

These Obama administration regulations were, in fact, overly broad, with the intent of loan forgiveness, despite taxpayer cost.

The Trump administration's Department of Education subsequently issued a notice of proposed rulemaking and reviewed over 30,000 comments prior to publishing a final rule in September of 2019 to revise these 2016 regulations.

And let me just remind you, these 2016 regulations actually came about right at the end of the previous administration. The 2019 regulations, those that were derived after the 30,000 comments, the 2019 regulations will apply only to loans disbursed after July 1, 2020. So existing loans will remain subject to the 1994 or the 2016 rules, depending upon the issue date.

The new regulations will provide loan relief to those students who have been lied to and suffered financial harm. They will also hold institutions accountable, grant due process to all parties, allow for the use of arbitration, and expand the closed school look-back period from 120 to 180 days.

If this rule is not allowed to take effect, the 2016 regulations will remain. The definition of misrepresentation under the 2016 regulation is so broad that nearly everyone will eventually receive loan forgiveness, so this may, in fact, have the effect of making college free.

Now, free college sounds like a great benefit to society, but it is not practical, and it would force those who can't or won't go to college to pay for those who do.

In addition, eliminating the cost to higher education will limit the competitiveness of institutions, reducing the superiority of American colleges and universities.

Now, we heard last night in the Rules Committee that this Congressional Review Act is important to combat for-profit colleges, but the rules apply to all institutions. This means that even those institutions that inadvertently make a mistake, such as not updating a graduation rate on a flyer, will suffer financial penalties and, in fact, may have to close, despite no intentional wrongdoing.

The 2019 borrower defense rule is a significant improvement over the 2016 regulations and will save the taxpayer money, ensure due process, and hold fraudulent higher education institutions accountable.

Mr. Speaker, I urge opposition to the rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

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

I want to thank Congresswoman SUSIE LEE and Chairman BOBBY SCOTT for their leadership on advocating for America's students.

In the economy that we are in today, some kind of postsecondary training, whether it is an associate's degree, an apprenticeship program, or a 4-year program, is necessary in order to get the skills that are required in order to support a family and earn a decent living, and that is what education should be about in this country.

Sadly, in order to get that education, too many young people and people transitioning into their next job are taking on mountains of debt. Student debt is now \$1.3 trillion, more than credit card debt in this country.

As a result, these students, these graduates, often, or some who drop out are holding back from making other necessary investments to support their families, holding back on buying a home, and holding back on starting families and putting away money for their retirement because they are so saddled with debt.

One of the contributors to this huge increase in student debt has been the effect of predatory for-profit colleges. They have exploited potential students with false promises of high-paying jobs; and, particularly shameful, they have recruited the most vulnerable low-in-

come individuals: first-generation students, veterans. They have recruited them into junk programs.

Education should always be a vehicle to opportunity. Instead, these students are left with a bag of promises and crushing student debt.

This is a real problem. This is a real issue. That is why President Obama's Department of Education enacted the borrower defense rule to outline a clear, transparent process for student loan relief and to institute protections for those students and protections for taxpayers as well, because we are often talking about taxpayer-backed loans. The Obama borrower defense rule would help defrauded students get the loan debt relief that is owed to them under the law.

Secretary DeVos, however, has refused to implement this rule, and as of December 2019, 240,000 defrauded borrowers are still waiting for her to act on their claims. That includes 6,000 people from my home State. This rule further underscores why Secretary DeVos is unsuited for this position.

We have to protect students from these for-profit colleges that have defrauded them, and I encourage my colleagues to join me in supporting this rule and the legislation that will be coming to the floor.

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

Soon we will vote on the previous question, and if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to require the House to immediately proceed to consideration of H. Res. 791, a resolution supporting the protestors in Iran.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of this amendment into the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), the Republican leader, to explain the amendment.

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

Mr. Speaker, over the weekend, the world saw powerful images coming out of Tehran. Iranian protestors, many of them students, braved gas and gunfire to gather in the streets and speak out against their oppressive government for lying to its people. We saw video footage of people putting their personal safety at risk so their fellow citizens and the countries of the world could know the truth about what was going on inside Iran.

The Iranian protestors are showing incredible courage, standing up to a government that kills and brutally silences its own people. To get a sense of how brave their actions are, think about this: When Iranians took to the streets to protest late last year, many of them were shot and killed by their

own country's security forces. Death tolls show Iran's Government killed 1,500 people during the 2-month demonstration.

According to experts, this is the bloodiest crackdown on protestors since the Islamic Revolution of 1979. It came after the Supreme Leader of Iran gave a chilling order to "do whatever it takes to end it."

Sadly, attacks on innocent civilians have been all too common in Iran. This is just another horrifying chapter in their long history of harming their own citizens.

What is happening in Iran is a reminder that here in the United States there should never be any hesitation to stand with people in their calls for freedom. From the beginning, America has been a shining beacon of hope for those seeking a free society. Our task is to embrace that identity and the responsibility that comes with it.

Especially now, we cannot shrink from the sources of our national greatness. That is why I stand here today: to ask you to lend freedom your voice and unconditional support.

