

O'Halleran	Sarbanes	Titus
Ocasio-Cortez	Scalise	Tlaib
Omar	Scanlon	Tonko
Palazzo	Schakowsky	Torres (CA)
Pallone	Schiff	Torres Small
Palmer	Schneider	(NM)
Panetta	Schrader	Trahan
Pappas	Schrier	Trone
Pascrell	Schweikert	Turner
Payne	Scott (VA)	Underwood
Pence	Scott, Austin	Upton
Perlmutter	Scott, David	Van Drew
Peters	Serrano	Vargas
Peterson	Sewell (AL)	Veasey
Phillips	Shalala	Vela
Pingree	Sherrill	Velázquez
Pocan	Shimkus	Visclosky
Porter	Simpson	Wagner
Posey	Sires	Walberg
Pressley	Slotkin	Walden
Price (NC)	Smith (MO)	Walker
Quigley	Smith (NE)	Walorski
Raskin	Smith (NJ)	Waltz
Ratcliffe	Smith (WA)	Wasserman
Reed	Smucker	Schultz
Reschenthaler	Soto	Waters
Rice (NY)	Spanberger	Watkins
Rice (SC)	Spano	Watson Coleman
Richmond	Speier	Weber (TX)
Riggleman	Stanton	Webster (FL)
Roby	Stauber	Welch
Rodgers (WA)	Stefanik	Wenstrup
Roe, David P.	Stell	Westerman
Rogers (AL)	Steube	Wexton
Rogers (KY)	Stevens	Wild
Rooney (FL)	Stewart	Williams
Rose (NY)	Stivers	Wilson (SC)
Rouda	Suozzi	Wittman
Rouzer	Takano	Womack
Roybal-Allard	Taylor	Woodall
Ruiz	Thompson (CA)	Wright
Ruppersberger	Thompson (MS)	Yarmuth
Rush	Thompson (PA)	Young
Rutherford	Thornberry	Zeldin
Ryan	Timmons	
Sánchez	Tipton	

NAYS—22

Amash	Harris	Mooney (WV)
Brooks (AL)	Hern, Kevin	Perry
Burchett	Higgins (LA)	Rose, John W.
Cline	Hunter	Roy
Ferguson	Jordan	Sensenbrenner
Gohmert	Massie	Yoho
Gosar	McClintock	
Grothman	Meadows	

NOT VOTING—15

Biggs	Graves (MO)	Norman
Buck	Green (TN)	Olson
Clyburn	Hastings	Sherman
Dean	Herrera Beutler	Swalwell (CA)
Duncan	Lawrence	Wilson (FL)

□ 1031

Messrs. MEADOWS, GROTHMAN, and JOHN W. ROSE of Tennessee changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. KELLY of Mississippi, FULLER, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. DUNN, Ms. DELBENE, and Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REQUEST TO CONSIDER H.R. 962, BORN-ALIVE ABORTION SURVIVORS PROTECTION ACT

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 962, the Born-Alive Abortion Sur-

vivors Protection Act, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under guidelines consistently issued by successive Speakers, as recorded in section 956 of the House Rules and Manual, the Chair is constrained not to entertain the request unless it has been cleared by the bipartisan floor and committee leaderships.

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. I urge the Speaker and the majority leader to immediately schedule the born-alive bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is not recognized for debate.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of inquiring of the majority leader the schedule for next week.

I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the majority leader.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), the Republican whip, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the House will meet at 2 p.m. for legislative business, with votes postponed until 6:30 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday and Wednesday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate and 12 p.m. for legislative business.

Members are reminded that when the House is considering appropriations bills, votes will occur after 7 p.m. and, obviously, before as well.

On Thursday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business. Last votes on Thursday are expected to occur probably between 2 and 3 p.m. That is different, as I know most Members are used to leaving at 11. We are leaving at 10:30 today, but it will be somewhere between 2 and 3 p.m. on that Thursday.

We will consider several bills under suspension of the rules. The complete list of suspension bills will be announced by the close of business today.

The House will also consider a contempt resolution. This resolution would force Attorney General Barr and former White House Counsel McGahn to comply with congressional subpoenas that have been duly issued by the House Judiciary Committee. The resolution will authorize the Judiciary Committee to pursue civil action to seek enforcement of its subpoenas in Federal court.

Madam Speaker, it also authorizes House committees that have issued subpoenas as part of their oversight and investigation responsibilities to seek civil enforcement of those subpoenas when they are ignored.

Madam Speaker, in addition to that contempt resolution, the House will consider H.R. 2740, the Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, Legislative Branch, Defense, State, Foreign

Operations, and Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act of 2020.

