



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 165

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 13, 2019

No. 45

## House of Representatives

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

### DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,  
March 13, 2019.

I hereby appoint the Honorable DARREN SOTO to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,  
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

### MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2019, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

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

### CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF H. LEON COMER, SR.

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

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in celebration of the life of H. Leon Comer, Sr., who passed away at the age of 91 on Tuesday, March 5, 2019. He was a man born of humble means who never lost sight of where he came from.

He was the son of the late John Stoll Comer, Sr., and Annie Lee Roach

Comer, where he was one of seven siblings. He was born in Rock Hill, South Carolina, where he attended Oak Ridge Elementary School and later served in the United States Merchant Marines.

He was married to Francis Watkins Comer for 64 years and had two children, Brenda Comer Sutton and Leon "Chip" Comer, Jr.

Leon Comer believed in the value of hard work and, after working as a manager of a beer distributor in the greater Rock Hill market for 12 years, he founded Comer Distributing in 1971, with only five employees, distributing 250,000 cases of beer, with only three routes.

The original building, consisting of only 5,000 square feet, was located on Pendleton Street, and later expanded to 17,000 square feet to a much larger site on Carmel Road.

Comer Distributing expanded into the greater Columbia market in 2012 and, 1 year later, added another 11,200 square feet of space. The company opened in a two-story office building in 2018, along with an expanded warehouse. The company has grown to 70 employees, providing 1.5 million cases of a variety of brand-name beverages each year.

Leon retired in 1990; however, over the course of his lifetime, he served on many boards, clubs, and commissions, including the Rock Hill Economic Development Board; York County Natural Gas Authority; York Masonic Lodge #385; Hejaz Shriners; Winthrop Eagle Club, where he was a founding member; Ducks Unlimited; the South Carolina Beer Wholesalers Association, serving twice as chairman of the board; the Waterfowl Association; the American Legion; Frank Roach Post #34; the USC Gamecock Club; and many more organizations and local groups.

Leon and his wife, Frances, were longtime members of St. John's United Methodist Church, where he was very active for many years. The lives that

have been positively affected by the giving and donations to Christian causes, such as the men's shelters and the Boys and Girls Clubs, will be remembered for years to come.

The company is now being run by his son, Chip Comer, and the legacy of his father can be summed up by the words of Chip when he said the following: "My father is the epitome of what I would always want to be, as he taught me so many life lessons growing up."

Leon Comer left an indelible imprint on the many lives that he touched, and he will be remembered as a man who epitomized the meaning of "true service above self" and was a man who dedicated his life to serving his faith, his family, and his country.

May God bless Leon Comer and his family.

### FIX THEM BEFORE WE FLY THEM

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

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, and still I rise; and I rise today because I love my country and because I love the people, and I love their lives and I care about them. And because I love them and I care about them, I call upon the President of the United States of America to ground the 737 MAX 8.

This plane is unfit to fly. We have had two go down in the last 6 months. Two down within 6 months is two too many.

We cannot put profits above people, Mr. President. This is an opportunity for you to exert your executive power in a positive way on behalf of people who fly these planes.

It is not about the pilots; it is about the planes. These planes are unfit to fly, and we cannot put profits above people, and they are to be grounded until they are fit.

□ 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.

H2683

Ground them until they are fixed. They are unfit to fly. Fix them before we fly them.

#### SCOUTING ORGANIZATIONS PROVIDE VALUABLE EXPERIENCES

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, Scouting organizations are pivotal in the lives of so many American youth, and this week there has been much to celebrate. Yesterday, the Girl Scouts of the USA marked its 107th birthday, and tonight the Boy Scouts of America will conclude its annual report to the Nation.

Girl Scouts help girls develop into the future leaders of our economy, our communities, our country, and the world by encouraging them to dream big and work hard to achieve their goals. In fact, many Congresswomen have been Girl Scouts, and we saw some Congresswomen deliver speeches on this floor yesterday in honor of the Girl Scouts building girls of courage, confidence, and character for 107 years.

Mr. Speaker, I know firsthand the positive impact that Scouting can have on the life of a young person. I have been actively involved with the Boy Scouts of America since I was 11 years old.

On May 17, 1977, I became an Eagle Scout myself, as a member of Boy Scout Troop 52 in Walker Township, Pennsylvania. Over the years, I have proudly held various leadership roles with Boy Scout troops in Pennsylvania, including two separate stints as Scoutmaster for Troop 353 and president of the Juniata Valley Boy Scout Council. One of my greatest honors was to witness 29 young men achieve the rank of Eagle Scout during my tenure as Scoutmaster.

Many Eagle Scouts will gather tonight in the Capitol to conclude the annual Report to the Nation delegation trip. I am proud to be a part of the Eagles on the Hill reception, and I look forward to hearing from the Scouts.

Members of Congress and I will speak about how Scouting positively impacted our lives. And after the speeches, the Scouts will have a chance to discuss their experience in Scouting as a whole, as well as their time in the Report to the Nation delegation.

Report to the Nation is an annual event meant to connect some of Scouting's best and brightest with government officials and elected representatives. Each year, 6 to 10 representatives of the Boy Scouts meet with senior government officials, including the President and key congressional leaders, with the goal of providing an update of what Scouts have achieved over the past year. This also allows members of the Federal Government an opportunity to meet some of the Nation's brightest young Scouts. The delegation spends between a week

and 10 days in Washington, D.C., conducting meetings and touring the city.

The Report to the Nation delegation stems from the congressional charter of the Boy Scouts of America, dating back to June 15, 1916, and represents millions of Boy Scouts.

Mr. Speaker, I know that the Boy Scouts of America and the Girl Scouts of the USA both contribute to the spirit of this Nation and play an essential role in educating our youth. These organizations build character; they help young people become actively engaged in their communities; and they promote serving others in ways big and small. And that is something we can all respect and admire.

#### A COMMUNITY IN PERIL

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

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise with great urgency to sound an alarm because we have a community in peril.

The Liberian community in Minnesota and around the Nation is dealing with a crisis of our very own making. When the DED, Deferred Enforced Departure, program expires on March 31, thousands of our Liberian friends and neighbors will be at risk of losing their jobs and their homes and being deported back to a nation that they no longer know.

Thousands of Liberians settled in the United States in the 1990s and early 2000s when their country was devastated by civil wars. My friend Louise Stevens was one of them. She was a woman with a dream of a good life who worked hard to get an education and worked hard to get a good job; and because of a civil war she had nothing to do with, she had the courage and bravery to flee her home and start over in America.

She slept on a mattress in a friend's living room for over a year. She and her kids shared two rooms for another year. And when President Clinton introduced the DED program in 1999, she was finally able to work without fear of being deported.

She went to Boston Scientific and, with her education and work ethic, was able to get a good job and start a career that spanned 18 years. Now, she is over 60 years old, and she could lose everything once again.

"The world took everything from me," she told us. "Now I have a home; I have a job; I have a hospital to go to; I have friends; and Minnesota is my home. America is my home. I can't wrap my head around a piece of paper telling me we don't care; you can't live here anymore."

Another of my Liberian constituents, Michael, told us that "I am almost 50. My friends in Liberia are either dead or living outside of the country. If I am sent back, I will have accomplished nothing. My whole life is here, and this is my home."

Another, Abdi Mohamed, who is afraid of losing his brother: "I cannot begin to imagine the nightmare this will create in my community," he said. "I am not ready to let my bond with my brother go. We love to go shopping at the Mall of America. Dave and Busters is so much fun together. I am not ready for this."

Mr. Speaker, we can do something about this. We can stop the nightmare from becoming a reality. We can legislate a fix.

It is time to act. This is what we are here to do: to put people before politics and make a real difference in our communities.

Our Liberian neighbors are friends; they are workers; and they are taxpayers. They have played by the rules; they have worked exceptionally hard; and they have thrived in good jobs. If we lose them, we will be losing our workforce; we will be losing our community; and we will be losing our family.

We have 18 days to act, 18 days to do something to make sure that our Liberian community will never have to spend another sleepless night wondering if the world will take everything away from them once again.

#### THANKING OUR FARMER COOPERATIVES

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

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, in many parts of my district and all across Kansas, farmer cooperatives are the foundation of a modernized and productive agriculture industry. For decades, co-ops have been farmers' primary business partner, supplier, and grain buyer. Memberships have been passed down from one generation to another, and relationships have been lifelong.

Today, our farmer co-ops are as strong and as important as ever. In the far reaches of my district, the co-ops provide feed, fertilizer, and fuel to farmers.

As times and needs have changed, so too have our co-ops. From online platforms for account statements and purchasing to precision technology that reduces fertilizer inputs and improves soil productivity, innovation has been necessary and vital to the co-ops' success.

Kansas farmer co-ops are responsible for more than 4,600 jobs and \$1.1 billion in total economic impact, statewide. These member-owned organizations have been and will continue to be vital to the continued growth and success of the agriculture industry.

Farmers are facing steep headwinds, and organizations like the co-ops are important in helping producers navigate through uncertainty in the industry.

We often take the time to thank our farmers, but it is also important we thank the hardworking men and

women of our farmer co-ops for the valuable time and expertise they put into supporting our farmers and our agriculture industry.

#### CELEBRATING NATIONAL AG DAY

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in celebration of National Ag Day, a celebration of our Nation's oldest and most important industry and the hardworking men and women who put food on our table, clothes on our back, and fuel in our cars.

The number of people in agriculture today is but a fraction of what it was 100 years ago, but the impact of today's agriculture industry is unprecedented. Today's farmer feeds about 165 people, and agriculture remains this country's number one export.

In Kansas, agriculture accounts for nearly half the State's economy, and, in my district, that number is more than 60 percent. For many rural communities, farming and ranching is the sole economic driver.

Kansas is the national leader in agriculture, ranking first in the production of grain sorghum, second in the production of wheat, third for cattle, and fourth in the production of sunflowers. In fact, Kansas is second in the Nation for the total number of acres farmed.

□ 1015

Winters like the one we are currently experiencing at home have highlighted the time and dedication farmers and ranchers have to their land and animals. In Kansas, farmers with livestock are working around the clock to ensure the animals are healthy, warm, and well fed. That means enduring subzero windchills, blizzard-like conditions, and middle-of-the-night checks.

While agriculture has become a target of environmentalists who want to discontinue life as we know it in Kansas, I am here today to testify to the great work farmers and ranchers have done to protect and improve our air, land, and water. Farmers are the original conservationists, and continue to find ways to do more with less, while protecting our most valuable natural resources.

National Ag Day is our opportunity to celebrate farmers and ranchers, highlight the impact they have on our communities and country, and remember the thousands of products made possible by their hard work.

Back home, it is a day to introduce thousands of grade school kids to the agriculture industry with fun things like how to milk a cow, gathering eggs, and even flying drones.

I encourage Members to join me today in celebration of National Agriculture Day and take time to thank a farmer.

#### HONORING JOHN KILZER

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, today I learned that John Kilzer, a friend, an

important figure in Memphis and in the music community, passed away.

John Kilzer was 62 years old. He was born in Jackson, Tennessee, up the road from Memphis, but he lived most of his life in Memphis.

He was the epitome of what Memphis is about. A lot of times people in Memphis call us grit and grinders, and the city is the city of grit and grind. It comes from the basketball team, the Grizzlies.

John's life was Memphis and John's life was grit and grind. He was a high school All-American basketball player who went to the University of Memphis, then Memphis State, and played basketball. Didn't play it that well, but he played it. He was on the team; a good outside shooter and a scrapper.

He got interested in other things and he had some demons with him too. Those demons came along maybe from his father, who was an alcoholic, and it caused John to have problems with abuse of drugs and alcohol as well. It interfered with his basketball career, interfered with his music life, but he never let it keep him down. He came back. He came back every chance he could.

He came back as a musician who was signed by David Geffen, had two albums by Geffen, one song that made the top ten, and songs recorded by Maria Muldaur, Rosanne Cash, and others.

He became a minister and he had a series of ministries in St. John's United Methodist Church in Memphis. It was called Recovery Ministry, where he had other musicians come and join him, and they performed for folks who were having trouble with addiction, gave them a concert every Friday and helped them on the road to recovery.

He never forgot people, especially little people. He made a big difference.

For a man from Jackson, Tennessee, who was a tall guy who played basketball, to become a musician and become a minister and a writer: quite a life.

He was influenced by Reverend James Lawson, a hero of the civil rights movement, whose simple presence at a Calvary Church Lenten service influenced John to get back into ministry.

He had a ministry degree and a Ph.D. in ministry as well that he got in London, England.

He was influenced in music—which he dabbled with but wasn't very good—by Teenie Hodges, a guitarist for Al Green. He came over to see the basketball team and saw a guitar in John's room. He took up with John and taught him the finer points of music, songwriting, and guitar playing, and John did good at that, but what John did best was helping his fellow human being.

He never gave up. He always saw hope and opportunity. And he thought in universal terms.

So when I read about my friend, John, dying, the first thing I did was go around to try to find his CD in my

condo. Most of my CDs are in Memphis, about 1,000 to 1, but I looked around and couldn't find John's CD. It must be in Memphis.

So I thought, maybe I can talk to my friend Alexa, see if Alexa can help me. I said, "Alexa, play me some John Kilzer." And Amazon Music had John Kilzer, about eight or nine songs in there, including a song he wrote with Kirk Whalum, a great saxophonist and a legend in Memphis and in the music scene, called "Until We're All Free". We are not all free until we are all free. It is a great song.

So if you have a chance, if you have got Alexa as a friend, ask her to play you some John Kilzer. It is good music.

#### CONGRESS MUST MEET ITS CONSTITUTIONAL OBLIGATION

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

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with a heavy heart as another individual has lost her life on U.S. Highway 12 in my home State of Minnesota, in fact, right in my neighborhood.

U.S. Highway 12 is the road we drive to get to and from our hometown of Delano, Minnesota. This is one of the most dangerous stretches of road in our State. The highway has actually been called the "Corridor of Death."

On March 2, 2019, Marleena Anna Dieterich, an 18-year-old from Delano, Minnesota, lost her life in another crash on this highway.

Marleena was a student at Delano High School, a member of our hometown, and a young life with so much promise. We lost her far too soon.

Today I rise to remember the life of Marleena, to remember that she was an honor student, a black belt in Taekwondo, and was planning to major in biomedical sciences and minor in premed. Her life held endless promise.

This accident, like so many on U.S. Highway 12, was tragic and senseless.

Over the years, some improvements have been made to portions of U.S. Highway 12, but until massive improvements are made to the most dangerous stretch of this highway, tragic accidents will continue to occur.

Since the beginning of 2019, just 2 months, 14 crashes have already occurred on that stretch of the highway leading into Delano in Minnesota's Sixth Congressional District. More must be done, and quickly.

While we are committed to working with the Minnesota Department of Transportation and the Highway 12 Safety Coalition to ensure that Minnesotans can travel safely and securely on this road, I am inviting our Transportation Secretary Chao to visit us and see firsthand some of our most desperate transportation needs in Minnesota.

At the Federal level, Congress must start to exercise its obligation under Article I of the Constitution to dedicate and direct Federal funds to build,

maintain, and improve our Federal highways, especially lifesaving safety improvements.

Together, we can find a solution to the safety hazard that U.S. Highway 12 poses, and together, we will.

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE MINNESOTA  
WHITECAPS

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, this March, during the National Hockey League's Gender Equality Month, I want to congratulate the Minnesota Whitecaps for making it to the National Women's Hockey League playoffs.

Not everyone can play professional sports, but everyone can participate at some level. Sports are a great training ground for life. Lessons in sportsmanship, teamwork, how to handle adversity are all important to the development of productive, contributing citizens in a civil society.

Professional women athletes play a large role in the development of girls hockey in communities across the country, but especially the Minnesota hockey community.

We are lucky to have inspiring players turn coaches that mentor the next generation of female hockey players and great Americans.

I know the entire Minnesota hockey world is proud of the Whitecaps.

Congratulations on your success, and good luck in the playoffs.

HEALTHPARTNERS RECOGNIZED FOR SERVING  
THE UNDERSERVED

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize HealthPartners for receiving the 2019 CMS Health Equity Award from the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services.

This award recognizes organizations that demonstrate an exceptional commitment to serving the most underserved individuals among us.

HealthPartners has locations throughout Minnesota's Sixth Congressional District, which I am honored to represent in this Congress.

HealthPartners is committed to eliminating healthcare disparities for those with language, cultural, and other barriers.

I am pleased to congratulate this outstanding company for receiving this well-deserved award.

I hope other healthcare providers will take note of the small changes that can make a big difference in eliminating bias in the distribution of healthcare services.

SUPPORTING STATE AND LOCAL  
TAX DEDUCTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Speaker, tax day is approaching on April 15, and I again rise to state my support for the State and local tax deduction.

There were many positive aspects to the tax bill that I voted against.

I support reducing the corporate tax rate, but it should not have been done

by increasing personal taxes on any hardworking middle-income Long Islander in my district.

The \$10,000 cap that was made to the SALT deduction was a punch in the gut to middle-class taxpayers in my district.

There were positive aspects, as I said, of the tax bill: expanding the medical expense deduction, preserving education and student deductions, doubling the child tax credit, the AMT changes.

And as I stated, changing the corporate tax rate helps make the United States more competitive globally, to improve our business climate, to help create more jobs, but it should not be done by raising taxes on the personal income side.

I have been working closely with colleagues on both sides of the aisle to address this issue. I have been working with Democratic Representative JOSH GOTTHEIMER of New Jersey. I cosponsor legislation between PETER KING, a Republican, and TOM SUOZZI, a Democrat, H.R. 257. NITA LOWEY introduced a bill that I cosponsor, H.R. 188.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage all my colleagues in this Chamber to work together to address this important issue, because it is important to deliver tax relief to all Americans.

Now, I do have an important message, though, to the Governor of New York, the mayor of New York City, those who are running State and local governments in States like mine. The reason why our State and local tax deduction was as high as it was is because our State and local taxes are as high as they are.

So everybody needs to look in the mirror and figure out what we can do to do our part, because all levels of government need to deliver tax relief.

My home State of New York has some of the highest taxes in the entire country. It is ranked as the second worst State in the entire Nation to do business. You couple that with the loss of the SALT deduction, and it has only sped up the amount of businesses and individuals who are choosing to leave our State.

It was very upsetting to see an effort by elected officials, some here in Congress, others in the State legislature to push away 25,000 good-paying Amazon jobs that would have been coming to Long Island City.

Now, we all must do our part. The State and local tax deduction has been around in some way since, you could say, Abraham Lincoln's administration. He used the State and local tax deduction to help keep this union together and fight the Civil War.

It was a tough debate a little over a year ago now when the tax law was passed through both Chambers and signed by the President, but next month, as April 15 approaches and people have to pay their taxes, they are going to be seeing less in their return, many will be seeing less in their return where I am from. Some will be getting more, and that is great.

I didn't oppose this bill because all of my constituents were going to see a tax increase. It was that too many were going to see a tax increase.

Now, all, when they are getting their tax return need to understand that throughout the year, money was added to their paycheck because of a change in the way that taxes were calculated with withholdings through the year. So that is something else to factor in when trying to figure out the impact of the tax bill. Again, some people will be seeing less than they owe, others will be seeing more.

In this Chamber, in the halls of the New York State capitol, in the halls of State capitols everywhere, in city halls, in county and town governments all throughout America, we all need to do our part to deliver tax relief.

□ 1030

Because at all levels of government, really, it is not a revenue issue that has been leading to the situation that we face as a country and in our local governments. It has been an expenditure issue.

Whether you could save a dollar, a million dollars, a billion dollars, wherever you can find money to save, we need to get better at how we tax and spend the people's money. We need to spend it as if it is our own.

Mr. Speaker, there is a message here to my colleagues in this Chamber. I ask for their support of this legislation, multiple bills that have been introduced. I make that plea to the Senate, to the administration, and also to all those representatives of State and local governments responsible for the fact that the reason our deduction was as high as it was, was because our State and local taxes were as high as they were. But we need to do our part here in this Chamber.

HONORING THE LIFE OF FORMER  
CONGRESSMAN RALPH HALL

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

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, on March 7 of this year, 6 days ago, we lost our colleague Ralph Hall.

Ralph's journey among us here in Congress and our world started on May 3, 1923, in a town called Fate, Texas. Never in American history has a town of birth been more appropriate for a man than Fate, Texas. Ralph's life was all about fate, great faith, and God.

As fate would have it, Ralph left Fate and moved to Rockwall when he was 3 years old. He started working there at a local convenience store.

As fate would have it, guess who showed up? Bonnie and Clyde, the notorious killers on a rampage throughout Texas, Arkansas, Oklahoma, that part of our country. They gave Ralph a 25-cent tip—a quarter—big money in those days. He was so excited, he showed his boss the quarter and noticed a newspaper lying there on the

floor. Whose picture was on the front of that paper? Bonnie and Clyde.

