



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 166

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JANUARY 28, 2020

No. 18

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BUTTERFIELD).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
January 28, 2020.

I hereby appoint the Honorable G.K. BUTTERFIELD to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2020, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with time equally allocated between the parties and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

QUESTIONS TO THE SENATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. And still I rise, Mr. Speaker, and I rise today because I have a question. I have a question for posterity. I have a question for those who reside and dwell within the Senate. I have a question, but I also have a predicate for the question.

The predicate is this: Knowing what you know, knowing that the National Security Advisor was in the room with the President, knowing that he has in-

dictated that there were concerns within him with reference to the President's dealings with other countries, heads of state, knowing that he took his consternation to the Attorney General of the United States of America, knowing that the Attorney General expressed some concerns as well, knowing what you know, that the National Security Advisor, not just another person in the room but the person who advises the President on concerns with reference to our security, knowing this, how can you possibly thwart efforts to have the National Security Advisor give testimony before the Senate in the impeachment trial?

I have another question. This question is one for eternity.

Knowing that the hands of history are writing your legacy, knowing that future generations, that your grandchildren, that the people who will look to you for leadership will read what the hands of history will record, knowing that history will afford you the opportunity to be on the right side, the right side of history, how can you possibly decide that you will conduct yourself in a trial for the ages such that history will record that you were on the wrong side of history?

My dear friends, this is bigger than you. It is bigger than all of us. This is about the country we love and government we have.

We have a great opportunity to do justice in the Senate, and the only way we can do justice is to have witnesses testify.

I said before that I believe that there would be 51 Senators who would vote to have witnesses. Today, I am absolutely confident that there will be 51 or more Senators who will move to have witnesses present themselves and give testimony. To do otherwise would allow the greatest country in the world to have history record that, when we had the opportunity to stand up for the Constitution, some of us turned our backs and looked the other way.

This is your time, Senate. This is your time, Members of the great deliberative body. I beg that you will do what you must and have witnesses present themselves so that we will have history record that we did the right and just thing.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CARSON of Indiana). Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair, not to a perceived viewing audience.

NAVIGABLE WATERS PROTECTION RULE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, last week, I had the pleasure of joining the Environmental Protection Agency and the Army Corps of Engineers in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, for an event announcing NWP, or the Navigable Waters Protection Rule, a rule that will replace the flawed 2015 WOTUS, Waters of the United States rule.

For decades, there has been confusion and never-ending litigation over WOTUS. During my time as chairman of the House Agriculture Committee's Conservation and Forestry Subcommittee, which included watersheds and oversees environmental policy regarding agriculture, I heard from many farmers and ranchers, landowners, and environmental advocates about just how harmful WOTUS was to their businesses and to their way of life.

WOTUS was a gross overreach and particularly dangerous for the agriculture industry, as vast new areas of farmlands would be subject to the Clean Water Act and costly new permitting mandates for the very first time, even beyond our farms and ranches. Anyone who owned any property, private property rights would be

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H571

regulated. Ninety-nine percent of Pennsylvania was swept under these overreaching WOTUS regulations.

In addition to taking away States' authority to manage water resources, the 2015 WOTUS rule expanded the Clean Water Act far beyond the law's historical limits of navigable waters and the long-held intent of Congress. Instead of providing much-needed clarity to the Clean Water Act, WOTUS created even more confusion.

Thankfully, the negative impact of WOTUS was brought to an end when the Trump administration repealed it this past fall.

I support the Clean Water Act, and I agree that it must be clarified. However, this must be done without undue burdens on farmers, landowners, private property owners, and commercial activities that are already effectively regulated by the States.

Times have been very tough over the past decade for many farmers in rural areas. An average farm income was nearly halved during that period. Regulatory uncertainty—notably, the former WOTUS rule—only made things more difficult.

I am confident, however, that the new Navigable Waters Protection Rule is a step in the right direction and will address many of the regulatory gray areas that WOTUS did not. This new rule clearly defines four commonsense categories of Federal waters that would be regulated, while providing clarity on what is not regulated. This includes ditches, isolated ponds, and prior converted croplands.

The Navigable Waters Protection Rule will still support strong water protections without compromising the rights of States and without unnecessary burdens to the agriculture industry.

With clearly defined State and Federal regulations, our Nation's farmers can continue to focus on what they provide all of us: food, fiber, building materials, and energy that we all rely upon.

HONORING THE GREENSBORO FOUR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleague from North Carolina, Congresswoman ALMA ADAMS, as we introduce a resolution recognizing the significance of the Greensboro Four sit-in protest which took place on February 1, 1960, 60 years ago.

The Greensboro, North Carolina, sit-in was a civil rights protest that commenced when four young African American college students staged a sit-in at the segregated lunch counter of F. W. Woolworth department store in Greensboro. They refused to leave after being denied service only because of their race.

The four young men—Ezell Blair, Jr.; David Richmond; Franklin McCain; and Joseph McNeil—were students from North Carolina A&T College, now known as North Carolina A&T State University. I might add that A&T State University is now the largest HBCU in the country.

Mr. Speaker, I would also mention that Congresswoman ALMA ADAMS is a graduate of A&T State University and served as a college professor across the street at Bennett College for more than 40 years.

The Greensboro Four students were influenced by the unanimous Supreme Court decision in *Brown v. Board of Education*, 1954, wherein the Court ruled that State laws establishing racial segregation in public schools are unconstitutional even if the segregated schools are otherwise equal.

The students were also influenced by the Supreme Court decision in *Keys v. Carolina Coach Company*, 1955, wherein, the Court broke with its historic adherence to the *Plessy v. Ferguson* separate but equal doctrine and interpreted the Interstate Commerce Act as banning the segregation of Black passengers on buses traveling across State lines. The *Keys* case originated at the bus station in Roanoke Rapids, North Carolina, located in the heart of my congressional district.

The *Keys* ruling was announced 6 days prior to Rosa Parks' refusal to move from her seat on a segregated bus in Montgomery. And without question, the Rosa Parks Montgomery bus boycott, lasting 381 days, also inspired the Greensboro Four students.

The students were also inspired to act following the 1955 brutal lynching of Emmett Till after he was accused of offending a White woman in a Mississippi grocery store.

These four college students blazed a trail that ignited a movement to challenge racial segregation in public facilities throughout the segregated South. The sit-in movement soon spread to college towns throughout the South.

The Greensboro Four sit-ins contributed greatly to the civil rights movement and served as a catalyst for the mobilization of college students in the movement, evolving into the formation of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, which was founded in Raleigh, North Carolina, in April 1960. Some of the organizers of SNCC were Congressman JOHN LEWIS, Congressman JIM CLYBURN, and Diane Nash.

Nationwide participation in this new movement included over 700,000 people, including students, clergymen, and unified citizens, both Black and White. Many of the protestors, more than 3,000, were arrested for trespassing, disorderly conduct, or disturbing the peace.

However, the Greensboro Four remained peaceful throughout the 6-month sit-in, and their actions made an immediate and lasting impact, forc-

ing Woolworth's and other establishments to change their discriminatory policies. On July 26, 1960, the Woolworth's lunch counter was finally integrated. Today, the former Woolworth's now houses the International Civil Rights Center and Museum, which features a restored version of the lunch counter where the Greensboro Four sat. Part of the original counter is on display at the Smithsonian National Museum of American History here in Washington.

On Saturday of this week, February 1, the museum will commemorate the 60th anniversary of this historic event at the Greensboro Coliseum. Past award recipients have been numerous. They include Oprah Winfrey; Jesse Jackson, Sr.; President Nelson Mandela; and many, many others.

The award recipients this year will be: President Barack Obama, the Reverend Al Sharpton, Danny Glover, Mrs. Clayola Brown, Reverend Cardes Brown, Dr. Linda Brown, and Mrs. Emma Washington.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution that Ms. ADAMS and I introduce seeks to encourage all of the States to include in their educational curriculum the history and contributions of the Greensboro Four. It is imperative that we learn the lessons from the past and reaffirm that the ethnic and racial diversity of our country enriches our Nation.

We are always stronger together. We must never forget, in all things, to demand justice and equality for all.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the Greensboro Four. I congratulate the International Museum, and I look forward to participating in the great gala they will have this weekend in Greensboro.

NAVIGABLE WATERS PROTECTION RULE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend President Trump for providing much-needed relief and regulatory clarity through the enactment of the Navigable Waters Protection Rule.

Under the Obama administration, in an era rife with government overreach and constricting regulations, our Nation's hardworking farmers were subjected to regulations—specifically, under the Waters of the United States rule—that impeded on their businesses and their livelihoods.

Instead of enacting meaningful environmental protections and returning power back to State, local, and municipal governments, WOTUS put government overreach in the express lane. Farmers were forced to hire expensive attorneys to define which bodies of water on their properties were subject to Federal regulations.

The most concerning part is that bodies of water such as small ponds,

ditches, drains, and even areas of dry land were subject to these regulations.

□ 1015

Sadly, this is just another textbook example of the types of government overreach that must be eliminated. Thanks to the Navigable Waters Protection Rule, erroneous, misguided regulations enacted by the Obama administration are finally repealed. Hard-working Americans will once again have the freedom to compete within the marketplace, spur innovation, and create lasting value.

Under this rule, regulatory certainty will be returned to farmers, landowners, and manufacturers; the laws and specific powers that the Federal Government has been given under the Constitution and the Clean Water Act will be respected; and the relationship between the Federal Government and the State regarding the managing of land and water resources will be rebalanced.

By eliminating these constructive regulations, President Trump continues to deliver on his promises to our farmers, landowners, and manufacturers.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to stand alongside the President as we support, defend, and fight for the men and women who provide food, shelter, and essential commodities that Americans rely on every day.

RECOGNIZING NATIONAL SLAVERY AND HUMAN TRAFFICKING PREVENTION MONTH

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, January has been proclaimed as National Slavery and Human Trafficking Prevention Month.

These appalling criminal acts not only tear at the fabric of our society, but they also reflect a blatant disregard for the sanctity of human life.

Though human trafficking is often a hidden crime, its effects are far-reaching. It is estimated that over 25 million people—children and adults around the world—are victims of both human trafficking and slavery. Traffickers rob victims of their freedom, split families apart, and impose sizeable threats to communities.

Let's be clear. We must remain relentless in our fight to end these abhorrent crimes. We must all work together to protect and support survivors, prosecute those responsible, and proactively foster a culture of justice and accountability for these crimes.

ACT ON PHYSICIAN SHORTAGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA) for 5 minutes.

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about the healthcare crisis that we have in America today—primarily, the physician shortage that exists throughout the entire United States. It is a crisis that we must do something about.

In the next 15 years, the United States is expected to face a shortfall of

over 4,000 primary care physicians alone. Rural and low-income communities, many of which I represent, are expected to feel the brunt of this shortage, communities such as those in California, like the San Joaquin Valley.

The San Joaquin Valley has the lowest number of physicians in the State, approximately 0.9 physicians per 1,000 people. That is less than one. The statewide average is 2.2 physicians for every 1,000 people, which is twice as many.

Last week, I introduced legislation to help tackle this crisis. The Expanding Medical Education Act of 2020 will provide over \$200 million in funding to promote medical training in areas of high need throughout the country, like the San Joaquin Valley, with a focus on diverse and medically deprived communities.

We have Governor Gavin Newsom's and our local legislators' support on this legislation. Medical institutions, such as the University of California, San Francisco, have used funding from this effort to train and develop home-grown physicians under the residency program for 45 years in the valley and throughout the State. It is very important.

We have discovered that when you train physicians locally, residents, they are more inclined to practice in that area—in our case, in the valley—and bring healthcare to our communities.

Studies consistently show that students who can find quality education near their homes and families will be more likely to stay there after graduation. It is just common sense.

Growing our own doctors is essential to confronting this medical crisis, and I will continue to fight for every dollar to ensure that our valley residents have access to the necessary healthcare that they deserve.

RECOGNIZING TOM FLORES

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I also rise today to recognize the career of Tom Flores, a trailblazer in the Latino/Hispanic communities in professional football. It is appropriate. With the Super Bowl coming up this Sunday, I can't think of a better time to do it.

A native of my hometown, Fresno, California, Tom Flores was a gifted athlete, both in high school and college, and, later, in professional football. He played for the Oakland Raiders, becoming the first Hispanic starting quarterback in professional football.

Tom's success didn't stop there. After ending his playing career, he went on to win Super Bowl XI as the assistant coach for the Raiders in 1977. Then, 4 years later, he again led the team to victory as head coach, becoming the first Hispanic coach to win a Super Bowl, both in 1980 and in 1983. He won it twice.

To this day, he is one of only two people in history to win multiple Super Bowls as a player, an assistant coach, and a head coach. Mike Ditka is the

only other coach who falls in that category.

Tom Flores is terrific. He left professional football with a record of 97 wins and 87 losses as head coach, including a playoff record of 8 wins and 3 losses, including a stint as head coach and general manager of the Seattle Seahawks.

Since retiring, Tom Flores has used his influence to bring educational opportunities to the valley, his home, a place he has never, ever forgotten, through the Tom Flores Youth Foundation effort. Over the years, he has raised nearly \$2 million to support local school districts in science, art, and athletic programs.

Sadly, Tom Flores was short of the required votes needed for induction into the Professional Football Hall of Fame, and this is not the first time he has been passed over.

This week, I am introducing a resolution calling for the recognition of his significant accomplishments in the sport and his induction into the Pro Football Hall of Fame—well deserved and overdue.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation and honor the invaluable contributions that Coach Tom Flores has made to his community, to his country, and to America's game.

We have the Super Bowl this Sunday. We will all be watching it, I am sure. I know Tom Flores will be. He deserves to be in the national Pro Football Hall of Fame at Canton, Ohio. I can't think of anyone more deserving than Coach Tom Flores.

REMEMBERING THE LIFE OF DAVID GLASS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WOMACK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember the life of David Glass.

David was born in 1935 and grew up in Mountain View, Missouri. He joined the U.S. Army after high school and then earned a degree at Missouri State. He started a career in business, eventually making his way to Arkansas.

He was hired by the famous Sam Walton in 1976 as the chief financial officer for Walmart, a young discount retailer at the time. Nobody knew then that his hiring would transform the company.

An entrepreneur in his own right, David helped further unleash the potential of the organization. Under his leadership, Walmart grew exponentially and transformed from a rural chain into the international business we all know today.

After succeeding Sam Walton as the chief executive officer of the company, he led the building of supercenters, introduced the sale of grocery items, helped develop automated distribution centers, and increased international acquisitions and operations. He advanced the company into the future while maintaining the founding principles of his predecessor, Sam Walton.

He would never admit it, but much of the success of Walmart and the growth of our region is a reflection of the work of David Glass.

His business expertise was rivaled only by his love of baseball. He famously helped keep the Kansas City Royals franchise from leaving Kansas City in 1993. Under his ownership, the team saw two American League pennants and a World Series trophy in 2015. His passion for the sport, the team, and the city helped bring success on the field.

Whether in Arkansas or Kansas City, the contributions of David Glass will long be remembered. I had the privilege of knowing him, not only as an accomplished businessman and a novel thinker, but as a friend.

I hope you will join me in celebrating his life, in praying for his wife, Ruth, and his children, Dan, Don, Dayna, and their families during the time of his passing.

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF
FORREST WOOD

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the life and legacy of a legend in Arkansas business, the founder of Ranger Boats, the late Forrest Wood.

Forrest was born in Flippin, Arkansas, in 1932, and his life reflected everything the Natural State has to offer. As a pioneer with a love for the outdoors, Forrest spent his time raising cattle and acting as a guide on Bull Shoals Lake, the White River, the Buffalo River, and Crooked Creek.

He became known throughout the region as an elite fishing guide. He eventually leveraged his skills on the water to create a float trip business, and in 1968, he began building lake boats. That year, he built six boats. Named after the Army Rangers and the Texas Rangers, Forrest Woods' Ranger Boats quickly became a household name in America.

He soon went from producing 6 to 600, and his novel concept became the modern bass boat that we know today. Forrest's ingenuity and vision transformed the boating and fishing industry across our Nation.

No one I know has loved or served Arkansas' great outdoors more than Forrest Wood. Whether as an entrepreneur, instructor, or former chairman of the Arkansas Game and Fish Commission, he was committed to ensuring people enjoy the outdoors for generations to come.

He will forever be remembered as a legend in the fishing industry, and I believe his biggest asset was his redeeming personality. A loyal friend, mentor, and dedicated family man, his genuine smile and caring nature will be sorely missed.

Mr. Speaker, as he is laid to rest this week, I ask that we keep his wife, Nina, and the entire Wood family in our prayers.

ADDRESS DETROIT BULK
STORAGE COLLAPSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. LAWRENCE) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, on November 26, 2019, during the Thanksgiving holiday, a dock piled with aggregates collapsed into the Detroit River.

Local and State authorities were slow to communicate with each other, and misinformation quickly spread. Concerns about polluted drinking water, even radioactive contamination, caused confusion and concern in my district. Many of us learned about the collapse from a Canadian newspaper, which published an article days after the collapse.

Over 2 months later, the site continues to deteriorate. The shoreline continues to erode, and contaminated soil is still spilling into the water. More recently, a sinkhole developed at the site, discharging even more contaminants into the water.

The area's long-serving industrial history was another source of concern for public health and the environment. During the 1940s and the 1950s, the site produced uranium for the development of the atomic bomb.

Recently, the site has been leased to companies openly storing toxic chemicals and piles of aggregates along the water.

Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed in the site owner's lack of urgency to quickly fix this problem. Over 2 months later, aggregate is still spilling into the water. The owners have failed to address the erosion and, now, the emerging sinkhole.

Mr. Speaker, I join with the EPA and the Michigan Department of Environmental, Great Lakes, and Energy, or EGLE, to hold this owner accountable to the fullest extent possible.

□ 1030

The owner has missed key deadlines to submit cleanup plans and, so far, their proposals don't even come close to stopping the erosion. If it is the responsibility of the violators to clean up their mess, how do we know they will do it properly and efficiently?

I expect our State and Federal agencies to continue to take action to safeguard our public health. They are continuing to test the surrounding area for contamination and are regularly updating my office with test results.

The risks to our public health cannot be dismissed. My constituents have witnessed how government action can help or hurt our communities.

We cannot forget the Flint water crisis. We witnessed a failure of government. Just last year, the Detroit Public Schools shut off its drinking fountains after finding elevated lead and copper. In the last year, Michigan has led the Nation in active PFAS sites, drawing national attention to the efforts of these "forever chemicals" in our waters.

We cannot—and I will fight to make sure we do not—repeat the Flint water crisis. We must learn from our mistakes. This situation demands a sense of urgency to restore the public's faith in our government to protect them from being contaminated by water.

This is why I am continuing to monitor the ongoing cleanup and remediation of the collapsed site. While the latest test results showed no significant threat to the public health, I will work with the State to ensure the site's cleanup and urge the State to push for a third-party independent study. We have the right to know that the surrounding water and the environment is safe from contaminants.

I will also remain in communication to ensure the drinking water in Michigan and—also with government oversight—that we in America have safe, clean water, and we must continue the fight for affordable water.

If there is a threat to our public health, the government has a responsibility to safeguard our constituents from harm.

OUR RESPONSE TO THE
CORONAVIRUS OUTBREAK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, with more than 4,500 people confirmed infected in China, and over 100 deaths, the coronavirus certainly has my attention. But as the outbreak of the coronavirus strain originating in China continues, I want to remind Kansans that U.S. health officials remain on high alert and are fully prepared for any situation.

The Centers for Disease Control currently has teams on the ground, both domestically and internationally. Domestically, the CDC is working closely with local public health departments to identify potential cases early and make sure patients get the best and most appropriate care. To control the spread of the outbreak, the CDC has preventive screening measures in major U.S. airports.

Last year, President Trump signed into law the reauthorization of the Pandemic and All-Hazards Preparedness Innovation Act. This bill has been critical for improving preparedness and response, and bolstering the emergency response workforce, as well as increasing communication and efforts in medical countermeasures.

The administration has also consistently prioritized funding to build on investments to protect the civilian population in the event of public health emergencies related to infectious disease outbreaks.

As a physician, I understand the uncertainty and fear infectious disease outbreaks can have. But first, I want to encourage Kansans to follow recommendations from your own doctor. And if you have any concern about the situation, you should call your doctor's

nurse and talk to them about the situation and your concerns.

But all that being said, I might offer these tips: First of all, make sure you have gotten your flu shot. Now, the flu shot won't protect you from a coronavirus, but it is a much bigger threat to you right now than the coronavirus is.

Children, pregnant women, and our senior citizens, who are most susceptible to viruses should avoid public places where exposure risk is high.

Thorough handwashing is a great best practice as we continue to work through the flu and cold season.

And, finally, follow the CDC and State Department's recommendations regarding travel to China.

If you are at all concerned about any symptoms you are experiencing, especially if you are having new onset of wheezing or shortness of breath, you should contact your primary care doctor.

Now, thus far, only 5 cases have been confirmed in the United States, and all cases include recent travel to China. While testing can now only be done at the CDC, we hope that a commercially-available test will soon be available in February, which will help us contain and monitor this virus.

These global outbreaks impact us here at home, and that is why we respond to infectious disease outbreaks with urgency and as a global community. Efforts by President Trump and this administration have ensured our health agencies have the funding and resources necessary to combat outbreaks and protect Kansans.

I am confident in the measures being taken by our national healthcare officials and agencies, as well as by our local health departments, our local doctors, nurses, and our local hospitals.

NEW NAVIGABLE WATERS PROTECTION REGULATIONS

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, last Friday, I was honored to join EPA Region 7 Administrator Jim Gulliford at the Kansas Commodity Classic in Manhattan, Kansas, to announce the EPA's new Navigable Waters Protection Rule. The rule provides a clear definition of Waters of the United States, otherwise known as WOTUS, delivering on President Trump's promise to cut burdensome regulations and slash bureaucratic red tape to empower farmers, ranchers, builders, small businesses, and other landowners.

Kansas farmers and ranchers are the original and best conservationists in the world, and I have heard from them about this issue since I came into office. This new rule will tremendously reduce the burden on Kansans who work in dairy, cattle, and crop operations, and allow them to implement conservation methods without Federal overreach.

The EPA's new Navigable Waters Protection Rule will continue to protect our environment without stifling economic growth and rebalance the re-

lationship between the Federal Government and States in managing our land and water resources.

The Navigable Waters Protection Rule ends decades of uncertainty over where Federal jurisdiction begins and ends. It also ensures that America's water protections, among the best in the world, remain strong, while giving our States and Tribes more flexibility in determining how best to manage their land and water resources to protect the environment and local economies.

Go Chiefs.

HONORING THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF CONSTER DAVIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CLOUD) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CLOUD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Ms. Conster Davis and to wish her a very happy 100th birthday.

Ms. Davis is a citizen of south Texas whose life has been characterized by a servant-hearted desire to help others and to work hard.

During World War II, she drove rivets into airplane wings, playing her part, along with countless other American women, in the war effort.

Today, at 100 years old, she spends her time supporting the students and staff at Galvan Elementary School in Corpus Christi, Texas, where she is affectionately known as Granny Davis.

She mentors the pre-K students and helps teachers with clerical work. She also served as a Senior Corps Foster Grandparent for 25 years, mentoring young people and pouring into them during some of the most formative years of their lives.

Ms. Davis loves caring for young people and shows it by investing much of her time and energy into the children of Corpus Christi.

It is difficult to imagine the tremendous impact Ms. Conster Davis has had in living a life of service that continues today to impact generation after generation.

On behalf of the people of the 27th Congressional District of Texas, I am proud to honor her life and service.

HONORING THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF JAKE GODBOLD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. RUTHERFORD) for 5 minutes.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of Mayor Jake Godbold, who served the city of Jacksonville from 1978 to 1987 and, sadly, passed away last week.

Mayor Godbold, or simply "Jake," as we all called him, was a man of the highest integrity whose contributions to northeast Florida are seemingly infinite.

One thing I will always remember about Jake was that when he spoke to

you, he made you feel as though you were the only person in the room. I recall fondly my first interaction with the Mayor occurred actually when I was a young patrolman on the north side of Jacksonville. And as an officer, I soon learned every time the Mayor saw a police officer or a firefighter, he would stop whatever he was doing and would take the time to speak with that officer or that firefighter.

Jake loved our policemen, our firemen, and our city, and they all loved him back. He will be dearly missed.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF ROBERT SHIRCLIFF

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of Mr. Robert Shircliff of Jacksonville.

Bob lived his Christian faith and was well-known for his giving and loving character. His extraordinary contributions and service to our country and local community are truly legendary. Deeply beloved by the people of Jacksonville, Mr. Shircliff passed away last week at the age of 91.

He served on the boards of numerous civic groups, such as the Community Foundation and led countless efforts to support institutions like St. Vincent's HealthCare, the Jacksonville Symphony, United Way, and the Cummer Art Museum, just to name a few.

Despite his success, he remained humble and grateful to those around him. He once said, "I've tried coming into the office on Saturdays and changing the world, and I can't do it. But if I come in on Monday, and I'm surrounded by really good people, anything can happen."

On behalf of the Fourth District of Florida, I want to offer my condolences to the many friends and loved ones of Mr. Shircliff. His service, generosity, and leadership has made northeast Florida a better place to live, work, and play.

And since Bob's arrival, heaven is truly a better place.

SUPPORTING CHILD NUTRITION RULEMAKING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. COMER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to applaud the Trump administration's recent proposed rulemaking for school meals and the Summer Food Service Program.

As a member of the Agriculture Committee, and ranking member on the Education and Labor Subcommittee with jurisdiction over the child nutrition programs, I have consistently heard from school food service administrators in my district about their frustrations with the heavyhanded Obama-era regulations.

I am glad to see the administration is seeking input from those who administer these programs every day. This new rule will provide needed flexibility for food service supervisors to adapt their menus to teach students proper

nutrition habits that they will adopt during crucial periods of growth and into adulthood.

These food service professionals know the needs of their students best, and I look forward to seeing this rule finalized and our schools and communities become even stronger.

UPDATES ON AGRICULTURE AND THE TRADE WAR WITH CHINA

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I think most people in this body know that I am a farmer by trade, and I represent a southern Kentucky district that is one of the biggest agricultural districts in America.

I am very pleased today to give an update on the accomplishments that the Trump administration and Congress has made over the past 3 years with respect to agriculture.

Anyone that keeps up with President Trump knows that he sincerely cares about the farmers in America; and he realizes that the farmers, through no fault of their own, have been on the front lines of this trade war with China.

But if you talk to any farmer, as I do on a regular basis when I am home in Kentucky, the farmers still strongly support the President and they understand why we are in this trade war. They also understand the efforts that have been made and the accomplishments that have been achieved with respect to agriculture from this administration and from this Congress over the past 3 years.

I want to touch on three areas where we focused in Congress, where I focused as a member of the Agriculture Committee, to improve our agriculture for our family farmers who are struggling, again, on the front lines of this trade war with China.

First of all, regulations. As with many other industries in America, one of the first things that President Trump looked at, and then the Republicans and the majority of this body looked at 3 years ago, was the regulations. Many industries, especially in agriculture, felt like there were burdensome regulations that were holding farmers back, holding agriculture back.

So, one by one, this administration, whether it was through the U.S. Department of Agriculture, or the EPA, has looked at every regulation to deem whether that regulation was necessary, or whether that regulation was excessive and needed to be scaled back.

□ 1045

I am very pleased to report that the biggest regulation that scared most people in agriculture was the WOTUS rule from the Obama administration. I am very pleased, last week, this administration completely eliminated the WOTUS rule with respect to navigable streams. Under the Obama regulation, every mud puddle in Kentucky would have been defined as a navigable stream, therefore, creating a situation where farmers would be breaking the

law to farm the land that they farmed for many generations.

Next is tax policy. We focused very heavily on passing the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, which helped cut taxes overall, but one thing that helped agriculture is the accelerated depreciation rule, which encouraged farmers to make a bigger investment.

And, lastly, trade. We have had huge success on the trade front over the past couple of weeks here in Washington, and I applaud the Trump administration for their efforts to not only sign the USMCA, which is the new modern NAFTA deal that puts workers on a level playing field in America with workers in Mexico and Canada, but it also enhances agriculture opportunities.

Also, the phase one trade deal that the President signed recently with China, this focuses on agriculture. It brings back those markets that we lost in agriculture because we were on the front lines of this trade war, and it also increases new markets for agriculture.

I am very pleased with the achievements that have been made in agriculture, but I realize that our farmers are struggling and we have a lot more work to do. I pledge to continue to work with the Trump administration to see that our farmers are treated fairly and that we can continue to grow our Nation's most important industry: agriculture.

HONORING THE MEMORY OF PHILIP M. VAN HOY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BISHOP) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the memory of Philip M. Van Hoy of Charlotte, who passed away unexpectedly Saturday morning.

Phil was a preeminent attorney, a mentor to a generation of conservatives, and a dear friend of 30 years.

Phil grew up in Charlotte and graduated from Duke University and the University of North Carolina Law School, but he was a lifelong Duke fan. Upon graduation, Phil enlisted in the U.S. Army Reserve, eventually leaving as a first lieutenant.

As a lawyer, Phil served Duke Power and, in due course, founded the law firm Van Hoy, Reutlinger, Adams & Dunn, where he handled some of the most complex employment cases at every level, including the United States Supreme Court. In 2013 and 2019, Phil was named Lawyer of the Year for employment law by Best Lawyers in America.

Though Phil was a gifted lawyer, his true passion was Republican politics. Phil served as vice chairman of the Mecklenburg County Republican Party and was an alternative delegate to the RNC convention that nominated Ronald Reagan.

But most significantly, Phil was a mentor to a generation of conserv-

atives. He organized a lunch that still goes on in Charlotte, and they refer to it affectionately as the "Hun Lunch"; although, as Phil was quick to point out, Attila the Hun was no conservative. He was a collectivist.

Phil welcomed me 30 years ago to the Hun Lunch, and it continues weekly today. Its members are devastated by his loss.

I am lucky to count Phil as a cherished friend. Friends will remember, particularly, his trademark sharp wit, the ever-ready joke, and the gleam in his eye much more since his untimely passing and will remember his consistent kindness and commitment to values.

Jo and I extend our deepest condolences and prayers to Sylvia and their two sons, Travis and Marshall. May Phil Van Hoy rest in peace.

HONORING THE LIFE OF TERRY L. HUNT

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Terry L. Hunt, who passed away this weekend while on a business trip to Kenya.

Mr. Hunt was president of Lumbee Tribe Enterprises and a valued member of the Lumbee Tribe. Terry's life was dedicated to the success of the Lumbee people, and his passing represents a grave loss.

Mr. Hunt was a native of the Fairmont community in Robeson County, North Carolina. Terry graduated from Fairmont High School in 1979 and served his community as a police officer with the Fairmont Police Department.

In 1993, Terry rose to the position of chief of police and was selected by the Attorney General to help shape the national law enforcement initiative for cases of missing children.

Mr. Hunt was deeply devoted to his community, and when he retired from law enforcement in 2001, he continued his public service. Mr. Hunt represented his district on the Lumbee Tribal Council from 2011 to 2017 and was elected as economic development chairman, taking an active interest in economic affairs of the Lumbee people.

While Mr. Hunt left us far too young, it is altogether fitting that he passed while finalizing a new contract for the Tribe-owned business that he led. Mr. Hunt served his community until the very end, a community that is deeply mourning his loss.

Terry's work will go on, but no one will be able to fill his shoes. May his love and dedication for his people be an example for all of us.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 51 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. LEE of California) at noon.

PRAYER

Reverend Jeffrey F. Kirby, Our Lady of Grace Catholic Church, Indian Land, South Carolina, offered the following prayer:

Good and gracious God, You have ordered all things according to Your laws of goodness and righteousness.

You bless all Your children with equal dignity and endow them with talents to pursue happiness. In Your kindness, You inspire and raise up leaders for Your people.

We ask You to bless this House of Representatives, made up of these leaders, and to bless their work during today's session. Grant them prudence and fortitude. May they seek Your divine wisdom and give You due homage in all their deliberations and decisions. May they always seek the common good, the public benefit, and true justice and peace for all.

We ask all these blessings from You, who are the Lord God and the giver of life, forever and ever.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House her approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from California (Mr. CISNEROS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. CISNEROS led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

WELCOMING REVEREND JEFFREY F. KIRBY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. NORMAN. Madam Speaker, it is my honor to recognize and nominate today's guest, Father Jeffrey Kirby, to serve as guest chaplain for the noon prayer.

Father Kirby, pastor of Our Lady of Grace Parish in South Carolina and the adjunct professor of theology at Belmont Abbey College, is a devout follower of Jesus Christ and lives his life as a light unto others.

Father Kirby received his bachelor of arts and master's degree from Franciscan University of Steubenville before receiving his doctorate in moral theology from Holy Cross University in Rome.

His selflessness led him to enlist in the National Guard during his studies, and he even served on a relief effort for Hurricane Mitch.

In 2002, he entered seminary in Rome and was ordained a Catholic priest. He has since served parishes across South Carolina, from Clemson to Walhalla to Seneca to Columbia and now Lancaster.

Governor Nikki Haley selected him in 2016 to receive the Order of the Palmetto, our State's highest civilian honor.

In His word, and one that exemplifies Father Kirby's life, the Book of Malachi 2:7 reads: "For the lips of a priest should guard knowledge, and people should seek instruction from his mouth, for he is the messenger of the Lord of hosts."

In light of his many years of ministry, it is my honor to welcome Father Kirby as the guest chaplain of the United States House of Representatives.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to 15 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

CONGRATULATING 2020 CALIFORNIA DISTINGUISHED SCHOOLS

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

Mr. CISNEROS. Madam Speaker, it is with great pride that I rise today to honor and congratulate 13 elementary schools in California's 39th District for their selection as 2020 California Distinguished Schools.

The 39th District elementary schools awarded this distinction include: Aca-cia, Blandford, Buena Terra, Charles G. Emery, Golden, Hidden Trails, Killian, Laguna Road, Laurel Elementary Magnet School of Innovation and Career Exploration, Mesa Robles, Robert C. Fisler, Wedgeworth, and Ybarra Academy of Arts and Technology.

Our students' success is a testament not only to their dedication but also to the tireless efforts made by educators, administrators, staff, and parents.

Madam Speaker, I ask that you and my honorable colleagues join me in congratulating these 13 California distinguished schools for their tremendous educational achievements.

CELEBRATING SCHOOL CHOICE

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

Mr. LAMBORN. Madam Speaker, I rise during this week to celebrate school choice.

Americans lose their freedom when parents aren't allowed to decide on their own where to send their children to school. A one-size-fits-all approach doesn't encourage growth for the next generation of Americans.

In March, the Supreme Court will be hearing oral arguments for the case of Espinoza v. Montana Department of Revenue. The Court's decision could have important ramifications for public funding of private and public schools.

In my district, I am proud of the work being done by Steve and Joyce Schuck, champions of the school choice movement in Colorado. Steven Woodford is also doing great work for the homeschool communities of Colorado.

These key leaders in our community are enabling students to have educational opportunities they wouldn't otherwise have.

Colorado is making great strides in the school choice movement, and I am proud to represent both the community leaders who facilitate it and the talented students of this generation.

COMMEMORATING TODD PORTUNE AND NATHANIEL JONES

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

Mr. CHABOT. Madam Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I rise today to honor two iconic Cincinnati leaders who passed away over the weekend.

On Saturday, we lost longtime Hamilton County Commissioner and former Cincinnati City Councilman Todd Portune.

Todd was a true leader, willing to put aside political differences and work together on issues to benefit our community. He was also someone I considered not only a respected colleague but a friend.

Then, on Sunday, Cincinnati suffered another loss with the passing of Judge Nathaniel Jones.

As a civil rights leader, a Federal judge, and a person, Judge Jones was one of those rare people who was universally admired and respected. Having worked with Thurgood Marshall on Brown v. Board of Education, having helped South Africa overcome apartheid, and having served as general counsel for the NAACP, Judge Jones not only improved the lives of people in Cincinnati but across the country and, in fact, across the globe.

Madam Speaker, while Cincinnati will sorely miss Commissioner Portune and Judge Jones, their accomplishments will be felt by our community and across our Nation for generations to come.

SUPPORT PROTESTERS IN REPUBLIC OF GEORGIA

(Mr. OLSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OLSON. Madam Speaker, I have a question. What does Oscar the Grouch from Sesame Street have in common with the republic of Georgia's oligarch Bidzina Ivanishvili? What do they have in common?

Answer: They are both puppets who trash their own home.

Vladimir Putin's puppet has attacked foreign investment in Georgia and crushed basic human rights.

A company from Texas, Frontera Resources, has been drilling in Georgia for years and years and years. They have created great jobs in America and great jobs in Georgia. They have created freedom. That was until the government took over all of their operations, all of their equipment. Now, they are drilling zero wells in Georgia.

Of course, the Napoleon of Siberia, Vladimir Putin, is happy to control Georgia's oil. His puppet, oligarch Ivanishvili, is getting rich off the backs of the Georgian people.

It is time to wake up. As this photo from Getty shows, the protesters in Georgia need our support. Join me in raising our voices for freedom in Georgia.

RECOGNIZING NATIONAL SCHOOL CHOICE WEEK 2020

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

MR. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, I am grateful to be an original cosponsor of H. Res. 814 to designate January 26 to February 1 as National School Choice Week.

As the husband of a teacher, father of four, and grandfather of eight, I appreciate the importance of school choice. We must continue to support magnet, charter, traditional, public, private, and homeschools inspired by Zan Tyler across the country.

Every year, I have the opportunity to meet with students and teachers and talk to them about their unique educational experiences and why they think school choice is important. I will be visiting schools this Friday to renew this discussion.

What we have seen is too many top-down mandates from unelected Washington bureaucrats who do not know the needs of students like their parents, teachers, and local school boards do. The quality of our children's education is too important to rely on a one-size-fits-all approach.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism with the courageous leadership of President Donald Trump.

SAY NO TO THE PRO ACT

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

Mr. KELLER. Madam Speaker, as part of a productive district work period, our team met with job creators and employers who are members of the Williamsport/Lycoming Chamber of Commerce.

The topic of discussion was the so-called Protecting the Right to Organize Act, otherwise known as the PRO Act. One thing was clear from these individuals: The PRO Act is a bad bill that has too much government interference in the employee-employer relationship.

More than being bad for employers, the PRO Act is terrible for workers. Cloaked in the language of employee protection, the real result of the PRO Act is providing workers with fewer choices, fewer rights, and an inability to speak directly for themselves.

Our Nation is experiencing the greatest economy in generations with the lowest unemployment rate for all categories of Americans since I was 4 years old. Congress should not pass legislation that would slow economic growth, stifle job creation, and limit workers' free choice and privacy. Yet, that is exactly what the PRO Act would do.

If Congress really cares about jobs, the economy, and workers' rights, it should say no to the PRO Act.

EXTEND RIGHT TO LIFE TO ALL

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, last week marked the 47th anniversary of Roe v. Wade.

Our Nation's Founders enshrined in the Declaration of Independence that all humans are "endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

Since that fateful Roe v. Wade decision, we have denied the first of those basic rights, the right to life, to more than 60 million unborn children.

I rise today in opposition to this atrocity, and I rise in support of the brave individuals who flooded the National Mall this past Friday to take part in the annual March for Life.

As long as abortion exists in our country, a dark cloud will hang over us, but the March for Life makes me hopeful that this cloud will not hang over us forever. I have great hope that life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness will extend to all Americans born and those yet to be born.

EVIDENCE PERTINENT TO IMPEACHMENT TRIAL

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

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, we have gone through and are going through a serious time in our country. The Senate is engaged, as was said the

other day, in one of its most important duties and responsibilities.

This weekend, a draft of the upcoming book by President Trump's former National Security Advisor, Ambassador John Bolton, was reported on by The New York Times.

In that book, Ambassador Bolton, who was the National Security Advisor and foreign policy advisor for President Donald Trump, revealed additional evidence pertinent to the impeachment trial now underway in the Senate. There is strong and direct evidence that the President linked critical military aid to Ukraine. It is reported that so many of his advisers, including Mr. Bolton, could not understand that aid being withheld to our ally.

He reveals that the President linked that critical military aid to Ukraine to the announcement of an investigation by President Zelensky, which was intended to benefit President Trump personally and politically.

□ 1215

Ambassador Bolton's book further confirms this and reveals that he was in the room; not a whistleblower; not somebody relying on hearsay, in the room with the President, and heard him state clearly that the two were linked or, said in another way, that there was a quid pro quo, as was alleged in Article I of the Articles of Impeachment. They were linked and that congressionally-appropriated military aid to Ukraine would not be released until President Zelensky responded to the President's personal, political demands.

Whether you are a lawyer or not, you have watched trials on TV, or perhaps been a witness in a trial. A trial is to examine and weigh the evidence, all the relevant evidence. That is the definition of a fair trial, of a quest for justice trial, a trial in which the jurors are impartial and seeking truth; not a trial in which the jurors refuse to hear the evidence the prosecution wants to submit.

It is unheard of that a juror would say, no, I don't want to hear that evidence. The juror's duty is to hear the evidence and to seek the truth. And the witnesses raise their hand, swear to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth; the whole truth, a key phrase in that witness' oath.

That, of course, includes Ambassador Bolton's testimony, the whole truth; what he heard directly from the President, as well as others who have firsthand knowledge of facts relevant to the truth or falsity of the allegations; in this case, abuse of power and obstruction of justice.

And, of course, so many of those witnesses have been ordered by the President not to tell the truth, not to testify, to fight subpoenas of the Congress of the United States.

A juror cannot be impartial if he or she willfully ignores evidence upon which the case might turn.

As a Washington Post editorial stated powerfully yesterday:

If Senators fail to summon Bolton, whom they were talking about, they will turn the Senate trial into a farce.

I might use the words show trial. We are familiar with show trials. Show trials are to pretend that you are seeking justice while you exonerate, theoretically, a guilty party.

I will remind Members of the iconic Japanese monkeys, the macaques. The three of them sit and see no evil, hear no evil, speak no evil. I would characterize that as a see no evil, hear no evil, speak no truth juror. Keeping your eyes shut and ears plugged is refusing to hear, refusing to weigh the facts. See no evil, hear no evil, speak no truth.

In the old Supreme Court Chamber, if you visit that, you will see Lady Justice, a statue, with no blindfold. We hear that justice is blind. Justice cannot be blind. Justice must see the facts. It must see the equities. It must see who said what, when, where, how, and make a judgment.

A great legislator and contemporary of our Founders, Edmund Burke, once said, "The only thing necessary for the triumph of evil is for good men to do nothing."

This is a serious time in America. We will judge whether or not party is above principle; whether truth is trumped by see no evil, hear no evil, speak no truth.

Madam Speaker, I implore the good men and women of the United States Senate, do not do nothing, which Edmund Burke said was the only thing necessary for evil to triumph. Do something that will secure your place in history to be remembered for your courage, your honesty, and honoring your oath.

Allow witnesses like Ambassador Bolton to be heard. Allow a fair and impartial trial.

Madam Speaker, I believe that is what the American people are looking for. They are pretty divided on whether or not this is an impeachable offense. I get that. That is a legitimate argument to make.

But what is not legitimate is not to listen to the evidence. Senators must now do their duty to their oaths, to our Constitution, and to its authors, and to the cause of truth itself, to allow Ambassador Bolton and other witnesses to be heard.

I urge Senators to uncover their eyes, uncover their ears. The American people and history are waiting to hear truth from them. They are waiting for the Senate trial to seek the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth.

HONORING THE GREENSBORO FOUR

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

Ms. ADAMS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor and recognize those

four young men from North Carolina A&T State University who helped bend the arc of history towards justice, the Greensboro Four.

On February 1, 1960, 60 years ago this upcoming Saturday, David Richmond, Franklin McCain, Jibreel Khazan, and Joseph McNeil, took their seats at a Woolworth lunch counter in Greensboro, North Carolina, and changed American history forever. And after they were refused service, they continued to sit at that lunch counter until the store closed.

The next day, 12 more students sat at that same lunch counter; and by the next week, thousands of demonstrators began to fight against Jim Crow in North Carolina.

To honor the triumphs of these four young men, and to commemorate their efforts to make this a more just society, I am proud to introduce today, with my colleague, Representative G.K. BUTTERFIELD, a resolution recognizing the significance of the Greensboro Four sit-in.

May we all continue to live by their example as we make this a fairer and more equitable America for all that call it home.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3621, STUDENT BOR- ROWER CREDIT IMPROVEMENT ACT, AND PROVIDING FOR CON- SIDERATION OF SENATE AMEND- MENT TO H.R. 550, MERCHANT MARINERS OF WORLD WAR II CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL ACT OF 2019

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 811 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 811

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. 3621) to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act to remove adverse information for certain defaulted or delinquent private education loan borrowers who demonstrate a history of loan repayment, 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 Financial 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 Financial Services now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116-47, 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. 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. 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 take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 550) to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the United States Merchant Mariners of World War II, in recognition of their dedicated and vital service during World War II, with the Senate amendment thereto, and to consider in the House, without intervention of any point of order, a motion offered by the chair of the Committee on Foreign Affairs or his designee that the House concur in the Senate amendment with each of the two amendments specified in section 4 of this resolution. The Senate amendment and the motion shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except as specified in section 3 of this resolution.

SEC. 3. (a) The question of adoption of the motion shall be divided between the two House amendments specified in section 4 of this resolution. The two portions of the divided question shall be considered in the order specified by the Chair.

(b) Each portion of the divided question shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SEC. 4. The amendments referred to in the second and third sections of this resolution are as follows:

(a) An amendment consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116-48.

(b) An amendment consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116-49.

SEC. 5. If only one portion of the divided question is adopted, that portion shall be engrossed as an amendment in the nature of a substitute to the Senate amendment to H.R. 550.

□ 1230

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN) is recognized for 1 hour.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, on Monday, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 811, providing for consideration of two measures: H.R. 3621, the Comprehensive CREDIT Act; and the Senate amendment to H.R. 550.

The rule provides for consideration of H.R. 3621 under a structured rule, with 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and the ranking member of the Committee on Financial Services. It self-executes Chairwoman WATERS' manager's amendment, which updates definitions, amends requirements for issuance of final rules, includes protections for workers affected by a Federal shutdown, and makes other technical changes. It also makes in order 14 amendments.

The rule also provides for consideration of two House amendments to the Senate amendment to H.R. 550. The rule provides for 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs for each House amendment. Finally, the rule provides for separate votes on each House amendment.

Madam Speaker, on H.R. 3621, the Comprehensive CREDIT Act of 2020, credit scores and credit reports play a critical role in determining which of our constituents across America will be able to pay for college, rent an apartment, buy a car or a house, start a business, meet major unexpected expenses, or even, increasingly, get a particular job.

Most Americans do not have the wealth to pay out of pocket for major expenditures, so credit is essential; and credit scores and credit reports have become the key screening and sorting mechanism, the key gatekeeper that makes the difference for millions of Americans between having the money to pay for college or not, being able to buy a house or rent an apartment or not, and, increasingly, qualifying as an employee for a specific position or not, because so many employers are increasingly using credit scores and credit reports as part of the qualifying process for appointing and hiring new employees.

The system of credit scores and credit reports is deeply flawed today, and we have done nothing to reform it in 17 years. The Federal Trade Commission tells us that one in five Americans has an error on at least one of their credit reports, and 5 percent of the people have errors grave enough to result in their being denied credit or having to pay substantially more for their mortgages or their auto loans or to obtain insurance policies.

The three big CRAs, consumer reporting agencies—Equifax, TransUnion, and Experian—have files on more than 200 million American consumers, which means that there are errors in the credit reports of at least 40 million of our constituents and serious, potentially life-changing errors in the credit reports of 10 million Americans across the country.

Correcting these errors often takes considerable time and procedural effort, as well as knowledge on how to communicate with the credit reporting companies. The Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, the CFPB, determined that, in 2018, credit reports were the single most complained-about financial product in our country, and the three big CRAs were the most complained-about financial companies in America.

Many vulnerable populations like seniors, stressed and busy working-class Americans, and less financially literate young Americans describe immense frustration in trying to solve problems with credit scoring and reporting companies. Even beyond the errors and mistakes, the credit system takes advantage of the financially insecure and precarious, converting transitory lapses of poverty into a lifetime of financial stigma and hardship. It is very expensive to be poor in America.

Consumers lack the right to a free annual credit score. Many consumers who try to get a free annual credit report or to obtain their scores get tricked into purchasing high-priced credit monitoring or subscription services.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 3621, the Comprehensive CREDIT Act of 2020, comprehensively addresses these abuses and combines six bills carefully constructed by our colleagues on the Financial Services Committee to improve transparency, fairness, and accuracy in America's credit reporting system. It reforms and upgrades the process for consumers seeking to resolve errors in their credit reports, and it seeks to ensure that consumer financial information held by the CRAs will be accurate, complete, and verifiable.

This bill will:

Prohibit reporting on consumers' debt relating to medically necessary procedures and delay reporting by 1 year for other forms of medical debt;

Remove adverse credit file information relating to defaulted or delinquent private education loans for borrowers who demonstrate a history of essentially timely and faithful loan repayments for these loans;

Permit reasonable interruptions in the consecutive repayment periods for student borrowers facing unique and extenuating life events;

Prohibit most current and prospective employers from using credit reports to make employment decisions unless required by a local, State, or Federal law or government;

Shorten the time period adverse credit information stays on consumer re-

ports from 7 years to 4 years and from 10 to 7 years for bankruptcy information;

Give consumers a new right to appeal the results of disputes with the CRAs; and

Improve the oversight capabilities of the CFPB on credit reporting agencies and their scoring modules and require these agencies to better train their personnel on addressing consumer concerns.

It has been more than 15 years since we enacted comprehensive reform of the credit reporting system. The House can be proud of the significant progress this credit reform package will bring to hardworking people across America for whom credit and credit reports are the lifeline to education, housing, and, in many cases, good employment and financial stability.

Madam Speaker, on the Senate amendment to H.R. 550, the House also considers the rule on two important amendments to the Senate amendment of H.R. 550.

The first amendment, based on Representative RO KHANNA's No War with Iran Act, clarifies that Congress has not authorized military force against Iran and asserts Congress' funding power to enforce the congressional authorization requirements under the War Powers Resolution of 1973. It, thus, prohibits funds for any military force in or against Iran unless Congress declares war or enacts specific statutory authorization for the use of military force against Iran or there is a national emergency created by an attack upon the United States or our Armed Forces consistent with the provisions of the War Powers Resolution.

The second amendment, based on Representative BARBARA LEE's bill, will repeal the 2002 AUMF for the Iraq war against Saddam Hussein, which authorized the President to use the Armed Forces to the extent "he determines to be necessary and appropriate" to "defend the national security of the United States against the continuing threat posed by Iraq" and "enforce all relevant United Nations Security Council resolutions regarding Iraq."

The commanding premise of the 2002 authorization was the need to counter the threat of weapons of mass destruction putatively possessed by Saddam Hussein. But Saddam Hussein actually never had nuclear weapons or other weapons of mass destruction and was driven from office in 2003 and was killed in 2006. The current government in Iraq is a strategic partner of the United States in the struggle against nonstate terror groups like ISIS and al-Qaida and poses no threat to our national security.

The 2002 AUMF does not authorize, and has never authorized, the use of force against Iran; yet it was invoked by National Security Advisor Robert O'Brien as a primary source of the administration's authority to engage in military hostilities against Iran, including the strike against Qasem Soleimani.

This is one problem with obsolete AUMFs hanging around decades after they were approved. Presidents can treat them like a loaded gun sitting on a table which can be picked up at will and used in a completely different context for a completely different reason.

The 2002 authorization must be repealed to ensure that no President now or in the future can use it as a pretextual justification for deploying military force without congressional authorization or a formal declaration of war as called for by the Constitution of the United States.

Madam Speaker, the Framers gave Congress the power to declare war because they had just had a revolution against the kings and the monarchs who, for centuries, plunged their populations into wars of vanity, intrigue, political advantage, and distraction of the population. The Framers understood that the power over life and death, over war and peace, was far too awesome to vest in one person, much less a political actor motivated by the desire for fame, prestige, and power. By giving Congress the exclusive power to declare war and to appropriate funds for war, the Framers made certain that the momentous decision to go to war, to send our troops into battle, would belong primarily to the representatives of the people, both the people who fight and die in our wars, their parents, and their families, and the communities that they are drawn from.

Over the last month, the President initiated a dramatic escalation of tensions with Iran without the consent of Congress and without consulting Congress pursuant to the War Powers Resolution of 1973. In the case of the strike against Qasem Soleimani, Congress was never consulted by President Trump, although he apparently spoke with several people who were guests of his at Mar-a-Lago, where the decisions were apparently being made.

On January 7, Iran retaliated for the killing of General Soleimani by launching ballistic missiles against our military and coalition forces in Iraq. We now know that at least 34 troops have been diagnosed with traumatic brain injuries from these strikes, injuries the President has dismissed as headaches. We have still yet to receive any legitimate explanation for the justification for the strike in Iraq, and the administration's subsequent briefing on these actions left far more questions than answers and troubled even many Republican Senators to the point of extreme frustration.

On January 8, when administration officials briefed Members of Congress on the President's actions, both Democrats and Republicans, alike, expressed grave concerns about the briefing, with one Member highlighting the administration had given no time, place, or method justifying the attacks. The President later said there were four threats to United States Embassies, an explanation which apparently was withdrawn in the aftermath. So we still don't know.

In any event, Madam Speaker, we need to return to the Constitution of the United States and the rule of law. The grave decision to go to war is one that belongs properly with Congress.

If we can send our sons and daughters into battle and ask them to exercise the most powerful courage in the world to do that, certainly, we can exercise and summon up the moral and political courage needed just to properly exercise our constitutional powers. We have the power and we have the duty to declare war when we engage in military hostilities abroad, and that is what we are doing with these two amendments.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume and thank my friend from Maryland for yielding.

Madam Speaker, it is not lost on me that you are in the chair for this debate; and having put in the years that you have put in working on this issue, I know you couldn't be down here for your amendment later on this afternoon. I am glad that you are in the chair today.

It matters, folks who invest themselves in ideas around here; and what I love about this Chamber is that, if a man or a woman, either side of the aisle, any region of the country, commits themselves to something, commits themselves in a transparent, heartfelt way, their colleagues respond to that.

I have had the great pleasure of voting for your amendments on this topic many times over the years because what my friend from Maryland says is exactly right. When it comes to matters of war and peace, this institution has, in many ways, by the wheelbarrow load, carried its authority down to 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue and left it down there, and the American people deserve better than that. Our men and women in uniform deserve better than that. And we, as stewards of this institution, can do better than that.

Though, while I am pleased to see you in the chair, Madam Speaker, I confess I regret that it is on this bill, at this time, in this way.

For decades, you have worked to build bipartisan support; you have not tried to work alone. When you have had to, you do go it alone. When you are going to be the only voice there, you will lead because you believe, and you will follow that path. But when you can, you build bridges.

What is so frustrating to me about the rule that is before us today is we have an opportunity to come together; we have an opportunity to speak with one voice; we have an opportunity to restore exactly the kind of dialogue that my friend from Maryland suggests this House owes the American people; and we are letting it slip.

□ 1245

I will start with the easier one. That is the Financial Services Committee bill that is wrapped up in this rule.

Madam Speaker, I don't know if you recall. It was just a few weeks ago we had another Financial Services Committee bill. It was H.R. 2534. It was the Insider Trading Prohibition Act.

It seems like something we ought to all be able to get together on, but it was brought to the floor in a partisan way with absolutely no consultation on the other side. It was going to be a straight party-line vote, but to the credit of the chairwoman and ranking member of the Financial Services Committee, they continued to work together right up until the Rules Committee finished its meeting—you know that is the last stop before the bill comes to the floor—and they found a bipartisan pathway forward.

They changed directions from what was going to be a straight party-line vote on the floor of the House that goes nowhere, to a vote—let me consult my notes because I want to be right—410-13 was the result when we got together and worked in a bipartisan way. That is a bill that is going to go somewhere.

All the challenges my friend in Maryland talked about with credit reporting agencies, they are real, and the ranking member on the Financial Services Committee agrees with that. In fact, he has a substitute that has supported those ideas in a bipartisan way that he wanted to make in order to try to get us away from a partisan path.

The Rules Committee, in its wisdom, voted on a party-line vote to deny the ranking member an opportunity to bring forward the bipartisan language that he had.

So, we will go down this partisan road. Again, that is a partisan road on protecting consumers. It is a shame that has to happen. This bill is going to go nowhere. The President has promised he will veto it. The Senate is not going to take it up. We are not going to protect any consumers. We had a chance to, and we let that slip. Shame on us.

As shameful as that is in the financial services space, as you know from your decades of work in the war and peace space, the consequences of failure for war and peace are even greater.

Time and time again, oftentimes with your leadership, this House has had opportunities to revisit the Authorization for Use of Military Force that it passed in 2001 and that it passed in 2002. Generally, it is in our appropriations bill, as you well know, because the committee of jurisdiction, the authorizing committee, the Foreign Affairs Committee, that has the ability to have a full-throated debate on this issue to decide whether to repeal, whether to replace, how to structure that, has not moved legislation forward. We are in that exact same place today.

You introduced your language, Madam Speaker, in May 2019. That is the language that this rule is going to stuff into the Congressional Gold Medal bill for merchant mariners. We will talk about that here in a bit. It is

going to stuff your language that you introduced in May that has never had a markup.

Now, you led this issue when President Bush was in the White House, and we didn't get a markup. You led this issue while President Obama was in the White House, and we didn't get a markup. You are now leading this issue while President Trump is in the White House, and we still have never had a markup.

Now, don't tell me about your commitment to men and women in uniform. Do not tell me about what our Framers intended and bring language that has never had a committee markup to the House floor.

I asked these questions last night in the Rules Committee, Madam Speaker. I said: So which operations that are going on in Iraq today are going to be curtailed if we repeal the AUMF tomorrow?

I am not misremembering, Madam Speaker. So many times, when you have offered this language, you offered it for a date certain in the future. You recognized that doing something immediately would have consequences that would be very difficult for men and women in uniform to deal with, difficult for the administration, difficult for our allies. So very often you said: Let's put this down the road 6 months, 9 months, 12 months. Let's be certain that we are going to be done with it, but let's give time to transition.

I asked: This language today, what is the impact of that?

I asked: Which members of the State Department have come to testify that this is not going to put our allies in a predicament, in a precarious predicament in Iraq?

The answer was: Well, we haven't had those hearings. We don't know those answers. We believe that we know, but we have not had those folks come to testify.

Well, what about the FBI? How is this going to impact counterterrorism operations?

Well, we have not had those conversations. We have not had that in an open hearing. We have not had a chance to talk about it.

Well, what does the Pentagon have to say?

Madam Speaker, we have an opportunity to do this in a thoughtful, bipartisan way.

The leadership that the new majority is providing in the House, candidly, gives you an opportunity to do things that might not have been possible in a Republican-led House. After your decade of work on that, I think you have earned that, and it would have been a bipartisan vote.

Instead, we are here today for a partisan exercise, with no input from the minority, that the President has already recommended a veto on.

I think our men and women in uniform deserve better. I think this institution deserves better.

Madam Speaker, I don't know if you were paying attention as the Reading Clerk read. He did not go through and read all the amendments that were offered.

For the very important issue of credit agencies and how we regulate them, the majority, in its wisdom, has made 14 amendments in order. Fourteen different ideas are going to be considered for how we regulate credit reporting agencies.

For the question of war and peace—what should be the wind-down timeline, how quickly should it take effect, who should be affected, what are the impacts of that, should it be replaced, should it just be repealed—for those very complicated life-and-death questions, no committee hearing, not one amendment made in order.

The majority, in its wisdom, has provided 1 hour of debate on the floor of the House.

My friend from Maryland is very adept at quoting our Framers. His knowledge of the Constitution runs deep. Debate has never meant an hour to come down to the House floor in a take-it-or-leave-it fashion. Debate, as our Framers intended it, meant that we were going to engage in dialogue with one another, that we were going to have a conversation about how to get it right together, that we were going to do what you have done for much of your career, in terms of building coalitions. We are doing none of it today.

Madam Speaker, I have 30 minutes on the rule. We will have an hour of a take-it-or-leave-it debate.

For our men and women in uniform, as I hold the veto threat from the White House here, and we are going to produce a partisan outcome with no hope of overriding a Presidential veto, if the Senate were even to take it up, which it won't, we are going to be absolutely no closer to achieving the goal that you and I have striven for together. In fact, I believe we are going to be further away from that goal at the end of this.

I used all the ability I had as a Rules Committee member to try to keep this from going forward last night because I believe it is a missed opportunity. But on a 9-4 party-line vote, I was defeated.

Madam Speaker, the only way to get back to the partnership that our men and women in uniform deserve, the partnership that the efforts that you have brought forward over the years have received, is to defeat this rule today and have the open hearing in the Foreign Affairs Committee, to have that testimony from the experts in this field, and then to move forward, not on a party-line vote that goes nowhere in this House, but in a big, big, bipartisan vote that moves through the Senate and either receives the President's signature or overrides that veto. This isn't going to get that done.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mas-

sachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), the distinguished chairman of the House Rules Committee.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN) for yielding me the time and for his leadership on the Rules Committee.

Madam Speaker, something has been happening over the last few decades. Power meant to be held in these Halls, granted to us by the Constitution, intentionally given to us by our Founders, has ended up instead in the hands of whoever sat in the Oval Office.

It wasn't stolen by any particular President. No, Madam Speaker. We gave it away.

Congresses run by both parties surrendered it to Democratic and Republican administrations alike year after year after year.

Nowhere is this more pronounced than when it comes to matters of war and peace. Make no mistake, the Constitution is clear on this: The President may be Commander in Chief, but only Congress has the power to declare war. It is right there in Article I, Section 8.

But we abdicated that responsibility. We have been too content to stand on the sidelines and watch as wars were crafted and carried out by the White House with virtually no input from the people's House.

Our troops, the very people we represent, have received orders to deploy. Taxpayer dollars have been shoveled overseas. Policies have changed from one administration to the next. But too often, Congress remained silent, not because we were too engaged on other urgent matters, but because we feared the political risk of a vote.

Many of our colleagues, on a bipartisan basis, have tried to force debates and votes. I have joined many of my colleagues, from ADAM SMITH and BARBARA LEE and RO KHANNA to TOM COLE and Walter Jones and MATT GAETZ.

In fact, I have stood here more than two dozen times and pleaded for the chance to vote on many conflicts, like Afghanistan, Iraq, and Syria.

Too often, these simple calls for debate were ignored, but these are precisely the issues our constituents sent us here to debate, the hard ones, the ones where lives are at stake.

Now, I don't care who is President. I don't care who controls the House. When our troops are ordered to engage, they do not do so casually. And once they are deployed, it is not easy for them to withdraw. We all know this. Wars are easy to start but are very, very hard to end.

This is why how they begin is the most crucial decision. It cannot be left to one person. The Constitution enshrines that power in our hands, the people's representatives, the people's voice, and the people's House.

Today, Madam Speaker, the process of reclaiming that authority begins. This rule contains two measures.

The first is a resolution from Congresswoman LEE to repeal the 2002 Iraq

AUMF. For nearly two decades, this AUMF has been used by multiple Presidents to unilaterally engage our troops in conflicts that Congress never imagined when it was first passed.

It was used to justify the recent strike against Iranian General Soleimani.

If you think the consequences are limited, bear in mind that 34 more of our troops now suffer from traumatic brain injuries from Iran's retaliatory strike.

Pay attention to the words of Marine General Frank McKenzie, U.S. commander in the Middle East, who told our troops on Thursday that 20,000 newly deployed troops to the region could be there for "quite a while."

Repealing this AUMF isn't just about ensuring that this President cannot use it as justification for asserting military force without proper congressional authorization. This vote is about ensuring that no President can.

The second item included in this rule is legislation from Congressman KHANNA to prohibit funding for military action against Iran that is not authorized by Congress.

The situation with Iran remains volatile. If tensions should escalate again and President Trump wants to use military force, he must come to Congress first, period.

These measures passed overwhelmingly as bipartisan amendments to the House-passed NDAA bill last year. These are not new items or new ideas. Unfortunately, both were stripped out of the bill in final conference.

It is my hope that this House will again approve these measures and that the Senate will recognize the urgency of their passage.

Madam Speaker, I have heard a lot of talk about what it means to support our troops. Let me just say this: We respect their service when we give them an honest, thoughtful debate about their sacrifice, about possible deployments that impact not only them but their families and their loved ones.

Members of our military put their lives on the line for this country. The least we can do is have the guts to vote on their fate.

Let's respect our troops. Let's respect this institution. Let's finally get back to respecting the Constitution, doing our jobs, and voting on issues of war and peace.

I have to tell you, I am just sick and tired of hearing excuse after excuse, not only now, but over the last several years, from my colleagues as to why we can't have these debates, why we can't vote on these issues.

Madam Speaker, it is time now for my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying measure.

□ 1300

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to amend the

rule to provide for a motion to recommit on the Senate amendment to H.R. 550 so that minority voices can be heard on the critical issue of war.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would advise that all time has been yielded for the purpose of debate only.

Does the gentleman from Maryland yield for the purpose of this unanimous consent request?

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, no, I do not yield for that purpose. All time is yielded for the purpose of debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland does not yield; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. KEVIN HERN) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to amend the rule to provide for a motion to recommit on the Senate amendment to H.R. 550 so that minority voices can be heard on the critical issue of war.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Maryland has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. GUTHRIE) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to amend the rule to provide for a motion to recommit on the Senate amendment to H.R. 550 so that minority voices can be heard on the critical issue of war.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Maryland has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX), because I have seen the gentleman from Maryland change his mind many times over the years when he was on the wrong side of an issue to make himself right.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to amend the rule to provide for a motion to recommit on the Senate amendment to H.R. 550 so that minority voices can be heard on the critical issue of war.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Maryland has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GRIFFITH) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to amend the rule to provide for a motion to recommit on the Senate amendment to H.R. 550 so that minority voices can be heard on the critical issue of war.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman

from Maryland has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. MILLER) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mrs. MILLER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to amend the rule to provide for a motion to recommit on the Senate amendment to H.R. 550 so that minority voices can be heard on the critical issue of war.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Maryland has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. LAMBORN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to amend the rule to provide for a motion to recommit on the Senate amendment to H.R. 550 so that minority voices can be heard on the critical issue of war.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Maryland has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. JOYCE) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to amend the rule to provide for a motion to recommit on the Senate amendment to H.R. 550 so that minority voices can be heard on the critical issue of war.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Maryland has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. OLSON) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. OLSON. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to amend the rule to provide for a motion to recommit on the Senate amendment to H.R. 550 so that minority voices can be heard on the critical issue of war.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Maryland has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. CONAWAY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to amend the rule to provide for a motion to recommit on the Senate amendment to H.R. 550 so that minority voices can be heard on the critical issue of war.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Maryland has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLER) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. KELLER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to amend the rule to provide for a motion to recommit on the Senate amendment to H.R. 550 so that minority voices can be heard on the critical issue of war.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Maryland has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BABIN) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. BABIN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to amend the rule to provide for a motion to recommit on the Senate amendment to H.R. 550 so that minority voices can be heard on this critical issue of war.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Maryland has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. CHABOT. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to amend the rule to provide for a motion to recommit on the Senate amendment to H.R. 550 so that minority voices can be heard on the critical issue of war.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Maryland has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SPANO) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. SPANO. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to amend the rule to make in order the Cole-McCarthy amendment that would ensure the President can protect the United States and our ally, Israel.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would advise that all time has been yielded for the purpose of debate only.

Does the gentleman from Maryland yield for the purpose of this unanimous consent request?

Mr. RASKIN. No, I do not. I have yielded for the purpose of debate only, and I would love to have a real debate about the resolution that is before us.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland does not yield; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

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

Madam Speaker, I share with my friend from Maryland that if the gentleman is interested in a real debate, the gentleman would allow minority voices to be heard.

If the gentleman is not following this, the reason that Members are coming to the floor to make this request is because these resolutions, as they pertain to dealing with Iran, do nothing to protect our ally, our strongest friend in the Middle East, Israel, and we would like to make sure that Israel is protected.

I ask my friend if he would yield for the debate on protecting our friend, Israel, and to have an opportunity for not dozens of minority amendments, but my friends are asking unanimous consent for one single Republican amendment to the underlying bill: a right that has been guaranteed to the minority for over 100 years, but has been turned off by clever procedural tricks in this particular rule today.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to amend the rule to make in order the Cole-McCarthy amendment that would ensure the President can protect the United States and our ally, Israel.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Maryland has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. POSEY) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request, understanding that my friend from Maryland has called for a real debate.

Mr. POSEY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to amend the rule to make in order the Cole-McCarthy amendment that would ensure the President can protect the United States and our ally, Israel.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Maryland has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MEUSER).

Mr. MEUSER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to amend the rule to make in order the Cole-McCarthy amendment that would ensure the President can protect the United States and our ally, Israel.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Maryland has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. MARSHALL. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to amend the rule to make in order the Cole-McCarthy amendment that would ensure the President can protect the United States and her ally, Israel.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman

from Maryland has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. WALDEN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that we would amend this rule, which then would make in order the Cole-McCarthy amendment.

Now, that amendment would ensure the President can protect the United States and our ally, Israel. I don't think that is asking too much.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Maryland has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

The Chair would advise Members that even though a unanimous consent request is not entertained, embellishments accompanying such requests constitute debate and will become an imposition on the time of the Member who yielded for that purpose.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to amend the rule to make in order the Cole-McCarthy amendment that would ensure the President can protect the United States and our ally, Israel.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Maryland has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to amend the rule to make in order the Cole-McCarthy amendment that would ensure that the President can protect the United States and our ally, Israel.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Maryland has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to amend the rule to make in order the Cole-McCarthy amendment that will ensure the President can protect the understand and our ally, Israel.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Maryland has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to amend the rule to make in order the Cole-McCarthy amendment that would ensure the President can protect the United States and our ally, Israel.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Maryland has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. PALMER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to amend the rule to make in order the Cole-McCarthy amendment that would ensure the President can protect the United States and our ally, Israel.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Maryland has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

□ 1315

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

Madam Speaker, your rulings here today follow very clearly the Rules Committee meeting we had just across the Chamber last night that allowed for absolutely no amendment or discussion of any kind on two war resolutions that have received no markup of any kind in the committee of jurisdiction.

I know that seemed like a bothersome and worrisome procedural process to have just gone through. Madam Speaker, in those few minutes that you were ruling those unanimous consent requests out of order, we have just discussed whether or not our commitment to Israel and its safety and security will be hampered by the underlying Khanna amendment in more detail than any committee of jurisdiction has ever done. In these few minutes of Members' asking for a debate and being told no, ironically, when time was yielded for the purpose of debate only, we have discussed the issue more than in any markup in any committee of jurisdiction.