This will be the first of several minibuses, Madam Speaker, that will be coming to the floor over this work period. It is my intention to pass all 12 appropriations bills through the House by the end of June. This package is the first step toward the House doing its work.

This is, as I said, the first step toward precluding the possibility of a shutdown at the end of this year, as occurred at the beginning of this year. I am hopeful that all Members will cooperate with Chair LOWEY and Ranking Member GRANGER, who have led their committees in working extraordinarily hard, 12 subcommittees, all of which will have marked up their bills by the middle of next week and be ready for floor action. This is one of the earliest times we have considered it.

My Republican colleagues passed a number of bills, as well, in the last year. It was in the Senate that we didn't get that done. But the fact of the matter is, hopefully, we will be able to get this done.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, as we start the appropriations process to, ultimately, get to the point where we are able to pass our appropriations bills prior to September 30, I think the gentleman recognizes that the only way we will have an opportunity to get to a point where we don't have a shutdown is if we are in agreement, both between the House and Senate as well as with the White House, on the actual number, the amount of money that the Federal Government would be able to spend in that year.

We have had agreements in prior years, budget agreements, on how we are going to do that. I think the gentleman understands that even within the Democratic-controlled House, there is not an agreement. The Budget Committee, the majority's Budget Committee, was not able to pass a budget. It was not even able to pass out of committee an amount of money to determine what we could spend in the House or the Senate. There is not an agreement at all.

In fact, if you look, it is the first time in 9 years that the House Budget Committee did not produce a budget. That budget, that is usually the document that says this is the amount of money that the appropriations bills can ultimately equal up to, whether it is defense or all the other bills.

Next week, more than half of the discretionary spending of the country is going to be on the House floor. The Department of Defense bill alone represents more than half of the discretionary spending, and there is not an agreement between the House and Senate or with the White House on how much we are going to fund defense.

I would like to see us get that agreement, but, clearly, the gentleman

knows we don't have one. Unfortunately, those bills are typically bipartisan, and the Appropriations Committee has produced a very partisan defense bill. That doesn't happen often.

I wish the Democrats on the committee would have worked with the Republicans on the Appropriations Committee to produce a bipartisan bill so that we would have a better chance of getting something that can get signed into law.

If we want to avoid a shutdown, the best way to do it is to work with both parties, not just produce a Democratic-only bill. That doesn't happen too often. Unfortunately, I think that is the direction we are headed.

I would like to ask the gentleman, number one, if he has any kind of idea on how we are going to get to a budget agreement, an agreement on some kind of spending forecast, so that we can have a picture of how we can get bills that can get signed into law and an amendment process that would be fair to both sides.

I think we have talked about this before, how so far this Congress, it has been very tilted, where the lion's share of amendments that are coming out of the Rules Committee are only Democratic amendments. There has been a history this Congress of shutting out Republican amendments on the floor, and I would hope there would be a more fair process as these important bills—DOD, Labor-H, and some of the other bills—are going to be coming to the floor, where the Rules Committee would at least allow both sides to speak as we try to produce a bill that could be bipartisan but, so far, has not been.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCALISE. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

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

First of all, of course, there was no budget last year. There was a budget that was passed in the latter part of the year before, but that was for reconciliation purposes so that Republicans could pass their tax bill with less than 60 votes in the United States Senate. So I wouldn't go too far on the budget.

Republicans were in charge for 8 years, and they never had a budget. That doesn't mean we didn't pass one through the House, but there was never a budget. There was never a budget that was implemented, that I can remember, in the long term.

□ 1045

But that aside, as the gentleman probably knows, I, in January, started talking with his leadership, with Ranking Member GRANGER, with Senator MCCONNELL, with Senator SHELBY, with Senator LEAHY, with Mrs. LOWEY, and with our leadership about the necessity to reach an agreement on the level of discretionary spending, which we call the caps.

Clearly, as Senator MCCONNELL pointed out in our discussions, the White House was a critical component of that because, as the gentleman knows, in order to change the sequester, which I think is one of the stupidest policies that we put in place, but in order to change the sequester, we would have to have a bill signed by the President. So, clearly, the President would have to be involved.

Unfortunately, sometime thereafter, Mr. Vought and Mr. Mulvaney suggested that we ought to go to sequester, that we ought to just march to the sequester numbers.

For the Members who may not know exactly what that means, that means a \$54 billion cut in defense spending. I don't really think anybody in this House thinks that is an appropriate step for us to take, but that is what Mr. Mulvaney and Mr. Vought of OMB suggested, except, by the way, they crossed their fingers to say we will use \$180 billion of additional deficit spending out of the overseas contingency operations to fund defense.

