



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 165

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, APRIL 3, 2019

No. 58

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. KIM).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,

April 3, 2019.

I hereby appoint the Honorable ANDY KIM to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer:

Loving God, You are compassionate and merciful. We give You thanks for giving us another day. This morning the House welcomes Jens Stoltenberg, NATO's Secretary General. When the world remembers the 70th anniversary of the alliance, may he find a welcome here, and may the cooperation of so many countries continue into a future of mutual respect and security among the community of nations.

There are many issues which press upon our Nation now, and more lie upon the legislative horizon. Pour forth an abundance of wisdom, knowledge, and understanding upon the Members of Congress and upon Your people so that, together, solutions for the betterment of our Nation might be forged.

Bless us this day and every day. May all that is done be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

The SPEAKER pro tempore 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.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. After consultation among the Speaker and the majority and minority leaders, and with their consent, the Chair announces that, when the two Houses meet in joint meeting to hear an address by His Excellency Jens Stoltenberg, Secretary General of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, only the doors immediately opposite the Speaker and those immediately to his left and right will be open.

No one will be allowed on the floor of the House who does not have the privilege of the floor of the House. Due to the large attendance that is anticipated, the rule regarding the privilege of the floor must be strictly enforced. Children of Members will not be permitted on the floor. The cooperation of all Members is requested.

The practice of reserving seats prior to the joint meeting by placard will not be allowed. Members may reserve their seats by physical presence only following the security sweep of the Chamber.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, March 28, 2019, the House stands in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly, (at 9 o'clock and 3 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1052

JOINT MEETING TO HEAR AN ADDRESS BY HIS EXCELLENCY JENS STOLTENBERG, SECRETARY GENERAL OF THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION

During the recess, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 10 o'clock and 52 minutes a.m.

The Assistant to the Sergeant at Arms, Ms. Kathleen Joyce, announced the Vice President and Members of the U.S. Senate, who entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, the Vice President taking the chair at the right of the Speaker, and the Members of the Senate the seats reserved for them.

The SPEAKER. The joint meeting will come to order.

The Chair appoints as members of the committee on the part of the House to escort His Excellency Jens Stoltenberg into the Chamber:

The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER);

The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN);

The gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. LUJÁN);

The gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES);

The gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. CLARK);

The gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF);

The gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL);

The gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY);

The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY);

The gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY);

The gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE);

□ 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.

H2989

The gentlewoman from Wyoming (Ms. CHENEY);

The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. EMMER);

The gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER);

The gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WALKER);

The gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SMITH);

The gentleman from California (Mr. NUNES); and

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL).

The VICE PRESIDENT. The President of the Senate, at the direction of that body, appoints the following Senators as members of the committee on the part of the Senate to escort His Excellency Jens Stoltenberg, Secretary General of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization into the House Chamber:

The Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL);

The Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE);

The Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY);

The Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO);

The Senator from Iowa (Ms. ERNST);

The Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT);

The Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH);

The Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS);

The Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN);

The Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY);

The Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR);

The Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN);

The Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN);

The Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED);

The Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ);

The Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN); and

The Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN).

The Assistant to the Sergeant at Arms announced the Acting Dean of the Diplomatic Corps, His Excellency Serge Mombouli, the Ambassador of the Republic of Congo.

The Acting Dean of the Diplomatic Corps entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seat reserved for him.

The Assistant to the Sergeant at Arms announced the Cabinet of the President of the United States.

The members of the Cabinet of the President of the United States entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

At 11 o'clock and 10 minutes a.m., the Sergeant at Arms, the Honorable Paul D. Irving, announced His Excellency Jens Stoltenberg, Secretary General of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

The Secretary General of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, escorted

by the committee of Senators and Representatives, entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and stood at the Clerk's desk.

(Applause, the Members rising.)

The SPEAKER. Members of Congress, I have the high privilege and the distinct honor of presenting to you His Excellency Jens Stoltenberg, Secretary General of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

(Applause, the Members rising.)