He told his boss, "They just came here. They are in Rockwall. That is their car." His boss called the local sheriff. Ralph couldn't hear the conversation, but the sheriff said something to the effect of, "Thanks for calling about Bonnie and Clyde. I've got two stray dogs I've got to catch. Once I get those dogs, I'm going after Bonnie and Clyde."

After the surprise attack on Pearl Harbor, Ralph joined our Navy to fly naval aircraft. He went to Pensacola, Florida, for his first training.

As fate would have it, he met a Hall of Fame baseball player, Ted Williams of the Boston Red Sox, the last man to hit over .400 in a season. Knowing he had Ted on his baseball team, Ralph found a young Army sergeant and said: "Hey, son, I want to bet you my whole paycheck on a baseball game, Navy versus Army."

The day of the game, Ralph knocked on Ted's door. Ted answered with a fishing pole and some gear to go fishing. Ralph said, "You have to play baseball and beat Army." Ted said, "I came here to learn to fly, defend America, and then fish." Ralph held the game up so Ted could go AWOL, absent without leave, and go fishing.

Of course, that night, Ralph had to go home to his queen, his beloved Mary Ellen, and tell her, "Honey, I have just lost my entire paycheck betting on a baseball game with the Army."

Ralph got out of flight school and went to war. He flew the F6F Hellcat on aircraft carriers. Now, I was a naval aviator, and I have to tell you, those guys were crazy, crazy, crazy courageous. Right now, if you land on an aircraft carrier, you have what is called the meatball. This ball gives you course and glide slope. In those days, they had guys with paddles.

Ralph said his proudest achievement in naval aviation during the war was to make sure on his record book that his takeoffs were the same number as his landings.

As fate would have it, once again, Ralph came home to Rockwall, Texas, to become a lawyer. The local county judge retired, so there was a vacancy. People said, "Ralph, you should run our county. File for election." Ralph didn't want to play politics. That wasn't his business. But driving home, he said, "You know what? I will just apply, maybe be there for just a couple months and go back home to my lawyer job." He filed 1 minute before the deadline that year, 1 minute.

He was driving home. The local radio was booming: "Ralph Hall, running for county judge." Guess who was outside his home, waiting with an angered look on her face? His queen, Mary Ellen.

That fate got Ralph going into public service and got Ralph here on Capitol Hill.

As fate would have it, when America goes back to the Moon sometime in the next couple years, they are going to do that because of Ralph Hall.

God bless Ralph Hall. As our dear friend Gene Cernan said: May you always have fair winds and following seas. You shot for your Moon. You are still among the stars.

God bless Ralph Hall.

#### NATIONAL AGRICULTURE DAY

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

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, as a third-generation farmer from California's San Joaquin Valley, I wish everyone a happy National Agriculture Day, something that we do throughout our country.

I am proud, obviously, to represent the heart of California's San Joaquin Valley. But our agricultural productivity throughout the country, beginning with the very origins of the history of the United States, has truly been one of the tremendous assets that we have had.

We are home to the most productive agricultural land in the world, not only throughout the country, but in California. Our farmers, our dairymen and -women, our ranchers, and our livestock folks feed the country. I have often said that our food security, that dinner that we have on our dinner table every night, is a part of America's national food security.

As a senior member of the House Agriculture Committee, I am proud that we delivered a comprehensive farm bill last year. Now it is part of our job to ensure that we implement that farm bill as a safety net for agriculture throughout the country. But it is also a safety net for those who are working poor, those who are, unfortunately, recipients of food assistance programs and the school lunch and the school breakfast programs. So the farm bill does a great deal to help all Americans.

This year, the Agriculture Committee will work to ensure that those promises we made in the farm bill will be implemented in the way we intended. The subcommittee that I chair, the Subcommittee on Livestock and Foreign Agriculture, will be at the vanguard of that effort.

Today, on National Agriculture Day, let us thank those who grow America's food and fiber and put it on America's dinner table every night. I am talking about the farmers, the dairymen and -women, and the farmworkers, who, through their hard work and the fruits of their labor, make this all come together.

#### VISAS FOR CITIZENS OF PORTUGAL

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, soon, the Portuguese Caucus will be reintroducing legislation that is important for not only the United States, but for our ally Portugal. We will be introducing bipartisan legislation that will allow citizens of Portugal to be eligible for what is called the E-1 treaty trader visa and the E-2 treaty investors visa.

Portugal is one of the United States' oldest allies and a close economic part-

ner. The United States became Portugal's largest trading partner outside the European Union in 2015. Bilateral trade reached \$4.2 billion in 2015, a 30 percent increase from 5 years ago.

However, because Portugal did not have a bilateral investor treaty with the United States before joining the European Union, they are one of only five European Union countries whose citizens are not eligible for the E-1 and E-2 visas.

This is long overdue. It is good for the United States; it is good for Portugal; and it is good for increased economic activity between both countries. It is bipartisan. Hopefully, this year, we will be successful in implementing these E-1 and E-2 treaty investor visas.

#### 70TH ANNIVERSARY OF NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, this year marks the 70th anniversary of the founding of NATO, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

We helped create NATO, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, not only to protect our European allies, but to protect our interests. For 70 years, it has done just that, a remarkable success.

Next month, in April, we have invited the Secretary General of NATO to come address a bipartisan joint session of Congress to take assessment of and to commend our NATO partners, along with the United States, for a job well done.

How do you say a job well done? Well, after World War II, over the last 70 years, this is the longest peacetime period in Europe in 1,000 years. Think about that. The last 70 years has been the longest peacetime period in Europe in more than 1,000 years.

NATO has been one of the cornerstones that has created that peace dividend, being an absolute and critical barrier against the aggression of the Soviet Union and other totalitarian states, being there for the fall of the Iron Curtain. NATO's relevance today is just as important as it was then.

#### RECOGNIZING McCAFFREY'S FOOD MARKETS

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, our local businesses in Bucks County, Pennsylvania, help make our community vibrant and prosperous. Today, I am proud to recognize one such business, McCaffrey's Food Markets, which was recently named Business of the Year by the Newtown Business Association. Each year, the Newtown Business Association recognizes a business that contributes to our regional economy and contributes substantially to the community at large.

The McCaffreys opened their first supermarket in 1986 in Lower Makefield and over the past three decades has expanded throughout Pennsylvania and

New Jersey while maintaining its headquarters in Middletown Township.

McCaffrey's Food Markets and the McCaffrey family are both noted for their generosity to our community and are noted supporters of the American Red Cross, St. Mary's Medical Center, the American Cancer Society, and the 9/11 Garden of Reflection, among many other organizations and memorials.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud McCaffrey's Food Markets, the McCaffrey family, and all their amazing employees for their investment in our community and their entrepreneurship.

I also thank Bill Sheffer and Beverly Dimler of the Newtown Business Association for all their leadership in our community.

#### RECOGNIZING BUCKS COUNTY ASSOCIATION FOR THE BLIND AND VISUALLY IMPAIRED

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a nonprofit organization in Bucks County, Pennsylvania, that is seeking to assist college students as they enter the workforce. The Bucks County Association for the Blind and Visually Impaired, based in Newtown, recently teamed up with Bucks County Community College to collect attire for college students.

Mr. Speaker, a critical component to ensuring the success of recent college graduates, and those who will be graduating in the future, is making sure that they are equipped with the resources they need to succeed. I applaud the work of the Bucks County Association for the Blind and Visually Impaired, especially the organization's executive director, Anne Marie Hyer, for her service.

I also thank Bucks County Community College for its collaboration with this dynamic organization and so many others in our community.

#### HONORING JOHN POPRIK

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I rise today to honor the life and memory of a very, very special member of the Bucks County community, John Poprik, whom we recently lost.

Born in Philadelphia, John attended Father Judge High School and Drexel University, where he graduated in 1970 with a degree in accounting. He was a respected business executive, having served as the CFO of Better Material Corp. before becoming the CFO of Sommer Maid Creamery.

John was truly dedicated to making our community a better place through public service. He served on the Northampton Bucks County Water and Sewer Authority, the Bucks County Drug and Alcohol Commission, and Pennsylvania's Office of Unemployment Compensation Board of Review.

More than anything, John was a dedicated family man. He spent some of his most treasured moments with his five grandchildren, his wife, Pat, and his children.

I extend my deepest condolences to his beloved wife of 50 years, my dear friend Pat Poprik, and their sons, Brad and Matt. May John, a good and decent

and honorable man, enjoy his eternal reward for a life well-lived.

□ 1045

#### WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

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

Mr. WALTZ. Mr. Speaker, each year in the month of March, our Nation takes time to celebrate Women's History Month and to recognize the important role women have played in our personal, local, national, and world history.

We have made progress elevating women throughout our society, but it is not enough. There is still more work to be done here at home and around the world.

Women play a critical role in the history of every American.

As the son of a single mother who worked multiple jobs while putting herself through night school, I owe everything I am to this strong, independent, American woman. She and millions of other women like her blazed the trail for me, for today's young women, and, particularly, for my 15-year-old daughter, Anderson.

I am proud to be raising a young woman at a time where we have seen tremendous gains for women in our Nation.

I am proud to serve alongside a historic 102 women here in this Congress, the 116th Congress, including trailblazers like MARTHA MCSALLY, the first female fighter pilot in Congress, and numerous other Republican colleagues in the House who were the first women to represent their districts: Representatives like LIZ CHENEY and ELISE STEFANIK, who are working diligently to ensure more female candidates have the resources they need to compete in our election system, and countless others who inspire me.

As these national role models continue to be important, it is also critical to recognize the important role local heroes and local women have in our communities and our Nation, including many from my own district in Florida. That is why each week this month I will be honoring local women who have had or are having an important impact in our community, women like:

Alice Scott Abbott, a Flagler County resident of the early 1900s who worked with the national women's suffrage movement and, following the ratification of the 19th Amendment, fervently employed her fellow Flagler County women to register and participate in the 1920 November election;

Dr. Mary McLeod Bethune, who founded the Volusia County School that would later become Bethune-Cookman University. She was a national leader on issues related to civil rights, to education, to women and young people until her death in 1955.

Mr. Speaker, as these local heroes exemplify, women and their contribu-

tions are critical to our success as a nation, but I also believe their strength is an essential part of our national security.

As a Green Beret who operated all over the world, I know firsthand where women thrive in business, where they thrive in civil society, in politics, and in government, extremism does not. Where women thrive, extremism fails.

As an Afghan elder once told me during one of my combat tours, he shared with me his secret weapon in defeating the Taliban. It wasn't a weapon or a missile or some type of other secret device. It was his teenage daughters, whom he had sent to India to be educated. He looked at me and said: This is our secret weapon to defeat extremism.

And I will quote for you, Mr. Speaker, the Nobel Peace Prize-winning young girl who was shot in the face for attending school, Malala Yousafzai. She said: "Extremists have shown what frightens them most: a girl with a book."

So this Women's History Month must serve as a reminder that as a nation we have a responsibility to empower women who participate in every aspect of our society—not only for the betterment of America, but also as an example for the world.

So thank you to the women of my district, our Nation, and the world who worked to make their communities a better place for us all.

#### DAYTONA BIKE WEEK

Mr. WALTZ. Mr. Speaker, This week is Daytona Bike Week, where my district welcomes nearly 300,000 avid motorcyclists for our community's 78th annual celebration of liberty, freedom, and two-wheeled, motorized muscle. No other event comes close to matching our combination of bikes, Florida beaches, sun, and fun.

It all started in January 1937, on a 3.2-mile race course running along the world's most famous beach—Daytona Beach. Riders first headed south on the paved roadway of Route A1A, turned left onto the beach, then raced north on the sand until turning back onto the pavement at a spot now marked by a favorite local restaurant named Racing's North Turn. Then, the riders did it again and again and again for 200 miles.

This was the birth of the famed Daytona 200 motorcycle race and the Bike Week that now surrounds it. Since then, only World War II has interrupted these annual festivities. Today, the Daytona 200 headlines Bike Week as a spectacular finale in the famed Daytona International Speedway.

Don't miss the week's other high-adrenaline racing, too. The American Flat Track series opens its season this week, and the Daytona Supercross is back again, bigger and better than ever.

If you are unsure of where to start, try the brand-new official Bike Week Welcome Center, located in One Daytona.

So to everyone visiting Daytona this week, thank you for supporting our local businesses. Have fun and ride safe.

### RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 52 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. VARGAS) at noon.

### PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: God of the universe, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

We ask Your blessing upon this assembly and upon all who call upon Your name. Send Your spirit to fill their hearts with those divine gifts You have prepared for them.

May Your grace find expression in their compassion for the weak and the poor among us, and may Your mercy encourage good will in all they do and accomplish this day.

As the Members of the people's House face the demands of our time, grant them and us all Your peace.

May all that is done this day 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. Will the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DUNN) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. DUNN 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. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

### REJECT THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

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

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, President Trump's budget landed with a thud on the backs of working Americans this week.

Its message is quite simple: this administration will reward wealth with one hand and target working families with another.

To this President, avoiding the estate tax for wealthy heirs is an entitlement, but the healthcare of everyday Americans is expendable.

To this President, carried interest on passive income is a worthy tax benefit for executives, while a livable minimum wage for a working parent is a burden we cannot afford.

To this President, a lengthy record of felony convictions won't deny your tax credit for a private jet, but a conviction for misdemeanor drug possession could cost you the roof over your head.

A budget that puts Americans first doesn't deem millions of Americans unworthy.

A budget that puts Americans first doesn't starve them of housing, of healthcare, and of food because their President counts stock market gains as more important than our common humanity.

But putting Americans first has never been the fundamental policy of this administration. It has always been to draw a bright line between the wealthy and the striving.

I stand to reject this budget.

### HONORING THE LIFE OF MAYOR BETTY WALKER

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

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mayor Betty Walker of Chiefland, Florida, who passed away on Monday, February 25.

Mayor Walker served the citizens of Chiefland as an elected city commissioner for over 15 years and as mayor and vice mayor for 11 of those years.

Betty Walker was the first African American female elected official for the city of Chiefland. She was a great leader. She loved her community immensely. She advocated for the police and fire departments and the maintenance departments as well.

Mayor Walker had recently retired after spending almost 40 years helping adults with intellectual and developmental disabilities.

She truly loved the people of Chiefland. She was passionate about parks and recreation and always had a vision for her city.

Mayor Walker leaves behind a rich legacy that not many can match.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in honoring a life well lived and a community leader who will be missed by many, Mayor Betty Walker of Chiefland.

### YEMEN

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

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, today in Yemen, there are millions of Yemeni people who are on the brink of death from famine and disease, lack of access to food and water, basic medicine and healthcare.

Thousands of Yemeni civilians have died in this genocidal war being waged by Saudi Arabia with support from the United States. They have been living under the looming threat of death at a moment's notice.

This must end. Not another day can go by with U.S. support for this genocidal war.

Saudi Arabia is not our ally. They spend billions of dollars spreading the Wahhabi-Salafist ideology that fuels terrorist organizations like ISIS and al-Qaida. They take the weapons that they get from the United States and provide them to al-Qaida.

Enough is enough.

Mr. Speaker, today, the Senate is taking an important vote, and I urge my colleagues in the Senate to hear the pleas of the Yemeni people who are begging for their lives. Vote today to end the unconstitutional U.S. support for Saudi Arabia's genocidal war in Yemen.

### HONORING FRED HILSEN RATH

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

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in honor of the life and legacy of a friend and Holocaust survivor, Fred Hilsenrath, who recently passed away at the age of 90.

Fred was only 4 years old when Adolph Hitler took over as chancellor of Germany.

After spending years in concentration camps throughout Romania, facing death, witnessing some of the most heinous and grotesque atrocities the world has seen, Fred and his family were finally rescued by a Jewish Russian soldier.

With his new-found freedom, Fred moved to the United States to finish his education in electrical engineering.

After meeting his wife, Eleanor, Fred moved first to San Francisco and, finally, to retire in Fairfield Bay, Arkansas. Here, he wanted that slower pace of life.

In his later years, Fred advocated to young people, "Find your passion early and pursue it, even if adversity comes your way."

He was a role model and friend to many across the State of Arkansas, and I extend my condolences, respect, and affection to his friends, family, and loved ones.

### TRUMP'S BUDGET

(Mrs. KIRKPATRICK asked and was given permission to address the House



for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I am here to represent the residents of Arizona's Second Congressional District. I work for them.

Our constituents sent us here to practice good government and to fight for their values and interests, so I am upset with the President's recent budget request.

A budget is an expression of our values, and this budget further proves how out of touch Donald Trump is with real American families.

This budget ransacks Medicaid, Medicare, and affordable healthcare. It makes it harder for Americans to have access to quality healthcare.

This budget abandons hungry families who are struggling to make ends meet. It fails farmers and rural communities. It pushes affordable college further out of reach, making it harder for students to attend college. And this budget demands billions for a wasteful, ineffective wall.

We need to have a budget that prioritizes working families and not large corporations.

We need to invest more in our education system and invest more in our young people, not less.

What the President has laid out does not accomplish the goals or values of American families, and I reject this budget.

#### RURAL COMMUNITIES ARE FORGOTTEN AND LEFT BEHIND

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

Mr. COX of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Equality Act.

Too often in our policy debates, it is our rural communities that are forgotten and left behind. And for LGBTQ people living in rural America, this is no different.

If you want to live and work and raise your family in rural America, you should be able to have that choice, but it is unfortunately the case today that rural LGBTQ families are denied opportunities in housing, employment, and healthcare access.

While in California we have comprehensive laws to protect LGBTQ people and protect them against discrimination, this is not the case everywhere.

That is why we need bills like the Equality Act.

This bill would take important steps to protect every LGBTQ family from discrimination in housing, employment, and financing.

It will help ensure that every family that chooses to live in rural America can fully participate in our society free from fear of discrimination simply because of who they are or who they love.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. CON. RES. 24, EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF CONGRESS THAT THE REPORT OF SPECIAL COUNSEL MUELLER SHOULD BE MADE AVAILABLE TO THE PUBLIC AND TO CONGRESS, AND PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM MARCH 15, 2019, THROUGH MARCH 22, 2019

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 208 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

#### H. RES. 208

*Resolved*, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 24) expressing the sense of Congress that the report of Special Counsel Mueller should be made available to the public and to Congress. All points of order against consideration of the concurrent resolution are waived. The amendments to the concurrent resolution and the preamble printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted. The concurrent resolution, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the concurrent resolution, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution and preamble, as amended, to adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

SEC. 2. On any legislative day during the period from March 15, 2019, through March 22, 2019—

(a) the Journal of the proceedings of the previous day shall be considered as approved; and

(b) the Chair may at any time declare the House adjourned to meet at a date and time, within the limits of clause 4, section 5, article I of the Constitution, to be announced by the Chair in declaring the adjournment.

SEC. 3. The Speaker may appoint Members to perform the duties of the Chair for the duration of the period addressed by section 2 of this resolution as though under clause 8(a) of rule I.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DESAULNIER. 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 gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 208, providing for the consideration of H.

Con. Res. 24, a resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the report of Special Counsel Mueller should be made available to the public and to Congress.

The rule provides for consideration of the legislation under a closed rule.

The rule self-executes two amendments to simply clarify that the resolution is calling for the release of the special counsel's findings in addition to any report.

□ 1215

It provides 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the Judiciary Committee.

Finally, the rule provides standard recess procedures for the period of March 15 through March 22.

Mr. Speaker, when the Justice Department named the special counsel for the Russia investigation, acting Attorney General Rod Rosenstein said: "A special counsel is necessary in order for the American people to have full confidence in the outcome. Our Nation is grounded on the rule of law, and the public must be assured that government officials administer the law fairly."

This investigation has been about following the facts wherever they may lead, getting to the truth of Russia's involvement in the 2016 election, and ensuring government is transparent and accountable to the American public.

This does not predetermine the outcome of that investigation. It simply expresses that the report of the special counsel should be made available to Congress and to the American people.

The public, including my constituents in California—our constituents in California, Mr. Speaker—want to know what happened. Nearly 9 in 10 Americans in both parties say the investigation should produce a full public report on their findings. Not only do the American people want to know, but they deserve to know. Congress needs to preserve their ability to know.

Our election system is an integral part of what makes us the beacon of Western democracy. Any and all attempts to undermine this system is an attack on our country's values and cannot be taken lightly.

This is a serious investigation with consequences for our elections, democracy, government, and the future of this country and democracy itself. There is no one with more intimate knowledge of Russia's involvement in our election than the special counsel.