In other words, yes, we will do the sequester, but it will really only have an effect on the nondefense, education, healthcare, medical research, law enforcement, et cetera. It would only have an effect on that side of the budget.

I didn't think that made much sense. And, very frankly, I think all of the people that I just mentioned that I had talked to didn't think it made sense either.

Obviously, Paul Ryan, when he was Speaker, didn't think it made sense, because he led a deal with Senator MURRAY to give us numbers that we thought were reasonable, and we came to an agreement.

I would hope that we could do that now. I know there are some negotiations at the top four level and in the White House that have not reached agreement yet. I think that is unfortunate.

Now, the gentleman observed that we haven't passed a budget. He is correct. But we did pass the exact same number that the Budget Committee reported out for discretionary spending, and we adopted it in the rule.

He is right; we did not adopt it in the budget as it was offered, but that wasn't necessary, because in either event, that wouldn't have solved the problem.

But we adopted the same exact number, the Democrats voted for that number, to which the committee marked its bills. As the gentleman knows, that was \$733 billion on defense and \$639 billion on nondefense. There was some argument on our side as to whether those numbers ought to be closer together, but that aside, that is what those bills have been.

So there is a number, and it was a number that was used by the Appropriations Committee, and it is a number that is reflected in the bills that we will be bringing to the floor.

Now, of course we could wait, as I think, frankly, the White House wants us to wait, until September, maybe September 27, 28, or 29, and then they would say: Well, we are going to do a CR at last year's numbers.

Now, that would be a little more than sequester, no doubt about that, but it would not be a number that I think the Members of this House on either side of the aisle would be happy with—maybe for different reasons but, nevertheless, not happy with.

So I am in agreement that we need to reach a number. We need to pass a bill, because, if we do not, under the law that we passed some years ago, 15 days after the first session of this Congress adjourns, sequester will automatically go into effect.

Nobody would be happy. America will not be happy. Our security will suffer and our people will suffer under those numbers. So I am in full agreement that we ought to reach a number.

Now, with respect to the appropriations bills, I think we need to move them. Obviously, there is going to be a lot of negotiation back and forth, a lot of different steps will need to be taken. But this is a first step; it is an important step; and it sets a marker as to where we are going to start negotiations.

Hopefully, those negotiations will bear fruit with the Senate and with the White House, because I know the gentleman shares my view that shutting down the government is not an option that we ought to be pursuing. Hopefully, we, through these actions, can preclude that from happening, and I think that will be a positive result.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

I share the majority leader's understanding that there is a negotiation going on to see if we can get an agreement on the budget numbers. We are not there yet.

I understand the gentleman that the majority has to move, at some point, on those appropriations bills next week. We all know that the bills that are being moved are not bills that we have an agreement on and, unfortunately, started off on a very partisan nature. Hopefully, we can get to a more bipartisan nature in the bills, bills like defense, that are coming up.

We want our military to be properly funded, and we want our military to have the certainty that they don't have to operate under a CR, they don't have to operate under a cloud of potential shutdown.

Our men and women in uniform, as we get ready to honor the brave sacrifices that were made on D-Day—tomorrow, of course, marks the 75th anniversary of D-Day and the heroic efforts that so many made, sacrificing their lives. Over 10,000 American soldiers died, and, of course, we reflect and pause to thank them for their sacrifice, to recognize that sacrifice that they made.

And just as they did, today we have men and women in uniform risking

their lives for our country. And we don't want to have this potential that, if we get to September 30 and can't get an agreement on what that proper level should be, that they should worry whether or not they are going to get paid.

So, hopefully, we can keep that work going, those conversations and negotiations going to finalize an agreement that we can get. We are not there yet. We will see where it goes next week.

We then want to shift over now and talk about what else is going to be on the floor next week, and that is going to be this contempt resolution. I haven't seen the language. I don't know when the gentleman's side plans to file.

I would ask the majority leader, it is clear that there is a march to impeachment, that this starts, maybe, the formal march to impeachment on the House floor. But just this Sunday, the majority whip was asked on a TV show if he felt the House was going to impeach the President of the United States, and he said yes.

There has been no evidence that would necessitate an impeachment. We had this nearly 2-year investigation by Mr. Mueller, and it was all about whether or not there was collusion between the President and Russia. They looked into whether or not there was any kind of interference by Russia in our elections.