Secretary General STOLTENBERG. Madam Speaker, Mr. Vice President, honorable Members of the United States Congress, ladies and gentlemen, I am really truly honored and grateful for the privilege of addressing you all today and to represent the 29 members of the NATO alliance.

Seventy years ago tomorrow, NATO's founding treaty was signed in this great city. On that day, President Truman said: "We hope to create a shield against aggression and the fear of aggression; a bulwark which will permit us to get on with the real business of government and society; the business of achieving a fuller and happier life for all our citizens."

Our alliance was created by people who had lived through two devastating world wars. They knew only too well the horror, the suffering, and the human and material cost of war. They were determined that this should never happen again. And they were also determined to stand up to the expansion of the Soviet Union which was taking control over its neighbors, crushing democracies, and oppressing their people.

So they founded NATO with a clear purpose: to preserve peace and to safeguard freedom, and—with an ironclad commitment by all members of the alliance—to protect each other. They made a solemn promise: one for all and all for one.

This commitment has served us well. Peace has been preserved and freedom maintained.

Yes, allies have been involved in conflicts in different parts of the world, and allies have suffered the pain of terrorist attacks, but no NATO ally has been attacked by another country. The Cold War ended without a shot being fired in Europe, and we have experienced an unprecedented period of peace. So the NATO alliance is not only the longest lasting alliance in history, it is the most successful alliance in history.

Ever since the founding of our treaty, our alliance, in 1949, every Congress, every American President, your men and women in uniform, and the people of the United States of America have been staunch supporters of NATO.

America has been the backbone of our alliance. It has been fundamental to European security and for our freedom. We would not have the peaceful and prosperous Europe we see today without the sacrifice and the commitment of the United States.

For your enduring support, I thank you all today.

So NATO has been good for Europe. But NATO has also been good for the United States. The strength of a nation is not only measured by the size of its economy or the number of its soldiers, but also by the number of its friends. And through NATO, the United States has more friends and allies than any other power. This has made the United States stronger, safer, and more secure.

Madam Speaker, Mr. Vice President, it is good to have friends.

Yesterday, as I flew over the Atlantic, I looked out of my window at the ocean below, the great ocean that lies between our two continents. The Atlantic does not divide us; it unites us, and it binds us together.

For Norwegians like me, the Atlantic Ocean defines who we are. Indeed, it was a Norseman, Leif Erikson, who was the first European to reach American shores almost 1,000 years ago—a fact more people would know if he hadn't left so quickly and decided not to tell anyone about it.

For adventurers like Leif Erikson, the Atlantic Ocean was never a barrier. Rather, it was a great blue bridge to new lands and new possibilities. For millions of Europeans, it has been a bridge to freedom, sanctuary, and hope.

My grandparents were among them. My mother was born in Paterson, New Jersey, and I lived part of my childhood in San Francisco. So, this has given me a sense of kinship with this wonderful country, a kinship that has only grown throughout my life.

For instance, I remember well during the Cold War, when I was a conscript in the Norwegian Army, our forces were trained and equipped to hold the line. But we knew that we could not take on the might of the Soviet Union alone, and Norway is actually bordering the Soviet Union or was bordering the Soviet Union during the Cold War.

But we also knew that we were not alone. We knew that, if needed, our NATO allies, led by the United States, would soon be there with us. We enjoyed a level of security that only our transatlantic alliance could provide.

So, thanks to NATO, as a young man during the Cold War, I felt safe. And that says something about the strength of our alliance.

Madam Speaker, Mr. Vice President, Members of Congress, at the entrance to the NATO headquarters in Belgium, there are two monuments—one, a piece of the Berlin Wall. Designed to keep people in and ideas out, it failed. It failed because the ideas and the values of those who built it were less compelling and less powerful than ours, because we, as NATO, were resolute. We stood together and would not back down.

The other monument is a twisted steel beam from the North Tower of the World Trade Center, a memorial to the ordinary people going about their business on an ordinary day when the unthinkable happened, a memorial to the 2,977 people who lost their lives on

9/11, a reminder of how all NATO allies stood with the United States in its hour of need.