There is not one Member of this Chamber who does not think our Nation's sons and daughters in uniform deserve better. There is not one Member of this Chamber who does not think our ally Israel deserves better.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I rarely fail to be moved by my good friend from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL) with his directness, his charm, and his legislative prowess. But I have to say I fail to be moved by this last jack-in-the-box procedural maneuver of people getting up and asking for unanimous consent to do something that my friends failed to do for the last 8 years when they could have had a hearing at any point on the War Powers Act, yet they didn't do it.

Now, I believe that all of my friends who got up in the line were operating under a misapprehension because there was a hearing in the House Foreign Affairs Committee on January 14—that is about 2 weeks ago—called “From Sanctions to the Soleimani Strike to Escalation: Evaluating the Administration's Iran Policy” and all the implications in terms of Congress' war powers.

For the life of me, I can't understand why my good friend is not joining us today. I understand that it is always possible to summon up a procedural objection when the substantive task at hand is too difficult to do politically. I understand this would require people to make the President of the United States mad because, like every President before him—and this is a bipartisan issue, as Chairman MCGOVERN said—this President wants to be able to decide for himself whether or not the United States of America is going to be plunged into war.

The very simple proposition that we bring before the House that everybody in the Chamber can speak to right now, and everybody in the Chamber can vote on, is the repeal of the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002.

That was 18 years ago. We have kids who could die in a war against Iran in Iraq, or a war in Iran, based on this resolution, and they weren't even born when this Authorization of Use of Military Force was adopted by Congress.

The real question is: Are we going to have the courage to stand up for the Constitution and to stand up for our constituents and say that we will not go to war unless there is a specific statutory authorization by Congress or a declaration of war or there is an actual attack on the United States such that the President is really acting in self-defense?

Both Democratic and Republican Members of Congress were bewildered and frustrated by the presentation of this administration as to why the United States of America needed to commit that strike when they did.

There were changing stories. About every 20 minutes, we got a new story about why it was necessary. I have not heard a single word on the other side—to their credit—defending any of the justifications or rationalizations or pretexts that were offered by the administration.

So, we come back to a constitutional point that is not difficult, and that is one that came up at that Foreign Affairs Committee hearing a couple of weeks ago. It is one that we talked about in the Rules Committee last night in debate. It is one that every one of us is invited to join in right now on the floor of the House to discuss, which is the one that was made by the chairman of the Rules Committee.

I have to say a word in honor of our great chair on the Rules Committee. He has been invoking the Constitution and the exclusive power of Congress to declare war for two decades, through

Democratic Presidents, Republican Presidents, Bushes, Clintons, Obamas, and now Trump. He has been saying the same thing, which is that we should not be committing American troops to wars abroad without a vote of Congress, which was the explicit design of the Framers of the Constitution.

Go back to the Preamble of the Constitution:

We the people, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, ensure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and preserve to ourselves and our posterity the blessings of liberty do hereby ordain and establish the Constitution of the United States of America.

The very next sentence in Article I states that the legislative power is vested in a Congress of the United States, a House of Representatives and a Senate. Then, it sets forth all of our powers, including the power to declare war, the power of taxes, the power to appropriate money, the power to raise armies, the power to maintain a navy, and so on. All of that is with Congress.

You go all the way through Article I, Madam Speaker, and then you get to Article II, where the President is denominated the Commander in Chief of the Army and the Navy in times of actual conflict and insurrection, and the President's core job is to take care that the laws are faithfully executed.

That includes the Constitution itself, of course, and it includes the War Powers Resolution of 1973.

This is a very clear principle. It is a constitutional axiom we are advancing today. We had a hearing on it a couple of weeks ago, but we don't need weeks and months of hearings. Obviously, our good friends didn't think it required any hearings over the 8 years that they were in control of the House of Representatives.

It is a simple proposition, which is that the war power belongs to Congress. We have to declare war. We can't run away from it any more than our brave troops can run away from battle when they have been committed to battle.

All we are saying is that if there is going to be war against Iran, if there is going to be a war against the new government in Iraq—not Saddam Hussein, who is gone and dead—then we have to declare the war; we have to authorize the war; and we have to debate and deliberate over it as contemplated by the Founders of our country. That is our job.

We had a bipartisan vote invoking the War Powers Resolution on January 9. It ended up 224–194, but we had Democrats and Republicans invoking the War Powers Resolution with respect to the situation in Iran.

Again, I am not quite sure why our colleagues don't want to do this with us. I understand it is easier to do it when the opposing party is in the White House, but we have many Members on both sides of the aisle who have demonstrated their courage by invoking the War Powers Resolution and by

standing up for the Constitution. That is what we have to do today, and we have the perfect opportunity and legislative vehicle to do it right now.

I reserve the remainder of my time, Madam Speaker.

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

Madam Speaker, I don't question my friend from Maryland's passion at all. He says that we have the perfect vehicle to get this done today. I refer you back to the rule. That perfect vehicle is called H.R. 550, the Merchant Mariners of World War II Congressional Gold Medal Act of 2019.

You haven't heard us talk about merchant mariners or gold medals yet today because, as you know, Madam Speaker, this rule would strip out all the language in the underlying bill that deals with gold medals and merchant mariners and replace it with matters of war and peace.

I will quote the author of one of the amendments that is stuffed into the merchant mariners bill in place of the merchant mariners language, Mr. KHANNA, who said in Politico last week: "Majority Leader Hoyer has done an excellent job in figuring out a procedure for how we can get a vote on the floor on these bills without an MTR," a motion to recommit.

Madam Speaker, a motion to recommit is what you heard folks asking unanimous consent for. A motion to recommit in this case would be the only opportunity for any voices to be heard at all on this issue.

My friend from Maryland proudly talks about a single hearing that was held 2 weeks ago, but it wasn't held on this bill. There has been not one markup, not one word, discussed in committee, marked up, and reported to the floor of this House—not one.

My friend from Maryland says that we have to debate and deliberate over matters of this gravity, that that is our job.

Madam Speaker, let's do our job: debate and deliberate.

What does it tell you? That I have been voting with the Speaker on these issues for almost a decade, on issues of war and peace, and I am offended by the process that you are using to bring this to the floor the first time.

Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS).

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

Again, just to recapitulate, today's rule provides for consideration of legislation to do two things: one, to limit funding for any military action in or against Iran; and, two, repeal the 2002 Authorization for Use of Military Force. I do believe it is correct to advocate for Congress to retake Article I powers, and it is correct to negotiate a new Authorization for Use of Military Force.

I was not here in 2002. I was not able to vote on that legislation. However,

we should not repeal the existing 2002 authorization without a hearing, without a markup, and without fully assessing how it will affect our troops in the region. Further, we should evaluate whether or not a new Authorization for Use of Military Force should take its place.

In fact, 2 or 3 weeks ago, Democratic leadership of this House brought H. Con. Res. 83. The House passed this earlier this month. In the findings, the majority stated: "The United States has national interests in preserving its partnership with Iraq." Yet, here we are now just a few weeks later considering a repeal of that very authority.

If it was important 3 weeks ago, how did it become unimportant today? We don't know because we haven't had a hearing.

Limiting funding for any military action in and against Iran simply broadcasts our plans or lack thereof to the enemy, potentially inciting further aggression. Weakness is provocative.

I voted for an amendment to the National Defense Authorization Act prohibiting funding for authorized military action in Iran because it was offered, considered, and voted on following regular order. But neither piece of legislation addressing war authorities before us today has been marked up or has had committee consideration.

We heard last night in the Rules Committee that there have been hearings focused on Iran and that, in fact, suffices. But, realistically, regional hearings do not allow for the serious discussion required for an Authorization for Use of Military Force and including funding for military action.

In addition, currently, the Democratic majority is using a vehicle that removes minority Republicans' ability to offer that one opportunity to amend the bill that is known as the motion to recommit. That is a long-honored tradition of both sides that there should at least be one opportunity for the minority to be heard.

So, I believe it is wrong to rush to limit war authorities, and it is irresponsible.

Do you know what, Madam Speaker? In a dangerous world, it is downright dangerous. Congress should be authorizing action through a renegotiated Authorization for Use of Military Force rather than passing a resolution prohibiting funding for military activity.

□ 1330

I remember on the floor of this House, a former colleague, Rob Simmons from Connecticut, a Republican, when there was an effort to limit funding during the most kinetic part of the Iraq war. Mr. Simmons had served in the Armed Forces during the Vietnam conflict, and he related, from one of these very podia, how, as a young soldier in Vietnam, he had heard that Congress had withdrawn the funding for what he was doing. I will never forget his words. He said: At that mo-

ment, I hated the United States Congress.

That is the effect we can have on the young men and women whom we have sent to answer the call of duty, that Congress could and should be working to provide the necessary authorities for our Commander in Chief as he directs these brave young men and women in uniform rather than broadcasting our limitations to the enemy.

Again, weakness is provocative.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland has 5½ minutes remaining.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time to close.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, we will offer an amendment to the rule that will make in order a bipartisan resolution, an amendment to deal with fentanyl and its listing on schedule I.

Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN) for the purpose of explaining that previous question vote.

Mr. WALDEN. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague and friend on the Rules Committee for yielding me the time.

Our proposal to defeat the previous question and offer this amendment would do no underlying violence to the two bills—it has nothing to do with them—but it would save lives of all kinds of people in America.

You see, fentanyl is a synthetic, manmade opioid. It is 50 times more potent than heroin. It is 100 times more potent than morphine. It is a scheduled drug under the Controlled Substances Act. However, Madam Speaker, drug traffickers are able to make small changes to fentanyl and its chemical structure, and that creates a new variation of the substance.

Now, these so-called analogues are not on the schedule of controlled drugs. They are outside of the control of law enforcement, and they are incredibly dangerous—may I say, deadly.

For example, one of these analogues, carfentanyl, is 100 times as potent as the same amount of fentanyl, 5,000 times more potent than a unit of heroin, and 10,000 times as potent as a unit of morphine.

Now, the creation of analogues outpaced the Drug Enforcement Administration's ability to schedule them, so the DEA used emergency authorities to place all of the analogues in schedule I.

The Controlled Substances Act, the CSA, provides the Attorney General with the authority to temporarily place a substance in schedule I of the CSA for 2 years if he finds that such action is necessary to avoid an imminent hazard to the public safety. In 2018, the Trump administration's DEA used this authority to place fentanyl analogues and fentanyl-like substances on that schedule I.

So here is the issue: The emergency scheduling order expires next Thursday, February 6, and Congress has yet

to extend it. The Senate passed an extension, Madam Speaker, I believe, unanimously; but, so far, Democrats in the House have not acted.

There is no excuse for this. There is no reason for this. Lives will be lost. We have seen a series of delay tactics, and that is leading to an expiration of this incredibly important authority.

With the United States Senate dealing with impeachment, there is no time for the House to generate a new product, a different bill, before this expires. So the House needs to pass the Senate extension this week so law enforcement does not lose or have a lapse on this important capability to fight fentanyl, which is deadly, which is added to heroin, which causes deaths all across America.

We are using this limited tool we have asking for a defeat of the previous question so that we can offer this should-be-unanimous amendment to get it on a vehicle so it can become law.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, I am prepared to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to put the text of our amendment to amend the rule to add S. 3201 in the RECORD immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

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

Everything we have talked about has been partisan and divisive. What you have just heard from the gentleman from Oregon is to say, in the midst of why ever it is the majority has chosen to use this rule today to move partisan priorities, to make statements instead of policy, that we have one opportunity to make policy, actual policy, policy that passed the Senate unanimously, policy that America needs, desires, that is going to expire next week, and that, if we added it today, would go straight to the President's desk for his approval.

I can't count the number of times my colleagues have said that issues deserve debate. I didn't come here to be part of a debating society. I came here to be a part of a getting-something-done group, conscientious men and women who want to do the best they can to serve their constituents.

My friend from Oregon is offering us a chance to do exactly that today, and I would ask my friends—they have seen fit to use a very strange procedure to turn a Congressional Gold Medal for merchant mariners bill into a bill on war and peace. They have seen fit to strip away an opportunity for any voices to be heard on any of those measures whatsoever.

They could, as long as they are setting precedent, go ahead and support our defeat of the previous question

today to add one more item so that we don't leave here today having just made a point, so that we can leave here today having made a difference, as my friend from Oregon is giving us the opportunity to do.

Mr. WALDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODALL. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. WALDEN. Madam Speaker, the gentleman's passionate statements are all accurate and true. It was not that long ago we came together as a Congress, the last Congress, under my leadership of the Energy and Commerce Committee, and passed nearly 60 pieces of legislation into one, the SUPPORT Act, that deals with the opioid crisis, the substance use disorder crisis in America, and one of the key points of that was dealing with this illegal fentanyl that is coming in.

If we let this authority expire, the real practical consequence is these evil actors, these chemists in their labs, will simply alter the chemical makeup, which they do all the time, create an even more deadly or powerful fentanyl that can go into heroin and other drugs and kill our citizens, and they can do that lawfully because that new substance will not be covered.

Now, we would hope the majority would move the Senate bill. But we have seen no text; we have heard no schedule. This authority expires next week on February 6, and we only have a legislative day or two left.

Madam Speaker, lives hang in the balance. This, we should adopt.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I know my friend from Maryland is prepared to close.

We had a bipartisan pathway forward on credit reporting agencies and reform, but the majority, in its wisdom, saw fit to shut those voices out; and this rule makes in order a partisan pathway forward that will go to the President's desk, if it makes it through the Senate, for a veto.

For decades, you have worked to build bipartisan support for finally re-examining an AUMF that should have been reexamined decades ago. The majority, in its wisdom, has decided to shut out all voices, Republican and Democrat, hold no markups, change language not at all, and make a partisan exercise of what should be a bipartisan issue, in this House; and my friend from Oregon is offering us an opportunity to take what has always been a bipartisan effort to protect our young people from the harms of opioids, to prevent traffickers from making chemical changes that allow them to thwart the law, and move that to the President's desk immediately.

Madam Speaker, defeat the previous question. Defeat the previous question so that we can at least do one thing that we know will make a difference today, one thing that will bring us together, one thing the Senate did unanimously and the President would put a

signature on tomorrow. Let's do that one thing: defeat the previous question.

I tell my colleagues, if they won't defeat the previous question, they are going to have to defeat the rule, because they have turned protecting consumers into a partisan exercise, protecting men and women in uniform into a partisan exercise, and all of the goodwill that men and women of this Chamber have put into building for decades becomes a little bit weaker today.

Defeat the previous question; if not, defeat the rule.

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

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

I want to thank my good friend from Georgia for our robust and active exchange today.

We came to debate matters of war and peace and the reassertion of Congress' essential constitutional powers over the declaration of war and the commitment of our troops and our funds to foreign wars.

These are critical issues that our friends, when they were in charge of the Chamber, routinely ignored; but we are confronting them, and we invite them in enthusiastically to be part of this process of reasserting Congress' war powers.

But the minority's previous question is obviously unnecessary and an irrelevant distraction from the important issues that we have come to address. And I want to be clear about this: It is an unnecessary distraction because the House majority leader committed this morning to bringing up S. 3201, which extends the ban on all fentanyl-based substances. It took place this morning. Check docs.house.gov, which has the complete running explanation of what is taking place. This morning, he scheduled it for the very first item of business tomorrow.

So the bill that my friends are valiantly promising to bring to the floor if we defeat the previous question is already scheduled to be considered as the first item of business tomorrow morning under suspension of the House rules.

And I will remind my colleagues of what defeating the previous question means. It gives control of the floor to the minority. We are not going to do that because we are here to prevent unauthorized war with Iran; to repeal the obsolete and unnecessary 2002 AUMF, which addressed the situation with Saddam Hussein; and to modernize the credit reporting system, which is failing millions of Americans, our constituents.

For all of the reasons that we have discussed during this robust debate, we need to ensure that the whole House gets the chance to vote on all of these things: on the repeal of the 2002 Iraq AUMF and on reforming the credit reporting system so our people have better access to credit and we have real transparency and fairness in people's credit reports and credit scores.

I hope that all of our colleagues, both in the majority and the minority, will join us in voting “yes” on the previous question and “yes” on this rule so we can move on to serious, thoughtful, deliberate consideration of all of these critical measures that we bring before the Congress and the American people.

I also hope that all of our colleagues will join me in supporting S. 3201, the fentanyl legislation, which our colleague discussed, on suspension tomorrow.

Mr. WALDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RASKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. WALDEN. Madam Speaker, we agree on the fentanyl issue, I think.

My understanding is that the leader posted this, Madam Speaker, at 11:50 this morning, about a half an hour after we posted our previous question proposal to bring this to the floor.

We are just curious what text, when it is scheduled. We need to resolve this issue, we would agree.

□ 1345

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, reclaiming my time. I am thrilled to be able to assure the gentleman that we are taking up the exact Senate bill in its exact verbatim text.

Mr. WALDEN. Madam Speaker, I ask the gentleman when that will occur.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, this will occur tomorrow morning on the first bill at 12:15, 12:30. It is the first bill.

Madam Speaker, let me just say that I hope our friends take yes for an answer, and I hope that this will perhaps usher in their ability to support the underlying legislation here because I know that they agree with us that the Constitution gives the House of Representatives and the Senate the power to declare war. It gives Congress the power to declare war, to spend money on war. We should not allow a President of any party—Democratic, Republican, or anything else—to usurp that power and to engage in unilateral Presidential wars without our specific authorization, without our declaration, unless there is an attack on the land, the people of the United States, or our Armed Forces, as specified in the War Powers Resolution.

Madam Speaker, I urge a “yes” vote on the rule and the previous question.

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

AMENDMENT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 811

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 bill (S. 3201) to extend the temporary scheduling order for fentanyl-related substances, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill 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 Energy & Commerce; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 7. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of S. 3201.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam 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 on the resolution.

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.

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.

GLOBAL HOPE ACT OF 2019

Mr. PHILLIPS. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5338) to authorize the Secretary of State to pursue public-private partnerships, innovative financing mechanisms, research partnerships, and coordination with international and multilateral organizations to address childhood cancer globally, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5338

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 “Global Hope Act of 2019”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Approximately 300,000 children aged 0 to 19 years old are diagnosed with cancer each year.

(2) The most common categories of childhood cancers include leukemia, brain cancer, lymphoma, and solid tumors, such as neuroblastoma and Wilms tumor.

(3) Most childhood cancers can be cured with generic medicines and can be cost-effective for all income levels.

(4) In the United States, the survival rate for children diagnosed with cancer is over 80 percent. In many developing countries, the mortality rate of children diagnosed with cancer is around 80 percent. In some parts of Africa, the mortality rate reaches 90 percent.

(5) In September 2018, the World Health Organization announced a new effort—the Global Initiative for Childhood Cancer—with

the aim of reaching at least a 60-percent survival rate for children with cancer by 2030, thereby saving an additional 1,000,000 lives.

SEC. 3. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress as follows:

(1) The work of the United States on infectious disease remains the core tenet of United States work on global health.

(2) As the United States and international partners continue to succeed in lowering incidences of infectious diseases, global mortality rates of non-communicable diseases will become an increasing burden that must be addressed.

(3) The United States should work to support the goals of the World Health Organization Initiative for Childhood Cancer, helping increase survival rates for children with cancer.

SEC. 4. STATEMENT OF POLICY.

The United States shall seek to—

(1) increase political commitment for childhood cancer diagnosis, treatment, and care globally;

(2) support efforts to increase the survival rate of children with cancer globally;

(3) support efforts to train medical personnel and develop the capabilities of other existing healthcare infrastructure to diagnose, treat, and care for childhood cancer;

(4) improve access to affordable and essential medicines and technologies that treat childhood cancer;

(5) elevate and prioritize efforts to reduce the mortality rate of childhood cancer in international organizations such as the United Nations;

(6) pursue research and research partnerships with international institutions to identify low-cost interventions and best practices to diagnose, treat, and care for childhood cancer in the United States and globally; and

(7) improve partnerships with international health ministries and pharmaceutical companies to facilitate efforts for broader, global clinical trials for medicines to treat or care for childhood cancer in the United States and globally.

SEC. 5. AUTHORIZATION.

The Secretary of State, in coordination with the heads of relevant Federal departments and agencies, is authorized and encouraged to—

(1) pursue public-private partnerships, other research partnerships, and innovative financing mechanisms to address childhood cancer globally; and

(2) coordinate with appropriate agencies of the United Nations and other relevant multilateral organizations to address childhood cancer globally.

SEC. 6. REPORT.

Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall submit to the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate a report that includes the following:

(1) An assessment of opportunities for United States engagement in global efforts to increase the worldwide survival rate of children with cancer.

(2) An assessment of efforts taken by the United States to support efforts to increase the worldwide survival rate of children with cancer.

(3) An assessment of existing programs funded by the United States that could be expanded to support efforts to increase the worldwide survival rate of children with cancer.

(4) An assessment of how such increased international engagement could positively affect—

(A) survival rates of individuals with childhood cancer in the United States; and

(B) reductions in the rates of infant and pediatric morbidity and mortality.

SEC. 7. COST LIMITATION.

No additional funds are authorized to be appropriated to carry out the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 8. CHILDHOOD CANCER DEFINED.

In this Act, the term “childhood cancer” means cancers formed or diagnosed in individuals under the age of 20.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PHILLIPS) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PHILLIPS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 5338.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, the measure before us is a wonderful bipartisan bill written by Ranking Member MCCAUL and supported by Chairman ENGEL.

Every year, more than 300,000 children from all around the world are diagnosed with childhood cancer, and their lives are instantly turned upside down.

Among them is my very own daughter, Pia, who was diagnosed with Hodgkin's lymphoma when she was 14 years old. While she has since been cured and is among the very lucky ones, as a father, I know all too well the horror that devastates way too many families around the world every single day.

The Global Hope Act works to leverage the resources developed in the United States to explore public-private partnerships in the fight against childhood cancer all around the globe.

It calls on the Secretary of State to coordinate these activities across the executive branch on this very important initiative and to submit a report assessing current efforts and future opportunities to end such heart-wrenching suffering.

This is a good and very commonsense bill to expand the global fight against childhood cancer. I commend the ranking member for his outstanding work on this issue, and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting it.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of my bill, the Global Hope Act. I am proud to have introduced this bill with my good friend, Chairman ELIOT ENGEL. I thank the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PHILLIPS) for his strong support and his personal story. I also thank the co-chair of the Childhood

Cancer Caucus, JACKIE SPEIER, for her tireless work with me in the caucus to help these children.

I have been a tireless advocate for these children with cancer since I first came to Congress. In 2010, I helped found the Childhood Cancer Caucus really to give a voice to patients, advocates, and the children.

This endeavor is deeply personal for me, as well. Growing up in elementary school, my best friend passed away from leukemia. Back then, it was a death sentence.

Since founding the caucus, we have been very successful. Congress passed bipartisan legislation to improve cancer treatment options, boost research opportunities, and address health issues of the nearly 500,000 long-term childhood cancer survivors.

Today, childhood cancer is largely treatable with an 80 percent, 5-year survival rate in the United States.

Unfortunately, in developing countries, the opposite is true. Children diagnosed with cancer in developing countries have an 80 percent mortality rate.

Madam Speaker, in sub-Saharan Africa, the mortality rate of children diagnosed with cancer is as high as 90 percent. This says nothing of the tens of thousands of cases that are believed to go undiagnosed every year.

I truly believe that a child's birthplace should not determine their fate from cancer. That is why I introduced the Global Hope Act.

My bill authorizes the Secretary of State to pursue public-private partnerships, increase access to treatment options, train health professionals, and, ultimately, improve care for children with cancer in developing countries. These partnerships will leverage decades of U.S. investments to strengthen health infrastructure and build the capacity of health ministries.

This legislation does not take away funds from other critical global health interventions and infectious disease efforts. Rather, these public-private partnerships will build on existing programs to improve childhood cancer survival rates.

Organizations such as Texas Children's Hospital and St. Jude, private sector partners such as Bristol-Myers Squibb and Teva, and nonprofits such as ACCESS are already starting this important work and are now seeing results in Botswana and other nations. These efforts are also supported by the World Health Organization's Global Childhood Cancer Initiative.

Launched in 2018, the WHO aims to build political support and institutional capacity to treat childhood cancer in developing countries. The initiative set a goal of saving an additional 1 million lives by 2030.

For the past two decades, the United States has been a global leader in funding health programs around the world, and I am proud to support this life-saving work.

Most recently, we passed a resolution affirming the U.S. commitment to the

Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria and secured robust funding in the fiscal year 2020 appropriations bill.

Our work to fight HIV/AIDS and eradicate other infectious diseases is far from over. But there is a critical opportunity to build on the successes of these global health programs and integrate projects aimed at improving childhood cancer care and available treatment options.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this important, life-saving measure, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER), my friend and co-chair of the Childhood Cancer Caucus.

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Minnesota for granting me the time.

To my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL), let me say that this will be the most significant piece of legislation that you can take great pride in having authored, as your career continues in this august body. I can't begin to say how grateful I am to be working with you, not just on this bill but on our Childhood Cancer Caucus and the great work that you have done.

This particular bill, the Global Hope Act, will have a profound impact on children around the world who have been diagnosed with cancer, 80 percent of whom die because of that diagnosis, while here in the United States, 80 percent of those children now live.

This is a remarkable effort that we must embrace wholeheartedly on both sides of the aisle.

The Chinese effort, the Belt and Road Initiative, where they are investing in concrete around the world, says something about their values. This shows that we, in this country, are investing in people, particularly in children around the world, to save their lives.

I join my colleague, again, in saying how important this legislation is, how enthusiastically I support it, and how, as we move forward, we can recognize that this is the kind of leadership that will bring peace around the world.

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

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Speaker, I am prepared to close, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, let me thank my dear friend, JACKIE SPEIER, for her leadership on this issue and as the co-chair of the caucus. I think we can prove that, in this toxic, partisan, difficult time in this Congress, we can work across the aisle, Republican and Democrat, but most importantly as Americans, to get good things done for not only the American people but for the world and save the children of the world.

I think Congresswoman SPEIER is correct. We passed a lot of bills together that have saved lives, but I

think this one probably is the most profound one. It is very difficult to pass a bill in the Congress, much less get it signed into law, but when you pass a bill and see it saving lives, that is perhaps the most remarkable and gratifying experience I have personally had in my eight terms in Congress.

Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman so much for her friendship.

Madam Speaker, in closing, I remember being in Texas Children's Hospital in September 2018 to hear from the President of Botswana about the project Global HOPE initiative inspired by Baylor College of Medicine and their early work against HIV/AIDS and the epidemic in Africa. Global HOPE is starting to deliver childhood cancer care in sub-Saharan Africa, as I speak.

At the event, when I met the President of Botswana, where the Global HOPE Act was recently constructed in a new pediatric facility in Botswana, which I will be visiting next month with my little, childhood cancer survivor, Sadie Keller. It is starting to train a new generation of Botswanan oncologists.

What I was most impressed by was when he told me about the legacy of PEPFAR and what we did as a Nation. He said: PEPFAR saved a generation of my people from extinction—from "extinction."

It is my hope that this bill saves a generation of children from this dreaded disease. I believe that childhood cancer can be the next successful Global HOPE initiative that will save lives.

Madam Speaker, I want to thank, particularly, Dr. Poplack, who was the chief oncologist at Texas Children's. He is the one who is responsible for this initiative. We are taking their initiative and turning it into law in the Congress. I will be there next month to commemorate International Children's Cancer Day.

Madam Speaker, I do want to reference, too, my little childhood cancer fighter and survivor, Sadie Keller. She came into my office, and there are a lot of lobbyists in this town, but the children had no voice. They had no power. That is why JACKIE and I formed the Childhood Cancer Caucus, to give them a voice.

□ 1400

When she entered my office—she is 7 years old here—in her pink dress, I knew I had met somebody very special. I canceled my calendar, my schedule for the rest of the day, and I took her on a tour of the Capitol.

Here we are looking—we had no idea they were even taking pictures—but I took her to the Rotunda in the Capitol. I remember we spun around and looked at the top of the Capitol.

Then I took her out to the Speaker's balcony, one of the most beautiful views in this Capitol building. Looking out on the horizon toward the future, seeing the ominous dark clouds, but also a ray of sunshine. The sunshine

that is coming in, the sunshine that little Sadie has brought to my life, the sunshine that we are trying to bring to all these children out there who have gone through some really tough experiences. I have met many of them, like the Congressman from Minnesota's daughter, and it is very heartbreaking to see them in the hospitals. Some survive, and some don't.

But this effort will take it to the next step, to take our fight against this dreaded disease. We have done so much to help children in the United States. The FDA's approval of CAR T, which takes your own immune system and attacks your own cancer through your own T cells, rather than injecting chemo—which is really a derivative of World War I mustard gas, which has been banned from the battlefield, which kills the cancer just before it kills you.

You can imagine the survivorship issues with these children, because they have the rest of their lives, if they survive, to deal with.

So, I want to thank all those friends of mine on the other side of the aisle for helping me move this forward. This is a momentous day for our fight against childhood cancer. It is a momentous day to take it global and take the fight globally.

I look forward to this bill's passage in the Senate and it being signed into law.

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

Mr. PHILLIPS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume for the purpose of closing.

Madam Speaker, childhood cancer is devastating; yet, many types can now be treated effectively and at relatively low cost. It is incumbent on all of us to make sure the United States' policy is working toward this end and doing what we can to stop the suffering.

The Global Hope Act is a good measure that leverages the resources developed here in the United States to explore public/private partnerships to fight childhood cancer all around the globe.

I am very grateful to Ranking Member MCCAUL for his dedication and tireless work on this cause.

I am proud to support this, and I urge all my fellow Members to do the same.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PHILLIPS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5338, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUPPORTING THE RIGHTS OF THE PEOPLE OF IRAN TO FREE EXPRESSION

Mr. PHILLIPS. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 752) supporting the rights of the people of Iran to free expression, condemning the Iranian regime for its crackdown on legitimate protests, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 752

Whereas, on November 15, 2019, popular protests against the Iranian regime began and rapidly spread to at least 100 cities throughout the country, in the most significant antigovernment protests in Iran since June 2009;

Whereas the protests began in response to an announced increase on the price of fuel and protesters have expressed numerous economic grievances, while also calling for the structural reform of the political system and condemning current and former Iranian leaders;

Whereas reports indicate that Iranian security forces have used lethal force in arresting more than 7,000 people and killed hundreds of people in connection with the protests;

Whereas reports indicate that Iranian Government authorities have, in many instances, refused to return victims' bodies to their families and that security forces have removed bodies from morgues and transferred them to unknown locations;

Whereas, on November 16, 2019, Iranian authorities began implementing a near-total shutdown of internet services, stopping nearly all means of online communications for people inside Iran, to preclude the sharing of images and videos of deadly violence being used by security forces;

Whereas section 103(b)(2)(B) of the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (22 U.S.C. 8512(b)(2)(B)) authorizes licensing services relating to personal communications over the Internet, to improve the ability of the Iranian people to speak freely;

Whereas General License D-1 authorizes the provision of key communication tools to the Iranian people with the aim of ensuring that the Iranian people can freely access the internet;

Whereas, on November 16, 2019, Iran's Interior Minister Abdolreza Rahmani Fazli said that the Iranian regime will no longer show "tolerance" and "self-control" toward the protesters;

Whereas, on November 17, 2019, Iranian Supreme Leader Ayatollah Ali Khamenei called the demonstrators "villains" galvanized by foreign enemies and domestic insurgents and ordered Iranian security services to "implement their duties" to end the protests;

Whereas, on November 18, 2019, Iran's Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps deployed to the city of Mahshahr and engaged in mass repression, reportedly killing as many as 100 people;

Whereas several laws provide authorities to designate and sanction elements of the Iranian regime involved in significant corruption or serious human rights abuses, including the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010, the Countering America's Adversaries Through Sanctions Act, and the Iran Threat Reduction and Syria Human Rights Act of 2012;

Whereas the Iranian regime was implicated in a March 2018 plot in Albania and June 2018 plot in France against Iranian opposition activists;

Whereas Iran's Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps and its Basij militia have been sanctioned by the United States for planning and carrying out serious human rights abuses against the Iranian people, including for the cruel and prolonged torture of political dissidents;

Whereas in August 2018 the United States criminally charged two persons for acting as illegal agents of the Government of Iran for having conducted surveillance on Jewish and Israeli facilities and Iranian political dissidents;

Whereas the regime has routinely violated the human rights of Iranian citizens, including by implementing ongoing, systematic, and serious restrictions of freedom of peaceful assembly and association and freedom of opinion and expression, including the continuing closures of media outlets, arrests of journalists, and the censorship of expression in online forums such as blogs and websites;

Whereas the Department of State's 2018 Human Rights Report on Iran noted "severe restrictions on free expression, the press, and the internet, including censorship, site blocking, and criminalization of libel; substantial interference with the rights of peaceful assembly and freedom of association, such as overly restrictive nongovernmental organization (NGO) laws; egregious restrictions of religious freedom; restrictions on political participation; widespread corruption at all levels of government";

Whereas, on November 18, 2019, Secretary of State Mike Pompeo stated that, "The United States is monitoring the ongoing protests in Iran closely. We condemn strongly any acts of violence committed by this regime against the Iranian people and are deeply concerned by reports of several fatalities. . . The Islamic Republic must cease violence against its own people and should immediately restore the ability of all Iranians to access a free and open Internet.";

Whereas, on November 22, 2019, the United States imposed sanctions on Iran's Minister of Information and Communications Technology for his role in shutting down internet access in Iran;

Whereas, on November 18, 2019, the Office of the German Chancellor stated that, "It is legitimate and deserving of our respect when people courageously air their economic and political grievances, as is currently happening in Iran. The Iranian government should respond to the current protests with a willingness to engage in dialogue. . . We urge the government in Tehran to respect freedom of assembly and expression.";

Whereas, on November 20, 2019, the French Foreign Ministry stated that, "France is following the demonstrations taking place in Iran with concern. It expresses its deep concern at reports that a large number of demonstrators have been killed in the last few days. It reaffirms its attachment to respect for the freedom of expression and to access to means of communication, as well as to the right to demonstrate peacefully. France calls on Iran to comply with its international human rights obligations, in particular the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.";

Whereas, on November 21, 2019, the European Union stated that, "The protests in several Iranian cities over the past days have, according to reports, led to serious loss of life and left many people injured. We convey our condolences to the families of victims and wish a speedy recovery to those injured. Socio-economic challenges should be addressed through inclusive dialogue and not through the use of violence. We expect Iran's

security forces to exercise maximum restraint in handling the protests and for protestors to demonstrate peacefully. Any violence is unacceptable. The rights to freedom of expression and assembly must be guaranteed. We also expect the Iranian authorities to ensure the free flow of information and access to the internet.";

Whereas, on November 26, 2019, Secretary of State Michael Pompeo stated, "The Iranian people are once again on the streets because of the regime's poor economic management. And instead of addressing their grievances, Tehran has responded with violence and blaming those outside of the country.";

Whereas, on December 8, 2019, the High Representative of the European Union Josep Borrell Fontelles stated that, "A growing body of evidence indicates that despite repeated calls for restraint, the Iranian security forces' disproportionate response to recent demonstrations has led to high numbers of deaths and injuries. For the European Union and its Member States, the widespread and disproportionate use of force against nonviolent protestors is unacceptable.";

Whereas, on December 8, 2019, the High Representative of the European Union Josep Borrell Fontelles stated that "A growing body of evidence indicates that despite repeated calls for restraint, the Iranian security forces' disproportionate response to recent demonstrations has led to high numbers of deaths and injuries. For the European Union and its Member States, the widespread and disproportionate use of force against nonviolent protestors is unacceptable.";

Whereas Iran is a member of the United Nations, voted for the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and is a signatory to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, among other international human rights treaties;

Whereas in violation of these and other international obligations, Iranian regime officials continue to violate the fundamental human rights of the Iranian people;

Whereas the Iranian regime has a long history of violent repression of dissent, including—

(1) in 1988, the Iranian regime carrying out the barbaric mass executions of thousands of political prisoners by hanging and firing squad for refusing to renounce their political affiliations and in some cases for possessing political reading material, including prisoners of conscience, teenagers, and pregnant women;

(2) in 1999, the Iranian regime brutally suppressing a student revolt that was one of the largest mass uprisings up until that point in the country since 1979;

(3) following voting irregularities that resulted in the 2009 election of President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, the Iranian regime brutally suppressing peaceful political dissent from wide segments of civil society during the Green Revolution in a cynical attempt to retain its undemocratic grip on power; and

(4) beginning in December 2017, and continuing for several months after protests erupted in more than 80 cities, the Iranian regime suppressing such protests with repressive force that resulted in at least 25 deaths and 4,000 arrests;

Whereas, on January 9, 2018, the House of Representatives overwhelmingly passed H. Res. 676, a resolution supporting the rights of the people of Iran to free expression and condemning the Iranian regime for its crackdown on legitimate protests;

Whereas, on December 5, 2019, the Department of State identified the Great Tehran Penitentiary (Fashafuyeh) and Qarchack Prison as entities responsible for gross violations of internationally recognized human rights in Iran and subject to the imposition

of sanctions under section 106 of the Countering America's Adversaries Through Sanctions Act (22 U.S.C. 9405);

Whereas, on January 8, 2020, the Iranian military shot down a civilian airliner Ukrainian Airlines Flight 752 in a surface-to-air missile strike, killing 176 civilians aboard;

Whereas for three days, the Iranian military denied that it shot down Ukrainian Airlines Flight 752 before admitting responsibility on January 11, 2020;

Whereas peaceful protestors amassed throughout Iran on January 11, 2020, and subsequent days, decrying the Government of Iran's downing of the Ukrainian airliner, subsequent campaign of lies and obfuscation, and continued undemocratic practices; and

Whereas in response to peaceful protests throughout early January 2020, Iranian Government forces fired live rounds and used brutal tactics against civilians in a manner well-documented by international human rights organizations, media, and scores of Iranians: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) stands with the people of Iran that are engaged in legitimate and peaceful protests against an oppressive, corrupt regime;

(2) condemns the Iranian regime's serious human rights abuses against the Iranian people, significant corruption, and destabilizing activities abroad;

(3) commends the statements of support for the protestors from the executive branch and key allies;

(4) calls on all democratic governments and institutions to clearly support the Iranian people's right to live in a free society;

(5) demands that the Iranian regime abide by its international obligations with respect to human rights and civil liberties, including freedoms of assembly, speech, and press;

(6) urges the Administration to work to convene emergency sessions of the United Nations Security Council and the United Nations Human Rights Council to condemn the ongoing human rights violations perpetrated by the Iranian regime and establish a mechanism by which the Security Council can monitor such violations;

(7) encourages the Administration to provide assistance to the Iranian people to have free and uninterrupted access to the internet, including by broadening General License D-1;

(8) calls on companies to reject requests by the regime to cut off the Iranian people from social media and other communications platforms;

(9) respects the proud history and rich culture of the Iranian nation and fully supports efforts by the people of Iran to promote the establishment of basic freedoms that build the foundation for the emergence of a freely elected, open, and democratic political system;

(10) supports the right of Iranian dissidents to assemble, without fear of persecution and violence, whether in Iran or internationally; and

(11) urges the President and the Secretary of State to work with the international community to ensure that violations of human rights are part of all formal and informal multilateral or bilateral discussions with and regarding Iran.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PHILLIPS) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PHILLIPS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H. Res. 752.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, since November, Iranian protesters have flooded the streets, demonstrating against corruption, high fuel, and high food prices. Protests flared up in recent weeks after the government of Iran took responsibility for downing a Ukrainian airliner after, of course, initially denying it.

Peaceful protesters have been met with violence and brutality from the Iranian regime. Over 1,500 people have been killed, and thousands more injured.

For decades, this has been the horrifying standard practice of the regime, heinous human rights abuses and significant corruption, even targeting Iranian dissidents abroad.

We must send a clear message now to the protesters that we stand with them. Today's resolution shows that solidarity; that we stand for the rights of the Iranian people to free expression, and we condemn the regime for its crimes.

Today, we urge the President and the Secretary of State to work with the international community to ensure that violations of human rights are part of all formal and informal, multilateral or bilateral discussions with and regarding Iran.

Sending a strong message of support is important, but the United States must do more to help the Iranian protesters. The administration should help the Iranian people access free and uninterrupted internet, including broadening General License D-1, the Treasury Department's license of personal communication devices and software that helps Iranians access the free flow of information.

The administration should also welcome, not deny, Iranian visitors to the United States, because giving Iranians an opportunity to experience our great country for themselves is the best way to counter anti-American sentiment and fear.

There is much that we can do to help the protesters, and we must start today with this resolution. I urge all my colleagues to join me in passing this great measure.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Iranian people and our condemnation of the Iranian regime's crackdown on legitimate protests.

I want to first thank Congressman DEUTCH for bringing this important legislation, introducing this resolution. And I am proud to be a cosponsor of it.

Twice in the past 3 months, the Iranian people have bravely raised their voices to protest the conduct of the despotic Iranian regime. And both times, these peaceful, popular demonstrations have been met with utter violence.

In November, protestors across Iran voiced their anger at an abrupt increase in gasoline prices. This soon broadened to voicing their anger at the regime as a whole.

The Islamic Republic of Iran responded with brutal force. Security thugs opened fire on unarmed protestors. The regime cut off the internet in an attempt to silence the voice of the people and suppress the evidence of the security forces' bloodshed.

Despite the regime's efforts, the world still knows about their cruelty. We have all seen the videos of security forces shooting innocent people on the streets. The regime killed as many as 1,500 people, by far the largest and most violent crackdown since the 1979 revolution.

Just a few weeks later, the Iranian people were once again furious with their government. This time, it was because the regime shot down a commercial airliner, killing 176 innocent people, many of whom were Iranian. Even worse, the regime did not admit to having done so for 3 days. They intentionally lied to their own people and to the world.

Once again, security forces fired on peaceful protestors.

The broad frustration with this cruel, lying regime is evident. An Iranian Olympic medalist announced she was defecting because of "hypocrisy, lies, injustice, and flattery."

Iran's State TV anchor resigned, saying, "It was very hard for me to believe the killing of my own countrymen. I apologize for lying to you on television for the last 13 years."

With this resolution, we declare that the House of Representatives stands with the people of Iran demanding accountability from their leaders.

I thank the President for loudly and clearly supporting the rights of the Iranian people. The President has urged the regime not to use violence against their own people. He has also worked to hold the Iranian regime accountable for its cruelty.

The administration has actively sought information about the perpetrators of violence through its tip line. Using those tips, the administration has sanctioned those with blood on their hands, such as the IRGC commander who oversaw a massacre in November, killing as many as 148 people. I want to thank the administration for taking concrete action to support the people of Iran.

This resolution is our opportunity in the Congress to show the same support.

It is an important step, but we can and must do more. Our next course of action should be to pass my bill that holds the Iranian officials accountable for serious human rights abuses.

So let's stand together as Americans and keep the process and pressure up on this dangerous regime.

And let me just say, I have talked to many Iranians throughout this country, and the people of Iran are watching what we say here. Our voices do matter in Iran and to the Iranian people who are in the United States.

So I want to again thank Congressman DEUTCH for bringing this important resolution that stands up for the people of Iran.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH), the author of this important resolution, and the chairman of the Subcommittee on the Middle East, North Africa, and International Terrorism.

Mr. DEUTCH. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend from Minnesota for yielding.

I appreciate the kind words of the ranking member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, and I appreciate his leadership.

Special thanks, as well, to the ranking member of the Middle East, North Africa, and International Terrorism Subcommittee, Mr. WILSON, for his leadership on these issues and his commitment to standing up for the Iranian people.

In mid-November, popular protests against the Iranian regime began and rapidly spread to at least 100 cities throughout the country, in the most significant anti-government protests in Iran since 2009.

While protesters took to the streets in response to an increase in fuel prices, they also called for structural reform of the Iranian political system. They condemned current and former leaders.

In response, Iranian authorities shut down the internet. Security forces used lethal force, killing hundreds of people, marking the highest casualty rate of any protest movement in Iran since the Islamic revolution 4 decades ago. And they arrested over 7,000 more.

Protesters returned earlier this month after Iran shot down Ukrainian Airlines Flight 752 as it took off from Tehran's International Airport, killing all 176 people on board, and then tried to cover it up.

The Iranians in the streets were frustrated by the regime's lies, frustrated by their incompetence, and chanted against the IRGC and against the Supreme Leader. As in November, Iranian authorities met these protests with unlawful, disproportionate force.

Congress has long expressed bipartisan support for the human rights of the Iranian people, including the rights to peaceably assemble and the right to protest.

Congress has also supported the rights of Iranian dissidents and authorized the licensing of communication services to improve the ability of Iranian people to speak freely.

In keeping with that tradition, H. Res. 752 expresses the support of the House of Representatives for the rights of the Iranian people to free expression and condemns the regime for its crackdown on the recent, legitimate, peaceful protests in Iran.

The resolution condemns the Iranian regime's serious human rights abuses, its significant corruption, destabilizing activities abroad, and urges the President and the Secretary of State to work with the international community to ensure that violations of human rights are part of all formal and informal multilateral or bilateral discussions regarding Iran.

I also encourage additional efforts by this House to support the people of Iran. These include initiatives proposed by my colleagues, like the one by Representative TOM MALINOWSKI, to end the ban on Iranians and other citizens of predominantly-Muslim countries from entering the United States. If we truly support the Iranian people, we need to allow them to visit so they can experience our vibrant society, so they can experience democracy, so that they can see pluralism and our great democratic traditions. I look forward to working with my colleagues to help advance these measures as well.

I thank my colleagues for their strong support of this resolution which demonstrates that Congress stands with the Iranian people and supports their right to live in a free society.

□ 1415

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON), the ranking member on the Subcommittee for the Middle East, North Africa, and International Terrorism.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, I thank the Republican leader, MIKE MCCAUL, for yielding.

I am pleased to speak in favor of H. Res. 752, which supports the rights of the Iranian people to protest without violent consequences from the Islamic Republic regime, which I coauthored with my appreciative colleague, Chairman TED DEUTCH from Florida.

Last November, thousands of people all over 100 cities of Iran demonstrated against the regime's oppressive economic and tyrannical other policies. The Islamic Republic responded viciously to these peaceful protests. The regime killed over 1,000 people and arrested thousands more. We mourn the deaths of these courageous individuals who died while advocating for their rights.

The Iranian people again voiced their anger in January when the Islamic Republic lied about shooting down a Ukrainian civilian passenger Boeing jet, killing 176 people.

How did the regime respond to the protests over the death of these innocent people? By using more violence against innocent civilians.

Today, we say to the people of Iran: We respect the importance of Persian culture to the world and your right to be heard without fear. We support your rights to ask for a better governance. We ask for accountability from your government, to ask for a government that puts your interests first and does not deceive you with blatant corruption. We will not allow you to be overlooked or forgotten, and we will stand by you while this regime brutalizes you.

President Donald Trump has taken a firm stand in support of the protestors, saying: "To the brave, long-suffering people of Iran: I've stood with you since the beginning of my Presidency, and my administration will continue to stand with you. We are following your protests closely and are inspired by your courage."

I agree with President Donald Trump, and I am gratified to stand today in support of the free expression of the Iranian people. President Trump's sanctions deter terrorism and protect American families.

I thank my colleagues for bringing this bipartisan resolution to the floor. I look forward to seeing it pass and continuing to work together to support the rights of the Iranian people.

Iranian Americans are extraordinarily successful in America and very much appreciated in every State. In my home State of South Carolina, Iranian American doctors are vital.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. RUIZ), my friend.

Mr. RUIZ. Madam Speaker, I am proud of the growing Iranian American community in my district, California's 36th. I have spoken with members of the community, and I have watched the protests in Iran.

I am increasingly concerned and outraged at what we are witnessing from the Iranian regime. The violence, the oppression, the internet blackouts, the large-scale incarcerations—these are egregious human rights violations.

Over 7,000 Iranians have been arrested and, tragically, over 1,000 killed by Iranian security forces since November of last year.

This shameful use of violence by the state security forces, sweeping internet shutoffs, jailing of journalists and protestors, these are just the most recent examples of merciless attempts of censorship by a regime with a long, abhorrent history of oppression and violence against its own people.

We must support the protestors seeking nothing but their fundamental human rights and civil liberties such as the freedom to assemble openly, speak freely, and have an open and free press. That is why I stand with my Iranian American constituents in support of bipartisan H. Res. 752: to support the rights of the people of Iran to free ex-

pression and to say, forcefully, that we condemn the Iranian regime for its violent tactics to oppress its legitimate protestors.

To the Iranian people seeking freedom, democracy, and human rights: I stand with you. The United States Congress stands with you. The American people stand with you. We will continue supporting you as you fight for your basic rights, freedom, and democracy.

That is why I urge my colleagues to pass H. Res. 752 here today.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Madam Speaker, in 2016, President Obama sent \$1.7 billion of untraceable cash on shrink-wrapped cargo pallets to the regime in Iran. The Iranian expatriates in my district reported that immediately following this shameful spectacle, the Iranian Guard expanded dramatically and began a brutal round of repression that cost thousands of innocent Iranians their lives.

Thankfully, President Trump has reversed these destructive policies of appeasement. The renewal of sanctions against Iran is again bringing economic pressure on the regime and causing European nations to reconsider their ties with that tyranny.

Iran is one of the oldest and greatest civilizations in history, yet it has been suppressed and plundered by a clique of theocratic thugs who comprise the illegitimate Iranian Government.

This resolution is an important gesture, but it is empty and idle without action. We need to support the freedom-fighting organizations operating within Iran with the same financial resources that Obama sent to their oppressors. I challenge the House majority to do so.

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

Madam Speaker, I met with a group of Iranian Americans just this last weekend, and I talked to them about their friends in Iran who are fighting this oppression. I saw the video, the internet feed that they are able to get out of country. One of the problems has been they shut down the internet. They control the internet in Iran because it was built with security in mind, first.

It is very difficult to get communications both inside and outside of Iran, but we are working on those technologies today, Madam Speaker, so that these people can communicate with the outside world. They are being held hostage themselves by the Ayatollah, who held our Embassy officials hostage in 1979. They are listening to our voices here in the Congress, and they are shooting out texts and emails, and we are finding ways to get them to communicate.

There are 80 million people in Iran, once a great empire, the Persian empire that brought us so many great things; and now, under this oppressive theocracy, the majority of these people

do not support their own oppressive, brutal killing regime.

The Islamic Republic of Iran, in my judgment, their days are limited, and it is time for the people of Iran to take back their country. And when I say this to the people of Iran, know that the American people stand with the people of Iran. Know that this House stands with the people of Iran and that this Congress and President stand with the people of Iran.

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

Mr. PHILLIPS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume for the purpose of closing.

Madam Speaker, Iranian people want the same thing that Americans want: peace, opportunity, and security. It is critical that we now support the peaceful protestors in Iran today.

Today's resolution shows that we stand in solidarity with the Iranian people in their struggle against the cruelty of their regime, and I hope all Members will join me in supporting this important measure.

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

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 752, a resolution supporting human rights and fundamental freedoms in Iran. Today, we send a vital message to the protest movement in Iran that—as they face persecution and violence—the House of Representatives stands in solidarity with them.

For decades, the Iranian regime has oppressed dissidents. From the 1988 massacre to the 2009 protests to today, people who dared to speak against the Iranian regime have been subject to torture, arrest, disappearance and worse. Iran's prisons are some of the most notorious in the world.

The protests have escalated since the Iranian regime lied to the world about their responsibility for shooting down the Ukrainian jetliner. It is unfathomable that for three days, the Iranian regime sought to hide their culpability.

The United States must do what we can to help support those who fight for human rights and freedom in Iran. This resolution outlines some important steps, including expanding internet access for Iranian dissidents by easing the restrictions on sharing software and hardware for personal communication devices.

I would also add that if the Trump administration wants to send a message of solidarity to the Iranian protest movement, they should repeal the ill-conceived Muslim ban, which has prevented Iranians from visiting and studying in America.

The American people have no quarrel with the people of Iran. America should welcome those Iranians who want to see America for themselves.

I'd like to thank Mr. DEUTCH and Mr. WILSON for spearheading this important resolution.

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 752, which reinforces our nation's support for the rights of the Iranian people to have free speech, free association and fair elections. For over 40 years the Iranian regime has engaged in terrorism and has been a declared enemy of freedom, human rights, and freedom of religion. The Iranian re-

gime, a designated state sponsor of terrorism, states its antipathy for the United States on a daily basis. The regime has engaged in atrocities in Iran and throughout the world.

Recently President Trump authorized the removal of Iranian terrorist Qassem Soleimani. The president had the legal authority to do so under the Congressionally enacted AUMF pertaining to Iraq. In the United States, expatriates from Iran applauded this as long overdue justice for a leading proponent of terror, death and destruction. This action should have been taken years ago by the Obama Administration. Instead of addressing Iran's terrorist actions, the prior administration gave aid and support to the terrorist regime. No doubt some of that aid, including billions of dollars, was used to kill innocent people. It took the courage of a real leader to be bold and do what needed to be done.

Our country supports the Iranian opposition via the Organization of Iranian American Communities. Their fight is our fight. With patience, a new day will dawn in Iran and its people will be free again.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PHILLIPS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 752, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TIBETAN POLICY AND SUPPORT ACT OF 2019

Mr. PHILLIPS. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4331) to modify and reauthorize the Tibetan Policy Act of 2002, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4331

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 “Tibetan Policy and Support Act of 2019”.

SEC. 2. MODIFICATIONS TO AND REAUTHORIZATION OF TIBETAN POLICY ACT OF 2002.

(a) TIBETAN NEGOTIATIONS.—Section 613 of the Tibetan Policy Act of 2002 (22 U.S.C. 6901 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by inserting “without preconditions” after “a dialogue”; and

(ii) by inserting “or democratically-elected leaders of the Tibetan community” after “his representatives”; and

(iii) by adding at the end before the period the following: “and should coordinate with other governments in multilateral efforts toward this goal”;

(B) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (3); and

(C) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

“(2) POLICY COMMUNICATION.—The President shall direct the Secretary of State to ensure that, in accordance with this Act, United States policy on Tibet, as coordinated by the United States Special Coordi-

nator for Tibetan Issues, is communicated to all Federal departments and agencies in contact with the Government of the People's Republic of China.”;

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking “until December 31, 2021”; and

(ii) by inserting “and direct the Department of State to make public on its website” after “appropriate congressional committees”;

(B) in paragraph (1), by striking “and” at the end;

(C) in paragraph (2), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

“(3) the steps taken by the United States Government to promote the human rights and distinct religious, cultural, linguistic, and historical identity of the Tibetan people, including the right of the Tibetan people to select, educate, and venerate their own religious leaders in accordance with their established religious practice and system.”.

(b) TIBET PROJECT PRINCIPLES.—Section 616 of such Act (22 U.S.C. 6901 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (d), by striking paragraphs (1) through (9) and inserting the following:

“(1) neither provide incentive for, nor facilitate the migration and settlement of, non-Tibetans into Tibet;

“(2) neither provide incentive for, nor facilitate the transfer of ownership of, Tibetan land or natural resources to non-Tibetans;

“(3) neither provide incentive for, nor facilitate the involuntary or coerced relocation of, Tibetan nomads from their traditional pasture lands into concentrated settlements;

“(4) be implemented in consultation with the Tibetan people and, as appropriate, after the conduct of cultural and environmental impact assessments;

“(5) foster self-sufficiency and self-reliance of Tibetans;

“(6) respect human rights and Tibetan culture and traditions;

“(7) be subject to ongoing monitoring and evaluation; and

“(8) be conducted, as much as possible, in the Tibetan language.”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(e) UNITED STATES ASSISTANCE.—The President shall provide funds to nongovernmental organizations to support sustainable development, cultural and historical preservation, health care, education, and environmental sustainability projects for Tibetan communities in Tibet, in accordance with the principles specified in subsection (d) and with the concurrence of the United States Special Coordinator for Tibetan Issues under section 621(d).”.

(c) DIPLOMATIC REPRESENTATION RELATING TO TIBET.—Section 618 of such Act (22 U.S.C. 6901 note) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 618. DIPLOMATIC REPRESENTATION RELATING TO TIBET.

“(a) UNITED STATES CONSULATE IN LHASA, TIBET.—The Secretary should seek to establish a United States consulate in Lhasa, Tibet—

“(1) to provide consular services to United States citizens traveling in Tibet; and

“(2) to monitor political, economic, and cultural developments in Tibet.

“(b) POLICY.—The Secretary may not authorize the establishment in the United States of any additional consulate of the People's Republic of China until such time as a United States consulate in Lhasa, Tibet, is established under subsection (a).”.

(d) RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION IN TIBET.—Section 620(b) of such Act (22 U.S.C. 6901 note) is amended by adding at the end before the period the following: “, including with respect

to the reincarnation system of Tibetan Buddhism”.

(e) UNITED STATES SPECIAL COORDINATOR FOR TIBETAN ISSUES.—Section 621 of such Act (22 U.S.C. 6901 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c) to read as follows:

“(c) OBJECTIVES.—The objectives of the Special Coordinator are to—

“(1) promote substantive dialogue without preconditions between the Government of the People’s Republic of China and the Dalai Lama or his representatives or democratically-elected leaders of the Tibetan community leading to a negotiated agreement on Tibet and coordinate with other governments in multilateral efforts toward this goal;

“(2) encourage the Government of the People’s Republic of China to address the aspirations of the Tibetan people with regard to their distinct historical, cultural, religious, and linguistic identity;

“(3) promote the human rights of the Tibetan people;

“(4) promote activities to preserve environment and water resources of the Tibetan plateau;

“(5) encourage sustainable development in accordance with section 616(d), cultural and historical preservation, health care, education, and environmental sustainability projects for Tibetan communities in Tibet; and

“(6) promote access to Tibet in accordance with the Reciprocal Access to Tibet Act of 2018 (Public Law 115-330).”;

(2) in subsection (d)—

(A) in paragraph (5), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) by redesignating paragraph (6) as paragraph (8); and

(C) by inserting after paragraph (5) the following:

“(6) provide concurrence with respect to all projects carried out pursuant to assistance provided under section 616(e);

“(7) seek to establish international diplomatic coalitions to—

“(A) oppose any effort by the Government of the People’s Republic of China to select, educate, and venerate Tibetan Buddhist religious leaders in a manner inconsistent with Tibetan Buddhism in which the succession or identification of Tibetan Buddhist lamas, including the Dalai Lama, should occur without interference, in a manner consistent with Tibetan Buddhists’ beliefs; and

“(B) ensure that the identification and installation of Tibetan Buddhist religious leaders, including any future Dalai Lama, is determined solely within the Tibetan Buddhist faith community, in accordance with the universally-recognized right to religious freedom; and”;

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(e) PERSONNEL.—The Secretary shall ensure that the Office of the Special Coordinator is adequately staffed at all times to assist in the management of the responsibilities of this section.”.

SEC. 3. STATEMENT OF POLICY REGARDING THE SUCCESSION OR REINCARNATION OF THE DALAI LAMA.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) Notwithstanding that Tibetan Buddhism is practiced in many countries including Bhutan, India, Mongolia, Nepal, the People’s Republic of China, the Russian Federation, and the United States, the Government of the People’s Republic of China has repeatedly insisted on its role in managing the selection of Tibet’s next spiritual leader, the Dalai Lama, through actions such as those described in the “Measures on the Management of the Reincarnation of Living Buddhas” in 2007.

(2) On March 19, 2019, Chinese Ministry of Affairs spokesperson reiterated that the “reincarnation of living Buddhas including the Dalai Lama must comply with Chinese laws and regulations and follow religious rituals and historical conventions”.

(3) The Government of the People’s Republic of China has interfered in the process of recognizing a successor or reincarnation of Tibetan Buddhist leaders, including in 1995 by arbitrarily detaining Gedhun Choekyi Nyima, a 6-year old boy who was identified as the 11th Panchen Lama, and purporting to install its own candidate as the Panchen Lama.

(4) The 14th Dalai Lama, Tenzin Gyatso, issued a statement on September 24, 2011, explaining the traditions and spiritual precepts of the selection of Dalai Lamas, setting forth his views on the considerations and process for selecting his successor, and providing a response to the Chinese government’s claims that only the Chinese government has the ultimate authority in the selection process of the Dalai Lama.

(5) The 14th Dalai Lama said in his statement that the person who reincarnates has sole legitimate authority over where and how he or she takes rebirth and how that reincarnation is to be recognized and if there is a need for a 15th Dalai Lama to be recognized, then the responsibility shall primarily rest with the officers of the Dalai Lama’s Gaden Phodrang Trust, who will be informed by the written instructions of the 14th Dalai Lama.

(6) Since 2011, the 14th Dalai Lama has reiterated publicly on numerous occasions that decisions on the successions, emanations, or reincarnations of the Dalai Lama belongs to the Tibetan Buddhist faith community alone.

(7) On June 8, 2015, the United States House of Representatives unanimously approved House Resolution 337 which calls on the United States Government to “underscore that government interference in the Tibetan reincarnation process is a violation of the internationally recognized right to religious freedom . . . and to highlight the fact that other countries besides China have long Tibetan Buddhist traditions and that matters related to reincarnations in Tibetan Buddhism are of keen interest to Tibetan Buddhist populations worldwide”.

(8) On April 25, 2018, the United States Senate unanimously approved Senate Resolution 429 which “expresses its sense that the identification and installation of Tibetan Buddhist religious leaders, including a future 15th Dalai Lama, is a matter that should be determined solely within the Tibetan Buddhist faith community, in accordance with the inalienable right to religious freedom”.

(9) The Department of State’s Report on International Religious Freedom for 2018 reported on policies and efforts of the Government of the People’s Republic of China to exert control over the selection of Tibetan Buddhist religious leaders, including reincarnate lamas, and stated that “U.S. officials underscored that decisions on the reincarnation of the Dalai Lama should be made solely by faith leaders.”.

(b) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—It is the policy of the United States that—

(1) decisions regarding the selection, education, and veneration of Tibetan Buddhist religious leaders are exclusively spiritual matters that should be made by the appropriate religious authorities within the Tibetan Buddhist tradition and in the context of the will of practitioners of Tibetan Buddhism;

(2) the wishes of the 14th Dalai Lama, including any written instructions, should play a determinative role in the selection,

education, and veneration of a future 15th Dalai Lama; and

(3) interference by the Government of the People’s Republic of China or any other government in the process of recognizing a successor or reincarnation of the 14th Dalai Lama and any future Dalai Lamas would represent a clear violation of the fundamental religious freedoms of Tibetan Buddhists and the Tibetan people.

(c) HOLDING CHINESE OFFICIALS RESPONSIBLE FOR RELIGIOUS FREEDOM ABUSES TARGETING TIBETAN BUDDHISTS.—It is the policy of the United States to consider senior officials of the Government of the People’s Republic of China who are responsible for, complicit in, or have directly or indirectly engaged in the identification or installation of a candidate chosen by China as the future 15th Dalai Lama of Tibetan Buddhism to have committed—

(1) a gross violation of internationally recognized human rights for purposes of imposing sanctions with respect to such officials under the Global Magnitsky Human Rights Accountability Act (22 U.S.C. 2656 note); and

(2) a particularly severe violation of religious freedom for purposes of applying section 212(a)(2)(G) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(2)(G)) with respect to such officials.

(d) DEPARTMENT OF STATE PROGRAMMING TO PROMOTE RELIGIOUS FREEDOM FOR TIBETAN BUDDHISTS.—Consistent with section 401 of the Frank R. Wolf International Religious Freedom Act (Public Law 114-281; 130 Stat. 1436), of the funds available to the Department of State for international religious freedom programs, the Ambassador-at-Large for International Religious Freedom should support efforts to protect and promote international religious freedom in China and for programs to protect Tibetan Buddhism in China and elsewhere.

SEC. 4. POLICY REGARDING THE ENVIRONMENT AND WATER RESOURCES ON THE TIBETAN PLATEAU.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) The Tibetan Plateau contains glaciers, rivers, grasslands, and other geographical and ecological features that are crucial for supporting vegetation growth and biodiversity, regulating water flow and supply for an estimated 1.8 billion people. Global warming threatens the glaciers in Tibet that feed the major rivers of South and East Asia, which supply freshwater to an estimated 1.8 billion people.

(2) Rising global temperatures—especially in the Tibetan Plateau where the average temperature has increased at twice the global average—will result in variable water flows in the future.

(3) The construction in Tibet of large hydroelectric power dams intended to be used in part to transmit power to Chinese provinces outside of Tibet, as well as other infrastructure projects, including the Sichuan-Tibet railroad, may also lead to the resettlement of thousands of Tibetans and transform the environment.

(4) The grasslands of Tibet play a significant role in carbon production and sequestration and Tibet’s rivers support wetlands that play a key role in water storage, water quality, and the regulation of water flow, support biodiversity, foster vegetation growth, and act as carbon sinks.

(5) Rising temperatures and intensifying evaporation, can affect the water supply, cause desertification, and destabilize infrastructure on the Tibetan Plateau and beyond.

(6) Traditional Tibetan grassland stewardship practices, which can be key to mitigating the negative effects of warming on the Tibetan Plateau, are undermined by the

resettlement of nomads from Tibetan grasslands.

(7) The People's Republic of China has approximately 20 percent of the world's population but only around 7 percent of the world's water supply, while many countries in South and Southeast Asia rely on the rivers flowing from the Himalayas of the Tibetan Plateau.

(8) The People's Republic of China has already completed water transfer programs diverting billions of cubic meters of water yearly and has plans to divert more waters from the Tibetan plateau in China.

(b) **WATER RESOURCES IN TIBET AND THE TIBETAN WATERSHED.**—The Secretary of State, in coordination with relevant agencies of the United States Government, should—

(1) pursue collaborative efforts with Chinese and international scientific institutions, as appropriate, to monitor the environment on the Tibetan Plateau, including glacial retreat, temperature rise, and carbon levels, in order to promote a greater understanding of the effects on permafrost, river flows, grasslands and desertification, and the monsoon cycle;

(2) engage with the Government of the People's Republic of China, the Tibetan people, and nongovernmental organizations to encourage the participation of Tibetan nomads and other Tibetan stakeholders in the development and implementation of grassland management policies, in order to utilize their indigenous experience in mitigation and stewardship of the land and to assess policies on the forced resettlement of nomads; and

(3) encourage a regional framework on water security, or use existing frameworks, such as the Lower Mekong Initiative, to facilitate cooperative agreements among all riparian nations that would promote transparency, sharing of information, pollution regulation, and arrangements on impounding and diversion of waters that originate on the Tibetan Plateau.

SEC. 5. DEMOCRACY IN THE TIBETAN EXILE COMMUNITY.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—Congress finds the following:

(1) The 14th Dalai Lama advocates the Middle Way Approach, which seeks genuine autonomy for the six million Tibetans in Tibet.

(2) The 14th Dalai Lama has overseen a process of democratization within the Tibetan polity, beginning in Tibet in the 1950s and continuing in exile from the 1960s to the present and to address the needs of the Tibetan people until such time as genuine autonomy in Tibet is realized, the 14th Dalai Lama devolved his political responsibilities to the elected representatives of the Tibetan people in exile in 2011.

(3) In 2011 and again in 2016, members of the Tibetan exile community across some 30 countries held elections to select political leaders to serve in the Central Tibetan Administration parliament and as chief executive, elections which were monitored by international observers and assessed to be free and fair.

(4) The Dalai Lama has said that the Central Tibetan Administration will cease to exist once a negotiated settlement has been achieved that allows Tibetans to freely enjoy their culture, religion and language in Tibet.

(b) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) Tibetan exile communities around the world should be commended for the adoption of a system of self-governance with democratic institutions to choose their leaders;

(2) the Dalai Lama should be commended for his decision to devolve political authority to elected leaders in accordance with democratic principles; and

(3) as consistent with section 621(d)(3) of the Tibetan Policy Act of 2002 (22 U.S.C. 6901 note), the United States Special Coordinator for Tibetan Issues should continue to maintain close contact with the religious, cultural, and political leaders of the Tibetan people.

SEC. 6. SUSTAINABILITY IN TIBETAN COMMUNITIES SEEKING TO PRESERVE THEIR CULTURE, RELIGION, AND LANGUAGE.

The Secretary of State should urge the Government of Nepal to honor the Gentleman's Agreement with the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees and to provide legal documentation to long-staying Tibetan residents in Nepal who fled a credible threat of persecution in Tibet in order to allow them to more fully participate in the economy and society of Nepal.

SEC. 7. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) **OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES SPECIAL COORDINATOR FOR TIBETAN ISSUES.**—There is authorized to be appropriated \$1,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2021 through 2025 for the Office of the United States Special Coordinator for Tibetan Issues.

(b) **TIBETAN SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM AND NGAWANG CHOEPHEL EXCHANGE PROGRAMS.**—

(1) **TIBETAN SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM.**—There is authorized to be appropriated \$675,000 for each of the fiscal years 2021 through 2025 to carry out the Tibetan scholarship program established under section 103(b)(1) of the Human Rights, Refugee, and Other Foreign Relations Provisions Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-319; 22 U.S.C. 2151 note).

(2) **NGAWANG CHOEPHEL EXCHANGE PROGRAMS.**—There is authorized to be appropriated \$575,000 for each of the fiscal years 2021 through 2025 to carry out the “Ngwang Choepel Exchange Programs” (formerly known as “programs of educational and cultural exchange between the United States and the people of Tibet”) under section 103(a) of the Human Rights, Refugee, and Other Foreign Relations Provisions Act of 1996.

(c) **HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE AND SUPPORT TO TIBETAN REFUGEES IN SOUTH ASIA.**—Amounts authorized to be appropriated to carry out chapter 9 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and the Migration and Refugee Assistance Act of 1962 for each of the fiscal years 2021 through 2025 are authorized to be made available for humanitarian assistance, including food, medicine, clothing, and medical and vocational training, for Tibetan refugees in South Asia who have fled facing a credible threat of persecution in the People's Republic of China.

(d) **TIBETAN AUTONOMOUS REGION AND TIBETAN COMMUNITIES IN CHINA.**—There is authorized to be appropriated \$8,000,000 for each year of the fiscal years 2021 through 2025 under chapter 4 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2346 et seq.) to support activities which preserve cultural traditions and promote sustainable development, education, and environmental conservation in Tibetan communities in the Tibet Autonomous Region and in other Tibetan communities in China.

(e) **ASSISTANCE FOR TIBETANS IN INDIA AND NEPAL.**—There is authorized to be appropriated \$6,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2021 through 2025 under part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151 et seq.) for programs to promote and preserve Tibetan culture and language development, and the resilience of Tibetan communities in India and Nepal, and to assist in the education and development of the next generation of Tibetan leaders from such communities.

(f) **TIBETAN GOVERNANCE.**—There is authorized to be appropriated \$3,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2021 through 2025 for programs to strengthen the capacity of Tibetan

institutions and strengthen democracy, governance, information and international outreach, and research.

(g) **VOICE OF AMERICA AND RADIO FREE ASIA.**—

(1) **VOICE OF AMERICA.**—There is authorized to be appropriated \$3,344,000 for each of the fiscal years 2021 through 2025 to Voice of America for broadcasts described in paragraph (3).

(2) **RADIO FREE ASIA.**—There is authorized to be appropriated \$4,060,000 for each of the fiscal years 2021 through 2025 to Radio Free Asia for broadcasts described in paragraph (3).