Of course, he did find that there was interference by Russia. Russia tried to interfere with our elections while Barack Obama was President of the United States.

Now, what did Barack Obama do to stop that? I don't know. I don't know if that is going to be investigated—it should be—whether or not the President did everything in his powers at the time to stop Russia from interfering with our elections.

We need to work together to make sure it doesn't happen again. That should be our focus.

There was no collusion, by the way, and he found that. There was no obstruction of justice.

I know the committee wants to keep focusing and looking into everything that they can to try to find more evidence that wasn't there, but if they start bringing and you start bringing resolutions to hold, for example, the Attorney General in contempt—we haven't seen what the charges are, but some of the things that the Judiciary Committee has asked the Attorney General to produce, if the Attorney General produced that information, he would be violating law.

Why would you hold the Attorney General of the United States in contempt of Congress for not breaking the law?

Those are some of the things we have seen. Again, we haven't seen the final language. We have heard some conjecture by the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, by others who want to start this impeachment drumbeat.

Madam Speaker, I would just urge caution to the gentleman as the House floor becomes politicized to just try to impeach the President because some people just don't like the fact that he was elected in 2016.

There will be an election next year. There are a whole lot of people on the Democratic side who are already trying to get the nomination to unseat the President, and that debate is already going on in the country, and it will happen in full next year.

Let's let the people of this country decide who the President of the United States is. Let's respect the fact that the people of this country, in 2016, said they wanted Donald Trump to be the President of the United States, and he is the President of the United States, and he is carrying out his duties, and he is carrying out the agenda that he campaigned on, as it should be.

If somebody wants to carry out a different agenda, next year they are going to have that opportunity to present it to the people of this country.

But even though there was no collusion identified by the special counsel, this idea that we are still going to just start bringing legislative instruments to the floor like contempt and then, ultimately, as the majority whip said Sunday that he felt that there would be impeachment on the House floor, I would just urge caution to the gentleman. This next week, this legislation that is going to be brought forward is all a part of that.

We should respect this process more. We should respect the fact that the Attorney General of the United States has an obligation to enforce the laws of this country. And when he is asked by Congress to do something that would actually violate laws, we ought to respect the fact that he said he would come and testify to the Judiciary Committee, to the members of the Judiciary Committee.

Then the Judiciary Committee changed the rules of the game and said they didn't want Members of Congress to question him; they wanted staff to question, which would be unprecedented, so he didn't come. But he did say he would come and testify to the committee under the normal processes that have always been in place.

So with that, again, we haven't seen the legislation yet. Once we do, we will review it, but I would just urge caution.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Very frankly, the person who rejected the premise that this matter was over was Robert Mueller in a relatively short press conference in which he answered no questions, but he clearly demonstrated that he thought Mr. BARR misrepresented the fact that this was over. In fact, he said:

If we thought the President had not done anything wrong and we were convinced of that, we would have said so. We did not say so.

Now, having said that, this is not related to impeachment. This is related to the Congress' authority, under the Constitution of the United States, to receive information from the executive on behalf of the American people.

Now, if Mr. BARR believes that the information requested need not be submitted, then he had nothing to fear, because what we are seeking is a court ruling, an independent body's ruling as to whether or not he ought to be held in contempt and directed by a court to provide the information to the Congress of the United States, acting pursuant to its constitutional duty.

Madam Speaker, I will tell my friend that it is a sad day when the Republicans and Democrats do not stand together on behalf of not only this institution's constitutional authority, but responsibility to get the information it needs both with respect to, as, again, Mr. Mueller pointed out, the very serious issue of the Russians trying to affect our democracy and our elections.

There is no dispute of that fact. In fact, nine Russians were indicted by the Mueller special counsel for exactly that purpose.

□ 1100

Now, this resolution to which the gentleman refers authorizes the Judiciary Committee to pursue civil action to seek enforcement in Federal court of its subpoenas to Attorney General Barr and former White House Counsel McGahn, who is no longer a Federal employee. It also authorizes House committees that have issued subpoenas as part of their oversight and investigation responsibilities. Let me emphasize that: Investigation responsibilities, oversight. That is part of the constitutional responsibility of the Congress of the United States, which, by the way, your party pursued extraordinarily vigorously over the last 8 years of the Obama administration, and, very frankly, in previous administrations.

We are seeking civil enforcement to have a determination as to whether or not Attorney General Barr, Mr. McGahn, and indeed others, who have refused to comply with constitutionally sanctioned requests by the Congress of the United States for information on behalf of the American people. The President of the United States, like Barr, said it is over.