One monument is a symbol of freedom, the other a symbol of solidarity. Both are symbols of NATO, who we are and what we stand for, what so many of our brave men and women have fought for and sometimes died for, but not in vain and not alone.

The men and women of our armed forces have served together over decades. This includes, actually, also, many of you in this room, in this Congress, in my delegation. And I pay tribute to you and to all those who serve in the defense of freedom.

There is no higher cause than freedom. And in these two monuments, we see the challenges we have overcome as an alliance.

We deterred the Soviet Union during the Cold War; stopped wars and atrocities in the Balkans; fought terrorism from Afghanistan to the Middle East; welcomed the newly free nations of Central and Eastern Europe into our alliance, helping to spread democracy, peace, and prosperity.

And NATO's door remains open. This year, the Republic of North Macedonia signed the accession protocol. And with your support, North Macedonia will soon become the 30th member of our alliance.

So, what started in 1949 with 12 members has proven a powerful force for peace, an alliance that others strive to join, showing the historic success of NATO.

But as you all know, success in the past is not a guarantee of success in the future. And we have to be frank. Questions are being asked on both sides of the Atlantic about the strength of our partnership.

And, yes, there are differences. We are an alliance of many different nations, with different geography, history, and political parties: Republicans and Democrats, conservatives and labor, independents, greens, and many more. This is democracy.

Open discussions and different views are not a sign of weakness, they are a sign of strength. So, we should not be surprised when we see differences between our countries.

Today, there are disagreements on issues such as trade, energy, climate change, and the Iran nuclear deal. These are serious issues with serious disagreements. But we should remember that we have had our disagreements also before: the Suez crisis in 1956; the French withdrawal from military cooperation in NATO in 1966; or the Iraq war in 2003, which was strongly supported by some allies and equally strongly opposed by others.

The strength of NATO is that, despite our differences, we have always been able to unite around our core task, to defend each other, protect each other, and to keep our people safe.

We have overcome our disagreements in the past, and we must overcome our differences now, because we will need our alliance even more in the future.

We face unprecedented challenges, challenges no one nation can face alone.

The global balance of power is shifting. The fight against terrorism is a generational fight. We have only just seen the beginning of the threats in cyberspace. Artificial intelligence, quantum computing, and big data could change the nature of conflict more fundamentally than the Industrial Revolution. And we will need to continue to deal with a more assertive Russia.

In 2014, Russia illegally annexed Crimea, the first time in Europe that one country had taken part of another by force since World War II.

And we see a pattern of Russian behavior, including a massive military buildup from the Arctic to the Mediterranean and from the Black Sea to the Baltic; the use of a military-grade nerve agent in the United Kingdom; support for Assad's murderous regime in Syria; consistent cyberattacks on NATO allies and partners, targeting everything from Parliaments to power grids; sophisticated disinformation campaigns; and attempts to interfere in democracy itself.

NATO has responded with the biggest reinforcement of our collective defense in decades. For the first time, we have combat-ready troops deployed in the east of our alliance. We have increased the readiness of our forces, tripled the size of the NATO Response Force; modernized our command structure; bolstered our cyber defenses; and we have stepped up our support for our close partners, Georgia and Ukraine, sovereign nations with the sovereign right to choose their own path.

We do all of this, not to provoke a conflict, but to prevent a conflict, and to preserve peace; not to fight, but to deter; not to attack, but to defend.

There is no contradiction between deterrence, defense, and dialogue. We do not want to isolate Russia. We strive for a better relationship with Russia. But even without a better relationship, we still need to manage a difficult one. So we need to talk, and we do talk, to reduce risks, to avoid incidents, accidents, and miscalculations.

We also need dialogue in order to work for arms control. My generation was shaped by the deployment of thousands of nuclear missiles in Europe in the 1980s, missiles capable of destroying our cities and killing millions of people in moments.