To date, this investigation has resulted in 34 people and three companies being criminally charged; nearly 200 charges filed; seven guilty pleas; one conviction following a jury trial; and the investigation, while costing \$25 million, has recovered approximately \$48 million in assets from tax evasion.

Mr. Speaker, eight Federal and congressional intelligence and national security groups believe Russia interfered



in our election, with the Central Intelligence Agency, the National Security Agency, the FBI, and the Office of the Director of National Intelligence concluding that Vladimir Putin personally “ordered an influence campaign in 2016 aimed at the U.S. Presidential election” to “undermine public faith in the democratic process.”

The last time our country had a special counsel operating under the same rules as this probe was in 1993 to investigate the Waco siege and allegations of government wrongdoing. Prosecutors posted their final report directly on the internet with hundreds of pages of exhibits and timelines. The American people must receive the same transparency when this report is released.

I encourage my friends across the aisle to support the release of this report. We have commitments to support it from three House Republican leaders, including the minority leader, the minority whip, and the Republican Conference chair. I hope all my colleagues across the aisle will join us in this vote to ensure that we are on the record that we will share one of the most important investigations of our time within these halls and with all of America.

This is happening on our watch, and it is our job to be faithful to our oath to defend and uphold democracy. As Justice Brandeis famously said, “Sunlight is said to be the best of disinfectants.”

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

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I thank my friend from California for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, when I see someone of your stature come to the chair, I think: We must be down here to debate some serious American public policy. We must be down here to change the law in ways that can only happen once in a generation when people come together to make things happen.

I don't know what they told you when you came to the chair this morning, but let me be the first to tell you that is not at all why we are here today. What we are here to say today is important, that the American people have a vested interest in confidence in our democracy. That is a value shared from the furthest side of the left to the furthest side of the right. But the resolution we have here before us today is just a restatement of current law.

Sometimes I think, Mr. Speaker, that we undermine faith in the democracy when we try to pretend that division exists where division does not, where we try to pretend that we are doing great things when, in fact, we are not.

This is an opportunity today to speak with a voice in Congress that says the special counsel should release the report. But let me be clear, because we sometimes do more harm than good,

that is going to be the headline: “House Votes for Special Counsel to Release Report.” That is not actually what the resolution says, and I want to guide you.

If you have a copy, Mr. Speaker, you can go back through it. It is not going to be on page 1. It is not going to be on pages 2, 3, 4, or 5. The real substance of the resolution is back on the bottom of page 5, early on page 6. It says, “to the extent permitted by law.”

As you know from your legal background, Mr. Speaker, the law does not allow the special counsel to release so many things. Grand jury testimony, for example, nowhere in the country is grand jury testimony disclosed. Those facts are gathered, but that is never disclosed. Intelligence sources and methods, that is never disclosed, nor would anybody on the other side of the aisle suggest that it should be.

That is why, in the resolution drafted by the Democratic chairman of the Judiciary Committee, it says specifically that these things need not be released because it is prohibited by law. I only make that point, Mr. Speaker, because sometimes the headlines are all we read when they come through on our Twitter feed. Sometimes we believe the headline tells the whole story.

I want to make it clear that there is unanimity in this Chamber that transparency is valuable in our Republic. But it is also true that this is a nation of laws. The reason the special counsel exists is because we are a nation of laws, and the substance of the special counsel's report is going to be governed by those laws. To the extent allowable by law, our Attorney General has already said he wants to make the entire thing available.

I don't know how you want to characterize the resolution today, Mr. Speaker, whether you want to characterize it as an insistence of the House on how the administration should behave or just a big attaboy to our new Attorney General to say: You are doing a great job, and we are behind you 100 percent in what you have already promised the American people you were going to do.

However you characterize that resolution—we heard it in the Rules Committee, as my friend from California suggested—it is coming to the floor today under a closed rule. So if anybody has any additional changes they want to make, those changes will not be permitted. This is a take-it-or-leave-it resolution from the Rules Committee today.

But as a restatement of current law, it is quite clear. Again, you have to go all the way to the back of the resolution to find those 10 lines of substance. But when you get there, you will find these are already things the Attorney General has agreed to, and all Americans should be pleased about that outcome.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, let me join with my friend from Georgia in noting how important it is that you are presiding, my good friend, with lots of history between the two of us in our political life in California and our education, I might add to the Jesuits.

I want to say to my good friend, I look at this as one of those opportunities where we may not get a headline. Unfortunately, too many of the headlines talk about how divisive it is here. Certainly, there is a lot of that.

But when I go home and do town-halls—and I do a lot of them in northern California—when this question comes up about polarization, I talk about all the times we do work together that don't get out, certainly, in the headlines, because that is not what sells advertising, apparently. I think this is one of those moments that we aspire to that, that we actually aspire that somebody picks up on this; that all of us, in these extraordinary circumstances, are being faithful to our oath; that we make sure that the things that may have happened, that apparently did happen, that the public needs confidence in us.

When we look every day, including today, at the affronts and the attacks on so many institutions in America, and this institution having had challenges, this might be one of those opportunities, at least for us, to say: We agree. We may have differences of opinion about who did what, but we have faith.

For me, I think history will say that this special counsel is one of those providential Americans. With his background, with his determination to believe in fidelity and truth, we were lucky to have this person at this point in time.

I put my faith in this institution. I put faith in the special counsel. In this instance, I hear from you, my friend from Georgia, that we are going to put our faith in this institution and one another, that we can show the American people that this is, indeed, more important than party, and it is more important than any of our individual political careers.

I did want to mention, Mr. Speaker, that this is a sense of Congress and that this is not the first time we have brought a resolution like this to the floor. In fact, just last week, we brought a resolution to the floor to send a message to the American people that Congress is united in condemning anti-Semitism and bigotry in all its forms. There are people who criticized us for bringing that and thought that it was unnecessary, but we brought that to the floor.

A majority of Republicans joined Democrats, an overwhelming majority, in voting for it. Leader MCCARTHY called it a resolution to make a statement. Whip SCALISE said, regarding the resolution, “We must all take a strong

stand against hatred and bigotry wherever we see it, and I am glad this resolution makes" sense.

We agree with our colleagues on the other side of the aisle that passing these types of resolutions can make a strong statement. Although they may seem to some as unnecessary, these statements on these kinds of important issues, I believe, are very necessary for this institution to make, particularly when they are bipartisan.

Today, we are letting Attorney General Barr and everyone else know that we are all united behind one common principle, which I believe he agreed to in his confirmation hearings, which the Member from Georgia alluded to. That complete transparency, consistent with law, is vital to the success of our democracy. The American people deserve to have access to this report.

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

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS), a senior member on the Rules Committee and a subcommittee ranking member on the Energy and Commerce Committee.

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

Mr. Speaker, today, I rise in opposition to the rule providing for consideration of H. Con. Res. 24 to release the special counsel's investigation report, a report that, I may note, has not yet been issued.

The resolution we are considering here today will not change the law; it will not increase transparency; and it will provide no new benefit to the American people. Quite simply, this resolution merely states current law. This resolution simply restates current Department of Justice protocol.

We had a Member here in this House who was also a physician and who was a member of the other party, former Congressman McDermott of Washington State. I remember one time Republicans offered a sense of Congress resolution that had something to do with taxes. The gentleman took to the floor of the House and said, if you want to do something about taxes, do something about taxes, but a sense of Congress resolution, why you might as well be sending a get-well card to the IRS.

That is the force with which we are exercising our congressional time today. Speaker PELOSI and the Democratic leadership have decided to use valuable legislative time to consider a resolution that changes nothing and does not serve the American people.

In the time that we have spent debating this resolution, we could have been discussing more serious matters before this body. Let's just run through a few of them.

The Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act has been brought to the floor 17 times, yet the current Democratic leadership refuses to bring up this legislation for a vote. I might remind the body that this bill is not

about abortion but saving the lives of children who are, in fact, born alive.

□ 1230

You know, I don't make it a habit of watching "60 Minutes" on television, but last Sunday night, "60 Minutes" had a news story on the dramatic advances in the treatment and perhaps—perhaps—inching towards a cure for sickle cell disease.

Sickle cell disease is a painful condition I witnessed many times as a resident at Parkland Hospital back in the 1970s.

For years, sickle cell received very little attention. Now, I am happy to say in the last Congress, under the leadership of DANNY DAVIS of Illinois, our subcommittee worked on and passed his bill dealing with sickle cell. It finally was passed by the Senate in October of last year, and it was signed into law by the President last December.

As a consequence, the push for sickle cell research has continued. The 21st Century Cures Act, which this Congress worked on at the end of the previous administration, certainly can be given some credit for that. But, I have to tell you, it was dramatic to have the Director of the NIH interviewed on "60 Minutes" talking about a cure for sickle cell.

So our work that we do here is important. It does impact the lives of real people, and I think that is just one dramatic example.

Well, another example was the first tax reform, 31 years, that was signed into law last year, and here we are a month out from tax day. We could use this time to strengthen the progress we made on the tax reform that was passed last year.

In the last Congress, we helped American people keep more of their hard-earned money. We should be working to continue that momentum, perhaps make those tax cuts permanent for the middle class.

We could be discussing the Democrats' government-run, bureaucratic, top-down healthcare plan that would strip hardworking Americans of their private health insurance and offer less coverage at more expense to American taxpayers, but we are not.

Today, we could be talking about patent abuse entities, so-called patent trolls, particularly troublesome in the eastern district of Texas, where most of those cases are litigated.

The House could be considering the Troll Act, legislation that I have introduced for three terms of Congress to limit patent assertion entities and protect Americans' intellectual property.

We could be using this time to discuss our Nation's critical need for border security to protect the American people and defend our borders.

In February of 2019, the shortest month of the year, only 28 days, more than 75,000 people that we know of crossed the border without legal status, in excess of a 100 percent increase

from the same period last year. People argue whether that is an emergency. I believe that it is, but we could be talking about that.

In a week in which more than 150 lost their lives, we could be using this time to discuss aviation safety and does Congress need to do anything further to ensure the continued safety of the American traveling public.

So time and again, we found that Members on the other side of the dais are far more interested in discrediting the President than working on policy that will help the American people, this President who, in the first 2 years and 2 months of this administration, has probably been more productive than any Presidency in the last 50 years.

And, finally, Mr. Speaker, we could be using this time to address the false and misleading comments that a member of the Judiciary Committee made about the Department of Health and Human Services.

Last month, a Member of this House grossly mischaracterized the work being done by the Department of Health and Human Services to care for unaccompanied alien children by stating that the Office of Refugee Resettlement created "an environment of systemic sexual assaults by Health and Human Services staff on unaccompanied alien children."

Mr. Speaker, that accusation is false, and it was made without that Member ever having visited an ORR facility. Those comments are a discredit to the effort by dedicated personnel of the Office of Refugee Resettlement, those employees who deal with a problem that dates back to the Obama administration when the Office of Refugee Resettlement was unprepared for the task.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BEYER). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BURGESS. If Democrats don't like the work that the Office of Refugee Resettlement is doing, you are in the majority. You have the ability to introduce legislation and pass legislation to do something different.

Instead of standing here today discussing this superfluous resolution, the Democrats could be using this time to change a law that they clearly don't like.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from the agency's Administration for Children and Families regarding this issue.

ADMINISTRATION FOR  
CHILDREN & FAMILIES,

Washington, DC, February 28, 2019.

Representative TED DEUTCH,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE DEUTCH: At the February 26th House Judiciary Committee hearing, you stated that ORR created "an environment of systemic sexual assaults by staff on unaccompanied alien children" and went on to conclude that you have seen "thousands of cases of sexual assault, if not by

HHS staff, then by staff HHS oversees.” (emphasis added). However, this is unsupported by the data you provided and none of the allegations involve HHS employees. By mischaracterizing the data during a televised hearing, you impugned the integrity of hundreds of federal civil servants who, like Commander White, work tirelessly to ensure the well-being of the nearly 50,000 unaccompanied alien children who they have been charged by federal law to protect annually. On behalf of these dedicated employees of HHS assigned to the UAC program, we request that you apologize to these career civil servants for your untoward and unfounded comments. Acknowledging that you were wrong is the moral, decent and right thing to do.

Child safety is our top priority in managing the UAC program. All but one of our care facilities are licensed by the authorizing state residential child care agency, and operate under intense state and federal oversight. Because ORR care facilities diligently track all allegations of a wide range of sexually inappropriate conduct, ranging from name calling or use of vulgar language to more serious claims, the data given to Congress by our agency reflects allegations much broader than just ‘sexual abuse’ (as defined in 34 U.S.C. §20341 and in ORR regulations at 45 C.F.R. §411.6), to also include ‘sexual harassment’ (as defined in ORR regulations at 45 C.F.R. §411.6) and ‘inappropriate sexual behavior’ (a catch-all category for sexual behaviors that do not rise to the level of sexual abuse or sexual harassment).

The total number of sexual conduct allegations reported to ORR decreased in FY2017 (1,069 total) but otherwise has generally remained relatively stable each year (FY2015: 1,000 total, FY2016: 1,226 total, FY2018 (through July): 1,261 total). The vast majority of the allegations reported to ORR are ‘inappropriate sexual behaviors’ involving solely UAC, and not staff or any other adults. Facilities can often resolve these allegations by, for example, counseling the minors about more appropriate behaviors.

More serious allegations rising to the level of ‘sexual abuse’ are reported to both ORR and the Department of Justice (DOJ). Of these, the vast majority involve ‘UAC-on-UAC’ allegations; the distinct minority involve adults. In FY2015, 279 allegations of sexual abuse were reported. Of these, 8.6% (24 instances) involved allegations of facility-staff-on-minor sexual abuse. These metrics fluctuated in subsequent years but remained relatively consistent. In FY2016, ORR and DOJ received 348 allegations of sexual abuse, and 16.1% (56 instances) involved facility-staff-on-minor allegations; in FY2017, ORR and DOJ received 264 allegations of sexual abuse, and 18.6% involved facility-staff-on-minor allegations (49 instances); in FY2018 (through July), ORR and DOJ received 412 allegations of sexual abuse, and 11.9% involved facility-staff-on-minor allegations (49 instances). Thus, the total number of incidents of alleged ‘sexual abuse’ involving facility-staff-on-minor misconduct across a four-year period spanning the previous administration and this administration was 178 out of approximately 182,806 children under UAC care or about 0.10% of all children placed in ORR custody during that period. None of the allegations involved ORR or other HHS federal staff. These allegations were all fully investigated and remedial action was taken where appropriate.

Your office staff requests an additional briefing from ORR program officials on these allegations. ORR will be happy to meet with you once you correct the hearing record and provide an apology to the dedicated men and women working tirelessly to protect and im-

prove the lives of unaccompanied alien children in our care.

Sincerely,

JONATHAN H. HAYES,  
*Acting Director,  
Office of Refugee Resettlement.*

Mr. BURGESS. So here is the bottom line: House Democrats do not like the President of the United States, and we know that.

Less than 3 months into the 116th Congress, the Democrats have shown that they will work against President Trump to the detriment of the American people.

We are here in the United States House of Representatives to serve the American people, and the legislation we are considering here today will not do that.

President Trump has urged us at the State of the Union, asked all the Members present, to reject the politics of revenge, resistance, and retribution and embrace the boundless potential of cooperation, compromise, and the common good. I also believe this is possible, and I recommend we get on with the task.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN), the distinguished chair of the Committee on House Administration.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution today.

We have a responsibility to the American people to uphold the Constitution and rule of law, and we also have an obligation, as a separate and equal branch of government, to act as a check on the executive branch.

Without access to necessary information, we can’t fulfill our constitutionally prescribed duties. We must have not only this report, but the evidence collected to support the report.

If the President has nothing to hide, then he would also support this resolution by tweet or verbal approval.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be a cosponsor of this legislation. It is very important for our country.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Antitrust, Commercial and Administrative Law.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution.

Special Counsel Mueller’s investigation has resulted in 199 criminal charges against 39 people and entities. Seven people have pleaded guilty, and five people have been sentenced to prison.

This investigation has been conducted on behalf of the American people, and they are entitled to know the results of this investigation.

This investigation was begun to safeguard our democracy, and the American people deserve to know the results of this investigation; and yet President Trump has repeatedly sought to attack and discredit the investigation, label-

ing it a witch hunt and even contemplating firing the special counsel.

The President’s pick for Attorney General, Bill Barr, has also made it clear during his confirmation hearing that he will only follow DOJ’s policies that are convenient for the President. Therefore, it is up to Congress to make sure that documents related to the special counsel’s investigation are preserved and published.

That is why I introduced the Special Counsel Transparency Act, with Congressman DOGGETT, to require the publication of the special counsel’s report.

No one person should decide what the public gets to see. The American people have a right to come to their own conclusions and to know that justice was served.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the American people. Allow them to see the results of the investigation conducted on their behalf. Bring transparency to this process. Support this resolution and signal a willingness to respect the right of the American people to see the consequences and the results of this important investigation which, again, was begun to safeguard our democracy.

This shouldn’t be a Republican or Democratic issue. Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will join us in our effort to preserve our democracy.

I thank, again, the gentleman for yielding.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to ask my friend from Rhode Island before he leaves the floor: The bill that he introduced, was that also a House resolution or was that an H.R. to insist on the revealing?

Mr. CICILLINE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODALL. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, this legislation that I introduced is an H.R. But if the point of the gentleman’s question is is that a more effective way to do it, I would welcome support on my resolution. I haven’t been as successful getting my Republican colleagues to join us.

We are hoping that this resolution is a way for him to find his way toward transparency, democracy, and spirit of bipartisanship and letting the American people know the results of the investigation.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Rhode Island introducing the bill.

And I think that is an important distinction, Mr. Speaker, and that is what you have heard, largely. You heard it in the Rules Committee; you have heard it down here on the floor, that: Listen, there are lots of things that we could be doing here, and if we wanted to pass a law that insisted that the entire report was released—those parts that are prohibited from being released under current law and those parts that are intended to be released under current law—we could do that. That is just not what we are doing.

What we are doing is saying: Hey, do you know what current law is? Follow current law. Follow current law. We, the House of Representatives, have thought about it, and in our deliberative wisdom, we are prepared to announce that we believe current law should be followed—Signed, U.S. House of Representatives.

There are those who would have you believe this is something more than that. It is not. There is nothing wrong with what we are doing today except that it is not a particularly valuable use of time.

When I opened, Mr. Speaker, you were not in the chair, but I mentioned that I think we do great damage to trust in our Republic when we seek division instead of highlighting our unity. To suggest that we are down here doing something to protect our Republic from its inevitable demise is just ridiculous. No such thing is happening here on the floor today. All that is happening on the floor today is saying that we, the duly-elected Members of the U.S. House of Representatives, believe U.S. law should be followed.

Mr. Speaker, I agree, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, in response to my friend from Georgia, I want to agree—and maybe we disagree a little bit.

I do think this is important. I think it is the unusual circumstance, and a lot of things that we have no direct control over have brought us to this circumstance.

Social media and the use of social media in our elections is relatively new, coming from the Bay area where so much of the genesis happened.

So I think it is important, and I do think there is lacking—and hyperbole is something that sometimes doesn't happen in this Chamber, but I think it is not a hyperbole to say that the U.S. House of Representatives, hopefully, unanimously says that the law should be followed to its letter.

So I think we agree, and I don't want to look for a way to disagree.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know what is in the Mueller report and neither do you. The American people don't know what is in the Mueller report, but they want to know. And I want to know, as you do, and why not?

Mr. Speaker, 81 percent of the American people polled say they want to know, and that includes 79 percent of the Republicans. That is good news.

Because what we do know, without knowing the details of the Mueller report, is that really bad stuff happened in the last election. Some of it was in a campaign, and some of it was in a foreign country that is our severe adversary; and I speak, of course, of Vladimir Putin's Russia.

But the bad stuff: a former campaign foreign policy adviser indicted and con-

victed, Mr. Papadopoulos; a former campaign manager on his way to jail, Mr. Manafort; a former campaign aide and Manafort's long-time junior business partner indicted; a former foreign policy national security adviser pleaded guilty, Mr. Flynn.

This is the high level of a campaign where crimes are not just being discussed; there have been convictions and guilty pleas. What is behind all of that? We need to know.

And, incidentally, Mr. Speaker, the American people are footing the bill for this—about \$25 million, as far as we can tell. They have got a right to know.

But, in addition to whatever happened in the campaign, really bad stuff happened in Russia. We know from our own intelligence agencies that Russia made a concerted effort and a determined effort and a well-financed effort to interfere in our election.

□ 1245

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, outside interference goes to the heart of our democracy. The most important challenge for our country is that we, the citizens of this country, make the decision on who is our President, who are our Senators, and who are our Representatives.

