

Hamilton County, we have had a 20 percent decrease in opioid deaths in the first half of 2018.

The decline is the result of multiple prevention efforts, a task force of first responders, law enforcement, health officials, and community leaders all working together to tackle this deadly epidemic. Their efforts are truly saving lives in our community.

Most importantly, their successes can be used as a model to help save thousands and thousands of lives across the country. And I can't think of any better news than that.

PRESIDENT TRUMP'S BUDGET

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

Mr. CARBAJAL. Mr. Speaker, this week the President broke his promise to America's seniors that he would not cut Medicare or Social Security benefits.

After Republicans in Congress passed a massive tax giveaway for corporations and the wealthiest 1 percent, the President now wants to balance the budget on the backs of our seniors and students.

This budget cuts \$2 trillion from Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security over the next 10 years, programs that our seniors have paid into for decades.

As students face a \$1 trillion student loan debt crisis, Trump's budget pushes affordable college further out of reach by cutting \$207 billion from student loan programs.

Thankfully, Americans voted overwhelmingly last election to place a check on this President by sending a new Democratic majority to Congress, and they can rest assured knowing that we will not consider the President's cruel budget cuts in this House.

GOVERNMENT TRANSPARENCY

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I have thus far released the interview transcripts of two individuals at the heart of the 2016 DOJ investigations controversy. Today, I am releasing a third.

As I have said before, I believe the American people deserve transparency and deserve to know what transpired at the highest echelons of the FBI during this tumultuous time for the Bureau.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I request the link, dougcollins.house.gov/strzok be placed into the RECORD so that the American people can review the transcript of Peter Strzok.

Out of an abundance of caution, this transcript has a limited number of narrowly tailored redactions relating only to confidential sources and methods, nonpublic information about ongoing

investigations and nonmaterial personal information.

I will continue to work to release as many transcripts as possible. The American people deserve transparency and the truth.

PRESIDENT TRUMP'S PROPOSED BUDGET CUTS

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

Mr. O'HALLERAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my deep concerns over the proposed budget cuts made in the President's budget and the skyrocketing deficits that will leave our children and grandchildren with trillions more in debt.

While it is imperative that we rein in wasteful government spending and get our national debt under control, we cannot do so at the expense of the men and women living in rural and Tribal communities and our seniors.

This budget proposal slashes trillions from healthcare programs that millions of seniors, working families, and veterans rely on every day. Additionally, it would cut infrastructure programs and funding for critical projects in rural America and hurt farming families.

This is not how we are going to curb spending and get our fiscal house in order. We need to act now to pass a bipartisan budget that addresses the debt crisis and invests in the future of our Nation.

THANKING THE ADMINISTRATION FOR DISASTER RELIEF IN NORTHERN CALIFORNIA

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, 25 months ago, we saw the crisis in Oroville, California, of the broken spillway at Oroville Dam, belonging to the State water project. Thankfully, emergency services were able to come in and, as soon as possible, get things functioning once again for the safety of the flood control as well as the storage and the hydroelectricity that is produced there.

We had much help that came from FEMA; and I want to say thank you to the folks at FEMA, this administration, and Secretary Nielsen for being on the spot in helping with this restoration process. \$333 million have flowed to helping the crisis at the spillway be restored to a working spillway.

Now, there are those who are clamoring for even more money, but that lies on the backs of the State of California and the DWR for the extra money, bringing it up to \$1.1 billion.

The State of California claims it is in a surplus situation, and it needs to pay its own bills and put the money aside to take care of the project—not the other 49 States—for the nonemergency part of the project.

So, again, thanks to FEMA for their attention to this, as well as the wildfire situation we had in Paradise, California, for helping us in northern California.

SUPPORTING THE DREAM AND PROMISE ACT

(Ms. GARCIA of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. GARCIA of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong and unwavering support for H.R. 5, the Dream and Promise Act.

I am proud to represent the 29th Congressional District of Texas. One of the things I am most proud of is the strong and vibrant immigration communities that reside in our district, where thousands of DACA, TPS, and DED recipients live, work, and play beside us as neighbors and colleagues. If Dreamers were forced to leave our district tomorrow, we would lose over \$400 million of GDP.