The resolution I introduced yesterday accomplishes three things:

It condemns the Government of Iran for shooting down Ukraine International Airlines flight 752, which killed 172 innocent civilians;

It expresses unequivocal support for the Iranian protestors; and

It calls on the Iranian regime to not use force against its own people, as it has done so many times before.

This resolution sends a strong message that the United States stands with the Iranian people and we are with them in their demands for free and honest government.

But the resolution also intends to amplify the voice of the Iranian protestors. It does not call for anything Iranians have not already demanded themselves.

This is an issue on which Congress should and must speak with one voice. We already passed similar measures supporting Hong Kong protestors by substantial bipartisan margins. It should not be difficult for us to pass this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I have been thinking a lot about what the Iranian protests mean today and in the future, and two things come to mind: a story and a quote.

□ 1245

The story is a small one. It happened a couple days ago at a university in Tehran. It is about a group of students and two big flags.

The Iranian Government had painted large American and Israeli flags in the middle of the street, as a sign of disrespect expecting people to walk over them. But a group of Iranian students courageously defied the regime's wishes. They would not walk on the flag and booed those who did. Some reported that the students were chanting "our enemy is in Iran, not America."

There are moments in time of history that the craving for freedom gets displayed, be it a young, lone man standing in front of tanks in Tiananmen Square, or be it some students in Tehran with fear just a few months before of being murdered, but not willing to walk on the American flag. A small moment with big meaning, for the students, for Iran and for us. It reminds me of the Hong Kong protestors who waved American flags and sang our national anthem.

The quote I have been thinking of comes from an anthology of speeches that Frederick Douglass read as a young man. The quote is this, "Let it be remembered, there is no luxury so exquisite as the exercise of humanity, and no post so honorable as his, who defends the rights of man."

Mr. Speaker, America is more than a country. We are an idea, an inspiration for those who yearn to be free and have the ability and dignity to determine their own destiny.

So many times in this body as these moments rose around the world, be it the shipyard workers of Poland, be it the craving of the Berlin Wall collapsing and becoming one, be it those in Hong Kong that want just freedom of speech.

Let us not be the Congress that misses the opportunity. Let us not be the Congress that takes 1 week earlier and sends a message to the Iran Government that is much different, that we are divided, that we would not stand up if they murdered their own people again, or we would not stand up if those who are young students who rose and would not walk across an American flag and booed those who would, those who would stand up in Iran and say "the enemy is in Iran, not in America." Let us not be that Congress.

Let us take this moment in time where history has shown that we are right when we stand with anyone who craves freedom. This resolution is the right way to amplify the call for freedom in Iran.

It is not just those on C-SPAN who are watching, it is the world who is watching. The world is much smaller today than at those other times. We will not have to wait for days or hours for the news to come across. It will be in a tweet, it will be in a text, or it will be in an Instagram.

There are important issues in this Nation, but there are none more important than whether we stand for freedom. I do not want this Congress to walk in shame that they missed this window. I do not want historians to look back in a few decades and see civilians were killed because they stood for freedom and America stood quiet. That is why I am asking that we vote "no" on this P.Q. This resolution deserves to be heard, but more importantly, the world deserves to hear this Congress act.

Do you agree that America is more than a country; that America is an

idea, that it could be so great of an inspiration, it would move the students to crave what we fought for? Let's take this moment in time to tell them we hear them, we stand with them, and this America will always defend freedom here and around the world.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to respond to the comments from my friend from California.

We know the Government of Iran admitted to mistakenly shooting down the Ukraine International Airlines flight. It was a tragedy, and tragedies led to tragedy. The people of Iran stood up and demanded accountability and are standing up from their government today.

This Congress supports those who have stood up to their government demanding transparency and fighting for their rights. That is why the concurrent resolution we passed last week reaffirmed that it is in our national interest to support the people of Iran and other Middle Eastern countries who demand an end to government corruption in violation of basic human rights.

As of this morning, the Foreign Affairs Committee is holding a hearing to examine our policy with Iran. While the Foreign Affairs Committee is hearing from experts on Iran, the House is taking action to protect students and protect Americans from discrimination in the workplace, and that is what this rule is about.

Make no mistake, defeating the previous question is not a vote on the McCarthy resolution, it is a vote to hand over control of the House floor to the minority.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the previous question so we may proceed to these critical pieces of legislation without delay.

I might add, just on a personal note, I would ask my colleagues to help—and I am sure they have had some cases of this—the Iranian Americans who have come to my office in my district with very troubling stories about their relatives who regularly have come to visit them in this country who are unable to come right now because of the travel ban by this administration.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN), a distinguished member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I have been a professor of constitutional law for 29 years, so I know the relationship between universities and students is sacred. We pledge to teach young people everything we know in order to propel them to become engaged citizens, educated human beings, and effective actors in the economy and society.

When I hear about for-profit colleges and universities ripping off young people and their families and plunging them into debt for unconscionable get-rich-quick schemes, it infuriates me as a professor, as a father, and as a Member of the House of Representatives representing the people of Maryland.

These rip-off institutions like Corinthian Colleges and ITT Technical Institute, which collapsed last year, leaves students with crushing debt, degrees that are not worth the paper they are printed on, and broken promises for the future.