We have to get to the bottom of what Russia did and how they did it so that we can take steps to make certain that that does not happen in the future. It is the American people who decide who is their leader.

Release the Mueller report.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am looking for something to disagree with my friend from Vermont about. I don't disagree with him about anything at all. I thought that was a very thoughtful presentation.

The only thing I would point out is the reason that he doesn't know what is in the Mueller report and the American people don't know what is in the Mueller report, is because as of today, there is no Mueller report. That is the only reason we don't know what is in it. It hasn't been released yet.

I don't mean released to the public. I mean, Mueller hasn't written it and handed it to the Attorney General yet, and so we don't know. When that happens, let me tell you what the Attorney General has said, Mr. Speaker. The Attorney General has committed to being transparent with Congress and the public consistent with the rules and the law. I don't think we would ask anything different of him.

The Attorney General has committed to providing as much information as he can consistent with current regulations. I don't think we would ask anything different of him than that, and,

certainly, this resolution does not ask anything different of him other than that.

He says that his objective and goal is to get as much information as he can to the public. That is exactly what this resolution asks for; exactly what he has already committed to. And he says, "I feel like I'm in a position in life where I can do the right thing and not really care about the consequences. I can be truly independent."

Well, that doesn't just mean truly independent from pressure put on him from the White House. It also means truly independent from statements of opinion sent to him by the U.S. House. He is going to do the right thing, as allowed by the law and resolutions. If he doesn't, this House can act and try to push a different outcome.

Just understand that that is not what this resolution does today. It is simply a statement of fact. To my friend from California, there are those Members of Congress that sometimes they speak and you just want to get out your sharp stick, Mr. Speaker, and poke them a little bit harder. They don't calm you down. They rile you up. My friend from California is one of those folks whose thoughtful words always recenter me and remind me what we have together.

He is right about the hyperbole, and I don't want to mischaracterize this resolution. It does do one thing that is not available in current law today, and that is, that it makes the official position of the United States House known. I have always presumed that the Attorney General would follow the law. This resolution says we expect the Attorney General to follow the law.

It is not that it does nothing. It is just that it does something so very little, perhaps our time would be better spent elsewhere, but I support the underlying premise.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend for pointing out that I am not a poker, that I might actually be trying to be thoughtful. Maybe it is because I was once registered as a Republican. I don't regularly admit that sometimes, at least not in my district.

But I do think this conversation is important on multiple levels, and I appreciate the fact that the gentleman is here to present his side of the aisle's position.

I think there is a danger here for us to resume to our corners, and this is an instance where I really think it is important—and, hopefully, it is newsworthy—to the media and to the general public that we are coming to this moment. Although it is a resolution, I still think it is significant without indulging in hyperbole.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER), my friend and a distinguished member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California,

and I thank the gentleman from Georgia. I have not heard you two be so agreeable. Disagreeable is what usually you are, but so agreeable, and the reason there is agreement here is, we all want to see what is in this report.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the rule and the underlying resolution, and I would like to remind everybody about what the Mueller investigation is about. Russia interfered in the 2016 U.S. Presidential election with, in my opinion, the goal of helping Donald Trump be elected.

This is a fact confirmed by the U.S. intelligence community, as well as by the House and Senate Intelligence Committees. This should concern every American, Republican, Democrat, or Independent.

In response to this unprecedented attack on our elections, Robert Mueller was appointed to serve as special counsel for the Justice Department to follow the facts wherever they may lead, whether they implicate people or exonerate people. We need to know precisely what happened, understand who was involved, how it was accomplished, and, ultimately, hold those responsible for this attack on our election accountable under our laws. This investigation will also ensure we better protect our elections in the future.

Now, we have had 2 convictions of Mr. Manafort, 7 guilty pleas, 34 people and 3 companies indicted as part of the Mueller investigation. Six of the people indicted were part of President Trump's inner circle with the campaign and business. So it is important for us to understand precisely what is in the report.

I appreciate the fact that the Rules Committee unanimously supported this particular rule and the underlying resolution, and I say to my friend from Georgia, you are right. The law is what it is and that it says the report should be withheld until fully written and prepared. And then if Mr. BARR does what he says he was going to do, it will be made available to all of us.

We are emphasizing that point because Americans should know precisely what happened and where this investigation has led. I thank my friend from California for bringing this rule.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I tell my friend, I do not have any speakers remaining at this point, so I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Let me thank the gentleman from California and congratulate him on his new distinguished post on the Rules Committee. My good friend who I have seen quite frequently over the years at the Rules Committee and I have known of his consistent concern with the rule of law and truly appreciate his comments today as it relates to the rule of law.

I would like my comments to be strictly on that question and really the

American people of whom each and every one of us come here to represent.

I don't want to recount in detail, but I do want to make mention that we know that the Intelligence Committee in January 2017 concluded—and that is the intelligence community concluded—in a report that Russian President Putin ordered and influenced the campaign of 2016 on the Presidential election. We all know recently there were attempts to influence the 2018 election.

We won't dwell on that. We won't dwell on the fact that there are discussions and review in the special counsel's work dealing with collusion or the questions dealing with the campaign of the present President and Russia.

I believe that the real point of this is to answer the questions of the American people. If we say that the purpose of appointing the special counsel to oversee the investigation is to ensure that the American public would have full confidence in the integrity of the investigation, regardless of what it says, I am here to say, regardless of what the Mueller report will say—and we know that there will be comments made by the general public, leaders of Congress, and that is their right as Americans—we want to reinforce the fact that the DOJ regulations themselves say that investigation results should be made fully extended to the American public in the public interest, and that the results of that report should be made available to the American people.

Obviously, being concerned about persons that are mentioned with no relevance whatsoever, as a lawyer, I would want to make sure such protections occur. But it is true that Special Counsel Mueller previously served in the Department of Justice as a prosecutor, and director of the FBI in the Republican and Democrat administrations where he built a reputation of competence, fairness, and nonpartisanship.

With that in mind, we thank him for the work he has done that has shown a number of guilty pleas and other responses.

But the main point is the American people need to know that their government adheres to the rule of law, and the integrity of the Constitution. All we are asking today is to reflect in a sense of Congress that you, the American people, that my colleagues in this House and the Senate should have the right to see the full report.

I ask for support of the underlying bill, and I ask us to do it in a bipartisan way.

Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the Committee on Judiciary, which has oversight of the Department of Justice, and as a senior member of the Committee on Homeland Security, which has oversight over our election security infrastructure, I rise in strong support of H. Con. Res. 24.

Mr. Speaker, I take no glee in standing here.

In fact, there are many parts of the last 22 months, since the day that Deputy Attorney

General Rod Rosenstein appointed former FBI Director Robert Mueller to be Special Counsel, where I have been concerned for the state of our democracy.

And I know, from my travels back to the 18th Congressional District of Texas, around our Nation, and to nations involved, that many Americans are concerned about our democracy.

Since well before the 2016 election, Americans have been concerned about how Russia was manipulating our election and the extent to which that crime was aided and abetted by associates of the Trump Campaign.

American intelligence officials have been keenly aware of this threat to the democracy posed by Russia's active measures campaign to sabotage the election and secure the American presidency for its preferred candidate, the current occupant of the Oval Office.

Shortly after the President took office, James Comey, the former director of the FBI testified to the House Intelligence Committee in a public congressional hearing that there was an active FBI investigation into Russia's interference and the extent to which Russia and was aided and abetted by agents of the Trump Campaign.

Shortly after the hearing, the President fired James Comey as FBI Director and went on broadcast television and cited the looming Russia investigation as his reason for doing so.

The next day in the Oval Office, the President of the United States met with the Russian Ambassador and other officials from the Kremlin and told them that he had gotten rid of "nut job" Comey and had gotten the Russian investigation off his back.

Mere days later, the Deputy Attorney General, Rod Rosenstein appointed legendary FBI Director and Department of Justice prosecutor Robert Mueller as Special Counsel to investigate whether Russia interfered in our election and whether that effort was aided and abetted by members of the Trump Campaign.

Since that time, the investigation has secured numerous indictments, convictions or guilty pleas from the: President's campaign manager, his deputy campaign manager, his campaign's foreign policy advisor, his former personal attorney, his longtime confidante, and many others, including Russian agents.

The president has attempted to dismiss these crimes and other charges brought—like obstruction of justice, perjury, making false statements, etc.—as "process crimes," when in actuality they are crimes designed to safeguard the integrity of the criminal justice system and the rule of law.

But these are merely the headlines, when we look closer at just what we have learned from the Russia investigation, we have a roadmap on how to manipulate the electoral process in the world's oldest democracy.

We know that the Russians manipulated our social media systems.

They did this by turning our social media platforms like Twitter and Facebook, into rowdy and unwieldy debates that turned Americans against one another.

They did this by creating fake online social media accounts and populated them on social media platforms.

After infiltrating the social media accounts of real Americans, these fake accounts sought to sow discord in these online communities by purposely exacerbating divisions within our

Nation and creating new ones—all with the intent of pitting Americans against one another.

While they were distorting the social media landscape, they were also selectively disseminating emails stolen from the Democratic National Committee and the campaign of Hillary Clinton with the purpose of timing the dissemination to maximize political damage on Secretary Clinton's campaign.

Based on the statements from the Trump Campaign, we also know that it was actively trying to suppress the votes of groups traditionally aligned with the Democratic party, including women, African Americans and young voters.

We now know, due to information uncovered during the pendency of the Special Counsel's investigation, Russians affiliated with the highest ranks of the Kremlin were at Trump Tower during the middle of the 2016 election.

We know that then-candidate Trump asked Russia, "Russia, if you're releasing, I hope you will find Hillary's stolen emails."

In May 2017, Special Counsel Mueller was appointed with the task of getting to the bottom of this.

The American people deserve answers to know how their last presidential election was a crime scene so that we may learn to ensure that the next one is also not a crime scene.

And, the American people have every reason to have confidence in the report produced by the Special Counsel.

The Special Counsel is a decorated American hero and public servant. He has served as the FBI director for presidents of both parties.

He has served as a line prosecutor, a United States Attorney and a leader within the Justice Department.

Despite protestations by the President, this is not a witch hunt—it has yielded the public indictments of 34 individuals and 3 companies, 7 guilty pleas, and 1 conviction.

The American people are watching.

The most recent public opinion poll shows that a super majority of Americans—a full 68 percent—wants the Mueller Report made public.

The Mueller Report is one unparalleled way in which Americans can learn this information with confidence.

And, finally, we must tackle a serious issue that is being discussed among elected officials and the Justice Department.

Over the past two years, we have been told that it is Justice Department regulations that a sitting President cannot be indicted. I will note that this principle has not been tested in court.

That regulation was implemented during the Watergate investigation, under the theory that the President cannot be subjected to criminal process.

But, assuming *arguendo* that this regulation is correct, and the President cannot be subjected to criminal process and therefore cannot and should not be indicted, it is a logical fallacy to say that because he cannot be indicted by virtue of his office, and because it is Justice Department regulation not to reveal information about unindicted parties and individuals, the Justice Department cannot reveal any information of potential wrongdoing by the President and not reveal any information to the body that possesses the constitutional responsibility for holding this president accountable.

For these reasons, I rise in strong support of H. Con. Res. 24, and urge my colleagues to support it and urge passage so the American people can learn how the 2016 election became a crime scene.

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

Mr. Speaker, I hope folks pay attention to some of those things that have brought folks together today, and I hope folks pay attention to some of those things that haven't brought us together today.

We have talked about whether there has been overstatement and hyperbole, whether it comes from that end of Pennsylvania Avenue or this end of Pennsylvania Avenue. None of us are advantaged by that. It breeds more distrust in the American public, and breeds more distrust in this institution.

We have talked about who is to blame within the administration. Of course, there is news today of Paul Manafort's sentence, not for anything related to the election, but for things related to his private business practices. There will be efforts to conflate those two investigations. Those are two different investigations, and I think the American people are disadvantaged if they are led to believe that those sentences are related to the election of the President of the United States.

But what you have heard is a lot of unanimity, as you would expect, that we are a Nation of laws and the rule of law should be followed, and transparency should be our touchstone, and the American People, the boss of each and every one of us, whether we work on that end of Pennsylvania Avenue or this end of Pennsylvania Avenue, have a right to know what their tax dollars have paid for and what their government is up to.

I find that very encouraging that we have that sense of agreement here today, Mr. Speaker. What is noticeably absent in this resolution is the dramatic overreach that I think has characterized most of the work we have done so far in 2019. Things that could have been partnership issues have been pushed further and further out to the edge of the political continuum that they became partisan issues.

This resolution does not make those mistakes of the past, and to my friend from California's point, these things are done incrementally. Trust is built incrementally; relationships grow incrementally; and success happens incrementally.

It is my great hope, Mr. Speaker, that those things that unite us, transparency, rule of law, trust in and of the American people will begin today to flourish in ways, perhaps, those common themes have not thus far. And both parties play a role in that disappointing outcome. But success has to begin on one day, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps success begins today.

I serve on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee. There is no

such thing as a Republican road or a Democratic bridge. There is no such thing as sitting in traffic on a Democratic highway or missing your child's soccer game because of malfunctions on a Republican road. We are all in this together.

□ 1300

I do not plan to offer a previous question today, Mr. Speaker, because this isn't one of those issues that dramatically divides us. My friend suggested in the Rules Committee we passed this out in, I think, our first voice vote of the year out of the Rules Committee, and I intend to do exactly that today.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my friend from California for yielding the time and leading the debate today, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, again, it is a pleasure to see you up there. And to my friend from Georgia, in his long, illustrious public career, I want to thank him for his comity here today.

I can't help but think so many Americans now and people who are filled with adrenaline and hyperbole talk about what a difficult time this is, and I wouldn't underestimate the challenges ahead of us; but, arguably, a more difficult time, I was thinking of Mr. Lincoln's comments about appealing to the better angels of our nature, and perhaps this is a turning point.

Certainly we will be tested, and we will fail on occasion, but to my friend, for whatever time both of us have left here, I would like to personally say to the degree we can find things that are of interest to your district and my district, they are of interest to the United States, and I would love to work with the gentleman to find those things.

Lastly, I just can't help but comment on my observation about providential Americans in history. I was reading about Mr. Mueller and his comments when he was FBI Director in the context of his amazing life and career as a combat veteran, a Bronze Star winner in the Marine Corps in Vietnam. I think of my own father who was a devoted Marine Corps combat veteran who is buried in Arlington. My dad and all marines, although I was not one, liked to always recite "Semper Fidelis."

The special counsel, in his comments when he was FBI Director, assures me that the work he does in ways that I find profound, talked about fidelity as he talked to his agents, that the fidelity to this Constitution, to this country, and to the truth will find us true to the path that we want to take and to success as we look for the better angels of our nature.

Mr. Speaker, this is a simple vote but an important vote. We need to get to the bottom of what happened and put faith in the special counsel's findings and put faith in the American public and the people that they can devise their own truth when we give them this investigation's report.



Mr. Speaker, you either believe the public and Congress should see the report or you don't. Fortunately, it looks like we are agreed that they should. We owe it to our constituents, the American people, and future generations to do the right thing always, but today, I think, in particular, to support the release of this report.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote on the rule and a "yes" vote on the previous question.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or votes objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

The House will resume proceedings on postponed questions at a later time.

#### ACKNOWLEDGING LACK OF TRANSPARENCY IN FINANCIAL TRANSACTIONS POSES A THREAT TO NATIONAL SECURITY

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 206) acknowledging that the lack of sunlight and transparency in financial transactions and corporate formation poses a threat to our national security and our economy's security and supporting efforts to close related loopholes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

##### H. RES. 206

Whereas money laundering and other financial crimes are serious threats to our national and economic security;

Whereas the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime has reported "The estimated amount of money laundered globally in one year is 2 - 5% of global GDP, or \$800 billion - \$2 trillion in current US dollars";

Whereas the scale, efficiency, and complexity of the U.S. financial system make it a prime target for those who seek to conceal, launder, and move the proceeds of illicit activity;

Whereas money launderers, terrorist financiers, corrupt individuals and organizations, and their facilitators have proven to adapt quickly in order to avoid detection;

Whereas given the global nature of money laundering and terrorist financing, and the

increasing interrelatedness within the financial system, a secure national and multilateral framework is essential to the integrity of the U.S. financial system;

Whereas extensive collaboration among financial regulators, the Department of the Treasury, law enforcement, and the private sector is required to curtail the illicit flow of money throughout the United States;

Whereas despite how extensive and effective these efforts are in the United States, there is still substantial room for improvement;

Whereas financial compliance, reporting, investigation, and collaboration, as well as courageous whistleblowers and investigative reporting have had significant impact in shining sunlight on the people and institutions behind dark money and markets;

Whereas in 2016, the Financial Action Task Force (FATF), the international standards setting body, evaluated the United States' anti-money laundering/combating the financing of terrorism measures and determined the United States has significant gaps in its framework;

Whereas in 2016, the FATF found that in the United States, "Minimal measures are imposed on designated non-financial businesses and professions (DNFBPs), other than casinos and dealers in precious metals and stones";

Whereas in 2016, the FATF recommended, "The U.S. should conduct a vulnerability analysis of the minimally covered DNFBP sectors to address the higher risks to which these sectors are exposed, and consider what measures could be introduced to address them";

Whereas dealers in arts and antiquities are not, by definition, covered "financial institutions" required to comply with the Bank Secrecy Act;

Whereas Federal authorities have cautioned that art collectors and dealers to be particularly careful trading Near Eastern antiquities, warning that artifacts plundered by terrorist organizations such as the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant are entering the marketplace;

Whereas, according to the Antiquities Coalition, "because the United States is the largest destination for archaeological and ethnological objects from around the world, the discovery of recently looted and trafficked artifacts in our country not only makes Americans and our institutions accessories to crimes, but also threatens our relations with other countries";

Whereas the real-estate industry, both commercial and residential, is exempt from having to develop and implement a four-pillar anti-money laundering program pursuant to the Bank Secrecy Act;

Whereas it was asserted in a 2018 Conference Report by the Terrorism, Transnational Crime and Corruption Center at the Schar School of Policy and Government of George Mason University, money laundering in real estate (MLRE) has damaging effects on local economies by negatively impacting property prices and displacing residents;

Whereas in 2017, in response to evidence about significant money laundering through real estate in the United States, the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network (FinCEN) issued Geographic Targeting Orders (GTOs) requiring limited beneficial ownership disclosure in certain transactions involving high-end luxury real estate and "found that about 30 percent of the transactions covered by the GTOs involve a beneficial owner or purchaser representative that is also the subject of a previous suspicious activity report";

Whereas the influx of illicit money, including from Russian oligarchs, has flowed large-

ly unimpeded into the United States through these anonymous shell companies and into U.S. investments, including luxury high-end real estate;

Whereas the United States has not fulfilled the recommended steps to address the money-laundering loopholes that the FATF has identified with DNFBP sectors;

Whereas high-profile enforcement actions against some of the largest and most sophisticated financial institutions raise troubling questions about the effectiveness of U.S. domestic anti-money laundering and counter-terrorism financing regulatory, compliance, and enforcement efforts;

Whereas there are financial institutions and individuals employed therein which continue to engage in egregious violations of the Bank Secrecy Act and enter into deferred prosecution agreements and non-prosecution agreements rather than facing convictions and sentences corresponding to the severity of their violations;

Whereas effective anti-money laundering programs must emphasize sound corporate governance, including business-line accountability and clear lines of legal responsibility for individuals; and

Whereas anti-money laundering examinations in recent years at times failed to recognize the cumulative effect of the violations they cited, instead narrowly focusing their attention on individual banking units, thus permitting national banks to avoid and delay correcting problems, which allowed massive problems to occur before serious enforcement actions were taken: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives—

(1) acknowledges that the lack of sunlight and transparency in financial transactions poses a threat to our national security and our economy's security;

(2) supports efforts to close loopholes that allow corruption, terrorism, and money laundering to infiltrate our country's financial system;

(3) encourages transparency to detect, deter, and interdict individuals, entities, and networks engaged in money laundering and other financial crimes;

(4) urges financial institutions to comply with the Bank Secrecy Act and anti-money laundering laws and regulations; and

(5) affirms that financial institutions and individuals should be held accountable for money laundering and terror financing crimes and violations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

##### GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on this legislation and to insert extraneous material thereon.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 206, a resolution I have introduced to inform the Congress and the American people about the persistent



money laundering loopholes and problems that continue to plague the American financial system.

I am pleased to bring this resolution to the floor in recognition of Sunshine Week. As part of Sunshine Week, the Financial Services Committee is shining a bright light on money laundering and discussing ways to strengthen our country's anti-money laundering and counterterrorism finance efforts.