Mr. Mueller says it is not over. Mr. Mueller says he did not have the authority pursuant to Justice policy to go further, but he pointed out that there are other bodies that have the authority and responsibility to do so. Who is that? Us, the Congress of the United States.

Now, one of the problems that we are having is that the President has instructed almost all of government not to respond to the Congress of the United States, not to answer questions, not to testify, not to appear. I have called that perhaps the biggest coverup in the history of any President who

has, in effect, given a blanket suggestion, and in some cases order, that people ought not to testify. He said there is no reason to go any further. He has made that decision. And especially in Congress where it is very partisan, obviously very partisan. We did think this is not partisan. This is our responsibility to the American people.

By refusing to cooperate with Congress, the Trump administration has engaged in a refusal to allow the Congress to exercise its responsibility, and therefore, we are going to continue to pursue the facts on behalf of the American people. And that is what this is about. You will note that we have not sought criminal contempt. We have, however, found it to be untenable, unacceptable to have an administration, any administration, Republican or Democrat, tell the Congress whether it is a Republican Congress or a Democratic Congress that it will not respond to requests for information, to subpoenas to testify, and for other information that Congress needs. So that is what we are going to do.

Mr. SCALISE. Well, the gentleman mentioned a lot of things that I think need to be addressed.

First, the idea that there is some coverup. Let's recognize and remember that for nearly 2 years of the Mueller investigation, President Trump fully complied with all of the requests that were made, and when the Mueller investigation was completed, first of all, Mr. Barr, the Attorney General, had an opportunity to review that report and give a summary to Congress.

During that period, Mr. Barr invited Mr. Mueller to review the report, to review his summary. Mr. Mueller chose not to participate in that. And so ultimately the Attorney General then gave Congress a summary, which made it crystal clear there was no collusion after almost 2 years and over \$30 million of taxpayer money looking into this where the President fully complied, his administration fully complied, and they were probing everything.

Mr. HOYER. Will my friend yield?

Mr. SCALISE. The gentleman will yield, but after I first go through this because these are important points to make because anybody that wants to use the term "coverup" ought to be very cognizant of what they are talking about when we talk about that investigation. Because that investigation was as thorough as any that we have seen, and the Attorney General and the special counsel were both involved in reviewing it, but the special counsel had an opportunity if he found wrongdoing to file charges. And the gentleman from Maryland knows that.

Mr. HOYER. No, I do not know that.

Mr. SCALISE. He could have filed charges, and he filed absolutely no charges. There were no charges filed, because there was nothing wrong that was found.

Mr. HOYER. And he said why he did not.

Mr. SCALISE. The task was to see if there was any collusion between Russia and the Trump campaign while Russia was interfering with the elections. We know Russia interfered with the elections.

Why did the Obama administration allow Russia to interfere with the elections? That is a question we should be probing. Why? Not just to go back in time, but to make sure it doesn't happen again. And how much time is being spent going and looking and seeing just exactly what Russia did to interfere with our election while Barack Obama was President? They are not doing that. They want to go after all these witch hunts, and was there more collusion. There was no collusion.

And so instead of saying, okay, they tried for 2 years. You had members of your own leadership team saying they had evidence of collusion, and yet, there was no evidence of collusion and they have never come forth and said they were wrong. They have never brought forward what their mysterious evidence was, because there was no evidence, because there was no collusion. And so instead of that, they are continuing to say, let's just hold contempt hearings for the Attorney General here on the House floor.

The majority whip says the House will impeach the President. The gentleman hasn't answered that. Well, where is that going to happen? When is that going to happen? Why don't we actually focus on the problems of this country? Because the same committee that continues down these rabbit holes and on these witch hunts, that same committee that has jurisdiction over this whole Mueller investigation that found no collusion, no charges filed by the special counsel, that is the same committee that has jurisdiction over the border crisis.

And the gentleman knows we have a crisis at our border. It is a serious crisis because we don't have control over our border yet. We need to get control over our border, but in the next 2 weeks—literally, in the next 2 weeks the department of DHS is about to run out of money to deal with this crisis.

And the President of the United States submitted a supplemental request to this majority asking to give additional funding so that we can take care of those kids that are coming over every day in the thousands, the unaccompanied children where the Department of Health and Human Services is about to run out of money to take care of those kids.

And so what happens to those kids? If they come over illegally, the law says what Homeland Security has to do. And if they come over and they are sick, which some of them are coming over very sick, they are turned over to DHS where DHS takes care of them, and DHS has told you they are about to run out of money and not a thing has been done.