The Obama administration adopted the borrower defense rule to authorize the Department of Education to provide debt relief to student borrowers who have been defrauded by these predatory, low-rent higher ed rip-off academies.

In Maryland, we have 3,754 students waiting for the Department of Education to review their borrower defense claims and relieve them of millions of dollars in loans that the American government disbursed to predatory colleges. Secretary Betsy DeVos, who is to education what Attorney General Barr is to justice, is not only keeping the Department of Education from processing 240,000 defrauded borrower claims nationwide, but she has drafted a new rule to make it nearly impossible for students to obtain relief from fraudulent colleges as of June 2020.

Secretary DeVos wants to replace a system of higher ed with a new system of higher debt. Under the old rule, groups of students defrauded by a predatory college would have received an automatic loan discharge of the debt from the rip-off institution. Under the new rule, defrauded students would have to submit individualized evidence to the satisfaction of the department that rip-off colleges intentionally misrepresented degree program outcomes, quality of instruction, or job placement opportunities. So even where these Bonnie-and-Clyde schools clearly violated the law en masse, students can still be denied relief if they can't prove that they were individually and intentionally deceived, if they can't file their claim fast enough, or if they can't document how much financial harm they have personally suffered.

Billionaire Secretary DeVos, the patron saint of the rip-off academies, is basically telling working class kids across America that life isn't fair, and now she is making that the law. Most victims of the higher debt industry will never fully recover from the lost time and opportunity, but by allowing these miseducation hucksters to rip them off, we are implicated as a Nation, and we must not fail them again. We must fully forgive every penny that the students were taken on a ride for. We must overrule the DeVos rule.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. TLAIB).

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding. I appreciate this time to speak on behalf of my congressional district, which I lovingly call the "13th District Strong."

Mr. Speaker, instead of working on behalf of students, Secretary DeVos is enriching predatory for-profit colleges that leave students with crushing debt

and useless degrees, and I rise today because we have to stop it.

If you want to see harm caused by the legacy of the DeVos-led policies, look no further than my district. In fact, students in Michigan will suffer for years to come because of Secretary DeVos' consistent record of putting for-profit interests first. And who are Secretary DeVos' latest targets, student borrowers who were defrauded by large for-profit colleges. Scams, Mr. Speaker.

I heard from one constituent in my district who was deceived by a for-profit college that suddenly, with no notice closed its doors 6 months into her 1-year program. Now she is burdened with thousands of dollars in loans and nothing to show for them, not even a certificate or a diploma. She did apply for the forgiveness program through the Department of Education but was denied.

If we don't stop this latest DeVos rule, we will guarantee that my constituent will bear the burden of unfairly paying for a diploma she has never received.

It is outrageous that our residents are the ones being punished instead of protected from this type of fraud and abuse. Sometimes I think these words "fraud and abuse" are just not strong enough. These are scams, criminal activity by these corporations coming in and targeting communities like mine that the majority are people of color.

Look at the advertisement, they are targeting specific communities where I have a number of single mothers who want to go back to school and better their lives or other folks who are non-traditional students are who they target. Again, these are the most vulnerable communities that we all represent.

We need to stop Secretary DeVos from this relentless effort to protect the bottom line for corporations at the expense of our residents, the students.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding.

I rise in opposition to this rule and primarily in opposition to H.R. 1230, that is one of the subjects of this combined rule that we have.

The legislation that is coming before, the Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act, reaches way too far. I am one of the people in this Congress that has met payroll clear back to 1975. I haven't kept track of all the people we hired, but we hired them across the full range that we had the opportunity of their age, whether it was on the young side or whether they stopped showing up on the other side. We want people that can do the job, and we want to take good care of those folks. We want to build a reputation that we are a good place to work. I want to have all of those workers come together at the Christmas party and

join together like family, and that is what happened just this past week with King Construction.

I think about what the impact of this proposed legislation does, and it works in the reverse of what many of the proponents would like to have it do. Certainly, when you take the definition of age discrimination and you expand it to mean if it is only the preponderance of the evidence—what we have in current law is a preponderance of evidence and the but-for language.

In other words, if an employee alleges they have been discriminated against because of age, there could be multiple other factors that were involved in that decision. Yet, as long as age is a component and it could be asserted effectively that that age was a but-for component, then that would be satisfactory as far as the legislation is concerned.

I think what happens instead is employers make prudent decisions, and when they do the hire, they are going to think, I have this applicant before me that is 62 years old. Picking an age, it could be 72 or 75 or less. That employer is going to have to make the calculation, what if this person is just setting me up? Or what if this person can't do the job and I have to remove them or terminate them? You are setting yourself up as an employer for potential liability, and that decision gets made at the hiring end, which means there will be a lot of seniors that don't have an opportunity to work because of the concern about the litigation that could be brought forward.

We have protection now, Mr. Speaker, in law and in state law, and that is where it needs to stay. It is a problem that doesn't exist and doesn't need to be solved.

□ 1300

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

Mr. Speaker, before I recognize the gentleman from Connecticut, I want to mention, like the previous speaker, I am a Member of this House who made payrolls for over 35 years in the restaurant business. I have a different perspective.