Thanks to the vision and leadership of President Reagan and Premier Gorbachev, the INF Treaty put an end to all these weapons.

But today, they are back. Russia has deployed new missiles in Europe. They are mobile, hard to detect, nuclear capable, cut the warning time to just minutes, and reduce the threshold for the use of nuclear weapons in an armed conflict.

NATO's position is united and clear. Russia is in violation of the INF Treaty. There are no new American missiles

in Europe, but there are new Russian missiles.

I continue to call on Russia to return to compliance with the INF Treaty. But so far, Russia has taken no steps to do so, and time is running out.

We do not want a new arms race. We do not want a new Cold War. But we must not be naive. An agreement that is only respected by one side will not keep us safe, so we must also prepare for a world without the INF Treaty.

We will be measured and coordinated. We will not mirror what Russia is doing. NATO has no intention of deploying land-based nuclear missiles in Europe. But NATO will always take the necessary steps to provide credible and effective deterrence.

Madam Speaker, Mr. Vice President, the fight against terrorism also demands our collective effort. The attacks on 9/11 made that clear.

NATO's response to those was swift. Within 24 hours, and for the first and only time in our history, we invoked Article 5 of the Washington Treaty, the collective defense clause, which states: "An armed attack against one . . . shall be considered an attack against them all."

So, 9/11 was not only an attack on the United States, but against all NATO allies. Within days, NATO aircraft were patrolling American skies. And in the wake of 9/11, NATO soldiers went to fight side by side in Afghanistan to prevent that country from ever again becoming a safe haven for terrorists who could attack us here at home.

Over the years, hundreds of thousands of troops from Europe and Canada have served in Afghanistan. Over a thousand have paid the ultimate price, and many more have been seriously wounded. We honor their service and their sacrifice.

NATO remains in Afghanistan today to fight terrorism and to train Afghan forces. Our goal is not to stay there forever. We should not stay any longer than is necessary. We went in together; we will decide on our future presence together; and when the time comes, we will leave together.

NATO fully supports the peace process. It must pave the way for Afghan reconciliation. There can only be peace if Afghanistan stays free from international terrorists. And for peace to be sustainable, it must build on our achievements. NATO has created the conditions for social and economic progress, bringing education and human rights to women and girls. Their rights must be preserved.

NATO is not only fighting terrorism in Afghanistan, we are also part of the Global Coalition to Defeat ISIS. The Coalition has made remarkable progress.

Once, ISIS controlled an area roughly the size of Virginia, and they imposed their twisted ideology on millions. They beheaded people, burned people alive, and traded women as sex slaves.

We should never forget their brutality; and, thanks to American leadership and our collective efforts, we have

stopped this brutality, and millions of people have been liberated.

But our work is not done. That is why NATO is stepping up our training of Iraqi forces, so they can better defend their country and make sure that ISIS can never return.

This is also why NATO supports our partners in the Middle East and North Africa, helping them to build up their intelligence services, border security, cybersecurity, and Special Operations Forces.

Training local forces and building local capacity are among the best weapons we have in the fight against terrorism. Prevention is better than intervention.

Madam Speaker, Mr. Vice President, some of you here today will have been directly affected by terrorism. You may have lost friends and loved ones. You know the reality of terrorism. I know it too.

I was Prime Minister of Norway on the 22nd of July 2011, a date that will live in infamy in the history of my country. That day, a terrorist detonated a bomb outside my office, killing eight people and injuring many more.

He then went to the island of Utoya, where young people were enjoying a summer camp. He killed a further 69 people, most of them teenagers with their whole lives ahead of them. It was the darkest day in Norway since the Second World War. It was the darkest day of my life.

Terrorism comes in many forms. Some perpetrators misuse religion, others misuse political ideology. They claim to be different from each other, fighting for different causes, but they are all the same. They believe in hatred, violence, and killing innocent men, women, and children. They are nothing more than cowards.

Terrorists attack our freedom, our values, and our way of life. Our answer must be more openness and more democracy. Our values will prevail.