(3) **BROADCASTS DESCRIBED.**—Broadcasts described in this paragraph are broadcasts to provide uncensored news and information in the Tibetan language to Tibetans, including Tibetans in Tibet.

SEC. 8. DETERMINATION OF BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled “Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation” for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the House Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PHILLIPS) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PHILLIPS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 4331.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, I thank Chairman MCGOVERN, along with Mr. SMITH, Mr. SUOZZI, and Mr. MEADOWS, for authoring this very important bill to update U.S. policies that support the preservation of Tibetan culture and faith as well as the environment of the Tibetan Plateau, which is vital not just to the Tibetan people, but also to the Himalayan ecosystem.

I also thank Speaker PELOSI, who has been a tireless champion of the Tibetan people for many years. She has a long history of shining a spotlight on human rights abuses in China and has ensured that this Chamber does its part to defend our values.

The Tibetan Policy and Support Act of 2019 updates existing legislation from 2002 to make sure our policies keep pace with the challenges facing Tibet today. This legislation comes at a very critical time for the Tibetan people as they seek to preserve their cultural and religious identity.

The Chinese Government has repeatedly asserted that it has a role to play in the selection of the next Dalai

Lama. This is analogous to the Government of Italy announcing that it can ignore Catholic tradition and unilaterally decide who the next Pope should be. Such disregard for the Tibetan faith is an undue violation of international religious freedoms.

This bill sends a very clear message to Chinese officials that, if they interfere in the selection process for a future Dalai Lama or other Tibetan Buddhist leader, they can be sanctioned by the United States for violating human rights.

The Tibetan Policy and Support Act also reauthorizes programs to preserve Tibetan culture and environment.

The Tibetan Plateau is home to 10 major Asian river systems feeding 10 different Asian states, and these resources are being threatened by large-scale hydroelectric projects. These rivers are of immense importance to the livelihood of not only Tibetan communities, but also the nearly 2 billion people in South and East Asia.

I urge all Members to join me in supporting this very good measure to continue underscoring our support for the Tibetan people.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, DC, January 10, 2020.

Hon. ELIOT L. ENGEL,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN ENGEL: This is to advise you that the Committee on the Judiciary has now had an opportunity to review the provisions in H.R. 4331, the "Tibetan Policy and Support Act of 2019" that fall within our Rule X jurisdiction. I appreciate your consulting with us on those provisions. The Judiciary Committee has no objection to your including them in the bill for consideration on the House floor, and to expedite that consideration is willing to forgo action on H.R. 4331, with the understanding that we do not thereby waive any future jurisdictional claim over those provisions or their subject matters.

In the event a House-Senate conference on this or similar legislation is convened, the Judiciary Committee reserves the right to request an appropriate number of conferees to address any concerns with these or similar provisions that may arise in conference.

Please place this letter into the Congressional Record during consideration of the measure on the House floor. Thank you for the cooperative spirit in which you have worked regarding this matter and others between our committees.

Sincerely,

JERROLD NADLER,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, January 24, 2020.

Hon. JERROLD NADLER,
Chairman, Committee on Judiciary,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN NADLER: I am writing to you concerning H.R. 4331, the Tibetan Policy and Support Act of 2019. I appreciate your willingness to work cooperatively on this legislation.

I acknowledge that provisions of the bill fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Judiciary under House Rule X, and that

your Committee will forgo action on H.R. 4331 to expedite floor consideration. I further acknowledge that the inaction of your Committee with respect to the bill does not waive any future jurisdictional claim over the matters contained in the bill that fall within your jurisdiction. I will also support the appointment of Committee on Judiciary conferees during any House-Senate conference convened on this legislation.

Lastly, I will ensure that our exchange of letters is included in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the bill. Thank you again for your cooperation regarding the legislation. I look forward to continuing to work with you as the measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

ELIOT L. ENGEL,
Chairman.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 4331, the Tibetan Policy and Support Act.

The Chinese Communist Party's, or CCP's, crusade against faith is the greatest threat to religious freedom in the world today. This bill reminds us that the religious persecution didn't begin under Chairman Xi. The CCP has always hated and feared religion.

Since China invaded Tibet in 1950, the CCP has tried to dismantle Tibetan Buddhism. In 1995, Chinese authorities kidnapped the second highest Tibetan faith leader and replaced him with a fraud.

The Chinese Communist Party wants to ensure Tibetan leaders are chosen according to their political agenda, not according to Tibetan Buddhist religious practices.

This bill states that the United States will not accept the CCP's destruction of Tibetan Buddhism, we will not accept fraudulent religious leaders appointed by Beijing, and we will not accept the CCP's control of deeply spiritual beliefs.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this important measure, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), the author of this important bill and the chairman of the Rules Committee.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his advocacy on behalf of this issue.

And the ranking member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, I am delighted to be here with him, and I want to thank him for his work on this.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4331, the Tibetan Policy and Support Act. I am proud to have introduced this legislation with Congressman CHRIS SMITH of New Jersey and with Senators RUBIO and CARDIN in the Senate.

I thank Chairman ENGEL and Ranking Member MCCAUL for their strong support of this bill and, more importantly, for their tireless leadership in support of the human rights of the Tibetan people.

□ 1430

Madam Speaker, our bill updates and strengthens the Tibetan Policy Act of 2002 to address the challenges facing the Tibetan people. Perhaps as importantly, it reaffirms America's commitment to the idea that human rights matter, that we care about those who are oppressed, that we stand with those who are struggling for freedom, and that we have a moral obligation to do something when we see something that is not right.

It should be clear that we support a positive and productive U.S.-China relationship, but it is essential that the human rights of all the people of China are respected by their government.

Unfortunately, the human rights situation in Tibet has gotten much worse. The Chinese Government has refused to enter into genuine dialogue with Tibetan leaders. Restrictions on access to Tibet, both for Tibetans and foreigners, have been tightened. International journalists have stated that the isolation of Tibet is as bad as North Korea, allowing human rights abuses and environmental degradation to be concealed from the outside world.

Last year, the Congress passed the Reciprocal Access to Tibet Act to demand that American journalists, diplomats, and tourists be given the same freedom to travel to Tibet that Chinese officials have to travel freely in America. I hope to see a report from the State Department, which was due in December, describing the steps that the administration has taken to implement this policy over the last year.

In addition, the Chinese Government has used advanced technology to intensify security and surveillance.

It has ratcheted up its so-called anti-crime and vice campaign targeting Tibetans.

Religious freedom continues to be severely curtailed, including through mandatory political education for religious leaders and arrests of Tibetans who display a photo of the Dalai Lama.

The Panchen Lama turned 30 years old this year, but he and his family remain incommunicado since being kidnapped by Chinese authorities in 1995, making him the world's longest-serving prisoner of conscience.

Finally, Chinese officials have intervened to select Tibetan Buddhist leaders and threatened to choose the successor to the 14th Dalai Lama. These actions are in clear violation of China's international obligations to protect religious freedom.

It is essential that U.S. policy toward Tibet be updated and strengthened. The bill we are considering today would establish as U.S. policy that the succession or reincarnation of Tibetan Buddhist leaders, including a future 15th Dalai Lama, is an exclusively religious matter that should be decided solely by the Tibetan Buddhist community.

Send a clear message that Chinese officials who interfere in the succession or reincarnation process will be subject

to targeted financial, economic, and visa-related sanctions, including those contained in the Global Magnitsky Act.

Strengthen the role of the State Department Special Coordinator for Tibetan Issues by including a mandate to work multilaterally to promote a genuine dialogue.

Mandate that no new Chinese consulates should be established in the United States until a U.S. consulate is established in Tibet's historical capital of Lhasa.

Direct the State Department to begin collaborative, multinational efforts to protect the environment and water resources of the Tibetan Plateau.

Support democratic governance in the Tibetan exile community.

The Dalai Lama should be commended for his decision to devolve political authority to elected leaders.

The Tibetan exile community is also to be commended for adopting a system of self-governance with democratic institutions to choose their own leaders, including holding multiple free and fair elections to select its parliament and chief executive.

The adoption of democracy within the Tibetan exile community ensures that the Central Tibetan Administration in Dharamsala, India, legitimately represents and reflects the aspirations of the Tibetan people around the world.

Standing together, the American people will remain steadfast partners of the Tibetan people. For 60 years, His Holiness the Dalai Lama and so many Tibetans have remained separated from their land and their home, while the people in Tibet endure some of the harshest human rights abuses in the world.

I am proud that today the House of Representatives is taking this important step to strengthen U.S. policy in support of the Tibetan people.

Madam Speaker, I thank my colleagues for their support, and I urge all of my colleagues to support this important legislation.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Speaker, let me first commend the Congressman from Massachusetts and his great work on this issue. He has been a really strong fighter for democracy and freedom-loving peoples around the world, whether it be the Hong Kong Democracy Act or the Tibetan people and their persecution in China. I thank Chairman MCGOVERN so much, from the bottom of my heart.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOH), the Republican leader of the Asia, the Pacific, and Nonproliferation Subcommittee.

Mr. YOH. Madam Speaker, I thank Chairman MCCAUL and Mr. PHILLIPS for their leadership on this. Also, Mr. MCGOVERN has been a strong leader on this, and I appreciate it.

This is the way Congress should work. We come together on a common goal; we get things passed; and it makes a significant difference.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4331, the Tibetan Policy and Support Act of 2019.

Madam Speaker, I thank Representative MCGOVERN for his work on this important and timely legislation, which would reauthorize the Tibetan Policy Act of 2002 and reaffirm our commitment to the Tibetan people.

Since the 1950 invasion of the Chinese PLA forces, Tibet has been a land of occupation and oppression. For too long, the Chinese Government has utilized campaigns of aggression and intimidation in trying to silence and bully its neighbor and territories.

In that regard, the people of Tibet have not been spared. The number of displaced Tibetans number in the hundreds of thousands, with 110,000 taking refuge just in India alone.

I join my colleagues in Congress in reiterating our support for Tibet, the Tibetan people, and the protection of their distinct cultural identity.

I also believe that as one of Tibet's strongest partners, the U.S. Congress should hear from Tibet's political and spiritual leaders, which is why I introduced legislation last year to invite the Dalai Lama to address a Joint Meeting of Congress via teleconference to discuss the peaceful solutions to international conflicts.

Madam Speaker, this legislation has wide bipartisan support in the House. To the people of Tibet, know that we support your fight against adversity and for religious freedom.

This legislation makes it clear that the U.S. Congress will not sit on the sidelines and watch as a spectator but, rather, advocate strongly for increased protections for the Tibetan people.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank him and my colleague on the other side of the aisle for this resolution.

Madam Speaker, I had the honor and the privilege of visiting the Dalai Lama, and I welcome this opportunity to speak of his work and the danger he and his people face.

H.R. 4331 is a bipartisan and bicameral bill to update and strengthen the Tibetan Policy Act of 2002 in light of new human rights, religious, and environmental challenges the Tibetan people face today.

In the 18 years since the original Tibetan Policy Act became law, human rights in Tibet has grown worse. The Chinese Government has refused any discussions with Tibetan leaders and has threatened to select Tibetan Buddhist leaders, in clear violation of international religious freedom and Tibetan Buddhist practices.

The new Tibet Policy and Support Act before us today writes into law U.S. policy that the succession or reincarnation of Buddhist leaders is a religious matter to be determined by the Tibetan Buddhist community alone.

Among other provisions, interference in the process of recognizing a successor or reincarnation of the Dalai Lama would result in targeted financial, economic, and visa-related sanctions.

When the Dalai Lama visited the Nation's capital in 2011, I introduced a resolution welcoming Tibet's spiritual leader and recognizing his lifelong commitment to world peace and human rights.

The Dalai Lama welcomed me into his home in 2008 as part of a congressional delegation led by Speaker NANCY PELOSI.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. HOULAHAN). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the additional time.

Tibetan children, monks, and exiles lined the streets to greet our delegation in 2008.

Our congressional visit heightened attention to continuing cultural genocide and brutality in Tibet. Our delegation had a meeting and lunch with the Nobel Prize-winning Dalai Lama and his government in exile.

The Dalai Lama and his people have nothing to fight with except their own nonviolent determination and the willingness of free people everywhere to raise their voices.

The Tibet Policy and Support Act before us today is important to convey and reinforce the understanding that the United States will never cease working to assure complete freedom for the Dalai Lama and his people.

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

Mr. PHILLIPS. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SUOZZI), my friend.

Mr. SUOZZI. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4331, the bipartisan Tibetan Policy and Support Act of 2019.

By voting for this legislation, we are standing with the Tibetans and their religious and cultural way of life that the Chinese Government is seeking to eliminate.

Since President Nixon went to China in 1971, most Americans have believed that with increased exposure to our economic system and to our system of democracy, the Chinese Government would become more like us. That simply hasn't happened.

Whether it is the Hong Kong students, Uighur Muslims, Christians, or Tibetan Buddhists, China does not support our way of life. It does not support religious liberty.

Freedom of religion is a fundamental freedom. We must raise our voices loud and clear for all that are harassed, imprisoned, tortured, persecuted, or killed seeking to live out their faith. An attack on religious freedom anywhere is an attack on religious freedom everywhere.

Chinese officials in Tibet continue to severely restrict religious freedom, speech, movement, and assembly. They continue to restrict access to the unique cultural environment of Tibet.

In July 2018, authorities displaced over 200 under-18-year-old monks from at least two monasteries in Tibet and forced them to attend government-run schools.

In October 2018, Chinese Communist Party officials opened a new political education camp to train Tibetans in Chinese Communist Party ideology, particularly grassroots party-building and antiseparatism.

International journalists have said that the isolation of Tibet is worse than that of North Korea, allowing the Chinese Government to conceal human rights abuses.

The aspirations of the Tibetan people for dignity and freedom are viewed by the Chinese Government as a direct threat to their existence as an authoritarian state.

Reeducation and surveillance methods pioneered in Tibet are being used to target the Uighurs in Xinjiang, where the Chinese Government has created a surveillance state unlike anything the world has ever seen.

The Chinese Communist Party's repugnant campaign to destroy the cultural and religious identities of Tibetans and Uighurs requires more than just words of condemnation. We must stand up to any country that restricts individual liberty and religious freedom.

This legislation would urge the administration to place economic or visa sanctions against Chinese officials who interfere with the process of recognizing the next Dalai Lama.

Chairman MCGOVERN and I hosted a townhall in Queens, New York, this past summer with the largest Tibetan diaspora community, and we learned of their inability to visit their families in Tibet.

This legislation will also direct the Department of State to establish a United States consulate in Lhasa, Tibet, to enable U.S. citizens better access to Tibet.

I am proud to be part of a legislative body that continues to advocate for Tibetans, for Uighurs, and for human rights and the rule of law in China.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 2 minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. SUOZZI. To quote the Dalai Lama: "Tragedy should be utilized as a source of strength. No matter what sort of difficulties, how painful experience is, if we lose hope, that's our real disaster."

The United States' strength is in our values, and our policies should not be separated from them. We must not lose hope.

□ 1445

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

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

The United States has a longstanding record of bipartisan support for the Tibetan people. Religious tolerance is an American principle, an American value, and one that we must express around the entire world.

I am pleased that we are moving forward with a measure today that updates United States policy so that we are not just continuing, but we are strengthening this support.

I hope all Members will join me today in supporting this important measure that shows our commitment to preserving Tibet's unique culture, lands, language, and religion.

I am also proud of the bipartisan work that this Chamber has passed on China human rights. This is the third bill this Chamber has passed in recent months, the Hong Kong Human Rights and Democracy Act, and now this bill on Tibet.

I urge support for this bill and passage in the Senate of each of these terribly important measures.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Again, I want to thank Chairman MCGOVERN for strengthening U.S. support for Tibet at this critical moment.

As the Tibetan community prepares for the Dalai Lama's succession, we must rein in the Communist Party's attempts to destroy the autonomy of Tibetan Buddhism.

I also want to thank the gentleman from Minnesota, and Speaker PELOSI for her strong support for human rights and religious liberties. The gentleman stood on the floor when we debated the Hong Kong Human Rights and Democracy Act. That is what we do as Americans: We defend freedom and we defend democracy. This Nation was formed upon the idea of religious freedom and religious liberty.

Under the Communist Party of China's rule, religion really doesn't exist. In fact, it almost prohibits religious freedom. It persecutes religious freedom. It kills religious freedom.

The Dalai Lama himself was exiled to India where he is today. The Communist Party of China is brutally murdering and oppressing the Tibetan people; oppressing religious freedom and liberty, oppressing the Uighurs where they sit in camps, as I speak, with no voice, and, yes, they suppress the Christian community as well.

So, again, I want to thank my friends on the other side of the aisle, and I thank Speaker PELOSI so much for supporting this legislation as we stood together to support Hong Kong and the people of Hong Kong.

We spoke earlier today about supporting the people of Iran against theocracy and oppression, and we support the Tibetan people in their effort to exercise their religious freedom and liberty.

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

Mr. PHILLIPS. Madam Speaker, I thank Ranking Member MCCAUL for his important words.

Madam Speaker, I am honored to yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), our distinguished Speaker of the House.

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for bringing this legislation to the floor.

I am pleased to follow the distinguished ranking member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Mr. MCCAUL. One of the joys of my service in Congress is to work in a bipartisan way on issues that relate to respecting human rights and religious freedom throughout the world.

I thank Mr. MCCAUL for his leadership and Chairman ELIOT ENGEL for his leadership in facilitating this all through the committee. I thank Mr. PHILLIPS for giving us access to the floor today.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the Tibetan Policy and Support Act of 2019, a strong, bipartisan and urgently needed legislation to strengthen America's commitment to the Tibetan people and their right to safeguard their distinct identity.

I salute Chairman JIM MCGOVERN, the chair of the Congressional-Executive Commission on China and chair of the Tom Lantos Human Rights Commission. I thank Mr. MCGOVERN for being a leading voice in Congress and in the country for human rights.

I thank Congressman CHRIS SMITH—the gentleman and I go back decades. He is the ranking member of the Congressional-Executive Commission on China, and also the co-chair of the Tom Lantos Human Rights Commission. I have worked with the gentleman for three decades to hold China accountable for its oppression, as well as for promoting human rights throughout the world. I thank Mr. SMITH for his leadership.

I also want to acknowledge Senator MARCO RUBIO for his leadership in the United States Senate. As we discussed, he has been on some of the issues we have talked about, supporting the people of Hong Kong, the Uighurs, and now this important legislation. I thank Senator MARCO RUBIO for his leadership and courage in facilitating some of this legislation through the Senate.

For many of us, the fight to protect human rights in China has been a long-term commitment, as I acknowledged with Mr. SMITH, as well as Frank Wolf, our former Member who worked with CHRIS SMITH so closely.

In 1987 when I first came to Congress, I heard Tom Lantos—we mentioned the Tom Lantos Human Rights Commission—he invited me to meet His Holiness the Dalai Lama to be in a small meeting with him. I heard His Holiness first describe his "Middle Way Approach" for Tibet. It was an approach about autonomy, not about independence.

So, when the Chinese say that it is about independence, that is not what it ever has been about as far as His Holiness' presentation on Capitol Hill or to the world.

Among other priorities, the Dalai Lama proposed that Tibet be allowed to be a zone of peace; that the Tibetan people's human rights be respected; and Tibet's natural environment be safeguarded.

He said: "The Tibetan people must once again be free to develop culturally, intellectually, economically and spiritually and to exercise basic democratic freedoms."

I just wanted to acknowledge that because he talks about Tibet's natural environment.

His Holiness was the first Nobel Laureate, the first winner of the Nobel Peace Prize to have presented in the testimonial his protection for the environment. It has been there for a long time. For many of us, the fight, again, has been a long time.

Twenty years after that meeting, in 2007, and in 2008, as Speaker of the House, I had the privilege of visiting Dharamshala. Our delegation was blessed to be received by His Holiness the Dalai Lama, and we had the opportunity to see the aspirations of the Tibetan people firsthand, especially in the eyes of the Tibetan schoolchildren we met.

It was a bipartisan delegation. We spoke to big crowds waving American flags. It was a beautiful thing. But it is important to note the children, the beautiful Tibetan children. In order for their children to be raised in the tradition of the Tibetan language, culture, and religion, parents had to send them from Tibet to India because, sadly, Tibetan aspirations of observing their culture are under threat because of brutal repression in Beijing. That was in 2008.

Then in 2015, along with Chairman MCGOVERN, the gentleman and I led the first congressional delegation in decades to enter Tibet. In Jokhang Temple, Potala Palace, and Sera Monastery, we again witnessed the deep faith of the Tibetan people and the beauty of their culture.

We also saw the Potemkin Village-like posturing of the Chinese regime. For example, they said: We are going to invite you to a family's home so you can see how Tibetan families thrive in their own culture, language, and religion.

So we go to the home—and you probably have never seen this in anybody's home—but they had a gigantic picture of President Xi in the living room. And then they talked about their grandchildren and that the daughter had taken them to school, and that is why they weren't there.

So, when the daughter then came back from so-called taking them to school, we said: Well, how are the children?

And she said: Children? What children?

They had these fake visits to homes to show us how they were respecting Tibetan culture.

And then years later in 2017, I led another bipartisan delegation, this time to Nepal in India, where we were blessed to be received by His Holiness the Dalai Lama again. We saw once more the beautiful children again waving American flags, but no closer to an autonomous Tibet.

Today, we are here to pass the Tibetan Policy and Support Act. In 2002, Congress passed the Tibetan Policy Act to support the aspirations of the Tibetan people to safeguard their distinct identity, as His Holiness had suggested.

But in the years since, China has cruelly accelerated its outrageous aggression against the Tibetan people. As the CECC, the Congressional-Executive Commission on China concluded in its most recent report, Beijing is increasing Sinicization efforts and restricting the religious freedom of Tibetan Buddhists, including with mandatory political education for religious leaders, large-scale evictions from Buddhist monasteries, and by replacing images of the His Holiness the Dalai Lama with past and current party leaders.

The report also concludes that Beijing is expanding a massive surveillance regime to intimidate Tibetans and prevent them from practicing their culture or observing their religion. We could see the cameras every place we went, especially near the monasteries.

Pursuing massive infrastructure projects—I have seen that over the years. And we fought some of this in the World Bank then with Chris Cox and others here then on the Republican side of the aisle, working together—pursuing massive infrastructure projects that violate the social, economic, and cultural rights of Tibetans, forcing scores of families from their homes and even detaining monks for peaceful protest.

And tightening access to Tibet for international visitors. International journalists have stated that the isolation of Tibet is worse than North Korea, allowing the Chinese Government to conceal human rights abuses and environmentally damaging large-scale projects.

Today, the House is taking action to update and strengthen the Tibetan Policy Act to address these growing threats.

We are supporting the Tibetan people's right to religious freedom and genuine autonomy by formally establishing a U.S. policy that the Tibetan Buddhist community has exclusive right to choose its religious leaders, including a future 15th Dalai Lama.

Imagine that the Chinese Government should think that they should be choosing the next Dalai Lama of the Tibetan Buddhists.

We are sending Beijing a clear signal that they will be held accountable for interfering in Tibet's religious and cultural affairs, making it clear that Chinese officials who meddle in the proc-

ess of recognizing the new Dalai Lama will be subject to targeted sanctions, including those in the Global Magnitsky Act.

We are protecting Tibet's environmental and cultural rights, working with international governments and the business community to ensure the self-sufficiency of the Tibetan people and protect the environment and water resources of the Tibetan Plateau. This is really very important to the sustainability of our planet.

This legislation also deploys America's diplomatic weight to encourage a genuine dialogue between Tibetan leaders and Beijing. It is unacceptable that the Chinese Government still refuses to enter into a dialogue with Tibetan leaders.

□ 1500

Congress will—and must—continue to take action to hold China accountable for its many abuses which sadly target so many, including the Uighur community—which Mr. MCCAUL and Mr. RUBIO in a bipartisan way had acted upon—which faces horrific human rights abuses, including forced sterilizations and the mass incarceration of millions. This is happening as we speak. Millions of people are subjected to this in China.

And, as we know, the current party chairman of the Uighur Autonomous Region, Secretary Chen, previously served as the top party official of the Tibetan Autonomous Region. So oppressive was he, they rewarded him by sending him to the Uighur Autonomous Region. That is so sad.

We also see human rights abuses, as we know, in Hong Kong, where millions are fighting for the democratic freedoms they were promised and, on the mainland, where journalists, human rights lawyers, Christians, and democracy advocates languish in jail cells.

Today, in the face of rising oppression in China, Congress has an urgent responsibility to act. Sikyong Dr. Lobsang Sangay, the President of the Central Tibetan Administration, has said that, "The very survival of Tibetan culture and identity is in peril." Madam Speaker, if we don't speak out for human rights in China because of commercial interests, then we lose all moral authority to speak out for human rights anywhere in the world.

As I have said on this floor to those who take the repressive Chinese Government's side, we ask: What does it profit a man to have gained the whole world and suffers the loss of his soul?

Madam Speaker, I urge a strong vote for this legislation and support the Tibetan people as they seek to defend their culture and their identity and to pursue a future of freedom of religion and dignity.

I thank, again, the members of the Foreign Affairs Committee for giving us the opportunity to talk about Tibet on the floor of the House today.

Repression in Tibet by the Chinese Government is a challenge to the conscience of the world. Let's take this step to address that challenge.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PHILLIPS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4331, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. PHILLIPS. 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 motion will be postponed.

KEEPING GIRLS IN SCHOOL ACT

Mr. PHILLIPS. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2153) to support empowerment, economic security, and educational opportunities for adolescent girls around the world, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2153

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the “Keeping Girls in School Act”.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

- Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
- Sec. 2. Appropriate congressional committees defined.
- Sec. 3. Findings.
- Sec. 4. Sense of Congress.
- Sec. 5. Secondary education for adolescent girls.
- Sec. 6. Global strategy requirement.
- Sec. 7. Transparency and reporting to Congress.

SEC. 2. APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.

In this Act, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

- (1) the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives; and
- (2) the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.

SEC. 3. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

- (1) Adolescence is a critical period in a girl's life, when significant physical, emotional, and social changes shape her future.
- (2) Adolescent girls are particularly vulnerable to HIV/AIDS, child, early and forced marriage, and other forms of violence which are detrimental to their futures, as evidenced by the following statistics:

(A) Each year, 380,000 adolescent girls and young women become newly infected with HIV, more than 1,000 every day, and comprise the fastest-growing demographic for new infections in sub-Saharan Africa.

(B) Each year, 12,000,000 adolescent girls around the world are married before their 18th birthday, and more than 650,000,000 women alive today were married as children.

(C) Child marriages often interrupt schooling, limit opportunities, and impact the physical, psychological and social well-being

of such girls. If there is no reduction in child marriage, the global number of women married as children is projected to increase by 150,000,000 by 2030.

(D) One-quarter to one-half of girls in developing countries become mothers before the age of 18, and girls under 15 are five times more likely to die during childbirth than women in their 20s.

(3) Approximately 130,000,000 girls around the world are not in school, and millions more are failing to acquire basic reading, writing, and numeracy skills.

(4) Girls between the ages of 10 and 19 are three times more likely than boys to be kept out of school, particularly in countries affected by conflict.

(5) Due to discriminatory gender norms and expectations, disparities in access to safe and quality education manifest early in a girl's life and continue to become more pronounced throughout adolescence.

(6) Girls living with disabilities are less likely to start school and transition to secondary school than boys living with disabilities and other children, and just 1 percent of women with disabilities are literate globally.

(7) While two-thirds of all countries have achieved gender parity in primary education, only 40 percent have achieved gender parity in secondary education.

(8) Adolescent girls who remain in school are more likely to live longer, marry later, have healthier children, and, as adults, earn an income to support their families, thereby contributing to the economic advancement of communities and nations.

(9) Since July 2015, more than 100 public-private partnerships have been formed between the United States Government and external partners to support innovative and community-led solutions in targeted countries, including Malawi and Tanzania, to ensure adolescent girls receive a quality education.

(10) The United States Global Strategy to Empower Adolescent Girls, published in March 2016, has brought together the Department of State, the United States Agency for International Development, the Peace Corps, and the Millennium Challenge Corporation, as well as other agencies and programs such as the President's Emergency Fund for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR), to address the range of challenges preventing adolescent girls from attaining an inclusive and equitable quality education leading to relevant learning outcomes.

(11) According to the United States Global Strategy to Empower Adolescent Girls, which is the first foreign policy document in the world solely dedicated to the rights and empowerment of girls globally, “[w]hile the Millennium Development Goals improved outcomes for girls in primary education, they also highlighted the need for a targeted focus on adolescents and young adults, particularly regarding the transition to and completion of secondary school”.

(12) PEPFAR, through its DREAMS (Determined, Resilient, Empowered, AIDS-free, Mentored, and Safe) Initiative, has worked to address a number of the specific barriers to education that adolescent girls face.

SEC. 4. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) every child, regardless of place of birth, deserves an equal opportunity to access quality education;

(2) the United States has been a global leader in efforts to expand and improve educational opportunities for those who have been traditionally disenfranchised, particularly women and girls;

(3) gains with respect to girls' secondary education and empowerment have been proven to correlate strongly with progress in

gender equality and women's rights, as well as economic and social progress, and achieving gender equality should be a priority goal of United States foreign policy;

(4) achieving gender parity in both access to and quality of educational opportunity contributes significantly to economic growth and development, thereby lowering the risk for violence and instability; and

(5) education is a lifesaving humanitarian intervention that protects the lives, futures, and well-being of girls.

SEC. 5. SECONDARY EDUCATION FOR ADOLESCENT GIRLS.

(a) AUTHORITY.—The Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development may enter into acquisition, assistance, or results-based financing agreements, including agreements combining more than one such feature, for activities addressing the barriers described in subsection (b) that adolescent girls face in accessing a quality secondary education. Such activities shall—

(1) set outcome-based targets to demonstrate qualitative gains;

(2) use existing United States Government strategies and frameworks relevant to international basic education and gender equality, including evidence-based interventions, to—

(A) integrate new technologies and approaches, including to establish or continue public-private partnerships or to pilot the use of development impact bonds (the results of which are verified by an independent evaluation);

(B) to the greatest extent possible, apply quasi-experimental and scientific, research-based approaches;

(C) promote inclusive, equitable and sustainable educational achievement; and

(D) support a responsible transition to education systems that are sustainably financed by domestic governments; and

(3) ensure that schools provide safe and quality educational opportunities and create empowering environments, so that girls can enroll in and regularly attend school, successfully transition from primary to secondary school, and eventually graduate having achieved learning outcomes and positioned to make healthy transitions into adulthood.

(b) SPECIFIC BARRIERS.—The barriers described in this subsection include—

(1) harmful societal and cultural norms;

(2) lack of safety at school or traveling to school, including harassment and other forms of physical, sexual, or psychological violence;

(3) child, early, and forced marriage;

(4) female genital mutilation;

(5) distance from a secondary school;

(6) cost of secondary schooling, including fees, clothing, and supplies;

(7) inadequate sanitation facilities and products available at secondary schools;

(8) prioritization of boys' secondary education;

(9) poor nutrition;

(10) early pregnancy and motherhood;

(11) HIV infection;

(12) disability;

(13) discrimination based on religious or ethnic identity; and

(14) heavy workload due to household tasks.

(c) COORDINATION AND OVERSIGHT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The United States Agency for International Development Senior Coordinator for International Basic Education Assistance, in coordination with the United States Agency for International Development Senior Coordinator for Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment and the Ambassador-at-Large for Global Women's Issues

at the Department of State, shall be responsible for the oversight and coordination of all activities of the United States Government carried out under this section.

(2) **DEVELOPMENT OF AGREEMENTS.**—In the development of results-based financing agreements described in subsection (a), the Senior Coordinators shall consult with the United States Agency for International Development Innovation, Technology, and Research Hub or any successor center that is responsible for developing innovative tools and approaches to accelerate development impact.

(3) **COORDINATION WITH OTHER STRATEGIES.**—Activities carried out under this section shall also be carried out in coordination with—

(A) the United States Global Strategy to Empower Adolescent Girls described in section 6; and

(B) the United States Government Strategy on International Basic Education, including its objective to expand access to quality basic education for all, particularly marginalized and vulnerable populations.

(d) **ACCEPTANCE OF SOLICITATIONS FOR AWARDS.**—The Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development shall seek to accept solicitations for one or more awards, pursuant to the authority in subsection (a), to conduct activities under this section beginning not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(e) **MONITORING AND EVALUATION.**—The Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development shall seek to ensure that activities carried out under this section—

(1) employ rigorous monitoring and evaluation methodologies, including ex-post evaluation, to ensure that such activities demonstrably close the gap in gender parity for secondary education and improve the quality of education offered to adolescent girls;

(2) disaggregate all data collected and reported by age, gender, marital and motherhood status, disability, and urbanity, to the extent practicable and appropriate;

(3) adhere to the Policy Guidance on Promoting Gender Equality of the Department of State and the Gender Equality and Female Empowerment Policy of the United States Agency for International Development; and

(4) use, to the extent possible, indicators and methodologies identified by the Inter-agency Working Group for the Strategy on International Basic Education.

SEC. 6. GLOBAL STRATEGY REQUIREMENT.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 5 years thereafter for not less than 10 years, the Ambassador-at-Large for Global Women's Issues at the Department of State, in consultation with the Senior Coordinator for Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment and the Senior Coordinator for International Basic Education Assistance at the United States Agency for International Development, shall—

(1) review and update a United States global strategy to empower adolescent girls;

(2) provide a meaningful opportunity for public review and consultation on the strategy; and

(3) submit the strategy to the appropriate congressional committees.

(b) **INITIAL STRATEGY.**—For the purposes of this section, the “United States Global Strategy to Empower Adolescent Girls”, published in March 2016, shall be deemed to fulfill the initial requirement under subsection (a).

(c) **CONSULTATION REQUIRED.**—In reviewing and updating the strategy under subsection

(a), the Ambassador-at-Large for Global Women's Issues, the Senior Coordinator for Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment, and the Senior Coordinator for International Basic Education Assistance shall, as appropriate, consult with—

(1) the heads of relevant Federal departments and agencies their designees, as well as experts on adolescent girls, gender equality, and empowerment issues throughout the Federal Government;

(2) the appropriate congressional committees;

(3) representatives of United States civil society and multilateral organizations with demonstrated experience and expertise in empowering adolescent girls or promoting gender equality, including local civil society organizations and beneficiaries where possible; and

(4) local organizations and beneficiaries in countries receiving assistance pursuant to the strategy, including youth and adolescent girls' organizations.

SEC. 7. TRANSPARENCY AND REPORTING TO CONGRESS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and biennially thereafter for 10 years until each activity initiated pursuant to the authorities under this Act has concluded, the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, in coordination with the Secretary of State, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report describing—

(1) the activities initiated under the authorities provided in this Act; and

(2) the manner and extent to which such activities are monitored and evaluated, in accordance with section 5(e).

(b) **AVAILABILITY.**—The report required by subsection (a) shall be made available on a text-based, searchable, and publicly available website of the United States Agency for International Development.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PHILLIPS) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PHILLIPS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2153.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the Keeping Girls in School Act, and I want to thank my dear friend and colleague, Representative LOIS FRANKEL, for her hard work on this bill.

Access to education should not depend on whether a child is a boy or a girl. Yet around the world, 130 million girls are kept out of school. Fifteen million girls of primary school age will never enter a classroom.

Think of what that means for their futures and for their ability to lead prosperous lives.

We know what a difference just a few years of school makes. On average,

when a girl in the developing world receives 7 years of education, she marries 4 years later and has fewer children. Better educated women tend to be healthier and live longer, and women with secondary school education earn almost twice as much as those with no education at all.

When women and girls have access to education, they lift up their entire communities. In societies that make strides in education equality, we see better health outcomes, improved economic well-being, and greater security for everyone. That is why getting more girls in classrooms should be a foreign policy priority of the United States of America. It is the right thing to do. It also helps drive stability and prosperity in the long run.

But today, too many still face barriers like harassment, early marriage, disabilities, and lack of access to hygiene. These barriers conspire against girls succeeding, particularly adolescent girls.

This bill highlights those barriers to keeping girls in school all around the world and requires USAID to support activities addressing them throughout their existing work and into the future.

I am very proud to support H.R. 2153, and I am grateful to Members on both sides of the aisle for helping push it forward.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Keeping Girls in School Act.

I want to thank Representative FRANKEL and Representative BROOKS for their leadership on this legislation.

The United States has been a global leader in funding programs to support women and girls from around the world. We recognize the importance of empowering women to succeed, and that starts with receiving an education.

This legislation codifies the existing U.S. strategy to empower adolescent girls, which coordinates efforts between the Department of State, USAID, the Millennium Challenge Corporation, the Peace Corps, and PEPFAR to ensure that our development assistance programs are addressing barriers to girls' attendance in schools. It also supports efforts to ensure girls receive a quality secondary education and have the support necessary to stay in school.

We know that when women and girls are educated and supported, they are more likely to invest in their families and in their communities.

Last year, I was honored to travel to Cote d'Ivoire to launch the Women's Global Development and Prosperity Initiative alongside Ivanka Trump and a Senate delegation. W-GDP seeks to reach 50 million women in the developing world by 2025 through efforts to empower and enable women to be entrepreneurs and productive members of the workforce.

I was also proud to be a cosponsor of the Women's Entrepreneurship and Economic Empowerment Act which was signed into law last year. We must continue our bipartisan efforts to ensure United States' support for women and girls around the world is strong.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the Keeping Girls in School Act, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Madam Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. FRANKEL), who is the author of this important bill and my dear friend.

Ms. FRANKEL. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend from Minnesota for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I want to start by thanking my very good friend, SUSAN BROOKS. Over the past 7 years together we have been involved in many efforts to advance women and girls. It is an honor to work with the gentlewoman.

I thank my other colleagues for the support to bring this bill to the floor. It is a bipartisan, bicameral bill. It is sponsored by Senators MURKOWSKI and SHAHEEN in the Senate. It is called the Keeping Girls in School Act.

Madam Speaker, I am going to start with a question:

Why should Americans even care that there are 130 million girls around the world who are kept out of school?

That a young girl in a Malawi village is too frightened to walk miles to a secondary school for fear of sexual assault?

Or that a 12-year-old girl in Mozambique is forced to marry and denied schooling?

Or that hundreds of girls are kidnapped from school by Boko Haram terrorists who believe women should be cooks or sex slaves?

Or care about the 14-year-old in Pakistan, Malala Yousafzai, shot in the head by the Taliban because she wanted girls to be educated?

So why should Americans care that there are 130 million girls around the world who are kept out of school?

Madam Speaker, there are 130 million reasons to care. According to the Malala Fund, the international non-profit organization that fights for girl's education, cofounded by Malala, girls' education strengthens economies and creates jobs. Millions of girls being educated means there are more working women with the potential to add up to trillions of dollars in global growth.

When girls are educated, communities are more stable and can recover faster from conflict. Extremism grows alongside inequality. When a country gives all its children secondary education they cut their risk of war in half.

Educated girls are healthier citizens who raise healthier families. They are less likely to marry young or to contract HIV, and they are more likely to have healthy, educated children. Each additional year of school a girl completes cuts both infant mortality and child marriage rates.

Madam Speaker, when the Keeping Girls in School Act is put into full force, it will mean that countries where girls are educated will be more peaceful, making violent conflicts less likely and countries more prosperous, allowing them to be more self-reliant and participate in international trade. This means a safer and more economically vibrant world.

The Keeping Girls in School Act recognizes the progress made in closing the gender gap for primary education in developing countries like Vietnam, Tunisia, and Nepal, and recognizes that we must do more to advance our young girls around the world.

This legislation focuses on the unique obstacles keeping adolescent girls from accessing quality education at the secondary level. It will give USAID innovative tools and new funding mechanisms to address and reduce barriers that keep girls out of school—barriers like female genital mutilation, sexual violence, HIV infection, family obligations, and lack of safety.

This legislation would also codify and require updates to the U.S. Global Strategy to Empower Adolescent Girls, bringing together civil society organizations, the private sector, and governments around the world to prepare girls to become the leaders of tomorrow.

I am going to end today, Madam Speaker, by paraphrasing a poem about a young girl's plea to her father in Kenya. It goes something like this:

Father says to her: You are grown up, and I am going to marry you off.

I say: I don't want a husband.

Our fathers say: A daughter is good because we marry her off and we get a crate of beer.

Our mothers say: A daughter is good; the bridegroom will surely buy us presents.

And I, the daughter, say: Mother, father, give me an education because a husband without an education is nothing.

Father, look at other communities that have educated their daughters and reap good fruit.

Father says: I will take my beloved sons to school and my beloved daughters will look after the cattle.

I say: O, father, let the daughter go to school.

Educating a girl is educating a nation.

Misery will surely be a thing of the past.

And goodness will spread like a good aroma. Let's surely then educate the daughter.

Madam Speaker, when our daughters are educated, the world will change for the better.

I urge support of this very good bill, the Keeping Girls in School Act.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. BROOKS), who is the lead Republican cosponsor of this bill.

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 2153, the Keeping Girls in School Act.

I want to thank my very good friend from Florida, Representative FRANKEL, for championing this incredibly important legislation, and also my colleague, Representative MCCAUL of Texas, for

helping ensure that this was through the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

I am the mother of a daughter, and from birth I let her know that she could be anything she wanted to be. If she wanted to be a lawyer, a doctor, a nurse, a teacher, or an engineer, she could do whatever she wanted.

We all know too well that many girls around the world are not so lucky. As my good friend, Representative FRANKEL, just talked about, Malala of Pakistan was shot at the age of 15 returning from school. I am very proud that the Children's Museum of Indianapolis in my home of Indianapolis will be inducting her into the Power of Children Exhibit, because she has fought for the human rights of girls and children being able to go to school.

She was shot returning from school, and the Malala Fund is now focusing on her activism and trying to make sure that girls have the right to go to school.

As we have learned, 130 million girls don't have the opportunity to go to school, and it is impossible for them to consider their big dreams and goals. So this bill is about breaking down these barriers that women and girls face in attending and staying in school.

□ 1515

We know that the evidence has already shown, if we can keep girls in secondary education, it can boost economies of low- and middle-income nations by as much as \$92 billion, annually. It can cut childhood deaths by 50 percent, annually. It can reduce violent conflict in countries, and it can reduce child marriage by 66 percent, annually.

Studies show that girls between the ages of 10 and 19 are three times more likely than boys to be kept out of school, particularly in these countries where there is so much conflict. Yet, if we keep girls in school past fourth grade—and we are trying to get them through high school—we know that their wages will rise, their countries will be better, their communities will be better.

With our foreign investments, why wouldn't we want to take all of the incredible aid that we provide and make sure that there are strategies in place to make sure that girls get education?

This bill outlines that inexhaustible list of 14 barriers that keep girls from entering and remaining in secondary school. So let's bring together the State Department, USAID, Peace Corps, Millennium Challenge, and PEPFAR to address those challenges.

We know that young girls like Malala, who is leading the way, is a child who is so powerful in her voice because of what she went through. We know that, when girls succeed, nations and our world will succeed.

Madam Speaker, thank you, and I urge passage.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. HOULAHAN),

my friend and colleague on the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Ms. HOULAHAN. Madam Speaker, when I rise for women and girls around the world, I do so with the awareness that the barriers that we face do not exist in a vacuum, that a woman's right to education, to bodily autonomy, and to self-determination are all connected. To combat these barriers, we must enact comprehensive legislation that relies on years of data, studies, and advocacy efforts to establish a truly equal world across gender lines.

According to UN Women, every additional year of primary school increases girls' eventual wages by 10 to 20 percent. It also encourages them to marry later, to have fewer children, and leaves them less vulnerable to violence.

In our effort to achieve gender parity, it is crucial that we work with international partners and global organizations that are making great progress on this issue. Initiatives like the U.N. Joint Program to End Child Marriage are looking at this issue holistically, with the understanding that social protection, health, education, and social and behavioral change must all be addressed in order to spark sustainable changes for women and girls around the world. That is why I co-sponsored the Keeping Girls in School Act, which would empower girls by increasing their educational opportunities and economic security.

Girls and women deserve to be educated, to be economically independent, and to be the deciders of their own fate, and that is what we believe in the United States, and that is what we need to fight for in all corners of this world. I encourage all of my colleagues on both sides of this aisle to join me and to take a stand for women and girls across the globe.

The first step on the path to a more peaceful world starts with the empowerment of women and girls. A vote for the Keeping Girls in School Act is a vote for equality, for empowerment, and for a safer and more prosperous world for us all.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Speaker, yesterday in this Chamber we honored the life of a dear friend of mine, a colleague I came into the Congress with in 2005, Michael Fitzpatrick, and it was quite an honor to know him and to call him my friend. With that, I want to yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK), his brother and a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Madam Speaker, I want to thank my friend and my colleague, Mr. MCCAUL, for yielding and for his kind words and for his friendship.

Madam Speaker, first, I want to thank the entire committee, including yourself, Madam Speaker, Representative FRANKEL, and Representative BROOKS, for all of your and their work on this very, very important issue.

As a co-chair of the bipartisan International Basic Education Caucus, I want to join with all of our colleagues today to voice our strong support for H.R. 2153, the Keeping Girls in School Act, a bill that many of us helped introduce.

Today, as was echoed earlier, many girls worldwide are not in school, and this bill will work to close the gender gap between boys and girls and work to keep girls in school through the high school level, when girls are at the highest risk of dropping out.

This is a commitment of the U.S. to support programs, policies, and resources to help vulnerable girls stay in school. This bill will provide results-based aid grants, lower the cost of secondary education, and make sure that schools are safe for all of our children.

We must work to ensure that girls in every country are able to stay in school so that we can empower them in order to reduce poverty and create safer, healthier communities. The Keeping Girls in School Act will help reduce barriers girls around the world face when trying to remain in school and help them access more opportunities.

Madam Speaker, the top line summary of H.R. 2153 states this bill is "to support empowerment, economic security, and educational opportunities for adolescent girls around the world." However, this bill will do much more than that. This bill provides opportunity. This bill provides hope. This bill will give some of our most vulnerable a chance to succeed.

As Madam Speaker said earlier, we need to be a voice for the voiceless. And, Madam Speaker, I want to thank you for doing just that, yourself and Representative BROOKS, because these 130 million girls, they need a voice, and we are going to be that voice for them here today.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WALTZ), a distinguished member of the United States military who served our country so well overseas in some very dangerous places.

Mr. WALTZ. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of this important legislation.

Every child deserves access to a quality education—every child—and, unfortunately, that is not always the case for girls around the world. Adolescent girls, in particular, are most at risk of dropping out of school.

Worldwide, there are about 61 million girls between the ages of 6 and 14 who are not in school, and that is unacceptable. It is just unacceptable.

Madam Speaker, as a Green Beret who has operated all over the world, I have seen this up close and personal. I have seen this firsthand. I can tell you this from my experiences: I know firsthand that, where women thrive in business, where women thrive in civil society, in politics, and in government, extremism doesn't. That is it. Where women thrive in all of those places, the extremists do not.

So this isn't just an economic issue, although that is a very important one, or a humanitarian issue. This is a national security issue—for the United States of America, for the Western world, for the entire world.

For me, in one of my combat tours in Afghanistan, an Afghan elder I knew, whom I developed a relationship with throughout this tour, in every meeting kept talking about his secret weapon, his secret weapon. This was how we were going to defeat the Taliban and defeat the extremists, with this secret weapon.

I finally demanded to see this secret weapon. It wasn't a missile. It wasn't a weapon, per se, at all. It was his teenage daughters. That was his secret weapon. What he was doing was he was sneaking them out of Afghanistan and over to India to be trained as a lawyer and a doctor.

He pointed to them and said: Commander MIKE, this is how we are going to defeat the extremists. This is how we are going to win.

So I echo my colleagues who have mentioned the hero Malala Yousafzai. My favorite quote from her is: "Extremists have shown what frightens them most: a girl with a book."

So as a father of a young woman who is here with me today on the floor, about to turn 16, this is personal for me. This legislation is especially important to me. And every girl around the world, like her, deserves the chance to attend school and access a proper education. This legislation is a critical step in increasing these opportunities for young women, globally.

I want to commend my colleague and fellow Floridian, Madam Speaker, Representative FRANKEL, for her leadership on this issue. I also want to thank Ivanka Trump for her leadership.

Girls' education and women's empowerment should not be a partisan issue at all. It is an American issue. It is one of leadership, and it is one of human rights, of basic human rights.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

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

We have heard some really powerful testimony about the rights and the role of women throughout the world, and I think back to my own time as a counterterrorism Federal prosecutor, to chairman of the Homeland Security Committee, and now my role on the Foreign Affairs Committee. Where women are oppressed, democracy and freedom is oppressed. Where extremism exists, the rights of women are denied.

I also want to thank you, Madam Speaker, Ms. FRANKEL, for your leadership in bringing this bill to the floor.

It is a national security issue. I really view it that way because, where women are empowered, we don't have extremism.

Chairman ENGEL and I will be at the Canadian Embassy this night talking about the Global Fragility Act and the ONE Campaign and Bono's efforts to

stabilize the world, stabilize this whole region from extremism. What we found, whether it was Boko Haram taking 270 Catholic grade school girls hostage, to the Taliban raining down on educated women or women trying to get an education, to the story of Ms. Yousafzai, to killing women in the streets, it is absolutely unacceptable.

I am proud today that we stand as Americans and not as partisans standing for the rights of young women. I have four daughters myself, and they live in freedom, and they know education is important. But women around the world deserve this right. Regardless of where you are born, women and girls around the world deserve this right.

We have seen it from Afghanistan, to the Sahel, to Pakistan and, really, all over the world. I think the number, 130 million. I love the quote that the biggest threat to extremism is a girl with a book. That is what we are going to change.

Madam Speaker, thank you for your boldness and your courage and leadership in bringing this to the floor, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume for the purpose of closing.

Madam Speaker, I want to thank you, Congresswoman FRANKEL, for your hard work on this measure. You have been a tireless advocate for women and girls here at home and all around the world.

I also want to thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WALTZ), my colleague, who had brought his daughter here to the floor moments ago in a heartwarming gesture. I, too, am a father of two extraordinary daughters, Daniela and Pia. They have received the blessings of education and know how lucky they are. They, like me and like so many of us here in the U.S. House of Representatives, know how important it is to extend that same blessing to every girl around the world. That is why this is one of those areas in which American leadership is vitally important.

The benefits of supporting education for women and girls are as clear as can be. But more than that, helping more people live up to their potential and to pursue their dreams is a great reflection of our values, the values that should be at the very center of American foreign policy. Girls' education must be made a strategic development priority.

This is a good measure, which I am pleased to support, and I urge all of my colleagues to do the same.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. FRANKEL). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PHILLIPS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2153, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the

rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3621, STUDENT BORROWER CREDIT IMPROVEMENT ACT, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF THE SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 550, MERCHANT MARINERS OF WORLD WAR II CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL ACT OF 2019

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 811) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3621) to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act to remove adverse information for certain defaulted or delinquent private education loan borrowers who demonstrate a history of loan repayment, and for other purposes, and providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 550) to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the United States Merchant Mariners of World War II, in recognition of their dedicated and vital service during World War II, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on:

Adoption of House Resolution 811, if ordered; and

The motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 4331.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 227, nays 184, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 25]

YEAS—227

Adams	Clay	Espallat
Aguilar	Cleaver	Evans
Allred	Clyburn	Finkenauer
Axne	Cohen	Fletcher
Barragán	Cooper	Foster
Bass	Correa	Frankel
Beatty	Costa	Fudge
Bera	Courtney	Gallego
Beyer	Cox (CA)	Garamendi
Bishop (GA)	Craig	García (IL)
Blumenauer	Crist	García (TX)
Blunt Rochester	Crow	Golden
Bonamici	Cuellar	Gomez
Boyle, Brendan F.	Cunningham	Gonzalez (TX)
Brindisi	Davids (KS)	Gottheimer
Brown (MD)	Davis (CA)	Green, Al (TX)
Brownley (CA)	Davis, Danny K.	Grijalva
Bustos	Dean	Haaland
Butterfield	DeFazio	Harder (CA)
Carbajal	DeGette	Hastings
Cárdenas	DeLauro	Hayes
Carson (IN)	DelBene	Higgins (NY)
Cartwright	Delgado	Himes
Case	Demings	Horn, Kendra S.
Casten (IL)	DeSaunier	Horsford
Castor (FL)	Deuch	Houlahan
Castro (TX)	Dingell	Hoyer
Chu, Judy	Doggett	Huffman
Cicilline	Doyle, Michael F.	Jackson Lee
Cisneros	Engel	Jayapal
Clark (MA)	Escobar	Jeffries
Clarke (NY)	Eshoo	Johnson (GA)
		Johnson (TX)

Kaptur	Morelle	Scott (VA)
Keating	Moulton	Scott, David
Kelly (IL)	Mucarsel-Powell	Serrano
Kennedy	Murphy (FL)	Sewell (AL)
Khanna	Nadler	Shalala
Kildee	Napolitano	Sherman
Kilmer	Neal	Sherrill
Kim	Neguse	Sires
Kind	Norcross	Slotkin
Krishnamoorthi	O'Halleran	Smith (WA)
Kuster (NH)	Ocasio-Cortez	Soto
Lamb	Omar	Spanberger
Langevin	Pallone	Speier
Larsen (WA)	Panetta	Stanton
Larson (CT)	Pappas	Stevens
Lawrence	Pascrell	Suozi
Lawson (FL)	Payne	Swalwell (CA)
Lee (CA)	Perlmutter	Takano
Lee (NV)	Peters	Thompson (CA)
Levin (CA)	Peterson	Thompson (MS)
Levin (MI)	Phillips	Titus
Lewis	Pingree	Tlaib
Lieu, Ted	Pocan	Tonko
Lipinski	Porter	Torres (CA)
Loeb sack	Pressley	Torres Small (NM)
Lofgren	Price (NC)	Trahan
Lowenthal	Quigley	Trone
Lowe y	Raskin	Underwood
Lujan	Rice (NY)	Vargas
Luria	Richmond	Veasey
Lynch	Rose (NY)	Vela
Malinowski	Rouda	Velázquez
Maloney,	Roybal-Allard	Visclosky
Carolyn B.	Ruiz	Wasserman
Maloney, Sean	Ruppersberger	Schultz
Matsui	Rush	Waters
McAdams	Ryan	Watson Coleman
McBath	Sánchez	Welch
McCollum	Sarbanes	Wexton
McEachin	Scanlon	Wild
McGovern	Schakowsky	Wilson (FL)
McNerney	Schiff	Yarmuth
Meeks	Schneider	
Meng	Schrader	
Moore	Schrier	

NAYS—184

Abraham	Fortenberry	Marchant
Aderholt	Foxx (NC)	Marshall
Allen	Fulcher	Massie
Amash	Gaetz	Mast
Amodei	Gallagher	McCarthy
Arrington	Gianforte	McCaul
Babin	Gibbs	McClintock
Bacon	Gohmert	McHenry
Baird	Gonzalez (OH)	McKinley
Balderson	Gooden	Meadows
Banks	Gosar	Meuser
Barr	Graves (GA)	Miller
Bergman	Graves (LA)	Mitchell
Biggs	Graves (MO)	Moolenaar
Billirakis	Green (TN)	Mooney (WV)
Bishop (NC)	Griffith	Murphy (NC)
Bishop (UT)	Grothman	Newhouse
Bost	Guest	Norman
Brady	Guthrie	Nunes
Brooks (AL)	Hagedorn	Olson
Brooks (IN)	Harris	Palazzo
Buchanan	Hartzer	Palmer
Buck	Hern, Kevin	Pence
Bucshon	Herrera Beutler	Perry
Budd	Hice (GA)	Posey
Burchett	Hill (AR)	Ratcliffe
Burgess	Holding	Reed
Calvert	Hollingsworth	Reschenthaler
Carter (GA)	Hudson	Rice (SC)
Carter (TX)	Huizenga	Riggleman
Chabot	Hurd (TX)	Roby
Cheney	Johnson (LA)	Rodgers (WA)
Cline	Johnson (OH)	Roe, David P.
Cloud	Johnson (SD)	Rogers (KY)
Cole	Jordan	Rose, John W.
Comer	Joyce (OH)	Rouzer
Conaway	Joyce (PA)	Roy
Cook	Katko	Rutherford
Crawford	Keller	Scallise
Crenshaw	Kelly (PA)	Schweikert
Curtis	King (IA)	Scott, Austin
Davidson (OH)	King (NY)	Sensenbrenner
Davis, Rodney	Kustoff (TN)	Shimkus
DesJarlais	LaHood	Simpson
Diaz-Balart	LaMalfa	Smith (MO)
Duncan	Lamborn	Smith (NE)
Dunn	Latta	Smith (NJ)
Emmer	Lesko	Smucker
Ferguson	Long	Spano
Fitzpatrick	Loudermilk	Stauber
Fleischmann	Lucas	Stefanik
Flores	Luetkemeyer	Steube

Stewart
Taylor
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Timmons
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Wagner
Walberg

Walden
Walker
Walorski
Waltz
Watkins
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westernman
Williams

Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Wright
Yoho
Young
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—18

Armstrong
Byrne
Collins (GA)
Connolly
Estes
Gabbard

Granger
Heck
Higgins (LA)
Kelly (MS)
Kinzinger
Kirkpatrick

Mullin
Rogers (AL)
Rooney (FL)
Steil
Stivers
Van Drew

□ 1601

Messrs. KHANNA and PETERS changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. LEE of California). The question is on the resolution.

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. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 223, nays 189, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 26]

YEAS—223

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Axne
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brindisi
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleave
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Cunningham
Davids (KS)
Davis (CA)

Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Españillat
Evans
Finkenauer
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel
Fudge
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Haaland
Harder (CA)
Hastings
Hayes
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Horn, Kendra S.
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Kaptur

Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim
Kind
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsock
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Luján
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse

Norcross
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rose (NY)
Rouda
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz

Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Sanchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stanton
Stevens
Suozi

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)

NAYS—189

Gooden
Gosar
Graves (GA)
Palmer
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Griffith
Grothman
Bacon
Baird
Hagedorn
Harris
Hartzler
Hern, Kevin
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Hill (AR)
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hurd (TX)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Katko
Keller
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Cole
Comer
Conaway
Cook
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
Davidson (OH)
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxy (NC)
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Golden
Gonzalez (OH)

Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Rodgers (WA)
Roe, David P.
Rogers (KY)
Rose, John W.
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sherrill
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spano
Staubert
Stefanik
Steube
Stewart
Taylor
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Timmons
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Waltz
Watkins
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westernman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Wright
Yoho
Young
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—17

Byrne
Collins (GA)
Estes
Gabbard
Granger
Heck

Higgins (LA)
Kelly (MS)
Kinzinger
Kirkpatrick
Mullin
Rogers (AL)

Rooney (FL)
Steil
Stivers
Van Drew
Yarmuth

□ 1610

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.

TIBETAN POLICY AND SUPPORT ACT OF 2019

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4331) to modify and reauthorize the Tibetan Policy Act of 2002, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PHILLIPS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 392, nays 22, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 27]

YEAS—392

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Allred
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Axne
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Bishop (UT)
Bost
Brady
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Cole
Comer
Conaway
Cook
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Cunningham
Curtis
Davids (KS)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Davis, Rodney
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Españillat
Evans
Ferguson
Finkenauer
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel

Cleave
Cline
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Comer
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Green, Al (TX)
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Haaland
Hagedorn
Harder (CA)
Hartzer
Hastings
Hayes
Hern, Kevin
Herrera Beutler
Higgins (NY)
Hill (AR)
Himes
Holding
Hollingsworth
Horn, Kendra S.
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga
Hurd (TX)
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson (TX)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Kaptur
Katko
Keating

Keller
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamb
Lamborn
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Lesko
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loeback
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marshall
Mast
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCarthy
McCauley
McClintock
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McNerney
Meadows
Meeks
Meng
Meuser
Miller
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell

Murphy (FL)
Murphy (NC)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newhouse
Norcross
Nunes
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Olson
Omar
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Panicke
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Pence
Perlmuter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Posey
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Riggleman
Roby
Rodgers (WA)
Roe, David P.
Rogers (KY)
Rose (NY)
Rose, John W.
Rouda
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Rutherford
Ryan
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scalise
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill

Shimkus
Simpson
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Soto
Spanberger
Spano
Speier
Stanton
Staubert
Stefanik
Stevens
Stewart
Suozi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Timmons
Tipton
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small
(NM)
Trahan
Trone
Turner
Underwood
Upton
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Waltz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watkins
Watson Coleman
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Wexton
Wild
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Wright
Yarmuth
Yoho
Young
Zeldin

NAYS—22

Amash
Babin
Biggs
Bishop (NC)
Brooks (AL)
Buck
Budd
Burgess

NOT VOTING—16

Byrne
Collins (GA)
Estes
Gabbard
Granger
Heck
Higgins (LA)
Kelly (MS)
Kinzinger
Kirkpatrick
Mullin
Rogers (AL)
Rooney (FL)
Steil
Stivers
Van Drew

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Madam Speaker, I was absent today due to a medical emergency. Had I been present, I would have voted: "yea" on rollcall No. 25, "yea" on rollcall No. 26 and "yea" on rollcall No. 27.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ESTES. Madam Speaker, I was not present for Roll Call vote No. 25 on Ordering the Previous Question, as Amended, Providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3621) Student Borrower Credit Improvement Act, and providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 550) Merchant Mariners of World War II Congressional Gold Medal Act. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

Madam Speaker, I was not present for Roll Call vote No. 26 on Agreeing to the Resolution, as Amended, Providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3621) Student Borrower Credit Improvement Act, and providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 550) Merchant Mariners of World War II Congressional Gold Medal Act. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

Madam Speaker, I was not present for Roll Call vote No. 27 on Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass, as Amended. Tibetan Policy and Support Act. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

PROVIDING FOR A JOINT SESSION OF CONGRESS TO RECEIVE A MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I send to the desk a privileged concurrent resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON RES. 86

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Tuesday, February 4, 2020, at 9 p.m., for the purpose of receiving such communication as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOMENT OF SILENCE HONORING VICTIMS OF THE KOBE BRYANT HELICOPTER CRASH

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

Mr. ROUDA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in solidarity with the California delegation to speak about the terrible loss our community has endured and to honor the lives of those who perished on Sunday.

We are all heartbroken by the loss of life, as this week our neighbors lost parents, children, friends, coaches, and

heroes in a horrific accident: Alyssa, Keri, and John Altobelli; Gianna and Kobe Bryant; Payton and Sarah Chester; Christina Mauser; and Ara Zobayan.

They were all connected by a love of the game, a steadfast belief in sports being bigger than a score, more than just an hour or two on the court.

The parents we lost knew all too well that the early morning wake-ups, sweaty car rides, and late nights in a gym were worth the lessons they instilled in their children: teamwork, dedication, and faith.

Our community lost kids who were overflowing with promise; kids who were great competitors and even better friends; kids you could count on, on and off the court; kids who pushed themselves to be more and who were the best daughters that any parent could ask for.

All of us wish they could play another game.

Orange County is grieving, but we will find solace and purpose in the example they left behind and the belief in something bigger than ourselves.

I ask that in Orange County and across our Nation, we think of the lives lost, in neighborhood basketball courts, school gyms, NBA arenas, and wherever the game is played.

May God bless their families, and may our community come together to offer them this support in this trying time.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS), my distinguished colleague.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I stand today on behalf of all Californians; certainly, the entire city of Los Angeles; and millions of fans worldwide who are mourning the sudden and tragic loss of one of the greatest athletes we have ever known: Kobe Bryant.

Celebrated as a king in Los Angeles, Kobe's death is deeply painful for our city and his millions of fans everywhere.

For decades, he dazzled generations of fans and aspiring athletes, leaving a legacy as a prolific athlete, devoted husband, loving father, and philanthropist that will never be forgotten.

This tragic event is made worse by the death of his 13-year-old daughter, Gianna Bryant, a beautiful young lady who was so full of life and potential.

Our hearts go out to his wife, Vanessa; surviving daughters, Bianka, Natalia, and Capri; relatives; teammates; and friends.

On behalf of the California delegation, we lift up the names of Kobe Bryant; his beloved daughter, Gianna; and all the victims of this horrible tragedy in prayer and reverence. We send our deepest condolences to their loved ones, now and forever.

Mr. ROUDA. Mr. Speaker, I ask that all Members and guests in the gallery rise for a moment of silence.

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 5598

Mr. STEWART. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove myself as a cosponsor of H.R. 5598.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1630

HONORING THE LIFE OF GRANDMASTER KEVIN THOMPSON

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

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor a true warrior from my district, Grandmaster Kevin Thompson. Grandmaster Thompson was a son of Newark and a world-famous martial artist.

He was a lightweight fighter at 155 pounds who defeated many heavy-weight challengers.

In his time, he won more than 100 trophies at world championships in three disciplines: weapons, forms, and fighting.

Today, he is in the Black Belt Hall of Fame alongside noted martial artists Bruce Lee and Chuck Norris. Through his skill, he earned the rank of grandmaster, a rare honor for his achievements and contributions to the sport.

Grandmaster Kevin Thompson's bravery and courage helped him battle Lou Gehrig's disease until his passing on January 8, but that will not dim the bright legacy he left in the world of martial arts and in our Newark community.

RECOGNIZING HARLEY WHEELER ON HIS RUGBY ACHIEVEMENTS

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

Mr. BURCHETT. Madam Speaker, I rise to recognize Harley Wheeler, an outstanding rugby player from Knoxville, Tennessee. His granddad, Roy, and his grandmother—he recently lost—Alice, were dear friends of mine.

Harley played rugby since he was 14 and is now one of the top players in the United States. Harley began his rugby career with the South Doyle Rugby Club while a student at South-Doyle High School. In 2015, he enrolled at Life University to compete on its rugby team at the collegiate level.

Harley's 4 years on the Life University rugby team were incredibly successful. The team advanced to the Division 1A College Rugby National Championship match every year he was on the team, and won the championship in 2016, 2018, and 2019.

After graduating with a degree in business, Harley was selected to represent the United States on the inter-

national stage at the 2019 Pan American Games in Lima, Peru. Team USA finished third at the games, defeating Brazil 24-19. Harley scored 10 points during the bronze medal match.

As we approach the 2020 Summer Olympics, I wish Harley the best of luck as he competes for a spot on the national rugby team. I hope to see him representing Knoxville and the United States in Japan.

PREVENT DOMESTIC EXTREMISM

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

Mr. MALINOWSKI. Madam Speaker, last week in my New Jersey district I hosted a briefing with over 80 faith leaders: Jewish, Christian, Muslim, Hindu, and Sikh. We didn't discuss how to build a better world. We just talked about how to protect their houses of worship from violence.

Whether a synagogue in Pittsburgh, a mosque in New Zealand, a shopping mall in Texas, or a Jewish deli in New Jersey, people are being targeted for who they are, for what they believe.

Last year, Congress did something to help. We restored funding to the Department of Homeland Security to prevent domestic extremism—including violent acts of anti-Semitism—which the Trump administration cut in 2017. This has allowed DHS to substantially increase the number of staff working with State and local governments to stop these attacks.

This year, there is more to be done, from stepping up investigations and prosecutions of domestic terrorists, to designating transnational neo-Nazi groups as terrorist organizations, to confronting social media companies over algorithms that amplify hate.

Let's make this a priority in 2020 until no one need be afraid anymore.

NATIONAL SLAVERY AND HUMAN TRAFFICKING PREVENTION MONTH

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

Mr. SPANO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize National Slavery and Human Trafficking Prevention Month.

Globally, there are over 40 million victims of human trafficking at any given time, 75 percent of them women and girls, and 25 percent are children. While 81 percent are trapped in forced labor, millions more are in forced sexual exploitation and forced marriages.

Not only is human trafficking at epidemic levels overseas, but it is also experiencing rampant growth in our own backyard.

Statistics rank the State of Florida as the third highest trafficking destination in the U.S. Human trafficking traps millions of the most vulnerable

members of society into modern-day slavery and generates annual profits of \$150 billion.

Events like the February Super Bowl in Miami are major targets. It is imperative that we give law enforcement the tools needed to identify and prevent human trafficking.

We also need to pass legislation that deters and punishes the perpetrators and allows the victims to heal and re-acclimate.

This rapidly growing issue demands our attention. Let's work together, no matter which side of the aisle we sit on, to end this evil for good.

RECOGNIZING JAMIE DURRENCE

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. Jamie Durrence who has been selected to serve as the 2020 chair of the Georgia Restaurant Association Board of Directors.

I can't think of someone more deserving of this responsibility. In his more than 20 years managing restaurants in Savannah, he has rejuvenated Savannah's restaurant scene with four restaurants that serve fresh ingredients, unique menus, quality service, and overall exceptional dining experiences.

Much of Mr. Durrence's penchant for the restaurant industry stems from his youth when he was raised on a working farm just outside of Savannah.

As chairman of the Georgia Restaurant Association Board of Directors, Mr. Durrence will be tasked as the chief spokesperson for the industry and will be an integral part of the statewide events.

I know that the Georgia restaurant industry is in good hands with Mr. Durrence.

Congratulations, Mr. Durrence. Keep up the good work.

HONORING BRETT MILAM FOR DONATING HIS KIDNEY

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

Mr. WENSTRUP. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Clermont County resident Brett Milam for selflessly donating his kidney to a stranger in need.

He recently shared his decision with our community in The Clermont Sun in Ohio where he works, describing his recent kidney donation and journey.

Brett was inspired by an article written by a man who had made the same choice to donate a kidney for no other reason than to commit an act of kindness.

As Brett tells it, after months of research, contemplation, and discussion with other organ donors, he decided to help a stranger, giving them an early Christmas present: a healthy kidney.

I applaud Brett for making this donation to save a complete stranger's life, and I am particularly moved by the selflessness and kindness that Brett made with this action.

Brett's choice to donate his kidney demonstrates the most compassionate side of humanity.

Today, I recognize Brett Milam for his extremely selfless act of kindness.

Thank you, Brett, and God bless.

COMMENDING EPA ADMINISTRATOR ANDREW WHEELER

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Speaker, I wish to commend EPA Administrator Andrew Wheeler for his recent clearing up of the definition of waters of the United States, known as WOTUS, indeed, causing a lot of woe for people in my district and the Western U.S., especially.

Under the 2015 definition, it seemed every puddle, every ditch, every possible water source was going to be brought under the fist of the U.S. Government. With much dismay, many farmers, ranchers, people building, and people doing simple things were unable to understand what they were supposed to do. Indeed, it was a long arm of government overreach.

What we have heard since then: "Oh, the sky is falling. This is going to roll back protections."

These aren't protections. These are things that are way beyond the scope of what government should be doing.

It limited the scope of rivers and large streams and our oceans. So with all of "the sky is falling" you are hearing, no, it isn't anything like that. Indeed, it is putting it back into more equitable space.

What this rule does is, indeed, end the confusion and ends the Federal overreach and helps us get back to business and still protect the environment.

STATE OF THE ECONOMY

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include any extraneous materials on the subject of this Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I come to the floor this afternoon with a number of my Democratic colleagues to

speak about the subject of paramount concern for most Americans: the economy. Healthcare, the economy, and their jobs are what folks are focused on when they wake up in the morning.