I wanted to hire the most talented person in front of me, and I wanted my managers to do the same thing. I don't think this rule, these kinds of laws, will inhibit that.

I understand the intuitive perspective, but if you believe in hiring the best person, I don't think you have to be afraid of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY).

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Rules Committee's motion and passage of the underlying bill, H.J. Res. 76, which will block Secretary Betsy DeVos' antistudent borrower defense rule.

Over the last 5 years, for-profit college chains have, without warning,

closed their doors on enrolled students who had paid their tuition—Corinthian College, ITT Tech, Dream Center, and Education Management Corporation—as have smaller schools like Ridley-Lowell in New London, Connecticut, which shut its doors midterm without notice on a school day 2 years ago.

In 1993, Congress created the borrower defense rule through the Higher Education Act to relieve student loan debt for student victims of fraud. Now, we have a Secretary of Education who wants to gut that law by making students whose classes, diplomas, and certificates have been terminated have to jump through a ridiculous maze of hoops before they can get what Congress intended back in 1993 and what the Obama administration was actually implementing—namely, justice—a complete discharge of student loan debt on the basis that students were victims of fraud.

The convoluted explanation that the DeVos Department used to deny discharge is a smokescreen for the administration's blatant bias in favor of for-profit colleges.

One group that sees the harm that the Education Department will do with the new rule is, surprisingly to some, The American Legion, America's oldest and largest veterans organization. As the National Commander stated recently, thousands of student veterans have been targeted and defrauded over the years by some of these rip-offs and have lost precious GI Bill benefits as a result.

As the commander states: "The rule, as currently written, is fundamentally rigged against defrauded borrowers of student loans, depriving them of the opportunity for debt relief that Congress intended to afford them under the Higher Education Act."

Mr. Speaker, this Chamber should heed The American Legion, stand up for student veterans and all students, and vote for H.J. Res. 76.

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

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. SHALALA), a distinguished member of the Rules Committee.

Ms. SHALALA. Mr. Speaker, the 2016 borrower defense rule created a process for student loan borrowers to demonstrate that their loans did not need to be repaid due to their school's misleading, fraudulent, or otherwise illegal conduct.

Many of those that closed their doors left thousands of students with no credible recourse. Instead of working to protect students and taxpayers, however, the Education Secretary and the Department have repeatedly sided with these bad actors.

By rewriting the borrower defense rule to favor those institutions, the Secretary has made it harder for borrowers to get relief and shifted the cost of providing debt relief from the schools to the taxpayer.

Several independent reports have concluded that this rewrite is fundamentally rigged against defrauded borrowers, depriving them of the opportunity for assistance promised them under the Higher Education Act. According to an analysis based on the Department's data, the changes to the financial triggers in the 2019 rule will result in institutions repaying only 1 percent of the eligible loan debt.

Mr. Speaker, I have led three institutions of higher education. The Secretary has created a bureaucratic nightmare. Even I, after reading the regulation carefully, could not figure out all the information that was necessary to apply for relief.

The Federal Government should be putting students and taxpayers first rather than helping financially irresponsible schools stay afloat.

Mr. Speaker, nearly 20,000 students in my State are currently seeking relief because they were cheated by predatory colleges. I did not come to Congress to protect corporations that seek to take advantage of low-income students, veterans, and taxpayers.

Until we take a definitive stance on for-profit schools, they will continue to defraud students.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the gentleman from California (Mr. DESAULNIER) how many more speakers he has.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, I have one more speaker.

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

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a September 3 Institute for College Access and Success article titled "Defrauded Students Left Holding the Bag Until Final 'Borrower Defense' Rule."

[From The Institute for College Access & Success, Sept. 3, 2019]

#### DEFAUDED STUDENTS LEFT HOLDING THE BAG UNDER FINAL "BORROWER DEFENSE" RULE

Claiming to protect students and hold colleges accountable, on Friday the Department of Education finalized its so-called borrower defense rule. The rule allows students to seek to cancel student loans connected to fraud and other illegal activity by their colleges. "If a school defrauds students, it must be held accountable," said Secretary of Education Betsy DeVos in the press release.

Yet the Trump Administration's proposal would do virtually nothing to hold schools accountable for their misdeeds or to protect students who were wronged. To really understand the impact of the rule, you have look at page 669 of the notice where—in a table titled "Assumptions for Main Budget Estimate Compared to PB2020 Baseline"—the Department published its own estimates of the likely impact of the rule:

Borrowers will be required to repay the vast majority of loans resulting from colleges' wrongdoing. Only about 3 cents of every dollar borrowed will be forgiven under the borrower defense rule.

Colleges, on the other hand, will rarely face any questions. They will repay only about a penny for every dollar of loans stemming from misconduct.

The Department expects substantial amounts of illegal activity by colleges. In 2021 alone, the Department expects nearly

200,000 borrowers to suffer from colleges' illegal conduct, but their rule would leave borrowers to repay 97 percent of the resulting \$2.5 billion in debt.

Source: TICAS analysis of data provided by the U.S. Department of Education, "U.S. Department of Education Finalizes Regulations to Protect Student Borrowers, Hold Higher Education Institutions Accountable and Save Taxpayers \$11.1 Billion Over 10 Years," August 30, 2019. Available at <https://bit.ly/21POWdk>.