Our immigration policies put politics over people, which often hurt our children who are in constant fear of being separated and uprooted from the country they call their own. This is wrong for our economy. This is wrong for our communities. This is wrong for our country.

It is time that we pass a permanent solution for these vital members of our society, which is why I urge all my colleagues to support H.R. 5.

WE HAVE GOT TO KNOW IF OUR PRESIDENT IS A CROOK

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

Mr. CASTEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, just last week we passed H.R. 1, the For the People Act, with its worthy aim: to ensure that this government represents the voices of all Americans and not just the privileged and powerful.

Now, among the many reforms in H.R. 1, one would require that candidates for President and Vice President must disclose their tax returns. Giving voters personal tax information has been a tradition of Presidents since 1973, when Richard Nixon, of all people, released his returns and said: "People have got to know whether or not their President is a crook." On that issue, I agree with Mr. Nixon.

Now, that seems to be the thinking of my home State legislature, too, which has been working on legislation that would require any Presidential or Vice Presidential candidate who wants to be on the ballot in Illinois to release their tax returns. They think that the people have the right to know the true character of the person who will sit in the White House.

Mr. Speaker, we have got to know if our President is a crook. I would like to see the Senate take up this bill.

And if they are unable to follow in the great leadership of this House, I

hope that other States will follow the great leadership of the State of Illinois.

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

EXPRESSING SENSE OF CONGRESS THAT THE REPORT OF SPECIAL COUNSEL MUELLER SHOULD BE MADE AVAILABLE TO THE PUBLIC AND TO CONGRESS

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 208, I call up the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 24) expressing the sense of Congress that the report of Special Counsel Mueller should be made available to the public and to Congress, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 208, the amendments to the concurrent resolution and the preamble, printed in House Report 116-17, are agreed to, and the concurrent resolution, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the concurrent resolution, as amended, is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 24

Whereas, on January 6, 2017, the Office of the Director of National Intelligence released a report concluding that “Russian President Vladimir Putin ordered an influence campaign in 2016 aimed at the US presidential election”, that the goal of this campaign was “to undermine public faith in the US democratic process”, and that “Putin and the Russian Government developed a clear preference for President-elect Trump”;

Whereas, on March 20, 2017, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) testified that he was authorized by the Department of Justice to confirm that the FBI is investigating whether “there was any coordination” between individuals associated with the Trump presidential campaign and the Russian Government;

Whereas part 600 of title 28, Code of Federal Regulations, as in effect on March 7, 2019 (in this resolution referred to as “Special Counsel Regulations”), provides for the appointment of a Special Counsel when the Attorney General or Acting Attorney General “determines that criminal investigation of a person or matter is warranted and—(a) That investigation . . . by a United States Attorney’s Office or litigating Division of the Department of Justice would present a conflict of interest for the Department or other extraordinary circumstances; and (b) That under the circumstances, it would be in the public interest to appoint an outside Special Counsel to assume responsibility for the matter”;

Whereas the Special Counsel Regulations call for any individual named as Special Counsel to be a “lawyer with a reputation for integrity and impartial decision making and with appropriate experience to ensure that both the investigation will be conducted ably, expeditiously and thoroughly, and that investigative and prosecutorial decisions will be supported by an informed understanding of the criminal law and Department of Justice policies”;

Whereas, on May 17, 2017, the Acting Attorney General appointed former FBI Director Robert S. Mueller III to serve as Special Counsel “to ensure a full and thorough investigation of the Russian government’s efforts to interfere in the 2016 presidential election”, including an exam-

ination of “any links and/or coordination between the Russian government and individuals associated with the campaign of President Donald Trump”, “any matters that arose or may arise directly from the investigation”, and “any other matters within the scope of 28 C.F.R. 600.4(a)”;

Whereas the Acting Attorney General explained that he had appointed Special Counsel Mueller because he “determined that it is in the public interest . . . to . . . appoint a Special Counsel to assume responsibility for this matter . . . based upon the unique circumstances, the public interest requires [him] to place this investigation under the authority of a person who exercises a degree of independence from the normal chain of command . . . [and that] a Special Counsel is necessary in order for the American people to have full confidence in the outcome. Our nation is grounded on the rule of law, and the public must be assured that government officials administer the law fairly”;