The Joint Economic Committee now headed on our side of the aisle by DON BEYER from Virginia, released two reports today that all Americans should look at carefully. One of them focuses on the failure of the 2017 Trump tax cuts which Chairman NEAL will be focusing on shortly.

Republicans claim that the tax cuts would pay for themselves and not add a penny to deficits and debt. That is a theory that we have heard time and time again from Republicans to support their tax cuts for the wealthiest in our country. Both experience and evidence tell us that their tax cuts always end up driving our deficits up, hurting the middle class, and placing the burden on future generations.

I hope Americans will read that report and draw the same conclusions that so many economists have made about the dangerous tax scam.

The second report which we will be focusing on this evening concerns the economy more broadly. It asks a question that many Americans may be asking this year: Is the Trump economy doing as well as the President claimed it would?

And: Can the President take credit for economic growth that began long before he took office?

I want to thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER) for his efforts as vice chair of the Joint Economic Committee, as well as the former vice chair, CAROLYN MALONEY, who now heads up the Oversight and Reform Committee.

I will be yielding to Mr. BEYER soon to speak more about the content of the committee's report. He will be followed by Mr. NEAL who is the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, and a senior member of this body. He is probably one of the most knowledgeable people, not only about taxes, but about the economy in general.

But first I want to speak a little bit about this President's record on the economy.

President Trump sought office on a raft of economic promises. He promised to create 25 million new jobs in 10 years.

He promised 6 percent growth in our domestic product.

He promised to eliminate the \$19 trillion national debt.

He promised to get wages up for American workers with \$4,000 raises as a result of the tax cuts.

And the President promised to make healthcare much less expensive and much better.

□ 1645

Let's see how he is doing.

On the first measure, job growth, job growth has slowed under President Trump. Let me repeat that. Job growth has slowed under President Trump

compared to the level of the economic expansion that began under his predecessor.

This chart—and it will probably be hard to see for many viewers—shows that job growth was highest here in the years before President Trump took office and then lower, following.

Now, what does that mean?

Let me give you the big figure, Madam Speaker, because the specifics of the chart will be difficult for people to see on the floor and in the gallery.

What it means is that, on average—and this is an important fact to remember—under President Obama, there were 227,000 jobs created per month over the last 35 months of his term.

Now we have had 35 months of the Trump term. What has he done to realize that promise of 25 million jobs?

Madam Speaker, 36,000 less jobs per month have been created under Donald Trump than under Barack Obama in the same timeframe.

Now, that is important because the President, of course, claims that this is the best economy we have ever seen. As I said, that is 36,000 fewer jobs per month, and 1.26 million fewer jobs over President Trump's term from the trend he inherited.

Madam Speaker, I am going to show you a chart on how the economy that President Obama had put in place with the help of the Congress was going straight up.

At this pace, President Trump's 4-year term will not achieve the same level of job creation as the previous 4-year term of President Obama. In fact, he would fall—listen to this figure—2.5 million jobs short.

So, when we hear the President at a rally claiming this great economic boom, remember, 2.5 million less jobs created.

President Trump also loves to cite the low unemployment rate, which, in December 2019, stood at 3.5 percent. That is, indeed, a low number. It is a good number in the sense that it shows that so many of our people are working. But underlying those facts are so many of our people are working one, two, and three jobs so they can support themselves and their family.

Now, when he took office, the rate was 4.7 percent. It is 3.5 percent now and 4.7 percent when he took office. Compare that to the decline in the unemployment rate during the same period in President Obama's second term.

At his second inauguration, the rate was 7.9 percent. He left office with 4.7 percent. That is 3.2 percent less. He left the office with a 4.7 percent unemployment rate, continuing a strong decline.

Under President Obama, a decline of 5.3 percentage points from when he took office; under President Trump, a decline of 1.2 percentage points.

Madam Speaker, let me give you that figure again. Under President Obama, he inherited from George Bush a declining employment. It spiked at 10 percent, and under President Obama,

that came down to 4.7 percent. That is where you get the 5.3 percent reduction. Actually, he halved the unemployment rate if you figure it that way.

Under President Trump, however, he inherited a downward trend—in other words, less unemployment as opposed to more unemployment from Bush to Obama—and he has failed to keep the pace that President Obama established.

This was the decline in the unemployment rate under Barack Obama. This is what has happened: steeper decline under Obama, got to a low number, and it has been reduced by 1.2 percent as opposed to the 4.7 percent that Obama reduced it to.

While President Trump boasted that his administration would see a 6 percent GDP—that is growth in the domestic product of our country, our entire production—that would have been good; 6 percent would have been phenomenal. It was also not attained.

Over the first 11 quarters of his term, that figure was 2.6 percent, dropping to 2.1 percent in the third quarter of last year. The Federal Reserve estimates that 2020 will see it fall even lower as any short-term stimulus from his tax cut disappears. Mr. NEAL is going to talk about the tax cut and what was promised and what was delivered.

Madam Speaker, I would simply point out to you that what you see is, essentially, a level 2.5 percent average growth under President Obama and under President Trump, notwithstanding the extraordinary trillion-dollar tax cut that was infused in the economy. Again, Mr. NEAL will speak more to that.

It is clear the Trump tax cut did little to boost GDP as he claimed it would, and, of course, he claimed many more jobs.

On deficits and the debt, President Trump's promise would seem laughable if the reality weren't so dangerous.

Instead of reversing deficits and eliminating the debt, he has overseen an increase fueled by his 2017 tax cut that gave \$2 trillion in new, unpaid-for tax cuts primarily to the wealthiest in our country.

Last week, to the surprise of no one who understands the history of Republican tax cuts, President Trump suggested he might seek cuts to Medicare and Social Security to offset the deficits created by his tax cuts. I will leave it to Chairman YARMUTH to go into greater detail about the Trump deficits.

We have all seen this President's campaign on reducing America's trade deficit, but it has increased on his watch. In fact, according to the Joint Economic Committee's report, as many as 450,000 jobs were lost in 2019 alone as a result of this President's trade wars.

The President loves to stand at the podium at his rallies and shout slogans about how his is the best economy ever and how he inherited a mess from President Obama. Those statements, sadly, as so many of his have been

shown to be, are not accurate. That is a polite way to say it. The facts tell the opposite story.

Over the course of the Obama Presidency, 10.8 million jobs were created as the unemployment rate fell from, as I said, 10 percent to 4.7 percent. In the last 11 quarters of President Obama's term, real GDP growth was averaging 2.6 percent—a remarkable turnaround from the 8.4 percent deficit, decline, that he inherited, a decrease in the last quarter before he took office.

Now, annual median income, Madam Speaker, you will note, under President Obama, the red line starts declining 2008, 2009. The deepest recession that we have experienced in our lifetimes, which started in December of '07, you will see real household income declined significantly.

But you will see, when the recovery program that President Obama and Democrats put in place in our country, the American Recovery Act, you saw employment going up, average income going up, and you see it going up to \$63,179.

The tax cut, you will see a real spike here. This is under President Obama, and then you see the tax cut, this line here, and then you see a flattening out. While it has increased, it has been a much slower increase. So, when he says it is the best economy, the folks here who were experiencing this kind of increase would beg to differ.

Compare that to the first 2 years of Trump's Presidency with an increase in annual median household income of \$1,400. This indicated, under President Obama, an increase of \$4,800 in median income, three times as much—as a matter of fact, more than three times. In fact, incomes at every level have grown faster under Democrats than under Republicans since 1968.

So this is not just picking a particular year to make a point. This is 68 years, average. The blue, Democrats, increase in every quintile. That means those at the bottom increase substantially and, yes, those at the top increase.

This is not, as some Republicans charge us with, class warfare. Everybody did better, on average, with Democratic Presidents in the 20 years during that period of time that we had the Presidency and the 30 years that the Republicans had the Presidency. Those are the averages, and you can see, in every quintile, everybody in America did better under the Democrats' economic programs.

President Trump's economy is just the latest chapter in a long story in which, time and time again, Democratic leadership has seen our economy out of a recession and danger as President Obama did when he inherited, as I said, the deepest recession anybody less than 95 years of age in our country has experienced.

This is a contrast that House Democrats will be highlighting this year when Americans will again entrust the President and Congress with crafting

economic policies. That means jobs for them. That means some money to invest in their children, in their families, in their mortgages, in buying a car, a refrigerator, or a new stove or fixing their heat when it goes out.

What President Trump doesn't seem to understand, however, is that a thriving economy is more than growing the stock market.

Let me say this as an aside. I don't have a slide here now, but the average growth in the stock market under Democrats from 1948 until 2008—I am not sure exactly when we ended the study—was more in every Democratic administration.

It is about real economic security for American workers and their families; it is about whether America is still a place where everyone has a fair shot, where everyone has access to opportunities, and where everyone can get ahead. That is what that chart shows, and that is over a significant period of time.

By that measure, the President's record has been dismal.

Now, healthcare, what I started with, is one of the greatest concerns. Jobs and healthcare were our issues in the last election. We added 63 Members to the Democratic side of the aisle, which is why we are in the majority, because people knew that we were the party that was focused on healthcare and on jobs and had delivered.

This chart shows the uninsured rate. It was going down over the last 3 years, but because of the assault on the Affordable Care Act and the uncertainty that was created, as you will see, 2014, 2013, 2016 the President is elected, it comes down and flattens out. Why? Because they are not supporting healthcare. We need to get it back up so there are less and less uninsured.

Mr. NEAL represents the State of Massachusetts where 100 percent of children are covered and 97 percent of adults. That is what the Affordable Care Act was based upon, the Massachusetts plan, when Governor Romney was the Republican Governor in Massachusetts.

As a result of the policies of this President, the number of Americans without health insurance rose to 8.5 percent in 2018. That was the first increase in a decade.

□ 1700

Not having health insurance is bad for your health and bad for your psyche and bad for your family.

His efforts, meaning President Trump, alongside congressional Republicans to repeal, undermine, and sabotage the Affordable Care Act have brought uncertainty to health insurance markets and made it harder for working families to get affordable coverage for the care they need.

We are working very hard on that. We are trying to bring prescription drug costs down. We are trying to fix the problem of surprise billing. We want to make sure that Americans have affordable, quality healthcare.

On wages, we see another lost opportunity. For 3 years, President Trump and the Republican-led Senate have refused to support legislation to raise the minimum wage, which has not been raised in over a decade, which the House finally passed a bill last year, under the Democratic majority, which tries to lift that minimum wage so people can live and support themselves when they are working 40 hours a week. No American working 40 hours a week ought not to be able to afford to support themselves and to help support a family.

According to the monthly jobs report for December, hourly wage growth slipped to its lowest rate in 18 months. When you listen to the President talk at these rallies about this economy, remember that figure and check it. Go to Google or go to some reference point. Check it.

According to the monthly jobs report for December, last month, hourly wage growth slipped to its lowest rate in 18 months. That is a far cry from the \$4,000 annual salary increase President Trump promised would trickle down from his tax cuts for the wealthiest in America.

American workers deserve better. America deserves better. American exporters deserve better. American farmers and small business owners deserve better than this uncertain Trump economy. All Americans deserve better.

That is why the Democratic-led House voted last year to raise wages, ensure equal pay for equal work, and give Federal employees a long-overdue cost of living adjustment.

That is why we voted to lower prescription drug prices, a bill that sits in the Senate, untended by Senator MCCONNELL.

That is why we voted to make it easier for more workers to save for secure retirement, thanks to Chairman NEAL and the Ways and Means Committee.

That is why we voted to protect multiemployer pension funds, so that hundreds of thousands of people would not be left out in the cold after contributing to and being promised a pension in their old age.

Now, as we look to 2020, House Democrats will continue to make economic opportunity our focus. I look forward to bringing more legislation to the floor this year to ensure that we do not squander the gains of our recovery under President Obama. We will keep looking for ways to help America get ahead.

I hope all of my colleagues will look at the facts that I put forward and see what the Obama economy did and that the last 3 years have been a continuation of the Obama economy. Just look at the line. It is almost a straight line up.

I appreciate that a number of my Democratic colleagues are here this evening to add to this conversation. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER), my friend, former Lieutenant Government, former Amba-

sador, and the vice chair of the Joint Economic Committee.

Mr. BEYER. Madam Speaker, I want to thank Majority Leader HOYER for his exemplary leadership and thank the distinguished chair of the Ways and Means Committee, RICHARD NEAL, for his friendship and his wise counsel.

Madam Speaker, you be the judge.

Two weeks ago, the World Economic Forum held its annual conference in Davos, and the central theme of the meeting this year was climate change, the most critical issue we face.

President Trump spoke at the conference, but instead of focusing on climate change, he made what amounts to a campaign speech, claiming that he has worked a miracle with the U.S. economy. The fundamental basis of his argument is wildly wrong. He claimed that the economy he inherited from Barack Obama was "in dismal shape." On the basis of this fundamental re-writing of history, he claimed credit for the strong U.S. economy.

The economy is booming, he proposed, not because Barack Obama helped dig us out from the worst recession since the Great Depression or because of the hard work and ingenuity of the American worker, but because of Donald Trump's magical touch, the same magical touch he had with his Atlantic City casinos which went bankrupt, and Trump Shuttle and Trump University and Trump Mortgage and Trump Steaks and the Trump board game and Trump Vodka.

That is quite a record.

I am a businessman. With my brother, my sister, my dad, we spent 46 years now building a highly successful company. And I know it is not easy, but I also know that when a businessman has a string of spectacular failures, you wouldn't hire him to be CEO of your company, let alone President of the United States.

But here we are. Serendipitously, with much luck, I became vice chair of the Joint Economic Committee recently, and I couldn't be more thrilled by the confidence of my Democratic leadership and the opportunity to serve.

The Joint Economic Committee studies and advises Members of Congress about the economy. We are like the economic think tank for the economy to delve into the issues and, when necessary, to set the record straight.

So, when the President stands up at Davos and claims that he is an economic miracle worker, supposedly saving the economy from what he claims is the disaster he inherited, the Joint Economic Committee has to step up to the plate. I was more than pleased when Majority Leader HOYER asked me to help lead this hour of discussion. So, today, we will talk about the supposedly dismal economy.

Was it a wreck, as the President imagines it? Far from it.

Has he worked miracles with the economy? No way. The data shows that this is not true.

Did his tax cuts supercharge the economic growth? Very weak evidence.

And did his tax cuts pay for themselves? Again, no way.

Has the President's trade war helped American businesses and consumers? We will argue it has done much more harm than good.

And The Washington Post Fact Checker found that, during his Presidency, Donald Trump has made more than 1,500 lies or misleading statements about the economy, and he brazenly repeats them even when corrected.

I suspect, next week, in this very Chamber, when he gives the State of the Union Address, we will hear many of those same misleading claims again.

Madam Speaker, when you hear him make a claim about almost anything, you can pretty much know, more often than not, that it is not true.

So, in his Davos speech at the World Economic Forum, when he said that the economy he inherited from Barack Obama was dismal, he also said: "We have the greatest economy we've ever had in the history of our country."

This claim and many others did not make it by the fact checkers at the Associated Press. This isn't unusual. He is often caught red-handed, in flagrante delicto, making easily debunked claims on a wide range of topics. And since the beginning of his administration, his record of falsehoods is astonishing.

The Washington Post Fact Checker says Trump has made over 16,000 false or misleading claims in his first 3 years of office. When you hear this President say almost anything about the economy, it is likely to be more wrong than right.

For example, he did not create a strong economy; he inherited it. This is made absolutely clear in a rigorous, carefully sourced new report by the Democratic staff on the Joint Economic Committee. This is what the report shows: that the economy Donald Trump inherited from Barack Obama was strong and getting stronger.

Madam Speaker, you can see this on the chart right here. Unemployment was below 5 percent, GDP growth was 2 percent in the fourth quarter of 2016, and 227,000 jobs were being created every month.

President Obama led the economy a very long way back from the economic records that he inherited from his predecessor. Here is how bad it was.

At the worst of the Great Recession, unemployment had reached 10 percent, but by the time President Obama left office, unemployment had already been cut more than in half, down to 4.7 percent.

When he took office, the economy was hemorrhaging 700,000 jobs per month. By the time he left, the economy had already added jobs for 76 straight months, the longest in American history.

Inflation was low. Wages and incomes were rising. It was a remarkable turnaround. It was not, as the President said at Davos, dismal.

The President called the current economy a miracle due to his golden touch, but, no, he inherited this from the previous economy.

So let's thank the President, but not this President. Let's thank my old boss, President Obama.

The President often cherry-picks a strong month of job growth and implies that it is representative, but let's look at things in the long term, which is how economists actually measure these things.

In the first 35 months of the Trump administration, his economy added 191,000 jobs per month. In the last 35 months of Barack Obama, his economy added 227,000 jobs per month. That is a 36,000 job-per-month difference over a comparable 35 months each. Donald Trump wants you to forget that, but let's not let him get away with it.

The job market is strong. Unemployment is 3.5 percent. But, again, he didn't create low unemployment; he inherited it, and you can see that in the long-term trends. It was at 4.7 percent; now it is down to 3.5.

But his signature policy impact, the \$1.9 trillion in tax cuts, didn't go into effect until 2018. So unemployment had already dropped to 4.1—that is the Obama effect, the 4.1. So the last six-tenths of a percent cost us \$1.9 trillion, and it might be much higher than that.

Madam Speaker, was the cost worth it? Is the President an economic genius? You be the judge.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I thank Congressman BEYER, and I appreciate his leadership on the Joint Economic Committee.

I am now pleased to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL), one of the senior Members of the House of Representatives, the dean of the Massachusetts delegation and the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, who, as I said earlier, is as knowledgeable about tax policy and its consequences as anybody in this House.

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, this is an opportunity to call attention to some of the suggestions that have been made by this President and this White House as to the economic growth that he claims credit for.

On the day that Barack Obama became President, America was losing 800,000 jobs a month. When Barack Obama left the White House, there were 14.3 million new jobs that had been created. That is a real turnabout. This notion that there was this dismal economy that President Trump inherited is simply not true.

So let's even go back to the end of the Clinton years, which, despite what President Trump says, the greatest economic growth spurt in American history took place during Bill Clinton's Presidency—plus four balanced budgets. So, when Bill Clinton said goodbye to the country, we were staring at a \$15 trillion projected surplus over the next 10 years.

Let's do the math. A \$1.3 trillion tax cut in 2001, a \$1 trillion tax cut in 2003,

and, borrowing, \$2.3 trillion tax cuts in 2017.

So let's take a look at this with some precision for a moment. That means, when you add the borrowing cost, meaning principal and interest, to what actually was embraced by two Republican Presidents, that means we have cut taxes, over about a 15-year period, by \$5 trillion, added a trillion dollars to the debt this year, and now a national debt of \$20 trillion, all based upon the theological notion—that is what it is, theology—that tax cuts pay for themselves.

You cannot find a mainstream economist in America who will say that tax cuts pay for themselves.

When we look back at what was done with the tax bill in December of 2017, it goes like this:

A major piece of legislation was written in 51 days, without one hearing, without one professional witness, without one economic forecast, but again, this fundamental belief that, as the President said in a meeting at the White House with some of us, he didn't see why we couldn't have “6 percent growth.”

He completely suggested that Obama's economic growth spurt would be far surpassed by his, yet that has not happened. We have had, during the Clinton years, 2.3 to 5 percent quarters of economic growth, averaging, in the end, the highest of any President in the last century—really remarkable.

And then this suggestion, even though mainstream economists kept saying, no, the economy, even with the sugar high of the tax cut, will settle back down to less than 2 percent, so we are at 1.8 percent with \$20 trillion worth of debt.

□ 1715

The Obama years, even climbing out of the recession, averaged north of 2.3 to 2.4 percent of economic growth, given the worst recession, as the majority leader said, since the Great Depression.

The argument was that we were going to have this unparalleled economic growth because of the Republican tax bill. That has not happened.

The issues have settled back, and it has flat-lined, but here are a couple of things that I want to mention here that I think really bear noting.

Productivity, which is probably the most important part of raising quality-of-life measures for the American people, a growth spurt of productivity, that has really not happened.

Here is another key element of economic discernment: worker participation rates. If you really want to know what is happening, that is what you focus on.

The postwar norm is about 66 percent, meaning two-thirds of the American people got up and went to work every day. Where are we now? At about 63.8 percent.

The tax cut did not issue one response to one of the most fundamental

challenges facing the American people, the American family, and the American economy. Madam Speaker, 2 million people have left the workforce because of opioid addiction. Two million people have left the workforce because of addiction.

We wondered why Social Security disability climbed during those years. It was because of opioid addiction.

Back to that issue about labor participation rates and productivity, there has been no change. Poverty rates remain stubborn.

Here is something we should all be concerned about: There are still 40 million Americans who receive food stamps. If you give those people a choice between good jobs and food stamps, they will always take the good jobs, always take the good jobs.

The number of people who are working in this gig economy with uncertain hours, no benefits, two jobs, three jobs, where they would all like to have one that gave them some decent benefits and a good retirement, those are the challenges we face.

Think about this number—again, numbers are stubborn—40 percent of the American workforce every day gets up, goes to work, and is not in a qualified retirement plan. Their retirement is going to be Social Security.

All of these numbers that we have depicted here portray a very different story about the President's suggestions when compared to the reality of where we find ourselves. The uncertainty every day, largely based upon some of the bombast, the unpredictability of where we head, all are part of the challenge that we face.

But this idea that this economic growth period has all been because of President Trump, it is simply not true. He inherited a very good economy from Barack Obama.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments, and I hope the American people really focus on this. So much has been said by both sides that the American people really need to look at this themselves and figure out when did they do well, when did their families do well, who was watching out for their healthcare, who wanted to make sure that we bring up the income of those at the lowest levels of incomes in our country, and make a decision on their behalf as to who they want to support and who they believe.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH), chairman of the Budget Committee in the House of Representatives.

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

Earlier today, the Congressional Budget Office released its updated budget and economic outlook for the next decade. This report once again confirms that, despite the economic expansion he inherited, the fiscal outlook has worsened since President Trump took office.

Under President Trump, deficits have risen to heights not usually seen outside of recessions and major world

wars. They have increased every year, an unusual trend given that deficits tend to fall as unemployment rises.

In fact, the deficit in 2019 was the highest since 2012, when we were recovering from the Great Recession and the unemployment was 8 percent, more than double today's rate.

As a result of these deficits, the national debt has climbed higher and faster than CBO projected at the end of the Obama administration. Perhaps we shouldn't be surprised. After all, this is the same President who proclaimed just last week, "Who the hell cares about the budget?" The record is clear that he doesn't.

On their face, these fiscal facts might not be so concerning if one forgets about the multitude of deficits we face in the real economy: crumbling infrastructure, skyrocketing healthcare costs, widening student achievement gaps, warming climate, lower life expectancy.

In light of these and other problems, it is difficult to escape the conclusion that we should be making bolder investments in American families and our Nation's future. But President Trump didn't use our fiscal space to repair the roads and bridges that support our economy, to reduce drug prices for working families, or to bolster our environmental resilience in the face of the defining threat of a generation. No, President Trump and Republicans in Congress ran up our tab with a \$1.9 trillion tax cut—if you add interest, \$2.3 trillion—that showered benefits on corporations and the wealthy.

Madam Speaker, that \$1.9 trillion had little meaningful impact on the economy, other than increasing our already shameful income inequality. Madam Speaker, that \$1.9 trillion could have been, but was not, put toward making childcare more affordable, college education more accessible, and retirement security more achievable for American families.

Making this situation far worse, President Trump is once again suggesting that he will offset the deficits that his signature policy exploded by cutting Social Security and Medicare, taking money right out of the pockets of America's seniors and forcing them to foot his bill.

Our economy and budget face difficult times ahead. An aging population and rising healthcare costs mean economic growth is projected to be slower and deficits are expected to be larger going forward.

Addressing this issue over the next several decades will require a balanced approach that includes a fair tax system.

President Trump has taken us precisely in the wrong direction by adding trillions to the debt for a tax giveaway for the rich that yielded little in return for everyone else. He is squandering the chance to lay the groundwork for a more productive and equitable economy.

Despite these challenges, we still have the opportunity to make respon-

sible investments in the American people, our infrastructure, and the environment, investments that reflect our values, promote a stronger economic and fiscal outlook, and move our Nation forward.

As chairman of the Budget Committee, I have stressed that we need to think seriously about severe and persistent deficits in the real economy, not just deficits in the budget. That doesn't mean that we can spend tax dollars without thought or discretion, but it does require that we use our Nation's resources, including our deficits, more wisely than this administration has. It means prioritizing policies that improve the living standards of current and future generations that support those most in need and help mitigate the challenges American families are facing today and the challenges they may face tomorrow.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments, and I thank him for his leadership on the Budget Committee.

I might say, as a result of his work, last year, 2019, we completed the appropriations process. Unlike the previous year, when our Republican colleagues were in charge and the government was shut down when the new Congress took office, we kept the government open. There was no drama. On January 3, everybody was working and being served by their government.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE), whose father was such a good friend of mine and who does such an excellent job. His dad would be proud of him here in Congress.

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, I thank our majority leader for those kind words. I also thank Joint Economic Committee Vice Chairman BEYER, Budget Committee Chairman YARMUTH, and Ways and Means Committee Chairman NEAL for organizing this Special Order hour.

It is important to discuss the state of our economy because it is a case of true contrast. Trump's economic decisions have created two very distinct Americas.

There is the one America for the affluent where incomes are rising and taxes are dropping. There is the other America, the one reserved for minorities and low-income Americans, the one for middle Americans, the one that is losing manufacturing jobs to automation and cheap, foreign labor, the one that forces people to turn to minimum wage jobs as careers.

President Obama worked to unite these two Americas. Trump has worked very hard to divide them, once again.

As President, Trump is known for two major business moves. First, he passed his 2017 Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, but his law did not give the vast majority of Americans tax cuts. It actually cut their tax deductions. He did not improve their ability to get new jobs. He made it more difficult.

He has taken away benefits that low- and middle-income American families

took for granted. He took away their ability to deduct moving expenses when they had to find a better job and support their families. He took away their ability to deduct alimony, which could lead to more deadbeat dads. He even forced average Americans to declare more of their income, costing them more money in taxes. And while you cannot deduct your moving expenses, millionaires can deduct the entire cost of a private plane.

Then, Trump chose to impose tariffs on Chinese goods. Economic advisers said the move would hurt our country before Trump did it, and they were right. A Federal Reserve study published last December said that tariffs have caused Americans to lose critical manufacturing jobs and raised the costs of goods for consumers.

Manufacturing jobs have helped millions of Americans get out of poverty, and that opportunity wanes today. They have allowed older generations to pay the college tuitions of younger generations. They have been critical for minorities to grab a piece of the American Dream.

President Trump likes to point to his work around minorities participating in the job sector, but where I come from in north New Jersey, we do not see it. Where I come from in my district, we do not see it.

It is a situation of two Americas, once again, one for the haves and the other for the have-nots. The majority of the people under this President have not.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments; for his leadership on the minimum wage, to try to lift people up at the bottom of the wage scale; and also for his leadership on healthcare, to ensure that they have access to affordable, quality healthcare.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. HOULAHAN), a Representative from the Philadelphia suburbs who served so well in the military of our country and then became a very successful businesswoman. I know she knows a lot about how to run a business and how to run an economy.

Ms. HOULAHAN. Madam Speaker, I thank the majority leader for bringing us together this evening to talk about the economy.

January was Jobs Month for me in my district and my team. I spent time home in my community in Pennsylvania and here in Washington focused on three things: one, making sure that our economy is working for everyone and that Pennsylvanians can afford to live where they work and pay their bills while receiving fair pay; two, supporting our small businesses, which are the backbone of our economy; and three, ensuring our workforce is adapting to new technologies and to the future of their work.

□ 1730

Earlier this month, we got the jobs report from December, and there was a

lot to be optimistic about. Unemployment rates remain low, and we added more than 300,000 nonfarm jobs.

The administration also likes to point to the record-high stock market as an indication of the impact of its economic policies. To be sure, there are good signs, and this steady economic improvement began well before the President and his administration took office and, thankfully, it continues.

With this in mind, I would like to share, though, what I saw and heard during Jobs Month in my community.

My community is in the enviable position of having a very low unemployment rate. I hear more from employers who are struggling to fill empty positions than from long-term unemployed people who are looking for work.

But that doesn't tell the whole story. The rosy jobs report from January doesn't tell the story of people who work in my community, or who would like to, but can't afford to even live there.

Last week, I was in Phoenixville, Pennsylvania, meeting with affordable housing advocates and proponents for more mass transit options near those affordable housing options. During that visit, I learned that in our area, about a quarter of the people are renters.

Working an average wage for renters, a 9-5 job is not nearly enough for a modest, two-bedroom home in my community. People are working extra hours, holding down two jobs or more to be able to afford to live where they work; or they are living elsewhere, where the cost of living is lower, and they are commuting ridiculous amounts of time, using inadequate road and rail infrastructure to get to their work. And they are losing precious time with their families in the process.

A booming stock market is good for some, but it doesn't change the daily math and daily experience of so many people in my community.

The House has passed legislation to raise the minimum wage and to help workers save for retirement, and we need to see action in the Senate to ensure that our economy is working for all Americans, not just for those who have enough money to invest in the stock market.

Earlier this month, many in my community also celebrated progress on the U.S.-Mexico-Canada Agreement, a trade deal that was important for many small businesses in my community, including our agricultural producers. I was very proud to support that agreement.

But this administration's trade policies have also harmed my community. The trade war in China has hurt small businesses as well as larger manufacturers whose business models are built around global trade in my community.

Although we now have a "Phase 1" deal with China, businesses in my community are eager for a real and lasting agreement that doesn't harm the American businesses in an effort to punish China.

Madam Speaker, I also want to highlight just one other aspect of the January jobs report that stuck out to me. Just like here in Congress, women are entering the workforce at historic rates. Like so many women, and men, frankly, I have faced the real struggles of how to balance both raising a family and excelling at work. Our policies need to be adopted to support and encourage our changing workforce.

We have shown that we can work on a bipartisan basis to enact paid parental leave, as an example, for Federal workers, setting the example for other employers.

We need to examine how we provide for childcare for working parents. We need how to examine how to ensure that pregnant workers have protections if they need an accommodation in the job during their pregnancy. And we need to ensure that we are paying equal pay for equal work. All of these policies can help move our economy forward, and all deserve the attention of our Senate and our counterparts in the White House.

Over the last few weeks, I have learned a lot by visiting manufacturing facilities in my community, like OmegaFlex in Exton, Pennsylvania, or laying tile at the Chester County Intermediate Unit, or working alongside the IBEW workers training newly-separated veterans for work.

I have come away deeply optimistic about where we are headed, but also armed with motivation to move forward with the bold policies that we need to make sure our economy is working for everyone, for all of us, to support our small businesses, and to prepare our workforce for the future ahead. There certainly is work to be done.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her comments, and I know that she is working her district very, very hard, and listening to people, which is what we need to do.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. ADAMS), who is the leader of the group that I am very enthusiastic about that is helping our historically Black colleges and universities. I thank her for her leadership on that and so many other educational issues and economic issues for our families.

Ms. ADAMS. Madam Speaker, I thank the majority leader for yielding, and for his leadership, and for organizing this Special Order Hour.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in setting the record straight when it comes to the Trump economy.

The Trump economy was on sad display in Charlotte, North Carolina, on Monday, when 1,300 of my constituents stood in line for a chance at 185 affordable housing units in West Charlotte.

Instead of investing in shelter, affordable housing, and community health, the Trump economic policy is about consolidating wealth. The Trump

economy is one that works for the American billionaire, but not for the union boilermaker. It is an economy that works for executives with golden parachutes, but not for educators teaching elementary school students parachute games.

It doesn't have to be this way. In 2016, when Donald Trump was elected, he inherited a robust economy, thanks to President Obama and his administration. It was President Obama who turned our economy around and helped pull us out of the Great Recession. Seventy-five consecutive months of private sector job growth? Thanks, President Obama.

However, since then, Trump's "Billionaires First" policies have hurt our neighbors and our families. Some of these harmful policies: The U.S. withdrawal from the Paris climate agreement; the ongoing trade war with China, and threats to place tariffs on goods imported from our allies; this administration's cruel efforts to dismantle and weaken the Affordable Care Act; Trump's heartless immigration policies that have led to fearmongering and separation of families at the border.

Trump economic policy is not about helping others. Instead, the cruelty is the point. In fact, the only compassionate thing about his economic policy is that it looks out for billionaires, and not just millionaires like himself.

But Scripture tells us that, "Whoever loves money never has enough; whoever loves wealth is never satisfied with their income." The dividends we seek as public servants are not from increased wealth, but from a more perfect commonwealth.

Luckily, the American people are standing up to push back against this economy. And whether it is a small business owner who gives the homeless a place to park their cars at night, or the community advocates helping their displaced neighbors find new homes, the Queen City knows that service is the rent we pay for living on this Earth.

The American people are working for the people, and so is the people's House. It is time for the Trump administration to do the same.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her comments.

I am now pleased to yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), one of the senior Members of the House of Representatives, the chair of the Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee that deals with so many of these issues that have been discussed over the last hour.

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Speaker, I thank the majority leader for the opportunity to speak on this Special Order.

Americans are struggling under President Trump. They are desperately waiting for their incomes to rise and

their costs to slow. Yet, the President has failed to fully deliver on his promises to them. That is according to the Joint Economic Committee's excellent new report.

In fact, according to this report, growth in median annual household income was three times greater during the last 2 years of the Obama administration than the first 2 years of the Trump administration.

And mostly, job growth has slowed. According to the report, in the first 35 months of President Trump's term, there were 36,000 fewer nonfarm jobs created per month than the final 35 months of President Obama's term.

This is despite the Republicans' 2017 tax law. It will cost \$1.9 trillion, but 83 percent of its benefits go to the top 1 percent. Working people, middle-class families cannot afford more of the President's giveaways to the wealthy and the well-connected.

The single biggest economic challenge of our time is that people's pay is not keeping rise with skyrocketing costs, healthcare, childcare, housing. They struggle, including in my State of Connecticut.

The United Way put out a report, it is Asset Limited, Income Constrained, Employed, the ALICE report. And what essentially it says is that people who are working one or two jobs just can't make a standard of living. They are above the poverty line, but they can't make it.

Out of the 20 most common jobs or occupations, registered nurses, cashiers, laborers, et cetera, only one pays enough to reasonably support a household; that is operations managers.

Under this President, many Americans are suffering something akin to a personal economic crisis. To claim otherwise is to ignore the reality of their circumstances.

We see their suffering. That is why the House has passed the Paycheck Fairness Act for equal pay, lower drug costs to reduce prescription drug costs, raise the wage by raising the minimum wage to \$15 by 2025.

We need to work hard to make opportunity real for people. We urge the President to join us because, as this new report from the Joint Economic Committee indicates, Americans need a break, not more broken promises.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her comments.

Madam Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. STEVENS).

Ms. STEVENS. Madam Speaker, I rise to discuss the impact of our economy on our American workers and on our American manufacturers.

The headlines are real. We are in a technical manufacturing recession, as measured by productivity and output.

As we know, and as it has been stated many times tonight, the Tax Cut and Jobs Act of 2017 was a permanent tax giveaway for the wealthiest corporations, not our suppliers, not our workers, but the wealthiest among us, at the expense of everyday Americans.

We have the benefit of hindsight to point out what many experts at the time cautioned; that this would ultimately not lead to significant job gains or raise workers' wages.

\$1.5 trillion added to our deficit. The levels are alarming. The facts are out today.

Madam Speaker, it is clear. We must do better. We must continue to work for the people.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Madam Speaker, in 2009, President Obama came into office during the Great Recession. He inherited a dreadful economy but worked hard for policies that would stimulate growth and help the average American. Thankfully, his policies worked and America is on the upswing.

However, we now have a President who wants to take credit where credit is not due. President Trump is reaping the benefits of Obama's economic policies, while harming the people who were still left behind. Recovering from a recession and lifting up all Americans takes more than eight years, and this President has not taken the torch.

Instead of building on Obama's success, Trump has kicked the Americans who are still down.

When farmers in the 2nd Congressional District of Georgia and all across the nation were suffering from major crop losses from natural disasters, President Trump decided to start a trade war with China. Trade wars do not often have victors, but they always have losers.

American farmers, workers, and consumers were the losers.

Our farmers lost business, our workers lost wages, and our consumers paid higher prices—all to cover the costs of the tariffs—not China and not President Trump, the architect of this bad plan.

When running for office, then-candidate Trump said he would use his knowledge of tax cuts for the rich to help the people who this economy still isn't working for. When he was elected, one of the first things he did was give a \$1 trillion tax cut to the super rich—also known as himself and his friends.

Trickle down economics did not work then and they do not work now. Giving money to the wealthy does not translate to higher wages for workers. It means more money for the already super wealthy.

The Trump tax cut has also ballooned an already too high national deficit. When you take a pay cut, you cannot pay your bills, so your debt grows. But it's not the wealthy who will feel the pain from an exploding deficit that will slow our economic growth. It is everyday Americans who will feel the effects—lower wages lead to a lower standard of living. The Peterson Foundation estimates that if the national debt continues rising as is, the average income for a family of four will drop by \$16,000 over the next three decades.

\$16,000 is not much for those at the top. But it is devastating for those in the middle and working class. Food stamps, unemploy-

ment benefits, Medicare, and Social Security could all face cuts because of tax cuts for the wealthy.

We should be trying to make the nation a better place for our children and grandchildren. Instead we have a leader who wants to leave them with our debt. Instead we have a leader who wants to ride on President Obama's coattails and lure us into a false sense of security, so he and his rich friends can have even more—when so many in America have less!

America is supposed to be a land of opportunity, where anyone can succeed with enough hard work. Trade wars, tax cuts for the rich while cutting food stamps for the poor are not the way to make America great. Instead of building on our success and lending a helping hand to those in need, this President has only sought to help himself.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I thank Majority Leader Hoyer Chairmen Neal of Ways and Means and Chairman Yarmuth of the Budget Committee and Vice-Chairman Beyer of the Joint Economic Committee for holding this very important and timely Special Order to review and assess the state of the national economy two years after the Republican-controlled Congress enacted the Trump-GOP TaxScam.

The verdict is now in and it leads to the inescapable conclusion that the Trump TaxScam has not accelerated the economy, rather it is a significant drag on the booming economy President Barack Obama bequeathed to his successor, the current occupant of the office.

Specifically, two points cannot be stressed enough.

First, President Trump did not create the strong economy; he inherited it.

Second, we paid an extremely high price—\$1.9 trillion—for tax cuts that have done so little for the economy.

Madam Speaker, most of President Trump's claims about the economy are false or highly misleading.

There is no such thing as a "Trump bump"—key economic indicators are the same or worse.

The President's signature economic policy—the \$1.9 trillion tax cut—has failed to deliver the promised economic boost and his second major economic policy—the trade war—is a self-inflicted wound, hurting farmers, consumers, businesses and the economy.

Madam Speaker, those of us who were there remember well that the morning of January 20, 2009, which was one of the coldest days on record in Washington, DC.

But it was nothing compared to the chill wind blowing through the American economy and body politic because at that time the nation was facing economic challenges unseen since the Great Depression: Americans were losing their jobs at a frightening rate of 800,000 per month; the national unemployment rate had risen to 7.8 percent and would continue to climb until reaching its peak of 10.0 percent in October 2009.

For African Americans, the numbers were much grimmer, a jobless rate of 13.5 percent in January 2009 which would grow to 16.5 percent by the end of the year.

And on top of this, tens of thousands of American families each month were losing their health insurance and their homes to foreclosure.

And the average price of gas exceeded \$4 per gallon.

It was against this backdrop that the new President of the United States, Barack Obama, rose to take the oath of office.

After being sworn in as the nation's 44th President, President Obama reassured an anxious but hopeful nation, saying:

"Today I say to you that the challenges we face are real. They are serious and they are many. They will not be met easily or in a short span of time. But know this America: They will be met."

Because of the actions President Obama took, not to further the interests of himself but of the American people, these challenges were more than met and overcome and for that Barack Obama's presidency is regarded by historians as a consequential presidency that changed America for the better.

Madam Speaker, before Trump took office in January 2017, the economy had recovered from the Great Recession and overall economic indicators were already strong and were trending stronger.

Unemployment had been cut by more than half during the Obama administration, from a peak of 10 percent to 4.7 percent.

The economy had experienced 76 consecutive months of job growth, the longest sustained period of growth in American history.

GDP growth was strong, average of 2.6 percent annually in the last 11 quarters of the Obama Administration and median household income growth was strong and trending upward, increasing \$4,800 during in last two years of the Obama administration.

Even Greg Mankiw, chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers under President George W. Bush, had to admit that "the economy was in fine shape at the end of the Obama administration, despite what the current President falsely asserts.

Madam Speaker, I will include in the RECORD an op-ed published on February 17, 2016 in the Washington Examiner, entitled "Seven Years of Change You Can See and Feel."

President Obama actually had a plan to tackle the economic woes that were affecting the American people.

Working with the Democratic-controlled Congress, the President signed into law the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, which created 3.7 million jobs and saved the jobs of millions of teachers, firefighters, police officers, and social service providers.

The Recovery Act also cut taxes for working families, extended unemployment insurance, and expanded the Earned Income and Child tax credits, which disproportionately benefit African American families.

The Recovery Act ended the Great Recession, transformed the economy from one hemorrhaging jobs to one that has created over 16 million new jobs over a record 71 consecutive months.

The national unemployment rate has dipped under 5 percent for the first time since President Clinton left office, the deficit has been cut by 71 percent, and the Dow Jones stock market index topped 18,000 in 2015, an increase of 177 percent over where it stood the day President Obama took office.

And, as an added benefit, the average price of gasoline has been reduced from more than \$4.11 per gallon to \$1.80, the lowest price since before the tragedy of September 11.

In short, Madam Speaker, President Obama bequeathed a booming and vibrant economy to his successor, who promptly took actions to undermine it and explode the national debt.

Madam Speaker, the GOP TaxScam was the wrong policy at the wrong time because it showered benefits on the top 1 percent and large multinational corporations while doing little for everyday working Americans and Main Street small business owners.

GOP TaxScam also raises the nation's debt by \$1.9 trillion at a time when the economy was already strong, and when we are facing major long-term budgetary challenges driven by our aging population.

And rather than devoting resources to wise investments in our workers and small businesses, the GOP TaxScam further burdens working families, endangers Americans' retirement security, and worsens our budgetary outlook.

Our long-term economic growth trajectory is unchanged and there is no sign of an investment boom.

Real wage growth for workers remains modest and factories and jobs are more likely to go overseas.

The federal deficit is soaring as corporate tax receipts plummet and the tax code is riddled with even more special-interest tax breaks and loopholes.

THE GOP TAXSCAM LED TO A RECORD-SETTING \$1 TRILLION IN STOCK BUYBACKS

The GOP TaxScam delivered huge benefits to rich investors and CEOs through record-setting stock buybacks in 2018 while average workers struggle to pay for rising health care and living costs.

Stock buybacks do nothing to improve business operations or help workers.

THE GOP TAXSCAM SHOWERS BENEFITS ON THE WEALTHY AND LARGE CORPORATIONS WHILE DOING LITTLE FOR WORKERS AND MAIN STREET SMALL BUSINESSES

The GOP tax cut is heavily tilted toward the wealthy and corporations and exacerbates the stagnation of wages for the vast majority of workers and worsens income and wealth inequality.

The GOP tax law does nothing to help small businesses gain access to capital and grow their receipts.

Only 5 percent of small businesses pay taxes at the corporate level and most of the pass-through tax cuts go to the largest 2.6 percent of businesses.

THE GOP TAX LAW ENCOURAGES COMPANIES TO SEND FACTORIES AND JOBS OVERSEAS

Under the GOP tax law, income generated by American companies abroad face tax rates that are half the new top corporate rate of 21 percent.

Some companies may be able to avoid tax altogether on tangible investments made offshore.

This further incentivizes companies to move tangible assets, such as factories and machinery, overseas.

Rather than protecting workers and their families, the GOP tax law tilts the playing field against American workers.

THE GOP TAX LAW INCREASES DEFICITS BY \$1.9 TRILLION WHEN WE ARE FACING MAJOR BUDGETARY CHALLENGES DRIVEN BY OUR AGING POPULATION

Even after accounting for any economic growth effects, the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) estimates the GOP taxscam increases deficits by \$1.9 trillion over the ten

years 2018 to 2028—hardly the "pay for itself" message we heard from the Administration and Republicans in Congress.

Our friends across the aisle promised the GOP TaxScam would significantly boost economic growth, spurred an investment boom, drove unemployment down to the lowest level since the 1960s, created jobs for millions of workers, and helped middle-class families keep more of their paychecks.

All of these claims have collapsed in the crucible of actual experience.

THE GOP TAXSCAM DID NOT SIGNIFICANTLY BOOSTS THE ECONOMY

In the seven quarters before and after passage of the Trump TaxScam, GDP growth is unchanged from the Obama economy, averaging 2.5 percent.

By 2023, the tax law's positive effect on economic growth will fade away entirely.

The GOP TaxScam Does Not Spur Business Investment

There is no evidence of an investment boom, which Republicans promised would be the key to unleashing unprecedented economic growth and wage gains.

Nonresidential business investment grew by less than 1 percent in the third quarter of last year, while business' orders for durable goods (another measure of investment) fell in December for the fourth time in five months.

Instead of encouraging investment, the tax cut triggered a record level of stock buybacks.

GOP TAXSCAM NOT CAUSE OF LOWEST UNEMPLOYMENT SINCE 1968

President Trump is coasting on an economic expansion—now the second-longest on record—that began under President Obama.

The law has not changed the unemployment trend.

The unemployment rate has fallen steadily since the end of the Great Recession.

THE GOP TAXSCAM HAS NOT CREATED JOBS FOR MILLIONS OF WORKERS

More jobs were created in President Obama's last two years in office than President Trump's first two years, a monthly average of 227,000 for Obama contrasted to an average of 191,000 for Trump.

Monthly non-farm job growth has slowed in the first 35 months of the Trump administration compared to the last 35 months of the Obama administration—36,000 fewer jobs per month under Trump.

The tax law also encourages companies to send factories and jobs overseas rather than protecting jobs at home.

THE GOP TAXSCAM IS NOT HELPING MIDDLE-CLASS FAMILIES KEEP MORE OF THEIR PAYCHECKS

There has been very little increase in private sector compensation or wages since the tax law passed.

Real wage growth continues to be disappointingly modest, and real bonuses increased by just 2 cents per hour between December 2017 and September 2018.

The law ignores the stagnation of working-class wages and worsens income and wealth inequality.

In fact, only 35 percent of the tax law's benefits in 2018 will go to the bottom 80 percent of households making less than approximately \$150,000 per year.

EVEN THOUGH FEDERAL REVENUES HAVE RISEN, THE GOP TAXSCAM HAS CREATED A MAJOR REVENUE DEFICIENCY PROBLEM

Corporate tax receipts dropped an astounding 31 percent drop in 2018, with total receipts

as a share of GDP falling to the lowest levels since the end of the Great Recession despite healthy economic growth and a tight labor market.

Revenue last year was 16.4 percent of the economy, almost two percentage points below the 50-year average of 18.3 percent in years in which unemployment fell below 5 percent.

By contrast, spending as a share of GDP last year fell right at the historical average.

Predictably, the President and our Republican friends seeks to evade blame and responsibility for the fiscal mess and exploding debt they have created.

Instead of redressing the harm caused by the Trump TaxScam, Republicans resort again to their past practice of blaming the deficit on the entitlement programs such as Social Security, Medicare, SNAP, and veterans benefits and seek to slash these programs to the barebones.

For example the President sought to cut non-defense discretionary (NDD) programs by \$1.4 trillion, including cuts to Medicare and Medicaid, reduce funding for SNAP by \$220 billion or 22 percent, and deny infrastructure funding for, cash-strapped state and local governments; and pile more hardships on struggling Americans with \$327 billion in cuts to direct spending programs that safeguard basic living standards they need to get by.

The President is obsessed with dismantling and destabilizing health care for millions of Americans by making yet another attempt to "repeal and replace" the Affordable Care Act passed under the extraordinary leadership of President Barack Obama which provided health security to more than 20 million Americans.

Madam Speaker, we now entering Act III of the immorality play we predicted the President would write.

Act I was the cutting of taxes for the rich; Act II was the inevitable exploding of the deficit we predicted would result and our Republican friends denied would ever happen.

And now we have Act III, in which Republicans claim to have newly rediscovered their horror over the deficits created by their fiscal irresponsibility and insist that the mess they created but be cleaned up by slashing investments in the programs relied upon by the 90–95 percent of Americans who were made worse off by the GOP TaxScam.

The President should be embarrassed and ashamed of his economic stewardship and thankful every day to President Obama for tackling and solving the major economic challenges facing Americans.

HONORING THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF OFFICER KATIE THYNE

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I rise today on a solemn occasion. I have the honor of representing Newport News, Virginia, and last week, the Newport News community lost Police Officer Katie Thyne, who was tragically killed in the line of duty.

Officer Thyne was only 24 years old and was the mother of a 2-year-old daughter. The Newport News community has lost someone who dedicated her life to public service.

In addition to serving with the Newport News Police Department, Officer Thyne was a Navy veteran, and she also spent time volunteering as a basketball coach at the local Boys and Girls Club.

Only 11 Newport News police officers have died in the line of duty in the last 100 years, and the last loss of an officer in the line of duty occurred over 25 years ago. Officer Thyne was the first woman.

I want to send my deepest condolences to the friends and family of Officer Thyne, as well as members of the Newport News Police Department who are dealing with this tragic loss of a colleague.

CONGRESSIONAL WESTERN CAUCUS

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Madam Speaker, before I begin, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the topic of my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Madam Speaker, I rise this afternoon to lead a Special Order alongside my colleagues from the Congressional Western Caucus to discuss important efforts to modernize one of our Nation's bedrock conservation laws that has sorely grown outdated and ineffective.

The Endangered Species Act was signed into law 47 years ago to protect and revitalize species of endangered or threatened animals and wildlife, truly, a worthy goal.

Unfortunately, the ESA has earned a recovery rate of only about 3 percent, a staggering failure to protect the very species that it was intended to aid.

□ 1745

And while it has failed to safeguard those species, the law has been used as a political spearhead for frivolous litigation that threatens private property rights, public land use decisions, local communities, and American jobs.

Fortunately, there are ongoing efforts in the people's House here and within the White House to update and modernize the Endangered Species Act to better protect species, all while treating States, property owners, and local stakeholders as partners rather than obstacles to species conservation.

The Western Caucus recently unveiled a package of 18 bills introduced by members across the rural West and beyond to strengthen the ESA. These bills reflect our intention to bring this

arcane law into the 21st century, aiming to create a more comprehensive and streamlined approach to support species recovery while ensuring our communities are not burdened by overregulation and misleading data.

This package includes my legislation, the Weigh Habitats Offsetting Locational Effects Act, to ensure all conservation measures are considered when Federal decisions that impact ESA-listed species are being made.

By establishing a process that considers the totality of conservation efforts, we can incentivize private investment in species recovery, streamline Federal decisionmaking, and promote the comprehensive efforts of States, local communities, and Tribes.

We should not tie our hands when it comes to species recovery. Using the best available science, considering all ongoing conservation measures, streamlining the process for listing decisions, and empowering State and local efforts creates a comprehensive approach to advance species recovery and fulfills the true intent of the Endangered Species Act.

Madam Speaker, with this package of bills, you will hear more from many of my colleagues in the Western Caucus. We are taking a very important step toward truly strengthening the ESA.

The Trump administration has also unveiled improvements to the implementation of ESA regulations developed to increase transparency and effectiveness of the law.

Secretary of the Interior David Bernhardt has rightly focused on updating the administration of ESA to target the areas where resources will do the most good, which, of course, are the direct, on-the-ground conservation measures.

Much like legislation in the Western Caucus package that I and my colleagues have championed, the updates direct listing decisions to be based solely on the best science available as well as commercial information. Only when sound science, not politics, determine conservation measures can we truly begin to turn the tide to achieve successes under the ESA.

The revisions also establish greater certainty for timely decisionmaking by Federal agencies and applicants, therefore providing streamlined actions and coordination for conservation efforts.

With partners like President Trump, Interior Secretary Bernhardt, and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Director, Aurelia Skipwith, I believe we truly can reverse the abysmal track record currently set under the Endangered Species Act.

Unfortunately, we are seeing efforts right here in the people's House to completely undermine and halt these important steps being taken by the administration. Our conversation this afternoon is quite timely, I believe, because tomorrow the lead Democrat in the House Natural Resources Committee is marking up legislation to thwart the administration's rule to

bring more transparency and modernization into the ESA.

Why anyone would be proud of the status quo in which only 3 percent of the species that have been listed under this law have recovered truly does baffle me. That 3 percent is quite the meager report card, so it is disappointing to see so many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle advocate for the status quo. I would hope they join me and my colleagues who are working to strengthen this law in order to provide real results, not simply evoking political talking points aimed at appeasing litigious environmental groups.

Madam Speaker, like far too many regulations that come from our Nation's Capitol, relying on top-down decisions from bureaucrats only serves to limit economic prosperity. These decisions have not only negatively impacted local communities, they have done close to nothing to recover and protect threatened animals and wildlife.

I am looking forward to partnering with many of my colleagues from the Western Caucus this afternoon to describe our efforts here in the people's House to finally modernize the Endangered Species Act, something that is far overdue for our wildlife, for our environment, and for all of our communities.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. GIANFORTE), my colleague and good friend, who is a true leader for conservation.

Mr. GIANFORTE. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend from Washington for yielding. He has been a leader in our efforts to reform the Endangered Species Act and to return management of wolves back to the States.

I also thank the chairman of the Western Caucus, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR). Congressman GOSAR has been instrumental in putting together this package of 17 bills to modernize the Endangered Species Act.

I wish we were here tonight to celebrate the successful recovery of the grizzly bear in the greater Yellowstone ecosystem and elsewhere. The great news is the grizzly has recovered. Unfortunately, constant litigation has prevented the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service from delisting the bear and returning management to the States.

I brought Secretary Bernhardt of the Department of the Interior to meet with families, ranchers, and local leaders in Choteau, Montana, just last fall. Parents told us how they put bars on their windows because the grizzly bears were looking in their children's bedrooms. One mom told me of a grizzly bear that chased her into her home when the bear heard the sound of her child crying.

At the point bears view children as a food source, we need to make changes. We have to put human safety ahead of the recovered grizzly bear.

Misuse and abuse of the Endangered Species Act are also shutting down responsible forest management. Every

forest service project in Montana seemingly ends up in court. The result: We are unable to manage our forests, improve wildlife habitat, and reduce the severity of wildfires.

We must put commonsense guardrails on the Endangered Species Act. We must restore it to its original purpose of recovering species, not serving as a tool for frivolous lawsuits from extreme special interest groups that work to shut down critical projects in our State.

To address these abuses of the ESA, I introduced the Less Imprecision in Species Treatment Act, or the LIST Act. The LIST Act helps modernize the ESA. The LIST Act empowers the Fish and Wildlife Service to promptly act on sound, established science to delist species that have recovered—and that should be our goal.

The bill allows the Fish and Wildlife Service to reverse listings that were made due to bad data, and the bill prohibits abuses of the listing process. It will ban those who intentionally submit false information from submitting listing petitions for 10 years.

These are commonsense reforms. I am proud to sponsor the LIST Act and support the rest of the package to better protect species, increase collaboration, and improve forest health.

These pieces of legislation focus efforts on recovering species native to the U.S. They ensure that data used to make listing decisions is publicly available on the internet, and they promote voluntary wildlife conservation agreements and candidate conservation agreements with assurances.

We can and must modernize the Endangered Species Act to work better, and the Western Caucus has offered a path forward.

Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Washington State for his leadership on this.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Madam Speaker, I thank Mr. GIANFORTE; his legislation, the LIST Act, is exactly the kind of update we need. It is a straightforward, science-based tool that equips Fish and Wildlife with exactly the kind of ability to make decisions based on facts regarding listing decisions. I thank the gentleman for his leadership. He is a great spokesman for the State of Montana, and I appreciate his help here this evening.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SMITH), my good friend.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Madam Speaker, I thank Mr. NEWHOUSE for yielding and for organizing this Special Order. I thank him for presenting to this body this piece of legislation with all the reforms of the Endangered Species Act. It is something that is extremely important.

Coming from the State of Missouri, we have folks who come from all over the country to hike our trails and to float our rivers. We are also home to the first Ozark National Scenic Riverway designated by a national

State park in southern Missouri. So we have many people who come to southeast and south central Missouri to look at our nature, to see the native plants and the native species, which several of them are designated within the Endangered Species Act.

Mr. NEWHOUSE made a comment earlier about only 3 percent of the species come out of the Endangered Species Act, that they come back. By any other measure, that would be a complete failure, and that is why we need these reforms. That is why we need these revisions.

Nowhere is the pain of the Endangered Species Act regulations, no greater place are those burdens felt than in local communities, and that is why we have the legislation, the EMPOWERS Act. And it mandates—not mandates the communities, it mandates the Federal Government to make sure that they get local input from communities in any kind of designation for an Endangered Species Act.

It is common sense. It is an easy approach. It is something that I think we can all get behind since they know their area better.

When you talk about the Endangered Species Act, this is something that is very personal to me, and it is personal to the people that I represent in southern Missouri.

Just a few years ago, we had a young lady, 13 or 14 years old, who was floating with her family on the White River, and a very unfortunate event happened where she got caught up underneath a broken dam and she lost her life. That family outing turned into a day that they will never forget, a day that I won't forget.

The big issue here is that dam shouldn't have been there, or it should have been rebuilt or replaced. You see, the dam was broken in a flood several years earlier but was never replaced and couldn't be torn out, even with the local community wanting to tear out the dam, the reason being because of an endangered species, one called the Ozark hellbender. It is a salamander. It was found in the White River near the dam, so that could be a resting place for this endangered species.

Because of that, a young lady will never graduate high school. She will never go to college. She will never walk down the aisle.

That is unacceptable. We are fortunate now that dam no longer exists, but it shouldn't have taken the loss of a life for Federal bureaucrats to get their act together to get that dam removed.

So this is one example that is extremely personal to the people I represent and it is extremely personal to me why we need these reforms in the Endangered Species Act.

□ 1800

Government should not stand in the way of safety. An endangered species should not have more importance than a human life.

I am looking forward to these reforms. These reforms bring sanity back to the Endangered Species Act through commonsense reforms, Missouri commonsense reforms, reforms such as transparency of the rulemaking process.

It helps put a stop to nuisance lawsuits from extreme environmental groups, using the best science available and, critically, bringing local communities into the decision-making process through my bill, the EMPOWERS Act.

We all agree commonsense review is needed, but what we don't need is redundant and unnecessary paperwork that only serves to keep Washington bureaucrats employed.

Madam Speaker, I thank Mr. NEWHOUSE for having me here tonight. He is doing the Lord's work, and I appreciate the honor of being here with him.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Madam Speaker, I thank Mr. SMITH, and I appreciate him for sharing some really personal impacts of a law that—can anyone think of another law that has been in place for 47 years without any kind of improvements or changes? It doesn't happen very often.

When we see impacts like that, that impact people's lives—they truly do—not only species that we are trying to protect but the people who are trying to live in concert with those species, it is something that really speaks, I think, to a lot of us. So I thank the gentleman very much for his bill.

The EMPOWER Act, I think, will give a lot of much-needed change and improvement to this process so that States and local communities can have a say. We should have more positive results from the ESA and move forward from that abysmal 3 percent success rate that we should not be proud of.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TIPTON), my good friend.

Mr. TIPTON. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague from Washington for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to be able to highlight the importance of modernizing the Endangered Species Act.

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service states that it implements the Endangered Species Act by working with others to conserve the ecosystems upon which the Endangered Species Act and threatened species depend upon and by developing and maintaining conservation programs for these species to improve their status to the point that the protection of the ESA is no longer necessary.

I wholeheartedly agree with that mission, and we should do everything possible to be able to grant the Fish and Wildlife Service the ability to be able to better protect at-risk or endangered species. I believe this can be done by utilizing local and State officials in a greater capacity.

Much of that legwork doesn't have to be done at the Federal level and can in-

stead be taken over by landowners who are out on the ground every day, working their land for farming, ranching, and for other purposes. They know the challenges that the threatened and endangered species face. They are in a unique position to be able to provide input on the best conservation strategies.

That is why, with this concept in mind, I have introduced the LOCAL Act, to be able to incorporate that hands-on local experience, to make sure that we are achieving what the ultimate goal is: to actually rehabilitate the species, to be able to take it off the endangered species list, and to be able to protect others from being added.

In the past 46 years of the law's existence, there is one glaring statistic that points to reforms being necessary. Since the ESA was first signed into law, there have been over 1,660 species listed. Of those, only 54 species have fully recovered, or an underwhelming 3 percent.

These numbers speak volumes that a one-size-fits-all mentality does not always result in the way that it is intended to. Not only that, but the red tape, timeframe, and expense to be able to recover a species is astronomical.

It is important to note that the goal of the ESA is to be able to keep species off the list in the first place, not keep them on for undetermined lengths of time.

Madam Speaker, I am glad to join my colleagues in the Congressional Western Caucus to be able to highlight the necessity of ESA reform.

In Colorado, we are proud to be able to have an abundance of wildlife, wildlife that resides on our public lands and, in many cases, in our own backyards. As residents of the State, we self-promote taking extra caution in our lands so that they may be preserved for future generations to enjoy.

After almost 50 years of lackluster results of recovering endangered species, I believe it is time that we rethink our strategy and place more trust in the local stewards of the land, not just bureaucrats in Washington.

If the goal is truly to recover species and to be able to protect species, let's make sure that we have programs in place that are going to achieve those results that we can all embrace.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Madam Speaker, I thank Mr. TIPTON for his comments. I have to say that he just hit the nail right on the head.

The ESA should encourage and incentivize voluntary conservation efforts. Species recovery, habitat recovery agreements, along with private property conservation grants and habitat conservation loan programs for State and local governments, will save money and resources while boosting conservation.

The more we can do this locally, the more we can direct these measures, the more impact they will have on accomplishing what we want from this conserving of species.

Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for this commonsense approach, this collaborative approach that he has taken, and for showing leadership on all of these crucial issues that are important to us in the West and all over the country, to the whole Nation.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR), the leader of the Congressional Western Caucus, someone who has shown a true sense of commitment to make the ESA something that it should be, something that is successful that we can all be proud of.

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE), my friend, for yielding.

I would like to first look at the Special Order and give a big "thank you" to Mr. NEWHOUSE for his passion for solving these issues affecting the Western States.

Madam Speaker, I have been honored to be the chairman of the Congressional Western Caucus for the past 3 years. In that time, the caucus has been the leading voice in the charge to modernize the decades-old Endangered Species Act.

It is clear that the ESA simply isn't working the way it should. Statistics show that only 3 percent of species listed under the act have been delisted.

Madam Speaker, if only 3 percent of the patients admitted to a hospital walked out healthy, that hospital would be shut down immediately. This rate of ineptitude is not sustainable.

Back in September, I was proud to organize and chair a forum of Members of Congress and more than 30 stakeholders from across the country to hear firsthand testimonials about how the ESA is broken and to hear suggestions for modifications and reform to make it work better. These testimonies hit home, exposing the fact that the Endangered Species Act is in disrepair and in desperate need of reform.

There have been several very positive developments in modernizing ESA in the last year alone. The administration, with the full support of the Congressional Western Caucus, proposed three new rules for the ESA.

This new rulemaking is the first substantial amending of the act since the 1980s. These new rules make the ESA more transparent and efficient, and they act more in line with Congress' intent.

In addition, I am excited about the Congressional Western Caucus' Endangered Species Act reform package for the 116th Congress, which currently comprises 17 separate pieces of legislation. This package includes six bills that were included in a similar package in the 115th Congress and three other bills from Western Caucus members offered in the 115th Congress. It seeks to codify the three regulations recently finalized by the Trump administration. It also includes six new bills. These bills protect private property rights, encourage voluntary conservation, improve forest health in order to

preserve and protect species and local communities, increase multiple-use activities, and protect critical infrastructure.

The sponsoring Members of these bills come from nearly every geographic corner of the United States. These Members are taking constituent-driven initiatives and working to make them law.

The need for a package like this is obvious. For example, forests are burning across the West on a yearly basis, in part because of ludicrous ESA restrictions.

Similarly, I am sure everyone in this Chamber is familiar with some of my Democratic colleagues' sentiments that if we do not pass the Green New Deal, the world will end in 12 years. What they do not talk about is that there is no way that their already unrealistic renewable energy goals can be met without large-scale buildup of new power lines and other energy transmission infrastructure. Under current environmental regulations, including the ESA, building pieces of that very infrastructure could take at least 12 years, so I guess we are all doomed anyway.

As I mentioned earlier, great steps have been taken by the Trump administration to bring the ESA into the 21st century. My Democratic colleagues, however, Madam Speaker, cannot help themselves and are preparing to fight these commonsense proposals instead of helping and getting onboard.

Tomorrow, the Natural Resources Committee will mark the bill that will undo these landmark reforms to the ESA. This is, once again, a purely political act by this House, and it has no chance of going anywhere.

Instead, I call on my Democratic colleagues to work with us to build on the new regulations from the Trump administration to get the ESA working again and better protect species.

Once again, Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague, Mr. NEWHOUSE, for allowing me to speak during this important Special Order today and for his leadership in highlighting the need to reform the Endangered Species Act.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Madam Speaker, I thank Mr. GOSAR for being here tonight. He truly has been a leader in this effort to modernize the ESA. I thank him for his commitment to that.

Legislation like he is proposing is going to be a huge step in improving the situation that we have in this country. So, I thank the gentleman for being here, again, very much.

If I could just say, I think it will improve the predictability for endangered species listings and critical habitat designations, but it will also level the playing field by applying the same standards for listing as we do for delisting a species.

If a species is recovered, we should celebrate that. It should be a happy day, something that is a good thing. That is our goal. Then we can remove it from the endangered list so that re-

sources can then be directed toward species that still need to be protected and brought back. It just makes sense.

I think the best example that comes to mind is the gray wolf. We should be celebrating that. They are back, and they are back strong. The science is clear about that. They are recovered, and it should be removed from the list so that we can better come to the aid of other endangered species.

Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for being here tonight.

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for hosting this Special Order.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA), my good friend and fellow farmer.

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Speaker, I thank Mr. NEWHOUSE for his leadership on this and for providing this time for us here this evening to be able to talk about this issue in a very real and constructive way.

The ESA passed in 1973, I think with a pretty strong bipartisan effort, signed by President Nixon. It was very well intentioned at the time, as were some of the other protection measures that were put in place for air and water.

As we saw the other day here with the changing of the WOTUS rule, the waters of the United States rule, over time, regulations can get out of control. They can be used for politics. They can be used for controlling people, for NIMBYism, and for no-growth and all that. I think that is really what these have expanded into.

Our job is to provide oversight. Our job is to provide course corrections, to make sure the ship is on the course it was intended 40-plus years ago.

The package of reforms that are being talked about by my colleagues and the bills that are being offered aren't here to gut the Endangered Species Act or to eliminate species. It is to bring back that course correction that we are looking for.

Though it was signed 40 years ago, it is our job to constantly monitor it and make sure it is working.

We talked earlier about that 3 percent of species that were listed that have recovered. Now, 3 percent doesn't give you a very good batting average, I think, in any league, so that would be considered a failure.

It is not because of a lack of effort or lack of spending. Certainly, in my own State of California, where species have been listed, we have issues with fish, with delta smelt, with salmon, and yet trillions of gallons of water are expended flushing the delta each year to find a lower result. Only two smelt have been caught in their check traps in the last five quarters, I think. That doesn't show success, but it shows a lot of damage to the people who need that water for other purposes as well.

□ 1815

So, let's find and focus on things that are going to be helpful to the species to

be recovered and doesn't have to damage people and their livelihoods along the way.

Reform is necessary to refocus the efforts of the Federal Government to help them recover more timely. One of the longtime listed in California, the valley elderberry longhorn beetle, was listed for approximately 40 years. And, yet, in 2012, the Fish and Wildlife Service was saying: Okay, we think it is time to pull that from the list. Let's do the work involved to remove it from the list because they had seen some success in that time period.

An important part that we don't talk about enough is what is known as critical habitat. Critical habitat is any host plant or other vehicle for a possible endangered species that might take residence there.

So the bush itself, the elderberry bush, any one of those, basically cannot be touched because it might be a potential habitat for a traveling elderberry beetle, although maybe none of them have ever been tracked in that particular area. Yet, every single bush—it is a battle. It is a fight.

Now, why are we fighting over the bushes? It is because many of these grow in floodplain areas, on levees that need to be maintained, rebuilt, and upgraded. We have a lot of potential for flooding in northern California.

Indeed, it wasn't so much potential as several times we have had bad floods result. And I would mention in the Yuba City-Marysville area, two very big floods in 1986 and 1997 that happened from crumbling levees.

Why don't they maintain the levees?

Because they can't. It is getting the permits and getting through the process and then being able to afford it by the time you have done that with all the requirements that are put on to maintain this habitat.

To maintain these elderberry bushes, in this case, makes it cost prohibitive for these local levee districts to be able to do their job.

So, what happens?

Nothing happens.

And so, in 1986 there was a giant flood, hundreds, thousands of homes in 1986. In 1997, it happened again. If the lesson wasn't learned, 11 years later in 1997, it happened again in the Yuba City-Marysville area. And at this point, three lives were lost in addition to all of that other damage. Three lives were lost needlessly because we couldn't learn the lessons and get the permits done to get the levee work done.

Why does that have to be?

Because of roadblocks, because of endless lawsuits and slow-moving bureaucracies that won't issue the permits and help with the funding that needs to get done.

So, finally, after all that was litigated, the government had to pay approximately \$400 million in damages for the losses of life and property in these floods.

It is pretty disgusting. But still, every single bush is litigated as a potential for critical habitat, even

though there may not ever be one of the species you are talking about, in this case the valley elderberry longhorn beetle, that might potentially use it.

So what happened with the delisting in 2012?

Well, they finally gave up because of litigation and about how they do the sampling of the beetle; how they do the sampling of the habitat of the beetle.

They said, Well, we can't tell if it is the valley elderberry longhorn beetle or the California elderberry longhorn beetle that might be making these boreholes in the plants and in the ground there.

So they just gave up and said, We are not going to delist it anymore.

That is similar to the situation my colleagues were talking about with the gray wolf. You can find plenty of gray wolves all over the upper Midwest and those other States. Yet, the standard seems to be in the Endangered Species Act, you have to find two or four remaining pairs in every single county, otherwise it is still listed as endangered in California or anywhere else.

The rules have gone too far. We need caps on the attorney's fees that make it not such an incentive for environmental groups to use this as a way to get paid as well as the way to stop progress, stop things that people need.

So I hope this package of bills at least can be a light and example of a direction we are trying to take back to reasonableness and how the Endangered Species Act is interpreted and used; not abused, not used as a weapon, weaponized against what we need for flood control to save peoples' lives or water storage.

