

noose inside a Missouri high school? A noose on the campus of Duke University? Another at American University?

As a historian, who also happens to be old enough to remember “Whites Only” signs on motels and restaurants that trumpeted the power of laws enforcing segregation, I posit that it means we must lay to rest any notion that racism is not still the great divide.

As someone who has experienced the humiliating sting of racial epithets and the pain of a policeman’s blow—simply because I was black and in a neighborhood not my own—I would argue that it answers a naive and dangerous question that I hear too often: Why can’t African-Americans get over past discrimination?

The answer is that discrimination is not confined to the past. Nor is the African-American commitment to American ideals in the face of discrimination and hate.

The exhibitions inside the museum combine to form a narrative of a people who refused to be broken by hatred and who have always found ways to prod America to be truer to the ideals of its founders.

In the process of curating these experiences, I have acquired, examined and interpreted objects that stir feelings of intense pain. Anger and sadness are always parts of this work, but I never let them dominate it. Instead, I use them to help me connect with the people who have suffered and continue to suffer immeasurable pain and injustice, while clinging to their humanity and their vision of a better country.

I see the nooses in the same way. They are living history. Viewed through this lens, they are no less a part of the story the museum tells than the Klan robes, the slave shackles small enough to fit a child, the stretch of rope used to lynch a Maryland man in 1931 or the coffin used to bury the brutally murdered Emmett Till.

If you want to know how African-Americans continue to persevere and fight for a better America in the face of this type of hatred, you need only visit the museum, where the noose has been removed but the rest of the remarkable story of our commitment to overcome remains. Anyone who experiences the National Museum of African American History and Culture should leave with that realization, as well as the understanding that this story is continuing. The cowardly act of leaving a symbol of hate in the midst of a tribute to our survival conveyed that message as well as any exhibit ever could.

150TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, last night in the Kennedy Caucus Room, the U.S. Capitol Historical Society honored the Senate Appropriations Committee with a celebration of its 150th anniversary. Past and present committee members and staff gathered to reflect on the history of the committee, and Senate Historian Betty Koed gave a wonderful keynote address.

Established on March 6, 1867, the committee’s powers are rooted in article 1, section 9, of our Constitution which states, “No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law.” The Founders recognized the power of the purse as one of the most important tools Congress has to ensure our system of checks and balances and to conduct oversight of the executive and judicial branch—but it is much

more than that. The Appropriations Committee is where we translate the priorities of a nation into the realities of the people.

Our country is not a business, where we allocate resources only according to the bottom line. We do not invest in order to make a profit or a one-for-one dollar in return. We invest in those areas where it is uniquely right for government to take the lead. We invest in the areas that make a difference in the everyday lives of Americans and that help build the foundations of our country and our economy—infrastructure, national security, our environment, education, science and research, healthcare.

I want to thank the U.S. Capitol Historical Society for organizing this anniversary celebration, and I ask unanimous consent that the text of the remarks given by Senate Historian Betty Koed be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE 150TH ANNIVERSARY

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 28, 2017

BETTY K. KOED, SENATE HISTORIAN

On March 6, 2017, the Senate reached an important milestone in the history of its committees. The Committee on Appropriations turned 150 years old.

For its first quarter-century, the Senate operated without permanent legislative committees. Instead, it relied on temporary “select” committees to manage proposals and write bills. In 1816, having created nearly a hundred of these ad hoc committees, the Senate decided on something more permanent.

In December of 1816, it created eleven standing committees, including Judiciary, Foreign Relations, Commerce, and Finance. However, it did not create a Committee on Appropriations.

Over the next five decades, the Finance Committee handled most appropriations, but that overworked committee struggled with the haphazard funding requests of executive agencies.

Wishing to appear frugal, agency directors often understated their funding needs to the House of Representatives and then, in the hectic final days of a session, quietly turned to the Senate for emergency funds.

The threat of suspended operations usually convinced Congress to replenish the coffers. If agencies ran a surplus, directors simply spent those funds as they pleased.

By the 1860s senators realized that they needed to gain better control over appropriations. The Civil War had vastly expanded federal spending. In fact, in 1865, expenditures passed the billion-dollar mark for the first time in our national history.

The lack of centralized control over appropriations also played to the president’s advantage, and the executive often spent millions without first securing formal congressional appropriations.

In other words, by the end of the Civil War, no less than the power of the purse was at stake.

On March 6, 1867, two years after similar action taken by the House, Senator Henry Anthony of Rhode Island proposed a new committee to consider spending bills.

The Senate agreed—by unanimous consent—and passed subsequent legislation to better regulate how such funds were used.

Before long, this new committee became a Senate powerhouse. Led by strong chairmen like Iowa’s William B. Allison, the Appropriations Committee reached new heights of influence during the Senate’s Gilded Age.

Not surprisingly, senators who did not serve on the committee began to complain. Did this upstart committee have too much power? Chairmen of the legislative committees, as well as the heads of executive agencies, said yes, and looked for ways to wrest back some of that power.