Whereas Special Counsel Mueller has previously served in the Department of Justice as a prosecutor, United States Attorney, and Director of the FBI under both Republican and Democratic administrations, and his selection as the Special Counsel elicited bipartisan praise recognizing his reputation for competence, fairness, and nonpartisanship;

Whereas the Special Counsel’s investigation has thus far resulted in the public indictment of 34 individuals and 3 companies, 7 guilty pleas, and 1 conviction following a jury trial;

Whereas the Special Counsel Regulations provide that “[a]t the conclusion of the Special Counsel’s work, he or she shall provide the Attorney General with a confidential report explaining the prosecution or declination decisions reached by the Special Counsel”;

Whereas, on January 15, 2019, at his confirmation hearing before the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, Attorney General William Barr testified “I . . . believe it is very important that the public and Congress be informed of the results of the special counsel’s work. For that reason, my goal will be to provide as much transparency as I can consistent with the law”;

Whereas, on February 22, 2019, the chairs of six committees of the House of Representatives wrote to Attorney General Barr to inform him of their expectation that he will make Special Counsel Mueller’s report public “to the maximum extent permitted by law”;

Whereas transparency is consistent with the overall purpose and intent of the Special Counsel Regulations and the accompanying Department of Justice commentary, which notes the importance of “ensur[ing] congressional and public confidence in the integrity of the process”;

Whereas the need for transparency is most pronounced with regard to investigations that involve the President or individuals associated with his campaign as the President is responsible for the appointment of the senior leadership of the Department of Justice;

Whereas the Department of Justice’s United States Attorney’s Manual indicates that in public filings and proceedings, prosecutors “should remain sensitive to the privacy and reputation interests of uncharged third-parties”, that is, of persons who the Department considers may be, but are not yet criminally charged;

Whereas this general nonstatutory policy of sensitivity to the “interests of uncharged third-parties” should be inapplicable to a sitting President because the Department of Justice’s Office of Legal Counsel has previously written that “a sitting President is constitutionally immune from indictment and criminal prosecution”;

Whereas the Department of Justice has on numerous recent occasions provided investigatory information to Congress and the public concerning investigations of high-level public officials in both pending and closed cases;

Whereas in the only other instance where a Special Counsel was appointed under the Spe-

cial Counsel Regulations (in 1999, concerning the 1993 confrontation in Waco, Texas), both the interim and final reports, including findings, provided by the Special Counsel were released to the public by the Attorney General; and

Whereas the allegations at the center of Special Counsel Mueller’s investigation strike at the core of our democracy, and there is an overwhelming public interest in releasing the Special Counsel’s report to ensure public confidence in both the process and the result of the investigation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That Congress—

(1) calls for the public release of any report, including findings, Special Counsel Mueller provides to the Attorney General, except to the extent the public disclosure of any portion thereof is expressly prohibited by law; and

(2) calls for the full release to Congress of any report, including findings, Special Counsel Mueller provides to the Attorney General.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

□ 0915

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NADLER. Mr. 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 H. Con. Res. 24.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H. Con. Res. 24 expresses the sense of Congress that any report Special Counsel Robert Mueller delivers to the Attorney General should be released to the public and to Congress. This concurrent resolution is important for several reasons.

First, transparency is fundamental to the special counsel process, especially when dealing with matters of national security involving the President.

In January 2017, the U.S. intelligence community unanimously reported that “Russian President Vladimir Putin ordered an influence campaign in 2016 aimed at the U.S. Presidential election” and that “Putin and the Russian Government developed a clear preference for President-elect Trump.” As a result of the importance of this charge and the clear conflict of interest in a matter involving the President, Robert Mueller was appointed as special counsel by the Acting Attorney General “in order for the American people to have full confidence in the outcome.”

This is why in the only other instance involving the appointment of a special counsel under the regulations, concerning the Waco tragedy, the special counsel’s report was released in full by the Attorney General.

Second, this resolution is critical because of the many questions and criticisms of the investigation raised by the President and his administration. It is