Criminals like drug traffickers, human traffickers, fraudsters, kleptocrats, rogue governments, and other corrupt individuals and organizations know our financial system well and work hard to find ways to circumvent our anti-money laundering laws.

Congress has enacted numerous laws to improve the transparency of financial transactions that touch institutions in the United States and those on each end of a financial transaction. We have created reporting mechanisms, strengthened law enforcement and intelligence capacities, and promoted responsible, privacy-protecting information regimes to ensure that both the industry and the government have the tools needed to rid the economy of these illicit funds. However, there are still glaring problems and loopholes in our system that Congress must address.

The resolution that I have introduced highlights two significant loopholes that remain: the lack of transparency in, number one, the arts and antiquities industry and, number two, the real estate industry.

First, we know that ethnic and cultural artifacts are stolen and traded to garner funds for bad actors. According to the Antiquities Coalition: "The United States is the largest destination for archeological and ethnological objects from around the world." We know, too, that terror groups like ISIS have looted and sold these treasures to fund their operations, which the head of UNESCO, the United Nations' cultural heritage agency, said was worth millions of dollars and conducted on an "industrial scale." However, today, dealers in arts and antiquities are exempt from the Bank Secrecy Act, creating a huge loophole for bad actors to launder funds.

Second, the significance of the real estate loophole in the United States was acknowledged in 2017 by the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network, FinCEN, when it issued Geographic Targeting Orders, GTOs, requiring limited ownership information to be disclosed and reported in some high-end real estate transactions. In fact, FinCEN has noted that "about 30 percent of the transactions covered by the GTOs involve a beneficial owner or purchaser representative that is also the subject of a previous suspicious activity report."

The movement of illicit funds throughout the global financial system raises numerous questions regarding the actors who are involved in these

money laundering schemes and where the money is going. This is precisely why the Financial Services Committee is investigating the questionable financing provided to President Trump and The Trump Organization by banks like Deutsche Bank to finance its real estate properties. The committee is also concerned that Trump-branded and managed condo buildings, for example, have taken millions from suspect Russians or individuals from former Soviet states through cash transactions, some well above the market value and many through shell companies.

Congress must close these loopholes, and financial institutions, including the biggest banks, also must do their part and fully comply with our BSA/AML laws. Although most do, we can continue to see not only failures in compliance, but also egregious acts where money laundering and terror finance are facilitated.

Further, many of our largest financial institutions have facilitated money laundering through our U.S. financial system from abroad. One scheme was carried out in Deutsche Bank's Moscow and London branches using mirror trading, in which corrupt traders in Russia managed to move \$10 billion in illicit funds out of Russia by buying blue chip stocks in rubles and selling them for U.S. dollars in London. Deutsche Bank was fined nearly \$630 million for allowing this mirror trading scheme to take place.

Another scheme involved Danske Bank, wherein \$230 billion in suspicious funds moved from Russia and other former Soviet states through one of Danske Bank's small Estonian branches to several U.S. financial institutions.

We also know that real estate is frequently used to launder dirty money. Bad actors like Russian oligarchs and kleptocrats often use anonymous shell companies and all-cash schemes to buy and sell commercial and residential real estate to hide and clean their money.

Today, these all-cash schemes are exempt from the Bank Secrecy Act. This must stop. In passing this resolution today, we also remind our colleagues in the banking industry of their responsibilities.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, this resolution has benefited from the comments of the ranking member of the Financial Services Committee, Mr. McHENRY, and other members of the committee, and I thank them for their thoughtful consideration of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this resolution that recognizes the need to close these loopholes and to urge financial institutions to comply with the law.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairwoman WATERS of the House Financial Serv-

ices Committee for offering this resolution.

I rise in support of this resolution, and I look forward to working with the gentlewoman from California to incorporate its basic principles into future legislation produced by our committee to tackle the illicit drug trade, international financing that moves around the globe that is illicit in nature, as well as combating human trafficking and using the financial system to traffic in human beings, which I think is absolutely abhorrent.

This resolution reflects the Financial Services Committee's longstanding emphasis that we have on protecting our national security and ensuring the integrity of the financial system. The size and scope of that system, along with the preeminent role of the U.S. dollar in global trade, requires us to remain vigilant against illicit finance, money laundering, and other significant threats.

Already this Congress, the House has passed several of our committee's bills designed to identify new risks in illicit finance and to strengthen our banks' cooperation with law enforcement authorities. We are also looking forward to addressing a more comprehensive reform of processes under the Bank Secrecy Act in order to crack down on money laundering much more effectively.

We believe technology can be a great driver of those reforms and more efficiently and effectively enforce those laws. We are working together to achieve that bipartisan outcome and update to that very important piece of legislation. This, I think, represents a down payment, rhetorically, on that interest that we have of combating illicit finance wherever it may be.

I hope that we can continue to engage in a meaningful way in that bipartisan dialogue to achieve reforms to the Bank Secrecy Act, with the understanding it is important to safeguard our national security, while upholding a financial system that is open, transparent, and efficient and that is, in many ways, the envy of the rest of the world, without unduly burdening businesses in a manner that ends up turning away legitimate trade and commerce. Striking that balance is obviously that fine art that this Congress seeks to do, and we hope to do that well coming out of our committee.

Now, Republicans and Democrats should also be able to agree that these laws and regulations require us to strike a balance. That has to be a stated objective, and I am hopeful that the chairwoman will continue to work with us based on that principle. I am encouraged by that opportunity on the Bank Secrecy Act and Illicit Finance for us to tackle those items.

I thank the chairwoman for sponsoring this resolution. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to support it, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1315

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DAVID SCOTT), who is a senior member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, this is a very important and timely resolution because, in recent years, the lack of sunlight and transparency in financial transactions and corporate formation has brought us to the forefront of the very dangerous role that dark money plays in our financial system.

Money laundering; loopholes in markets like real estate, the arts, and antiquities can be taken advantage of by criminals who facilitate their nefarious deeds. And, Mr. Speaker, according to the Financial Action Task Force, real estate alone accounted for one-third of all the criminal assets confiscated worldwide between 2011 and 2013, in that 3-year period.

Even more concerning, Mr. Speaker, is this: some of these transactions are conducted by anonymous shell companies who are exploiting loopholes in our financial system, creating a lack of transparency for who really is the beneficial owner of the assets.

This is very important, Mr. Speaker.

This critical resolution offered by my colleague and chairwoman, Ms. MAXINE WATERS, recognizes how important this issue is not only to the stability of our financial system but to the national security of our great Nation.

It urges that much more be done with these loopholes and lets us shine a bright light into the darkest corners of our financial system.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, I rise to encourage my colleagues to support this resolution that will protect our financial system from abuse and corruption. I am hopeful that it will be unanimous, with all of our colleagues supporting this important resolution.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOODEN), my colleague and a new member of the House Financial Services Committee, for the purposes of a statement.

Mr. GOODEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 206, legislation that acknowledges the grave threat that terrorist organizations and international drug cartels pose to our Nation's financial system and economic system.

Introduced in the Financial Services Committee, this resolution reaffirms that the House of Representatives supports efforts currently under way in American and international financial institutions to identify bad actors and hold them accountable for their crimes.

The stakes couldn't be higher. Just as financial transparency has already helped us combat weapons of mass destruction, traffickers, corrupt foreign actors, and terrorist financiers, it also serves as a powerful weapon against organized criminal networks.

When criminals like El Chapo seek to exploit a complex and interconnected financial system, we must seek to untangle and bring clarity.

As we enhance financial transparency, we diminish a criminal's ability to commit crimes. In fact, I would consider this an important part of President Trump's efforts to secure our borders from those who are actively trying to infiltrate our country to finance drug trafficking and other criminal or terrorist activities.

Just as we need to build the wall at our southern border to keep out drug cartels and gangs, we need to be securing our economy from those who use the United States to conceal, launder, and move money generated from illegal activity.

Given the global nature of money laundering and terrorist financing, a secure national and multilateral framework is essential to the integrity of our financial system here at home.

Simply put, we should be doing all that we can to give financial institutions the tools they need to catch those who support the drug cartels that infiltrate our southern border or illegally engage in money laundering and terrorism financing.

For those reasons, I support this resolution and would like to thank the ranking member and Chairwoman WATERS for the time this afternoon.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN), the chair of the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations on the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join the chorus of persons who are complimenting the chairwoman for many jobs well done. This, of course, is just another of the many wonderful things that she is doing to help people across the globe.

Mr. Speaker, I support H. Res. 206 because it addresses the launderability of money at the foundation of criminality.

When it comes to arts and antiquities, according to an Art Basel report by UBS, the United States remains the largest art market, valued at \$26.6 billion, and it accounts for 42 percent of the global total in 2017.

This means, of course, that the United States is likely to be the largest destination for stolen ethnic and cultural arts—black market, black market art, black market money. That is why we have to find a way to prevent the laundering of this money.

The United States of America should not allow ourselves to be the financier for those who perpetrate dastardly deeds in many countries around the world. An example might be Syria, where you have terrorists who will take stolen artifacts, find a way to put them into commerce, and use that money to support terrorist activities.

That is not what we are about. We must find a way to close the loopholes that allow persons in this country to

purchase these artifacts and allow that money to get back to those who would perform these dastardly deeds. I call them dastards. That is with a "D," dastards.

These dastards must be stopped. This resolution is a great step in the right direction to prevent the perpetration and perpetuation of this activity.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH), a longtime member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from California for her leadership on this issue and also for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 206, a resolution that acknowledges the threat to our national security posed by loopholes in our financial transaction laws.

Today, our anti-money laundering and antiterrorism finance laws are dangerously outdated. Billions of dollars in bribes are paid around the world every year, and the amount of money laundered globally is estimated to be 2 to 5 percent of global GDP. Far too much of this cash flow comes through the United States financial institutions.

The international community agrees. The Financial Action Task Force—the global standard-setting body—has said that we have significant gaps in our security laws.

By passing this resolution, Congress can show it understands that illicit financing networks are the root and branch of any terrorist or criminal organization's operations.

We can also show that we understand by addressing those gaps and loopholes in our laws. We can move toward a safer society and a safer world.

Money laundering and other financial crimes support human trafficking, terrorism, and corruption around the world. These crimes endanger Americans every day, and we need to do more.

I strongly urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support H. Res. 206. I want to thank the chairwoman, again, for her kindness.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to note for the House that the original draft of this resolution that was put forward and made public by committee Democrats was not one that committee Republicans had vetted. And, in that conversation, we had revised the text of this resolution.

So, out there today is the original text Chairwoman WATERS had offered. She undertook, through her staff and through my staff, and we worked out the changes, so the language here is something that should receive unanimous approval of the House of Representatives.

In fact, it states some very important things that we find important in

the House Financial Services Committee.

Now, if there is illicit financing and our laws are not detecting it, that is a problem, is it not? And we should address that problem, however it manifests itself.

And we have two examples here, using artwork and using real estate; but we also would use money in order to possess that artwork, that real estate. So we want to make sure that we are getting at that money, that flow, within our financial markets and getting at that.

There is bipartisan agreement, and the language here is not the original language Chairwoman WATERS offered and maybe, perhaps, the one that she would want to pass. But, in her effort at bipartisanship, she worked with committee Republicans, changed the resolution, and now before us we have a new resolution.

This new resolution should meet the approval of everyone in this House.

I want to state that very clearly. This is not a Democrat product. Actually, it is because Chairwoman WATERS did author it, but she was willing to hear our feedback on the Republican side. That is helpful.

What this would be is the fifth bill that we have passed out of the House Financial Services Committee that has received bipartisan support. That is a good sign. That is a good sign, in a broken Washington, that we can actually do some sensible things.

And outlined here, this resolution got out of, really, prescriptive positions that we are still negotiating on on this idea of beneficial ownership, which our colleague, Subcommittee Chair MALONEY, has been working on intensely, as have FRENCH HILL from Arkansas and BLAINE LUETKEMEYER from Missouri on the Republican side.

And they are still working through the contents of that, and we are still not in agreement. So we removed that language, and I think that is a very hopeful thing.

I didn't really want to get into the mechanics of how we came to this, but I think it is important for the House to note that that work has been done. Before us is a new resolution that should be able to meet the support of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I want to finish by saying this, that Chairwoman WATERS said she would work with us on this; she worked with us on this. I am grateful for that.

Recognizing that there are more Democrats than Republicans in the House, the gentlewoman could have passed this resolution if she saw fit, on a partisan basis, but she thought it was important to actually have a bipartisan outcome so we can have bipartisan legislating following this.

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

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I cannot describe how pleased I am working with Mr. MCHENRY and the way that he

has expressed to you in his presentation how we have worked together, and I thank him for that. I am very appreciative of that, and I will continue to work on those issues that the gentleman alluded to.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY), the chair of the Subcommittee on Investor Protection, Entrepreneurship, and Capital Markets.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairwoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this very important resolution.

For too long, criminals and terrorists have used our financial system to launder their dirty money and to hide all of their assets.

This issue is incredibly important to me because I have been working on legislation to crack down on anonymous shell companies for about 10 years, and Chairwoman WATERS has always been a strong supporter and is, in fact, an original cosponsor of my legislation.

So I want to highlight one particular passage from this resolution which talks about the pilot program that FinCEN conducted in 2016 where they collected beneficial ownership information in certain real estate transactions in Manhattan and Miami.

The findings from the pilot program were shocking. They found that about 30 percent of the transactions involved a beneficial owner that had previously been the subject of a suspicious activity report from a bank, which strongly suggests that criminals and other bad actors are using anonymous shell companies to launder or hide money.

Requiring companies to disclose their beneficial owners would provide transparency to law enforcement. It would also protect Americans from terrorism financing by cracking down on the ability of terrorists to get financing in our country. And it would also help financial institutions keep the bad actors out of the financial system.

That is why I have been working so hard to pass my beneficial ownership bill, and I look forward to continuing to work in a bipartisan way with Ranking Member MCHENRY and others to address this important issue.

I must say that this issue was brought to me by law enforcement, and they told me they will be tracking money that they think is terrorism financing. They hit an LLC; they cannot get any more information about who owns this real estate or company in our country. We have to stop that.

So I strongly urge support for the chairwoman's resolution, and I urge my colleagues to support it as well and to support the bipartisan beneficial ownership bill which will shortly be on the floor.

□ 1330

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

I want to reiterate that what my colleague, Mrs. MALONEY, the chair of the

Subcommittee on Investor Protection, Entrepreneurship, and Capital Markets outlined, outlined is an ongoing conversation we are having on her piece of legislation around beneficial ownership. We are still working through that process. I think the talks have been productive, but there is a lot of work to do. There is not quite consensus yet on how we achieve that right balance.

Notwithstanding that, you have to look at the contents of the resolution before us. I think this is, while not perfect—if I had drafted the resolution, I would have also included the international drug trade and human trafficking as two highly important areas that need our attention and focus as policymakers. But that is a sin of omission rather than commission.

I would also target a broader set of regimes. ISIS is targeted in this, and I think that is strong. We have bipartisan agreement that we have to fight this terrorism network and evil ideology that they have put upon the world, and how they act out in this, and we have to have a concerted effort, as Americans, in a bipartisan way, to fight them.

I would also add to that the regimes in China, Russia, and North Korea as other state actors that are doing really horrible things in terms of cyber threats, but also through money laundering—not just a regime, but there are a lot of regimes around the world.

So this is not a complete resolution, but I think it is worthy of our support. I think this is a first step in that longer conversation about modernizing the Bank Secrecy Act and making sure that we are targeting illicit financing.

I ask my colleagues to vote for this resolution, and I look forward to continuing the conversation with my Democratic colleagues on more bipartisan outcomes.

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

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I include in the RECORD the following letter of general support for H. Res. 206 from the Fraternal Order of Police.

NATIONAL FRATERNAL  
ORDER OF POLICE®

Washington, DC, March 13, 2019.

Hon. MAXINE M. WATERS,  
Chairman, Committee on Financial Services,  
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. EMANUEL CLEAVER II,  
Chairman, Subcommittee on National Security,  
International Development and Monetary  
Policy, Committee on Financial Services,  
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. PATRICK T. MCHENRY,  
Ranking Member, Committee on Financial Services,  
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. STEVEN E. STIVERS,  
Ranking Member, Subcommittee on National Security,  
International Development and Monetary Policy, Committee on Financial Services,  
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM CHAIRMAN, MR. CHAIRMAN AND REPRESENTATIVES MCHENRY AND STIVERS: I am writing on behalf of the members of the Fraternal Order of Police to advise you of our continued support for the collection of beneficial ownership information to

combat terrorist financing, money laundering and other criminal activities. We strongly agree with many of the points raised in H. Res. 206 as they pertain to the collection of this information and we look forward to working with the Committee on Financial Services and the Subcommittee on National Security, International Development and Monetary Policy to address these issues, in the months ahead.

For years, the FOP has supported the collection of beneficial ownership information and we've been proud to partner with Representatives Carolyn B. Maloney (D-NY) and Peter T. King (R-NY) on legislation entitled the "Corporate Transparency Act." A discussion draft sharing that same title is being considered by the committee today and the FOP is once again prepared to support this important legislation.

Transnational criminal organizations and terrorist operations are using our banks, financial institutions and other means to profit from their illegal activity. This is a well-documented problem for our financial institutions and for law enforcement as we work together to shut down these sophisticated criminal enterprises.

Congress and this committee have played a leadership role in identifying the problem and working with law enforcement to develop legislation like the "Corporation Transparency Act." In addition, this Administration also agrees with this approach—last July U.S. Secretary of the Treasury Steven T. Mnuchin testified before this committee and stated that there is a real need to "have access to beneficial ownership information for law enforcement and for combating terrorist financing."

The Secretary's remarks were very clear that this is a pressing issue and the vulnerability of our financial institutions poses a genuine threat to public safety and national security. Under current laws, shell corporations may be used as front organizations by criminals conducting illegal activity such as money laundering, fraud, and tax evasion. Legislation like the "Corporation Transparency Act" and other measures identified in H. Res. 206, propose to combat this misuse of U.S. corporations by requiring the U.S. Department of the Treasury, specifically the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network (FinCEN), to collect beneficial ownership information for corporations and limited liability companies formed under State laws unless the State is already collecting this information. It is vital that such information, once collected, be available to law enforcement at every level—local, State, tribal and Federal—upon a lawful request. The sharing of this information will help speed the ability of law enforcement to investigate any possible connection between these corporations and terrorist funding.

All too often, investigations will hit a dead end when we encounter a company with hidden ownership. Just as robbers or burglars wear masks to hide their faces and make identifying them more difficult; the criminals we are chasing in these cases use shell corporations as masks, concealing themselves while still profiting from their crimes. When we are able to expose the link between shell companies and drug trafficking, corruption, organized crime and terrorist finance, law enforcement will be able to bring these criminals to justice and make our citizens and our nation safer.

We would also like to raise our concerns about proposals that would increase the monetary threshold for filing Currency Transaction Reports and Suspicious Activity Reports, thereby reducing the information law enforcement currently receives. It is not clear what policy or public safety aim such a change is intended to accomplish. Organized

criminal enterprises are already aware of the current thresholds and often take steps to avoid triggering these alerts and bringing scrutiny to their operations. Increasing these thresholds may negatively impact law enforcement and investigations into money laundering and other financial crimes.

On behalf of the more than 345,000 members of the Fraternal Order of Police, I want to thank this committee for its leadership on this issue and most of all, for its willingness to engage and work with the law enforcement community on the collection of beneficial ownership information. By working together, I believe we can make our financial system and our nation safer from criminal and terrorist organizations. If I can provide any additional information on this matter, please do not hesitate to contact me or my Executive Director, Jim Pasco, in my Washington office.

Sincerely,

CHUCK CANTERBURY,  
National President.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, as we join together during this Sunshine Week to highlight the importance of transparency in our economy and our national security, and the preservation of our rule of law, we cannot ignore the insidious harm that is being done by institutions like Deutsche Bank, Danske Bank, and others that facilitate money laundering and financial crime.

Kleptocracy and corruption around the world and here at home, as the Trump family and its companies have proven, can only thrive with the co-operation or willful blindness from financial institutions that move, hide, and launder their ill-gotten money, money that can come in and out of the financial system through investments in real estate, art, and other luxury markets across America.

I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle would agree that we need to close loopholes that allow criminals and terrorists to hide from sunlight and scrutiny, and I urge the House to support H. Res. 206, as amended.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 206, as amended.