If we are going to play the climate-change game, then we need to be able to have more of these tools available to us to store water.

It would certainly help if we had more input from our local stakeholders on this who actually know how to get a project done.

Finally, the Marysville-Yuba City area I was talking about, using local districts and local efforts, they did some amazing work after a lot of roadblocks were overcome.

So finally, the last bit—which is up to the Army Corps of Engineers—is going to be completed in that area of rebuilding the levees and putting the slurry wall in that is going to make them much less likely to erode and blow out. In 2020, the last piece is going to be done, if the Army Corps stays on their own unique schedule.

This is many years after those two floods. So I commend the great work that has been done up to this point, but how many needless years of risk in these flood zones have to happen because we can't get out of our own way because of a permit or because of somebody's interpretation of a critical habitat for a creature that doesn't even show up to these critical habitat areas?

I am tired of fighting the fight against people who don't seem to care

how it affects the people who they govern.

And so this is, I hope, a true effort that everybody can see to reform this act into something that actually works for people, works for the species, and gets a little better batting average than 3 percent recovery rate, which is pathetic, especially for the trillions of gallons of water we lose to the delta each year, the risk we have for people in flood zones, the high cost, the loss of potential, and the anguish that all of that brings.

Madam Speaker, I am glad we had this time to be able to share this with the public that is watching and our colleagues who are hopefully listening that we can reform the act and still have it pursue the goals of making the endangered species, that we talk about and care about, come off those lists because they are thriving once again.

We have seen some successful examples. The bald eagles, which I can see outside the window of my home in my rice field there, that is pretty tremendous. But we have got to get our batting average up, especially when you look at what it is costing society in lost potential and, unfortunately, sometimes in lost lives.

Madam Speaker, I appreciate Mr. NEWHOUSE yielding me the time, and I appreciate his efforts on this.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Madam Speaker, I thank Mr. LAMALFA and have to say that he has been a true leader in the Congressional Western Caucus and in the House of Representatives. It is awesome to be able to have someone contribute as much as the gentleman does that has the experience and the knowledge of how these laws impact real people.

Madam Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. OLSON), my friend who actually serves on the important, powerful Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Mr. OLSON. Madam Speaker, I want to thank my friend, Mr. NEWHOUSE, for yielding. He is from my birth State of Washington, Fort Lewis, the old Madigan Army Medical Center in 1962. That was a long, long time ago.

I thank the gentleman for coming to see the Petra Nova project in my district, the only viable carbon capture project in the whole world.

I thank the gentleman on behalf of the Congressional Western Caucus for taking the time to see real solutions to real problems.

My bride is a girl from Los Angeles, California—Hollywood. This is a big time back home for my Nancy: the Screen Actors Guild, the SAG Awards, which happened last weekend, and before that, the Golden Globes. The granddaddy of them all, the Oscars, is coming up this weekend.

If the success of the ESA was a movie, it would get a 0.0 Rotten Tomatoes score.

It would be a horror story that surpasses Hannibal Lecter, Freddy Krueger, and Jason. It would be a story

of how misused ESA is a threat to our national security, global freedom, and guarantees more greenhouse gases plaguing our world.

This story will be set in west Texas and southeast New Mexico. It stars an unremarkable creature named the dunes sagebrush lizard with best supporting actor played by a radical, antigrowth environmental activist.

The lizard lives on top of the Permian Basin, the most powerful force America has had for peace and clean air in the past two decades. That happened because of reemergence of American oil and gas as the number one producer in the entire world. That is because of the hydraulic fracturing revolution that has swept our Nation and the world.

The Permian Basin is leading the hydraulic fracturing revolution. Experts expect it to produce, by itself, 8 million barrels of oil per day in the next 4 years. That is up from its high, a mere 2 million barrels per day just 10 years ago.

That means, one, American shale play will be a bigger producer of oil and gas than every country in the world. That means bigger than Saudi Arabia, bigger than Russia, bigger than OPEC.

Two countries that emit the most greenhouse gases, they are China and India. Their only natural power source is coal. Right now, as I speak, megatons of American liquefied natural gas coming from the Permian Basin, the Bakken shale play in South Dakota, and Marcellus shale play here out East are going to China and India. Their air will be cleaner because of American energy.

It is a win-win for the jobs here in America, exporting technology to our friends for cleaner air and cleaner air in the global context.

You would think the environmental groups would love this, but, sadly, you would be wrong. For 10 years, people who have never been to the Permian Basin and can't spell Odessa if I spot them O-D-E-S-S, are pushing actively to have the dunes sagebrush lizard listed as an endangered species.

In 2012, they pushed President Barack Obama hard to have that listing. President Obama said, No, it is unnecessary. The locals are taking care of the issue by themselves. President Obama was right. The species is still with us today. But that hasn't stopped these liberals from using the Endangered Species Act to support OPEC and Russian energy.

They filed another lawsuit this past summer that is going through the courts. They know by doing that, they hinder growth because people are afraid to invest in the place that may have a pop-up endangered species that is not actually endangered.

These groups follow someone from Hollywood who is not a real person. His name is Forrest Gump. His motto is: "Stupid is as stupid does."

Enough of the stupidity. The ESA must focus on species, not political

dreams: My bill, the Listing Reform Act, H.R. 5585, addresses this exact problem.

I close by saying something we all know: “Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall set you free.”

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments. I did have the privilege of visiting the gentleman's district and seeing firsthand the Parish Generating Station, a state-of-the-art carbon capture and sequestration facility. It was amazing and truly helped me understand the potential of the technology that we now have at our disposal.

It is that kind of thing that will allow our Nation to truly lead in the American energy renaissance.

□ 1830

Unfortunately, all too often, some of the complications from the bureaucracy get in the way, and things like the ESA can prevent us from reaching our full potential.

I thank the gentleman for his leadership and ensuring that the economic effects are something too that we need to take into account. I appreciate the gentleman's contributions here this evening.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from the Fifth Congressional District of the great State of Arizona (Mr. BIGGS).

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE). I appreciate his leadership and work on these very important issues.

I am grateful to have a few minutes to speak and to address some of these issues that confront us as a nation and confront us in the Western part of this country, particularly in Arizona.

Land management and species management are critically important issues everywhere in this country, especially so in the West. Nationwide, the Federal Government owns one out of every three acres. But when you go to the West, Madam Speaker, it is one out of every two acres. In fact, in my State of Arizona, only about 20 percent of the total land area is in private hands. Federal holdings actually exceed the size of the State of Virginia.

Of course, Federal control over land means that bureaucrats in Washington, D.C., rather than knowledgeable State and local officials get to set the rules, and that certainly is the case when it comes to the Endangered Species Act.

ESA listings, in theory, are meant to give short-term support for species recovery. They are not supposed to turn into permanent classifications. However, as we have been hearing a litany of stories in this Special Order tonight—and as everyone who participates in this country knows—the reality is far different. In fact, less than 2 percent of species have been removed from the ESA list.

Another significant problem is that current Fish and Wildlife Service policies make it far easier to list a new

species than to examine the current list for potential removal.

Excessive ESA listings place enormously costly requirements on private landowners and even State and local government agencies.

For this reason, I introduced the LIST Act in the last Congress to greatly speed up the rate in which recovered species may be taken off the ESA list once the Secretary of the Interior receives objective data that the species in question has recovered. I am pleased to see that my good friend from Montana, Representative GREG GIANFORTE, is championing the LIST Act this year. It is a great piece of legislation.

Meanwhile, I am aiming to reform the ESA from an entirely different perspective with a new bill I introduced last week that I am calling the American Sovereignty and Species Protection Act.

I would bet that most Americans would be surprised to learn that the ESA currently allows the U.S. Government to buy foreign land—that is right, non-U.S. land, land in foreign nations—to protect endangered species in other countries. While this may be a well-intentioned policy, it is tragically naive. Remember that just because a Department of the Interior official purchases foreign land with the hope that it will be used to protect an endangered species, it does not mean that a foreign government will see things in the same way. Because the U.S. does not have sovereignty over the internal affairs of other nations, and exerts especially little influence over the developing nations in which so many endangered species live, I would much rather see taxpayer dollars used to advance domestic priorities.

The American Sovereignty and Species Protection Act, the LIST Act, and all the other ESA modernization efforts we have been talking about today in this packet of bills will help us to scale back bureaucratic overreach and still ensure that critically endangered species are protected. Both aims are achievable.

As the Western Caucus' chief regulatory officer, I will work with great leaders like those who have spoken and like our host today, DAN NEWHOUSE from Washington, to ensure that our goals are met.

Madam Speaker, I thank Mr. NEWHOUSE for his leadership and for yielding.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman helping us here this evening as we get down to the final few minutes of our hour.

While the thought behind foreign land acquisition in the ESA may have been well-intentioned, we need accountability, and we need to be able to determine whether results are being achieved.

The point the gentleman made about investing in our efforts domestically makes a lot of sense where we can focus on a results-driven approach using science and not emotion. So I

thank my friend very much for that thought.

In trying to accommodate schedules, if I may, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN) for a few thoughts that he has on this. He is a member of the Western Caucus. We are happy to adopt South Carolina as a Western State.

Mr. NORMAN. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend for his leadership on this issue and for what he has done over a long period of time to help this all-important issue.

Let me just echo what has already been said. I am a real estate developer. I have felt the effects of the bureaucratic overreach of the Endangered Species Act. I have seen where a heelsplitter snail can slow up projects for as many as 4 to 5 years.

I have been watching from a distance, and now, finally, we have decided to take action. I rise in support of the long-overdue efforts to modernize the Endangered Species Act and specifically my bill that would help continue protections for species while, more importantly, protecting the rights of individual property owners. My bill, the Property Rights Protection Act, would do just that.

Everyone agrees that it is important to protect these species that are threatened or endangered, but far too often, it comes at the expense of the constitutional rights of landowners.

This vital piece of legislation would ensure that we achieve both goals. We protect species, but we also protect our rights as property owners.

If the Federal Government deems land to be critical habitat because a species is endangered, then they ought to compensate the landowners, plain and simple. I believe that there needs to be a more equitable way to treat property owners who far too often find themselves in this type of situation. This legislation will be an excellent step in that direction.

Many landowners cannot afford the litigation costs that so many of these groups put before the landowners to get the rights that they deserve.

I really hope that all of my colleagues can come together to support this important piece of legislation to protect our rights and species and, more importantly, come together to update an antiquated law that is the Endangered Species Act that has been in need of modernization for far too long.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Madam Speaker, I appreciate Mr. NORMAN's thoughts. We should be doing everything in our power to incentivize landowners to be active participants in conservation efforts for threatened and endangered species.

Without oversight over whether current restrictions set by the Federal Government would actually help these species, and with very little recourse available for the property owner, this legislation takes a very important step forward to ensure there is a collaborative approach.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the good gentleman from the First Congressional District of the great State of Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, I appreciate my friend from Washington, who is a great Member of Congress and who knows exactly some of the damage that the Endangered Species Act has done. We certainly have experienced that in Texas.

We did, in the House, modernize the Endangered Species Act in my first term, 2005 and 2006, and it was quite an education to me because I thought the Endangered Species Act was all about trying to save endangered species. But I got an education. I found out that was not what the Endangered Species Act was about because if it was just about saving endangered species, we would have saved a lot more than 1, 2, and 3 percent of the endangered species.

One of the things that we did in that bill that I thought was common sense because I know there are landowners—I hear about these situations—and that is what they rely on to feed their families. There is a doctrine that is not an official doctrine known as shoot, shovel, and shut up. Somebody sees an endangered species, and they are scared if somebody sees it, then the use of their land will be taken away, and they will no longer be able to provide for their family.

Even though I believe that it is a taking anticipated under the Bill of Rights, which requires remuneration, that is not what the courts have found. But in that modernized bill back in my first term, we said: Look, if you are going to tell a landowner he can't use his land, or she can't use her land, then you ought to pay them because you have taken away the use.

I was shocked to find that there were people on the other side of the aisle who said: No, no, no. We don't want that in there.

But that will save species; people will be more willing to volunteer that they found an endangered species.

The answer was: Well, they shouldn't even have that land anyway.

I appreciate the efforts of the gentleman from Washington. Hopefully, we can work together because we do indeed care about endangered species, and modernization will allow us to save a whole lot more than 1, 2, or 3 percent.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Madam Speaker, I thank Mr. GOHMERT. The gentleman knows full well from his time serving on the House Natural Resources Committee just how ineffective the current ESA is performing. I thank the gentleman for his leadership and for spearheading the SAVES Act, as he described, to enhance our conservation measures for endangered species.

Madam Speaker, you just heard from a variety of members from the Congressional Western Caucus who represent not only rural districts in the West but also communities across the Nation, from Montana to Missouri,

from South Carolina to California. Their message was clear: We must modernize the ESA. Doing so will be good for the species. It will be good for communities. It will be good for taxpayers. And it will be good for our economy.

A few Members were unable to join us tonight. I want to list some of the bills that they are sponsoring: Congresswoman CHENEY's Increasing Access and Multiple Use Act, Congressman WESTERMAN's PETITION Act, Congressman MIKE JOHNSON's Critical Habitat Improvement Act, Congressman YOUNG's LAMP Act, Congressman STEWART's Critical Infrastructure Act, Congressman CALVERT's FISH Act, Congressman MCCLINTOCK's Endangered Species Transparency and Reasonableness Act, and Congressman BUCK's Threatened Species Protection Improvement Act.

All of these bills are critical for a comprehensive update to ensure the ESA accomplishes what it was designed to do: recover threatened and endangered animals and wildlife.

This package is supported by dozens of organizations, including the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Counties, the Family Farm Alliance, the National Endangered Species Act Reform Coalition, the American General Contractors Association, the Independent Petroleum Association of America, the National Association of Home Builders, the Western Energy Alliance, the United Snowmobile Association, the National Mining Association, American Agri-Women, and the National Cotton Council, amongst many, many, many others.

As we continue to push for reforms to the ESA in the people's House and work with the administration and the White House to support the Department of the Interior's updated implementation regulations, I hope that my colleagues will join us in recognizing that we can do so much better to recover our Nation's magnificent flora and fauna.

The Western Caucus will remain at the forefront of this effort. A 3 percent success rate is failing our wildlife across this beautiful country. We must do better.

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

WHY IMPOUNDMENT CONTROL ACT MATTERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH) for 30 minutes.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YARMUTH. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. YARMUTH. Madam Speaker, a week from today, we will hear about the state of our Union from an impeached President who has repeatedly shown a complete disregard for the principles on which that union was founded.

President Trump has brazenly trampled the constitutional boundaries of executive power, damaging the foundation of our democracy. He shamelessly betrayed his oath of office by putting his own corrupt agenda before our national security.

His withholding of aid to Ukraine has dominated the news, but the administration's willingness to pervert our laws for President Trump's ego, personal vendettas, and political gains goes much deeper.

Earlier this month, the nonpartisan U.S. Government Accountability Office, or GAO, issued a legal opinion stating that Trump's Office of Management and Budget, OMB, violated Federal law, specifically the Impoundment Control Act of 1974, by withholding foreign aid.

Madam Speaker, I will include that opinion in the RECORD.

□ 1845

As chairman of the Budget Committee, which has jurisdiction over this law, it is my responsibility to provide the full story to the American people and to Members of Congress so that we can all fully understand what is happening to our government.

To start with, this violation of Federal law was not an innocent mistake. Withholding Ukrainian aid was an intentional and brazen abuse of power. This quid pro quo is the most egregious example that we know of, but the Budget Committee has been concerned by OMB's questionable behavior and apparent violations of the Impoundment Control Act for some time.

A deeper look clearly reveals how methodically the President and his administration have been circumventing our laws to advance their authoritarian view of executive power. To understand their scheme, we must understand the law they tried to secretly dodge and ultimately broke, the Impoundment Control Act.

The U.S. Constitution grants Congress the power to appropriate our tax dollars, while the President's administration carries out these spending decisions. It is a simple but incredibly important check on executive power.

In 1974, Congress passed the Impoundment Control Act, the ICA, in response to another law-breaking President, President Nixon. By refusing to spend congressionally appropriated funds for programs he opposed, such as funding for clean drinking water, Nixon's administration was impounding funds.

An impoundment means any action or inaction that prevents Federal funds

from being obligated or spent, either temporarily or permanently.

By passing the ICA, Congress reasserted its constitutional power of the purse by establishing procedures to block the President and other government officials from substituting their own funding decisions for those of Congress.

It created two pathways the executive branch can use to reduce, delay, or eliminate congressionally appropriated funding: They can propose to cancel funding, which is known as a rescission, or delay funding, which is a deferral, but both must meet strict requirements.

For example, if the President wants to eliminate funding for a specific program, he must first secure congressional approval to cancel that funding. The ICA requires that the President send a special message to Congress identifying the amount of, the reasons for, and the effects of a proposed rescission.

After submitting this special message, the President can withhold those funds for up to 45 legislative session days while Congress considers the request. But if Congress does not pass a law to cancel those funds within that 45-day period, those funds must be released. So even with this process, the President cannot cancel funding without Congress' explicit approval.

Also, the President cannot use the rescissions process to run out the fiscal year clock, in other words, to withhold funds for so long that they can no longer be used. We will come back to rescission, so keep this in mind.

Now, the ICA defines a deferral as withholding, delaying, or effectively preventing congressionally approved funds from being obligated or spent, either through executive action or inaction. But here is the catch. There are only three narrow circumstances in which the President can propose a deferral: to provide for contingencies, to achieve budgetary savings through approved operational efficiency, and as specifically provided by law.

Notice that policy reasons is not one of the three.

As with rescissions, the ICA requires that the President send a special message to Congress identifying how much they want to defer, why, and for how long. However, a proposed deferral may not extend beyond the end of the fiscal year. Only once Congress receives this special message can the President withhold those funds.

Again, the President cannot withhold funds for so long that they can no longer be used.

I hope that didn't make anyone's eyes glaze over, but the details of the Impoundment Control Act are at the heart of this administration's lack of respect for our Nation's separation of powers and rule of law.

Today, nearly 46 years after the ICA became law, Congress confronts a President and an administration eager to blow past the boundaries of execu-

tive budgetary power and co-opt Congress' power of the purse for the President's personal gain.

This brings us to 2018 and one the first red flags. My committee's concerns about ICA violations under the Trump administration actually started in 2018, when I was serving as the committee's ranking member.

Multiple reports warned that the Trump administration was considering a late-in-the-year rescissions package that would have effectively started that 45-day clock close to the end of the fiscal year. As you recall, the ICA requires congressional approval before funds can be canceled. By withholding funds through their expiration date, President Trump and OMB aimed to game the system and create a backdoor rescission. The White House had to abandon this scheme in the face of bipartisan condemnation.

To send a clear message to the White House and to put an end to any future attempts at backdoor rescissions, then-Chairman WOMACK and I, in October of 2018, requested GAO's legal opinion on whether an ill-timed rescission package from the White House would violate the ICA.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD the letter that then-Chairman WOMACK and I sent to the GAO.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,
Washington, DC 20515, October 31, 2018.

Hon. GENE L. DODARO,
Comptroller General, U.S. Government Accountability Office, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. DODARO: We are requesting clarification in the form of a legal opinion on the issue of proposed rescissions of funds submitted close to their expiration date. It is important that Congress remain at the center of the decision of whether to withhold funds. To that end Congress should have adequate time to receive, consider, and act on any rescission message sent by the President.

Under the Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (ICA), the President may submit a special message proposing the rescission of budget authority and may withhold funds from obligation for a period of 45 calendar days of continuous session following transmission of the special message. Public Law No. 93-344, as amended, 1012; 2 U.S.C. §683. If Congress does not pass a rescission bill within the 45-day period, the ICA requires that the funds be released for obligation. Specifically, section 1012(b) states: "Any amount of budget authority proposed to be rescinded or that is to be reserved as set forth in such special message shall be made available for obligation unless, within the prescribed 45-day period, the Congress has completed action on a rescission bill rescinding all or part of the amount proposed to be rescinded or that is to be reserved."

As you know, the rescission process has been used this year for the first time since the Clinton Administration. Naturally, some questions have arisen. One question of particular importance to Congress concerns whether the executive can use the rescission process to withhold funds from obligation for the duration of the 45-day period, even if the funds expire before the end of that period.

GAO has never issued an opinion on the legality of withholding funds in this circumstance. We now request GAO's legal opinion regarding whether the ICA allows

funds to be withheld from obligation in this situation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

STEVE WOMACK,
Chairman,
JOHN YARMUTH,
Ranking Member.

Mr. YARMUTH. In December 2018, GAO issued a decision, which I will include in the RECORD, concluding that, while the ICA does, under limited circumstances, allow the President to withhold money for up to 45 congressional session days, the President cannot freeze the money for so long that it can no longer be used.

GAO confirmed Congress' constitutional role, saying: "A withholding of this nature would be an aversion both to the constitutional process for enacting Federal law and to Congress' constitutional power of the purse, for the President would preclude the obligation of budget authority Congress has already enacted and did not rescind."

Mr. WOMACK and I both welcomed this opinion from GAO, calling it an important confirmation of Congress' constitutional authority over funding decisions.

While GAO was deliberating, OMB submitted their views, as is customary. A letter from OMB's general counsel seems to assert the belief that the President can do whatever he wants, that he doesn't have to respect our separation of powers or the will of Congress to cancel funds he doesn't want to spend, that he is above the law.

As GAO stated in their opinion: "The President has no unilateral authority to withhold funds from obligation."

"The President cannot rely on the authority in the ICA to withhold amounts from obligation, while simultaneously disregarding the ICA's limitations."

This deliberate disregard for our laws undermines our democracy. The executive branch is not a monarchy, but this attitude is a pernicious problem with this administration.

Less than a year later, in August of 2019, a document, a letter apportionment from OMB, was leaked. An apportionment is a legally binding budget document used by OMB to set the rate at which an agency spends its funds over the course of a fiscal year.

For example, we wouldn't want an agency to come to Congress in March saying that it has already spent its entire annual operating budget and must cease operations unless Congress provides more money. To prevent this, OMB apportions agencies money. However, this leaked letter from August 3, 2019, raised multiple red flags.

First, this letter apportionment, sent to officials at the State Department and the U.S. Agency for International Development, put an abrupt freeze on billions in foreign aid less than 60 days before the end of the fiscal year.

OMB put a legally binding hold on 15 key accounts that covered a spectrum of assistance, international control,

peacekeeping operations, global health programs, foreign military financing programs, and more.

Similar to 2018, reports were circulating that President Trump planned a late-in-the-year rescissions package, despite GAO's decision just 9 months earlier rebuking the tactic as an end run around Congress.

On August 19, Senate Budget Committee Ranking Member SANDERS and I wrote a letter to President Trump's Acting Chief of Staff and OMB Director Mick Mulvaney urging him to follow the law and to respect Congress' constitutional authority.

Second red flag, this apportionment was signed by Michael Duffey, an administration political appointee. Since OMB's inception, career officials with knowledge and expertise of the apportionment process and impoundment law, not political appointees, have signed these highly technical budget documents. This means that OMB took the unprecedented step of stripping career officials of their normal role in the apportionment process and, instead, gave this responsibility to someone who had been appointed by the President. This was, to say the least, suspicious.

Third red flag, under current law, apportionments are not public documents. OMB sent no special message to Congress to flag this hold on foreign aid, as the law requires; they kept Congress in the dark. If the document had not been leaked, Congress might not have ever discovered this suspicious funding freeze.

What else were they hiding?

While this leaked August 3 letter apportionment is what first alerted Congress to the President's willingness to break the law, at that time we could not have guessed how nefarious it really was. A few weeks later, the Budget Committee would uncover a pattern of abuse of the apportionment process, our separation of powers, and current law.

As part of our investigation, my committee asked OMB for documents and answers detailing their involvement in the withholding of foreign aid. After review of the materials provided to us, it was clear that this was an intentional and willful abuse of power.

To lay this out as plainly as I can, I will outline what happened chronologically.

It all starts on May 23, 2019, when the Pentagon sent a letter to Congress certifying that the Government of Ukraine had met Congress' anticorruption requirements and was, therefore, eligible to receive the critical security assistance it needed. Most importantly, the Pentagon notified lawmakers of its plans to spend the money.

Keep in mind that this is critical funding Ukraine needs to protect itself from Russia, our shared adversary.

The first sign of trouble came almost a month later, on June 19, 2019. In response to our request for answers, OMB

asserts that this is when they first reach out to the Department of Defense to ask about the Ukraine Security Assistance Initiative, or USAI, funds.

Mark Sandy, an Afghanistan veteran and top career OMB official who is responsible for managing the flow of Pentagon funds, testified that OMB officials were told the President wanted the Ukraine aid paused, but he didn't understand why.

So, while reaching out to the Pentagon to learn more about the aid package, he also repeatedly pressed Mr. Duffey about why President Trump imposed the hold. But Mr. Sandy didn't get a clear answer. He testified that Mr. Duffey "didn't provide an explicit response on the reason. He simply said, 'We need to let the hold take place'—and I'm paraphrasing here—and then revisit this issue with the President.'"

Just about a week later, on June 27, Mick Mulvaney was flying on Air Force One with President Trump when he fired off a quick email to an aide back in Washington. The email said: "I'm just trying to tie up some loose ends. Did we ever find out about the money for Ukraine and whether we can hold it back?"

The aide, Robert Blair, replied that, while they could carry out the President's request, the move to withhold aid passed in a bipartisan spending deal would not go over well with Congress. "Expect Congress to become unhinged," he wrote back.

I don't know about unhinged, but Congress was not going to let this abuse of executive overreach go unanswered.

These early conversations are critical to our timeline because they show that this administration's abuse of our laws and plans to blackmail a foreign nation into helping President Trump cheat our elections was premeditated.

President Trump, Mulvaney, and Duffey abused OMB's authority to withhold Ukraine security assistance at the same time President Trump directed his personal lawyer, Rudy Giuliani, and his associates to solicit foreign interference in our elections.

In July, they set their plans in motion. During an interagency meeting on July 18, an OMB staffer relayed President Trump's order to freeze all Ukraine assistance to the State Department and the Pentagon. This stunned and infuriated our own top Ukrainian diplomats, who understood the necessity of strong American support for Ukraine in their fight against Russia. Later that day, the House Foreign Affairs Committee was warned about the hold by administration sources, urging them to investigate.

But the bottom line was that there was no legal way for President Trump to withhold aid to Ukraine without Congress' approval. Since it was a politically motivated hold, it would not even qualify for a deferral under the ICA. If the President was going to hold this aid hostage, he had to find a way to go behind Congress' back and se-

cretly impound hundreds of millions of taxpayer dollars.

Mr. Sandy testified that, on July 19, Mr. Duffey proposed using the apportionment process to implement the hold, that is, to use a legally binding budget document to withhold security assistance to Ukraine.

Mr. Sandy also testified that, while approving apportionment schedules for agencies is routine, attaching a footnote to block spending was so unusual he did not recall another event like it in his 12 years of service at OMB.

□ 1900

There is a reason for that. It could be considered a violation of the Impoundment Control Act.

As you will recall, the ICA prohibits the President and his administration from withholding aid unless it is done under the authorities of the Impoundment Control Act, which require notification to Congress, which OMB did not want to do.

A week later, on July 25, President Trump had his now-infamous call with Ukrainian President Zelensky, where he asked a foreign government to dig up dirt on a political rival. Just 90 minutes after the President hung up the phone, Mr. Duffey emailed the Pentagon, putting a hold on the Ukraine aid.

In his email, which was only obtained under the Freedom of Information Act, Mr. Duffey shared OMB's plan to "formalize the pause with an apportionment footnote" that would come later that day. In another red flag, Mr. Duffey asked Pentagon officials to keep this "hold" decision as secret as possible.

According to documents obtained by the House Budget Committee, at 6:44 p.m. Eastern time, just hours after the "perfect call," Mr. Sandy signed an apportionment that officially imposed what OMB claimed at the time to be a "brief pause" in USAI funds.

OMB inserted a footnote into the apportionment that froze all remaining USAI funding until August 5. The footnote states that the funds are being held "to allow for an interagency process to determine the best use of such funds," but also that "DOD may continue its planning and casework for the initiative during this period."

Why would OMB allow the Pentagon to continue working on current plans and casework if they were claiming they needed to freeze the funds to review those same plans and casework? Because this hold was never about a policy review. This hold was this administration's attempt to get around Congress and secretly undermine the law, to freeze foreign aid so that they could use it to pressure Ukraine into helping President Trump cheat to win reelection in 2020.

It is the same hold that Mulvaney referenced in his June email to Mr. Blair while flying on Air Force One with the President, and it is the same hold that would ultimately lead to grounds for impeachment.

The July 25 apportionment would be the last one Mr. Sandy would sign. The White House needed to make sure the aid remained frozen while they kept up their pressure campaign on President Zelensky. But OMB career officials were becoming uneasy about the freeze and the illegality of using apportionments to create secret impoundments.

In an unprecedented move, Mr. Sandy was stripped of his authority to oversee the management of Ukraine aid, and the apportionment authority was transferred to President Trump's political appointee, Mr. Duffey.

Remember that leaked letter apportionment that raised red flags? When that apportionment leaked in early August, Congress still didn't know about the plot to withhold the Pentagon's \$250 million in Ukraine aid. So here we have 15 State and USAID foreign aid accounts on hold, one of which includes \$26.5 million in Foreign Military Financing funds for—you guessed it—Ukraine. On top of that, this apportionment is the first one with Mr. Duffey's signature.

August was a busy time for Mr. Duffey. Someone who had never before signed apportionment documents started signing all the apportionment documents in both the National Security Division and the International Affairs Division instead of career officials. On August 6, Mr. Duffey signed the first extension of what was supposed to be the brief withholding of the Pentagon's USAI funds, using another footnote to freeze the funds until August 12.

Separately, on August 9, our documents show Mr. Duffey signed another apportionment affecting the State Department and USAID foreign funds included in the leaked apportionment. This time, OMB said the agencies are only allowed to spend 2 percent of the funds each day, and it withholds the rest from the agencies. That is not a programmatic, funds management, or even a policy decision.

The State Department doesn't send a couple thousand dollars to support international peacekeeping missions one day and then a couple thousand dollars to support international narcotics control the next. That is not how it works.

Limiting agencies to such a minuscule amount effectively prevented these funds from being spent at all, while at the same time, the apportionment continued to withhold the majority of remaining funds. It was another backdoor attempt to freeze funding and possibly rescind it completely by running out the clock.

On August 19, Senator SANDERS and I sent our letter to OMB and the White House, calling on the administration to stop impounding funds, to respect GAO's legal opinion from the previous December, stating that a late-in-the-year rescission request that prevents congressional action and withholds funds until they can no longer be used would violate the ICA.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD the letter Senator SANDERS and I sent to Director Mulvaney.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, August 19 2019.

Hon. MICK MULVANEY,
Director, Office of Management and Budget,
Washington, DC.

DEAR DIRECTOR MULVANEY: We write to express our profound concern regarding the Administration's reported plan to submit a rescission request to the Congress just a few weeks before the end of the fiscal year.

Under the Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (ICA), the President may submit a special message proposing the rescission of budget authority and may withhold funds from obligation for a period of 45 calendar days of continuous session following transmission of the special message. In keeping with Congress's constitutional power of the purse, however, such funding must be released absent approval by Congress within the 45-day period. Specifically, section 1012(b) of the ICA states:

Any amount of budget authority proposed to be rescinded or that is to be reserved as set forth in such special message shall be made available for obligation unless, within the prescribed 45-day period, the Congress has completed action on a rescission bill rescinding all or part of the amount proposed to be rescinded or that is to be reserved.

Submitting a rescissions request and withholding funds from obligation this late in the fiscal year could result in funding being withheld through its expiration date. In December 2018, at the request of the House Budget Committee, the U.S. Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a legal opinion that addressed this circumstance. GAO found that "the ICA does not permit the withholding of funds through their date of expiration." Further, GAO determined that absent Congressional action to rescind the funds,

amounts proposed for rescission must be made available for prudent obligation before the amounts expire, even where the 45-day period for congressional consideration provided in the ICA approaches or spans the date on which funds would expire: the requirement to make amounts available for obligation in this situation prevails over the privilege to temporarily withhold the amounts.

The authority provided by the ICA to the Executive Branch to withhold funds temporarily is necessarily limited. The GAO opinion states:

It would be an abuse of this limited authority and an interference with Congress's constitutional prerogatives if a President were to time the withholding of expiring budget authority to effectively alter the time period that the budget authority is available for obligation from the time period established by Congress in duly enacted appropriations legislation.

As the chairman and ranking member of the respective House and Senate committees with jurisdiction over the Impoundment Control Act, we affirm our strong agreement with the legal analysis and conclusions reached by GAO. We strongly urge the Administration to refrain from sending a rescission message to the Congress; however, in the event the Administration submits such a message, it must take measures to ensure that the affected funds will be prudently obligated in the event the Congress does not approve the rescission, as required by law. To withhold these funds until they can no longer be prudently obligated or until they expire, in the absence of Congressional approval of the rescission, would violate the

ICA and flout an important constitutional check. We trust that you will comply with the law and respect the constitutional role of the Congress to remain at the center of funding decisions.

Thank you for your attention to these concerns.

Sincerely,

JOHN YARMUTH,
Chairman, House Committee on the Budget.

BERNARD SANDERS,
Ranking Member, Senate Committee on the Budget.

Mr. YARMUTH. At this time, we did not understand that the President and OMB actually had learned from their 2018 attempts to circumvent Congress. But they learned the wrong lesson. Now, they were just trying to bypass Congress completely.

By the second week of August, Mr. Duffey was issuing holds on USAI funds every couple of days to block the Pentagon from sending aid. OMB was doing what it could to keep the President's hold on Ukraine aid active, but on August 28, a senior administration official told Politico about the hold on USAI funds. The President's scheme was unraveling.

On August 29, our documents show Mr. Duffey signed another letter apportionment releasing 25 percent of the remaining State Department and USAID funds each Sunday in September. With this latest trick, it was clear these agencies were not going to be able to spend all the funds Congress appropriated before they expired on September 30. And in fact, they didn't, which was apparently OMB's intention all along.

Meanwhile, Mr. Duffey was still signing apportionments to freeze USAI funds until September 12. During this time, DOD warned that OMB's ongoing hold on Ukraine assistance would prevent them from using all the funds Congress appropriated before they expired on September 30. And, of course, DOD was right.

On September 18, Chairwoman LOWEY and I wrote to OMB, expressing deep concerns about OMB's escalating abuses of its apportionment authority and its blatant attempts to undermine Congress' power of the purse. Basically, we told them to stop their pretty obvious attempts to evade, invalidate, and violate congressional appropriations laws and the ICA.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD that letter of September 18.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,
Washington, DC, September 18, 2019.

Hon. MICK MULVANEY,
Acting Chief of Staff, The White House,
Washington, DC.

Hon. RUSSELL VOUGHT,
Acting Director, Office of Management and Budget, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. MULVANEY AND MR. VOUGHT: We write to express our deep concerns about the Office of Management and Budget's (OMB's) increasingly dubious and politicized applications of budget law, as well as the role they have played in impeding other agencies' ability to use their enacted appropriations.

OMB's actions have already damaged important government programs, diminished our country's security and standing abroad, and if continued, threaten to permanently undermine fundamental checks and balances in our constitutional republic.

Specifically, during the last year, OMB has demonstrated a growing willingness to abuse its Presidentially-delegated apportionment authorities and impermissibly disrupt the balance of powers between the branches. The agency's apportionment authorities may not be used as a form of executive control or influence over agency functions. Rather, they may only be exercised in the manner and for the purposes prescribed in the Antideficiency Act (ADA) and in compliance with other appropriations and budget laws, including title X of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (Impoundment Control Act). None of those laws give the Executive Branch the unilateral power to invalidate duly enacted statutes through the apportionment process.

Nevertheless, OMB continues to abuse those authorities, and the apportionment process, to flout the Constitution's assignment of the power of the purse to Congress. OMB's inexplicable and unprecedented apportionment actions have withheld critical funding provided for the Department of State and United States Agency for International Development (USAID) in a manner inconsistent with long-standing policies and procedures. Those OMB actions are deleteriously impacting the prudent obligation of foreign assistance intended to support U.S. interests, and are hindering the efficient and effective management of U.S. funds and programs. Indeed, those actions seem to be specifically designed to obstruct the agencies' ability to use their appropriations for their Congressionally-approved purposes in the final weeks before they expire. We have serious legal concerns that those actions will result in *de facto* impoundments, and we are deeply troubled that this may be OMB's unstated goal.

The apportionment actions at issue also undermine important programs and policies that Congress funded, to among other things:

Fulfill U.S. treaty obligations and support the nation's international allies and partners;

Counter Russian aggression and Chinese influence across the globe;

Respond to humanitarian crises all over the world, including in Venezuela, Syria, and Burma;

Counter violent extremism in the Sahel, Yemen, and elsewhere; and

Enable important initiatives such as the Indo-Pacific Strategy and Power Africa.

Withholding funds through the apportionment process until they can no longer be prudently obligated is a back-door rescission without Congressional approval. A year ago, OMB retreated from its plan to illegally impound State Department and USAID appropriations through a cynically-timed rescissions proposal—a misguided scheme that OMB threatened again this year, even after clear warning from the Government Accountability Office (GAO) that such attempts were in violation of the Impoundment Control Act. We are concerned that OMB's intransigence on these issues has led it to try to accomplish through the apportionment process what it had hoped to accomplish with a rescissions proposal.

OMB has continued to push this unlawful agenda and perniciously broadened its sights to target funding provided by the Congress to the Department of Defense to counter Russian aggression. In particular, OMB withheld funding provided for the Ukraine Security Assistance Initiative, a vital form of Congressionally-directed assistance that

helps Ukraine defend its sovereign territory. As with the State and USAID funding, this funding also expires at the end of this month, and recent estimates indicate that at least tens of millions—and potentially over one hundred million—in funds will expire as a result of OMB's attempts to stifle the Department of Defense's access to this lawfully provided funding. This apparent impoundment has interrupted the Defense Department's work on security programs that have been in place with a partner nation for years.

OMB also took the unusual and perhaps unprecedented step of delegating the authority to execute these apportionments to a political appointee, in lieu of career civil servants who have historically been the designated officials responsible for overseeing and executing these technical budget documents. More than that, the apportionment actions taken by this political appointee have no justifiable policy, program, or funds management rationale.

We are deeply troubled by this pattern of OMB interference with agencies' use of appropriations for authorized purposes. All the funding for the programs and policies mentioned above was negotiated in good faith between, and subsequently approved by, bipartisan majorities in the Congress, and was signed into law by President Trump. Moreover, we are deeply concerned that OMB has intended that these actions take place without Congressional oversight or transparency to the public, given that OMB has been unwilling to provide apportionments even pursuant to written requests by our committees.

We assure you that our committees will remain focused on OMB's use of apportionments and that we will respond forcefully to Executive Branch actions that seek to override the Congress' most fundamental constitutional power. We are actively pursuing a range of options to ensure that OMB is held accountable for any improper apportionment actions and to ensure that the Congress remains at the center of funding decisions. In the meantime, we urge you in the strongest possible terms to return OMB to its function of administering enacted laws, to immediately release for use all remaining expiring funds, and to cease further attempts to evade and invalidate the laws passed by the Congress. We sincerely hope you can be successful in restoring the trust that OMB has historically held as a valuable institution and good steward of federal funding.

JOHN A. YARMUTH,
Chairman, House Committee on the Budget.

NITA M. LOWEY,
Chairwoman, House Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. YARMUTH. But then, Madam Speaker, the whistleblower report was made public. The report outlined how President Trump instructed his administration and OMB officials to put a hold on almost \$400 million in Ukraine security assistance ahead of his July 25 phone call with President Zelensky. The President abused his power and betrayed the oath he took before the American people to defend our national security and honor our Constitution.

As the plan unraveled, the picture became clear. The administration was abusing the apportionment process to secretly and illegally impound funding provided by Congress to protect our national security, to use this leverage against a foreign nation to help the

President cheat our elections, and they couldn't hide it any longer.

On September 24, Speaker PELOSI announced a formal impeachment inquiry into the shady dealings of the Trump administration.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter of September 27 that Chairwoman LOWEY and I sent to OMB, seeking answers and documents related to the withholding of the Ukraine aid, State and USAID funds, and abuse of the apportionment process.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,

Washington, DC, September 27, 2019.

Hon. MICK MULVANEY,
Acting Chief of Staff, The White House, Washington, DC.

Hon. RUSSELL VOUGHT,
Acting Director, Office of Management and Budget, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. MULVANEY AND MR. VOUGHT:

The Committees on the Budget and Appropriations are the primary committees charged with overseeing and writing federal budget and appropriation laws. Consistent with our authority, we are continuing our efforts in the 116th Congress to pursue productive improvements and reforms to the laws and authorities governing federal financial management to ensure that the Congress remains at the center of funding decisions. Specifically, our committees are considering legislative proposals related to the apportionment process and the withholding of funds, including in the context of the Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (ICA) and the annual appropriations acts.

As we stated in our September 18th letter, we have serious concerns that recent apportionment actions by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) to withhold military aid for Ukraine and other foreign assistance constitute unlawful impoundments in violation of the ICA and are an abuse of the authority provided to the President to apportion appropriations. In the short time since we sent that letter, additional reports have emerged detailing the circumstances surrounding the withholding of funding for Ukraine and OMB's involvement in that withholding.

According to those reports, at least a week prior to a July 25th phone call between President Trump and Ukrainian President Zelenskyy, President Trump told Mr. Mulvaney to withhold almost \$400 million in military aid and foreign assistance for Ukraine, and "[o]fficials at the Office of Management and Budget relayed Trump's order to the State Department and the Pentagon during an interagency meeting in mid-July." The reporting also indicates that "[t]here was concern within the administration that if they did not spend the money [appropriated for Ukraine], they would run afoul of the law" and that, eventually, Mr. Vought released the money.

On Tuesday, September 24, 2019, at the United Nations General Assembly, the President confirmed the withholding and added his reasoning, stating:

As far as withholding funds, those funds were paid. They were fully paid. But my complaint has always been—and I'd withhold again, and I'll continue to withhold until such time as Europe and other nations contribute to Ukraine. Because they're not doing it.

The recently declassified complaint submitted to the Office of the Inspector General of the Intelligence Community (ICIG) on Monday, August 12, 2019 provided similar confirmation of OMB's withholding of appropriated funding for Ukraine. The complaint, which appeared credible according to a letter from the ICIG, stated among other things:

On 18 July, an Office of Management and Budget (OMB) official informed Departments and Agencies that the President “earlier that month” had issued instructions to suspend all U.S. security assistance to Ukraine. Neither OMB nor the NSC staff knew why this instruction had been issued. During interagency meetings on 23 July and 26 July, OMB officials again stated explicitly that the instruction to suspend this assistance had come directly from the President, but they still were unaware of a policy rationale. As of early August, I heard from U.S. officials that some Ukrainian officials were aware that U.S. aid might be in jeopardy, but I do not know how or when they learned of it.

As reports continue to emerge, we have deepening concerns that OMB continues to demonstrate a pattern of impeding agencies’ ability to use their enacted appropriations; that recent apportionment actions taken by OMB to withhold military aid and foreign assistance funding administered by the Department of Defense, Department of State, and U.S. Agency for International Development constitute unlawful impoundments; and that OMB took the unusual and seemingly unprecedented step of delegating the authority to execute these apportionments to a political appointee, in lieu of career civil servants who have historically been the designated officials responsible for overseeing and executing these technical budget documents. These actions have collectively undermined the longstanding application and predictability of federal funds management processes and require closer examination by our committees to inform appropriate legislative responses and reforms.

Therefore, to support our committees’ efforts, we request that OMB produce written responses to the committees, no later than Tuesday, October 1, 2019, to the following questions:

(1) a. When did OMB first instruct agencies to withhold assistance for Ukraine, including amounts appropriated in section 9013 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2019 for the Ukraine Security Assistance Initiative and any applicable amounts provided in other appropriation acts for the Foreign Military Financing Program?

b. In which Treasury Appropriation Fund Symbol(s) (TAFS or account) were amounts withheld?

c. When was the first apportionment action executed for (each of) the relevant account(s) to withhold those funds?

d. Were the withheld funds made available for immediate use by the agencies during fiscal year 2019, and if so, when?

(2) a. When did OMB first instruct agencies to withhold funding in the accounts referenced in the letter apportionment effective as of 11:59 p.m. Eastern Daylight Time on Saturday, August 3, 2019 (“August 3, 2019 Letter Apportionment”)?

b. When were the first apportionment actions executed to withhold those funds?

c. Were the withheld funds made available for immediate use by the agencies during fiscal year 2019, and if so, when?

No later than Tuesday, October 1, 2019, we also request that OMB produce the following documentation to the committees:

(3) All apportionments or reapportionments for fiscal year 2019 that were executed in the last quarter of fiscal year 2019, including documentation of the approval date of each such apportionment action and any footnotes, for any applicable TAFS used for assistance for Ukraine or the Ukraine Security Assistance Initiative appropriation, including the Department of Defense, Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide account, 97-0100/2019 and account(s) for any applicable amounts provided in other appro-

priation acts for the Foreign Military Financing Program.

(4) All apportionments and reapportionments for fiscal year 2019 that were executed in the last quarter of fiscal year 2019, including documentation of the approval date of each such apportionment action and any footnotes, for each TAFS referenced in the August 3, 2019 Letter Apportionment and any applicable child accounts.

Finally, we request that OMB produce documentation to the committees, no later than Friday, October 11, 2019, on the following:

(5) Documentation sufficient to show the obligational status of the relevant assistance funding to Ukraine by account, including all amounts appropriated in section 9013 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2019 and any applicable amounts provided in other appropriation acts for the Foreign Military Financing Program, as of June 30, 2019 and as of September 30, 2019, including the specific amounts that were (a) unobligated, (b) obligated but not expended, and (c) obligated and expended.

(6) Documentation sufficient to show:

a. when OMB first instructed agencies to withhold assistance for Ukraine, including amounts appropriated in section 9013 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2019 and any applicable amounts provided in other appropriation acts for the Foreign Military Financing Program;

b. the amount of funding that was withheld from obligation, and in which account(s);

c. when the first apportionment action was executed to withhold those funds;

d. the period over which the funds were withheld;

e. whether the funds were, subsequent to those withholdings, made available for immediate use by the agencies during fiscal year 2019, and if so, when;

f. the factual, legal, and policy bases upon which these actions were taken; and

g. whether requests were made by the affected agencies to reapportion the funding at issue, or to alter the conditions of the apportionments in effect, and if so, whether those requests were granted.

(7) Documentation sufficient to show:

a. whether there was an “interagency process” related to the withholding or use of amounts appropriated in section 9013 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2019, and the basis for initiating such interagency process, including its stated purposes and goals;

b. what entities or agencies were involved in such interagency process;

c. when that process began; and

d. the conclusions reached through that process and when they were reached, including the outcomes of any interagency meetings that occurred on July 23, 2019 and July 26, 2019 related to the disposition of the funding.

(8) Documentation sufficient to show the obligational status of all amounts apportioned as unavailable in the August 3, 2019 Letter Apportionment. This documentation should show the status of those funds as of June 30, 2019 and as of September 30, 2019, and should show, at a minimum, the specific amounts by account that were (a) unobligated, (b) obligated but not expended, and (c) obligated and expended.

(9) Documentation sufficient to show:

a. when OMB first instructed agencies to withhold funding in the accounts referenced in the August 3, 2019 Letter Apportionment;

b. how much funding was withheld from obligation in each account, and over what period the amounts were withheld;

c. when the first apportionment actions were executed to withhold those funds;

d. whether the funds were, subsequent to those withholdings, made available for im-

mediate use by the agencies during fiscal year 2019, and if so, when;

e. the factual, legal, and policy bases upon which these actions were taken; and

f. whether requests were made by the affected agencies to reapportion the funding at issue, or to alter the conditions of the apportionments in effect, if any, and whether those requests were granted.

(10) Documentation sufficient to show the timeline and basis for the delegation of apportionment authority to the Associate Director for National Security Programs, any related delegation actions, and any other delegations of the apportionment authority to a political appointee during fiscal year 2019.

(11) All apportionments and reapportionments for fiscal year 2019 that were executed in the first three quarters of fiscal year 2019, including documentation of the approval date of each such apportionment action and any footnotes, for any applicable TAFS used for assistance for Ukraine or the Ukraine Security Assistance Initiative appropriation, including the Department of Defense, Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide account, 97-0100/2019 and account(s) for any applicable amounts provided in appropriation acts for the Foreign Military Financing Program.

(12) All apportionments and reapportionments for fiscal year 2019 that were executed in the first three quarters of fiscal year 2019, including documentation of the approval date of each such apportionment action and any footnotes, for each TAFS referenced in the August 3, 2019 Letter Apportionment and any applicable child accounts.

Thank you for your prompt attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

JOHN A. YARMUTH,
Chairman, House Committee on the Budget.

NITA M. LOWEY,
Chairwoman, House Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. YARMUTH. Madam Speaker, while we received a partial production of documents from OMB, they left out large batches of requested materials.

Meanwhile, the House committees involved in the impeachment inquiry were getting completely stonewalled by the administration. If they did nothing wrong, why wouldn't they turn over documents or allow officials to testify? If the President could clear his name, don't you think he would have done it by now?

Instead, the President and his Chief of Staff, Mick Mulvaney, have gone on national television and confessed to the very thing Congress caught them doing. Mulvaney's response? “Get over it,” and, “We do it all the time.”

In December 2019, the House Budget Committee released a report, which I intend to put in the RECORD, outlining three main takeaways from the documents produced by OMB.

Number one, the timeline of actions taken by OMB, as seen in the provided apportionments, shows suspicious activity and document a pattern of abuse of the apportionment process, OMB's authority, and current law.

Number two, OMB took the seemingly unprecedented step of stripping career officials of their normal role in

the apportionment process and instead vested a political appointee with that authority.

And, three, OMB's actions hindered agencies' ability to prudently obligate funds by the end of the fiscal year, bypassing Congress and creating backdoor rescissions in violation of the ICA.

Weeks after our report was published, the House of Representatives impeached Donald J. Trump for abuse of power and obstruction of justice.

On January 16, 2020, GAO issued a legal opinion, stating that the actions taken by OMB to withhold foreign aid to Ukraine violated the ICA. The non-partisan watchdog even went so far to say: "OMB's assertions have no basis in law."

GAO found the White House's action to withhold security assistance funding constituted an illegal deferral of funding in violation of the ICA. The ICA permits deferrals only for very limited purposes and requires advanced congressional notification. But this was not just a notification violation. GAO determined that this deferral was prohibited under the ICA, period.

As GAO emphasized: "The ICA does not permit deferrals for policy reasons. . . . OMB's justification for the withholding falls squarely within the scope of an impermissible policy deferral."

So even if the President had notified Congress in advance of the deferral, it still would have been illegal.

The White House has taken a disturbing sense of pride in its obstruction of Congress so it is no surprise that they failed to fully cooperate with GAO as well. In its decision, GAO called out the Trump administration, stating: "We consider a reluctance to provide a fulsome response to have constitutional significance."

The House Budget Committee repeatedly warned the Trump administration about the ICA. The Department of Defense warned them. The State Department warned them. Even people in the Executive Office of the President called out this flagrant abuse of Federal law. But the President ignored the warnings.

Instead, he used the powers of his office to subvert our laws, solicit foreign interference to help him cheat in his next election, and then try to cover it all up.

While the House has taken action to show that no one, including the President, is above the law, OMB is still scheming. President Trump's administration continues to abuse its authority and infringe on Congress' power of the purse—for example, holding up disaster relief to Puerto Rico. I would wager it is because the President couldn't handle some criticism from one of their mayors. We shall see.

Last March, my colleagues and I wrote a letter to OMB, which I intend to put in the RECORD, calling out this administration for declaring bogus national emergencies to steal funds Congress appropriated for crucial military construction and counternarcotic ini-

tiatives to use for the President's border wall, another decision motivated by the President's political campaign and not taxpayer interests. There is more, I am sure, that we just don't know about yet, but we will find out.

In the face of this administration's clear and present threat to our democracy, we must defend Congress' constitutional authority, protect our separation of powers, and strengthen the ICA to prevent such unilateral actions.

In March, I will introduce legislation that will protect Congress' power of the purse. It will promote transparency of the executive branch to limit abuse and ensure no President can hide lawbreaking from the American people again. It will add teeth to budget law by creating significant deterrents, including administrative discipline, to create more accountability for executive branch officials so they won't break the law, and it will ensure Congress remains front and center in determining whether emergency declarations made by the President and the related shifts in funding are justified.

Look, this is a lot of information, and I am normally not one to give long statements, but in the face of such horrendous attacks on our democracy, I wanted it all on the RECORD.

I am also submitting every letter I referenced into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as well. As chairman of the House Budget Committee, I felt it was my responsibility.

It is my hope that these facts help expose this administration's systemic lawbreaking because if they get away with this and Congress does not fight back, it will not stop. We all know that.

He could attack specific communities by withholding funds that support their healthcare. He could retaliate against Senators for their votes by freezing Federal investments in their States. He could punish States that he views as unsupportive of his election by withholding the infrastructure funds.

If we don't stop him, President Trump will use our taxpayer dollars to punish political adversaries. That creates a destructive precedent for other Presidents who follow.

I implore our Republican colleagues to join us in this effort to uphold the oath we all swore and to make it unequivocally clear that, in the United States of America, no one is above the law.

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

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

REVIEWING INHERITED IMMIGRATION CRISIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Madam Speaker, it appears we are at least in the final 2 weeks of this impeachment journey, and, therefore, it is time to begin to look at the issues that have been ignored or kept out of the newspaper for the last few months, which I think is quite frankly one of the reasons why we have had this impeachment.

I am going to address what progress has been made on these issues, largely President Trump making the progress himself without any help from Congress, and then address what we should do in the next few months prior to the next election.

I think the biggest crisis for the country that President Trump inherited was the immigration crisis, and President Trump has had several successes here on his own.

□ 1915

He has reduced the number of people placed in the United States from in May, close to 100,000 people by the Border Patrol, certainly, over 90,000 by the Border Patrol and probably another 10 to 12,000 people sneaking in the country without being processed at that time, to a position where, last month, the Border Patrol probably placed under 2,000 people in the United States.

First of all, it is important to review what President Trump has done. He has begun what we would call a migrant protection protocol, in which Mexico is holding asylum seekers on their side of the border. They have agreed to hold anybody who is Spanish-speaking, and recently, in an unpublicized success, has begun a program holding Brazilians who are trying to get in this country as well.

They also have an asylum cooperative agreement in which Guatemala is holding asylum seekers who are coming from other Central American countries without moving into the United States.

I will point out something that should be obvious. If you are looking for asylum, in other words, to get away from danger in your home country, you shouldn't necessarily have to come to the United States. If you are an asylum seeker in Honduras or El Salvador, for example, and you are coming north, and you are in danger in your home country, it would be enough to stop in Guatemala. You do not have to come here.

In addition, we have begun an interior reparation initiative for people from Mexico trying to come here. Normally, in order to try to come here, you have to deal with the Mexican drug cartels. By the United States or Mexico repatriating people in Central Mexico, first of all, they are in many cases, in a more prosperous part of Mexico and, secondly, are not being dealt with by the drug cartels. And finally, you are a little bit further away from the border, which is something we should do in the first place.

The next thing President Trump has done is he has completed 110 miles of

the border wall. We anticipate 630 of the 2,000 miles being done by the end of the year. It is very difficult to get through this wall and, actually, when you talk to the Border Patrol, they don't even like to refer to it as a wall. They like to refer to it as a wall system. But it is going to be over 30 feet high and six to 7 feet underground, making it very difficult to get through.

Recently, the Border Patrol apprehended people who were kind of stuck going up the wall and they got up the wall to the point at which they weren't able to get down.

But in any event, when you combine all these activities of the Trump administration, with very little help from Congress, as well as restricting entry of people who are probably going to become a public charge, we have reduced the number of people being placed in this country from 90,000 to 2,000.

So, what should Congress do?

What President Trump has done so far is successful but precarious. First of all, President Trump is not going to be President forever, and secondly, a lot of what President Trump has done is going to be subject to possible review by a bad judge.

Congress should immediately take up the following few actions, which I think any average American would consider okay, or consider mild.

First of all, we have to change the credible fear standard. Not everybody who comes here saying they are in danger at home is in danger at home. Congress ought to revisit that and pass something in the near future, hopefully soon. With President Trump no longer having to worry about the impeachment, he can use his position to drive that sort of bill through Congress.

Secondly, we still have problems with the Flores settlement and that we are restricting holding families to only 20 days pending adjudication. There is no reason—I have been down at the border to see how well we are treating people who are held down there. There is no reason why we should have to release people after only 20 days if we have a court hearing coming up.

Thirdly, we should change the current law with regard to unaccompanied minors. There are people who claim they don't like to see families separated, but back in May, we had, I think it was 8 or 9,000 minors coming into this country unaccompanied by adults.

Now, under current law in the United States, we can turn these minors back if they came from Canada or Mexico. We can't turn around minors or send them back if they come from other countries.

There are people around here who purport to want to keep families together. If a 15- or 16-year-old child comes here from Guatemala, because children are the future of any country, the Central American or South American families want their children back; and we should go back to the days in which it is legal to send back minors from other countries.

The next thing we should do is, President Trump has had success in the courts with preventing people from coming here who are going to become a public charge. Obviously, as we look to let people in our country—and I am going to digress here for one second.

There are people who say President Trump is anti-immigrant. The number of immigrants, the number of people who were sworn in legally in this country in 2018 was 761,000 people. That was more than any of the final 3 years under President Obama.

I am going to repeat that if anybody back there says President Trump is anti-immigrant. More people were let in in 2018, were legally sworn in as American citizens under President Trump than any one of President Obama's final 3 years.

But it is important, despite President Trump's victory in court, that Congress step up to the plate and make it statutory that, as we pick which new whatever, 750,000 new people get to become American citizens, we are not picking people who are going to become a public charge.

It is already a huge drain on the American people's budget to take care of people who are in desperate straits who were born Americans in the first place. It is just horrific that people want to let people in to become a public charge from other countries, particularly at a time that we are running trillion dollar deficits; not to mention, I think you are going to eventually have a problem with the fiber of America in the future if we let all people in.

The next thing that President Trump has done, I haven't mentioned, is he has, without a lot of fanfare, restricted tourist visas for people who are soon going to have children.

I have been at the border. Until you have been down there you don't realize the degree to which women frequently are coming to this country so that their children become citizens. The United States is one of only, I believe, two out of 40 western countries in the world in which you can become a citizen just by being born here. People are taking advantage of that. Again, it is an example of us not picking the immigrants we allow in here.

It is people being able to, first of all, have their children become citizens, and then because we want family reunification, the women who have the child are soon going to be allowed to be here without being appropriately vetted.

In any event, this is something that Congress ought to take up as soon as this impeachment is over.

Extend the time you can stay under the Flores settlement; adjust the credible standard for people who claim they are in danger back home; change the rules with regard to unaccompanied minors so we can reunite those children with their families. It is ridiculous that that bill is being held up.

Do something about the sanctuary cities which, right now, are a magnet,

and they scream to people in other countries that we are not supposed to take our immigration laws seriously.

Do something about the birthright citizenship in which we are one of the few countries around the world which says that if you come here, you automatically become a citizen.

But what other things should Congress be tackling over the next seven or 8 months before we break for elections?

Given the fact that we are broke; and given our concern that we do want to encourage marriage, where necessary; given that we want to encourage people to work and that we have a shortage of labor in this country, we have to look at our current safety net.

Now, right now, the economy is good, and the number of people on Foodshare—which is a good indication of the number of people who are taking advantage of our safety net—has dropped in the last couple of years due to the booming economy. There were still 34,000 people on Foodshare in 2018, average.

In 2003, another time in which the economy was largely booming, there were 21,000 people. What has happened over the last 16 years that we have had over a 50 percent increase in the people on Foodshare?

The economy is booming. Obviously, what is going on is, Foodshare, together with many other similar programs, have changed the work ethic of Americans. What can we do to address the ease with which people become involved in these programs?

And I am not saying we have to do anything to the people who absolutely need these programs. But I can think of no reason why we would have over a 50 percent increase in a 15-year period if we weren't quietly or slowly changing the work ethic of Americans.

There are three things that Congress should deal with, and that, hopefully, President Trump will champion. First of all, when I talk to people in my district, they are aware that there is a labor shortage, particularly in the factories, and other places as well. And it is frustrating how few people can pass the drug test. If you cannot get a job because you can't pass a drug test, you shouldn't get public benefits. So drug testing should be done.

The next thing that should be done, when I talk to people, particularly people who work in our grocery stores or our convenience stores, they are frustrated that we, right now, have IDs on Foodshare without any photos on them. And again, the people who are working these jobs suspect, highly suspect, that these programs are being taken advantage of. Congress should insist that we have photo IDs on Foodshare.

And, finally, there should be work requirements or an effort that people are trying to find work. This would be a measure of the sincerity of people as to whether it is possible—as to whether or not they are really trying their best to get off of public benefits.

I am going to mention three other quick things that I hope are taken care of, that I don't think any serious American should have a concern with.

I was very frustrated with the recent omnibus bills, recent appropriation bills that dealt with a lot of the parts of the Tax Code. One more time Congress did not have the guts to take up what I consider an exemption for the very wealthy, and that is the carried interest exemption.

I know President Trump has asked Congress to look at this. Right now, highfliers who are venture capitalists, hedge fund managers—hedge fund managers in particular—are getting capital gains treatment on what should be ordinary income. I can think of no reason, other than Congressmen like very wealthy people, why, if you are a hedge fund manager making millions a year, you are paying tax at capital gains rates rather than ordinary income rates.

Congress should have the guts to stand up to some of our wealthiest citizens and tax them at the rates that the average working man pays. I hope Congress will finally take this up and do what I know President Trump wants, and tax the carried interest of the wealthiest hedge fund managers as the average working man in this country.

The next thing I would like to do that should be automatic is, when insulin was invented, the inventor wanted it cheap and available to everybody. Unfortunately, right now, it can be wildly expensive, and it is much more expensive in this country than in other countries.

What we should do is we should treat insulin, not as a drug, but as a biosimilar, and see what we can do about rushing it to market so that the drug companies cannot make excessive amounts of money off of an invention that was designed—the inventor wanted it to be freely available to everybody.

The number of Americans with diabetes is excessively high, and the idea

that, under current law, we allow makers of insulin, which I don't really consider a pharmaceutical, but makers of insulin to charge an excessive amount, when it was invented years ago, is ridiculous. It will take this body standing up to the drug companies, but it is something this Congress does not do enough.

I realize there was a bill passed designed to deal with drug prices in this House. That bill, we all know, was politically unrealistic, and it probably would have resulted in a drastic reduction in innovation on generally new pharmaceuticals.

But a separate bill should be passed on insulin and, hopefully, that is something Congress can do.

The final thing Congress could do to help the average person is, in the future, do something to restrict the amount of student loan debt.

When I talk to people, they feel—and I believe this, because it was true when I went to school—there are people taking out more debt than they absolutely need.

□ 1930

I suppose this is true everywhere in our country; people probably have too much credit card debt, more than they need, and they are not disciplined, but it is particularly true of 18- or 19- or 20-year-olds.

There was a time in this country where, if universities wanted to, they could say: No, you don't need \$7,000 in debt this year; you need \$4,000 in new loans.

They are not able to do that anymore. We ought to give that ability back to universities, and we ought to begin to sanction universities if too many people are leaving that institution and are not able to pay back their loans.

I do blame the universities for part of this, and it is going to take some political will to stand up to these university administrators, but they are the ones who are leading some of these people

down the path with the nice brochure and the nice song and dance about how it is going to be so wonderful if you graduate from this university. Some people, of course, drop out of the university.

But either way, far too many people are not paying off the loans. They are having to spend way too long. They can't buy a house. They aren't forming a family.

Quite frankly, it is a publicized scandal, but it is still underpublicized the degree to which some of the best Americans who are doing what they are told are saddled with vast amounts of debt and not the income to pay it off; or, if they have the income to pay them off, it is taking all their income and they can't buy a house and they can't have kids.

I hope Congress does something serious there other than just say we should put hundreds of billions of dollars into paying off the loans.

In any event, these are things that I think Congress could take up. I think we could salvage this session. I know President Trump did all he could on immigration without the help of Congress.

I feel that the impeachment thing was designed to keep people's eyes off the ball on the issues that we should be addressing. There are some suggestions of what to do. I hope the American people insist they be done. I hope President Trump champions them.

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

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GROTHMAN. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 32 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, January 29, 2020, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

BUDGETARY EFFECTS OF PAYGO LEGISLATION

Pursuant to the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (PAYGO), Mr. YARMUTH hereby submits, prior to the vote on passage, for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that H.R. 4331, the Tibetan Policy and Support Act of 2019, as amended, would have no significant effect on the deficit, and therefore, the budgetary effects of such bill are estimated as zero.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3652. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final interpretive rule — User Fees for Agricultural Quarantine and Inspection Services [Docket No.: APHIS-2013-0021] (RIN: 0579-AD77) received January 17, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3653. A letter from the Senior Counsel, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting the Bureau's policy statement — Statement of Policy Regarding Prohibition of Abusive Acts or Practices received January 27, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3654. A letter from the Senior Legislative Officer, OCIA, Wage and Hour Division, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule — Joint Employer Status Under the Fair Labor Standards Act (RIN: 1235-AA26) received January 23, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

3655. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Kentucky: Cross-State Air Pollution Rule [EPA-R04-OAR-2019-0155; FRL-10004-69-Region 4] received January 27, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3656. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; AL and SC: Infrastructure Requirements for the 2015

8-hour Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standard [EPA-R04-OAR-2019-0014; FRL-10004-68-Region 4] received January 27, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3657. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Massachusetts; Transport State Implementation Plan for the 2015 Ozone Standard [EPA-R01-OAR-2008-0108; FRL-10004-34-Region 1] received January 27, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3658. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Missouri; Restriction of Emissions from Batch-type Charcoal Kilns [EPA-R07-OAR-2019-0662; FRL-10004-63-Region 7] received January 27, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3659. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Delegation of New Source Performance Standards and National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for the States of Arizona and Nevada [EPA-R09-OAR-2019-0632; FRL-10004-33-Region 9] received January 27, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3660. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Oklahoma: Incorporation by Reference of Approved State Hazardous Waste Management Program [EPA-R06-RCRA-2019-0343; FRL-10001-54-Region 6] received January 27, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3661. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants; Petroleum Refinery Sector [EPA-HQ-OAR-2010-0682; FRL-10004-55-OAR] (RIN: 2016-AT18) received January 27, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3662. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to the Petition Provisions of the Title V Permitting Program [EPA-HQ-OAR-2016-0194; FRL-10004-56-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AS61) received January 27, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3663. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final action — Withdrawal of Finding of Substantial Inadequacy of Implementation Plan and of Call for Texas State Implementation Plan Revision — Affirmative Defense Provisions [EPA-R06-OAR-2018-0770; FRL-10004-01-Region 6] received January 27, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3664. A letter from the Deputy Chief, Auctions Division, Office of Economics and Analytics and Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's public notice — Auction of FM

Broadcast Construction Permits Scheduled for April 28, 2020; Notice and Filing Requirements, Minimum Opening Bids, Upfront Payments, and Other Procedures for Auction 106 (AU Docket No.: 19-290) received January 27, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3665. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Supplemental Guidance Regarding the Chromium-Coated Zirconium Alloy Fuel Cladding Accident Tolerant Fuel Concept [ATF-ISG-2020-01] received January 22, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3666. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Policy, NMFS, Office of Protected Resources, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Taking and Importing Marine Mammals; Taking Marine Mammals Incidental to the U.S. Navy Training and Testing Activities in the Atlantic Fleet Training and Testing Study Area [Docket No.: 191211-0106] (RIN: 0648-BI85) received January 27, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3667. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone for Fireworks Display; Spa Creek, Annapolis, MD [Docket Number: USCG-2019-0846] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 22, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3668. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Notice on Relief for Reporting Required Minimum Distributions for IRAs for 2020 [Notice 2020-6] received January 28, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3669. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Student Loan Debt Forgiveness (Rev. Proc. 2020-11) received January 21, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3670. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final regulations and removal of temporary regulations — Transfers of Certain Property by U.S. Persons to Partnerships with Related Foreign Partners [TD 9891] (RIN: 1545-BM95) received January 21, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. LUCAS (for himself, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. BABIN, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio, Mr. WALTZ, Mr. OLSON, Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina, Mr. BALDERSON, Mr. POSEY, and Mr. ROONEY of Florida):

H.R. 5685. A bill to invest in basic scientific research and support technology innovation

for the economic and national security of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, Small Business, Natural Resources, and Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. HARTZLER (for herself and Ms. SCHRIER):

H.R. 5686. A bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to require that only a school food authority that had a negative balance in the nonprofit school food service account on June 30th of the year preceding the previous school year shall be required to establish a price for paid lunches; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. LOWEY:

H.R. 5687. A bill making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations, and in addition to the Committees on the Budget, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. AXNE (for herself and Mr. BALDERSON):

H.R. 5688. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for grants to enable States to carry out activities to reduce administrative costs and burdens in health care; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. BROWNLEY of California:

H.R. 5689. A bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to conduct a national survey of veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CONNOLLY (for himself, Mr. NORTON, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. WEXTON, Ms. MOORE, Mr. POCAN, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. HOYER, and Mr. BEYER):

H.R. 5690. A bill to increase the rates of pay under the statutory pay systems and for prevailing rate employees by 3.5 percent, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Ms. CRAIG (for herself, Mr. GUEST, Mr. STAUBER, and Mr. PHILLIPS):

H.R. 5691. A bill to require the Secretary to conduct a study and issue a report on the affordability of insulin; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GOHMERT:

H.R. 5692. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to issue regulations to modify the gross combination weight rating of a vehicle covered under Group B, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. KIND (for himself and Mrs. WALORSKI):

H.R. 5693. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to expand Medicare Rural Health Clinic Services and Federally Qualified Health Center Services to include physical therapy services; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MCCLINTOCK (for himself, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. STAUBER, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. STEWART, Mr. PERRY,

Ms. CHENEY, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. GOHMERT, and Mr. ARMSTRONG):

H.R. 5694. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to require publication on the internet of the basis for determinations that species are endangered species or threatened species, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. McEACHIN (for himself, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. CARBAJAL, and Mr. BUCHANAN):

H.R. 5695. A bill to require operators of offshore oil and gas facilities to report failures of critical systems to the Secretary of Interior, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. PAPPAS (for himself, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. HUFFMAN):

H.R. 5696. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to carry out an active transportation investment program to make grants to eligible applicants to build safe and connected options for bicycles and walkers within and between communities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. TAKANO:

H.R. 5697. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to furnish emergent mental health care to certain individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TIMMONS:

H.R. 5698. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Treasury to instruct the United States Executive Directors at the international financial institutions on United States policy regarding international financial institution assistance with respect to advanced wireless technologies; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. HOYER:

H. Con. Res. 86. Concurrent resolution providing for a joint session of Congress to receive a message from the President; considered and agreed to. considered and agreed to.