Methodology: Figures derived from U.S. Department of Education's publication of the unofficial text of the final rule on its web site on August 30, 2019. U.S. Department of Education, "U.S. Department of Education Finalizes Regulations to Protect Student Borrowers, Hold Higher Education Institutions Accountable and Save Taxpayers \$11.1 Billion Over 10 Years," August 30, 2019. Available at <https://bit.ly/21POWdk>. Because Table 3 provides the data by sector, we used other Department data on loan volume by sector to produce a weighted average, on the assumption that these figures are consistent over time. U.S. Department of Education, "Fiscal Year 2020 Budget Proposal," March 11, 2019, page Q-30, <https://bit.ly/21XI7Xm>. To translate these percentages into the number of affected students, we used other Department data on the number of students borrowing federal loans, again assuming that these figures are similar from year to year. Federal Student Aid Data Center, "Aid Recipients Summary," April 2019, <https://bit.ly/12MGL5wc>. To translate these percentages into dollar terms, we used projected loan volume in year 2021 from the Congressional Budget Office. Congressional Budget Office, "Student Loan Programs—CBO's May 2019 Baseline," May 2019, <https://bit.ly/21A5juo>. We examined fiscal year 2021, the first full year of the rule's implementation.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, according to the Institute for College Access & Success, the DeVos rule would forgive just 3 cents of every dollar borrowed by students. That means those scammed by bad actors and fly-by-night institutions would be forced to repay the vast majority of their loans for degrees they didn't get, often through no fault of their own.

We need to help defrauded borrowers, not defend for-profit colleges. That is what this resolution is all about.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. STEVENS).

Ms. STEVENS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.J. Res. 76 because we can no longer allow the denial of debt relief to students defrauded by predatory colleges.

We can no longer allow a system that looks to line the pockets of the failed for-profits at the expense of students. We can no longer allow Secretary DeVos to ignore a court order as she attempts to turn over every action of the previous administration at the expense of the American taxpayer and the American public.

People have been defrauded; people have been robbed; and we need justice.

Nearly 8,000 Michigan borrowers are waiting for relief from paying their Federal student loans, including Erica Maupin, who was going to school to become a paralegal until she was defrauded by a Corinthian College. Erica had to abandon her dream, and now she

doesn't know how she is going to provide for her family and pay off her debt because the Federal Government isn't keeping its promise.

I am glad that the House is taking this step today. We should all be proud that the House is taking this action. However, we should also recognize it comes at the expense of a great step backward of the current administration.

Because of the step backward that they took, we now have to take another two big steps forward to right this wrong and to bring justice to people like Erica, to people like the Michiganders who are waiting for their justice are are waiting for their debt relief, and for our For the People Agenda.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close, and I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, the underlying measures do not protect vulnerable Americans as intended.

H.R. 1230 would make it more difficult to prove age as a motivating factor in adverse employment actions. Republicans remain committed to eliminating all forms of discrimination and ensuring a productive and competitive workforce, but this bill ignores Supreme Court decisions and will place opportunities in the hands of trial lawyers rather than hardworking Americans.

H.J. Res. 76 is simply another partisan attempt to deny President Trump any success, even if it means harming American students.

Mr. Speaker, I remember when President Bush signed a Congressional Review Act overturning some of the ergonomic rules that the Clinton administration issued literally days before that President left office.

At the time, I ran a medical practice. I was a business owner wondering how I was going to pay for and comply with these new rules that seemed burdensome, complicated, and confusing. The repeal of these rules relieved what was sure to be a heavy burden on my shoulders and, certainly, many other small businesses.

Congressional Review Act resolutions have consequences, and we should fully evaluate the effect that they will have on Americans rather than just play politics.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on the previous question, a "no" vote on the rule, and a "no" vote on the underlying measures.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, these two issues are extremely important to the American public.

When I think of the comments from my friend from Iowa and the comments about having made a payroll, I reflect on my career making those obligations. He neglected to say that doing



what he suggested employers would do is discriminatory on its face.

I knew that when I instructed my managers and when I interviewed prospective employees, I was not to discriminate based on certain Federal and State categories. So by taking the lead that he assumed that some employers might do, that you wouldn't hire somebody who is older because you might find yourself in court, that would in itself be discriminatory.

What we are doing with this legislation is just bringing this to an equal perspective with other categories. You shouldn't discriminate based on ethnicity, gender, or sexual preference. Why should you have any different performance standards or adhere to the same level for older people?

Given that baby boomers, people of my generation, find they have to work longer and harder, and given the issues around retirement, I would think that all of us would want to make sure that they were protected and that the economy would get the benefit of their wisdom and experience, and not have them discriminated against.

On the second subject, Ben Franklin once famously said at the beginning of this country that an investment in education is always the best investment.

Sadly, with this administration, Mr. Franklin might not say that because young people who are encouraged to get degrees, to get undergraduate degrees and graduate degrees to be part of a knowledge-based economy, to take that access to the best educational system in the world in higher education in this country, it would end with them in debt and with a degree that is worthless in the open marketplace.

I would think that all Members of Congress would want to protect both aging workers and students who are defrauded.