In fact, when the Labor-HHS bill was in subcommittee, one of our Members

actually filed an amendment to try to include the money, so that we can keep taking care of the health needs of those kids that are coming over illegally, and that was rejected on a party line vote. Your party voted against that. And the committee of jurisdiction, instead of focusing on how to solve this problem, how we can help resolve this problem in a bipartisan way, which it should be bipartisan, we all ought to care about these kids that are coming over that have a lot of health issues that we are trying address, but they are about to run out of money. And what are we going to do about it? We have asked that this majority do something to address that request that was sent down from the President weeks ago.

But we are literally facing a crisis in a matter of days where they will run out of money. When is that going to be addressed by this majority? We have asked for it to be addressed, and it hasn't. So when is the Speaker going to bring legislation? Would the majority leader be willing to bring legislation? For weeks we have talked about it right here in this colloquy, and it hasn't been addressed. And so before it becomes a crisis where literally DHS cannot take and care for the health needs of these kids that are coming over, why don't we address it now, instead of waiting until they truly run out of money, can no longer take care of those kids and bad things would happen. I don't want those bad things to happen. I know you don't want those bad things to happen. And the President doesn't want those bad things to happen. That is why he sent that supplemental request weeks ago, and it hasn't been dealt with.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Let me deal with the question of the supplemental, first. There is a humanitarian crisis at the border. We need to deal with it. The President came down with a request some two-plus weeks ago.

Mr. SCALISE. Four.

Mr. HOYER. The Republicans held up consideration of a disaster bill that we passed in January. Now, this dealt with natural disasters, not the humanitarian crisis at the border. I understand that.

We passed that Monday ultimately because the administration wanted to undermine very badly the American citizens who live in Puerto Rico. Finally, we got agreement that that was the right thing to do and the Senate passed it overwhelmingly, then sent it over here. We tried to pass it by unanimous consent, and your side objected. You objected three times. So we had to pass it this Monday. We did overwhelmingly. Not as many perhaps on the gentleman's side as on my side, but we passed it handily.

The fact of the matter is, we need to deal with this humanitarian crisis. We need to deal with the humanitarian crisis, and if we limit it to dealing with

the humanitarian crisis, Madam Speaker, we will do it. And, in fact, Ms. LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD is in discussions on that now. My view is the four corners, meaning the Speaker, the Republican leader, Senator MCCONNELL, the majority leader, and Mr. SCHUMER are dealing with it. I hope they get it done very soon. And if they get it done we are going to move it because there is a crisis and we need to deal with it.

But I would urge my friend to urge his colleagues not to try to do some of the President's agenda unrelated to the humanitarian crisis. And if we can do that, we will get to an agreement, in my opinion.

Now let me go back to your what I believe to be inaccurate, recitation—as I believe Attorney General Barr's recitation of what the Mueller report says, and Mr. Mueller clearly made that very, very crystal clear that he had a different view as to whether that was.

Now, I have got a whole page here of things that the Mueller report says with reference to—“collusion” is a word that the President has created. It is not collusion, not a crime, *per se*. Conspiracy is a crime, but the President uses this word “collusion” as fake news, as a distraction, as a magician's trick to look over here, not here, so that I can fool you.

I asked the gentleman to yield when he said, well, the special counsel decided to do nothing. The special counsel made it very clear that under Justice Department directives, a sitting President cannot be indicted. And Mr. Mueller said if he can't be indicted, I don't want to make an allegation, which would not be fair because he cannot be indicted, and therefore, there will be no fora on which to defend himself. But he observed there was another forum, that was inappropriate for him, that did have the responsibility and the ability to take action, and that, as I said, is us.

Now, I won't go through this list of findings that the Mueller committee or task force, the special counsel concluded, but in my opinion, and I said this in a release 2 days after, were pretty damning and at a minimum worthy of the Congress of the United States trying to get to the bottom of what Manafort and Stone and others did in reference to WikiLeaks, welcoming the Russian participation that they thought was helping them. Mueller report.

So we can go into that at great length, but the proper way to do that is to do what we are doing, ask questions, have witnesses, review documents and other communications to get to the bottom of this, and we intend to do that. And we intend to do it in a considered, focused way.

Neither the Speaker nor I, as the gentleman has read, are saying that we are seeking impeachment, but we are seeking to do our constitutional duty, our responsibility to the American people and to the Constitution to ensure that, in fact, the American people

know what this administration or individuals who work with this administration or others were doing.

□ 1115

Madam Speaker, lastly, because we can go on at length about this, let me say that the gentleman protests too much. The Republicans control the United States Senate. Very frankly, the Intelligence Committee is working in a bipartisan fashion with Mr. BURR from North Carolina and Mr. WARNER from Virginia.