In the 1890s, senators curtailed the jurisdiction of the Appropriations Committee, giving control over spending in certain areas, such as agriculture, military affairs, and pensions, back to legislative committees.

Committee chairs were delighted, but with no centralized control over the budgetary process, the committees ran amok. Spending increased with little or no accountability.

And so, in 1921, again prompted by war-related costs that had pushed annual spending to more than \$25 billion a year, Congress passed the Budget and Accounting Act.

Signed by President Warren G. Harding, the 1921 law required an annual budget from the president, created the General Accounting Office (now GAO), the Bureau of the Budget (now the OMB), and led to the establishment of permanent subcommittees for Appropriations.

But passage of that bill was just the beginning. In implementing the new law, Chairman Francis E. Warren of Wyoming shaped the future of the committee.

In 1922 Warren introduced a successful resolution to again centralize the appropriations process. He also included in his resolution a revision to Rule 16, requiring that all general appropriation bills, and amendments to such bills, be referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

This, in essence, established the broad jurisdiction that the committee enjoys today.

Since that time, the Appropriations Committee has continued to evolve as its duties and workload were amended by subsequent legislation.

Of course, the biggest change came in 1974 with the Budget Act, which created the House and Senate Budget Committees along with the Congressional Budget Office. But, again, the Appropriations Committee remained intact.

In the 1980s and 90s, other elements were added—Gramm-Rudman, budget summits, PAYGO, CRs—but you know that history better than I do. You’ve been living it.

Today—150 years after its creation—the Senate Committee on Appropriations, ably led by Chairman Cochran and Vice Chairman Leahy, continues to be a powerful and influential voice in national policymaking.

Of course, that doesn’t mean that the appropriations process has always been easy. In fact, at times, it has been downright testy.

For example, on a hot day in August of 1950, as the Senate continued working past its targeted adjournment date, tempers inside the committee room got to be nearly as hot as the scorching summer sun.

“The Senate is beginning to show signs of overwork,” observed newspaper columnist Jack Anderson. “Sessions are growing longer,” he wrote, “and tempers shorter.”

Among the confrontations that caught Anderson’s eye was a battle between two of the Hill’s best known curmudgeons, Tennessee senator Kenneth McKellar and Missouri Representative Clarence Cannon.

They were the chairmen of the Senate and House Appropriations Committees and for years they had argued bitterly over federal spending. That battle reached a climax in 1950.

“A gavel-bashing, name-calling clash between 81-year-old . . . McKellar, and 71-year-

old . . . Cannon, was broken up . . . just short of physical violence," noted the Washington Post on August 19, 1950.

While meeting in conference, Senator McKellar had sharply commented on Cannon's personality, using language peppered with words such as blind, stupid, and pig-headed.

Infuriated, Cannon sprang from his chair, rushed towards McKellar, and shouted, "I've taken all I'm going to [take]." Startled but defiant, McKellar snatched the gavel and tried to rap it on Cannon's head.

"In the nick of time," the Post reported, a staff member "grabbed Cannon" and "two senators seized the gavel from McKellar."

Peace was restored . . . for the moment.

A decade later, another chairman of the Appropriations Committee—Senator Carl Hayden of Arizona—fought so bitterly with old Clarence Cannon that the two houses of Congress had to establish neutral ground.

Like McKellar, Hayden was an old hand at appropriations. With 50 years of congressional service behind him, his skillful management of spending bills had earned him the label, "the third senator from every state."

But Hayden's notable length of service had not prepared him for Clarence Cannon. In the House since 1923, Cannon knew his way around bicameral disputes.

This was a battle of the titans on Capitol Hill.

"Government agencies are frantically going broke," wrote a reporter in June of 1962, just because two members of Congress "keep yelling at each other."

For months, Cannon and Hayden had delayed action on legislation while they argued over seemingly petty issues.

The press dubbed it the "Battle of the Octogenarians," but underlying this crisis was a dispute as old as Congress itself.

Was the Senate truly the "upper house"?

Fueling the argument was a long-simmering House resentment of the Senate's general air of superiority, an attitude which had resulted in some rather high-handed practices.

For example, for nearly two centuries, all conference committees had been chaired by senators, and such meetings had always been held on the Senate side of the Capitol.

In 1962, the House decided to challenge this old custom of senatorial privilege. Leading the charge was Appropriations Chairman Clarence Cannon.

Defending the Senate's prerogatives—Carl Hayden.

Cannon informed Hayden that he refused to make the trek to the Senate side of the Hill for conference meetings. From now on, he insisted, senators had to walk to the House side—at least half of the time! Furthermore, he demanded that he be allowed to chair half of the conferences.

Hayden countered. In that case, he insisted, the Senate would initiate half of all appropriations bills.

The resulting stalemate lasted for months. Meeting after meeting produced no agreement. The appropriations process remained stalled well past the end of the fiscal year, while government agencies scrambled for funds.

Finally, Carl Hayden called for a truce. He suggested a special meeting to be held on neutral ground and turned to Senate Majority Leader Mike Mansfield for a solution.