Mr. Speaker, as you can see, we are on the floor this week to restore justice to those who need our help. Struggling students and workers deserve our support, not for us to turn our backs on them.

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

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

#### AMENDMENT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 790

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 6. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall proceed to the consideration in the House of the resolution (H. Res. 791) condemning the actions of the Government of Iran and supporting the protesters in Iran, their demands for accountability, and their desire for the Government of Iran to respect freedom and human rights. The resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and preamble to adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of House Resolution 791.

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of the adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 226, nays 191, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 16]

YEAS—226

Adams	Finkenauer	McBath
Aguilar	Fletcher	McCollum
Allred	Poster	McEachin
Axne	Frankel	McGovern
Barragán	Fudge	McNerney
Bass	Gallego	Meeks
Beatty	Garamendi	Meng
Bera	García (IL)	Moore
Beyer	García (TX)	Morelle
Bishop (GA)	Golden	Moulton
Blumenauer	Gomez	Mucarsel-Powell
Blunt Rochester	Gonzalez (TX)	Murphy (FL)
Bonamici	Gottheimer	Nadler
Boyle, Brendan F.	Green, Al (TX)	Napolitano
Brindisi	Grijalva	Neal
Brown (MD)	Haaland	Neguse
Brownley (CA)	Harder (CA)	Norcross
Bustos	Hastings	O'Halleran
Butterfield	Hayes	Ocasio-Cortez
Carbajal	Heck	Omar
Cárdenas	Higgins (NY)	Pallone
Carson (IN)	Himes	Panetta
Cartwright	Horn, Kendra S.	Pappas
Case	Horsford	Pascarella
Casten (IL)	Houlahan	Payne
Castor (FL)	Hoyer	Perlmutter
Castro (TX)	Huffman	Peters
Chu, Judy	Jackson Lee	Peterson
Cicilline	Jayapal	Phillips
Cisneros	Jeffries	Pingree
Clark (MA)	Johnson (GA)	Pocan
Clarke (NY)	Johnson (TX)	Porter
Cleaver	Kaptur	Pressley
Clyburn	Keating	Price (NC)
Cohen	Kelly (IL)	Quigley
Connolly	Kennedy	Raskin
Cooper	Khanna	Rice (NY)
Correa	Kildee	Rose (NY)
Costa	Kilmer	Rouda
Courtney	Kim	Roybal-Allard
Cox (CA)	Kind	Ruiz
Craig	Krishnamoorthi	Ruppersberger
Crist	Kuster (NH)	Rush
Crow	Lamb	Ryan
Cuellar	Langevin	Sánchez
Cunningham	Larsen (WA)	Sarbanes
Davids (KS)	Larson (CT)	Scanlon
Davis (CA)	Lawrence	Schakowsky
Davis, Danny K.	Lawson (FL)	Schiff
Dean	Lee (CA)	Schneider
DeFazio	Lee (NV)	Schrader
DeGette	Levin (CA)	Schrier
DeLauro	Levin (MI)	Scott (VA)
DelBene	Lieu, Ted	Scott, David
Delgado	Lipinski	Serrano
Demings	Loeback	Sewell (AL)
DeSaulnier	Lofgren	Shalala
Deutsch	Lowenthal	Sherman
Dingell	Lowe	Sherill
Doggett	Luján	Sires
Doyle, Michael F.	Luria	Slotkin
Engel	Lynch	Smith (WA)
Escobar	Malinowski	Soto
Eshoo	Maloney,	Spanberger
Españolat	Carolyn B.	Speier
Evans	Maloney, Sean	Stanton
	Matsui	Stevens
	McAdams	Suozzi

Swalwell (CA)  
Takano  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Titus  
Tlaib  
Tonko  
Torres (CA)  
Torres Small (NM)

Trahan  
Trone  
Underwood  
Vargas  
Veasey  
Vela  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Wasserman  
Schultz