Madam Speaker, if the gentleman, my friend, the whip, is frustrated, I suggest he call up his friends in the United States Senate to say they ought to do this; they ought to do that; and they ought to do the other.

If they think it is the right thing to do, maybe they will do it. But we intend to do our responsibility here.

Again, I would hope that we could join together in defense of the Congress' responsibility and authority and not have any administration—Republican, Democratic, Obama, Trump, any President—say, no, it is not going to give us any information, that some other body has disposed of that question.

Some other body is not us, and we need to move ahead on doing our responsibility.

Again, I would hope the gentleman would cooperate, but we are going to continue to do the business of the people of this country as well.

We have differences on that. We think this was a pretty historic week. We passed the disaster bill. We extended flood insurance, and we extended TANF, so neither one of them expired. Then, we passed the American Dream and Promise Act, legislation that will relieve the fears of 2-plus million people who are positive participants in the American Dream.

It was a bipartisan bill, not a lot from your side, but we think it is a historic piece of legislation. We hope the Senate takes it up.

We have been trying to get that bill on the floor for 8 years, without success. We got it on the floor. As I knew it would, it passed. I think it would have passed had we put it on the floor in the previous Congress, but we didn't get it to the floor.

Madam Speaker, I look forward to working with the whip toward reaching some bipartisan resolutions.

In particular, I agree with him, and I think we all agree that we want to make sure that we have the resources necessary to handle what is, in fact, a humanitarian crisis, with so many people fleeing natural disasters and man-made disasters—terror, murder, mayhem—for safety for themselves and their families, as have millions and millions and millions of people who preceded them who came to this country. Whether they came from Europe, Asia, Africa, South America, Central America, they came here because America had a beacon that they saw as

a land of opportunity and a land of freedom, equality, and justice, a land in which they wanted to live and make better.

Madam Speaker, we will continue to do our business as well as exercise our responsibilities.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments, and I would share a lot of the disagreements we have with how the Senate does business, whether it is a Republican or Democratic Senate.

Their rules, in many ways, work to undermine much of the good work that we do here in the House, whether it is a Republican or Democratic majority. We can find a lot of common ground on that disagreement.

As it relates to immigration, I, too, believe America has this unique place in the world as that shining beacon for anybody who seeks freedom, anybody who seeks the liberty that has been fought for with blood and treasure by so many heroes throughout generations to make America the place that people look to when they think about freedom.

We are also the most generous nation in the world when it comes to immigration, and we are proud of that. That is something we celebrate. We let over a million people a year into America to be a part of the American Dream, to come to seek the American Dream, and that is what it should be about.

It should be about seeking those things that make America great so that more people can come to add to the richness of this country. We do that, but we also are a nation of laws, and we can't lose sight of that at the same time that we want to maintain that beacon.

We only maintain it if we also maintain those great laws that we take an oath to uphold. All of us take that oath. That oath is critically important, because as people want to come here, they want to come here because of what America is. It is our job to preserve the greatness of what America is.

If we start to lose that, if we start to look the other way and ignore this law and try to undermine that law, it really weakens the greatness of our democracy.

When you look at the differences we had on the House floor, so many of us wanted to address the problems that are created by not having a secure border. But when you say, for example, that if somebody comes here when they are actually in a gang database, and by law, we can't even look at that database to see if that person coming into our country is a member of a gang or committed violent crimes, that is not what is the richness of America. We want to maintain the dream that people come here to seek.

We may disagree on the methods of getting there, but let's keep working to try to get to a better place, something signed into law to fix the problems with our immigration system, to get

back to a functioning, legal immigration system, instead of having thousands of people, whether they are part of that culture that wants to seek the American Dream or whether they are coming here to undermine what is great about America, think they can just traipse through, thousands a day at a time, because we have not secured our border.

In our homes, we have windows, doors, a yard. We might have a fence. But if we lock our door, we are locking it for a reason. It is not because we don't want anyone inside. It is because we only want to let in the people who are coming to be a part of what is great about our family and about our home. If somebody wants to come to do us harm, that is why we have the lock on the door.

We let over a million people a year into our country, and that is part of what is great about our Nation. No other country in the world, by the way, is close to the generosity in letting people into their country every year. No country is letting in over a million people a year.

We need to get back to a system where our immigration system works.

We passed a bipartisan bill last week to take care of the disaster needs of so many people around the country, and it was bipartisan. It was an example of what works.