Freedom will prevail over oppression, tolerance over intolerance, and love will always prevail over hate.

I see this in the flowers laid outside the mosques in Christchurch, New Zealand. I see this in the lives led by the young survivors of the attacks in Norway.

I see this in New York and Washington, two indomitable cities, cities that were not intimidated, not defeated, but which rose stronger than ever from the horror of that September morning.

Madam Speaker, Mr. Vice President, NATO is a strong alliance, but to remain a strong alliance, NATO must be a fair alliance.

In an ideal world, we would not need to spend any money on defense. But we do not live in an ideal world.

Freedom has enemies, and they need to be deterred. And if deterrence fails, we need to fight it.

Hitler could not have been stopped with peaceful protests. Stalin could not have been deterred with words. ISIS

could not have been defeated with dialogue.

Future enemies of freedom may choose violence again. Our desire for a peaceful world is simply not enough. We must act, and invest, to make it so.

NATO allies must spend more on defense. This has been the clear message from President Trump, and this message is having a real impact.

After years of reducing defense budgets, all allies have stopped the cuts and all allies have increased their defense spending. Before, they were cutting billions; now they are adding billions.

In just the last 2 years, European allies and Canada have spent an additional \$41 billion on defense. By the end of next year, that figure will rise to \$100 billion. This is making NATO stronger.

That money will allow us to invest in new capabilities our armed forces need; including advanced fighter aircraft, attack helicopters, missile defense, and surveillance drones. This is good for Europe, and it is good for America.

America's NATO allies provide important capabilities; including tens of thousands of intelligence personnel and cyber experts, giving the United States better eyes and ears where you need them, from tracking submarines in the Arctic to taking down the cyber networks of ISIS.

Europe provides the U.S. with a platform to project power around the world.

Last year, I was in Fort Worth, Texas, and I saw how industries from many NATO allies are working together to produce next-generation strike-fighter aircraft.

NATO has always had a technological edge. To keep that edge, we must innovate and capitalize on the ingenuity of our industries and our best minds, on both sides of the Atlantic. This will continue to provide us with advanced capabilities and create jobs in the United States, Canada, and Europe.

So our transatlantic bond is not just about security, it is also about prosperity.

It is not by chance that Article 2 of the Washington Treaty encourages economic collaboration between our Nations.

Europe and America have long been, by far, each other's largest trading partners, creating millions of jobs on both sides of the Atlantic, generating more than \$3 billion a day in trade, injecting trillions of dollars into our economies.

There is more wealth, greater health, better education, and more happiness thanks to the bond between our two continents.

Madam Speaker, Mr. Vice President, the ultimate expression of burden-sharing is that we stand together, fight together, and sometimes die together.

I have visited Arlington National Cemetery to pay tribute to all those American soldiers who have given their lives, many of them in defense of Europe.

Two world wars and the Cold War made it clear how important America is to the security of Europe and, equally, that peace and stability in Europe is important to the United States.

Our alliance has not lasted for 70 years out of a sense of nostalgia or of sentiment.

NATO lasts because it is in the national interest of each and every one of our Nations.

Together, we represent 1 billion people. We are half of the world's economic might and half of the world's military might.

When we stand together, we are stronger than any potential challenger economically, politically, and militarily.

We need this collective strength because we will face new threats, and we have seen so many times before how difficult it is to predict the future. We were not able to predict the fall of the Berlin Wall, the 9/11 attacks, the rise of ISIS, or Russia's illegal annexation of Crimea.

Since we cannot foresee the future, we have to be prepared for the unforeseen. We need a strategy to deal with uncertainty. We have one. That strategy is NATO.

A strong and agile NATO reduces risks and enables us to deal with surprises when they happen. And they will happen.

NATO is the most successful alliance in history because we have always been able to change as the world changes, and because, despite our differences, we are united in our commitment to each other.

NATO is an alliance of sovereign nations, united by democracy, liberty, and the rule of law, by a person's right to live their life in the pursuit of happiness, free from oppression—values that lie at the heart of the United States and at the heart of NATO.