Waters  
Watson Coleman  
Welch  
Wexton  
Wild  
Wilson (FL)  
Yarmuth

NAYS—191

Abraham	Granger	Palmer
Allen	Graves (GA)	Pence
Amash	Graves (LA)	Perry
Amodei	Graves (MO)	Posey
Armstrong	Green (TN)	Ratcliffe
Arrington	Griffith	Reed
Babin	Grothman	Reschenthaler
Bacon	Guest	Rice (SC)
Baird	Guthrie	Riggleman
Balderson	Hagedorn	Roby
Banks	Harris	Rodgers (WA)
Barr	Hartzler	Roe, David P.
Bergman	Hern, Kevin	Rogers (AL)
Biggs	Herrera Beutler	Rogers (KY)
Billirakis	Hice (GA)	Rooney (FL)
Bishop (NC)	Higgins (LA)	Rose, John W.
Bishop (UT)	Hill (AR)	Rouzer
Bost	Holding	Roy
Brady	Hollingsworth	Rutherford
Brooks (AL)	Hudson	Scalise
Brooks (IN)	Huizenga	Schweikert
Buchanan	Hurd (TX)	Scott, Austin
Buck	Johnson (LA)	Sensenbrenner
Bucshon	Johnson (OH)	Shimkus
Budd	Johnson (SD)	Simpson
Burchett	Jordan	Smith (MO)
Burgess	Joyce (OH)	Smith (NE)
Calvert	Joyce (PA)	Smith (NJ)
Carter (GA)	Katko	Smucker
Carter (TX)	Keller	Spano
Chabot	Kelly (MS)	Stauber
Cheney	Kelly (PA)	Stefanik
Cline	King (IA)	Steil
Cloud	King (NY)	Steube
Cole	Kinzinger	Stewart
Collins (GA)	Kustoff (TN)	Stivers
Comer	LaHood	Taylor
Conaway	LaMalfa	Thompson (PA)
Cook	Lamborn	Thornberry
Crenshaw	Latta	Timmons
Curtis	Long	Tipton
Davidson (OH)	Loudermilk	Turner
Davis, Rodney	Lucas	Upton
DesJarlais	Luetkemeyer	Van Drew
Diaz-Balart	Marshall	Wagner
Duncan	Massie	Walberg
Dunn	Mast	Walden
Emmer	McCarthy	Walorski
Estes	McCaul	Waltz
Ferguson	McHenry	Watkins
Fitzpatrick	McKinley	Weber (TX)
Fleischmann	Meadows	Webster (FL)
Flores	Meuser	Wenstrup
Fortenberry	Miller	Westerman
Foxx (NC)	Mitchell	Williams
Fulcher	Moolenaar	Wilson (SC)
Gaetz	Mooney (WV)	Wittman
Gallagher	Mullin	Womack
Gianforte	Murphy (NC)	Woodall
Gibbs	Newhouse	Wright
Gohmert	Norman	Yoho
Gonzalez (OH)	Nunes	Young
Gooden	Olson	Zeldin
Gosar	Palazzo	

NOT VOTING—12

Aderholt	Gabbard	Marchant
Byrne	Kirkpatrick	McClintock
Clay	Lesko	Richmond
Crawford	Lewis	Walker

□ 1343

Messrs. POSEY and SMITH of New Jersey changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 216, nays 200, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 17]

YEAS—216

Adams	Gomez	Omar
Aguiar	Gonzalez (TX)	Pallone
Allred	Gottheimer	Panetta
Axne	Green, Al (TX)	Pappas
Barragán	Grijalva	Pascarell
Bass	Haaland	Payne
Beatty	Harder (CA)	Perlmutter
Bera	Hastings	Peters
Beyer	Hayes	Peterson
Bishop (GA)	Heck	Phillips
Blumenauer	Higgins (NY)	Pingree
Blunt Rochester	Himes	Pocan
Bonamici	Horsford	Porter
Boyle, Brendan	Houlihan	Pressley
F.	Hoyer	Price (NC)
Brown (MD)	Huffman	Quigley
Brownley (CA)	Jackson Lee	Raskin
Bustos	Jayapal	Rice (NY)
Butterfield	Jeffries	Rose (NY)
Carbajal	Johnson (GA)	Rouda
Cárdenas	Johnson (TX)	Roybal-Allard
Carson (IN)	Kaptur	Ruiz
Cartwright	Keating	Ruppersberger
Casten (IL)	Kelly (IL)	Rush
Castor (FL)	Kennedy	Ryan
Castro (TX)	Khanna	Sánchez
Chu, Judy	Kildee	Sarbanes
Cicilline	Kilmer	Scanlon
Cisneros	Kim	Shakowsky
Clark (MA)	Kind	Schiff
Clarke (NY)	Krishnamoorthi	Schneider
Cleaver	Kuster (NH)	Schrier
Clyburn	Lamb	Scott (VA)
Cohen	Langevin	Scott, David
Connolly	Larsen (WA)	Serrano
Cooper	Larson (CT)	Sewell (AL)
Correa	Lawrence	Shalala
Costa	Lawson (FL)	Sherman
Courtney	Lee (CA)	Sires
Cox (CA)	Lee (NV)	Slotkin
Craig	Levin (CA)	Smith (WA)
Crist	Levin (MI)	Soto
Crow	Lieu, Ted	Spanberger
Cuellar	Lipinski	Speier
Davids (KS)	Loeb sack	Stanton
Davis (CA)	Loftgren	Stevens
Davis, Danny K.	Lowenthal	Suoizzi
Dean	Lowe y	Swalwell (CA)
DeFazio	Luján	Takano
DeGette	Luria	Thompson (CA)
DeLauro	Lynch	Thompson (MS)
DelBene	Malinowski	Titus
Delgado	Maloney,	Tlaib
Demings	Carolyn B.	Tonko
DeSaulnier	Maloney, Sean	Torres (CA)
Deutch	Matsui	Torres Small
Dingell	McBath	(NM)
Doggett	McCollum	Trahan
Doyle, Michael	McEachin	Trone
F.	McGovern	Underwood
Engel	McNerney	Vargas
Escobar	Meeks	Veasey
Eshoo	Meng	Vela
Espallat	Moore	Visclosky
Evans	Morelle	Wasserman
Finkenauer	Moulton	Schultz
Fletcher	Mucarsel-Powell	Waters
Foster	Nadler	Watson Coleman
Frankel	Napolitano	Welch
Fudge	Neal	Wexton
Galleo	Neguse	Wild
Garamendi	Norcross	Wilson (FL)
Garcia (IL)	O'Halleran	Yarmuth
Garcia (TX)	Ocasio-Cortez	