There were some Members who objected. Some of them objected because the humanitarian money that is needed to address this crisis at the border wasn't in the bill.

I am glad the gentleman acknowledged that we need to work to resolve it. Hopefully, we can do that next week before the crisis hits, before DHS actually runs out of money so that we have a severe crisis.

Let's work together to stop it. I know the gentleman has acknowledged he wants to do that. While there are some other things that are going to be on the floor next week that, unfortunately, will be very partisan in nature that we will disagree on, let's also try to work to address that crisis so that, again, we get back to the richness of what's great about this Nation.

Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman and look forward to working together next week on the things that we can accomplish for this country.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. SLOTKIN). Remarks in debate in the House may not engage in personalities toward the President, whether originating as the Member's own words or being reiterated from another source.

HOURLY MEETING ON TOMORROW, AND ADJOURNMENT FROM THURSDAY, JUNE 6, 2019, TO MONDAY, JUNE 10, 2019

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to

meet at 11 a.m. tomorrow, and further, when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet at 2 p.m. on Monday next, and that the order of the House of January 3, 2019, regarding morning-hour debate not apply on that day.

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

There was no objection.

ENACT NATIONAL RECYCLING STANDARDS

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Madam Speaker, there are more than 9,800 local recycling programs following different standards in the United States. There is no coordination.

Cities and counties are struggling, and recycling is at risk of collapsing. Increasingly, recyclable plastics and papers are going to landfills and incinerators, and poisoning our oceans and waterways.

It is time for a national recycling strategy to harmonize standards across the country, strengthen markets, and reduce contamination in the recycling system.

Leadership is needed from Congress to work with stakeholders to make recycling environmentally and economically sustainable.

For example, it is time for a standardized national system of labeling. Every household, business, school, park, and stadium should be using a universal, standardized labeling system that reduces contamination in the recycling stream and enhances the market viability of recyclable materials.

As citizens and consumers, Americans want recycling to work. It is time for Washington to get to work to make recycling work.

RECOGNIZING JUNIOR LEAGUE OF BUFFALO CENTENNIAL

(Mr. COLLINS of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. COLLINS of New York. Madam Speaker, 100 years ago today, Mary Crate Taylor brought together a group of 67 women to form the Junior League of Buffalo.

Ms. Taylor organized this group of all women volunteers to provide needed relief to families during the Depression era. During this era, the league generated tens of thousands of dollars in donations for various causes in western New York, including Children's Hospital.

Since 1919, the Junior League has created programs to curb substance abuse, assist mothers at risk of poverty, combat illiteracy, and empower women through many volunteer programs and projects.

Today, with more than 500 women, the Junior League has generated mil-

lions of dollars in donations that benefit cultural and community-based programs throughout western New York.

Happy centennial to the Junior League of Buffalo. Keep up the great work, and here is to 100 more.

WHO IS JAMES HOLZHAUER

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

Mrs. LEE of Nevada. Madam Speaker, on behalf of the people of Nevada's Third District, I rise today to recognize, "Who is James Holzhauer?"

James, a local Las Vegas resident, shocked the world with an unrivaled run on "Jeopardy!" and he did it in a very Vegas fashion: betting big, making some noise, and laying it all on the line.

Madam Speaker, with 32 straight wins and just over \$58,000 shy of the all-time record, James' "Jeopardy!" skills weren't the only thing on display. His charitable heart was as well. He donated his time and some of his winnings to noble local causes to improve the lives of our southern Nevada kids, students, families, and community as a whole.

He even paid tribute to the victims of the tragic October 1 shooting with the wager, as he put it, "Vegas Strong, 10.1.17," as in 10-1-17.

James may have just missed the record, but he is a legend in our eyes, and he did southern Nevada proud.

Congratulations, again, to James. And if I ever see him out at a trivia night in Vegas, I will make sure to get him on my team. I will buy the beer. He can handle the questions.

□ 1130

RECOGNIZING 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF D-DAY

(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, I rise today in honor of the 75th anniversary of the Allied D-Day invasion of France, to honor the bravery of our Armed Forces who served in that operation.

On June 6, 1944, 73,000 Americans took part in Operation Overlord to storm the beaches of Normandy. Sadly, the United States suffered more than 6,000 casualties in this operation. Ultimately, thousands more U.S. servicemen would fall in the coming weeks and months liberating the rest of Western Europe from German control.

Madam Speaker, last year I attended a wreath laying ceremony at the Normandy American Cemetery and Memorial in France. Looking out among the white crosses, one could see fathers buried next to sons and brothers next to brothers. The average age of those who perished was just 19 years old.