As President Eisenhower, NATO's first Supreme Allied Commander, said, "We are concerned not only with the protection of territory . . . but with the defense of a way of life."

Europe and North America are not separated by the Atlantic Ocean; we are united by it. And just like the Atlantic, NATO unites our continents, our nations, and our people. It has done so for 70 years.

And today, we must do everything in our power to maintain that unity for future generations, because come what may, we are stronger and safer when we stand together.

Madam Speaker, Mr. Vice President, it is good to have friends.

Thank you.

(Applause, the Members rising.)

At 11 o'clock and 56 minutes a.m., His Excellency Jens Stoltenberg, Secretary General of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, accompanied by the committee of escort, retired from the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The Assistant to the Sergeant at Arms escorted the invited guests from the Chamber in the following order:

The members of the President's Cabinet;

The Acting Dean of the Diplomatic Corps.

JOINT MEETING DISSOLVED

The SPEAKER. The purpose of the joint meeting having been completed, the Chair declares the joint meeting of the two Houses now dissolved.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 57 minutes a.m.), the joint meeting of the two Houses was dissolved.

The Members of the Senate retired to their Chamber.

The SPEAKER. The House will continue in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1226

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York) at 12 o'clock and 26 minutes p.m.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, April 3, 2019.

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

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on April 3, 2019, at 12:00 p.m.:

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 1839.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

CHERYL L. JOHNSON.

PRINTING OF PROCEEDINGS HAD DURING RECESS

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings had during the recess be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1585, VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2019

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 281 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 281

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. 1585) to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act of 1994, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. 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 the Judiciary now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116-9 modified by the amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules. Each such 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 amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommend with or without instructions.

□ 1230

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. LESKO), 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

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 281, providing for consideration of H.R. 1585, the Violence Against Women Re-

authorization Act of 2019, under a structured rule.

The rule self-executes a manager's amendment that makes technical changes to reflect appropriate statute sections, corrects terminologies, and makes in order 40 amendments.

Mr. Speaker, this year, we are celebrating the 25th anniversary of the Violence Against Women Act, VAWA, a landmark piece of bipartisan legislation that has helped to reduce instances of domestic violence and ensure that millions of survivors have access to the services they need.

VAWA was the first piece of Federal legislation to acknowledge domestic violence and sexual assault as crimes and has dramatically improved our Nation's response to helping survivors in both the short and long term.

Since its enactment in 1994, VAWA has brought together law enforcement, social service organizations, and victims' advocates to bring domestic violence to light, provide survivors with support, and hold abusers accountable for their actions.

VAWA was and still is a piece of legislation developed by the people who work closest to these issues in their communities. The bipartisan bill we will vote on this week reflects the ongoing commitment of Members on both sides of the aisle to ending domestic violence and abuse in all forms.

Before I get further into the components and details of the bill, I would like to share two stories about my constituents to illustrate why VAWA reauthorization is so necessary and why we must continue to commit ourselves to preventing domestic violence at every opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, please keep in mind that each of these stories happened in the past week in my district.

First, last week, a young woman was murdered by her ex-husband at a convenience store, where the two were meeting to exchange custody of their 6-year-old son. The ex-husband left their son at home and, instead, brought an AR-15 style rifle, which he used to murder the woman in the middle of the store.

He was caught by law enforcement after he fled the store, but as a result of these horrific actions, a young woman was murdered in cold blood and a child has, effectively, lost both parents.

This was not the first time the ex-husband had threatened to kill his ex-wife during a child custody exchange just like the one this past week. Following an incident 3 years ago, he was charged with harassment and making terroristic threats, and the woman was granted a protection-from-abuse order.

But this didn't prevent her or her family from living in fear of what her ex-husband might do next. Tragically, the very worst happened.

Then, just this past Sunday evening, another woman was asleep in her home in Upland with her three children when, just after midnight, her ex-boyfriend broke into her house, entered