NAYS—200

Abraham	Banks	Brooks (AL)
Allen	Barr	Brooks (IN)
Amash	Bergman	Buchanan
Amodei	Biggs	Buck
Armstrong	Bilirakis	Bucshon
Arrington	Bishop (NC)	Budd
Babin	Bishop (UT)	Burchett
Bacon	Bost	Burgess
Baird	Brady	Calvert
Balderson	Brindisi	Carter (GA)

Carter (TX)	Horn, Kendra S.	Roby
Case	Hudson	Rodgers (WA)
Chabot	Huizenga	Roe, David P.
Cheney	Hurd (TX)	Rogers (AL)
Cline	Johnson (LA)	Rogers (KY)
Cloud	Johnson (OH)	Rooney (FL)
Cole	Johnson (SD)	Rose, John W.
Collins (GA)	Jordan	Rouzer
Comer	Joyce (OH)	Roy
Conaway	Joyce (PA)	Rutherford
Cook	Katko	Scalise
Crenshaw	Keller	Schrader
Cunningham	Kelly (MS)	Schweikert
Curtis	Kelly (PA)	Scott, Austin
Davidson (OH)	King (IA)	Sensenbrenner
Davis, Rodney	King (NY)	Sherrill
DesJarlais	Kinzing	Shimkus
Diaz-Balart	Kustoff (TN)	Simpson
Duncan	LaHood	Smith (MO)
Dunn	LaMalfa	Smith (NE)
Emmer	Lamborn	Smith (NJ)
Estes	Latta	Smucker
Ferguson	Long	Spano
Fitzpatrick	Loudermillk	Staubert
Fleischmann	Lucas	Stefanik
Flores	Luetkemeyer	Steil
Fortenberry	Marshall	Steube
Foxx (NC)	Massie	Stewart
Fulcher	Mast	Stivers
Gaetz	McAdams	Taylor
Gallagher	McCarthy	Thompson (PA)
Gianforte	McCaul	Thornberry
Gibbs	McHenry	Timmons
Gohmert	McKinley	Tipton
Golden	Meadows	Turner
Gonzalez (OH)	Meuser	Upton
Gooden	Miller	Van Drew
Gosar	Mitchell	Wagner
Granger	Moolenaar	Walberg
Graves (GA)	Mooney (WV)	Walden
Graves (LA)	Mullin	Walorski
Graves (MO)	Murphy (FL)	Waltz
Green (TN)	Murphy (NC)	Watkins
Griffith	Newhouse	Weber (TX)
Grothman	Norman	Webster (FL)
Guest	Nunes	Wenstrup
Guthrie	Olson	Westerman
Hagedorn	Palazzo	Williams
Harris	Palmer	Wilson (SC)
Hartzler	Pence	Wittman
Hern, Kevin	Perry	Womack
Herrera Beutler	Posey	Woodall
Hice (GA)	Ratcliffe	Wright
Higgins (LA)	Reed	Yoho
Hill (AR)	Reschenthaler	Young
Holding	Rice (SC)	Zeldin
Hollingsworth	Riggleman	

NOT VOTING—13

□ 1352

Mr. VAN DREW changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I was absent today due to a medical emergency. Had I been present, I would have voted: “yea” on rollcall No. 16, and “yea” on rollcall No. 17.

#### ELECTING A CERTAIN MEMBER TO A CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Democratic Caucus, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 793

*Resolved*, That the following named Member be, and is hereby, elected to the fol-

lowing standing committee of the House of Representatives:

COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES: Mr. Garcia of Illinois.

Mr. JEFFRIES (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### APPOINTMENT OF INDIVIDUALS TO BOARD OF FEDERAL JUDICIAL CENTER FOUNDATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 629(b), and the order of the House of January 3, 2019, of the following individuals to the board of the Federal Judicial Center Foundation on the part of the House for a term of 5 years:

Ms. Elizabeth J. Cabraser, Sebastopol, California

Mr. Peter A. Kraus, Dallas, Texas

#### PRAISE FOR NEWARK MENTORING MOVEMENT

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to praise the Newark Mentoring Movement, an organization that wants to turn Newark into “Mentor City.”

Unlike most mentoring organizations, they do not supply mentors. Instead, they do a more valuable thing. They connect politicians with organizations who support mentoring so they can discuss how to increase mentoring opportunities in the future.

The importance of mentors in America has never been greater. Today, more than 30 percent of children come from single-parent homes, and it is incredibly difficult to raise children alone. Mentors give these parents a helping hand. They give their children a role model. They can help increase their grades and increase their self-esteem. In addition, they can put students on a better path and keep them on a positive trajectory.

We need to dedicate more time and resources to provide mentors for children across this great Nation. Every child must be given a chance to succeed.

#### HONORING FALLEN OFFICER PAUL DUNN

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

Mr. SPANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor one of Lakeland Police Department's finest. Officer Paul Dunn was a United States Marine Corps veteran and worked in law enforcement