By Mrs. TRAHAN (for herself, Mr.

MCKINLEY, Mr. ROSE of New York, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. BARR, Mr. BRINDISI, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. POCAN, Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. TRONE, Mr. DEFazio, Mrs. AXNE, Mr. WELCH, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. KELLER, Mr. HORSFORD, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. RIGGLEMAN, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. CISNEROS, Mr. GRIFFITH, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. UNDERWOOD, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. FUDGE, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. KATKO, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. COMER, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. TURNER, Mr. BUDD, Ms. FINKENAUER, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. BANKS, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. CLINE, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. BURCHETT, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Ms. SLOTKIN, Mrs. MILLER, Mr. GIANFORTE, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. KEATING, Mr. WITTMAN, Mrs. BUSTOS, and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio):

H. Res. 815. A resolution supporting Minor League Baseball, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Ms. ADAMS (for herself and Mr. BUTTERFIELD):

H. Res. 816. A resolution recognizing the significance of the Greensboro Four sit-in; to

the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK (for himself and Mrs. MURPHY of Florida):

H. Res. 817. A resolution raising awareness and encouraging the prevention of stalking by expressing support for the designation of January 2020 as "National Stalking Awareness Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. LUCAS:

H.R. 5685.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Constitution, Article I, Section 8, Clause 18:

"The Congress shall have Power . . . To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, of in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Mrs. HARTZLER:

H.R. 5686.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I: Section 8: Clause 3 The United States Congress shall have power "To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes."

By Mrs. LOWEY:

H.R. 5687.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The principal constitutional authority for this legislation is clause 7 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution of the United States (the appropriation power), which states:

"No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law . . ."

In addition, clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution (the spending power) provides:

"The Congress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States . . ."

Together, these specific constitutional provisions establish the congressional power of the purse, granting Congress the authority to appropriate funds, to determine their purpose, amount, and period of availability, and to set forth terms and conditions governing their use.

By Mrs. AXNE:

H.R. 5688.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. BROWNLEY of California:

H.R. 5689.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. CONNOLLY:

H.R. 5690.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 18

By Ms. CRAIG:

H.R. 5691.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

i. Article 1 Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GOHMERT:

H.R. 5692.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3—Congress has the authority to regulate interstate commerce

By Mr. KIND:

H.R. 5693.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. McCLINTOCK:

H.R. 5694.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the United States Constitution, "The Property Clause," which confers on Congress the power to make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the property belonging to the United States.

By Mr. McEACHIN:

H.R. 5695.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. PAPPAS:

H.R. 5696.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 7 and Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. TAKANO:

H.R. 5697.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, authorized by Congress' power to "provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States."

By Mr. TIMMONS:

H.R. 5698.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 30: Mr. ARMSTRONG.

H.R. 451: Mr. LAMB.

H.R. 490: Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.

H.R. 587: Ms. CHENEY and Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 839: Mr. CUELLAR.

H.R. 856: Mr. GOODEN.

H.R. 864: Mr. MEEKS.

H.R. 906: Mr. NORMAN, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. HARDER of California, Mrs. LURIA, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. RUPERSBERGER, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. COLE, Mr. RUTHERFORD, and Mr. SPANO.

H.R. 924: Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. SCHRIER, Ms. MOORE, Ms. GABBARD, Ms. TITUS, and Mrs. BUSTOS.

H.R. 929: Mr. PETERS, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. CORREA, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida,

Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. PANETTA, and Mr. KHANNA.

H.R. 991: Mr. ESPAILLAT.
H.R. 1043: Mr. LUJÁN.
H.R. 1049: Ms. DELAURO, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. DEFazio, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, and Ms. SPANBERGER.
H.R. 1135: Mr. BARR.
H.R. 1140: Ms. SLOTKIN.
H.R. 1154: Mrs. FLETCHER.
H.R. 1179: Ms. WEXTON.
H.R. 1236: Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 1244: Mr. QUIGLEY.
H.R. 1266: Mr. VARGAS.
H.R. 1370: Mrs. ROBY.
H.R. 1380: Mr. POSEY.
H.R. 1400: Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 1434: Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. STEIL, and Mr. CLOUD.
H.R. 1494: Ms. UNDERWOOD.
H.R. 1692: Mr. CLEAVER and Ms. PORTER.
H.R. 1749: Mr. CRENSHAW.
H.R. 1784: Mr. NEGUSE.
H.R. 1824: Ms. SLOTKIN.
H.R. 1868: Mr. TRONE.
H.R. 1897: Mr. MORELLE.
H.R. 2117: Mr. GALLAGHER and Mr. REED.
H.R. 2148: Ms. WEXTON.
H.R. 2149: Mrs. WAGNER.
H.R. 2153: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H.R. 2164: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 2199: Ms. BASS and Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H.R. 2201: Mr. DESJARLAIS.
H.R. 2208: Mr. SCHNEIDER.
H.R. 2215: Ms. BASS and Mrs. TORRES of California.
H.R. 2250: Mr. THOMPSON of California and Ms. BASS.
H.R. 2339: Mrs. MCBATH.
H.R. 2344: Ms. CRAIG.
H.R. 2431: Mr. TRONE.
H.R. 2456: Ms. GABBARD, Mr. HECK, and Mr. HARDER of California.
H.R. 2529: Mr. COOPER.
H.R. 2561: Mr. QUIGLEY.
H.R. 2564: Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 2569: Mr. CLEAVER.
H.R. 2571: Mr. RUTHERFORD.
H.R. 2599: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.
H.R. 2606: Mr. KEATING and Ms. DELBENE.
H.R. 2607: Mr. COLE.
H.R. 2633: Ms. GABBARD and Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 2662: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 2694: Ms. SLOTKIN, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma, Mr. PANETTA, and Ms. PORTER.
H.R. 2708: Mr. CLEAVER.
H.R. 2732: Mr. SHERMAN and Mr. PETERSON.
H.R. 2742: Mr. CURTIS.
H.R. 2748: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 2771: Mr. BRINDISI.
H.R. 2777: Mr. DEUTCH.
H.R. 2795: Mr. NEGUSE.
H.R. 2813: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 2818: Ms. MOORE.
H.R. 2850: Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. GABBARD, Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, and Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 2902: Mr. MORELLE.
H.R. 2970: Mr. O'HALLERAN.
H.R. 2986: Mr. COLE and Mr. FORTENBERRY.
H.R. 3062: Mr. WILLIAMS.
H.R. 3138: Mrs. LEE of Nevada.
H.R. 3208: Mr. PAPPAS.
H.R. 3219: Mr. KENNEDY.
H.R. 3250: Mr. PAPPAS.
H.R. 3378: Mr. MOULTON.
H.R. 3399: Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana.
H.R. 3414: Mr. CUELLAR, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, and Mr. VISCLOSKY.
H.R. 3446: Mrs. RODGERS of Washington.
H.R. 3463: Mr. PETERSON.
H.R. 3509: Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 3522: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 3582: Ms. PORTER.
H.R. 3632: Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma.
H.R. 3637: Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 3668: Mrs. TORRES of California.
H.R. 3828: Mr. COLE.
H.R. 3911: Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 3936: Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina.
H.R. 3969: Mr. LAMB.
H.R. 3979: Mr. MCADAMS.
H.R. 4078: Mr. DEUTCH and Ms. BARRAGÁN.
H.R. 4092: Mr. CURTIS and Ms. LEE of California.
H.R. 4097: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana and Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 4118: Mr. QUIGLEY.
H.R. 4141: Mr. BUTTERFIELD.
H.R. 4144: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 4194: Mr. O'HALLERAN.
H.R. 4236: Ms. UNDERWOOD.
H.R. 4308: Mr. KENNEDY.
H.R. 4326: Mr. WALKER, Mr. CRENSHAW, and Mr. TIPTON.
H.R. 4350: Mrs. WALORSKI and Mr. BUCHANAN.
H.R. 4361: Mr. COHEN, Mr. HURD of Texas, and Mr. VEASEY.
H.R. 4388: Ms. UNDERWOOD, Mr. COLE, and Mr. HARDER of California.
H.R. 4393: Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. HARDER of California, and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H.R. 4429: Mr. SOTO.
H.R. 4457: Mr. TRONE.
H.R. 4674: Ms. WEXTON.
H.R. 4691: Mr. KENNEDY.
H.R. 4738: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 4800: Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee and Mr. DUNCAN.
H.R. 4817: Mr. STIVERS.
H.R. 4845: Mr. KATKO.
H.R. 4864: Ms. STEVENS and Mr. BOST.
H.R. 4907: Ms. HOULAHAN and Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.
H.R. 4945: Mr. CROW.
H.R. 4968: Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 5002: Mr. RESCHENTHALER, Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma, Mr. WOMACK, Mrs. RODGERS of Washington, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. OLSON, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. BABIN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. SMUCKER, and Mr. CUELLAR.
H.R. 5041: Mrs. AXNE.
H.R. 5046: Mr. OLSON and Mr. LAHOOD.
H.R. 5051: Mr. GALLAGHER and Mr. YOHO.
H.R. 5085: Mr. WATKINS.
H.R. 5104: Mrs. DINGELL.
H.R. 5105: Mr. LYNCH.
H.R. 5106: Mr. LYNCH.
H.R. 5109: Mr. LYNCH.
H.R. 5110: Mr. LYNCH.
H.R. 5111: Mr. LYNCH.
H.R. 5112: Mr. LYNCH.
H.R. 5125: Mr. GOHMERT.
H.R. 5138: Mrs. HAYES.
H.R. 5153: Mrs. TORRES of California.
H.R. 5170: Ms. PORTER and Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 5173: Mr. BUDD, Mr. HAGEDORN, and Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma.
H.R. 5191: Ms. TITUS and Mr. HASTINGS.
H.R. 5199: Mr. HURD of Texas.
H.R. 5207: Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 5212: Mr. STEUBE.
H.R. 5224: Mr. NORMAN.
H.R. 5231: Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 5233: Mr. BRINDISI.
H.R. 5255: Mr. HARDER of California.
H.R. 5267: Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 5297: Mr. COOPER, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma, and Mr. COMER.
H.R. 5306: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 5309: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. CAS-TOR of Florida, and Ms. WILD.
H.R. 5312: Ms. SLOTKIN.
H.R. 5338: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. DEUTCH, and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 5350: Mr. GALLEG0, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. WELCH, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. RYAN, Ms. WEXTON, and Mr. SERRANO.
H.R. 5383: Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, and Mr. GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 5405: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.
H.R. 5414: Mr. CORREA.
H.R. 5434: Mr. HARDER of California.
H.R. 5469: Ms. PRESSLEY and Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.
H.R. 5516: Mr. GALLAGHER.
H.R. 5543: Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. HECK, and Mr. HARDER of California.
H.R. 5544: Mr. FITZPATRICK and Mr. NEGUSE.
H.R. 5546: Mr. COLE.
H.R. 5549: Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. MCKINLEY, and Mr. VEASEY.
H.R. 5552: Mr. KATKO, Mr. PAPPAS, and Ms. BARRAGÁN.
H.R. 5565: Mr. KILDEE.
H.R. 5570: Mr. BRINDISI and Mr. HARDER of California.
H.R. 5579: Mr. ARMSTRONG.
H.R. 5580: Mr. ARMSTRONG.
H.R. 5585: Mr. ARMSTRONG.
H.R. 5588: Mr. ARMSTRONG.
H.R. 5589: Mr. PAPPAS.
H.R. 5591: Mr. NORMAN and Mr. ARMSTRONG.
H.R. 5592: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H.R. 5596: Mr. GIBBS and Mr. LAMBORN.
H.R. 5598: Ms. SLOTKIN, Mr. CASE, Mr. KIND, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.
H.R. 5601: Mr. ARMSTRONG.
H.R. 5602: Mr. BRINDISI.
H.R. 5630: Mr. SWALWELL of California and Mrs. BUSTOS.
H.R. 5638: Mr. ARMSTRONG.
H.R. 5661: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 5664: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 5684: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.
H.J. Res. 40: Mr. DUNCAN.
H. Con. Res. 26: Mr. PAPPAS.
H. Con. Res. 68: Ms. SLOTKIN.
H. Con. Res. 84: Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas.
H. Res. 230: Mr. DESAULNIER.
H. Res. 255: Mr. MCHENRY and Mr. TIPTON.
H. Res. 310: Mr. STIVERS.
H. Res. 374: Mr. WOODALL, Mr. CLINE, Mr. BURCHETT, and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H. Res. 616: Mr. HARDER of California.
H. Res. 734: Mr. GALLAGHER.
H. Res. 742: Mr. CASE.
H. Res. 752: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.
H. Res. 787: Mr. TRONE, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. POCAN.
H. Res. 792: Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, and Mr. RUTHERFORD.
H. Res. 808: Mr. STANTON.
H. Res. 813: Ms. SLOTKIN, Mr. POCAN, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. ROUDA, and Mr. MAST.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MRS. LOWEY

H.R. 5687, making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes, does not contain any congressional earmark, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM
PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 5598: Mr. STEWART.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

82. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Spencer County, KY Fiscal Court, relative to a Resolution in Support of Industrial Hemp Amending 7 U.S.C. section 5940

Allowing 1% THC Content; which was referred jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and the Judiciary.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 166

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JANUARY 28, 2020

No. 18

Senate

The Senate met at 1:03 p.m. and was called to order by the Chief Justice of the United States.

TRIAL OF DONALD J. TRUMP, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The CHIEF JUSTICE. The Senate will convene as a Court of Impeachment.

The Chaplain will lead us in prayer.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

O God, You are our rock of safety. Protect us in an unsafe world. Guard us from those who smile but plan evil in their hearts. Use our Senators to bring peace and unity to our world. May they permit Godliness to make them bold as lions. Give them a clearer vision of your desires for our Nation. Remind them that they borrow their heartbeats from You each day. Provide them with such humility, hope, and courage that they will do Your will.

Lord, grant that this impeachment trial will make our Nation stronger, wiser, and better.

We pray in Your strong Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Chief Justice led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

THE JOURNAL

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Please be seated. If there is no objection, the Journal of proceedings of the trial is approved to date.

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Sergeant at Arms will make the proclamation.

The Sergeant at Arms, Michael C. Stenger, made proclamation as follows:

Hear ye! Hear ye! Hear ye! All persons are commanded to keep silence, on pain of imprisonment, while the Senate of the United

States is sitting for the trial of the articles of impeachment exhibited by the House of Representatives against Donald John Trump, President of the United States.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. The majority leader is recognized.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chief Justice, we expect several hours of session today, with probably one quick break in the middle.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you. Pursuant to the provisions of S. Res 483, the counsel for the President have 15 hours and 33 minutes remaining to make the presentation of their case, though it will not be possible to use the remainder of that time before the end of the day.

The Senate will now hear you.

Mr. Counsel CIPOLLONE. Mr. Chief Justice, Members of the Senate, just to give you a very quick, brief overview of today, we do not intend to use much of that time today. Our goal is to be finished by dinnertime and well before. We will have three presentations. First will be Pat Philbin, Deputy White House counsel. Then, Jay Sekulow will give a presentation. We will take a break, if that is OK with you, Mr. Leader. And then, after that, I will finish with a presentation. That is our goal for the day. With that, I will turn it over to Pat Philbin.

Mr. Counsel PHILBIN. Mr. Chief Justice, Members of the Senate, Majority Leader McCONNELL, Minority Leader SCHUMER, I would like to start today by making a couple of observations related to the abuse of power charge in the first Article of Impeachment. I wouldn't presume to elaborate on Professor Dershowitz' presentation from yesterday evening, which I thought was complete and compelling, but I wanted to add a couple of very specific points in support of the exposition of the Constitution and the impeachment clause that he set out.

It begins from a focus on the point in the debate about the impeachment

clause at the Constitutional Convention where maladministration was offered by George Mason as a grounds for impeachment, and James Madison responded that that was a bad idea, and he said: "So vague a term will be equivalent to a tenure during the pleasure of the Senate." That evinced the deep-seated concern that Madison had, and it is part of the whole design of our Constitution for ways that can lead to exercises of arbitrary power.

The Constitution was designed to put limits and checks on all forms of government power. Obviously, one of the great mechanisms for that is the separation of powers—the structural separation of powers in our Constitution. But it also comes from defining and limiting powers and responsibilities and a concern that vague terms, vague standards are themselves an opportunity for the expansion of power and the exercise of arbitrary power. We see that throughout the Constitution and in the impeachment clause as well. This is why, as Gouverneur Morris argued in discussing the impeachment clause, that only few offenses—he said few offenses—ought to be impeachable, and the cases ought to be enumerated and defined.

Many terms had been included in earlier drafts, when it was narrowed down to treason and bribery, and there was a suggestion to include maladministration, which had been a ground for impeachment in English practice. The Framers rejected it because it was too vague; it was too expansive. It would allow for arbitrary exercises of power.

We see throughout the Constitution, in terms that relate and fit in with the impeachment clause, the same concern. One is in the definition of "treason." The Framers were very concerned that the English practice of having a vague concept of treason that was malleable and could be changed even after the fact to define new concepts of treason was dangerous. It was one of the things that they wanted to reject from the English system. So

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

they defined in the Constitution very specifically what constituted treason and how it had to be proved, and then that term was incorporated into the impeachment clause.

Similarly, in the rejection of maladministration, which had been an impeachable offense in England, the Framers rejected that because it was vague. A vague standard, something that is too changeable, that can be re-defined, that can be malleable after the fact, allows for the arbitrary exercise of power, and that would be dangerous to give that power to the legislature as a power to impeach the executive.

Similarly—and it relates again to the impeachment clause—one of the greatest dangers from having changeable standards that existed in the English system was bills of attainder. Under a bill of attainder, the Parliament could pass a specific law saying that a specific person had done something unlawful—they were being attainted—even though it wasn't unlawful before that.

The Framers rejected that entire concept. In article I, section 9, they eliminated both bills of attainder and all ex post facto laws for criminal penalties at the Federal level, and they also included a provision to prohibit States from using bills of attainder.

In the English system, there was a relationship, to some extent, between impeachment and bills of attainder because both were tools of the Parliament to get at officials in the government. You could impeach them for an established offense or you could pass a bill of attainder.

It was because the definition of “impeachment” was being narrowed that George Mason at the debates suggested—he pointed out—that in the English system there is a bill of attainder. It has been a great, useful tool for the government, but we are eliminating that, and now we are getting a narrow definition of “impeachment,” and we ought to expand it to include “maladministration.” Madison said no, and the Framers agreed: We have to have enumerated and defined offenses—not a vague concept, not something that can be blurry and interpreted after the fact and that could be used, essentially, to make policy differences or other differences like that the subject of impeachment.

All of the steps that the Framers took in the way they approached the impeachment clause were in terms of narrowing, restricting, constraining, and enumerating offenses and not a vague and malleable approach, as they had been in the English system.

I think the minority views of Republican Members of the House Judiciary Committee at the time of the Nixon impeachment inquiry summed this up and reflected it well because they explained—and I am quoting from the minority views in the report:

The whole tenor of the Framers' discussions, the whole purpose of their many careful departures from English impeachment practice, was in the direction of limits and of

standards. An impeachment power exercised without extrinsic and objective standards would be tantamount to the use of bills of attainder and ex post facto laws, which are expressly forbidden by the Constitution and are contrary to the American spirit of justice.

What we see in the House managers' charges and their definition of abuse of power is exactly antithetical to the Framers' approach because their very premise for their abuse of power charge is that it is entirely based on subjective motive—not objective standards, not predefined offenses, but the President can do something that is perfectly lawful, perfectly within his authority. But if the real reason, as Professor Dershowitz pointed out—that is the language from their report—the reason in the President's mind is something that they ferret out and decide is wrong, that becomes impeachable, and that is not a standard at all. It ends up being infinitely malleable.

It is something that I think—a telling factor that reflects how malleable it is and how dangerous it is in the House Judiciary's report because after they define their concept of abuse of power and they say that it involves your exercising government power for personal interest and not the national interest and it depends on your subjective motives, they realize that is infinitely malleable.

There is not really a clear standard there, and it is violating a fundamental premise of the American system of justice that you have to have notice of what is wrong. You have to have notice of an offense. This is something Professor Dershowitz pointed out last night. There has to be a defined offense in advance. The way they try to resolve this is to say: Well, in addition to our definition, high crimes and misdemeanors involve conduct that is recognizably wrong to a reasonable person. And that is their kind of add-on to deal with the fact that they have an unconstitutionally vague standard.

They don't have a standard that really defines a specific offense. They don't have a standard that really defines, in coherent terms that are going to be identifiable, what the offenses are, so they just add on. It has to be recognizably wrong.

They say they are doing this to resolve a tension, they call it, within the Constitution because they point out—and this is quoting from the report—“The structure of the Constitution, including its prohibition on bills of attainder and the ex post facto clause, implies that peaceable offenses should not come as a surprise.”

That is exactly what Professor Dershowitz pointed out. And everything about the terms of the Constitution, speaking of an offense and a conviction, that crime should be tried by jury except impeachments. They all talk about impeachment in those criminal offense terms.

But the tension here isn't within the Constitution; it is between the House managers' definition, which lacks any

coherent definition of an offense that would catch people by surprise and the Constitution. That is the tension that they are trying to resolve between their malleable standards that actually states no clear offense and the Constitution and the principles of justice embodied in the Constitution that requires some clear offense.

I wanted to point that out in relation to the standards for impeachable offenses because it is another piece of the constitutional puzzle that fits in with the exposition that Professor Dershowitz set out. And it also shows an inherent flaw in the House managers' theory of abuse of power, regardless of whether or not one accepts the view that an impeachable offense has to be a defined crime. There is still the flaw in their definition of abuse of power; that it is so malleable, based on purely subjective standards, that it does not provide any recognizable notice of an offense. It is so malleable that it, in effect, recreates the offense of maladministration that the Framers expressly rejected, as Professor Dershowitz explained.

The second point that I wanted to make is, how do we tell, under the House managers' standard, what the illicit motive is; when is there illicit motive? How are we supposed to get the proof of what is inside the President's head because, of course, motive is inherently difficult to prove when you are talking about, as they conceded they are talking about, perfectly lawful actions, on their face, within the constitutional authority of the President? They want to make it impeachable if it is just the wrong idea inside the President's head. And they explain in the House Judiciary Committee report that the way we will tell if the President had the wrong motive is we will compare what he did to what staffers in the executive branch said he ought to do. They say that the President “disregarded United States foreign policy towards Ukraine” and that he ignored “official” policy that he had been briefed on and that “he ignored, defied, and confounded every . . . agency within the Executive Branch.”

That is not a constitutionally coherent statement. The President cannot defy agencies within the executive branch. Article II, section 1 of the Constitution vests all of the Executive power in a President of the United States. He alone is an entire branch of government. He sets policy for the executive branch. He is given vast power. And, of course, within limits set by laws passed by Congress and within limits set by spending priorities—spending laws passed by Congress—he, within those constraints, sets the policies of the government. And in areas of foreign affairs, military affairs, national security—which is what we are dealing with in this case—in foreign affairs and head of state communications, he has vast powers.

As Professor Dershowitz explained, for over two centuries, the President

has been regarded as the sole organ of the Nation in foreign affairs. So the idea that we are going to find out when the President has a wrong subjective motive by comparing what he did to the recommendations of some inter-agency consensus among staffers is fundamentally anti-constitutional. It inverts the constitutional structure, and it is also fundamentally anti-democratic because our system is rather unique in the amount of power that it gives to the President.

The Executive here has much more power than in a parliamentary system, but part of the reason that the President can have that power is if he is directly democratically accountable to the people. There is an election every 4 years to ensure that the President stays democratically accountable to the people. Those staffers in these supposed inter-agencies who have their meetings and make recommendations to the President are not accountable to the people. There is no democratic legitimacy or accountability to their decisions or recommendations. And that is why the President, as head of the executive branch, has the authority to actually set policies and make determinations, regardless of what his staffers may recommend. They are there to provide information and recommendations, not to set policy.

The idea that we are going to start impeaching Presidents by deciding that they have illicit motives if we can show they disagree with some inter-agency consensus is fundamentally contrary to the Constitution and fundamentally anti-democratic. Those were the two observations I wanted to add to supplement specific points on Professor Dershowitz' comments from last night.

I want to shift gears and respond to a couple of points that the House managers have brought up that are really completely extraneous to this proceeding. They involve matters that are not charged in the Articles of Impeachment. They do not relate directly to the President and his actions, but they are accusations that were brought up somewhat recklessly, in any event, and we can't close without some response to them. The first has to do with the idea that somehow the White House and White House lawyers were involved in some sort of coverup related to the transcript of the July 25 call because it was stored on a highly classified system.

Let me start with that. The House managers made this accusation of something nefarious going on. Let's see what the witnesses actually had to say. LTC Alexander Vindman—remember Lieutenant Colonel Vindman is the person who was listening in on the call and who raised a concern. He was the only person who went and raised a concern with NSC lawyers that he thought there was something improper, something wrong with the call. Even though he later conceded under cross-examination it was really a policy concern, but he thought there was something wrong.

And he had to say: "I do not think there was malicious intent or anything of that nature . . . to cover anything up."

He is the one who went and talked to the lawyers. He is the one whose complaint spurred the idea that, wait, there might be something that is really sensitive here. Let's make sure this is not going to leak. He thought there was nothing covering it up.

His boss, Senior Director Tim Morrison, had similar testimony.

(Text of Videotape presentation:)

Mr. CASTOR. So to your knowledge, there was no malicious intent in moving the transcript to the compartmented server?

Mr. MORRISON. Correct.

Mr. Counsel PHILBIN. The idea that there was some sort of coverup is further destroyed by the simple fact that everyone who as part of their job needed access to that transcript, still had access to it, including Lieutenant Colonel Vindman. The person who raised the complaint still had access to the transcript the entire time.

This is the way Mr. Morrison's testimony explained that.

(Text of Videotape presentation:)

Mr. CASTOR. And even on the code word server, you had access to it?

Lieutenant Colonel VINDMAN. Yes.

Mr. CASTOR. So at no point in time in your official duties were you denied access to this information, is that correct?

Lieutenant Colonel VINDMAN. Correct.

Mr. CASTOR. And to your knowledge, anybody on NSC staff that needed access to their official duties always was able to access it, correct, people that had a need to know and a need to access it?

Mr. MORRISON. Once it was moved to the departmental system? Yes.

Mr. CASTOR. OK.

Mr. Counsel PHILBIN. Now, Mr. Morrison testified that he recommended restricting access to the transcript, not because he was concerned there was anything improper or illegal, but he was concerned about a potential leak and, as he put it, how that "would play out in Washington's polarized environment" and would "affect bipartisan support our Ukrainian partners are currently experiencing in Congress."

He was right to be concerned, potentially, about leaks because the Trump administration has faced national security leaks at an alarming rate. Lieutenant Colonel Vindman, himself, said concerns about leaks seemed justified, and it was not unusual that something would be put in a more restricted circulation.

Now, what else is in the record evidence? Mr. Morrison explained his understanding of how the transcript ended up on that server.

(Text of Videotape presentation:)

Mr. MORRISON. I spoke with the NSC executive secretariat staff, asked them why, and they did their research and they informed me that it had been moved to the higher classification system at the direction of John Eisenberg, whom I then asked why. I mean, if that was the judgment he made, that's not necessarily mine to question, but I didn't understand it. And he essentially told me: I gave no such direction. He did his

own inquiry, and he represented back to me that it was his understanding that it was kind of an administrative error, that when he also gave direction to restrict access, the executive secretariat staff also understood that as an apprehension that there was something in the content of the Memcon that could not exist on the lower classification system.

Mr. CASTOR. To the best of your knowledge, there was no malicious intent in moving the transcript to the compartmented server?

Mr. MORRISON. Correct.

Mr. Counsel PHILBIN. Everyone who knew something about it and who testified agreed there was no malicious intent. The call was still available to everyone who needed it as part of their job, and it certainly wasn't covered up or deep-sixed in some way. The President declassified it and made it public. So why we are even here talking about these accusations about a coverup, when it is a transcript that was preserved and made public, is somewhat absurd.

The other point I would like to turn to—another accusation from the House managers—is that the whistleblower complaint was not forwarded to Congress. They have said that lawyers at the Department of Justice, this time, they accused OLC, the Office of Legal Counsel, of providing a bogus opinion for why the Director of National Intelligence did not have to advance the whistleblower's complaint to Congress.

Manager JEFFRIES said that OLC opined "without any reasonable basis that the Acting DNI did not have to turn over the complaint to Congress."

The way he portrayed this—now, there is a statute that says if the inspector general of the intelligence community finds a matter of urgent concern, it must be forwarded to Congress. And Manager JEFFRIES portrayed this as if the only thing to decide was were these claims urgent. He said: "What can be more urgent than a sitting President trying to cheat in an American election by soliciting foreign interference?"

Except that is not the only question. The statute doesn't just say, if it is urgent, you have to forward it. It talks about "urgent concern" as a defined term. If the House managers want to come and cast accusations that the political and career officials at the Office of Legal Counsel, which we all know is a very respected office of the Department of Justice, provides opinions for the executive branch on what governing law is, they should come backed up with analysis.

So let's look at what the law actually says, and I think we have the slide of that.

"Urgent concern is defined as a serious or flagrant problem, abuse, violation of law relating to the funding, administration, or operation of an intelligence activity within the responsibility and authority of the Director of National Intelligence involving classified information."

So the Office of Legal Counsel was consulted by the General Counsel at

the DNI's office, and they looked at this definition, and they did an analysis. They determined that the alleged misconduct was not an urgent concern within the meaning of the statute because they were not just talking about "Do we think it is urgent?" "Do we think it is important?" No. They were analyzing the law, and they looked at the terms of the statute.

"The alleged misconduct is not an urgent concern within the meaning of the statute because it does not concern the funding, administration, or operation of an intelligence activity under the authority of the DNI."

Remember, what we are talking about here is a head-of-state communication between the President of the United States and another head of state. This isn't some CIA operation overseas. This isn't the NSA's doing something. This isn't any intelligence activity going on within the intelligence community under the supervision of the DNI. It is the head of the executive branch, in the exercising of his constitutional authority, engaging in foreign relations with a foreign head of state.

So, in reaching that conclusion, the Office of Legal Counsel looked at the statute, case law, and the legislative history. It concluded that this phrase "urgent concern" included matters relating to an intelligence activity subject to the DNI's supervision, but it did not include allegations of wrongdoing arising outside of any intelligence activity or outside the intelligence community itself.

That makes sense. This statute was meant to provide for an ability of the inspector general's of the intelligence community, in overseeing the activities of the intelligence community, to receive reports about what was going on at intelligence agencies, those who were members of the intelligence community, and if there were fraud, waste, abuse—something unlawful—in those activities. It was not meant to create an inspector general of the Presidency, an inspector general of the Oval Office, to purport to determine whether the President, in exercising his constitutional authorities, had done something that should be reported.

This law is narrow, and it does not cover every alleged violation of law, the OSC explained, or other abuse that comes to the attention of a member of the intelligence community. Just because you are in the intelligence community and happen to see something else doesn't make this law apply. The law does not make the inspector general for the intelligence community responsible for investigating and reporting on allegations that do not involve intelligence activities or the intelligence community.

Nonetheless, the President, of course, released the July 25 call transcript, and it was also not the end of the matter that the whistleblower complaint and the ICIG's letter were not sent directly to Congress. As the OLC explained, if

the alleged complaint does not involve an urgent concern but if there is anything else there that you want to have checked out, the appropriate action is to refer the matter to the Department of Justice, and that is what the DNI's office did.

They sent the ICIG's letter, with the complaint, to the Department of Justice, and the Department of Justice looked at it. This was all made public some time ago. The Department of Justice examined the exact allegations of the whistleblower's and the exact framing and concern raised by the inspector general, which had to do with the potential of, perhaps, a campaign finance law violation. The DOJ looked at it—looked at the statutes, analyzed it—and determined there was no violation, and it closed the matter. It announced that months ago.

When something gets sent over to the Department of Justice to examine, you can't call that a coverup. Everything here was done correctly. The lawyers analyzed the law. The complaint was sent to the appropriate person for review. It was not within the statute that it required transmission to Congress. Everything was handled entirely properly.

Again, actually extraneous to the matters before you, there is nothing about these two points in the Articles of Impeachment, but it merits a response when reckless allegations are made against those at the White House and at the Department of Justice.

With that, Mr. Chief Justice, I yield my time to Mr. Sekulow.

Mr. Counsel SEKULOW. Thank you, Mr. Chief Justice, Majority Leader MCCONNELL, Democratic Leader SCHUMER, House managers, Members of the Senate.

What we are involved in here, as we conclude, is perhaps the most solemn of duties under our constitutional framework—the trial of the leader of the free world and the duly elected President of the United States. It is not a game of leaks and unsourced manuscripts. That is politics, unfortunately, and Hamilton put impeachment in the hands of this body—the Senate—precisely and specifically to be above that fray. This is the greatest deliberative body on Earth.

In our presentation so far, you have now heard from legal scholars from a variety of schools of thought, from a variety of political backgrounds, but they do have a common theme with a dire warning—danger, danger, danger. To lower the bar of impeachment based on these Articles of Impeachment would impact the functioning of our constitutional Republic and the framework of that Constitution for generations.

I asked you to put yourselves—in quoting Mr. SCHIFF's statement that his father made—in the shoes of someone else, and I said I would like you to put yourselves in the shoes of the President. I think it is important, as we conclude today, that we are reminded of that fact.

The President of the United States, before he was the President, was under an investigation. It was called Crossfire Hurricane. It was an investigation, led by the FBI, the Federal Bureau of Investigation. James Comey eventually told the President a little bit about the investigation and referenced the Steele dossier. James Comey, the then-Director of the FBI, said it was salacious and unverified—so salacious and unverified that they used it as a basis to obtain FISA warrants. Members—managers here, managers at this table right here—said that any discussions on the abuse from the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, utilized to get the FISA warrants from the court, were conspiracy theories.

At the very beginning, I asked you to put yourselves in the shoes of not just this President but of any President who would have been under this type of attack. FISA warrants were issued on people affiliated with his campaign—American citizens affiliated with the people of his campaign, citizens of the United States being surveilled pursuant to an order that has now been acknowledged by the very court that issued the order that it was based on a fraudulent presentation.

In fact, evidence specifically changed—changed by the very FBI lawyer who was in charge of this, changed to such an extent that the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court—as I said earlier, and I will not repeat it again—issued two orders, saying that when this agent—this lawyer—made these misrepresentations to the National Security Division, they also made a misrepresentation to a Federal court—the Federal court—the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court. This is a court where there are no defense witnesses and is a court where there is no cross-examination. It is a court based on trust. That trust was violated.

Then the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, James Comey, decides he will leak a memo of a conversation he had with the President of the United States. He is leaking the memo for a purpose, he said—to obtain the appointment of a special counsel. Lo and behold, a special counsel is appointed. It just so happens that that FBI agent—lawyer—who committed the fraud on the FISA Court, became a lawyer for the Mueller investigation, only to be removed because of political animus and bias found by the inspector general.

Then we have a special counsel investigation. Lisa Page, Agent Strzok—I am not going to go into the details. You know them. They are not in controversy. They are uncontroverted. The facts are clear. But does it bother your sense of justice even a little bit—even a little bit—that Bob Mueller allowed the evidence on the phones of those agents to be wiped clean while there was an investigation going on by the inspector general?

Now, if you did it, or if you did it, Manager SCHIFF, or if you did it, Manager JEFFRIES, or if I did that—destroyed evidence—if anyone in this Chamber did this, we would be in serious trouble. Their serious trouble is their getting fired. Bob Mueller's explanation for it is, I don't know what happened. I don't know what happened. I can't recall conversations.

You can't view this case in a vacuum. You are being asked—and I say this with the utmost respect—to remove a duly elected President of the United States. We have referenced the law school exams, and I love that. I thought there was great analysis yesterday. I appreciate all of that, but I want to focus today on my section, on what you are being asked to do. You are being asked to remove a duly elected President of the United States, and you are being asked to do it in an election year—in an election year.

There are some of you in this Chamber right now who would rather be someplace else, and that is why we will be brief. I understand. You would rather be someplace else? Because you are running for President, for the nomination of your party. I get it, but this is a serious, deliberative situation. You are being asked to remove a duly elected President of the United States. That is what the Articles of Impeachment call for—removal.

So we had a special counsel, and we got the report. Just for a moment, putting yourselves in the shoes of this President—or of any President who would be under this situation—you are No. 4 at the Department of Justice. His wife is working for the firm that is doing the opposition research on him and is communicating with the foreign former spy, Christopher Steele, who put together the dossier. It is being handled by Christopher Steele, through Nellie Ohr, to her husband—then, the fourth ranking member at the Department of Justice, Bruce Ohr. All of this is going on, and he doesn't want to tell everybody—and he has testified to this—what he is doing because he is afraid he might have to stop.

Might have to stop?

How did this happen? This is the Federal Bureau of Investigation. And then we ask why the President is concerned about advice he is being given?

Put yourself in his shoes. Put yourself in his shoes.

We have given you—and our approach has been to give—an overview, and to be very specific, to remove a duly elected President, which is what you are being asked to do, for essentially policy disagreements—you heard a lot about policy, although the one that I still—it still troubles me, this idea that the President—it was said by several of the managers—is only doing these things for himself.

Understanding what is going on in the world today, as we are here—they raised it, by the way. I am not trying to be disrespectful. They raised it: This

President is only doing things for himself while the leaders of opposing parties, by the way, at the highest level, to obtain peace in the Middle East—to say you are only doing that for yourself? I think the irony is that those statements were made while all of that was going on and other acts that this body has passed, some of them bipartisan, to help the American people.

Policy differences—those policy differences cannot be used to destroy the separation of powers. House managers spoke for—I know we have had disagreements on the time. It was 21 hours or 23 hours. They spoke during their time—a lot of time—most of it attacking the President, policy decisions. They didn't like what they heard. They didn't like there was a pause on foreign aid.

I have laid out before that there were pauses on all kinds of foreign aid. He is not the first President to do it.

But the one thing I am still trying to understand from the managers' perspective—and maybe it is not fair to ask the managers because you are not the leader of the House. But remember the whole idea that this was a dire national security threat, a danger to our Nation, and we had to get this over here right away. It had to be done before Christmas. It was so important; it was so significant; the country was in such jeopardy; the jeopardy was so serious that it had to be done immediately.

Let's hold on to the Articles of Impeachment for a month to see if the House could force the Senate to adopt rules that they wanted, which is not the way the Constitution is set up.

But it was such a dire emergency, it was so critical for our Nation's national interests, that we could hold them for 33 days. Danger, danger, danger. That is politics.

As I said, you are being called upon to remove the duly elected President of the United States. That is what these Articles of Impeachment call for.

They never really answered the question of why they thought there was such a national emergency. Maybe they will during questions; I don't know. If there was such a national emergency, they never did explain why it was that they waited. They certainly didn't wait to have the proceedings, as my colleagues have laid out; I mean, those proceedings moved in record time. I suspect that we have been here more than the House actually considered the actual Articles of Impeachment.

Is that the way the Constitution is supposed to work? Is that the design of the Constitution?

And then their question, of course, came up yesterday on the whole situation with Burisma and the Bidens and that whole issue, and my colleague went through that a great deal, and I am not going to do that.

But do we have a—we used to call this, in free speech cases, like a free speech zone. You could have your free

speech activities over here; you can't have them over there. Do you we have like a Biden-free zone? Was that was this was? You mention someone or you are concerned about a company, and it is now off limits? You can impeach the President of the United States for asking a question? I think we significantly showed the question.

I am not going to go through a detail-by-detail analysis of the facts, but there are some that we just have to go through.

You heard a lot of new facts yesterday in our presentation. On Saturday, what we were pointing to was a very quick overview, and then yesterday we spent the day—and we appreciate everybody's patience on that—going through the facts: They showed you this, but they didn't show you that.

The facts are important, though, because facts have legal ramifications; legal ramifications impact the decisions you make. So I don't take facts lightly, and I certainly don't take the constitutional mandate lightly, and we can't.

The facts we demonstrated yesterday and briefly on Saturday demonstrate that there was, in fact, a proper governmental interest in the questions that the President asked and the issues that the President raised on that phone call.

A phone call—now, let's—again, put your feet in the shoes of the President. Put yourself in the President's position. Do you think he thought, when he was on the call, it was him and President Zelensky he was talking to, and that was it? Or as I heard one commentator say it was—people listening in on the call—the President and 3,000 of his closest friends.

Let's be realistic. The President of the United States knew, when he was on that call, there were a lot of people listening from our side and from their side. So he knew what he was saying. He said it. We released a transcript of it.

The facts on the call that have been kind of the focus of all of this really focused on foreign policy initiatives both in Ukraine and around the globe. They talked about other countries. The President has been very concerned about other countries carrying some of the financial load here, not just the United States. That is a legitimate position for a President to take. If you disagree with it, you have the right to do that, but he is the President. As my colleague Deputy White House Counsel Philbin just said, that is the executive branch prerogative. That is their constitutional, appropriate role.

So the call is well documented. There were lots of people on the call. The person that would be on the other end of the quid pro quo, if it existed, would have been President Zelensky. But President Zelensky—and we already laid out the other officials from Ukraine—has repeatedly said there was no pressure. It was a good call. They didn't even know there was a pause in

the aid. All of that is well documented. I am not going to go through each and every one of those facts. We did that over the last several days.

President Zelensky's senior adviser, Andriy Yermak, was asked if he ever felt there was a connection between military aid and the request for investigations, and he was adamant that "We never had that feeling" and "We did not have the feeling that this aid was connected to any one specific issue." This is coming from the people who were receiving the aid.

So we talk about this whole quid pro quo, and that was a big issue. That is how this—actually, before it became an impeachment proceeding, there was—as the proceedings were beginning in the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence under Chairman SCHIFF's role, there were all these discussions: Is it a quid pro quo? Was it extortion? Was it bribery? What was it?

And we are clear in our position that there was no quid pro quo. But then yesterday, my cocounsel, Professor Alan Dershowitz, explained last night that these articles must be rejected—he was talking about from a constitutional framework—even if it was a quid pro quo, which we have clearly established there was not.

And this is what he said, and I am going to quote it verbatim:

The claim that foreign policy decisions can be deemed abuses of power based on subjective opinions about mixed or sole motives that the President was interested only in helping himself demonstrate the dangers of employing the vague, subjective, and politically malleable phrase "abuse of power" as a constitutionally permissible criteria for the removal of a President.

He went on to say:

Now, it follows from this that if a President—any President—were to have done what "The Times" reported about the content of John Bolton's manuscript, that would not constitute an impeachable offense.

I am quoting exactly from Professor Dershowitz. He said:

Let me repeat it. Nothing in the Bolton revelations, even if true—

Even if true.

would rise to the level of abuse of power or an impeachable offense. That is clear from history. That is clear from the language of the Constitution. You cannot turn conduct that is not impeachable into impeachable conduct simply by using words like "quid pro quo" and "personal benefit."

It is inconceivable that the Framers would have intended so politically loaded and promiscuously deployed a term as "abuse of power" to be weaponized—

Again, Professor Dershowitz.

as a tool of impeachment. It is precisely the kind of vague, open-ended, and subjective term Framers feared and rejected.

Now, to be specific: You cannot impeach a President on an unourced allegation. But what Professor Dershowitz was saying is that even if everything in there is true, it constitutionally doesn't rise to that level.

But I want to be clear on this because there is a lot of speculation out there with regard to what John Bolton

has said, which referenced a number of individuals. We will start with the President. Here is what the President said in response to that New York Times piece:

I NEVER told John Bolton that the aid to Ukraine was tied to investigations into Democrats, including the Bidens. In fact, he never complained about this at the time of his very public termination. If John Bolton said this, it was only to sell a book.

The Department of Justice.

While the Department of Justice has not reviewed Mr. Bolton's manuscript, the New York Times' account of his conversation grossly mischaracterizes what Attorney General Barr and Bolton discussed.

There was no discussion of "personal favors" or "undue influence" on investigations, nor did Attorney General Barr state that the President's conversations with foreign leaders were improper.

The Vice President's chief of staff issued a statement:

In every conversation with the President and the Vice President, in preparation for our trip to Poland—

Remember, that was the trip that was being planned for the meeting with President Zelensky.

the President consistently expressed his frustration that the United States was bearing the lion's share of responsibility for aid to Ukraine and that European nations weren't doing their part.

The President also expressed concerns about corruption in Ukraine, and at no time did I hear him tie Ukraine aid to investigations into the Biden family or Burisma.

That was the response responding to an unpublished manuscript that maybe some reporters have an idea of maybe what it says. I mean, that is what the evidence—if you want to call that evidence. I don't know what you call that. I would call it inadmissible, but that is what it is.

To argue that the President is not acting in our national interest and is violating his oath of office, which the managers have put forward, is wrong based on the facts and the way the Constitution is designed.

When you look at the fullness of the record of their witnesses—their witnesses—the witnesses' statements, the transcripts—there is one thing that emerged: There is no violation of law. There is no violation of the Constitution. There is a disagreement on policy decisions.

Most of those who spoke at your hearings did not like the President's policy. That is why we have elections. That is where policy differentials and differences are discussed. But to have a removal of a duly elected President based on policy differences is not what the Framers intended.

If you lower the bar that way, danger, danger, danger, because the next President or the one after that—he or she would be held to that same standard. I hope not. I pray that is not what happens, not just for the sake of my client but for the Constitution. Professor Dershowitz gave a list of Presidents, from Washington to where we are today, who, under the standard

that they are proposing, could be subject to abuse of power or obstruction of Congress.

We know that this is not about a President pausing aid to Ukraine. It is really not about the law. It is about a lot of attempts on policy disagreements that are not being debated here. My goodness, how much time—how much time has been spent in the House of Representatives hoping? They were hoping that the Mueller probe would result in—I mean, I am not going to play all the—I was thinking about it, playing all the clips from all the commentators the day after Bob Mueller testified. Bob Mueller was unable to answer, under his examination, basic and fundamental questions. He had to correct himself, actually. He had to correct himself before the Senate for something that he said before the House. So that is what the President has been living with.

And we are today arguing about what? A phone call to Ukraine or Ukraine aid being held or a question about corruption or a question about corruption that happened to involve a high-profile public figure? Is that what this is? Is that where we are?

Then what do we find out? The aid was released. It was released in an orderly fashion. The reform President, President Zelensky, wins, but there was a question on whether his party would take the Parliament. It did. They worked late into the evening with the desire to put forward reforms. So everybody was waiting, including—and you heard the testimony from, I will say, their witnesses—you heard the testimony—everybody was concerned about Ukraine. Everybody was concerned about whether these reforms could actually take place. Everybody was concerned about it. So you hold back.

It didn't affect anything that was going on in the field. We heard Mr. Crow worrying about the soldiers. I understand that, I appreciate that, but none of that aid was affecting what was going on in the battlefield right then or for the next 4 months because it was future aid. Are we having an impeachment proceeding because aid came out 3 weeks before the end of the fiscal year, for a 6-minute phone call? You boil it down, that is what this is.

It is interesting to me that everybody said: Well, the aid was finally released September 11 only because of the committee and the whistleblower we have never seen. Mr. Philbin dealt with that in great detail. I am not going to go over that again. But, you know, the new high court, the anti-corruption court, wasn't established and did not sit until September 5, 2019. So while the President of Ukraine was trying to get reforms put in place, the court that was going to decide corruption issues was not set until September 5.

I want you to think about this for a moment too. They needed a high court of corruption for corruption. Think

about that for a moment. Now, it is good that they recognized it, but remember when I said the other day that you don't wave a magic wand and now Ukraine doesn't have a corruption problem? The high court of corruption, which they have to have because it is not just past corruption—they are concerned about ongoing corruption issues.

You could put all of your witnesses back under oath in the next hearings you will have when this is all over, and you are going to be back in the House and you are going to be doing this again, putting them all back under oath, and ask them, Mr. SCHIFF, is there a problem with corruption in Ukraine? If they get up there and say: No. Everything is great now, hallelujah—but I suspect they are going to say: We are working really hard on it. But this idea that it has just vanished and now we are back into “everything is fine” is absurd.

Mr. Morrison testified that while the developments were taking place, the Vice President also met with President Zelensky in Warsaw. That was the meeting of September 1—the one, by the way, where the Vice President's Office said in response to this New York Times article that nobody told him about aid being held or linked to investigations.

Are you going to stop—are you going to allow proceedings on impeachment to go from a New York Times report about someone that says what they hear is in a manuscript? Is that where we are? I don't think so. I hope not.

What did Morrison say? You heard firsthand that the new Ukraine administration was taking concrete steps to address corruption. That is good. He advised the President that the relationship with Zelensky is one that could be trusted. Good.

President Zelensky also agreed with Vice President PENCE—this is interesting—that the Europeans should be doing more and related to Vice President PENCE conversations he had been having with European leaders about getting them to do more.

In sum, the President raised two issues he was concerned with to get them addressed.

Now I have already gone over—again, this is just the closing moments here of our portion of this proceeding. Aid was withheld or paused, put on a pause button not just for Ukraine but for Afghanistan, South Korea, El Salvador, Guatemala, Lebanon, and Pakistan. I am sure I am leaving countries out. But do you think the American people are concerned if the President says: You know, before we give a country, I don't know, \$550 million—some countries, only \$400 million—we would like to know what they are doing with it. You are supposed to be the guardians of the trust here. It is the taxpayers' money we are spending.

There was a lot of testimony from Dr. Fiona Hill, John Bolton's deputy. Here is what she said about aid that

was being held. This was her testimony: There was a freeze put on all kinds of aid and assistance because it was in the process at the time of an awful lot of reviews of foreign assistance.

Oh, you mean there was a policy within the administration to review foreign assistance and how we are doing it because we spend a lot of money?

By the way, I am not complaining about the money. I don't think anybody doesn't want to help. But we do need to know what is going on, and those are valid and important questions.

Manager CROW told you that the President's Ukraine policy was not strong against Russia, but Ambassador Yovanovitch stated the exact opposite. She said in her deposition that our country's Ukraine policy under President Trump actually—her words—“got stronger” than it was under President Obama.

So, again, policy disagreements. Disagreements on approach. Have elections. That is what we do in our Republic.

For 3 long days, House managers presented their case by selectively showing parts of testimony. Good lawyers show parts of testimony. You don't have to show the whole thing. But other good lawyers show the rest of the testimony. And that is what we sought to do to give you a fuller view of what we saw as the glaring omissions by my colleagues, the House managers.

The legal issues here are the constitutional ones, and I have been I think pretty clear over the last week, starting when we had the motions arguments, in my concern about the constitutional obligations that we are operating under. I have been critical of Manager NADLER's “executive privilege and other nonsense.”

I want you to look at it this way. Take out executive privilege; First Amendment free speech and other nonsense; the free exercise of religion and other nonsense; the right to due process and other nonsense; the right of equal protection under the law and other nonsense. You can't start doing that. You would not do that. No administration has done that, in fact, since the first administration, George Washington. They wanted information. He thought it was privileged. He said it was executive privilege.

Let's not start calling constitutional rights “other nonsense” and lumping them together. This is from the House of Representatives that actually believes the attorney/client privilege doesn't apply, which should scare every lawyer in Washington, DC, but more scary for their clients. They say that in writing, in letters. They don't hide it.

I would ask them—I am not going to; it is not my privilege to do that—do you really believe that? Do you really believe that the attorney/client privilege does not apply in a congressional

hearing? Do you really believe that? Because if that is what is believed or implied, then there is no attorney/client privilege—or is that the attorney/client privilege and other nonsense? Danger, danger, danger.

We believe that article I fails constitutionally. The President has constitutional authority to engage in and conduct foreign policy and foreign affairs. It is our position legally—the President at all times acted with perfect legal authority, inquired of matters in our national interest, and, having received assurances of those matters, continued his policy that his administration put forward of what really is unprecedented support for Ukraine, including the delivery of a military aid package that was denied to the Ukrainians by the prior administration.

Some of the managers right here, my colleagues at the other table, voted in favor of those—wanted Javelin anti-tank missiles for Ukraine. Some of the Members here did not, didn't want to do that, voted against that. I am glad we gave it to them. I am glad we allowed them to purchase Javelins.

I never served in the military. I have tremendous, tremendous respect for the men and women who protect our freedom. I have tremendous respect for what they are doing and continue to do.

This President actually allowed the Javelins to go. Some of you liked that idea; some of you did not. Policy difference. Were you going to impeach President Obama because he did not give them lethal aid? No. Nor should you. You should not do that. It is a policy difference. Policy differences do not rise to the level of constitutionally mandated or constitutional applications for removal from office. It is policy differences.

By the way, it is not just on lethal weapons; President Obama, as I said, withheld aid. He had the right to do that. You have allowed him to do that.

Oh, but we don't like that this President did it, so the rules change. So this President's rules are different than—he has a different set of standards he has to apply than what you allowed the previous administrations to apply. And you know what—or the future administrations to apply. That is the problem with these articles.

We have laid out, I believe, a compelling case on what the Constitution requires. When they were in the House of Representatives putting this together, did they go through a constitutionally mandated accommodation process to see if there was a way to come up with something? No, they did not. Did they run to court? No. And the one time it was about to happen, they ran the other way.

Separation of powers means something. It is not separation of powers and other nonsense. If we have reached now, at this very moment in the history of our Republic, a bar of impeachment because you don't like the President's policies or you don't like the

way he undertook those policies—because we heard a lot about policy. If partisan impeachment is now the rule of the day, which these Members and Members of this Senate said should never be the rule of the day—my goodness, they said it—some of them—5 months ago, but then we had the national emergency, a phone call. It is an emergency, except we will just wait.

But if partisan impeachment based on policy disagreements, which is what this is, and personal presumptions or newspaper reports and allegations in an unsourced—maybe this is in somebody's book who is no longer at the White House—if that becomes the new norm, future Presidents, Democrats and Republicans, will be paralyzed the moment they are elected, before they can even take the oath of office. The bar for impeachment cannot be set this low.

Majority Leader MCCONNELL, Democratic Leader SCHUMER, House managers, Members of the Senate—danger, danger, danger. These articles must be rejected. The Constitution requires it. Justice demands it.

We would ask the majority leader for a short recess, if we can, about 15 minutes.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. The majority leader is recognized.

RECESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. Chief Justice, we will be in recess for 15 minutes.

There being no objection, at 2:18 p.m., the Senate, sitting as a Court of Impeachment, recessed until 2:44 p.m.; whereupon the Senate reassembled when called to order by the CHIEF JUSTICE.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. The Senate will come to order. Please be seated.

Mr. Cipollone.

Mr. Counsel CIPOLLONE. I thank Mr. Chief Justice and Members of the Senate.

Well, I had kind of a lengthy presentation prepared, but I think you have heard a lot from our side, and I think we have made our case.

I just want to leave you with a couple of points. First of all, I thank the majority leader and thank Democratic Leader SCHUMER and all of you for the privilege of speaking on the floor of the Senate and for your time and attention. We really appreciate it.

We made three basic points. One, all you need in this case is the Constitution and your common sense. If you just look at the Articles of Impeachment, the Articles of Impeachment fall far short of any constitutional standard, and they are dangerous. If you look to the words from the past that I think are instructive, as I said last night, they are instructive because they were right then and they are right now, and I will leave you with some of those words.

(Text of Videotape presentation:)

Mr. NADLER. There must never be a narrowly voted impeachment or an impeachment supported by one of our major political parties and opposed by the other. Such an

impeachment will lack legitimacy, will produce divisiveness and bitterness in our politics for years to come, and will call into question the very legitimacy of our political institutions.

Ms. LOFGREN. This is unfair to the American people. By these actions you would undo the free election that expressed the will of the American people in 1996. In so doing, you will damage the faith the American people have in this institution and in the American democracy. You will set the dangerous precedent that the certainty of Presidential terms, which has so benefited our wonderful America, will be replaced by the partisan use of impeachment. Future Presidents will face election, then litigation, then impeachment. The power of the President will diminish in the face of the Congress, a phenomena much feared by the Founding Fathers.

Mr. MARKEY. This is a constitutional amendment that we are debating, not an impeachment resolution. The Republicans are crossing out the impeachment standard of high crimes and misdemeanors, and they are inserting the words "any crime or misdemeanor." We are permitting a constitutional coup d'etat which will haunt this body and our country forever.

Mr. MENENDEZ. I warn my colleagues that you will reap the bitter harvest of the unfair partisan seeds you sow today. The constitutional provision for impeachment is a way to protect our government and our citizens, not another weapon in the political arsenal.

Mr. SCHUMER. I suspect history will show that we have lowered the bar on impeachment so much we have broken the seal on this extreme penalty so cavalierly that it will be used as a routine tool to fight political battles. My fear is that when a Republican wins the White House Democrats will demand payback.

Mr. Counsel CIPOLLONE. You were right, but I am sorry to say you were also prophetic, and I think I couldn't say it better myself, so I will not. You know what the right answer is in your heart. You know what the right answer is for our country. You know what the right answer is for the American people.

What they are asking you to do is to throw out a successful President on the eve of an election with no basis and in violation of the Constitution. It would dangerously change our country and weaken—weakens—forever all of our democratic institutions. You all know that is not in the interest of the American people. Why not trust the American people with this decision? Why tear up their ballots? Why tear up every ballot across this country? You can't do that. You know you can't do that.

So I ask you to defend our Constitution, to defend fundamental fairness, to defend basic due process rights, but most importantly—most importantly—to respect and defend the sacred right of every American to vote and to choose their President. The election is only months away. The American people are entitled to choose their President.

Overtaking the last election and massively interfering with the upcoming one would cause serious and lasting damage to the people of the United States and to our great country. The Senate cannot allow this to happen. It

is time for this to end, here and now. So we urge the Senate to reject these Articles of Impeachment for all of the reasons we have given you. You know them all. I don't need to repeat them.

They have repeatedly said, over and over again, a quote from Benjamin Franklin: "It is a republic, if you can keep it." And every time I heard it, I said to myself: It is a republic, if they let us keep it.

I have every confidence—every confidence—in your wisdom. You will do the only thing you can do, what you must do, what the Constitution compels you to do: Reject these Articles of Impeachment for our country and for the American people.

It will show that you put the Constitution above partisanship. It will show that we can come together on both sides of the aisle and end the era of impeachment for good. You know it should end. You know it should end. It will allow you all to spend all of your energy and all of your enormous talent and all of your resources on doing what the American people sent you here to do: to work together, to work with the President, to solve their problems.

So this should end now, as quickly as possible. Thank you again for your attention. I look forward to answering your questions.

With that, that ends our presentation. Thank you very much.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. The majority leader is recognized.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. Chief Justice, I have reached an agreement with the Democratic leader on how to proceed during the question period. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the question period for Senators start when the Senate reconvenes on Wednesday; further, that the questions alternate between the majority and minority sides for up to 8 hours during that session of the Senate; and finally, that on Thursday, the Senate resume time for Senators' questions, alternating between sides for up to 8 hours during that session of the Senate.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. Chief Justice, we will complete the question period over the next 2 days. I remind Senators that their questions must be in writing and will be submitted to the Chief Justice. During the question period of the Clinton trial, Senators were thoughtful and brief with their questions, and the managers and counsel were succinct in their answers. I hope we can follow both of these examples during this time.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. During the impeachment trial of President Clinton, Chief Justice Rehnquist advised "counsel on both sides that the Chair will operate on a rebuttable presumption that each question can be fully and fairly answered in 5 minutes or less." The transcript indicates that the statement was met with "laughter."

Nonetheless, managers and counsel generally limited their responses accordingly. I think the late Chief's time limit was a good one and would ask both sides to abide by it.

MORNING BUSINESS

NATIONAL SLAVERY AND HUMAN TRAFFICKING PREVENTION MONTH

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, today, I join my colleagues on an important resolution condemning human trafficking both at home and around the world.

Congress made human trafficking a federal crime 20 years ago with passage of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act. Since then, I have worked with my colleagues on several pieces of legislation to strengthen existing protections and continue putting victims first.

President Trump has also made addressing human trafficking one of his top priorities. He signed my bill, the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2017 into law, as well as other measures that I cosponsored, such as the Stop Enabling Sex Traffickers Act, the Abolish Human Trafficking Act and the Frederick Douglass Trafficking Victims Prevention and Reauthorization Act. He also proclaimed January as National Slavery and Human Trafficking Prevention Month.

IOWA CAUCUSES

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, this coming Monday, the first in the Nation Iowa caucuses kick off the Presidential nomination process. The Presidential preference part of the caucus is just one part, however. In truth, the Iowa caucuses are an example of grassroots democracy. Iowa voters for each political party gather in each of the 1681 precincts across my State. At these neighborhood meetings, voters discuss issues of local and national importance and elect party officers and convention delegates. The platform planks approved and the officers and delegates elected often have a longer lasting impact on the political parties than the Presidential preference votes.

Mr. President, in a week, all political focus will be set on my home State of Iowa for the first in the Nation precinct caucuses. Many pundits ask why Iowa should be awarded this much impact in the Presidential nomination process? Iowans take this job seriously. They study the candidates' backgrounds and positions on issues and they thoughtfully listen to the debates. In Iowa, Presidential candidates must explain and discuss their positions and answer tough questions directly to citizens instead of relying on advertising. Candidates who have done this successfully will be rewarded with momentum and excitement that could launch the rest of their candidacy.

SUPPORT FOR AMERICAN VICTIMS OF TERRORISM

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, this past December, H.R. 1865, the Further Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2020, was enacted into law as Public Law 116-94. I want to take a moment to offer some clarity regarding section 903 of division J of the Act, which is a modified version of the Promoting Security and Justice for Victims of Terrorism Act of 2019.

I commend the Republican and Democratic Senators who have dedicated their time to pursuing justice for American victims of terrorism. We all want these victims to have their day in court and to be appropriately compensated. It is also important that we do so in a manner that does not do more harm than good. That is the balance that was sought in section 903 on a bipartisan basis.

One component of section 903 is a provision that enables the Palestinian Authority and the Palestinian Liberation Organization, PA and PLO, to conduct certain activities in the United States "exclusively for the purpose of conducting official business" and activities "ancillary" to those listed in the provision without consenting to personal jurisdiction in civil cases. The provision was included because Senators of both parties understand that it is in our national interest to permit certain activities related to the official representation of the PA and PLO. Having been part of the negotiation that resulted in this language, I believe it is important that we have a clear understanding of the types of activities that are considered "ancillary" to the conduct of official business.

While the official business of any foreign mission necessarily includes meetings with Members of Congress and their staff, representatives of the executive branch, and other public officials, ancillary activities are those which may not be essential for the minimal functioning of the mission but which support the mission's primary operations. By way of example, I am confident that every Member of this body would, as I do, consider a public statement, the issuance of a press release, or a meeting or public appearance—while not essential—to be ancillary to his or her primary functions as a U.S. Senator and would reject any attempt to define such activities otherwise.

That is also why, with regard to the PA and PLO, while we may or may not agree with the statements of its representatives, the law contemplates that its representatives may meet with advocates regarding relevant issues, make public statements, and otherwise engage in public advocacy and civil society activities that are ancillary to the conduct of official business without consenting to personal jurisdiction. Such jurisdiction is provided for elsewhere in section 903.

The message in this bill is clear: Congress is committed to pursuing justice for American victims of terrorism

while ensuring appropriate standards regarding the ability of foreign missions to conduct official business in the United States. This is a solution that protects U.S. national interests, and I thank the Senators on both sides of the aisle who have worked together to find a way forward on this measure.

THE PHILIPPINES

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President I want to take a few moments to discuss an issue that has garnered some attention in recent months, which is our relations with the Government of the Philippines, including President Duterte's counter-drug strategy and his government's treatment of those who have openly criticized that strategy.

It is important to first recount the long history of friendship and strategic cooperation between the United States and the Philippines. Family and cultural ties that extend back many generations bind us together, as do our shared goals in East Asia and the Pacific. Our Armed Forces regularly engage in joint exercises to enhance regional security. Despite our differences, relations between our two countries are strong and based on mutual respect.

We should also extend our deepest sympathies to those harmed by the recent eruption of the Taal volcano in Luzon. It has displaced tens of thousands of families and destroyed the livelihoods of many. The U.S. Agency for International Development and international organizations that receive U.S. funding like the World Food Programme are responding with humanitarian aid to those in need, which I and others in Congress strongly support.

One of the manifestations of our longstanding, close relations with the Philippines is the assistance we provide annually to promote a wide range of interests there, from humanitarian and economic assistance to military assistance, which in fiscal year 2019 totaled more than \$150 million. However, as is the case for other recipients of U.S. assistance, those funds are not an entitlement and they are not a blank check. For example, in the Philippines they may not be used to support police counter-drug operations. We condemn the thousands of extrajudicial executions of suspected drug users and drug-traffickers by police and their collaborators. Such a strategy is not consistent with due process and the rule of law, nor an effective way to combat the trafficking and abuse of illegal drugs that every country, including the United States, is struggling with. We do support treatment programs for Filipinos suffering from drug addiction.

We also stand strongly in support of freedom of expression, whether in the Philippines or anywhere else, including in our own country, and that, as well as President Duterte's counter-drug strategy, is what underlies our current

disagreement with his government that is illustrated, most recently, by the passage without opposition of S. Res. 142, which condemns the imprisonment of Senator Leila De Lima and calls for her immediate release. It also calls on the Government of the Philippines to guarantee freedom of the press and to drop charges against Maria Ressa and the online news network Rappler.

As said by Senator DURBIN who, like I, cosponsored that resolution, “[i]n the end, [De Lima’s] freedom and the end of government harassment against journalists like Maria Ressa will be important tests of whether cherished democratic norms we share with our long-standing Filipino allies will be respected by President Duterte.”

The response of the Duterte government was regrettable, albeit not uncharacteristic. Like Senator DURBIN, I have become accustomed to being on the receiving end of baseless personal attacks by President Duterte’s spokesman, as if those attacks might intimidate us or boost domestic support for his government. Rather than respond substantively to legitimate concerns about extrajudicial killings, impunity, and freedom of expression that I, Senator DURBIN, Senator MARKEY, our Democratic and Republican colleagues, the U.S. State Department, the United Nations, and respected human rights organizations have raised over the years, we are told that S. Res. 142 is based on “bogus narratives . . . promoted by Duterte’s usual antagonists.” We are accused of being “prejudiced” and “misguided,” our support for Senator De Lima “a direct and shameless affront to the Republic of the Philippines, which has long ceased to be a colony of the United States.” Our actions are called “brazen and intrusive to the dignity of an independent, democratic and sovereign state” which would “not be bullied by any foreign country or by its officials, especially by misinformed and gullible politicians who grandstand at our expense.” Going a step further, the Duterte government inexplicably threatened to deny visas to Americans who seek to visit the Philippines and who have nothing to do with these concerns.

Such vitriolic hyperbole is barely deserving of a response, but suffice it to say that none of us remotely regards the Philippines as a colony of the United States, nor are our concerns about the treatment of Senator De Lima and Maria Ressa an intrusion of the Philippines’ sovereignty, which we respect. S. Res. 142 is based on consistent reporting by the Trump administration’s State Department, the United Nations, and other credible observers, including in the Philippines, who share the conviction that defending freedom of expression has nothing to do with sovereignty. To the contrary, it is everyone’s responsibility, wherever it is denied. If there is any “intrusion of dignity” or “shameless affront” in this instance, it is the harassment, threats, false charges, and

imprisonment of those who have dared to criticize the Duterte government’s lawless counter-drug strategy.

None of us here, nor in the Philippines, has an interest in prolonging this dispute. To the contrary, we want to enhance our cooperation in a multitude of areas of common interest—from maritime security to human trafficking to climate change. What 100 U.S. Senators—Republicans and Democrats—have urged is succinctly spelled out in the resolution. Rather than deny visas to Americans, many of whom have family in the Philippines, and rather than resort to ad hominem attacks, there is, as Senator DURBIN has said, “an easy and honorable way forward.” As I have said for months, we are not aware of any credible evidence that Senator De Lima, who has been detained for nearly 3 years, is guilty of the crimes she has been accused of. If such evidence exists, it should be promptly produced in a public trial, and she should be provided the opportunity to refute it. Otherwise she should be released. As a former prosecutor, I know that is the minimum to which anyone accused of a crime is entitled.

And respected, courageous investigative journalists like Maria Ressa should be able to publish without fear of retaliation. There is no surer way to destroy the underpinnings of democracy than by using threats and unlawful arrest to silence the press.

IMPRISONMENT OF LOUJAIN AL-HATHLOUL

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I have spoken repeatedly about the unlawful imprisonment and abuse of human rights activists by the Saudi Government, which continue despite promises of reform by Crown Prince Mohammed bin Salman. In fact, the murder of Jamal Khashoggi, the botched coverup and sham investigation, and the ongoing, systematic repression of Saudi activists have only served to confirm what we already knew, which is that the Crown Prince is no reformer but, instead, a ruthless autocrat intimidated by non-violent dissent from his own people.

One such activist being unlawfully detained by the Saudi royal family—which for all intents and purposes is the government—is Loujain al-Hathloul, a prominent and outspoken women’s rights defender known for her activism against the women’s driving ban and the male guardianship system. In 2014, Ms. al-Hathloul, who had a driver’s license from the United Arab Emirates, UAE, was detained for 73 days after attempting to drive into Saudi Arabia from the UAE.

She was arrested again in May 2018 along with several other women’s rights activists, weeks before the Saudi Government lifted the ban on female drivers. She was detained and forcibly deported via private Saudi jet from the UAE and remains in a Saudi prison

today. According to Ms. al-Hathloul’s family and several human rights organizations, she has been tortured, sexually harassed, and threatened with rape and murder by Saudi officials.

For the first 10 months of her detention, Ms. al-Hathloul was held without charges or trial and for the first 3 months, without access to her family or lawyer. In her first trial session on March 13, 2019, she was charged with promoting women’s rights; calling for an end to the male guardianship system; and contacting international organizations, foreign media, and other activists. It is hard to believe that in the year 2020, advocacy that has been protected under international law for nearly half a century is grounds for imprisonment and prosecution in Saudi Arabia, a country whose leaders enjoy the best of what oil revenues can buy while subjecting their critics to treatment reminiscent of the 1800s.

Imprisoned, tortured, and charged with multiple “crimes,” Ms. al-Hathloul’s last court appearance was on April 3, 2019, more than 250 days ago. She remains in prison without any information regarding when her next court session will take place. The right of due process simply does not exist in Saudi Arabia.

This is typical of how Saudi Arabia treats those who dare to exercise their rights to free expression, association, and assembly. We should all be outraged, and in fact Republicans and Democrats in Congress as well as dozens of foreign governments have called for Ms. al-Hathloul’s release and the release of others facing politically motivated charges in Saudi Arabia. Until there are consequences for these violations of human rights and misuse of the judicial process, nothing will change.

Fortunately, our hands are not tied. The United States can do more than simply call for Ms. al-Hathloul’s release. Section 7031(c) of division G of the Further Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2020, which applies to all foreign countries, states that “[o]fficials of foreign governments and their immediate family members about whom the Secretary of State has credible information have been involved, directly or indirectly, in . . . a gross violation of human rights shall be ineligible for entry into the United States.”