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

The title of the resolution was amended so as to read: "Acknowledging that the lack of sunlight and transparency in financial transactions poses a threat to our national security and our economy's security and supporting efforts to close related loopholes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. CON. RES. 24, EXPRESSING SENSE OF CONGRESS THAT THE REPORT OF SPECIAL COUNSEL MUELLER SHOULD BE MADE AVAILABLE TO THE PUBLIC AND TO CONGRESS, AND PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM MARCH 15, 2019, THROUGH MARCH 22, 2019

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on adoption of the resolution (H. Res. 208) providing for consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 24) expressing the sense of Congress that the report of Special Counsel Mueller should be made available to the public and to Congress, and providing for proceedings during the period from March 15, 2019, through March 22, 2019, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 233, nays 195, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 124]

YEAS—233

Adams	Delgado	Krishnamoorthi
Aguilar	Demings	Kuster (NH)
Allred	DeSaulnier	Lamb
Axne	Deutch	Langevin
Barragán	Dingell	Larsen (WA)
Bass	Doggett	Larson (CT)
Beatty	Doyle, Michael	Lawrence
Bera	F.	Lawson (FL)
Beyer	Engel	Lee (CA)
Bishop (GA)	Escobar	Lee (NV)
Blumenauer	Eshoo	Levin (CA)
Blunt Rochester	Españillat	Levin (MI)
Bonamici	Evans	Lewis
Boyle, Brendan	Finkenauer	Lieu, Ted
F.	Fletcher	Lipinski
Brindisi	Foster	Loebback
Brown (MD)	Frankel	Lofgren
Brownley (CA)	Fudge	Lowenthal
Bustos	Gabbard	Lowe
Butterfield	Gallego	Lujan
Carbajal	Garamendi	Luria
Cárdenas	García (IL)	Lynch
Carson (IN)	García (TX)	Malinowski
Cartwright	Golden	Maloney,
Case	Gomez	Carolyn B.
Casten (IL)	Gonzalez (TX)	Maloney, Sean
Castor (FL)	Gottheimer	Matsui
Castro (TX)	Green (TX)	McAdams
Chu, Judy	Grijalva	McBath
Cicilline	Haaland	McCollum
Cisneros	Harder (CA)	McEachin
Clark (MA)	Hastings	McGovern
Clarke (NY)	Hayes	McNerney
Clay	Heck	Meeks
Cleaver	Higgins (NY)	Meng
Clyburn	Hill (CA)	Moore
Cohen	Himes	Morelle
Connolly	Horn, Kendra S.	Moulton
Cooper	Horsford	Mucarsel-Powell
Correa	Houlahan	Murphy
Costa	Hoyer	Nadler
Courtney	Huffman	Napolitano
Cox (CA)	Jackson Lee	Neal
Craig	Jayapal	Neguse
Crist	Jeffries	Norcross
Crow	Johnson (GA)	O'Halleran
Cuellar	Johnson (TX)	Ocasio-Cortez
Cummings	Kaptur	Omar
Cunningham	Keating	Pallone
Davids (KS)	Kelly (IL)	Panetta
Davis (CA)	Kennedy	Pappas
Davis, Danny K.	Khanna	Pascarell
Dean	Kildee	Payne
DeFazio	Kilmer	Perlmutter
DeGette	Kim	Peters
DeLauro	Kind	Peterson
DeBene	Kirkpatrick	Phillips

Pingree	Schrier	Torres (CA)
Pocan	Scott (VA)	Torres Small
Porter	Scott, David	(NM)
Pressley	Serrano	Trahan
Price (NC)	Sewell (AL)	Trone
Quigley	Shalala	Underwood
Raskin	Sherman	Van Drew
Rice (NY)	Sherrill	Vargas
Richmond	Sires	Veasey
Rose (NY)	Slotkin	Vela
Rouda	Smith (WA)	Velázquez
Roybal-Allard	Soto	Visclosky
Ruiz	Spanberger	Wasserman
Ruppersberger	Stanton	Schultz
Rush	Stevens	Waters
Ryan	Suozi	Watson Coleman
Sanchez	Swalwell (CA)	Welch
Sarbanes	Takano	Wexton
Scanlon	Thompson (CA)	Wild
Schakowsky	Thompson (MS)	Wilson (FL)
Schiff	Titus	Yarmuth
Schneider	Tlaib	
Schrader	Tonko	

## NAYS—195

Aderholt	Gooden	Olson
Allen	Gosar	Palazzo
Amash	Granger	Palmer
Amodei	Graves (GA)	Pence
Armstrong	Graves (LA)	Perry
Arrington	Graves (MO)	Posey
Babin	Green (TN)	Ratcliffe
Bacon	Griffith	Reed
Baird	Grothman	Reschenthaler
Balderson	Guest	Rice (SC)
Banks	Guthrie	Riggleman
Barr	Hagedorn	Roby
Bergman	Harris	Rodgers (WA)
Biggs	Hartzler	Roe, David P.
Bilirakis	Hern, Kevin	Rogers (AL)
Bishop (UT)	Herrera Beutler	Rogers (KY)
Bost	Hice (GA)	Rooney (FL)
Brady	Higgins (LA)	Rose, John W.
Brooks (AL)	Hill (AR)	Rouzer
Brooks (IN)	Holding	Roy
Buchanan	Hollingsworth	Rutherford
Buck	Hudson	Scalise
Bucshon	Huizenga	Schweikert
Budd	Hunter	Scott, Austin
Burchett	Hurd (TX)	Sensenbrenner
Burgess	Johnson (LA)	Shimkus
Byrne	Johnson (OH)	Simpson
Calvert	Johnson (SD)	Smith (MO)
Carter (GA)	Jordan	Smith (NE)
Carter (TX)	Joyce (OH)	Smith (NJ)
Chabot	Joyce (PA)	Smucker
Cheney	Katko	Spano
Cline	Kelly (MS)	Staubert
Cloud	Kelly (PA)	Stefanik
Cole	King (IA)	Steil
Collins (GA)	King (NY)	Steube
Collins (NY)	Kinzinger	Stewart
Comer	Kustoff (TN)	Stivers
Conaway	LaHood	Taylor
Cook	LaMalfa	Thompson (PA)
Crawford	Lamborn	Thornberry
Crenshaw	Latta	Timmons
Curtis	Lesko	Tipton
Davidson (OH)	Long	Turner
Davis, Rodney	Loudermilk	Upton
DesJarlais	Lucas	Wagner
Diaz-Balart	Luetkemeyer	Walberg
Duffy	Marchant	Walden
Duncan	Marshall	Walker
Dunn	Massie	Walorski
Emmer	Mast	Waltz
Estes	McCarthy	Watkins
Ferguson	McCaul	Weber (TX)
Fitzpatrick	McClintock	Webster (FL)
Fleischmann	McHenry	Wenstrup
Flores	McKinley	Westerman
Fortenberry	Meadows	Williams
Foxx (NC)	Meuser	Wilson (SC)
Fulcher	Miller	Wittman
Gaetz	Mitchell	Womack
Gallagher	Moolenaar	Woodall
Gianforte	Mullin	Wright
Gibbs	Newhouse	Yoho
Gohmert	Norman	Young
Gonzalez (OH)	Nunes	Zeldin

## NOT VOTING—3

Abraham	Mooney (WV)	Speier
---------	-------------	--------

□ 1359

Messrs. TAYLOR, COLLINS of Georgia, UPTON, YOUNG, CALVERT, and

Mrs. WAGNER changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. HUFFMAN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. SPANBERGER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

#### REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1146

Mr. HUFFMAN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. CLAY Higgins of Louisiana be removed as a cosponsor from H.R. 1146.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. WENSTRUP. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 962, the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors 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. WENSTRUP. Madam Speaker, I urge the Speaker to immediately schedule the born-alive bill.

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

#### REMEMBERING LOUISE SLAUGHTER

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

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, a year ago this week, our country lost one of its greatest legislators, Congresswoman Louise Slaughter.

In her 33 years in Congress, Louise Slaughter never backed down from a righteous fight. Here is just one example of Congresswoman Slaughter's grit. When she arrived in Congress, every single clinical trial at the National Institutes of Health was aimed at White men, so Congresswoman Slaughter secured the first \$500 million of Federal funding for breast cancer research.

My father and I both had the privilege to serve alongside Congresswoman Slaughter. We knew her as a fierce champion for women and workers throughout the country. There was something disarming about her Kentucky drawl that really made you feel at home. She was a thoughtful leader who could cut bad ideas down with her wit and determination.

Every time I left her presence, I left with a smile. Congresswoman Slaughter was truly one of the best human beings I ever met in my life. Her lifetime of service to this Nation will be celebrated by the American people for decades.

#### BORN-ALIVE ABORTION SURVIVORS PROTECTION

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

Mr. WENSTRUP. Madam Speaker, a few minutes ago, I rose to call for a vote on the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, which requires any baby who survives an abortion to receive the same medical care that any baby born at the same age would receive. It requires the baby to then be transported to a hospital.

As a doctor, I strongly believe that every patient, especially these infants born alive, should be given appropriate medical care. This should not even be a question.

New York recently celebrated passing a law that removes protections from babies born alive after an abortion attempt. Other States also fail to protect abortion survivors.

Therefore, it is our duty, as Members of Congress, to defend the God-given right to life for every baby in this situation. It is our duty, as compassionate human beings, to ensure that these uniquely vulnerable babies receive the care that they deserve.

It is past time to vote on H.R. 962.

#### REMEMBERING LOUISE SLAUGHTER

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

Ms. SHALALA. Madam Speaker, today, I would like to speak about my dear friend, Congresswoman Louise Slaughter.

Louise was larger than life, a force of nature, and a trailblazer for women. She was an embodiment of her district's long history in the women's rights movement, going back to Susan B. Anthony and Frederick Douglass.

She would have been so proud to see the record number of women elected to Congress this year. She would have been an extraordinary mentor. She was the best retail politician I have ever known.

I have never served in this body with Louise, but, as a Cabinet member, I knew her well and joined her in her district eight times and had numerous phone calls over the years.

She held degrees in microbiology and public health. Her knowledge of health policy and her political smarts helped her shepherd critical legislation. Thanks to Louise, we have the Affordable Care Act, the Violence Against Women Act, and the Genetic Information Nondiscrimination Act, just to name a few.

She was the first chairwoman of the Rules Committee. I am proud to now serve on this committee. It is Louise's spirit that keeps all of us going through long Rules Committee meetings. We should all aspire to be the person she was, to tirelessly serve our constituents, the Constitution, and this country.

#### HONORING JOHN POPRIK

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Madam Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I rise today to honor the life and the memory of a very special member of our Bucks County community, John Poprik, who our community recently lost.

Born in Philadelphia, John attended Father Judge High School and Drexel University, where he graduated in 1970 with a degree in accounting. He was a respected business executive, having served as the CFO of Better Material Corp. before becoming the CFO of Sommer Maid Creamery.

John was truly a dedicated man, dedicated to making our community a better place through public service. He served on the Water and Sewer Authority, the Bucks County Drug and Alcohol Commission, and the Pennsylvania Unemployment Compensation Board of Review.

More than anything, however, John was a dedicated family man. He spent some of his most treasured moments with his five grandchildren.

Madam Speaker, I extend my deepest condolences to his beloved wife of 50 years, my dear friend, Pat Poprik, and their sons, Brad and Matt.

May John, a good, decent, and honorable man, enjoy the eternal reward for a life he spent serving others.

#### REMEMBERING LOUISE SLAUGHTER

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

Mr. TONKO. Madam Speaker, 1 year ago, this body and our Nation lost one of its brightest lights with the passing of an extraordinary congresswoman and my dear friend, Louise Slaughter.

I first came to know Louise in the early 1980s when we served together in the New York State Assembly. We remained close until her passing on March 16, 2018. While I will always miss her presence, her legacy lives on in many, many ways.

It lives on in the renaming of the STOCK Act, an effort that I was proud to sponsor last Congress.

Louise's legacy lives on in the Fairport post office, renamed after Louise and her husband, Bob, a fitting tribute to a loving couple. I thank my colleague, JOE MORELLE, for making that happen.

Her legacy lives in the Rochester train station, named after Louise after years of her advocacy and determination to make it an improved destination and a special place of connection.

Most importantly, her legacy lives in the freshman class of this United States House of Representatives. Louise used to represent Seneca Falls and was proud of the women's rights movement that had its strongest, deepest roots in upstate New York.

This year, more than 100 women serve in this body for the first time in American history. Of course, if Louise were here, she would surely remind us that 100 is much less than half of 435 and that our work was far from over.

Madam Speaker, to my friend, Louise, our thoughts and prayers are with her as we mark 1 year since her passing. Today, we celebrate an incredible legacy, a legacy that is alive and burning bright with hope.

#### 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE AMERICAN LEGION

(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 to congratulate The American Legion on its centennial anniversary.

On Friday, March 15, The American Legion will celebrate 100 years since it was formed in Paris, France, after World War I. More than 1,000 people gathered for The American Legion's first caucus at the American Club in Paris on March 15, 1919.

Since then, The American Legion has grown to be the Nation's largest war-time veterans service organization, boasting more than 2 million members and 13,000 posts across all 50 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, France, Mexico, and the Philippines.

Its dedication to veterans, service-members, and their families extends from local community programs to State and Federal policy initiatives, including the establishment of the Veterans Administration in 1930 and the GI Bill in 1944. Hundreds of local American Legion programs and activities strengthen the Nation one community at a time.

Madam Speaker, I thank The American Legion for its service and wish its members a happy 100th birthday this Friday.

#### HONORING DONALD HERBERT EATON, JR.

(Mr. ESPAILLAT asked and was given permission to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Madam Speaker, New York suffered a heartbreaking loss with the passing of Donald Herbert Eaton, Jr., a Harlem native, a Korean war veteran, and an accomplished community activist.

His life was marked by selflessness and perseverance, common threads that guided him to serve his community and his Nation.

He was raised in a tough environment. Discrimination was at its peak. Yet, when his Nation called on him, he went to war and served honorably as a member of the 369th "Harlem Hellfighters" Infantry Regiment.

Upon his return, Eaton's longstanding commitment to service led him to spend 20 years leading efforts to help those in need: veterans, seniors, and the underprivileged.

Madam Speaker, may he rest in peace and may God comfort his children, Donald Eaton III and Geoffrey Eaton, Sr., and his two grandchildren, Geoffrey Eric Eaton, Jr., and Geoffrey S. Eaton III.

#### WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

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

Mr. TAYLOR. Madam Speaker, celebrated each March, Women's History Month serves as a time to honor and recognize the momentous achievement of women who have continued to shape the United States today.

What began as a week-long celebration in 1981 is now a month-long celebration starting in 1995.

This year, I am especially proud to highlight a group of women making history right now in Texas' Third Congressional District. Collin County, Texas, has 11 State district courts with 11 presiding judges, and 7 county courts at law with 7 presiding judges.

In 2017, an addition of a new judge brought the total number of female judges serving on district courts to six, meaning that, for the first time in history, a majority of the court seats are now held by women. But just this year, with the election of another woman in Texas' 219th district court, there are now seven women serving on the county's district benches. Making this accomplishment even more remarkable, just 12 years ago, there was only one female judge on the county's benches.

While only 33 percent of the judges throughout the United States are women, Collin County is leading the way with 64 percent of the district court judge benches held by women judges.

I salute Judge Corinne Mason, Judge Angela Tucker, Judge Jennifer Edgeworth, Judge Andrea Thompson, Judge Cynthia Wheless, Judge Jill Willis, Judge Piper McCraw, and Judge Emily Miskel.



## PRESIDENT TRUMP'S BUDGET

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, on Monday, the Trump administration released what has to be the cruelest and most irresponsible proposed budget in our Nation's 243-year history.

The Trump budget adds trillions of dollars to our national debt. The Trump budget cuts \$1.5 trillion from Medicaid, \$845 billion from Medicare, and \$26 billion from Social Security. Meanwhile, it cuts over 90 percent of the funding for freshwater in the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative.

We are not going to be able to combat deadly algal blooms in Lake Erie. We are not going to be able to contain invasive species like the Asian carp. We are not going to be able to restore the Great Lakes and its environmental integrity.

The President promised he would never cut Social Security, Medicare, or Medicaid, yet he has done exactly that. His proposed budget adds trillions to the national debt while also undermining the financial pillars of Medicare, Social Security, and Medicaid.

Madam Speaker, budgets are a reflection of our values, and President Trump's values are clearly with the 1 percent. He is out of step with the majority of the American people and, surely, those living in northern Ohio.

□ 1415

REMEMBERING LOUISE  
SLAUGHTER

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

Mr. MORELLE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in paying tribute to my dear friend and predecessor, Louise Slaughter.

As evidenced by the many laudatory statements being made today, Louise's contributions to this institution were immeasurable. Louise left a remarkable legacy:

The only woman to chair the Rules Committee;

A stalwart for women and children;

A leader who was instrumental in passing landmark healthcare legislation.

But what I remember most about Louise and what was at the heart of all her accomplishments is how much she cared for her friends and for her community.

Louise was my dear friend not only on the best of days, like when she encouraged me to run for my first elective office or celebrated with me when I was chosen to be the majority leader of the New York State Assembly, but also on the most difficult of days.

When my daughter Lauren passed away, Louise was there that afternoon spending hours at my house with our family. That is just who she was.

She had one of the biggest hearts of anyone I know. I am better for having known her, and I know that our entire country is better for her many years of dedicated service.

May you rest in peace, Louise Slaughter.

REMEMBERING LOUISE  
SLAUGHTER

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

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Speaker, I rise today with my colleagues to honor my friend and colleague, Congresswoman Louise Slaughter.

It is inconceivable to me that it has been 1 year since the passing of this force of nature. I am consoled by knowing that her legacy lives on in this Chamber.

The brilliant former chair of the powerful Rules Committee was sharp-tongued, sharp-witted, and sharp-eyed.

Everyone who knew her was made better by her presence.

Anyone who came up against her in an argument knew they were facing a steel backbone, but her disarming sense of humor and southern drawl were irresistible.

She even taught me how to speak Southern. "Bless your sweet heart" doesn't mean bless your sweet heart.

Congresswoman Slaughter knew fake when she saw it and was not afraid to call it out. She knew truth when she saw it and stood strong in its defense.

It is in her honor that we must continue to fight for this democracy that she never gave up on, and I hope that we will consider naming the Rules Committee room in her honor.

There are many people I like in our Chamber; few, I truly love. I loved Louise Slaughter.

REMEMBERING LOUISE  
SLAUGHTER

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

Ms. MATSUI. Madam Speaker, a year ago we said good-bye to Louise Slaughter, our dear, dear, friend.

Louise Slaughter was a titan of Congress. She was unforgettable.

When I first joined the Rules Committee after getting elected, I was immediately drawn to Louise. Louise took me under her wing. She even made fun of people that I thought were really wonderful, and she laughed because she knew we shared a joke.

Honestly, Louise was somebody who even made the late hours in the Rules Committee fun, too, with her wittiness and her intellect and the fact that, beneath it all, she absolutely loved serving in this wonderful House.

Louise lived in perfect balance. She was charming, yet intense; witty, yet resolute.

After spending time with Louise, you knew her heart was with the people of

western New York, and you knew she wasn't going to back down from her beliefs.

She loved her family. She loved her district as if they were her family, also. And we loved Louise because she loved everyone and gave support.

We miss you, Louise.

REMEMBERING LOUISE  
SLAUGHTER

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

Mr. LEWIS. Madam Speaker, I first met Louise Slaughter 32 years ago during our freshman orientation. From the first day, she stood out.

Louise was an unbelievable, kind, beautiful person. She was a born leader who was thoughtful, mindful, and she didn't take any stuff.

I loved Louise. She called me Brother John, and I called her Sister Louise.

We miss Louise.

I can see her standing up on this floor now speaking truth to power. She never gave up; she never gave in; she kept her faith; and she kept her eyes on the prize.

Madam Speaker, I thank Louise for her service, and I know she is with her beloved Bob.

REMEMBERING LOUISE  
SLAUGHTER

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

Ms. MOORE. Madam Speaker, I am so blessed to have known Louise McIntosh Slaughter, and I am so pleased to speak on her behalf today.

Louise was a legislator, with a capital L, and she lived up to the legacy of the ladies of New York. She represented Seneca Falls, and not only because it was her district, but she represented it in terms of her sentiments.

She was the sponsor of the Violence Against Women Act. She was the head of the Pro-Choice Caucus. She focused on medical research for women.

She was a thought leader. Consistent with her training in chemistry, she fought to decrease the amount of antibiotics, eliminate antibiotics in animals for consumption. She led on the issues of getting rid of lead, and, also, she really understood chemistry.

The first time she saw Bob Slaughter, she said, "I have just got to have him," and she went and got him.

She was a bridge to leadership. These freshmen would have really, really enjoyed being around the head of the Rules Committee, their bridge to the leadership.

And let me tell you, I loved her because she really knew how to make people happy. Madam Speaker, she gave me an orange purse because she thought that orange was a happy color and that I deserved to be surrounded by it.