Needless to say, Mansfield was anxious to end the battle. He searched for a proper meeting space. Finally, he opened EF-100, a small room located off the crypt, in the exact center of the Capitol.

"I even agreed to have it surveyed," Mansfield explained, "so that the conference table would not be so much as an eighth of an inch more on one side than the other."

Presented with this option, Chairman Cannon agreed to meet in conference, but stood firm in his demands to co-chair meetings.

To end the crisis, and probably urged on by Mansfield, Carl Hayden relented. The Senate sacrificed a few of its cherished privileges, and government operations returned to normal.

Pundits dismissed the battle as a tempest in a teapot, but more astute observers recognized that this high-profile battle was another chapter in an on-going struggle over the shared constitutional powers of the Senate and the House.

Finally, this evening I would like to highlight an important but mostly forgotten milestone in this committee's history.

Since 1867, about 300 senators have served on the committee. Of those 300, a mere dozen have been women. The first woman to serve was, of course, Margaret Chase Smith of Maine, who joined the committee in 1953.

As you all know, in 2012, Senator Barbara Mikulski—the second woman to serve on the committee—became the first woman to chair it.

Those are both major milestones in Senate history.

Here's one more.

Way back in 1911, a woman served as chief clerk to the Senate Appropriations Committee.

Her name was Leona Wells. She joined the Senate's clerical staff in 1901 and remained on the payroll for 25 years. I believe her to be the first woman to hold a top committee position in the Senate.

Born in Illinois in 1877, Wells moved to Wyoming when she turned 21, because this young suffragist could cast a vote in Wyoming. There she met Senator Francis E. Warren, whose patronage brought her to Washington.

As chair of the Military Affairs Committee, Senator Warren appointed Wells to the committee's clerical staff. When he became chairman of Appropriations in 1911, he brought Wells with him, giving her the position of chief clerk—although it appears that the Senate never officially gave her that title.

At the time, Leona Wells was unusual—a well-paid professional woman on Capitol Hill. In fact, she was so unusual that she attracted media attention.

Leona Wells "is probably the most envied woman in government service," reported the Boston Globe in an article titled "Uncle Sam's Highest Salaried Woman."

Not only did she earn a good salary, the Globe noted, but she is "the first woman employee of the Senate to be placed in charge of the affairs of a big committee."

Wells scouted new territory for female staff, but one area remained off limits—the Senate Chamber. When Chairman Warren was on the floor doing committee business, Wells had to wait outside.

Male committee clerks freely entered the chamber, but the Senate was not yet ready to admit a female staffer. Instead, as the Globe reported, Wells waited "just outside the swing doors of the chamber . . . and kept the door an inch or two ajar that she might hear everything that went on inside."

Leona Wells is largely forgotten now, but her service on the Appropriations Committee opened a door so other women could follow. Her story is also part of this committee's history.

This has been an all-too-brief summary of the history of this important committee, but I hope it will serve as a reminder.

Just like Francis Warren or Carl Hayden or even Leona Wells, all of you—chairs, vice chairs, members, and staff—are part of the history of the Committee on Appropriations.

ARMS SALES NOTIFICATION

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act requires that Congress receive prior notification of certain proposed arms sales as defined by that statute. Upon such notification, the Congress has 30 calendar days during which the sale may be reviewed. The provision stipulates that, in the Senate, the notification of proposed sales shall be sent to the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

In keeping with the committee's intention to see that relevant information is available to the full Senate, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the notifications which have been received. If the cover letter references a classified annex, then such annex is available to all Senators in the office of the Foreign Relations Committee, room SD-423.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEFENSE SECURITY
COOPERATION AGENCY,
Arlington, VA.

Hon. BOB CORKER,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, we are forwarding herewith Transmittal No. 16-68, concerning the Department of the Navy's proposed Letter(s) of Acceptance to the Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office in the United States for defense articles and services estimated to cost \$175 million. After this letter is delivered to our office, we plan to issue a news release to notify the public of this proposed sale.

Sincerely,

J.W. RIXEY,
Vice Admiral, USN, Director.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 16-68

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended

(i) Prospective Purchaser: Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office (TECRO) in the United States.

(ii) Total Estimated Value:

Major Defense Equipment * \$100 million.

Other \$75 million.

Total \$175 million.

(iii) Description and Quantity or Quantities of Articles or Services under Consideration for Purchase:

Major Defense Equipment (MDE):

One hundred sixty-eight (168) MK-54 Lightweight Torpedo (LWT) Conversion Kits.

Non-MDE includes: Shipping containers, operator manuals and technical documentation, U.S. Government and contractor engineering, technical and logistics support services.

(iv) Military Department: Navy.

(v) Prior Related Cases, if any: FMS Cases TW-P-AJX and TW-P-AKB.

(vi) Sales Commission, Fee, etc., Paid, Offered, or Agreed to be Paid: None.

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology Contained in the Defense Article or Defense Services Proposed to be Sold: See Attached annex.

(viii) Date Report Delivered to Congress: June 29, 2017.

* As defined in Section 47(6) of the Arms Export Control Act.