Secretary of State Pompeo unquestionably has such information. Ms. al-Hathloul’s prolonged, arbitrary detention and abuse in custody are gross violations of human rights. Secretary Pompeo should apply section 7031(c) and immediately impose visa restrictions on all Saudi Government officials involved, directly or indirectly, in her detention and abuse. That is our law.

It is as ironic as it is unconscionable that the Crown Prince has been praised for ending the ban on a woman’s ability to drive a car in Saudi Arabia, at the same time that his government is unjustly and cruelly imprisoning a courageous woman for advocating for that

very right. The Trump administration should apply the law as required in this case.

U.S. SENATE SELECT COMMITTEE ON ETHICS ANNUAL REPORT

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, for myself as chairman of the Select Committee on Ethics and for Senator CHRISTOPHER A. COONS, vice chairman of the committee, that the Annual Report for the Select Committee on Ethics for calendar year 2019 be printed in the RECORD. The Committee issues this report today, January 28, 2020, as required by the Honest Leadership and Open Government Act of 2007.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON ETHICS

116TH CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

JANUARY 28, 2020

The Honest Leadership and Open Government Act of 2007 (the Act) calls for the Select Committee on Ethics of the United States Senate to issue an annual report no later than January 31st of each year providing information in certain categories describing its activities for the preceding year. Reported below is the information describing the Committee's activities in 2019 in the categories set forth in the Act:

(1) The number of alleged violations of Senate rules received from any source, including the number raised by a Senator or staff of the Committee: 251. (In addition, 16 alleged violations from previous years were carried into 2019.)

(2) The number of alleged violations that were dismissed—

(A) For lack of subject matter jurisdiction or in which, even if the allegations in the complaint are true, no violation of Senate rules would exist: 135. (This figure includes 4 matters from the previous year carried into 2019.)

(B) Because they failed to provide sufficient facts as to any material violation of the Senate rules beyond mere allegation or assertion: 118. (This figure includes 5 matters from previous years carried into 2019.)

(3) The number of alleged violations for which the Committee staff conducted a preliminary inquiry: 16. (This figure includes 8 matters from previous years carried into 2019.)

(4) The number of alleged violations for which the Committee staff conducted a preliminary inquiry that resulted in an adjudicatory review: 0.

(5) The number of alleged violations for which the Committee staff conducted a preliminary inquiry and the Committee dismissed the matter for lack of substantial merit or because it was inadvertent, technical or otherwise of a de minimis nature: 11.

(6) The number of alleged violations for which the Committee staff conducted a preliminary inquiry and the Committee issued private or public letters of admonition: 0.

(7) The number of matters resulting in a disciplinary sanction: 0.

(8) Any other information deemed by the Committee to be appropriate to describe its activities in the previous year:

In 2019, the Committee staff conducted 36 Member and committee office campaign briefings (includes 6 remedial training sessions); 21 employee code of conduct training sessions; 11 public financial disclosure clin-

ics, seminars, and webinars; 19 ethics seminars and customized briefings for Member DC offices, state offices, and Senate committees; 4 private sector ethics briefings; and 3 international briefings.

In 2019, the Committee staff handled approximately 10,998 inquiries (via telephone and email) for ethics advice and guidance.

In 2019, the Committee wrote approximately 784 ethics advisory letters and responses including, but not limited to, 581 travel and gifts matters (Senate Rule 35) and 133 conflict of interest matters (Senate Rule 37).

In 2019, the Committee received 3,586 public financial disclosure and periodic disclosure of financial transactions reports.

TRIAL OF PRESIDENT DONALD J. TRUMP

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, the impeachment trial of President Trump has devolved into a parade of last-minute red herrings meant to distract this body from the issue at hand. The near-hysteria over books, boredom, and beef jerky has provided a convenient vehicle for the House managers, who are trying their best to peddle outrage as evidence.

We learned nothing new from the House managers' presentations, but outside the Senate Chamber, they have been doing their best to convince us that we are one "bombshell" away from, at last, having all the elements needed for a speedy conviction. These efforts to keep unfounded allegations in the limelight have not gone unnoticed by those who should be commanding our attention: the American people.

Outside the beltway, Americans have grown weary of trials and talking points. They have heard enough, and they have had enough.

Taking that feedback into consideration, I thought it might be helpful to offer an update on what we could be focusing on instead of this farcical partisan grudge match.

Behind the scenes, we are limping along as best we can, but our focus is necessarily distracted from regular business. Before our time was monopolized by impeachment, the Senate was making wonderful progress on filling the Federal bench with well-qualified, constitutionalist judges.

When we weren't interviewing those nominees, members of the Judiciary Committee spent time hearing testimony on privacy, competition, and the crisis on our southern border.

Before impeachment, Senators serving on the Veterans' Affairs Committee were hard at work considering a comprehensive mental health bill that would strengthen veteran mental health and suicide prevention programs. My own IMPROVE Act is part of this effort. We were also working on the IT Reform Act, which would improve information technology projects at the VA, and the Network of Support Act, which would help VA officials guide veterans through the emotional upheaval of transitioning between Active Duty and civilian life. We were

doing all of this in addition to our continued oversight of the VA MISSION Act, and check-ins on struggling clinics such as the one in Murfreesboro, TN, which just reduced bed space for veterans struggling with opiate addiction and thoughts of suicide.

This Thursday, we have an Armed Services Committee hearing on the U.S.' role in AFRICOM. When I visited with our troops in Djibouti and Somalia at the end of last year, I saw firsthand the importance of our advisory support on the African continent. Drawing down resources or personnel in AFRICOM would harm our position as we compete with Russia and China—but we won't have much time to discuss this potentially disastrous change. Every day, work grinds to a halt at 1:00 p.m., so that we can sit in our seats in the Senate Chamber and focus on the impeachment trial.

We could be paying attention to the full-blown health crisis plaguing our rural communities. Since 2010, 118 rural hospitals have shut their doors. Fourteen of those facilities were in my home State of Tennessee. Between these hospital closures, and high drug prices, there is enough work to be done in the health care sector alone to keep us busy through Christmas.

Mister President, if Tennessee is a good test group for the rest of the Nation—and it usually is—I can tell you that when asked to choose between discussing impeachment politics and real world problems, the American people are much more worried about trade, transportation, and manufacturing, and how evolving policy initiatives will affect prices at the grocery store.

I would encourage my colleagues to remember the cost of indulging these proceedings and to listen to their constituents back home and not the breathless coverage that dominates the 24 hour news cycle.

H. CON. RES. 83

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, H. Con. Res. 83 directs the President to terminate the use of U.S. Armed Forces to engage in hostilities against Iran, unless Congress has authorized the use of military force against Iran or such use is necessary to defend against an imminent armed attack. H. Con. Res. 83 was agreed to in the House of Representatives on January 9, 2020 and received in the Senate and referred to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations on January 13, 2020.

The War Powers Resolution, PL 93-148, has special procedures underscoring the privileged nature of a concurrent resolution like H. Con. Res. 83. Section 1546(c) of the War Powers Resolution requires that once a privileged concurrent resolution such as H. Con. Res. 83 has been passed by the House, it must be referred to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and "shall be reported out by such committee together with its recommendations within fifteen calendar days." Fifteen calendar

days from January 13 is today, January 28, 2020. Under the law, the concurrent resolution may be reported out with a favorable or unfavorable recommendation, or no recommendation at all, but it must be reported out.

Unfortunately, it appears that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee majority leadership has decided to allow the 15 calendar days to lapse without taking action on H. Con. Res. 83. This failure to act leaves a statutory obligation unfulfilled.

I understand that the chairman is basing this inaction primarily on the contention that a concurrent resolution under 50 U.S.C. 1544(c) may be privileged only if it uses the word "remove" or the phrase "removal of United States Armed Forces engaged in hostilities," rather than "terminate" or "terminate the use of United States Armed Forces to engage in hostilities" as used in H. Con. Res. 83. The argument appears to be that the use of "removed" in 1544(c) of the War Powers Resolution eliminates the possibility of privilege if any other terminology is used, regardless of functional equivalency. This argument suggests that "removal" is a term of art required for privilege.

The approach is unjustifiably restrictive. Treating "removal" as a term of art required for privilege is inconsistent with the overarching purpose of the War Powers Resolution and without support in either the statutory framework or legislative history. It also undermines Senate and congressional prerogatives.

The purpose of the War Powers Resolution was for Congress to reconfirm and reassert its constitutional powers over "undeclared" wars. The availability of a privileged and binding resolution to force a President to stop using U.S. Armed Forces in hostilities is central to that purpose. Limiting such privilege to a single phrase or word is inconsistent with this reassertion of congressional powers and is neither a feature of the statute nor its legislative history.

The statutory framework of the War Powers Resolution does not support the assertion that "removal" or "removal from hostilities" are terms of art that are required for and exclusive to the availability of privilege. To the contrary, those terms are not defined in law; nor is there any reference in the statute to a military or other usage of those phrases to suggest that they are terms of art.

The absence of statutorily mandated language for privilege in the War Powers Resolution directly contrasts with many other statutes in which Congress expressly requires specific language for privilege to attach. For example, in contrast to the War Powers Resolution, section 130(f) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, PL 83-703, section 101 of the Arms Export Control Act, PL 90-629, and section 216(c) of the Countering America's Adversaries Through Sanctions Act, PL 115-44 all require specific

text for privileged resolutions and provide that text in quotations in the statute. Clearly, as evidenced by laws enacted before and after the War Powers Resolution, Congress knows how to require the use of unique, statutorily mandated language for privilege to apply. The fact that it did not do so in the War Powers Resolution demonstrates that there was no intent to limit privilege to use of a single word or phrase.

Further, the legislative record of the War Powers Resolution does not support the assertion that there is an exclusive connection between the use of "removal" and the availability of privilege. To the contrary, the record indicates that "remove" and "terminate" were used synonymously. The record is replete with the interchangeable usage of synonymous terms consistent with a cessation of the use of U.S. forces in hostilities. For example, House Report 93-287 uses no less than seven terms in this regard, including "conclude," "disengage," "remove," "terminate," "abandon such action," and "stop." In fact, the conferees even used "terminate" to describe the privileged resolution envisioned in 1544(c), clearly demonstrating that these terms were considered to be functionally equivalent for purposes of War Powers. "The House joint resolution provided that use of United States Armed Forces by the President without a declaration of war or specific statutory authorization could be terminated by Congress through the use of a concurrent resolution. The Senate amendment provided for such termination by a bill or joint resolution." H. Rept. 93-547, Conference Report to H.J. Res. 542. This legislative history, in tandem with a statutory construct that does not require a term of art, demonstrates that the insistence on such a term for privilege is misguided.

Finally, strictly limiting privilege to a resolution that uses "remove" is inconsistent with Senate and congressional prerogatives. The purpose of the War Powers Resolution—reasserting the power of Congress over undeclared wars—can be vindicated only if the executive branch and its supporters in the Senate cannot use committee or floor procedure to bottle up a resolution consistent with both the purpose and construct of the War Powers Resolution. Reading into the statute a requirement for specific terminology where no such requirement exists unjustifiably restricts Senate action and limits the reassertion of congressional authority over War Powers.

For the reasons stated above, I urge the chairman to immediately take the necessary steps to ensure full compliance with the law.

REMEMBERING RETIRED ARMY COLONEL (DR.) ROBERT J.T. JOY

Mr. REED. Mr. President, today I pay tribute to a pioneer in the field of military medicine, retired Army COL Dr.

Robert J.T. Joy. Colonel Joy was founding professor of military medicine and commandant of the School of Medicine at the Uniformed Services University, USU. Most recently, he served as professor emeritus of USU's Section of Military Medical History. He passed away last year at the age of 90.

Born in Rhode Island and raised between Narragansett, RI, and St. Petersburg, FL, he studied pre-med and pre-law at the University of Rhode Island, before attending Yale University Medical School on a Reserve medical officers training scholarship.

From there, his service to his country began. After assignments stateside, Dr. Joy volunteered to lead the Walter Reed Army Institute of Research, WRAIR, team to Vietnam, where he received his first—of four—Legion of Merit medals and his team received a Meritorious Unit Citation for their field research. After becoming Deputy Director and then Director of WRAIR, many thought he had found his dream job.

However, after a meeting with Dr. Jay Sanford, the first dean of USU, in 1976, Colonel Joy received a transfer to take the position of professor of military medicine and commandant of the School of Medicine at the newly created USU. While there, he was instrumental in the creation of the field of military medical history, and his teachings, lectures, and leadership were integral to the development of today's "joint" concept of military medicine.

Dr. Joy retired from Active Duty in 1981 and was awarded the Distinguished Service Medal for his Army career. He continued to teach as a civilian professor until 2005, and his legacy lives on through his students—the physicians and surgical teams that continue to provide world-class care for our wounded, ill, and injured service members.

I would like to close with a quote about Dr. Joy from retired Army BG Robert Doughty, professor and chair of history at the United States Military Academy at West Point: "His contribution has influenced, and will continue to influence, students, historians, and soldiers for decades to come."

I salute Dr. Joy and extend my condolences to his family.

TRIBUTE TO CARY JONES

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I want to take a few minutes today to honor Cary Jones, an Oregonian retiring after a long career in the Coast Guard and the Department of Veterans Affairs. The bottom line is Mr. Jones has embraced and embodied the essence of public service throughout his distinguished career.

He joined the Coast Guard in 1976 and was stationed in Honolulu, Seattle, and Coos Bay. He served for several years aboard the USCGC *Boutwell*, a high-endurance cutter used to intercept smuggling vessels.

Mr. Jones left the Coast Guard in 2001 as a senior chief yeoman, and he could have sailed off into an easy retirement. Instead, he went to work for the VA, where he would spend nearly two decades helping Oregon veterans. He served in a number of roles at the Portland VA Medical Center, but in every capacity he sought to do right by veterans. He worked with my Portland staff for years, and if you ever want to get one of them going, just ask how helpful Cary Jones was. They will tell you he worked on more than 10,000 congressional inquiries, each of which represented an attempt to help an Oregon veteran or military family.

Cary Jones is a shining example of what public service is supposed to be all about. He has always been one of the good guys, in it for the right reasons, and always laser-focused on lifting up people who need a little bit of help.

Mr. Jones' career reminds me of a quote by the famous naturalist John Burroughs: "For anything worth having one must pay the price; and the price is always work, patience, love, self-sacrifice—no paper currency, no promises to pay, but the gold of real service."

And so today I say thank you to Senior Chief Yeoman Cary Jones for his work, patience, love and self-sacrifice.

I say thank you for leading by example, for showing countless Oregonians that public service is a noble calling, and for paying the gold of real service.

I wish you the best as you embark on your well-deserved retirement.

TRIBUTE TO CARL ADRIAN

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize the career and service of Carl Adrian, who is retiring this month after more than 16 years as the president of the Tri-Cities Economic Development Council in my home State of Washington.

Carl has devoted his career to making the Tri-Cities an economic powerhouse, and throughout his time as the longest serving president of TRIDEC, Carl Adrian accomplished so many important things for the region. Thanks in part to his work, the Tri-Cities of today is very different from the Tri-Cities of 16 years ago.

Under Carl's leadership, more than 1,300 businesses set up shop in the Tri-Cities and more than 35,000 new jobs were created. These business leaders weren't drawn to the Tri-Cities just because of the weather or the excellent Washington wine; they came because Carl helped create new opportunities and supported significant investments for employers in the region.

I have been so pleased to partner with Carl and TRIDEC on so many endeavors over the years. When it comes to Hanford, Carl saw the site as history that should be celebrated and remembered. We worked together to establish the Manhattan Project Historical Park in Richland, which honors the more

than 51,000 Hanford workers who helped drive our country's nuclear program and remembers those whose lands were taken when the facilities were built. The site is helping to educate new generations and bringing new visitors to the Tri-Cities. More than 10,000 people visit every year from all 50 States and more than 80 countries.

Carl also knows how important it is that we get Hanford cleaned up. He has been a stalwart advocate for the funding we need to clean up the site. And I share his strong belief that the Federal Government has a moral obligation to the Tri-Cities and our State to make sure the Hanford cleanup and its workers receive Federal funding they need.

Throughout his time at TRIDEC, Carl has worked on so many other projects of importance to the Tri-Cities. He has been one of the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory's strongest supporters, working tirelessly to make sure Congress and the Department of Energy recognize the importance of the lab to our region and country. As a result of his advocacy, the lab has experienced significant growth, particularly in energy innovation including grid security, battery storage and clean energy technologies.

I was also proud to work with Carl and TRIDEC to expand the Tri-City Regional Airport. His leadership enabled the airport to bring non-stop daily flights from San Francisco, Minneapolis, and Chicago to the region, along with many other destinations. These flights have helped grow the attractiveness of southeastern Washington and allowed many more people to see what the Tri-Cities have to offer.

For more than 16 years, Carl Adrian's leadership of the Tri-Cities Economic Development Council has made an impact throughout Southeastern Washington and our entire State. We are all grateful for his hard work and many contributions.

Congratulations on your retirement, Carl. I wish you and Rheta great success as you transition to the next chapter of your life.

TRIBUTE TO COLONEL ROBERT DE SOUSA

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, today I rise to honor the service of COL Robert DeSousa upon his retirement from the Army on February 29, 2020. For over 26 years, Colonel DeSousa has served with distinction and dedication in the U.S. Army Reserve and the Pennsylvania National Guard. Many Pennsylvanians may know Colonel DeSousa in his civilian capacity as the widely respected State director for my offices in the Commonwealth.

A native of New Jersey but an adopted son of Pennsylvania, Colonel DeSousa holds a bachelor's degree from Bucknell University, a law degree from the Dickinson School of Law, and a master's degree from the U.S. Army War College. He began his military career as a judge advocate with the U.S.

Army Reserve in 1993 and quickly established himself as an outstanding defense lawyer and soldier. Following the September 11 terror attacks, Colonel DeSousa aided in the mobilization of our troops and then deployed to Iraq in 2007. While deployed, he simultaneously held three distinct positions for the Pennsylvania National Guard, the U.S. Air Force, and the U.S. Army Reserve.

In 2008, Colonel DeSousa returned to serve in the 28th Infantry Division Headquarters of the Pennsylvania National Guard. The following year, he was tasked as the first ever regional defense counsel in what would become the Army's first fully integrated trial defense service for Reserve, Active Duty, and National Guard soldiers. As a result of Colonel DeSousa's leadership in this role, thousands of Army soldiers in nine different States gained greater access to legal defense services. He was subsequently appointed as the State judge advocate for the Pennsylvania National Guard's Joint Force Headquarters in 2013. In this position, from which he will retire this February, Colonel DeSousa advised the Pennsylvania National Guard's adjutant general and his command staff on legal and ethical matters while supervising nearly 50 judge advocates.

Colonel DeSousa has built an exemplary career on service and leadership. His selflessness and competency, undoubtedly aided by his positive can-do attitude and infectious smile, have earned him numerous honors in the U.S. Army Reserve and Pennsylvania National Guard. These honors include a Bronze Star Medal, Meritorious Service Medal, Army Commendation Medal, and over a dozen other commendations. His dedication to public service is evinced by his civilian career, too, having previously been a Federal law clerk, an assistant U.S. attorney, the chief counsel for Pennsylvania's Department of State, and the inspector general for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Thankfully, Colonel DeSousa's retirement is not the end of his service to Pennsylvanians. He will continue in his current role as State director for my Senate office, where he oversees the daily operations of my seven State-based offices. In this role, Colonel DeSousa is famous for his bits of wisdom he passes down. In particular, he reminds his colleagues often that "an email sent or a phone call made does not mean mission accomplished." Colonel DeSousa meets this mission every day, as he can generally be found out on the road, crisscrossing our great Commonwealth to meet with constituents.

Colonel DeSousa, who is known to appreciate a good cigar, the occasional whiskey, and, unrelatedly, sporting dapper bow-ties, is a true friend to Pennsylvanians anywhere. I offer Colonel DeSousa my heartfelt congratulations on his military retirement and

am grateful for his counsel, his continued service to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and his friendship.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

150TH ANNIVERSARY OF MISSOURI UNIVERSITY OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

• Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, today I stand to recognize the 150th anniversary of Missouri University of Science and Technology. Part of the University of Missouri System, Missouri S&T was founded in 1870 in Rolla, MO, as one of the first technological institutions west of the Mississippi and continues to be one of the top technological research institutions in the nation.

Originally established as the University of Missouri School of Mines and Metallurgy, Missouri S&T has grown from its original mining focus to offer 99 degree programs, while maintaining its leadership in engineering and the sciences. In fact, Missouri S&T is consistently ranked as one of the top engineering schools in the nation.

Missouri S&T was chartered on February 24, 1870, and classes were first called to order on November 6, 1871. Since that time, more than 60,000 men and women have gone on to carry their status as "miners" into successful endeavors all over the world. Missouri S&T alumni consistently achieve some of the highest average starting salaries in the Midwest, and the university is ranked sixth in the Nation for annual return on investment.

The campus boasts a Center for Infrastructure Engineering Systems, a Materials Research Center, a Center for Biomedical Research, and several other centers generating world-class discoveries. Faculty, staff, and students produce research on everything from bioactive glass and bioactive ceramic scaffolds for regenerating bone to advancing treatments for traumatic brain injury. Partnerships with hospitals, the U.S. Army, and local businesses that are industry leaders have strengthened and grown already successful programs and put Missouri S&T at the forefront of solving difficult problems.

The commitment of Missouri University of Science and Technology to educate young men and women and push for solutions to some of our most difficult problems is to be commended. I extend my sincere thanks for everything the faculty, staff, and administrators have accomplished over the last 150 years. Congratulations to Chancellor Mohammad Dehghani and all Missouri S&T faculty, staff, students, and alumni on this important occasion.●

RECOGNIZING THE BONNEVILLE HOTEL

• Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, along with my colleagues Senator JAMES E.

RISCH and Representative MIKE SIMPSON, I congratulate the city of Idaho Falls and Bonneville County on the preservation of the historic Hotel Bonneville.

The Bonneville County Heritage Association provided historical background about the area and the original naming and purpose of the hotel that has stood in Idaho Falls for nearly a century. The association notes this remarkable structure was named for Captain Bonneville, who led an expedition from 1832 to 1834 through the vast country between the Missouri and Columbia Rivers. Idaho later became part of the United States through the Oregon Treaty in 1846. Then, on March 4, 1863, President Abraham Lincoln signed a bill establishing the Idaho Territory, and Idaho became the 43rd State on July 3, 1890. Further, the Bonneville County Heritage Association explained that on February 7, 1911, Governor James Henry Hawley put an end to a fight for county division by signing a bill designating Bonneville County and naming Idaho Falls the county seat.

The Bonneville County Heritage Association found a May 1927 Times Register article providing an account of the historical significance of the Hotel Bonneville in Idaho Falls at the time of its construction that states the hotel "is the result of the desire on the part of a number of the people of Idaho Falls, and community, to have the use of a strictly first class hotel, with adequate accommodations and quality of service which would enable Idaho Falls, as a community, to invite public gatherings and conventions and to be prepared to take care of them in a way and manner, which would reflect on the community." The name Hotel Bonneville was selected for the original hotel to honor the founder of this part of the country, and the hotel opened its doors for business on June 1, 1927.

The Bonneville Hotel has recently undergone extensive renovations transforming it into an affordable housing complex that includes retail space. We commend the visionaries and partners who came together to provide a new life for this local landmark. A plaque at the building notes the original Hotel Bonneville was built by 481 citizens. Through the leadership of Idaho Falls Mayor Rebecca Casper, the Idaho Falls City Council, the Idaho Falls Redevelopment Agency, and the hard work and vision of many Idahoans, the renewal of this landmark honors the founders of the county and those who worked to build and renovate the hotel and preserves this historic building for generations to come. Congratulations on this local transformation.●

TRIBUTE TO BRANDON ROBERTS AND STACIA FUZESY

• Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, this week I have the honor of recognizing Brandon Roberts and Stacia Fuzesy of Chouteau County for their hard work and entrepreneurial spirit.

Brandon and Stacia opened the Golden Triangle Brewing Co. in Fort Benton. Their craft beers showcase the rich history of Montana ag and the grain growers of the Golden Triangle. Working with local farmers, Brandon and Stacia are energizing the local economy and crafting beers that Montanans can call their own.

They have also worked with local historians to help create unique names for their craft beer that highlight Montana history such as Shepweizen and Bentonbier.

It is my honor to recognize Brandon and Stacia for opening up this thriving Montana small business that promotes our rich history and values. Small craft breweries like the Golden Triangle Brewing Co. are helping drive the economy across Big Sky Country. Keep on brewing.●

TRIBUTE TO ANNA, GRACE, AND JOY WILLIAMS

• Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, this week I have the honor of recognizing Anna, Grace, and Joy Williams of Daniels County, for their hard work in planning Hands Across Scobey, an event that raised money for Montana foster children.

These three Montana sisters took the initiative to give back to their community and organize an effort to help those most vulnerable in our society—foster children.

Their mother, Ruth Williams, a mother of five, including one foster child, was the motivation for the 'Hands Across Scobey' event.

It is my honor to recognize Anna, Grace, and Joy for their selflessness and willingness to serve others. Their charitable effort is exemplary of the Montana spirit.

I look forward to following the future accomplishments of these three young ladies.●

TRIBUTE TO PASTOR DOUGLAS P. JONES

• Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize Pastor Douglas P. Jones of Welcome Missionary Baptist Church of Pontiac, MI, as the congregation and the Pontiac community celebrate his 30th pastoral anniversary.

Pastor Jones moved from his native Cincinnati in 1989 to Pontiac, MI, to assume leadership of Welcome Missionary Baptist Church. Under his guidance, membership at Welcome Missionary Baptist Church grew from a few hundred to more than 4,000 worshippers. From the very beginning of his tenure at the church, Pastor Jones has worked tirelessly to implement a vision of unity and kindness, bringing worshippers together so that they may find strength in their community and, with that strength, work toward positive change throughout the Pontiac area.

His focus on ensuring that church members' needs are met can be seen in

the number and diversity of ministries established at Welcome. In support of his younger members, Pastor Jones created both the Young Men Making a Difference Ministry for preteen and teenage boys, as well as the Teen Esteem Ministry for preteen and teenage girls. Pastor Jones has endeavored to create resources for the most vulnerable members of the Welcome community such as the T.I.P.—Tots, Infants, and Preschoolers—ministry, which looks after the congregation's youngest members, the Exodus Dependency Program, which assists those contending with problems relating to substance abuse and HIV, and the Domestic Violence Ministry.

Pastor Jones has not limited his dedication to service to the members of Welcome Missionary Baptist Church but, rather, extended his unwavering faith and generosity to the broader Pontiac community. He has been fundamental in the positive growth seen throughout the city over the last 30 years. He has served on committees, boards, and partnerships in support of the community, including the Pontiac Youth Assistance, the NAACP North Oakland Medical Center, and the Woodward Dream Cruise, Inc., to name only a few. Seeing a lack of unity among those trying to create change, Pastor Jones founded the Greater Pontiac Community Coalition, a federation of over 190 Oakland County individuals, community groups, clergy, elected officials, and businesses that work together to encourage positive change on the individual, social, and institutional level through advocacy and community action. Pastor Jones has further been a driving force behind helping the students of Pontiac achieve their goals of pursuing higher education. Under his guidance the Pontiac Promise Zone Scholarship Program was created, which has given many Pontiac students the chance to obtain the financial aid necessary to pursue their dreams of higher education in the State of Michigan.

Since his arrival in 1989, Pastor Jones has been a source of strength and good will for all those in the Pontiac community. He is often called upon to act as a consensus builder among groups and people of different perspectives, preaching partnership and cooperation in order to inspire success and transformation. He has worked tirelessly in pursuit of what he thinks is best for the community and has done so while spreading a message of morality and kindness.

I have no doubt that the congregation at Welcome Missionary Baptist Church is proud to call Pastor Jones their leader and celebrate his many accomplishments over the last 30 years. I am grateful to Pastor Jones for his friendship and for his selflessness in serving the residents of Pontiac and surrounding area. I wish Pastor Jones, First Lady JoAnn, and their family continued happiness and success as they continue to work for the betterment of the community.●

TRIBUTE TO NATHANIEL JONES

● Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I rise to honor the memory of one of our country's great civil rights leaders and judges, the Honorable Nathaniel Jones, who passed away on January 26 at the age of 93.

Judge Jones was a native of Youngstown in my home State of Ohio, a veteran who served in the Air Force during World War II, and a tireless advocate for justice and equality. After his time in the military, he earned an undergraduate degree and a JD from Youngstown State University.

For much of the 1960s, Judge Jones was the assistant U.S. attorney for the Northern District of Ohio at the appointment of Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy. In 1969, he became the general counsel for the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, NAACP, where he argued numerous cases before the Supreme Court.

In 1979 he moved to the Cincinnati area upon being appointed as an appeals judge for the Sixth Circuit by President Carter, and he served admirably in that role for decades. With all of his experience, and his reputation for integrity and problem-solving, Judge Jones was an active member of the Cincinnati community and widely respected in legal circles. As an example, he was asked to deliver the inaugural Judge A. Leon Higginbotham Distinguished Memorial Lecture at Harvard Law School.

His work also included helping to end the apartheid regime in South Africa, working to promote a free and independent Namibia, participating in the U.S.-Egypt Judicial Exchange Program, and advocating for human rights within the Soviet Union. Among his many accomplishments, he received the Distinguished Service Citation from the National Conference for Community Justice and the State Department's Millennium International Volunteer Award. For all of his accomplishments, worked in the House of Representatives to write and pass legislation to rename the U.S. courthouse in Youngstown after Judge Jones—the courthouse stands only a few miles down the road from where he was raised as a child. It now bears the name of this proud son of Youngstown.

Back home in Cincinnati, Judge Jones was just as important a figure in the fight for a more equitable society, having taught law at the University of Cincinnati, among other schools. I was proud to work with him on launching the National Underground Railroad Museum, housed in my hometown of Cincinnati. It is there in large part because of the efforts of Judge Jones, who also served as a co-chair of the board of trustees for the museum. I was honored to work with him over the years to further its mission. Just last fall, the University of Cincinnati College of Law renamed its Center for Race, Gender, and Social Justice in his honor.

Judge Jones was a model public servant, working to better his community

and his fellow man. I will remember him as a friend who brought people together to support racial healing, equality and to improve the community. His legacy of justice and equality before the law should inspire all of us to continue to seek positive change.

Today, my thoughts are with his family—his sister, Allie Jean, his daughters Stephanie and Pamela, his sons Rick, William, and Marc, and the many others whose lives he touched.●

REMEMBERING CARMELLA WOOD

● Ms. ROSEN. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to a great Nevadan, American, and member of the Greatest Generation, Carmella Wood, who passed away on January 26, 2020 at the age of 97 in Las Vegas, the city she called home in the Silver State since 2003.

Carmella, like many others of her generation, answered her country's call during World War II, volunteering to serve in the fight against tyranny. When the U.S. Army would not take her because of her 4-foot 11-inch height, she joined the war effort, working in a factory on the east coast building Corsair Bombers. Carmella's dedication to serving her country is reflected in the fact that even though the factory she was assigned to was 20 miles from her home, she never missed a day, sometimes having to walk in the snow the rest of the way to work when the bus she rode on could not completely reach the factory. She and the women she worked with day in and day out kept our troops in the fight, and these women would eventually come to be collectively and affectionately known as Rosie the Riveters. Rosies like Carmella produced over 297,000 airplanes, 102,000 tanks, 88,000 warships, and countless other pieces of wartime equipment which helped American and Allied troops defeat enemy forces both in the European and Pacific Theaters, winning the war and bringing an end to the terror Nazi Germany and Japan had inflicted upon countless countries.

After the war Carmella, like many other Rosies and members of the "greatest generation", returned to living their lives. They married, had kids of their own, and worked outside the home. However, Carmella never forgot her time as a Rosie. Over 20 years ago, she started attending national Rosie the Riveter Association reunions and other events where she was able to share her experiences and teach current generations about how these dedicated women kept America fighting in the war so their sacrifices and work are not forgotten or overlooked.

Mr. President, please join me in honoring and remembering Carmella Wood, one of our legendary Rosie the Riveters of World War II, a true Nevadan and American patriot who answered her Nation's call to service, someone who reflects the high ideals of this country. Her spirit, perseverance, and dedication are an inspiration to all Americans, and she will be truly missed.●

RECOGNIZING HULL'S SEAFOOD

• Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, as chairman of the Senate Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, each week I honor a small business that demonstrates America's unique entrepreneurial spirit. I am pleased to recognize a business for its participation in Florida's integral economy and its involvement in the community. Today, it is my pleasure to name Hull's Seafood of Ormond Beach, FL, as the Senate Small Business of the Week.

Jimmy Hull, owner of Hull's Seafood, spent his childhood exploring and catching fresh fish at Ponce Inlet. At 20 years old, he obtained his captain's license, began running fishing charters, and selling the day's catch to local markets. Eventually, Hull's Seafood opened its doors in 1984. This restaurant and market makes a conscious effort to support sustainability by only selling fresh-caught, local seafood. They guarantee each of their customer's seafood is of the highest quality. Over the years, Jimmy and his team have continued to expand the business. Led by Jimmy's strategic vision, Hull's Seafood has evolved from a small take-out kitchen into a full-service restaurant and market. In 2018, Hull's Seafood received support from the city of Ormond Beach, which provided a building improvement grant designed to assist local small businesses. Jimmy was able to more than triple the size of the restaurant and double the number of employees, adding an additional forty workers.

Today, Hull's Seafood Market and Restaurant continues to supply customers and other local restaurants with the freshest seafood available. After operating in Ormond Beach for nearly 40 years, the restaurant has become a landmark within the community and a gathering place for local residents. Located on Ormond Beach's downtown Main Street, Hull's Seafood is active within its community, participating in many city events and supporting local artists by hosting concerts and displaying art in the restaurant dining room. Additionally, Hull's Seafood makes a point of showcasing other local businesses on their social media pages. Jimmy stays true to his passion and is a commercial fisherman who also operates the restaurant's charter boat to take passengers on fishing trips. In 2018, Jimmy was awarded the Governor's Business Ambassador Award for the restaurant's continuous effort to create local jobs. Jimmy and his team was commended for his advocacy for fisheries and helping to maintain their sustainability in Florida.

Hull's Seafood is an excellent example of a community and family oriented small business. The entire team's efforts toward sustainability and providing high quality seafood do not go unnoticed. I am proud to recognize Jimmy and everyone at Hull's Seafood for their hard work, and I look forward to seeing their future successes. Con-

gratulations again on being named the Senate Small Business of the Week. •

TRIBUTE TO ORLY MUNZING

• Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I rise today in recognition of Orly Munzing, an extraordinary Vermonter and long-time advocate for family farms and resilient communities.

Orly founded Strolling of the Heifers in 2002 in Brattleboro, VT, to help bring awareness to the plight of small dairy farms. During Orly's tenure as executive director of Strolling of the Heifers, she transformed a small town parade into a widely renowned event celebrating sustainable agriculture and family farms. I am proud to have marched in many of these parades over the last 17 years to celebrate our farms and our communities in Vermont and around the country. Under Orly's leadership, Strolling of the Heifers has continued to expand, now including the farm-to-table culinary apprenticeship program to provide underserved community members with the vital skills necessary for obtaining good quality jobs in the food sector.

In addition to Strolling of the Heifers, Orly founded the nationally recognized Locavore Index, the first tool to measure the growth of the local food movement. She also created Windham Grows, a program to provide valuable skills and resources to farm and food entrepreneurs. Just this past year, Orly received the Innovation & Spirit Award from the Vermont Businesses for Social Responsibility as recognition of this work.

Prior to all these important accomplishments, Orly worked for 24 years as a learning specialist in the public school system and consulted with teachers on cutting-edge educational techniques. For decades, she has been a truly tireless champion who has made significant strides to create more healthy and prosperous rural communities. At a time of increased recognition of the profound impact agriculture and food have on the vibrancy of rural lands, our health, and the health of the planet, it is heartening to know that dedicated, passionate people like Orly are making a real difference in our communities.

Mr. President, I am not only enormously grateful for all of Orly's many contributions over the years, but I am also proud to call her a good friend. I wish her all the best in her retirement and know she will continue to fight for more environmentally sound and fundamentally just communities. •

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Roberts, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages

from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE
RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 3, 2019, as modified by the order of January 22, 2020, the Secretary of the Senate, on January 28, 2020, during the adjournment of the Senate, received a message from the House of Representatives announcing that the House had passed the following bill, without amendment:

S. 153. An act to promote veteran involvement in STEM education, computer science, and scientific research, and for other purposes.

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 3, 2019, as modified by the order of January 22, 2020, the Secretary of the Senate, on January 28, 2020, during the adjournment of the Senate, received a message from the House of Representatives announcing that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 943. An act to authorize the Director of the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum to support Holocaust education programs, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4704. An act to direct the Director of the National Science Foundation to support multidisciplinary research on the science of suicide, and to advance the knowledge and understanding of issues that may be associated with several aspects of suicide including intrinsic and extrinsic factors related to areas such as wellbeing, resilience, and vulnerability.

H.R. 5671. An act to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the United States Merchant Mariners of World War II, in recognition of their dedicated and vital service during World War II.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 943. An act to authorize the Director of the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum to support Holocaust education programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 4704. An act to direct the Director of the National Science Foundation to support multidisciplinary research on the science of suicide, and to advance the knowledge and understanding of issues that may be associated with several aspects of suicide including intrinsic and extrinsic factors related to areas such as wellbeing, resilience, and vulnerability; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

H.R. 5671. An act to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the United States Merchant Mariners of World War II, in recognition of their dedicated and vital service during World War II; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER
COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-3801. A communication from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "User Fees for Agricultural Quarantine and Inspection Services" ((RIN0579-AD77) (Docket No. APHIS-2013-0021)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 17, 2020; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-3802. A communication from the General Counsel of the Federal Housing Finance Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Rules of Practice and Procedure; Civil Money Penalty Inflation Adjustment" (RIN2590-AB07) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 21, 2020; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-3803. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to operation of the Exchange Stabilization Fund (ESF) for fiscal year 2019; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-3804. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Control of Firearms, Guns, Ammunition and Related Articles the President Determines No Longer Warrant Control Under the United States Munitions List (USML)" (RIN0694-AF47) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 17, 2020; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-3805. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on appropriations legislation within seven days of enactment; to the Committee on the Budget.

EC-3806. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Office of the General Counsel, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Adjustment of Civil Penalties for Inflation for Fiscal Year 2020" (RIN3150-AK11) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 21, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3807. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Office of the General Counsel, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revision of the NRC Enforcement Policy" (NRC-2019-0242) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 21, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3808. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulations, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Supplemental Guidance Regarding the Chromium-Coated Zirconium Alloy Fuel Cladding Accident Tolerant Fuel Concept" (NUREG-0800) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 21, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3809. A communication from the Regulations Coordinator, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting,

pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Medicare, Medicaid, and Children's Health Insurance Programs; Program Integrity Enhancements to the Provider Enrollment Process" (RIN0938-AS84) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 17, 2020; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-3810. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed license for the export of firearms, parts, and components abroad controlled under Category I of the U.S. Munitions List of 5.56mm and 7.62mm automatic rifles, sound suppressors, and major components to Estonia in the amount of \$1,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 19-101); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-3811. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed license amendment for the export of defense articles, including technical data and defense services, to Italy to support the manufacture, production, test, and inspection of wing assemblies and sub-assemblies for the F-35 aircraft in the amount of \$100,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 19-062); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-3812. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Uniform Resource Locator (URL) for the Department's Agency Financial Report for fiscal year 2019; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3813. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Reexamination of the Comparative Standards and Procedures for Licensing Noncommercial Educational Broadcast Stations and Low Power FM Stations, Report and Order" ((MB Docket No. 19-3) (FCC 19-127)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 21, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3814. A communication from the Chairman of the Office of Proceedings, Surface Transportation Board, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Civil Monetary Penalties - 2020 Adjustment" (Docket No. EP 716) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 21, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3815. A communication from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Sustainability Plan for the Solar Regional Test Centers"; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EC-3816. A communication from the Acting General Counsel of the National Credit Union Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Inflation Adjustment of Civil Monetary Penalties" (RIN3133-AF09) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 23, 2020; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-3817. A communication from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Hydrogen and Fuel Cell Activities, Progress and Plans: September 2016 to August 2019"; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-3818. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the

Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Student Loan Debt Forgiveness" (Rev. Proc. 2020-11) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 22, 2020; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-3819. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Transfers of Certain Property by U.S. Persons to Partnerships with Related Foreign Partners" (RIN1545-BM95) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 22, 2020; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-3820. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department's Annual Report of Interdiction of Aircraft Engaged in Illicit Drug Trafficking; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-3821. A communication from the Acting Administrator, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the cost of response and recovery efforts for FEMA-3426-EM in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico having exceeded the \$5,000,000 limit for a single emergency declaration; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3822. A communication from the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled, "Enrollment Projections in D.C. Public Schools: Controls Needed to Ensure Funding Equity"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3823. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Taking and Importing Marine Mammals; Taking Marine Mammals Incidental to the U.S. Navy Training and Testing Activities in the Atlantic Fleet Training and Testing Study Area" (RIN0648-BI85) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 23, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3824. A communication from the Acting Secretary, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Adjustment of Civil Monetary Penalty Amounts" (16 CFR Part 1.98) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 23, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3825. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone for Fireworks Display; Spa Creek, Annapolis, MD" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2019-0846)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 22, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3826. A communication from the Attorney, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Ohio River, Owensboro, KY" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2019-0820)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 22, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3827. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department

of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Morro Bay Harbor Entrance; Morro Bay, California" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2019-0963)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 22, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3828. A communication from the Attorney, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Neches River, Beaumont, TX" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2019-0614)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 22, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3829. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Straits of Mackinac, MI" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2019-0965)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 22, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3830. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zones; Waterway Training Areas, Captain of the Port Maryland - National Capital Region Zone" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2019-0765)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 22, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3831. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Special Local Regulations; Sector Upper Mississippi River Annual and Recurring Marine Events Update" ((RIN1625-AA08) (Docket No. USCG-2018-1008)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 22, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3832. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Special Local Regulation; St. Thomas Lighted Boat Parade, St. Thomas, U.S. Virgin Island" ((RIN1625-AA08) (Docket No. USCG-2019-0945)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 22, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3833. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Regulated Navigation Area; Thea Foss and Wheeler-Osgood Waterways EPA Superfund Cleanup Site, Commencement Bay, Tacoma, WA" ((RIN1625-AA11) (Docket No. USCG-2018-0970)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 22, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3834. A communication from the Attorney, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Regulated Navigation Area; Monongahela, Allegheny, and Ohio Rivers, Pittsburgh, PA" ((RIN1625-AA11) (Docket No. USCG-2019-0118)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Of-

fice of the President of the Senate on January 22, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3835. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Regulated Navigation Area; Lake Washington, Seattle, WA" ((RIN1625-AA11) (Docket No. USCG-2019-0296)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 22, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3836. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Section 73.3555 Multiple Ownership" ((MB Doc. No. 14-50) (47 CFR Part 73.3555)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 21, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Ms. MURKOWSKI, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources:

Report to accompany S. 2393, a bill to promote a 21st century energy workforce, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 116-208).

Report to accompany S. 2425, a bill to amend the Energy Policy and Conservation Act to establish the CHP Technical Assistance Partnership Program, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 116-209).

Report to accompany S. 2508, a bill to require the Secretary of Energy to establish a council to conduct a survey and analysis of the employment figures and demographics in the energy, energy efficiency, and motor vehicle sectors of the United States, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 116-210).

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. SANDERS (for himself, Mr. MERKLEY, and Mr. MARKEY):

S. 3227. A bill to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to designate per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances as hazardous substances under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 3228. A bill to amend section 249 of title 18, United States Code, relating to hate crimes, to clarify the motive requirement; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. CORTEZ MASTO (for herself and Ms. ROSEN):

S. 3229. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for an extension of the energy credit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. CORTEZ MASTO (for herself and Mr. PORTMAN):

S. 3230. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for an extension of funding for technical assistance to small practices and practices in health professional shortage areas under the Merit-based Incentive Payment System (MIPS); to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SCHATZ (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. WARNER, and Mr. CARDIN):

S. 3231. A bill to increase the rates of pay under the General Schedule and other statutory pay systems and for prevailing rate employees by 3.5 percent, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. SCHATZ:

S. 3232. A bill to promote and support the local arts and creative economy in the United States; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. ENZI, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 3233. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve access to skilled nursing facility services for hemophilia patients; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. PAUL:

S. 3234. A bill to adjust the normal and early retirement ages for receipt of benefits under the Social Security program, increase the maximum age for delayed retirement credit, and provide for progressive price indexing of benefits; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. MCSALLY (for herself and Mr. KAINE):

S. 3235. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to conduct a pilot program on posttraumatic growth, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CRAMER (for himself, Mr. DAINES, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. COTTON, Mr. INHOPE, and Mrs. BLACKBURN):

S. 3236. A bill to amend part D of title IV of the Social Security Act to ensure that child support for unborn children is collected and distributed under the child support enforcement program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. KING:

S. 3237. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve the annual wellness visit under the Medicare program; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. KING:

S. 3238. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide coverage of preventive home visits under Medicare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WICKER (for himself, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. CARPER, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. CASEY, and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 3239. A bill to designate the headquarters building of the Department of Transportation located at 1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE, in Washington, DC, as the "William T. Coleman, Jr., Federal Building"; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself and Mr. PORTMAN):

S. 3240. A bill to provide for the vacating of certain convictions and expungement of certain arrests of victims of human trafficking; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEINRICH (for himself and Mr. UDALL):

S. 3241. A bill to amend the John D. Dingell, Jr. Conservation, Management, and Recreation Act to establish the Cerro de la Olla Wilderness in the Rio Grande del Norte National Monument, New Mexico; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. DAINES):

S. 3242. A bill to amend the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 to protect

privacy rights, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN:

S. 3243. A bill to increase students' and borrowers' access to student loan information within the National Student Loan Data System; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. ROSEN (for herself and Mrs. FISCHER):

S. 3244. A bill to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to improve the detection, prevention, and treatment of mental health issues among public safety officers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. CORTEZ MASTO (for herself and Mr. JONES):

S. 3245. A bill to advance STEM education, provide for improved worker training, retention, and advancement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mr. SCHATZ, and Ms. CANTWELL):

S. 3246. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to direct the Federal Communications Commission to conduct a public auction of the C-band, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. SANDERS (for himself and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 3247. A bill to ban the practice of hydraulic fracturing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. WARREN, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mr. COONS):

S. Res. 484. A resolution recognizing January 27, 2020, as the anniversary of the first refugee and Muslim ban, calling on Congress to defund the Migrant Protection Protocols, and urging the President to restore refugee resettlement to historic norms; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. BROWN, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CORNYN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. ERNST, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. JONES, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. PETERS, Mr. REED, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. SMITH, Mr. SULLIVAN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. BARRASSO):

S. Res. 485. A resolution recognizing January 2020 as "National Mentoring Month"; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. TESTER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. RUBIO, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. TOOMEY, Ms. ERNST, Mr. WYDEN, and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. Res. 486. A resolution supporting the observation of National Trafficking and Mod-

ern Slavery Prevention Month during the period beginning on January 1, 2020, and ending on February 1, 2020, to raise awareness of, and opposition to, human trafficking and modern slavery; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TILLIS (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. CRAPO, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. CORNYN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mr. MARKEY):

S. Res. 487. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of Countering International Parental Child Abduction Month and expressing the sense of the Senate that Congress should raise awareness of the harm caused by international parental child abduction; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Ms. SINEMA (for herself, Ms. ERNST, Ms. ROSEN, and Mr. KING):

S. Con. Res. 35. A concurrent resolution providing for a joint hearing of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate and the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives to receive a presentation from the Comptroller General of the United States regarding the audited financial statement of the executive branch; to the Committee on the Budget.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 69

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mrs. LOEFFLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 69, a bill to allow reciprocity for the carrying of certain concealed firearms.

S. 208

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 208, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit certain retired members of the uniformed services who have a service-connected disability to receive both disability compensation from the Department of Veterans Affairs for their disability and either retired pay by reason of their years of military service or Combat-Related Special Compensation, and for other purposes.

S. 285

At the request of Ms. ERNST, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 285, a bill to require U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement to take into custody certain aliens who have been charged in the United States with a crime that resulted in the death or serious bodily injury of another person, and for other purposes.

S. 318

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 318, a bill to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to furnish medically necessary transportation for newborn children of certain women veterans.

S. 402

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 402, a bill to plan, develop, and make

recommendations to increase access to sexual assault examinations for survivors by holding hospitals accountable and supporting the providers that serve them.

S. 505

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) and the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) were added as cosponsors of S. 505, a bill to ensure due process protections of individuals in the United States against unlawful detention based solely on a protected characteristic.

S. 578

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 578, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the five-month waiting period for disability insurance benefits under such title for individuals with amyotrophic lateral sclerosis.

S. 633

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the names of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) were added as cosponsors of S. 633, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the members of the Women's Army Corps who were assigned to the 6888th Central Postal Directory Battalion, known as the "Six Triple Eight".

S. 642

At the request of Mr. ALEXANDER, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 642, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to Master Sergeant Rodrick "Roddie" Edmonds in recognition of his heroic actions during World War II.

S. 651

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 651, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the age requirement with respect to eligibility for qualified ABLE programs.

S. 696

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 696, a bill to designate the same individual serving as the Chief Nurse Officer of the Public Health Service as the National Nurse for Public Health.

S. 781

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 781, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the proper tax treatment of

personal service income earned in pass-thru entities.

S. 785

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the names of the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) were added as cosponsors of S. 785, a bill to improve mental health care provided by the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 803

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the names of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY) and the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) were added as cosponsors of S. 803, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to restore incentives for investments in qualified improvement property.

S. 805

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 805, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the processing of veterans benefits by the Department of Veterans Affairs, to limit the authority of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to recover overpayments made by the Department and other amounts owed by veterans to the United States, to improve the due process accorded veterans with respect to such recovery, and for other purposes.

S. 817

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the names of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER) and the Senator from Georgia (Mrs. LOEFFLER) were added as cosponsors of S. 817, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to remove silencers from the definition of firearms, and for other purposes.

S. 850

At the request of Mr. SULLIVAN, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 850, a bill to extend the authorization of appropriations to the Department of Veterans Affairs for purposes of awarding grants to veterans service organizations for the transportation of highly rural veterans.

S. 887

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 887, a bill to revise counseling requirements for certain borrowers of student loans, and for other purposes.

S. 888

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 888, a bill to require a standard financial aid offer form, and for other purposes.

S. 889

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 889, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to make technical improvements to the Net Price Calcula-

tor system so that prospective students may have a more accurate understanding of the true cost of college.

S. 892

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the names of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) and the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) were added as cosponsors of S. 892, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the women in the United States who joined the workforce during World War II, providing the aircraft, vehicles, weaponry, ammunition, and other materials to win the war, that were referred to as "Rosie the Riveter", in recognition of their contributions to the United States and the inspiration they have provided to ensuing generations.

S. 903

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 903, a bill to direct the Secretary of Energy to establish advanced nuclear goals, provide for a versatile, reactor-based fast neutron source, make available high-assay, low-enriched uranium for research, development, and demonstration of advanced nuclear reactor concepts, and for other purposes.

S. 1123

At the request of Mr. COONS, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1123, a bill to transfer and limit Executive Branch authority to suspend or restrict the entry of a class of aliens.

S. 1190

At the request of Mrs. CAPITO, the names of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) were added as cosponsors of S. 1190, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for payments for certain rural health clinic and Federally qualified health center services furnished to hospice patients under the Medicare program.

S. 1249

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1249, a bill to prioritize funding for an expanded and sustained national investment in basic science research.

S. 1644

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1644, a bill to ensure that State and local law enforcement may cooperate with Federal officials to protect our communities from violent criminals and suspected terrorists who are illegally present in the United States.

S. 1757

At the request of Ms. ERNST, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1757, a bill to award a Congressional

Gold Medal, collectively, to the United States Army Rangers Veterans of World War II in recognition of their extraordinary service during World War II.

S. 1781

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1781, a bill to authorize appropriations for the Department of State for fiscal years 2020 through 2022 to provide assistance to El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras through bilateral compacts to increase protection of women and children in their homes and communities and reduce female homicides, domestic violence, and sexual assault.

S. 1827

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1827, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude corporations operating prisons from the definition of taxable REIT subsidiary.

S. 1908

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1908, a bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to improve the efficiency of summer meals.

S. 1954

At the request of Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1954, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint commemorative coins in recognition of the 75th anniversary of the integration of baseball.

S. 2321

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 2321, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint a coin in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the establishment of Negro Leagues baseball.

S. 2417

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the names of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE), the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) were added as cosponsors of S. 2417, a bill to provide for payment of proceeds from savings bonds to a State with title to such bonds pursuant to the judgment of a court.

S. 2427

At the request of Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2427, a bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint and issue quarter dollars in commemoration of the 19th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 2570

At the request of Ms. SINEMA, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Mr.

DURBIN), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) and the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) were added as cosponsors of S. 2570, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to Greg LeMond in recognition of his service to the United States as an athlete, activist, role model, and community leader.

S. 2602

At the request of Mr. BURR, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2602, a bill to exclude vehicles to be used solely for competition from certain provisions of the Clean Air Act, and for other purposes.

S. 2661

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2661, a bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to designate 9-8-8 as the universal telephone number for the purpose of the national suicide prevention and mental health crisis hotline system operating through the National Suicide Prevention Lifeline and through the Veterans Crisis Line, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. GARDNER, the names of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) and the Senator from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) were added as cosponsors of S. 2661, *supra*.

S. 2705

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the names of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) were added as cosponsors of S. 2705, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to modify the requirements relating to the use of construction authority in the event of a declaration of war or national emergency, and for other purposes.

S. 2715

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2715, a bill to develop and implement policies to advance early childhood development, to provide assistance for orphans and other vulnerable children in developing countries, and for other purposes.

S. 2743

At the request of Mr. GARDNER, the names of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) were added as cosponsors of S. 2743, a bill to establish the China Censorship Monitor and Action Group, and for other purposes.

S. 2773

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2773, a bill to require non-Federal prison, correctional, and detention facilities holding Federal prisoners or detainees under a contract with the Federal Government to make the same information available to the

public that Federal prisons and correctional facilities are required to make available.

S. 2807

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2807, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve the quality of care furnished by hospice programs under the Medicare program.

S. 2809

At the request of Mr. VAN HOLLEN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2809, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to impose a surtax on high income individuals.

S. 2836

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2836, a bill to prohibit the Secretary of Health and Human Services from taking any action to implement, enforce, or otherwise give effect to the final rule, entitled "Protecting Statutory Conscience Rights in Health Care; Delegations of Authority".

S. 2864

At the request of Ms. SINEMA, the names of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) and the Senator from Georgia (Mrs. LOEFFLER) were added as cosponsors of S. 2864, a bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out a pilot program on information sharing between the Department of Veterans Affairs and designated relatives and friends of veterans regarding the assistance and benefits available to the veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 2881

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2881, a bill to require the Federal Communications Commission to make not less than 280 megahertz of spectrum available for terrestrial use, and for other purposes.

S. 2898

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2898, a bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for a full annuity supplement for certain air traffic controllers.

S. 2950

At the request of Mr. SULLIVAN, the names of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES) were added as cosponsors of S. 2950, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to concede exposure to airborne hazards and toxins from burn pits under certain circumstances, and for other purposes.

S. 2970

At the request of Ms. ERNST, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2970, a bill to improve the fielding of newest generations of personal protec-

tive equipment to the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

S. 2973

At the request of Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2973, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to harmonize the definition of employee with the common law.

S. 2991

At the request of Mr. SULLIVAN, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2991, a bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to conduct an independent review of the deaths of certain veterans by suicide, and for other purposes.

S. 3017

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3017, a bill to increase transparency and accountability with respect to World Bank lending for the People's Republic of China, and for other purposes.

S. 3018

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3018, a bill to require the United States Executive Director of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development to oppose assistance by the Bank for any country that exceeds the graduation threshold of the Bank and is of concern with respect to religious freedom.

S. 3023

At the request of Ms. ERNST, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3023, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize the Director of the National Institutes of Health to make awards to outstanding scientists, including physician-scientists, to support researchers focusing on pediatric research, including basic, clinical, translational, or pediatric pharmacological research, and for other purposes.

S. 3056

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 3056, a bill to designate as wilderness certain Federal portions of the red rock canyons of the Colorado Plateau and the Great Basin Deserts in the State of Utah for the benefit of present and future generations of people in the United States.

S. 3067

At the request of Mrs. CAPITO, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3067, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to combat the opioid crisis by promoting access to non-opioid treatments in the hospital outpatient setting.

S. 3086

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms.

MCSALLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3086, a bill to provide for the conversion of temporary judgeships to permanent judgeships, and for other purposes.

S. 3099

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3099, a bill to provide for the conveyance of certain property to the Southeast Alaska Regional Health Consortium located in Sitka, Alaska, and for other purposes.

S. 3100

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3100, a bill to convey land in Anchorage, Alaska, to the Alaska Native Tribal Health Consortium, and for other purposes.

S. 3139

At the request of Mr. DAINES, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mrs. LOEFFLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3139, a bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to more comprehensively address the interstate transportation of firearms or ammunition.

S. 3167

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3167, a bill to prohibit discrimination based on an individual's texture or style of hair.

S. 3174

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3174, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to the sale and marketing of tobacco products, and for other purposes.

S. 3176

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the names of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. Kaine), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES), the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO), the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) and the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER) were added as cosponsors of S. 3176, a bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and the United States-Israel Strategic Partnership Act of 2014 to make improvements to certain defense and security assistance provisions and to authorize the appropriations of funds to Israel, and for other purposes.

S. 3190

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor

of S. 3190, a bill to authorize dedicated domestic terrorism offices within the Department of Homeland Security, the Department of Justice, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation to analyze and monitor domestic terrorist activity and require the Federal Government to take steps to prevent domestic terrorism.

S. 3206

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 3206, a bill to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to increase voting accessibility for individuals with disabilities and older individuals, and for other purposes.

S. 3217

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3217, a bill to standardize the designation of National Heritage Areas, and for other purposes.

S. 3220

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3220, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to clarify that the provision of home and community-based services is not prohibited in an acute care hospital, and for other purposes.

S.J. RES. 60

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 60, a joint resolution to amend the War Powers Resolution to improve requirements and limitations in connection with authorizations for use of military force and narrowings and repeals of such authorizations, and for other purposes.

S.J. RES. 68

At the request of Ms. HARRIS, her name was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 68, a joint resolution to direct the removal of United States Armed Forces from hostilities against the Islamic Republic of Iran that have not been authorized by Congress.

At the request of Mr. Kaine, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 68, *supra*.

S. CON. RES. 34

At the request of Mr. DAINES, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 34, a concurrent resolution affirming the importance of religious freedom as a fundamental human right that is essential to a free society and protected for all people of the United States under the Constitution of the United States, and recognizing the 234th anniversary of the enactment of the Virginia Statute for Religious Freedom.

S. RES. 234

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr.

BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 234, a resolution affirming the United States commitment to the two-state solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, and noting that Israeli annexation of territory in the West Bank would undermine peace and Israel's future as a Jewish and democratic state.

S. RES. 420

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the names of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 420, a resolution encouraging the President to expand the list of the Department of Veterans Affairs of presumptive medical conditions associated with exposure to Agent Orange to include Parkinsonism, bladder cancer, hypertension, and hypothyroidism.

S. RES. 458

At the request of Mr. LANKFORD, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 458, a resolution calling for the global repeal of blasphemy, heresy, and apostasy laws.

S. RES. 469

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the names of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 469, a resolution supporting the people of Iran as they engage in legitimate protests, and condemning the Iranian regime for its murderous response.

S. RES. 481

At the request of Ms. ROSEN, the names of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES), the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT), the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH), the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. HAWLEY), the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO), the Senator from Utah (Mr. ROMNEY), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. Kaine), the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET), the Senator from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from

Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY), the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN), the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN), the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY), the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 481, a resolution commemorating the 75th anniversary of the liberation of the Auschwitz extermination camp in Nazi-occupied Poland.

At the request of Mr. WARNER, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 481, *supra*.

At the request of Mr. GARDNER, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 481, *supra*.

S. RES. 482

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 482, a resolution supporting the contributions of Catholic schools.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 484—RECOGNIZING JANUARY 27, 2020, AS THE ANNIVERSARY OF THE FIRST REFUGEE AND MUSLIM BAN, CALLING ON CONGRESS TO DEFUND THE MIGRANT PROTECTION PROTOCOLS, AND URGING THE PRESIDENT TO RESTORE REFUGEE RESETTLEMENT TO HISTORIC NORMS

Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. WARREN, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mr. COONS) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 484

Whereas the world is in the midst of the worst global displacement crisis in history, with more than 25,900,000 refugees worldwide, according to United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) estimates;

Whereas UNHCR reports that global resettlement needs have doubled in recent years, reaching over 1,440,000 refugees in 2020;

Whereas the United States Refugee Admissions Program (USRAP) is a life-saving solution critical to global humanitarian efforts, which serves to strengthen global security, leverage United States foreign policy goals, and support regional host countries while serving individuals and families in need;

Whereas the United States has been a global leader in responding to displacement crises around the world and promoting the safety, health, and well-being of refugees and displaced persons;

Whereas refugees are the most vetted travelers to enter the United States and are subject to extensive screening checks, including in-person interviews, biometric data checks, and multiple interagency checks;

Whereas the United States Government leverages resettlement to encourage other countries to keep their doors open to refugees, allow refugee children to attend school, and allow adults to work;

Whereas the USRAP emphasizes early self-sufficiency through employment, and most adult refugees are employed within their first six months of arriving to the United States;

Whereas refugees contribute to their communities by starting businesses, paying taxes, sharing their cultural traditions, and being involved in their neighborhoods, and reports have found that refugees contribute more than they consume in State-funded services—including for schooling and health care;

Whereas, for over 40 years, the United States has resettled up to 200,000 refugees per year, with an average admissions goal of 95,000 refugees per year;

Whereas the United States Government has advocated its leadership by setting a record-low refugee admissions goal in fiscal year 2020 at 18,000;

Whereas, on January 27, 2017, President Donald J. Trump released an executive order banning individuals from seven Muslim-majority countries and all refugees from entering the country;

Whereas, since that time, the President has taken further executive and administrative actions to ban people from Muslim-majority countries and to dismantle the United States refugee program, resulting in significantly lowered capacity and loss of institutional memory and experience in the historically successful USRAP;

Whereas the President issued a Proclamation on November 9, 2018, that wrongfully and illegally blocks people who cross between ports of entry from applying for asylum, and since then has taken further aggressive steps to dismantle the United States asylum system;

Whereas the Department of Homeland Security started implementation of the Migrant Protection Protocols on January 29, 2019, and it has exposed tens of thousands of asylum seekers to torture, kidnapping, trafficking, and exploitation by returning them to dangerous border cities in Mexico;

Whereas the 2018 Department of State country report for Mexico acknowledges serious and targeted risks faced by migrants and asylum seekers in, and transiting through, Mexico, such that it remains an unsafe place for many;

Whereas the United States has returned more than 24,000 asylum seekers alone to Nuevo Laredo and Matamoros, widely recognized as among the most violent cities in the world, located in the state of Tamaulipas, which is the subject of a Department of State “Level 4: Do Not Travel” advisory;

Whereas sending asylum seekers to another country limits and may completely eliminate their opportunity to identify and meet with counsel, thereby lowering their chances of obtaining relief; and

Whereas all individuals seeking asylum in the United States are entitled to due process and access to an attorney: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) reaffirms the United States’ proud history of refugee resettlement and protection of asylum seekers;

(2) recognizes January 27, 2020, as the anniversary of the first refugee and Muslim ban;

(3) reaffirms the strong bipartisan commitment of the United States to promote the safety, health, and well-being of refugees, including through resettlement and the asylum seeking process to the United States for those who cannot return home;

(4) underscores the importance of the United States Refugee Admissions Program and a robust asylum system as critical tools for United States global leadership;

(5) recognizes the profound consequences faced by refugees, asylum seekers, and their families who have been stranded, separated, and scarred by current United States policies, leaving thousands mid-process and more with little hope of protection in the United States; and

(6) calls upon the United States Government—

(A) to resettle a robust number of refugees to meet global need in fiscal years 2020 and 2021 with an emphasis on rebuilding the resettlement program and returning to historic norms;

(B) to operate the program in good faith in an attempt to meet their own stated objectives, restore historic refugee arrivals, improve consultation with Congress, and adhere to the clear congressional intent within the Refugee Act of 1980 (Public Law 96-212);

(C) to ensure that no funds be made available by any Act to implement or enforce the Migrant Protection Protocols announced by the Secretary of Homeland Security on December 20, 2018, or any subsequent revisions to those protocols;

(D) to enact the National Origin-Based Antidiscrimination for Nonimmigrants Act, introduced in the Senate as S.1123 (116th Congress) and in the House of Representatives as H.R.2214 (116th Congress), which would terminate the Muslim, refugee, and asylum bans; and

(E) to recommit to offering freedom to individuals fleeing from persecution and oppression regardless of their country of origin or religious beliefs.

SENATE RESOLUTION 485—RECOGNIZING JANUARY 2020 AS “NATIONAL MENTORING MONTH”

Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. BROWN, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CORNYN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. ERNST, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. JONES, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. PETERS, Mr. REED, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. SMITH, Mr. SULLIVAN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. BARRASSO) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. RES. 485

Whereas the goals of National Mentoring Month are to raise awareness of mentoring, recruit individuals to mentor, celebrate the powerful impact of caring adults who volunteer time for the benefit of young people, and encourage organizations to engage and integrate quality in mentoring into the efforts of the organizations;

Whereas there are young people across the United States who make everyday choices that lead to the big decisions in life without the guidance and support on which many other young people rely;

Whereas a mentor is a caring, consistent presence who devotes time to a young person to help that young person discover personal strength and achieve the potential of that young person;

Whereas quality mentoring encourages positive life and social skills, promotes self-esteem, bolsters academic achievement and college access, supports career exploration, and nurtures youth leadership development;

Whereas mentoring happens in various settings, including community-based programs, elementary and secondary schools, colleges, government agencies, religious institutions, and the workplace, and in various ways, including formal mentoring matches and informal relationships with teachers, coaches, neighbors, faith leaders, and others;

Whereas mentoring programs have been shown to be effective in helping young people make positive choices;

Whereas studies have shown that incorporating culture and heritage into mentoring programs can improve academic outcomes and increases community engagement, especially for Alaskan Native and American Indian youth;

Whereas young people who meet regularly with mentors are 46 percent less likely than peers to start using illegal drugs;

Whereas research shows that young people who were at risk for not completing high school but who had a mentor were, as compared with similarly situated young people without a mentor—

(1) 55 percent more likely to be enrolled in college;

(2) 81 percent more likely to report participating regularly in sports or extracurricular activities;

(3) more than twice as likely to say they held a leadership position in a club or sports team; and

(4) 78 percent more likely to pay it forward by volunteering regularly in the communities of young people;

Whereas students who are chronically absent are more likely to fall behind academically, and mentoring can play a role in helping young people attend school regularly, as research shows that students who meet regularly with a mentor are, as compared with the peers of those students—

(1) 52 percent less likely to skip a full day of school; and

(2) 37 percent less likely to skip a class;

Whereas youth development experts agree that mentoring encourages positive youth development and smart daily behaviors, such as finishing homework and having healthy social interactions, and has a positive impact on the growth and success of a young person;

Whereas mentors help young people set career goals and use the personal contacts of the mentors to help young people meet industry professionals and train for and find jobs;

Whereas each of the benefits of mentors described in this preamble serves to link youth to economic and social opportunity while also strengthening communities in the United States; and

Whereas, despite those described benefits, an estimated 9,000,000 young people in the United States feel isolated from meaningful connections with adults outside the home, constituting a “mentoring gap” that demonstrates a need for collaboration and resources: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes January 2020 as “National Mentoring Month”;

(2) recognizes the caring adults who serve as staff and volunteers at quality mentoring programs and help the young people of the United States find inner strength and reach their full potential;

(3) acknowledges that mentoring is beneficial because mentoring supports educational achievement and self-confidence, supports young people in setting career goals and expanding social capital, reduces juvenile delinquency, improves positive personal, professional, and academic outcomes, and strengthens communities;

(4) promotes the establishment and expansion of quality mentoring programs across

the United States to equip young people with the tools needed to lead healthy and productive lives; and

(5) supports initiatives to close the “mentoring gap” that exists for the many young people in the United States who do not have meaningful connections with adults outside the home.