### REMEMBERING LOUISE SLAUGHTER

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, it is fitting that we are honoring Congresswoman Slaughter during Women's History Month because her legacy is planted firmly in the history books.

She wasn't the daughter of wealth or privilege, but she traveled from the coalfields of Kentucky to become the first woman ever to chair the House Rules Committee.

Louise's 30 years of service here embodied what it means to be a public servant: writing the STOCK Act and the Genetic Information Non-discrimination Act, shepherding through the Affordable Care Act. I could go on and on.

There was no special interest too influential for her to take on, no politician too powerful.

Many of us saw her determination firsthand, whether we were with her on an issue or especially if we were on the opposite side. We are all better for it. This Chamber and this country are better for it.

I am proud to have worked alongside her. I am glad that she will be joining so many pioneering women in the National Women's Hall of Fame this year.

Madam Speaker, and on behalf of all the Members of this Chamber and on behalf of her staff, especially in the Rules Committee, let me just say we loved her, and we miss her a lot.

### APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO UNITED STATES HOLOCAUST ME- MORIAL COUNCIL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to 36 U.S.C. 2302, and the order of the House of January 3, 2019, of the following Members on the part of the House to the United States Holocaust Memorial Council:

Mr. ZELDIN, New York

Mr. KUSTOFF, Tennessee

### APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO BRITISH-AMERICAN INTER- PARLIAMENTARY GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2761, and the order of the House of January 3, 2019, of the following Member on the part of the House to the British-American Interparliamentary Group:

Mr. HOLDEN, North Carolina

### FIVE PILLARS OF WHAT WE BELIEVE SAVES US

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Madam Speaker, what we are going to do right now is, and we are going to hopefully only take about a half an hour, actually walk through sort of the continuing theme of how at least our math—and particularly in our office, we have been trying to put together sort of a unified theory of how do we deal with the reality of what is happening in our country with our demographics. We are getting older much faster, and our birth-rate has fallen dramatically.

Repeatedly, we have come up here with other boards that basically show, over the next 30 years, the greatest threat to our economy, to our society, to our country's priorities, is the fact that our interest, Social Security, Medicare, healthcare entitlement costs consume everything. The rest of the budget is functionally imbalanced.

I know this is uncomfortable because it is one of those things that is hard for us to talk about. It is not Republican or Democratic. It is demographics. It is math.

Part of that baseline, to understand 2008 to 2028, take those 20 years, 91 percent of the spending increase here in Washington, if you remove interest, 91 percent of the spending increase is—actually, I think it does include interest—interest, Social Security, healthcare entitlements.

We need to understand the basic math. And now, how do you actually deal with it?

How do you maximize economic growth?

How do you maximize labor force participation?

How do you encourage people, if we built the incentives, to actually stay in the labor force longer?

How do you actually embrace technology, particularly disruptive technology that crashes the prices and makes our society healthier and more efficient?

And then, how do we have an honest conversation of those earned benefits and build them so they have incentives in there that, if you are fit and healthy and happy, you are willing to stay in the labor force longer? Are there certain spiffs and benefits we can design into these?

So those are sort of our five pillars.

Today, we are going to do something that is fun.

We just grabbed a handful of concepts that are about technology, and the tough part—when you start talking about disruptive technology—it makes you sort of giddy for what the future is and the opportunities.

But there is this thing we call incumbency, particularly in economics—incumbency: the incumbent business; the incumbent medical provider; the incumbent over here.

These technologies are going to be a real challenge.

□ 1430

The running joke in our office is how many of us went to Blockbuster Video

last weekend. We sort of woke up one night and all decided to go home and hit a button called HBO Go, Netflix, those things. We no longer stood in line and got movie suggestions and went home with a little shiny disc.

We are going to walk through, first, some of the healthcare IT and why this is so important. I want you to first think about some of the technologies that are starting to roll out.

If you got to take home or had in the back of the office or we had on the back of the floor here something that looked like a gigantic kazoo that you could blow into and it told you whether you had the flu or whether you had a bacterial infection and, instantly, it could ping your medical records that you are carrying around both on your phone or in the cloud and instantly order your antivirals and they were delivered to your house, did we just crash parts of the price of healthcare? Of course we did.

Did we just make a lot of incumbent businesses? We are challenging part of their business model because you used this technology instead of going to the urgent care center or going to the emergency room or going to the hospital or even going to the pharmacy. But we have to be willing to think about these things. These types of technologies are rolling out all around us.

An Israeli company—the picture over in the far corner—actually has, and I guess it is being certified all across Europe right now, a desktop blood test that actually does a whole plethora of different blood tests with just a few drops. Remember, we talked about this 10 years ago. It turns out the technology now actually exists.

In a couple of blog posts, even the concept of going into an autonomous healthcare center—and we actually have about 10 of these up in the Phoenix area where you go in and sign up on an iPad. You take a picture of your driver's license and a picture of your insurance card.

You go into a booth alone. You put your arm in this thing. It does blood pressure and does a number of readings. You pick up this particular tool, and an avatar on the screen says: Can you shine this down your throat? Can you bend? Can you turn? Now do your ears, your eyes. It actually does algorithmic healthcare.

What if that few-drop blood test—actually, as a couple of blog posts talked about, you put your hand on something and it pricks your finger. It takes the blood test right there, and before you walk out the door, 5 minutes later, it is giving you a full blood workup.

What did you just do using technology to disrupt parts of healthcare costs?

These things are real. They are rolling out right now. There are amazing technologies in almost everything you can think of. But we are going to have to think about both the ecosystem and the complications of how it is paid

for—are these things that Medicare, Medicaid, and other insurers will pay for?—and how we do it.

Also, the data. What happens in a society where you are now going to be walking around with certain wearables?

You have the fancy watch that helps you manage your hypertension, the patch that does your blood oxygen, the port that helps you actually manage your blood sugar. There is lots of data coming off of those wearables. We, in our office, call them digiceuticals. How does that all tie into the rest of the ecosystem?

And that data, how do you actually get that data so a doctor or the algorithm can see, when you open your pill bottle—because the pill bottle has a sensor in it, we know when you took your pill, and 15 minutes later we see this on your EKG that is coming from your watch, we see this reaction, can that data become incredibly usable? Can that data be blinded from your own personal information and help all of society get healthier because we gained more data in those algorithms?

This is cutting edge, but it is not utopianism. We actually have those things right now today.

If you start to think about it, you can actually go to Amazon, or I am sure others online, and see that it exists today. For under a couple of thousand dollars, you can buy a handheld ultrasound. Think about that.

Apparently, there are other versions, faster, better, even ones coming in the future where the algorithm will actually read the ultrasound. You hold it up on your iPhone, and as you are using this handheld ultrasound to look at the picture, the algorithm is also going to help you interpret it.

What did an ultrasound system cost a few years ago? You can buy this online today. It exists, and we are doing experiments with it right now in a VA, I believe, just right here in Maryland. Apparently, they are having terrific outcomes because the doctor can walk up and check something.

These technologies exist. How do we start to have these technologies start to disrupt the price of healthcare? Because to be absolutely intellectually honest, if you actually look at the Affordable Care Act, ObamaCare, or Republican alternatives, we have spent a couple of decades in this body having a debate on who pays, not how to disrupt.

With the ACA, we are going to have government pay a lot more. Over here, in our version, we are going to try to create incentives to have individuals actually get market competition.

They have been debates on paying. We have almost never stepped up and said: What are our barriers at the State level? What are our barriers at the regulatory level? What are the barriers at the HHS levels that actually prevent the adoption of disruptive technologies?

These things do exist today. We need to actually embrace the concept of

rapid disruptive adoption of these technologies because, remember our five pillars, if we do not have a disruption in the cost of healthcare as we are getting older very quickly as a society, remember, in only 9 years, we have two workers for every one person in retirement.

In 9 years, if you pull interest out, half the spending here coming out of Washington, D.C., will be to those 65 and older, and it is, substantially, healthcare.

We all carry around these smartphones. Should our health records be on those? Of course they should be, because they should be portable with us because health data, health records are going to become something dramatically different than the record that is sitting there at the hospital. It is going to be living.

How many of you ever use something like Waze or a crowdsource on your phone? You are going to be having these things on your body, or the pill bottle that knows when you opened it. That data should be living with you so you are constantly managing.

There is a debate going on with those folks who build these algorithms. The fact that you had a surgery 7 years ago that is sitting on your health record or the health data that is coming off your wearables from the last 48 hours, which one is actually more valuable to your healthcare? The living data has incredible value in keeping you healthy. We need to find a way to embrace this and build this ecosystem.

This next one I put up, even though there are a dozen, we are going to show a couple of versions of this just for the fun of it. Think about the debates we are having here in Washington, D.C., and for those of us on the Ways and Means Committee in regard to drug pricing.

We need to fix many of the incentives. We need to actually deal with the fact that some of the games that are played on patents and other things—okay. That is an honest debate. But understand, the data says that half the pharmaceuticals that will be picked up at pharmacies today or delivered in the mail today, half of them will either not be used or will not be used properly.

Think about that just conceptually. Half of the pharmaceuticals that will be taken home today aren't going to be used properly. Is there a data solution?

We have everything from just the pill bottle top that lets us know that you opened it and when it opened and would tag your healthcare record, hopefully, be portable with you on your phone so we know that you actually took it, to actually, now, for those who may be on the severely mentally ill side who have certain maintenance medications that are providing miracles—they actually have a super small tiny chip that is actually in the pill itself that we can actually read that we know you are digesting it, that we know you took your meds.

Think about it. We need to embrace these types of technologies, even down to this type of pill dispenser for someone who may have a little more complicated issue where they take some of their pharmaceuticals either at multiple times during the day or they have certain complications.

Here is one that was shown at the Consumer Electronics Show in Las Vegas about 6 weeks ago. You put your cup under it and it automatically dispenses at a certain time and tells us what pharmaceuticals were delivered to you. It is technology dealing with the fact that we have documented that half the pharmaceuticals aren't properly used or used at all.

It turns out the data that will flow off of these things actually will help us. When you have a wisdom tooth taken out, do you really need 30 pills or do you need 3? It turns out, the data from this may actually help us dramatically change the way we do prescriptions in the first place.

So I am making the argument, it turns out that data and technology are also one of the solutions as we talk about pharmaceutical pricing.

Now we are actually going to move on to something else we, as a body—and this is going to take my brothers and sisters on the Democratic side and Republican side. We need to have a very, hopefully, math-based, honest conversation about how we are going to finance miracles that are coming, and some of them are going to be here before the end of this year.

We just put up this slide as part of the thought experiment. In America, we have about 8,000 Americans who have hemophilia A. The price range, we have actually found some documents that say the blood clotting factors and those things may be a half million dollars a year to keep that American stable.

What happens this November or December—which we are actually very hopeful is about to happen—when a single shot cures hemophilia A? How do we pay for it? What are we willing to pay for it? How do you value that in society? It is a single shot of a very small population so it is not like the next day there is going to be a competitor drug in the pipeline like we had with other drugs. In this case, it is a single-shot cure.

But we actually know that over 50 percent of all of our healthcare expense is to 5 percent of our brothers and sisters who have chronic conditions. What happens when we start having miracle drugs like a genomic biological like this that is curing diseases that are part of our brothers and sisters, that 5 percent who actually have the chronic conditions that consume over half of our healthcare dollars?

We are actually, as an office, proposing ideas of a type of healthcare bond so you can actually finance the adoption of the distribution of these disruptive, revolutionary drugs and then pay for it using some of what

would have been the future costs, pull those forward so you get the disruption of the future savings.

These individuals are out of that chronic condition, but we are going to have to have a very tricky conversation. How do you price it? What is the value of a pharmaceutical that is functionally a miracle that cures something like hemophilia A? How do you price it? There is only going to be one producer of it, would be my guess, because there is such a small population. There are only 8,000 Americans with hemophilia A. Is it worth \$1.5 million an injection?

There is actually a math way to get there dealing with the reality of this is a population that costs us a quarter of a million dollars a year to keep them healthy, and this is the life expectancy. What was the research cost, because we want these miracle drugs as part of our society to help us have that disruption as part of the holistic theory of technology, these new miracle drugs that are coming, to disrupt the future healthcare costs.

Now, I want you to take this concept a bit further and spread it beyond healthcare. Think of some of the crazy debates we have actually had here on the floor in regards to—forgive me—environment. I want to argue with you that there is a technology disruption that can make our environment cleaner but we don't actually hurt the economy. We can actually help it grow.

So here is my first thought experiment. This has been a fixation of mine for a few years here.

Think of the community you live in. What if tomorrow, instead of today's current model—you want to open up a paint shop or you want to open up a bakery or this and that. You go out and fill out forms. You send them down to the local environmental regulator. You may also file them with the State. If you are doing certain types of volatile organics, you may have to file with the EPA. You are basically filling up file cabinets. Do filled-up file cabinets make the environment, the air quality in your community cleaner?

□ 1445

It is an honest concept because we functionally have a 1938 regulatory model of file—lots and lots of paper—maybe even do quarterly audits, maybe annual audits, fill out more paper, and fill up file cabinets full of paper that functionally a lawyer gets to come and look at a couple years later.

Does that make the environment in your community cleaner?

What would happen if you had a few hundred or a few thousand people traveling around in your community that actually just had the little sensor traveling with them that they were collecting data on hydrocarbons, on volatile organics, and on ozone, and you could actually see the map of your community? If all of a sudden you had a hot spot over here because you find out you have clowns painting cars in

the backyard of their house, you would know about it instantly, and the environmental regulator, instead of putting paper in file cabinets, they would get in, hopefully, their electric vehicle, and go over and actually stop the clowns from painting cars in their backyard.

Which made the environment cleaner?

The trade-off here is actually very elegant because I don't need you to file lots of paperwork. I don't need you to actually be doing quarterlies and annu- als because if you screw up, we catch you instantly.

What made the economy grow, what reduced the bureaucratic burden in our society, and what actually made our communities healthier and cleaner?

It is just technology.

Mr. GAETZ. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

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

With all due respect to the gentleman from Arizona, he is very weird in that he runs his congressional office like a think tank where people contemplate the ways that technology can improve healthcare and the environment in a nonpartisan way, because these are not issues that have anything to do with whether someone is a Republican or a Democrat.

But so many of these ideas that the gentleman and I have discussed for years fail to make their way into the most dynamic economy and marketplace in the world, which is the United States of America.

So my question for the gentleman is: How do we go from the innovative space of great Americans coming up with sensor technology to action in the Congress or within our government that is worthy of the great people we serve?

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Will the gentleman enter into a colloquy?

Mr. GAETZ. I will.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. The gentleman is one of my buddies from Florida. He actually gets this, but he also knows I actually love the technology disruptions, because none of us has figured out if it is Republican or Democrat yet, which actually makes it possible for us to do it. Now, eventually, we will break it into partisan because everything has become weaponized and partisan around this body.

But, right now, think of this: this is a natural gas electric facility. It can power 5,000 homes. It is up and running outside Houston. It doesn't have a smokestack. All the ACO<sub>2</sub>, so all the carbon is captured. They actually came up with this brilliant technology that the carbon actually flows through. My understanding of the engineering is it helps spin the turbines, and then the excess carbon that is generated is safe and sold.

We actually have a tax credit that we adjusted that hopefully made it more

robust as we did tax reform that if you want to take some of that carbon you can put it in concrete, or a piece of plastic, or do it for certain types of oil recovery.

Mr. GAETZ. Was it a refundable tax credit or was it an upfront credit?

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. It is actually a tax credit according to the amount of tonnage you produce of ACO<sub>2</sub>.

Mr. GAETZ. So it is a production tax credit?

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Yes. But the beauty of it is that model has said that we have actually already created a value on this carbon, and if you don't put it into the environment but actually use it for other things as a filler in plastics, as a filler in concrete, in putting it back in to the ground to enhance recovery, we are already doing it. This technology isn't utopianism, it exists. It is already running.

How many times around here have we talked about that we can actually have a hydrocarbon generation without a smokestack?

The technology exists. If we are going to talk about a green agenda, then we actually all need to sit down and actually meet with the really smart researchers and scientists and actually understand the math and science. That science is way ahead of where our heads are.

The gentleman from Florida has some amazing technologies coming out of his State right now on everything from biogeneration to the ways to manage the environment.

Mr. GAETZ. I would ask the gentleman, as we try to take these good ideas that seem to not be emerging from the Federal Government but from several States and from local communities that are doing some of their own great work, I feel at times like you have got one party here that thinks that Big Government is always the answer, and you have another party who thinks that big business is always the answer, and at times these technological solutions come from neither. They come from the creative class, the innovative class.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. That is actually a brilliant way to phrase it.

My continuing thought experiment, and this is a little beyond where we were going, but it makes the point, visit Washington, D.C., or a bunch of other locations now. They are not going to give you a straw or they are going to give you a paper straw.

The math is—and this actually, I believe, comes from the United Nations—90 percent of all the plastic in the ocean—and, look, it is a big deal. I am looking at my data here, roughly 8 million tons a year of plastic goes in to the ocean. The gentleman is from a coastal State—comes from 10 rivers, eight of them in Asia, two of them in Africa.

If you actually really cared about plastic in the ocean, that 8 million tons, we would actually take our environmental policy, our trade policy, and

our foreign aid policy and say that we are going to actually help these 10 rivers that are responsible for 90 percent of the plastic in the ocean and work on those. But instead we do these feel-good, absurd, theatrical things of “my community isn’t going to do straws, don’t we feel better that we did something for plastic in the ocean?”

It had nothing to do with plastic in the ocean. It is these 10 rivers. Let’s grow up and stop the political theater.

Mr. GAETZ. So what is the get-out-of-jail-free card so that we can liberate ourselves from a policymaking climate that seems to be more robust in virtue signaling than in actually following data?

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. I knew you were going to say virtue signaling.

This is a little bit sarcastic, and I mean it to be slightly on the humor side, one of the first things every Member of Congress should put into their budgets is the ownership of a calculator, because we functionally work in a math-free zone where our feelings become public policy instead of the baseline data where we can actually have an impact of making our society and the world healthier and more economically prosperous. If you actually, genuinely cared about plastic in the ocean, we have 10 rivers, 90 percent of the plastic, we know exactly where they are; focus there, instead of the absurdity of the straw at your local whatever.

Mr. GAETZ. I appreciate the gentleman mentioning our oceans. As someone from a coastal State that means a great deal to me.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Coming from Arizona we have sort of this utopian view that one day Arizona may become a coastal State.

Mr. GAETZ. Based on the current rate of climate change you may get your wish.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Or an earthquake.

Mr. GAETZ. It doesn’t strike me as an enviable outcome. I do thank the gentleman again for yielding for this discussion.

It is my sincere hope that this is a discussion that we can have with Members of Congress from urban districts, rural districts, liberal Members, and conservative Members, because as the gentleman correctly points out, these are actually solutions that do not lend themselves to a partisan tilt.

I am sincerely hopeful that the gentleman will continue to lead on this subject, and I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. You are very kind, and I thank you for the colloquy.

Look, many of us just want to solve the problems. I have the best little girl in the world sitting in the back right now. She is 3 years old.

What does her future get to be like?

We have a demographic crisis. It is just math. We are getting older very quickly. If we don’t grow the economy, if we don’t have lots of labor force participation, and if we don’t use trade

and tax policy and innovation, we need these things to grow.

But instead, Madam Speaker, if you listen to the speeches that often end up behind these microphones, it is an absurdity that is partisan because we care about power more than actually doing those things that are so important for our future of this society.

So I want to give you one last, ultimate thought experiment. I am still just stunned this article hasn’t gotten more coverage around the country, but it is going to require many of us to actually deal with some of our political constituencies that have lots of folklore built into their belief systems.

About 6 weeks ago, an article came out. University of Illinois U.S. Agricultural Research Service published a paper saying—now, you all remember your high school or your first botany class or when you were actually learning about cell biology—there is actually a weird inefficiency in plant cells on how they grab a carbon molecule or oxygen molecule—we won’t geek out too much—but they found a way through a bit of genetic engineering to make the cell wall superefficient.

They basically believe that they have broken the Holy Grail that plants, commodity crops—right now they did it on tobacco plants, because the reason they do research on tobacco plants is we have known the genome of tobacco plants for quite a while now—40 percent increase in efficiency.

We have got to think this through. Now, there is a really disruptive side of that. Forty percent, tomorrow if you could plant a corn seed or wheat or something else, and it had 40 percent more yield, what does that mean to feeding the world 50 years from now?

Yay.

What does that mean to commodity prices?

Scary.

But you need functionally now 40 percent less land, 40 percent less water, 40 percent less fuel, and we actually have some data here from the IPCC 2014 report which is from the United Nations that just a little under one-quarter of all the human emissions, functionally greenhouse gases, come from agriculture.