SENATE RESOLUTION 486—SUPPORTING THE OBSERVATION OF NATIONAL TRAFFICKING AND MODERN SLAVERY PREVENTION MONTH DURING THE PERIOD BEGINNING ON JANUARY 1, 2020, AND ENDING ON FEBRUARY 1, 2020, TO RAISE AWARENESS OF, AND OPPOSITION TO, HUMAN TRAFFICKING AND MODERN SLAVERY

Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. TESTER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. RUBIO, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. TOOMEY, Ms. ERNST, Mr. WYDEN, and Mrs. SHAHEEN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 486

Whereas the United States abolished the transatlantic slave trade in 1808 and abolished chattel slavery and prohibited involuntary servitude in 1865;

Whereas, because the people of the United States remain committed to protecting individual freedom, there is a national imperative to eliminate human trafficking and modern slavery, which is commonly considered to mean—

(1) the recruitment, harboring, transportation, provision, or obtaining of an individual through the use of force, fraud, or coercion for the purpose of subjecting that individual to involuntary servitude, peonage, debt bondage, or slavery; or

(2) the inducement of a commercial sex act by force, fraud, or coercion, or in which the individual induced to perform that act is younger than 18 years of age;

Whereas forced labor and human trafficking generates revenues of approximately \$150,000,000,000 annually worldwide, and there are an estimated 40,000,000 victims of human trafficking across the globe;

Whereas victims of human trafficking are difficult to identify and are subject to manipulation, force, fraud, coercion, and abuse;

Whereas the Department of Justice has reported that human trafficking and modern slavery has been reported and investigated in each of the 50 States and the District of Columbia;

Whereas the Department of State has reported that the top 3 countries of origin of federally identified human trafficking victims in fiscal year 2018 were the United States, Mexico, and the Philippines;

Whereas, to help businesses in the United States combat child labor and forced labor in global supply chains, the Department of Labor has identified 148 goods from 76 countries that are made by child labor and forced labor;

Whereas, since 2007, the National Human Trafficking Hotline has identified nearly 52,000 cases of human trafficking;

Whereas, of the more than 23,500 endangered runaways reported to the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children in 2019, 1 in 6 were likely child sex trafficking victims;

Whereas the Administration for Native Americans of the Department of Health and Human Services reports that American Indian, Alaska Native, and Pacific Islander women and girls have a heightened risk for sex trafficking;

Whereas the Department of Justice found that studies on the topic of human trafficking of American Indians and Alaska Natives suggest there are—

(1) high rates of sexual exploitation of Native women and girls;

(2) gaps in data and research on trafficking of American Indian and Alaska Native victims; and

(3) barriers that prevent law enforcement agencies and victim service providers from identifying and responding appropriately to Native victims;

Whereas, according to the Government Accountability Office, from fiscal year 2013 through fiscal year 2016, there were only 14 Federal investigations and 2 Federal prosecutions of human trafficking offenses in Indian country;

Whereas, to combat human trafficking and modern slavery in the United States and globally, the people of the United States, the Federal Government, and State and local governments must be—

(1) aware of the realities of human trafficking and modern slavery; and

(2) dedicated to stopping the horrific enterprise of human trafficking and modern slavery;

Whereas the United States should hold accountable all individuals, groups, organizations, and countries that support, advance, or commit acts of human trafficking and modern slavery;

Whereas, through education, the United States must also work to end human trafficking and modern slavery in all forms in the United States and around the world;

Whereas victims of human trafficking deserve a trauma-informed approach that integrates the pursuit of justice and provision of social services designed to help them escape, and recover from, the physical, mental, emotional, and spiritual trauma they endured;

Whereas combating human trafficking requires a whole-of-government effort that rests on a unified and coordinated response among Federal, State, and local agencies and that places equal value on the identification and stabilization of victims, as well as the investigation and prosecution of traffickers;

Whereas laws to prosecute perpetrators of human trafficking and to assist and protect victims of human trafficking and modern slavery have been enacted in the United States, including—

(1) the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.);

(2) title XII of the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013 (Public Law 113-4; 127 Stat. 136);

(3) the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act of 2015 (Public Law 114-22; 129 Stat. 227);

(4) sections 910 and 914(e) of the Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act of 2015 (Public Law 114-125; 130 Stat. 239 and 274);

(5) section 1298 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (22 U.S.C. 7114);

(6) the Abolish Human Trafficking Act of 2017 (Public Law 115-392; 132 Stat. 5250);

(7) the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2017 (Public Law 115-393; 132 Stat. 5265);

(8) the Frederick Douglass Trafficking Victims Prevention and Protection Reauthorization Act of 2018 (Public Law 115-425; 132 Stat. 5472); and

(9) the Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2017 (Public Law 115-427; 132 Stat. 5503);

Whereas the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act of 2015 (Public Law 114-22; 129

Stat. 227) established the United States Advisory Council on Human Trafficking to provide a formal platform for survivors of human trafficking to advise and make recommendations on Federal anti-trafficking policies to the Interagency Task Force to Monitor and Combat Trafficking established by the President;

Whereas the Department of Defense, the General Services Administration, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration issued a final rule (80 Fed. Reg. 4967) to implement Executive Order 13627, entitled “Strengthening Protections Against Trafficking in Persons in Federal Contracts”, that clarifies the policy of the United States on combating trafficking in persons as outlined in the Federal Acquisition Regulation by strengthening the prohibition on contractors from charging employee recruitment fees;

Whereas, although such laws and regulations are currently in force, it is essential to increase public awareness, particularly among individuals who are most likely to come into contact with victims of human trafficking and modern slavery, regarding conditions and dynamics of human trafficking and modern slavery precisely because traffickers use techniques that are designed to severely limit self-reporting and evade law enforcement;

Whereas January 1 is the anniversary of the effective date of the Emancipation Proclamation;

Whereas February 1 is—

(1) the anniversary of the date on which President Abraham Lincoln signed the joint resolution sending the 13th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States to the States for ratification to forever declare, “Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude . . . shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction”;

(2) a date that has long been celebrated as National Freedom Day, as described in section 124 of title 36, United States Code; and

Whereas, under the authority of Congress to enforce the 13th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States “by appropriate legislation”, Congress, through the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), updated the post-Civil War involuntary servitude and slavery statutes and adopted an approach of victim protection, vigorous prosecution, and prevention of human trafficking, commonly known as the “3P” approach: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate supports—

(1) observing National Trafficking and Modern Slavery Prevention Month during the period beginning on January 1, 2020, and ending on February 1, 2020, to recognize the vital role that the people of the United States have in ending human trafficking and modern slavery;

(2) marking the observation of National Trafficking and Modern Slavery Prevention Month with appropriate programs and activities, culminating in the observance on February 1, 2020, of National Freedom Day, as described in section 124 of title 36, United States Code;

(3) urging continued partnerships with Federal, State, and local agencies, as well as social service providers and nonprofit organizations to address human trafficking with a collaborative, victim-centered approach; and

(4) all other efforts to prevent, eradicate, and raise awareness of, and opposition to, human trafficking and modern slavery.

SENATE RESOLUTION 487—SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF COUNTERING INTERNATIONAL PARENTAL CHILD ABDUCTION MONTH AND EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT CONGRESS SHOULD RAISE AWARENESS OF THE HARM CAUSED BY INTERNATIONAL PARENTAL CHILD ABDUCTION

Mr. TILLIS (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. CRAPO, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. CORNYN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mr. MARKEY) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 487

Whereas thousands of children in the United States have been abducted from the United States by parents, separating those children from their parents who remain in the United States;

Whereas it is illegal under section 1204 of title 18, United States Code, to remove, or attempt to remove, a child from the United States or retain a child (who has been in the United States) outside of the United States with the intent to obstruct the lawful exercise of parental rights;

Whereas more than 11,500 children were reported abducted from the United States between 2008 and 2018;

Whereas, during 2018, 1 or more cases of international parental child abduction involving children who are citizens of the United States were identified in 107 countries around the world;

Whereas the United States is a party to the Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction, done at The Hague, October 25, 1980 (TIAS 11670) (referred to in this preamble as the “Hague Convention on Abduction”), which—

(1) supports the prompt return of wrongly removed or retained children; and

(2) calls for all participating parties to respect parental custody rights;

Whereas the majority of children who were abducted from the United States have yet to be reunited with their custodial parents;

Whereas, during 2018, Argentina, Brazil, Ecuador, Egypt, India, Jordan, Lebanon, Peru, and the United Arab Emirates were identified under the Sean and David Goldman International Child Abduction Prevention and Return Act of 2014 (22 U.S.C. 9101 et seq.) as engaging in a pattern of noncompliance (as defined in section 3 of that Act (22 U.S.C. 9101));

Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States has recognized that family abduction—

(1) is a form of child abuse with potentially “devastating consequences for a child”, which may include negative impacts on the physical and mental well-being of the child; and

(2) can cause a child to “experience a loss of community and stability, leading to loneliness, anger, and fear of abandonment”;

Whereas, according to the 2010 Report on Compliance with the Hague Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction by the Department of State, research shows that an abducted child is at risk of significant short- and long-term problems, including “anxiety, eating problems, nightmares, mood swings, sleep disturbances, [and] aggressive behavior”;

Whereas international parental child abduction has devastating emotional consequences for the child and for the parent from whom the child is separated;

Whereas the United States has a history of promoting child welfare through institutions including—

(1) in the Department of Health and Human Services, the Children’s Bureau of the Administration for Children and Families; and

(2) in the Department of State, the Office of Children’s Issues of the Bureau of Consular Affairs;

Whereas Congress has signaled a commitment to ending international parental child abduction by enacting the International Child Abduction Remedies Act (22 U.S.C. 9001 et seq.), the International Parental Kidnapping Crime Act of 1993 (Public Law 103-173), which enacted section 1204 of title 18, United States Code, and the Sean and David Goldman International Child Abduction Prevention and Return Act of 2014 (22 U.S.C. 9101 et seq.);

Whereas the Senate adopted Senate Resolution 543, 112th Congress, on December 4, 2012, condemning the international abduction of children;

Whereas the Senate adopted Senate Resolution 431, 115th Congress, on April 19, 2018, to raise awareness of, and opposition to, international parental child abduction;

Whereas all 50 States and the District of Columbia have enacted laws criminalizing parental kidnapping;

Whereas, in 2018, the Prevention Branch of the Office of Children’s Issues of the Department of State—

(1) fielded more than 5,200 inquiries from the general public relating to preventing a child from being removed from the United States; and

(2) enrolled more than 4,700 children in the Children’s Passport Issuance Alert Program, which—

(A) is one of the most important tools of the Department of State for preventing international parental child abductions; and

(B) allows the Office of Children’s Issues to contact the enrolling parent or legal guardian to verify whether the parental consent requirement has been met when a passport application has been submitted for an enrolled child;

Whereas the Department of State cannot track the ultimate destination of a child through the use of the passport of the child issued by the Department of State if the child is transported to a third country after departing from the United States;

Whereas a child who is a citizen of the United States may have another nationality and may travel using a passport issued by another country, which—

(1) increases the difficulty in determining the whereabouts of the child; and

(2) makes efforts to prevent abductions more critical;

Whereas, during 2018, 232 children were returned to the United States and an additional 174 cases were resolved in other ways; and

Whereas, in 2018, the Department of Homeland Security, in coordination with the Prevention Branch of the Office of Children’s Issues of the Department of State, enrolled 236 children in a program aimed at preventing international parental child abduction: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes and observes “Countering International Parental Child Abduction Month” during the period beginning on April 1, 2020, and ending on April 30, 2020, to raise awareness of, and opposition to, international parental child abduction; and

(2) urges the United States to continue playing a leadership role in raising awareness about the devastating impacts of international parental child abduction by educating the public about the negative emotional, psychological, and physical consequences to children and parents victimized by international parental child abduction.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 35—PROVIDING FOR A JOINT HEARING OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET OF THE SENATE AND THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES TO RECEIVE A PRESENTATION FROM THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES REGARDING THE AUDITED FINANCIAL STATEMENT OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH

Ms. SINEMA (for herself, Ms. ERNST, Ms. ROSEN, and Mr. KING) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Budget:

S. CON. RES. 35

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring),

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This resolution may be cited as the “Fiscal State of the Nation Resolution”.

SEC. 2. ANNUAL JOINT HEARING OF BUDGET COMMITTEES TO RECEIVE A PRESENTATION BY THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 45 days (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays) after the date on which the Secretary of the Treasury submits to Congress the audited financial statement required under paragraph (1) of section 331(e) of title 31, United States Code, on a date agreed upon by the chairmen of the Budget Committees and the Comptroller General of the United States, the chairmen shall conduct a joint hearing to receive a presentation from the Comptroller General—

(1) reviewing the findings of the audit required under paragraph (2) of such section; and

(2) providing, with respect to the information included by the Secretary in the report accompanying such audited financial statement, an analysis of the financial position

and condition of the Federal Government, including financial measures (such as the net operating cost, income, budget deficits, or budget surpluses) and sustainability measures (such as the long-term fiscal projection or social insurance projection) described in such report.

(b) PRESENTATION OF STATEMENT IN ACCORDANCE WITH GAO STRATEGIES AND MEANS.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall ensure that the presentation at each joint hearing conducted under subsection (a) is made in accordance with the Strategies and Means of the Government Accountability Office, to ensure that the presentation will provide professional, objective, fact-based, nonpartisan, nonideological, fair, and balanced information to the Members attending the hearing.

(c) RULES APPLICABLE TO HEARING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Each joint hearing conducted by the chairmen of Budget Committees under subsection (a) shall be conducted in accordance with Standing Rules of the Senate and the Rules of the House of Representatives which apply to such a hearing, including the provisions requiring hearings conducted by committees to be open to the public, including to radio, television, and still photography coverage.

(2) PERMITTING PARTICIPATION BY SENATORS AND MEMBERS NOT SERVING ON BUDGET COMMITTEES.—Notwithstanding any provision of the Standing Rules of the Senate or the Rules of the House of Representatives, any Senator and any Member of the House of Representatives (including a Delegate or Resident Commissioner to the Congress) may participate in a joint hearing under subsection (a) in the same manner and to the same extent as a Senator or Member of the House of Representatives who is a member of either of the Budget Committees.

(d) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term “Budget Committees” means the Committee on the Budget of the Senate and the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The requirement under subsection (a) shall apply with respect to any audited financial statement under section 331(e)(1) of title 31, United States Code, submitted on or after the date of adoption of this resolution.

**ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 1 P.M.
TOMORROW**

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chief Justice, I ask unanimous consent that the trial

adjourn until 1 p.m., Wednesday, January 29, and that this order also constitute the adjournment of the Senate.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 2:54 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, January 29, 2020, at 1 p.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

CHARLES A. STONES, OF KANSAS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE FEDERAL AGRICULTURAL MORTGAGE CORPORATION, VICE BRUCE J. SHERRICK.

SECURITIES INVESTOR PROTECTION CORPORATION

THOMAS M. MISTELE, OF FLORIDA, TO BE A DIRECTOR OF THE SECURITIES INVESTOR PROTECTION CORPORATION FOR A TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 31, 2022, VICE GREGORY KARAWAN, TERM EXPIRED.

FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

JUDY SHELTON, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM FOR THE UNEXPIRED TERM OF FOURTEEN YEARS FROM FEBRUARY 1, 2010, VICE JANET L. YELLEN, RESIGNED.

CHRISTOPHER WALLER, OF MINNESOTA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM FOR A TERM OF FOURTEEN YEARS FROM FEBRUARY 1, 2016, VICE SARAH BLOOM RASKIN, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

FINCH FULTON, OF ALABAMA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION, VICE CARLOS A. MONJE, JR.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

JOHN CHASE JOHNSON, OF OKLAHOMA, TO BE INSPECTOR GENERAL, FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION, (NEW POSITION)

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

WILLIAM ELLISON GRAYSON, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF ESTONIA.

UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

JENNY A. MCGEE, OF TEXAS, TO BE AN ASSOCIATE ADMINISTRATOR OF THE UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT, VICE R. DAVID HARDEN.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

JULIE ELIZABETH HOCKER, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF LABOR, VICE KATHLEEN MARTINEZ, RESIGNED.

UNITED STATES PAROLE COMMISSION

ALMO J. CARTER, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE A COMMISSIONER OF THE UNITED STATES PAROLE COMMISSION FOR A TERM OF SIX YEARS, VICE CRANSTON J. MITCHELL, TERM EXPIRED.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

IN REMEMBRANCE OF CHRIS
ALLEN

HON. RICHARD E. NEAL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 2020

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to offer my condolences to the family and friends of Chris Allen, a valued member of the Senate Finance Committee staff. Chris was a leader on an issue that is of particular importance to me, retirement security. Chris will always be remembered for his tireless work ensuring the solvency of the pensions of thousands of workers in multiemployer pensions—and his leadership in making it easier for Americans to save for retirement in the SECURE Act.

An alum of Loyola College in Maryland and Johns Hopkins University, he worked on pension and benefit issues and exempt organization issues for the Senate Finance Committee, under both Chairmen CHUCK GRASSLEY and Orrin Hatch. Before he joined the Finance Committee, he worked as a senior economic policy adviser for Senator PAT ROBERTS. And before that, he worked as a consultant and advisor for various groups, including the Financial Accounting Foundation and the National Association of State Treasurers.

Widely known and widely liked, Chris will be remembered for his dedication, his passion, his candor and his sense of humor. His was a warm presence that lightened the tone of meetings and briefings. And he worked hard for what he believed in.

Not just widely known and widely liked, Chris will also be widely missed. We hold in our hearts those closest to Chris, especially his wife Lynda, his daughters Sophie and Lucie, and the rest of his family and friends.

I send my deepest sympathies to the Allen family, to his friends, and to Senator GRASSLEY and to our other colleagues in the Senate, and I ask my colleagues to do the same.

HONORING DYLAN COOK

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 2020

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Madam Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Dylan Cook. Dylan is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 135, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Dylan has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Dylan has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Dylan has contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project.

Madam Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Dylan Cook for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

RECOGNIZING FRANK AND
BELINDA VANDERSLOOT

HON. MICHAEL K. SIMPSON

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 2020

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Frank and Belinda VanderSloot for receiving the 2020 Alturas Institute John and Abigail Adams Award in recognition of their commitment to service and equal protection under the law.

Frank and Belinda VanderSloot have dedicated their time, talents and treasures to the betterment of our world.

When disaster strikes and the world wonders what can be done, the VanderSloots act. Donated trucks, planes, and cargo ships stocked with lifesaving supplies act as an answer to prayers for those whose lives have been turned upside down by natural disaster.

Thanks to their incredible partnership with the American Red Cross and the Salvation Army countless lives have been blessed and lives have literally been saved.

The list of their philanthropy is lengthy, from sponsoring an orphanage in Ecuador or the renovation and donation of a school in Idaho Falls. Family farms have been saved, business have flourished, and scholarships granted all because the VanderSloots choose to act.

Most recently Frank and Belinda have added to their legacy assisting hundreds of people who find themselves in the jaws of overly aggressive medical debt collectors. In establishing a one-million-dollar defense fund, they have given a voice to the voiceless.

Madam Speaker, Frank and Belinda VanderSloot give because of the goodness of their hearts, not for applause or accolades; which is why I stand today to congratulate them on receiving the 2020 Alturas Institute John and Abigail Adams Award and to thank them for 'enhancing lives and doing good where good is needed'.

HONORING DOMINIC & ADI WADE
FOR RECEIVING THE FULTON
MONTGOMERY REGIONAL CHAMBER
OF COMMERCE CHAMBER
FAMILY AWARD

HON. ELISE M. STEFANIK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 2020

Ms. STEFANIK. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Dominic & Adi Wade for receiving the Fulton Montgomery Regional Chamber of Commerce Chamber Family Award.

ing the Fulton Montgomery Regional Chamber of Commerce Chamber Family Award.

Dominic and Adi Wade, builders of Amsterdam's new shopping plaza, Southside Square, have created a wonderful selection of businesses near the Route 5 corridor. The Square now includes a range of small and medium size businesses that greatly benefit the surrounding area. These businesses include Pleasant Cleaners, Southside Beverage, Bourbon Street Wine and Liquor, and DomAdi's Deli. Dominic and Adi Wade established Bourbon Street and DomAdi's Deli themselves, both of which are thriving under their great leadership. The availability of adequate commercial real estate is vital to the economic wellbeing of a community, and the North Country has greatly benefited from the Wade's contributions.

Dominic and Adi Wade have made a lasting positive impact on the vitality of their community, providing much needed investment to the area. On behalf of New York's 21st District, I would like to congratulate the Wade Family for this well-deserved recognition. I look forward to their future success.

REMEMBERING THE LEGACY OF
COACH MARC STRINGER

HON. BRUCE WESTERMAN

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 2020

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to remember the incredible legacy of Coach Marc Stringer of White Hall, Arkansas. A longtime coach of basketball and football at White Hall High School, Mr. Stringer lost his battle with cancer several days ago.

Coach Stringer and his family have been longtime residents of Arkansas' Fourth District, and their story serves as a testimony of service to our fellow man and of dedication to seeing future generations succeed.

Coach Stringer coached for nine years, battling cancer for the last three. According to the faculty and students of White Hall School District, Coach Stringer was a "good coach, but an even better person." His dedication to students showed not only in his coaching ability, but also in his creation of Endure the Dirt Adventure Race and Personal Pep Rally, which awards scholarships to students whose families are facing a battle with cancer.

Coach Stringer was also awarded the Norm Stewart Legacy Award in 2018 at the Coaches vs. Cancer Program and the Arkansas Basketball Coaches Association PGC Transformational Coach Award for his perseverance throughout his health struggles.

I'm honored to recognize Coach Stringer's servant leadership and his legacy of endurance in adversity. My prayers are with his family as they mourn his loss.

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

HONORING DALTON SCOTT RIPLEY

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 2020

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Madam Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Dalton Scott Ripley. Dalton is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 120, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Dalton has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Dalton has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Dalton has contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project. Dalton raised the funds and placed a granite bench in the Veterans Memorial Plaza at the Livingston County Courthouse.

Madam Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Dalton Scott Ripley for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

ADVANCING RESEARCH TO PREVENT SUICIDE ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 27, 2020

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4704, which advances the knowledge and understanding of issues that may be associated with several aspects of suicide, including intrinsic and extrinsic factors related to wellbeing, resilience, and vulnerability.

The bill directs the National Science Foundation (NSF) to provide for additional multidisciplinary research on the science of suicide.

The fundamental research done by the NSF includes but is not limited to basic understanding of human social behavior, the neutral basis of human cognition, the basic understanding of cognitive, linguistic, social, cultural and biological processes related to human development across the lifespan, the basic understanding of perceptual, motor, and cognitive process, and their interaction in typical human behavior; and the basic understanding of the relevance of drug and alcohol abuse.

The rate of Americans dying by suicide is on the rise, increasing from 10.7 to 14 deaths per 100,000 people from 2001 to 2017.

In the UK, the rate of death by suicide per 100,000 people is 11.2, in Canada, 11.3, and in Japan, 14.3.

In 2019, the number of deaths per 100,000 people by suicide in Texas was 13.8, which is relatively high compared to the national high of 14.

Suicide among seniors over the age of 85 in Texas is the highest, with a rate of 19.2 deaths per 100,000 people.

In 2017, there were an estimated 1.4 million suicide attempts and more than 47,000 deaths by suicide nationwide.

Currently, suicide is the tenth-leading cause of death among people in the United States and the second-leading cause of death for young people between the ages of 15 and 34.

Societal costs including lifetime medical care and lost work costs associated with suicide are estimated at \$70 billion.

Ninety percent of all people who died by suicide in Harris County were suffering from a mental illness at the time, most often depression.

The NSF funds will support research that can improve our basic understanding of factors with potential relevance to suicide, including prevention and treatment.

The rate of suicide is far too high in the United States and we must be more aware of the issue in order to take preventative action.

I ask my colleagues from both sides of the aisle to join me in voting in support of H.R. 4704.

RECOGNIZING DR. THERESA FLOYD, PH.D.**HON. BILL POSEY**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 2020

Mr. POSEY. Madam Speaker, in honor of Black History Month, I rise today in recognition of Dr. Theresa Floyd, an African American Pioneer and outstanding constituent, who has devoted her life to promoting the importance of faith, family and community in our district.

As an educator, mentor, dedicated volunteer, wife of 54 years, and a mom to seven kids, Dr. Floyd has worn many important hats in our community. Her strong faith-based foundation can be attributed to her time at Jacksonville Theological Seminary, where she earned her Bachelor's, Master's and Doctoral degrees. During her education, she served as a role model and counselor for many students who went on to graduate and give back to our community.

Dr. Floyd founded the New Hope Pentecostal Church in Orange Park Florida, where she served the church in many capacities such as Executive Administrator, Board Member, Evangelist, Deaconess and even Choir Director. Her leadership in Orange Park was well regarded by her peers, eventually serving as a town councilmember, school counselor, teacher, and canvassing board member. Ultimately, she and her family were recognized as the Most Outstanding Black Family in the Town of Orange Park.

Currently Dr. Floyd acts as Pastor and Chief Executive of Faith and Deliverance Ministry in Vero Beach. In her role, she provides mentorship and guidance to those suffering from addiction, and helps those who need food and shelter. A true humanitarian, she is always putting others before herself.

The contributions that Dr. Floyd has made to Indian River County are immeasurable and will be felt for generations to come. We are grateful to her for her spiritual works and unwavering altruism, that have made the Treasure Coast a better place for all families to enjoy.

On Tuesday, February 18th, 2020, the Indian River County Board of Commissioners will honor Dr. Floyd's service to our community in celebration of Black History Month. The

Board is dedicated to celebrating African American pioneers in the community such as Dr. Floyd, who have paved the way for future generations.

I ask my colleagues of the U.S. House of Representatives to join me in recognizing Dr. Floyd's service to residents and families across our district, and her continued devotion to making our community a better place.

HONORING CITY OF COACHELLA FIRE DEPARTMENT CAPTAIN MARCOS MACHUCA**HON. RAUL RUIZ**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 2020

Mr. RUIZ. Madam Speaker, I rise to honor my constituent, City of Coachella Fire Department Captain Marcos Machuca, for his years of service to California's 36th Congressional District. After 42 years of exceptional service to our communities, Captain Machuca retired on November 30, 2019.

Captain Machuca fulfilled his childhood dream to serve his community when he joined the City of Coachella Fire Department in 1977. Over his decades' long career, he accumulated a wealth of leadership experience and made a difference in the lives of our friends, families, and neighbors.

Every day, Captain Machuca answered the call to defend our community. For example, when a semi-tractor caught fire in Oasis, he rescued the driver from his truck before it engulfed in flames. This is just one instance of how Captain Machuca's bravery saved a life and prevented tragedy.

Captain Machuca is more than a courageous first responder—he is also a skilled educator. As Fire Captain, he has instilled valuable lessons in the young firefighters he mentored, and he played a key role in growing Coachella's volunteer force.

As a two-time recipient of the Firefighter of the Year award, Captain Machuca exemplifies the qualities of our community's firefighters who work tirelessly to keep us safe. His selflessness, courage, and dedication to public service are inspiring, and his legacy will be felt in Coachella for years to come.

On behalf of our entire community, I thank Captain Machuca for his exceptional service and congratulate him on his well-deserved retirement.

HONORING ABRAM STUART**HON. SAM GRAVES**

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 2020

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Madam Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Abram Stuart. Abram is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 135, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Abram has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Abram has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous

merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Abram has contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project.

Madam Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Abram Stuart for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. DAVID P. ROE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 2020

Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, on January 27, 2020, I was unable to vote because I attended the funeral of a close friend.

Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 23, and YEA on Roll Call No. 24.

HONORING HANEHAN FAMILY DAIRY FOR RECEIVING THE NEW YORK STATE AGRICULTURAL SOCIETY'S NEXT GENERATION FARMER AWARD

HON. ELISE M. STEFANIK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 2020

Ms. STEFANIK. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Hanehan Family Dairy for receiving the New York State Agricultural Society's Next Generation Farmer Award. The NYS Agricultural Society honors established producers and industry newcomers who are farming in new and vibrant ways with the Next Generation Farmer Award. For NY agriculture to continue to be successful, the next generation of innovative farmers are needed to work the land, plant crops, raise livestock and feed our global population. The Hanehan family has diversified their business to remain competitive, while continuing their tradition and passing their successful business onto the next generation.

Hanehan Family Dairy maintains two farms in Mount Upton and Saratoga Springs. Upon returning from service in World War II, Edward Hanehan purchased the farm next door to the one that he grew up on. Today, his descendants include his three sons, 11 grandchildren and 19 great-grandchildren. Edward's sons, Charlie, Cliff, and Dave, currently run both farms and several of their children are working their way into the family business as partners, carrying on the agricultural tradition. In addition to their core business of dairy, they also breed livestock and grow pumpkins, raising around eight acres at each farm.

Agriculture is an essential component of the economy in Northern New York and Hanehan Family Dairy exemplifies the quality and diversity of North Country farms. On behalf of New York's 21st district, I would like to congratulate the entire Hanehan family for this well-deserved recognition. I look forward to their future success.

SUPPORTING VETERANS IN STEM CAREERS ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 27, 2020

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, as a senior member of the House Judiciary Committee and the Committee on Homeland Security, I rise in strong support of S. 153, the "Supporting Veterans in STEM Careers Act."

It is with the great sacrifice of the men and women, who have served in our armed forces and protected our freedom in mind that I urge members on both sides of the aisle to vote in favor this bill.

We often hear about the many difficulties veterans face while attempting to transition back to civilian life.

From physical and mental trauma to unemployment to the struggles associated with re-familiarizing themselves with civilian life, veterans face many obstacles in life after service.

With respect to employment, nearly one-third of veteran job seekers are underemployed, which is 15.6 percent higher than non-veteran job seekers.

In addition, the Texas Workforce Investment Council reported that in 2017, 35,734 veterans remained unemployed.

In 2019, LinkedIn published its Veteran's Opportunity Report, which stated that veterans who had degrees as well as four or more years of experience were less likely to land the job than less-experienced civilians who applied for the same role.

I am voting in favor of S. 153 because it seeks to address that barrier by encouraging veterans to study and pursue rewarding careers in science, technology, engineering, and math as well as by creating an interagency working group.

This group is tasked with coordinating federal programs for transitioning and training veterans for STEM careers.

By facilitating this process, veterans will be able to have a meaningful career that utilizes their skillsets and secures their livelihood.

In addition, S. 153 will result in filling thousands of open positions and contribute to growing our economy.

Today, STEM careers are growing at an unprecedented rate.

Texas is home to more than three-quarters of a million great STEM jobs.

In fact, Texas is expected to represent nearly 10 percent of future STEM opportunities in the nation.

According to a study by Syracuse University in 2018, Texas possesses the largest percentages of veterans working in the STEM workforce.

At the state-level, 9 percent of veterans work in STEM.

Yet, the report states that 18.66 percent of veterans in Houston are employed in STEM.

Throughout my tenure in Congress, I have strongly supported veterans.

With that in mind, I authored and introduced the "Helping to Encourage Real Opportunity for Veterans Transitioning from Battlespace to Workplace Act", or the HEROES Act, in previous congresses.

Through my advocacy work with veterans, I have come to understand that one of the

greatest barriers to entry for veterans seeking employment is that civilian employers do not adequately understand how the skills, experience, and training of veterans can contribute in the private sector.

In an effort to address this problem, the HEROES Act creates a Military Skills Translator Database to remove that obstacle and better incorporate veterans into the workforce, especially in fields like STEM.

I strongly believe that we must come together and address the barriers that prevent veterans from re-entering the workforce.

It is imperative that we, the American people, continuously recognize the sacrifices these men and women have made to ensure our freedom and safety.

We must take it upon ourselves to try and ease the burdensome transition that thousands of veterans' experience.

And so, I ask all members from both parties to join me in voting to pass S. 153.

HONORING BRADEN TONKS

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 2020

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Madam Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Braden Tonks. Braden is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 135, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Braden has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Braden has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Braden has contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project.

Madam Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Braden Tonks for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. TRENT KELLY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 2020

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Madam Speaker, I was unable to vote on January 27, 2020 due to National Guard obligations. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 23, and YEA on Roll Call No. 24.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF PETRA RUIZ OF COACHELLA VALLEY

HON. RAUL RUIZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 2020

Mr. RUIZ. Madam Speaker, I rise today to tell the Nation about the life and legacy of Petra Ruiz of the Coachella Valley.

Petra Ruiz was an organizer, activist, and leader who used her life to stand up for farmworking women across California.

As the son of farmworkers in the eastern Coachella Valley, I am all too familiar with the social, economic, and political hardships the farmworking community faces on a daily basis. The struggles can often be so great that you have to have someone or something to look to for inspiration. For me, and for so many of us in the Coachella Valley, Petra Ruiz was one such inspiration.

Petra was a fierce and loving leader who was held in high esteem, even by the people who didn't agree with what she had to say. But it was hard not to agree with what she had to say. You see, Petra believed in helping farmworking women across California advocate for themselves, for their families, and for their communities in the struggle for equality and their basic human rights.

Petra got involved in the union movement in the 1970s and was a warrior for justice and equality within the farmworking community through her final days.

A phrase that I have heard repeatedly in talking with members of the community and with her family is "she was always there." Petra was always there.

Even as a mother and a grandmother to a big family, she worked with the United Farm Workers of America to advocate for the rights of the farmworker community. Petra led marches; she attended meetings; she would even go door-to-door with flyers making sure that farmworkers knew their rights.

Petra was a remarkable woman, revered, admired, a mover and shaker, an effective leader who led with her actions as much as she did by her words. She inspired me to never say no to my dreams, to pursue justice at every turn, and to always believe I could make a difference.

Madam Speaker, while she is missed dearly, Petra's legacy didn't end with her passing. Her impact is felt today and will continue in the lives of generations to come.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 2020

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Madam Speaker, on January 27, 2020, I was unable to be present for the recorded votes on roll call no. 23 and 24. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on the motion to suspend the rules and pass, as amended H.R. 943, the Never Again Education Act, and YEA on the motion to suspend the rules and pass, as amended H.R. 4704, the Advancing Research to Prevent Suicide Act.

HONORING JACOB WOOTTON

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 2020

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Madam Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Jacob Wootton. Jacob is a very special young man who has

exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 135, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Jacob has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Jacob has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Jacob has contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project.

Madam Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Jacob Wootton for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

CELEBRATING THE FOUNDING OF COMMONWEALTH OF FAITH CHURCH

HON. RASHIDA TLAIB

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 2020

Ms. TLAIB. Madam Speaker, I rise today in tribute to Commonwealth of Faith Church as they put down their roots in Redford Township, Michigan.

Under the leadership of Pastor Torion Bridges, like-minded community members came together with the common goal of establishing a multi-generational house of worship to serve the spiritual needs of the surrounding community. They were able to establish a brand-new congregation by relighting the lamps of the building formerly home to St. Robert of Bellarmine Church. This group of people have sought to breathe new life into an existing building and work to bring a diverse group of people together in community service and in faith.

Please join me in recognizing Commonwealth of Faith Church as they establish their spiritual community and teachings, and become rooted in Redford.

HONORING MR. KEN ARMSTRONG FOR HIS YEARS OF SERVICE WITH THE BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA

HON. BRUCE WESTERMAN

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 2020

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. Ken Armstrong for his years of dedicated service to the Boy Scouts of America, specifically Troop ONE in Hot Springs, Arkansas.

First Presbyterian Church of Hot Springs chartered Troop ONE in 1923, making it the oldest continuously chartered chapter in the State of Arkansas. Mr. Armstrong's own career with Troop ONE began in 1994 and continued for another 25 years after he was named Scoutmaster for the troop in 1998. He will be retiring on February 9, 2020 after 21 years as the Scoutmaster for Troop ONE.

With more than 40 years of service as both a youth scout and as a Scoutmaster in Arkansas and Texas, Mr. Armstrong was also

awarded the Silver Beaver Award last year in recognition of his lifelong service in leadership. He remains a respected mentor and resource to countless young people in the Fourth District.

I'd like to thank Mr. Armstrong for his years of dedicated service and for his commitment to ensuring a brighter future for young people of the Fourth District of Arkansas.

NEVER AGAIN EDUCATION ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 27, 2020

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 943, "Never Again Education Act," which requires the creation of the Holocaust Education Assistance Program Fund for the Department of Education.

The fund will award grants to qualified entities to implement Holocaust education programs and host a series of regional workshops to provide teachers with assistance on how to incorporate Holocaust education into standard teaching while meeting state and local education requirements.

The establishment of the Holocaust Education Advisory Board to prepare application criteria for grant recipients, and the formulation of the Holocaust education program website will allow for a regulated, definitive introduction of this curriculum.

Holocaust Remembrance Day, January 27, is an international memorial day that marks the liberation of the Auschwitz-Birkenau death camps in January 1945.

In addition to the Auschwitz-Birkenau camp, we must also remember the victims of the Belzec, Bergen-Belsen, Buchenwald, Chelmno, Dachau, Dora-Mittelbau, Flossenburg, Gross-Rosen, Janowska, Kaiserwald, Majdanek, Mauthausen, Natzweiler-Struthof, Neuengamme, Oranienburg, Plaszow, Ravensbruck, Sachsenhausen, Sobibor, Stutthof, Terezin, Treblinka and Westerbork concentration camps.

The United States Holocaust Memorial Museum states that the extermination by the Nazi regime and its allies led to the deaths of 6 million Jews.

In addition to the millions of deaths within the Jewish community, the Third Reich separately targeted and murdered many other communities and ethnic groups, some estimates range from an additional 3 million to 11 million deaths.

These deaths include members of the LGBTQ community, the physically and mentally disabled, Freemasons, Jehovah's Witnesses, the Romani, Poles, Serbians, Spanish Republicans, members of the Soviet Union, Soviet Prisoners of War, people of Slavic descent, Germans of African descent, Communists, Socialists and more.

After Adolf Hitler's invasion of Poland on September 1, 1939, France and Britain declared war on Germany, officially beginning World War II.

World War II lasted from 1939 to 1945 and caused about 75 million deaths, including members of the military and civilians, around 3 percent of the world's population at the time.

Almost 75 years have passed since the end of World War II, but the aftermath is still a reminder of a brutal and merciless era of history

where racism and prejudice were unleashed on a grand scale seeking to quench the rights of man.

The United States Holocaust Memorial Museum reports that its Registry of Holocaust Survivors currently contains the names of over 195,000 survivors and family members.

In 1981, Holocaust survivor and Houston resident Siegi Izakson had the inspiration to create an education center and memorial to preserve the memory of those who perished, the stories of those who survived and to educate the public about the threats of prejudice and hatred in society.

Thanks to Siegi Izakson's tireless dedication, the Holocaust Museum Houston opened on March 3, 1996 and is fully bilingual in English and Spanish, contains a welcome center, multiple galleries, a research library, indoor theater, outdoor amphitheater and interactive terminals with doors open to 130,000 visitors per year.

In the United States, there are over 50 Holocaust museums and memorials dedicated to educating people about the dangers of hatred and genocide, protecting democratic values and preventing antisemitism.

In June 2019, Texas enacted S. Bill 1828, requiring that Texas schools include age appropriate instruction concerning the Holocaust for grades kindergarten through 12.

The Texas Holocaust and Genocide Commission has worked with Texas government agencies to adopt new educational standards that approach the Holocaust, genocide and mass murders.

Texas students will learn about these topics in their World Geography Studies, World History Studies, and United States History Studies Since 1877 courses.

I support this bill because it will enhance the quality of our students' education and provide them with an authentic understanding of this dark and complex chapter in world history.

The creation of the Holocaust Education Assistance Program Fund for the Department of Education will only improve the knowledge provided to our children.

The Holocaust Education Assistance Program Fund for the Department of Education will award grants to eligible entities to create Holocaust education program and conduct workshops with teachers on how to include this information along with students' normal educational programs.

The Department of Education will maintain a Holocaust education program website with resources for middle and high school students, establish the Holocaust Education Advisory Board to develop criteria for the fund's grants, and decide on content for the Holocaust education program website and lead efforts to promote donations for the fund.

The Holocaust requires us to remember the magnitude with which antisemitism, racism, Nazism and fascism destroyed millions of lives, as well as consider the consequences of apathy and passivity.

I ask my colleagues from both sides of the aisle to vote in support of H.R. 943.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. FILEMON VELA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 2020

Mr. VELA. Madam Speaker, I left the House chamber without casting my vote on the last measure of the evening. Had I been present, I would have voted AYE on H.R. 4704 Advancing Research to Prevent Suicide Act.

CELEBRATING THE 75TH BIRTHDAY OF DOUGLAS DILLARD

HON. RASHIDA TLAIB

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 2020

Ms. TLAIB. Madam Speaker, I rise today in honor of Mr. Douglas Dillard, a long-time resident of Detroit, Michigan, who celebrates his seventy-fifth birthday this year.

Mr. Dillard was born February 2, 1945, the second of seven children born to the late Christopher and Virginia Dillard. He is proud graduate of historical Detroit Northwestern High School, class of 1963. Mr. Dillard earned a Computer Science and Industrial Management degree from Detroit Institute of Technology.

After graduating, Mr. Dillard worked as a designer for Ford Motor Company Body Engineering, a career that spanned twenty-seven years. In his free time, Mr. Dillard was an enthusiastic softball player. He garnered numerous awards, including many All Stars and Most Valuable Player awards. Mr. Dillard has also participated in the Huntsman World Senior Games and has been inducted into its Hall of Fame. He currently operates Gray Street Housing. He enjoys his time spent with his wife Gloria and their three grown children.

Please join me in celebrating Mr. Douglas Dillard's seventy-fifth birthday.

RECOGNIZING INTERNATIONAL HOLOCAUST REMEMBRANCE DAY 2020

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 2020

Mr. CONNOLLY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the International Day of Remembrance of the Holocaust. The United Nations General Assembly designated January 27 as this remembrance day to inspire reflection on the events that led to the execution of more than six million Jews and countless other oppressed communities.

This year marks the 75th anniversary of the liberation of the Auschwitz-Birkenau Nazi death camp, which I visited in August 2018. This complex is most notorious for its horrific death toll, resulting in more than 1.1 million deaths in its few years of operation. To describe the inhumanity observed in Auschwitz and other camps, Holocaust survivor Lilly Appelbaum Malnik stated the following:

"And they said, 'From now on you do not answer by your name. Your name is your

number.' And the delusion, the disappointment, the discouragement that I felt, I felt like I was not a human person anymore."

We must never forget the victims of the Holocaust and never cease working towards a more just society. Within 25 years, it is likely no Holocaust survivor will be alive to account for the events carried out in extermination camps. According to a 2018 survey commissioned by the Conference on Jewish Material Claims Against Germany, 41 percent of American adults do not know about Auschwitz. With hate crimes reaching a 16-year high in 2018, it is imperative that we recount the atrocities of the Holocaust, lest discrimination based on race, religion, disability, sexual orientation, ethnicity, gender, or gender identity continue to spread.

Madam Speaker, people throughout the world are coming together to commemorate the more than six million lives lost during the Holocaust. We stand in solidarity with the United Nations in remembering these victims and honoring those who defend human rights. We must always be vigilant that this horror of humanity is never repeated.

HONORING THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF IAN MCBETH

HON. JOE NEGUSE

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 2020

Mr. NEGUSE. Madam Speaker, today I wish to honor the life and service of Mr. Ian McBeth, a Colorado-born firefighter who was killed in a helicopter crash in Australia this month. Mr. McBeth went to Australia as a volunteer assisting in fighting that nation's devastating wildfires.

Born and raised in Wray, Colorado, Mr. McBeth served in the Wyoming Air National Guard while a student at the University of Wyoming and later joined the Air National Guard in Montana. His service included tours in Iraq and Afghanistan. He is survived by his wife and three children.

Coloradans and Americans throughout the West know all too well the great cost wildfires have on life, land, and our environment. These devastating impacts are curtailed only through the enormous sacrifice and bravery of the men and women who set aside their personal safety to run toward the blaze with the goal of saving their neighbors and communities. We are endlessly indebted to all those who rise to serve these dire needs, and particularly those who give their lives in these fights.

I send my deepest condolences to Mr. McBeth's family, friends, and all those who were impacted by his loss. We thank Mr. McBeth for his many years of service for our nation.

REMEMBERING KENNETH C. RYKEN

HON. ERIC SWALWELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 2020

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Madam Speaker, I rise to recognize and honor the life

and memory of Kenneth C. Ryken, who recently passed away.

Ken was born in Walnut Creek, California on April 27, 1965, to proud parents Richard and Deanna Ryken. He grew up in the East Bay where he attended and graduated from Hayward High School in 1983. Upon graduating from high school, Ken went on to study at Chabot College, San Francisco State University, and the University of Southern California, where he received his law degree.

After graduating law school, Ken began practicing law with Sedgwick LLP, and in 1996 he joined the Alameda County District Attorney's office where I had the privilege of having him as a colleague. Ken served as the office's finance director and an assistant district attorney until his passing on January 5, 2020. Ken was frequently described as a "rock" and a "shining star" by his colleagues and superiors.

One of the accomplishments Ken was most proud of during his career was the creation of Clean Slate Services in collaboration with the East Bay Community Law Center. This practice helps reduce the pathways into the criminal justice system and removes barriers to employment and civic participation for people with criminal records. Ken's work was pivotal to the creation of this program, and it is only one of the many highlights of his career.

Ken's commitment to public service and his community extended beyond working for the Alameda County District Attorney's Office. Ken was a proud member of the 100 Club and the Hayward Rotary Club, and he served on the board of directors for the Hayward Area Historical Society. Outside of work Ken was known to be a music enthusiast who especially loved his bass guitar.

We lost Ken far too soon. He is survived by his wife of 17 years, Jean Luevano, as well as his children, Jackson and Lauren, grandson, Wesley, parents, Dick and Deanna, and siblings, Tim and Kathy. Ken loved spending time with his family and was always a proud husband, father, and grandfather. His legacy will live on through them and the everlasting impact he made on our community.

JIM LEHRER

HON. MICHAEL CLOUD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 2020

Mr. CLOUD. Madam Speaker, today, I pay tribute to Mr. Jim Lehrer who passed away at the age of 85 last week.

Mr. Lehrer is dear to Texas' 27th district because he graduated from Victoria College, right in my hometown of Victoria, Texas, in 1956.

As a student, he wrote for the college paper, the Jolly Roger, and worked as a ticket agent at the Continental Trailways station downtown.

Today a plaque near the bus station he worked at 65 years ago honors his accomplishments.

After college, he sacrificially served our country for three years with the United States Marines.

He then went on to the Dallas Morning News, reporting on local politics before making the change to television.

He never forgot his Texas roots, despite the fact that he went on to have a distinguished career as a world-renowned journalist.

Over the span of his lifetime, he moderated twelve presidential debates, cofounded and hosted PBS NewsHour for 36 years, and authored numerous books.

Through much hard work and determination, he achieved great success as a journalist, and we are proud that he called Victoria home for a little while.

He is survived by his wife of six decades, Kate, three daughters, Jamie, Lucy, and Amanda, and six grandchildren.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. NYDIA M. VELÁZQUEZ

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 2020

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Madam Speaker, on Monday, January 27, 2020, I regret not being present for two vote sessions. Had I been present, I would have voted in support of the Never Again Education Act, H.R. 943, Roll Call No. 23, and voted in support of the Advancing Research to Prevent Suicide Act, H.R. 4704, Roll Call No. 24.

HONORING KING BROTHERS DAIRY FOR RECEIVING THE NEW YORK STATE AGRICULTURAL SOCIETY'S BUSINESS OF THE YEAR AWARD

HON. ELISE M. STEFANIK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 2020

Ms. STEFANIK. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor King Brothers Dairy for receiving the New York State Agricultural Society's Business of the Year Award. For over 17 years, the NYS Agricultural Society has presented Business of the Year honors to both a producer and an agribusiness, recognizing the quality, leadership and innovation they demonstrate that enhances the integrity of the industry.

King's Ransom Farm, located in Schuylerville has been in operation for over 100 years. Jan and Jeff King's grandparents had been in the creamery business through the 1960s and in 2010, the family decided to return to their roots, establishing King Brothers Dairy. They began bottling and delivering milk from their own 1,000-cow herd to customers in their community and throughout the Hudson Valley. In 2019, they launched a retail store, selling over 34 flavors of ice cream and local products sourced from the area. When I visited the King Brothers Dairy in 2018 with USDA Secretary Perdue, I was impressed with their dedication to producing wholesome dairy products and providing excellent customer service. Their popularity within the community and their commitment to quality warrant this recent award.

Agriculture is an essential component of the economy in Northern New York and King Brothers Dairy exemplifies the quality and diversity of North Country farms. On behalf of New York's 21st District, I would like to congratulate the entire King Family for this well-deserved recognition. I look forward to their future success.

HONORING THE LIFE OF ENEDINA CELIZ RAPAN

HON. RAUL RUIZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 2020

Mr. RUIZ. Madam Speaker, I rise to remember and recognize the incredible life of Enedina Celiz Rapan, who passed away this month at the age of 93.

I was raised in a farmworker community with farmworker parents in the eastern Coachella Valley, where, for many of us, hardship and injustice can feel like the norm; and if it weren't for women like Enedina Rapan, many of us would still believe that it is true, and we would not be standing where we are today.

Enedina came to America at a young age to work hard, earn her living, and give her children a better life. And while she was working away in the fields, sweating in 120-degree heat with calloused hands, she witnessed the mistreatment of her fellow farmworkers and she saw their suffering.

If there is one thing about Enedina, it is that, when she saw injustice, she would speak up and get to work to fix it. So, when she saw farmworkers laboring for hours on end with no bathrooms nearby, she fought to bring restrooms to the fields.

And when she saw seniors in the community going hungry, she organized, asking for donations and cooking meals so they could have dinner to eat.

And Enedina devoted her life to standing up for people who were mistreated, discriminated against, and vulnerable. There was no voice too soft that Enedina didn't hear and elevate.

Enedina was a giant for our community, serving as a co-founder of Mujeres Mexicanas and Lideres Campesinas while working with the United Farm Workers of America and Cesar Chavez to stand up for the rights of farmworkers. She used her tireless will and unmatched strength to pick people up, fight for what is right, and make the Coachella Valley a better place for everyone who lives there.

I am better off because of Enedina's work. My family and the entire farmworker community of the Coachella Valley, we are all better off because of Enedina's work.

And she would not be happy with me for being up here talking about her, because she was so humble. A woman who elevated everyone's voice around her, she would never seek this type of recognition.

Madam Speaker, today, I want to make sure the country knows Enedina's story. I want to make sure you know about her contributions to our community and her unrelenting pursuit of justice. Enedina will be sorely missed, but her presence will be felt and her life, an inspiration for years to come.

MERCHANT MARINERS OF WORLD WAR II CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL ACT OF 2020

SPEECH OF

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 27, 2020

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, as a senior member of Congress, I rise in support

of H.R. 5671, the "Merchant Mariners of World War II Congressional Gold Medal Act of 2020", a bill that recognizes World War II merchant mariner veterans with congressional gold medals for their service to the United States.

I am a strong proponent of our veteran population having the recognition they deserve for their bravery, honor, valor and sacrifice.

Throughout World War II, our armed forces relied on the Merchant Marine to provide combat equipment, fuel, food, commodities and raw materials to troops stationed abroad in both theaters of operation, and they paid a heavy price in service to their country.

The Merchant Marine is a war essential supply chain that transports the nation's cargoes in times of peace and prosperity, and in times of war and grave danger.

Military missions and war planning are contingent upon the availability of resources and the Merchant Marine played a vital role in this regard.

The Merchant Marine provided for the successful transport of resources and personnel despite consistent and ongoing exposure to enemy combatants from both the air and the sea, including from enemy bomber squadrons, submarines, and naval mines.

The Merchant Marines were the best informed and most widely traveled, constantly supplying the front-line troops until they could break through German, Japanese and Italian aggression to secure victory.

The Merchant Marine suffered the highest per capita casualty rate in the U.S. Armed Forces during World War II.

An estimated 8,300 mariners lost their lives, and another 12,000 were wounded during WWII.

The Merchant Marine proved to be an instrumental asset on an untold number of occasions, participating in every landing operation by the United States Marine Corps, from Guadalcanal to Okinawa.

Merchant Marines were engaged in the longest battle of the war—the Battle of the At-

lantic, fought over the vital supply lines to Europe—and they fought longer than any other branch of the service.

These mariners have waited over 70 years to get the recognition they earned braving the perils of the Atlantic during the Second World War.

There are 1.5 million veterans living in Texas and each of them deserve recognition for their service and sacrifice for this nation.

Approximately 16 million Americans served in World War II and have come to receive veteran status after the somber duration, but victorious conclusion of the war.

More than a quarter million, 250,000 thousand civilian sailors, served in the U.S. Merchant Marine by the end of the war.

Despite their honorable, vital and heroic service in wartime, the men of the U.S. merchant marine were not officially accorded veteran status until 1988, decades following the end of World War II.

The feats and accomplishments of the Merchant Marine are deserving of broader public recognition.

Unfortunately, the courageous contribution of the Merchant Mariners sacrifices are commonly overlooked.

Every American owes these mariners a debt of gratitude we cannot begin to repay.

The Congressional Gold Medal would be an appropriate way to shed further light on the service of the merchant mariners in World War II and the instrumental role they played in winning that war.

I ask my colleagues from both sides of the aisle to vote in support of H.R. 5671.

HONORING RAYMOND LERMA

HON. TJ COX

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 2020

Mr. COX of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today in honor of Raymond Lerma, a be-

loved husband, father, and leader in the community of Corcoran, California. Ray passed away on January 11th. Among his many honored roles in life, Ray served 25 years as Mayor and Councilmember in Corcoran and was a pillar of the community.

Ray was born in El Paso, Texas and raised in Corcoran in a large and loving family that worked hard, long days in the fields of the Central Valley. Encouraged by his parents to reach for higher education, Mr. Lerma graduated from UC Berkeley—he was a proud CAL Bear.

After college, Ray returned to the community that raised him to build his own family with his beloved wife Lola. He touched countless lives in his 38 years as an educator at Corcoran High School. He also kept changing lives after retirement, teaching English as a second language to adult learners. Ray also served as a longtime board member of the Kings Community Action Organization, which helps bring resources to the Central Valley.

Ray once said that he wanted to be remembered as someone who made a difference in his community. I stand before you today to say we will always remember his dedication and contributions to the community, and we will miss his leadership.

Raymond Lerma leaves behind his wife Lola, their three children, Eva, Ramon, and Pablo, as well as his grandchildren.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BRETT GUTHRIE

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 2020

Mr. GUTHRIE. Madam Speaker, I was out of the chamber. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 24.

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S619–S644

Measures Introduced: Twenty-one bills and five resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 3227–3247, S. Res. 484–487, and S. Con. Res. 35.

Pages S636–37

Measures Reported:

Report to accompany S. 2393, to promote a 21st century energy workforce. (S. Rept. No. 116–208)

Report to accompany S. 2425, to amend the Energy Policy and Conservation Act to establish the CHP Technical Assistance Partnership Program. (S. Rept. No. 116–209)

Report to accompany S. 2508, to require the Secretary of Energy to establish a council to conduct a survey and analysis of the employment figures and demographics in the energy, energy efficiency, and motor vehicle sectors of the United States. (S. Rept. No. 116–210)

Page S636

Measures Considered:

Impeachment of President Trump: Senate, sitting as a Court of Impeachment, continued consideration of the articles of impeachment against Donald John Trump, President of the United States. **Pages S619–27**

A unanimous-consent-time agreement was reached providing that the question period for Senators start at approximately 1 p.m., on Wednesday, January 29, 2020; that the questions alternate between the Majority and the Minority sides for up to 8 hours during that session of the Senate; and that on Thursday, January 30, 2020, Senate continue time for Senators questions alternating between the sides for up to 8 hours during that session of the Senate. **Page S626**

Senate will continue consideration of the articles of impeachment against President Trump, on Wednesday, January 29, 2020. **Page S644**

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

Charles A. Stones, of Kansas, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Federal Agricultural Mortgage Corporation.

Thomas M. Mistele, of Florida, to be a Director of the Securities Investor Protection Corporation for a term expiring December 31, 2022.

Judy Shelton, of California, to be a Member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for the unexpired term of fourteen years from February 1, 2010.

Christopher Waller, of Minnesota, to be a Member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for a term of fourteen years from February 1, 2016.

Finch Fulton, of Alabama, to be an Assistant Secretary of Transportation.

John Chase Johnson, of Oklahoma, to be Inspector General, Federal Communications Commission.

William Ellison Grayson, of California, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Estonia.

Jenny A. McGee, of Texas, to be an Associate Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development.

Julie Elizabeth Hocker, of Pennsylvania, to be an Assistant Secretary of Labor.

Almo J. Carter, of the District of Columbia, to be a Commissioner of the United States Parole Commission for a term of six years. **Page S644**

Messages from the House:

Page S634

Measures Referred:

Page S634

Executive Communications:

Pages S635–36

Additional Cosponsors:

Pages S637–41

Additional Statements:

Pages S632–34

Adjournment: Senate convened at 1:03 p.m. and adjourned at 2:54 p.m., until 1 p.m. on Wednesday, January 29, 2020. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S644.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

BUILDING INFRASTRUCTURE IN AMERICA

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Subcommittee on Transportation and Safety concluded a

hearing to examine building infrastructure in America, focusing on an overview of the Build America Bureau and the Department of Transportation Rural Transportation Initiatives, after receiving testimony from Joel Szabat, Assistant Secretary for Aviation and International Affairs, performing the duties of Under Secretary for Policy, and Morteza Farajian, Executive Director, Build America Bureau, both of the Department of Transportation; and John McCarthy, Port of Tacoma Commission, Tacoma, Washington, on behalf of The Northwest Seaport Alliance.

U.S.-IRAN POLICY

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee received a closed briefing on United States-Iran policy and authorities for the use of force from Brian H. Hook, Special Representative for Iran, Joey Hood, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Near Eastern Affairs, and Marik String, Acting Legal Advisor, Office of the Legal Advisor, all of the Department of State.

AMERICA'S FISCAL PATH

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine America's fiscal path, including S. 2733, to save and strengthen critical social contract programs of the Federal Government, after receiving testimony from Douglas Holtz-Eakin, American Action Forum, and Henry J. Aaron, Brookings Institution, both of Washington, D.C.; Charles P. Blahous, George Mason University Mercatus Center, Rockville, Maryland; and Brian Riedl, Manhattan Institute for Policy Research, Alexandria, Virginia.

INTELLIGENCE

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee met in closed session to receive a briefing on certain intelligence matters from officials of the intelligence community.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 14 public bills, H.R. 5685–5698; and 4 resolutions, H. Con. Res. 86; and H. Res. 815–817, were introduced.

Pages H632–33

Additional Cosponsors:

Pages H633–34

Reports Filed: There were no reports filed today.

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein she appointed Representative Butterfield to act as Speaker pro tempore for today.

Page H571

Recess: The House recessed at 10:51 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon.

Pages H576–77

Guest Chaplain: The prayer was offered by the Guest Chaplain, Rev. Jeffrey F. Kirby, Our Lady of Grace Catholic Church, Indian Land, SC.

Page H577

Student Borrower Credit Improvement Act and Merchant Mariners of World War II Congressional Gold Medal Act—Rule for Consideration: The House agreed to H. Res. 811, providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3621) to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act to remove adverse information for certain defaulted or delinquent private education loan borrowers who demonstrate a history of loan repayment, and for other purposes, and providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 550) to award a Congressional Gold

Medal, collectively, to the United States Merchant Mariners of World War II, in recognition of their dedicated and vital service during World War II, by a ye-a-and-nay vote of 223 yeas to 189 nays, Roll No. 26, after the previous question was ordered by a ye-a-and-nay vote of 227 yeas to 184 nays, Roll No. 25.

Pages H579–88, H605–06

Suspensions: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measures:

Global Hope Act: H.R. 5338, amended, to authorize the Secretary of State to pursue public-private partnerships, innovative financing mechanisms, research partnerships, and coordination with international and multilateral organizations to address childhood cancer globally;

Pages H588–90

Supporting the rights of the people of Iran to free expression, condemning the Iranian regime for its crackdown on legitimate protests: H. Res. 752, amended, supporting the rights of the people of Iran to free expression, condemning the Iranian regime for its crackdown on legitimate protests;

Pages H590–94

Tibetan Policy and Support Act: H.R. 4331, amended, to modify and reauthorize the Tibetan Policy Act of 2002, by a $\frac{2}{3}$ ye-a-and-nay vote of 392 yeas to 22 nays, Roll No. 27; and

Pages H594–H601, H606–07

Keeping Girls in School Act: H.R. 2153, amended, to support empowerment, economic security, and educational opportunities for adolescent girls around the world.

Pages H601–05

Privileged Resolution: The House agreed to H. Con. Res. 86, providing for a joint session of Congress to receive a message from the President.

Page H607

Quorum Calls—Votes: Three yea-and-nay votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H605–06, H606, and H606–07. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 7:32 p.m.

Committee Meetings

TO REVIEW IMPLEMENTATION OF FARM BILL CONSERVATION PROGRAMS

Committee on Agriculture: Subcommittee on Conservation and Forestry held a hearing entitled “To Review Implementation of Farm Bill Conservation Programs”. Testimony was heard from Matthew Lohr, Chief, Natural Resources Conservation Service, Department of Agriculture; and Richard Fordyce, Administrator, Farm Service Agency, Department of Agriculture.

SECURITY UPDATE ON THE KOREAN PENINSULA

Committee on Armed Services: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Security Update on the Korean Peninsula”. Testimony was heard from John C. Rood, Under Secretary of Defense for Policy, Office of the Secretary of Defense, Department of Defense; and Lieutenant Gen. David W. Allvin, Director for Strategy, Plans and Policy—J5, Joint Chiefs of Staff.

EXPECTING MORE: ADDRESSING AMERICA’S MATERNAL AND INFANT HEALTH CRISIS

Committee on Education and Labor: Subcommittee on Health, Employment, Labor, and Pensions; and Subcommittee on Workforce Protections held a joint hearing entitled “Expecting More: Addressing America’s Maternal and Infant Health Crisis”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

OUT OF CONTROL: THE IMPACT OF WILDFIRES ON OUR POWER SECTOR AND THE ENVIRONMENT

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Energy; and Subcommittee on Environment and Climate Change held a joint hearing entitled “Out of Control: The Impact of Wildfires on our Power Sec-

tor and the Environment”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

LEGISLATION TO PROMOTE THE HEALTH AND SAFETY OF RACEHORSES

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Consumer Protection held a hearing entitled “Legislation to Promote the Health and Safety of Racehorses”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

ESCALATION WITH IRAN: OUTCOMES AND IMPLICATIONS FOR U.S. INTERESTS AND REGIONAL STABILITY

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on the Middle East, North Africa, and International Terrorism held a hearing entitled “Escalation with Iran: Outcomes and Implications for U.S. Interests and Regional Stability”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

ENDING GLOBAL RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights and International Organizations; and Subcommittee on Civil Rights and Civil Liberties of the House Committee on Oversight and Reform held a joint hearing entitled “Ending Global Religious Persecution”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

FENTANYL ANALOGUES: PERSPECTIVES ON CLASSWIDE SCHEDULING

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, and Homeland Security held a hearing entitled “Fentanyl Analogues: Perspectives on Classwide Scheduling”. Testimony was heard from Brett P. Giroir, Assistant Secretary for Health, Department of Health and Human Services; Amanda Liskamm, Director of Opioid Enforcement and Prevention Efforts, Department of Justice; Kevin L. Butler, Federal Public Defender, Northern District, Alabama; and public witnesses.

THE IMPORTANCE OF PUBLIC DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENTS FOR PROTECTING HUMAN HEALTH, THE CLIMATE, AND THE ENVIRONMENT

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources held a hearing entitled “The Importance of Public Disclosure Requirements for Protecting Human Health, the Climate, and the Environment”. Testimony was heard from Victor Snover, Mayor, Aztec, New Mexico; and public witnesses.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURES

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Water, Oceans, and Wildlife held a hearing on H.R.

4891, the “Western Water Security Act of 2019”; H.R. 5316, the “Move Water Now Act”; and H.R. 5347, the “Disadvantaged Community Drinking Water Assistance Act”. Testimony was heard from Representatives Torres Small of New Mexico and Cox of California; Grayford Payne, Deputy Commissioner for Policy, Administration, and Budget, Bureau of Reclamation; and public witnesses.

EXAMINING THE TRUMP ADMINISTRATION'S AFGHANISTAN STRATEGY

Committee on Oversight and Reform: Subcommittee on National Security held a hearing entitled “Examining the Trump Administration’s Afghanistan Strategy”. Testimony was heard from John F. Sopko, Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction.

PROTECTING THOSE WHO BLOW THE WHISTLE ON GOVERNMENT WRONGDOING

Committee on Oversight and Reform: Subcommittee on Government Operations held a hearing entitled “Protecting Those Who Blow the Whistle on Government Wrongdoing”. Testimony was heard from Glenn A. Fine, Principal Deputy Inspector General Performing the Duties of the Inspector General, Department of Defense; Michael E. Horowitz, Inspector General, Department of Justice; and public witnesses.

GSA OUTLEASES AND THE TRUMP OLD POST OFFICE HOTEL

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Subcommittee on Economic Development, Public Buildings, and Emergency Management held a hearing entitled “GSA Outleases and the Trump Old Post Office Hotel”. Testimony was heard from Emily W. Murphy, Administrator, General Services Administration.

LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS FOR PAID FAMILY AND MEDICAL LEAVE

Committee on Ways and Means: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Legislative Proposals for Paid Family and Medical Leave”. Testimony was heard from Representatives Wagner, DeLauro, and Stefanik; and public witnesses.

Joint Meetings

HUMAN RIGHTS IN CRIMEA

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe: Commission concluded a hearing to examine the state of human rights in Crimea, after receiving testimony from Oleg Sentsov, Ukrainian writer and filmmaker,

and Tamila Tasheva, Deputy Permanent Representative of the President of Ukraine in the Autonomous Republic of Crimea, both of Kyiv, Ukraine; and Melinda Haring, Atlantic Council Eurasia Center, Washington, D.C.

NEW PUBLIC LAWS

(For last listing of Public Laws, see DAILY DIGEST, p. D82)

H.R. 263, to rename the Oyster Bay National Wildlife Refuge as the Congressman Lester Wolff Oyster Bay National Wildlife Refuge. Signed on January 27, 2020. (Public Law 116–110)

H.R. 434, to amend the National Trails System Act to provide for the study of the Emancipation National Historic Trail. Signed on January 27, 2020. (Public Law 116–111)

S. 457, to require that \$1 coins issued during 2019 honor President George H. W. Bush and to direct the Secretary of the Treasury to issue bullion coins during 2019 in honor of Barbara Bush. Signed on January 27, 2020. (Public Law 116–112)

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 29, 2020

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Environment and Public Works: to hold hearings to examine stakeholder perspectives on the importance of the United States Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board, 10 a.m., SD–406.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: business meeting to consider S. 785, to improve mental health care provided by the Department of Veterans Affairs, S. 2336, to improve the management of information technology projects and investments of the Department of Veterans Affairs, S. 2864, to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out a pilot program on information sharing between the Department of Veterans Affairs and designated relatives and friends of veterans regarding the assistance and benefits available to the veterans, S. 524, to establish the Department of Veterans Affairs Advisory Committee on Tribal and Indian Affairs, S. 2594, to amend title 5, United States Code, to modify certain requirements with respect to service and retirement for the purposes of veterans' preference for Federal hiring, S. 850, to extend the authorization of appropriations to the Department of Veterans Affairs for purposes of awarding grants to veterans service organizations for the transportation of highly rural veterans, S. 3110, to direct the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a study on disability and pension benefits provided to members of the National Guard and members of reserve components of the Armed Forces by the Department of Veterans Affairs, S. 123, to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to enter into a contract or other agreement with a third party to review

appointees in the Veterans Health Administration who had a license terminated for cause by a State licensing board for care or services rendered at a non-Veterans Health Administration facility and to provide individuals treated by such an appointee with notice if it is determined that an episode of care or services to which they received was below the standard of care, S. 450, to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out a pilot program to expedite the onboarding process for new medical providers of the Department of Veterans Affairs, to reduce the duration of the hiring process for such medical providers, S. 3182, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out the Women's Health Transition Training pilot program through at least fiscal year 2020, and the nomination of Grant C. Jaquith, of New York, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims, 9:30 a.m., SR-418.

Select Committee on Intelligence: to receive a closed briefing on certain intelligence matters, 10 a.m., SH-219.

Special Committee on Aging: to hold hearings to examine protecting seniors from the Social Security Impersonation Scam, 9:30 a.m., SD-562.

House

Committee on the Budget, Full Committee, hearing entitled "The Congressional Budget Office's Budget and Economic Outlook", 10 a.m., 210 Cannon.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Health, hearing entitled "Improving Safety and Transparency in America's Food and Drugs", 10 a.m., 2322 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Communications and Technology, hearing entitled "Empowering and Connecting Communities through Digital Equity and Internet Adoption", 10:30 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Financial Services, Full Committee, hearing entitled "The Community Reinvestment Act: Is the OCC Undermining the Law's Purpose and Intent", 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Housing, Community Development, and Insurance, hearing entitled "Examining the Availability of Insurance for Nonprofits", 2 p.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, Subcommittee on Europe, Eurasia, Energy, and the Environment, hearing entitled "Resisting Anti-Semitism and Xenophobia in Europe", 2 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Committee on Homeland Security, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 1140, the "Rights for Transportation Security Officers Act"; H.R. 5273, the "Securing America's Ports Act"; H.R. 1494, the "HBCU Homeland Security Partnerships Act"; H.R. 5680, the "Cybersecurity Vul-

nerability Identification and Notification Act of 2020"; H.R. 5670, the "Transportation Security Transparency Improvement Act"; H.R. 5678, the "Privacy Office Enhancement Act"; and H.R. 5679, the "CISA Director Reform Act", 10 a.m., 310 Cannon.

Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Immigration and Citizenship, hearing entitled "Courts in Crisis: The State of Judicial Independence and Due Process in U.S. Immigration Courts", 9:30 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on Natural Resources, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 1049, the "National Heritage Area Act of 2019"; H.R. 1240, the "Young Fishermen's Development Act of 2019"; H.R. 2748, the "Safeguarding America's Future and Environment Act"; H.R. 2795, the "Wildlife Corridors Conservation Act of 2019"; H.R. 2956, to provide for the establishment of the Western Riverside County Wildlife Refuge; H.R. 3399, to amend the Nutria Eradication and Control Act of 2003 to include California in the program, and for other purposes; H.R. 4348, the "Protect America's Wildlife and Fish In Need of Conservation Act of 2019"; H.R. 4679, the "Climate-Ready Fisheries Act of 2019"; and H.R. 5179, the "Tribal Wildlife Corridors Act of 2019", 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Oversight and Reform, Full Committee, hearing entitled "75 Years After the Holocaust: The Ongoing Battle Against Hate", 10 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, Full Committee, hearing entitled "Losing Ground: U.S. Competitiveness in Critical Technologies", 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Space and Aeronautics, markup on H.R. 5666, the "National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act of 2020", 2 p.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Small Business, Full Committee, hearing entitled "SBA Management Review: Office of Field Operations", 11:30 a.m., 2360 Rayburn.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Full Committee, hearing entitled "Caring for Veterans in Crisis: Ensuring a Comprehensive Health System Approach", 10 a.m., HVC-210.

Committee on Ways and Means, Full Committee, hearing entitled "Paving the Way for Funding and Financing Infrastructure Investments", 1:30 p.m., 1100 Longworth.

Joint Meetings

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe: to hold hearings to examine human rights and democracy, focusing on obstacles and opportunities in the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe region, 10 a.m., 1334, Longworth Building.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

1 p.m., Wednesday, January 29

Senate Chamber

Program for Wednesday: Senate will continue to sit as a Court of Impeachment to consider the articles of impeachment against President Trump.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10 a.m., Wednesday, January 29

House Chamber

Program for Wednesday: Consideration of H.R. 3621—Student Borrower Credit Improvement Act. Consideration of the Senate amendment to H.R. 550—Merchant Mariners of World War II Congressional Gold Medal Act.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Cloud, Michael, Tex., E94
 Connolly, Gerald E., Va., E93
 Cox, T.J., Calif., E95
 Graves, Sam, Mo., E89, E90, E91, E92
 Guthrie, Brett, Ky., E95
 Higgins, Brian, N.Y., E92

Jackson Lee, Sheila, Tex., E90, E91, E92, E94
 Kelly, Trent, Miss., E91
 Neal, Richard E., Mass., E89
 Neguse, Joe, Colo., E93
 Posey, Bill, Fla., E90
 Roe, David P., Tenn., E91
 Ruiz, Raul, Calif., E90, E91, E94
 Simpson, Michael K., Idaho, E89

Stefanik, Elise M., N.Y., E89, E91, E94
 Swalwell, Eric, Calif., E93
 Tlaib, Rashida, Mich., E92, E93
 Vela, Filemon, Tex., E93
 Velázquez, Nydia M., N.Y., E94
 Westerman, Bruce, Ark., E89, E92



Congressional Record

printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Publishing Office, at www.govinfo.gov, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Publishing Office. Phone 202-512-1800, or 866-512-1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, contactcenter@gpo.gov. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197-9000, or phone orders to 866-512-1800 (toll-free), 202-512-1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202-512-2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Publishing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.