If you do the math—think about this—this 40 percent increase in yield for agriculture would functionally equal removing every car off the face of the Earth.

Think about the conversations we have here talking about the environment. Here is a miracle. And the reality we know from other disruptions in seeds that it can be rolled into society very quickly as these new seed stocks, except we are going to have to deal with our brothers and sisters saying: well, that is a genetically modified seed.

Yes, but it has this amazing disruption in the world. If you truly care about greenhouse gases, if that is your fixation, just moving to this new disruptive technology that I hope is real,

I hope the research continues to demonstrate a 40 percent production increase, this here could be the fastest, biggest disruption in greenhouse gases in the world because you could actually adopt these seed crops within just a few years.

That is an example of technology not just bringing a small improvement or even a disruption, in many ways it is a major disruption, but you have to deal with the politics of belief systems. It is genetically modified, but it is not a genetically modified seed stock to deal with pests or this and that, they just dealt with the inefficiency of the cell wall. It is a miracle. If it is true, it is a miracle. Think about it, though, but understand the disruptions that are going to roll through our society.

What happens to the value of agricultural land?

What happens to the ability of nations to ultimately feed themselves if all of a sudden they had a 40 percent increase in productivity?

But also what happens in our world if I come to you right now, Madam Speaker, and say that agriculture produces functionally, by my math, a bit more than 2½ times the amount of emissions of every car on the Earth?

So this technology would be as if you just removed every car off the Earth.

How come we don’t have these types of conversations here on the floor?

It is because it doesn’t fit our political folklore model of what has become just a stunningly partisan gotcha weaponized body.

As we go through our five pillars for the future one more time, the reason for the fixation on this, we have 74 million of our brothers and sisters who are baby boomers, the last baby boomer hits 65 in 9 years, many of the things we should have done we should have done a decade or two decades ago, and we didn’t have the political appetite. We have to deal with the reality that we have this population bubble that is getting older and our birthrates have substantially collapsed.

If we are going to keep our promises to those folks who have worked their entire lives who will be moving into their benefit years, we have to think disruptively. We have to be willing to do everything from tax policy, trade policy, and regulatory policy that we have talked about here using technology, to labor force participation, encouraging people all up and down the spectrum to actually enter the labor force.

We have to be willing to talk about redesigning some of the programs to incentivize, if you wish to work, you get to work. We are going to have to actually also embrace the miracle of these disruptive technologies and not be scared of them.

But this body is going to also have to deal with something that is very difficult for a political body, and that is a lot of our friends are going to either have to change their economic models and a lot of our States are going to

have to change their regulatory models just as we will. But it is these disruptions that give us the economic robustness to actually keep our promises over the next 30 years.

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

□ 1500

#### MEDICARE FOR ALL ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. TLAIB) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. TLAIB. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the subject of the Special Order today.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. TLAIB. Madam Speaker, I am honored to co-chair this Special Order for the Congressional Progressive Caucus with my amazing colleague from California, KATIE PORTER.

This is a privilege for me to be able to work with so many of my colleagues on the issues that they are very passionate about, from healthcare to environmental justice to LGBTQ rights. It has been an honor to lead this and to be part of this.

Today, we are talking about an important, important issue to one of my colleagues whom I have known for over 15 years as a community organizer and, later, as an immigration rights attorney working on civil rights issues. It is an honor to introduce my colleague from the State of Washington, the leader on healthcare for all, our wonderful, great colleague, Representative PRAMILA JAYAPAL.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL).

Ms. JAYAPAL. Madam Speaker, let me say how pleased I am to be with Ms. TLAIB today, leading the Special Order hour, and, Madam Speaker, how pleased I am to see you at the podium.

This is a fantastic group of individuals who have joined us here in Congress, and I couldn't be prouder to serve with both of you and with others who are here as well.

The topic of this Special Order hour is so important. It has been important to me, of course, but also to Members of Congress in general and to communities across the country, and that is the topic of healthcare.

I wanted to break this down a little bit, in terms of where we are on this issue for people who are watching, because this is one of the beauties of the Special Order hour, that we get to talk about the issues that matter; we get to explain things; and we get to put forward our proposals and our ideas.

I am so proud to say that, on February 27, I and my colleague, Representative DEBBIE DINGELL, introduced the Medicare for All Act of 2019, and we had 107 original cosponsors. Those are the folks who sign on right as it is getting introduced.

Of course, a bill gets introduced, and we always add people on after that. But this is 107 original cosponsors for this act that would build upon, improve, and expand Medicare so that it covers every single person in this country—universal healthcare, the idea that healthcare is a right and not a privilege.

Let me start by saying that we Democrats are absolutely united around the need to shore up the Affordable Care Act. There is no question that there is work to do immediately on some of the things that were done to take away access to those with pre-existing conditions, to strip away the benefits of the Affordable Care Act. We are 100 percent united around continuing to do that.

However, we have to have a bold vision that addresses the healthcare crisis in this country that leaves 30 million people uninsured and 40 million people underinsured, without access to healthcare.

We have to understand, in doing that, in the United States today, we spend, depending on what estimate you look at, about \$32 trillion to \$39 trillion on healthcare costs over 10 years. That is going up to about \$50 trillion over the next 10 years on healthcare. That is about 18½ percent of GDP.

If you look at every other major industrialized country in the world, what you see is that they provide healthcare, comprehensive care, to everybody in their country, and they do it at about half the cost, or less, of what the United States spends.

You might think that you could look at costs of healthcare in this country and you could say: Well, America has the best healthcare system in the world, and that is why we spend so much. We have the best healthcare outcomes.

Well, let's talk about that for a second. In the United States, we spend 18½ percent of our GDP on healthcare costs, yet we have the worst health outcomes of any peer country in the world.

Today in the United States, we have the highest maternal mortality rate. We know what that is; that is moms dying in childbirth.

We have the highest infant mortality rate. That is kids dying at young ages.

We have the lowest life expectancy rate of any of our peer countries. In fact, we are the only industrialized country in the world where life expectancy is going down and not up.

So we don't even have good health outcomes to show for our healthcare system.

That is why Representative DINGELL and I and our 105 additional cosponsors of the bill, and Representative TLAIB

and many others who are part of this effort, have introduced the improved Medicare for All Act of 2019.

What this bill does is it offers, first of all, comprehensive coverage to everyone in the country. We say that that includes primary care; it includes vision, dental, hearing; it includes mental health and substance abuse; it includes long-term services and supports, maternal healthcare, and more.

Everybody in the country will have access to healthcare when you get sick, not when you need an emergency room, not when you simply can't take your illness anymore, but when you actually get sick.

This bill is the first time that we will actually have long-term care supports and services included in this coverage. This is very, very important because it covers seniors, obviously, our elderly, as they get toward the end of their life, and it includes people with disabilities who have, traditionally, been left out of this entire sphere.

What we do is we say that, instead of the current system where you have to get so poor that you have to be on Medicaid—you have to have a low level of income, be on Medicaid—if you want long-term supports and services, and the automatic default is institutional care instead of home care, we flip that on its head and we say you get to stay at home with the people you love. You get to be in your home as you are dealing with these incredible challenges that you may have.

Our bill says no premiums, copays, and deductibles. We don't want you to have to think about that as you go to the doctor.

This is very important, because you will hear this is a government takeover of healthcare. That is what opponents of my bill are already trying to tell you.

I want you to hear this really clearly, if you are listening: We use the same network of doctors and hospitals that is already here.

In fact, I bet, if we had a roomful here and I were to ask people how many of you have been told, or have a family member or a relative who has been told, that you can't go to a certain hospital or doctor because it is out of network, or you only get a certain coverage if you go, I bet everybody would raise their hands. I see people raising their hands right now. Good for you. I feel like I have an audience here.

What our plan says is that you can go to any doctor or hospital. The government isn't taking over those services. It is not going to be a different government service. It is just the same as what you have right now.

The only thing that changes is, instead of having to argue with five insurance companies—because maybe you have Medicare and you have Medicare Advantage; maybe you don't have anything at all; maybe you have a combination of things put together. Instead of having to argue with five insurance companies, you get to just say:

This is a government insurance program. This is covered by one insurance program, a single payer.

If you have heard that statement, that is what that means. This is the way that almost every industrialized country in the world does it.

I think that we have to think about what the problem is here, why have we not been able to do this. We have, increasingly, seen our healthcare system, unfortunately, being moved more and more to a for-profit system that puts those profits over patients.

If you look at, for example, the cost of pharmaceutical drugs in our country today, it is so much more expensive to get insulin treatment or cancer treatments or even an MRI in the United States. I have clients and constituents who drive to Canada, who go to other places, because they can't afford the drugs here, and they can buy the exact same thing across the border for significantly cheaper.

We are having a crisis, Madam Speaker, where people are going to bed at night thinking about how they are going to pay their rent and pay for their cancer treatment, how they are going to afford to get the insulin treatments that they want. People are foreclosing on homes.

In fact, two-thirds of all the bankruptcies today in the United States are due to medical issues, medical costs. GoFundMe has become one of the most popular insurance plans around, where people are just banking on the goodness of people to take care of their healthcare costs. That is simply not acceptable.

If we want to take on this question of universal healthcare coverage, which, by the way, Teddy Roosevelt talked about in 1910, Harry Truman in 1945, President Johnson—this is not a radical idea. It is actually something that has been tried and tested.

But here in the United States, the idea that we could provide universal healthcare for everybody, make sure that people get the healthcare access that they need, this is the time for it. Seventy percent of the American people actually agree with us. You might hear that that support goes down if you say some other things, but let's be really clear that the fearmongering out there is driven by for-profit industries that, unfortunately, have a lot to lose if a plan like this were to pass, because we would actually make sure that we are not only providing universal coverage but that we also have cost containment built into our system.

That is what my bill does. We build in cost containment measures so that we can actually bring down the overall cost of healthcare in this country to what is standard in other countries around the world.

This is incredibly important to us, and as we think about who gains and who loses in this, I believe that it is actually a win-win for everybody who is concerned about putting patients over profits.

It is a win-win for doctors who have been trained to take care of patients but, instead, spend 25 to 30 percent of their time dealing with insurance companies and trying to do all the paperwork that needs to be there, trying to argue for a patient of theirs to be able to get the care they need.

It is a win for hospitals that want to make sure that they know what kind of budgets they are going to have and that they can work within that. We have something built into our plan called global budgeting, which is actually the standard in other countries but is being tested in Maryland to great effect, where hospitals get an overall amount of money, and they get a global budget. We have that built in as well.

It is a win for patients. This is the thing that is so important to emphasize again and again.

Actually, before I get to the patients, let me say it is also a win for our businesses, particularly our small- and medium-sized businesses. I have a lot of business owners who might disagree with me on a few other issues, many of them are across the aisle—they are Republicans; they are independents. They come up to me and they say: Representative, I don't agree with you on this or this or this, but please, can you get the Medicare for All bill passed, because we cannot, as small businesses and even medium-sized businesses and, by the way, even large-sized businesses, deal with the growing cost of these insurance premiums that we are paying that are really just going to line the pockets of top CEOs.

The CEO of UnitedHealth took home \$82 million, even as people are not able to afford treatments and are dying. The other CEOs have taken in \$52 million, \$29 million.

We have to make sure that the balance of something like healthcare, which is an essential, I believe, a common good in this country, that we are able to provide that to people.

There are lots of other places where markets can work, but in this marketplace where you need to make sure that healthcare is provided to everybody regardless of whether you are rich or poor, regardless of where you live, regardless of the color of your skin, this is where the government comes in to try to help make sure that that is actually possible.

This is a really important bill for us, and I am absolutely honored to have so many of my colleagues who are so smart on these issues, not only in liberal districts like mine but also in frontline districts, places that were held by Republicans for a very long time.

My Democratic colleagues flipped those districts, and they ran on this issue. They ran on this issue, and they won on this issue, because they know, and their constituents know, that it is time to take profit out of this system and make sure that it once again gets focused on the healthcare of people.

We also have an incredible coalition of labor unions that have come on board for the first time ever. Our teachers are on board, our machinists, our steelworkers. We have so many different unions that are on board this time.

Our disability rights community is on board.

Our women's organizations are on board, because for the first time, we make sure that everybody gets the care they need, whether they are a woman or a man, and we make sure that people have control over their reproductive choices.

We are absolutely thrilled about this.

I want to be clear about one thing, as I turn this back over to my incredible colleague from Michigan. This is not a messaging bill. I want to be clear about that.

For the first time in the House of Representatives, this bill is over 120 pages long. It is a detailed analysis and layout of exactly how this would work. It ensures that everybody gets healthcare. It keeps the existing system of delivery that we have. We are not changing the system of delivery.

It does not in any way say that insurance companies can't continue to operate. They just can't provide the same benefits that we are providing through the government insurance plan. That is actually the way Medicare works right now.

□ 1515

You can't provide the same benefits because we don't want a two-tiered system.

Now, if they want to provide benefits outside of what we provide, they are welcome to do so. That is how Medicare Advantage originally came in to being. Medicare Advantage plans, the benefits that are offered under those, would be included in our plan, so we wouldn't need those plans. But insurance companies are free to continue to innovate as they need to; and we have built in 1 percent of the cost of the bill for the first 5 years actually goes to a fund that ensures transition and appropriate support for workers in the insurance industries who may actually end up having to lose their jobs or to eventually transition into this new system that we have.

We will, for the first time, thanks to Speaker PELOSI's support, and others' support, we will have hearings on this bill. And whether you agree or you disagree with the premise, what I would ask is that you understand how critical it is to address and finally get to universal healthcare in this country.

This is a debate that should have been had on the House floor and in our committees a long time ago. We are finally going to have that with a number of different committees; and I am looking forward to continuing to help lead with all of my colleagues on ensuring that healthcare is a right and not a privilege; that you don't have to be wealthy to get basic healthcare; and



that we improve the ultimate competitiveness of our businesses, our families, our communities, and the health, the basic health, the right to live with dignity and respect for all of our people.

Ms. TLAIB. Madam Speaker, that was incredible. And obviously, many of us in the Congressional Progressive Caucus have fully supported so much of what Medicare for All stands for. I thank the gentlewoman from Washington for her leadership and courage for taking on such a bold move.

Madam Speaker, I am very honored to be here representing the community that raised me. I was raised in Southwest Detroit, in the 13th Congressional District. Growing up in Southwest Detroit, I actually thought that smell was normal, all the pollution that I kind of grew up in, all the truck traffic. As I got older, I realized it wasn't normal. It wasn't normal that so many of my neighbors were getting cancer or had respiratory issues. It wasn't normal that one of five children have asthma.

We have one of the highest—one of the worst air qualities in the State of Michigan in the 13th Congressional District; and it is the third poorest Congressional District in the country.

So the deadly consequences of being uninsured is real for my constituents at home; through no fault of their own, but for the fact that they live in communities that are polluted and communities that lack so much opportunity to be able to thrive.

So this is an important issue, not only to millions of Americans today, but to my residents; this need for universal healthcare. It is a topic that most, if not all of us in this Chamber were sent here to work on. It is a topic that is always on the minds of our residents every single day. It is a topic that is literally a life or death situation, and an issue that has bankrupted many of our families; an issue that we should not be worried about in this country.

We are the richest country on the planet, but the United States is the only industrialized country without universal healthcare.

Fifty thousand residents in my district are uninsured. This is why I am thrilled and excited that over 100 of my colleagues have signed on to sponsor the Medicare for All Act.

More than 30 million Americans are without access to healthcare right now without insurance, with an additional 40 million who cannot afford co-pays and the deductible.

Pharmaceutical companies make billions, Madam Speaker, in profits, while working Americans are forced to go through extraordinary measures to pay for care.

Just the other day, I heard a mother talk about losing her 6-year-old child, her little girl, because she couldn't afford insulin. This is why we need something bold, courageous, transformational, and that is supporting Medicare for All.

We spend the highest amount per capita in the world on healthcare. We need a better system for our constituents. We need Medicare for All.

This system is one that many more of my colleagues should get behind. It provides a system where our constituents will know that they are secure and getting healthcare that they need today. This is a system that will take away the worry of our constituents who have constant, day-in, day-out thinking about the cost of healthcare, and whether or not their current insurance even covers it.

It is really important to be clear about Medicare for All. One, it includes comprehensive coverage for primary care, for hospital, outpatient services, prescription drugs, reproductive health services, newborn care, long-term care services. This is so critical for my residents.

Constantly do I hear, day-in, day-out of families that are taking care of their parents and not having access to long-term care coverage.

It supports mental health and substance abuse treatment, laboratory and diagnostic services, and so much more.

Patients will have complete freedom to choose their doctors. I am going to say this again. Patients will have complete freedom, under the Medicare for All Act, to choose their doctors, hospitals, and other providers that they wish to see.

Long-term care, again, in support for our older Americans, our neighbors, and those with disabilities, will be covered.

Medicare for All will decrease the costs by reducing inefficiency; preventing healthcare corporations from overcharging; and increasing transparency in our system.

Medicare for All will also decrease prescription drug costs by allowing Medicare to finally negotiate our prices.

The legislation also preserves healthcare programs for our veterans and our Native Americans.

Healthcare is a right, Madam Speaker, not a privilege for the wealthy.

And not only is this the most incredible class, and not because I am part of it, but it really is, it is the largest incoming class since Watergate but, more importantly, it is the most diverse.

We not only ran because we wanted to be first, or we wanted to be diverse, we ran because we speak differently; we serve differently; and we are much more courageous than, I think, previous classes ever have been.

So, I am asking our colleagues to please stand up and support Medicare for All. Give it a chance. See the possibility of finally being able to provide for our constituents' universal healthcare.

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

#### AND STILL I RISE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of Jan-

uary 3, 2019, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN) is recognized for the remainder of the hour as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, and still I rise because I love my country. And I rise tonight on the Republican side of what we call the aisle.

I do so, Madam Speaker, because the issue that I will call to the attention of this august body is not an issue that I consider a Republican issue. I don't consider it a Democratic issue. I consider this an issue for the American people, past, present, and the future.

This is an issue that has plagued our country almost since its inception. It is an issue that we have avoided with intentionality, avoided because of discomfort, avoided through the years. But it is an issue that we have to address.

So I rise tonight, Madam Speaker, with love of country at heart on the Republican side of the aisle. And I rise to announce, as I have before, that we have to take up the question of impeachment.

I rise, Madam Speaker, to say this and to give some explanations. There are many things that are being misunderstood. I trust that I can bring some degree of clarity to the issues that are misunderstood.

And I know, Madam Speaker, as I rise, and understand that this will come to a vote in this House; I know that it will be a tough vote for many people. I understand. It will be a tough vote for a multiplicity of reasons. It will be a tough vote.

I know what tough votes are like, so I understand. I have people in my community, one example, members of the clergy that I have had to explain some very tough votes to. I have some that have, to this day, not agreed with the tough votes that I have had to take.

Tough votes. I came here to take tough votes. I came here to deal with tough issues, the difficult. I came to do what I believe should have been done long before now; but the opportunity to do it has presented itself since I arrived in Congress, so I take on this challenge. And I understand that this will be a tough vote.

Before I get to some of the nuances of the explanation that I would like to give, let me just tell you who I will be voting for when I take this tough vote. I will be voting for the slave mother who had a baby ripped out of her arms, taken to the auction block.

This is why I can relate to those mothers on the border who had their babies ripped out of their arms; and still, many have not been returned to their mothers, their fathers. I can relate because I understand the historical context. I will be voting for them.

Tough vote, but I will be voting for the slave father who never got to see his child because the mother and the child were taken away, auctioned off, sent to some distant plantation; never allowed the opportunity to enjoy the love that a father ought to with a



child. That is the historical context of why I will be voting and what I will be voting for.

I will also be voting for the elderly mother who was of African ancestry, who had to say “yes, ma’am” and “yes, sir” to the 3-year-old children of the master. At that time it would have been called the boss, but it was the master; had to say “yes, ma’am” and “yes, sir” to the children.

To the father, I will vote for the father who was called “boy,” demeaned in the presence of his son. I know. I saw that happen to my father. I know about that elderly mother. I saw it happen to her, the elderly black mother. I will be voting for them. They have come through the years to get me here. I won’t forget them.

I will be voting for the LGBTQ person who was fired for showing up at work and saying I married the love of my life, who happens to be the same sex as that person was. I am an ally of the LGBTQ community.

I am going to vote for those persons who have been discriminated against.

□ 1530

I will be voting for those who lost their lives in the Tree of Life synagogue, lost their lives to bigotry, hate.

I will be voting for those who lost their lives at the church in Charlotte.

I will be voting for the woman, who was a peaceful protestor, who lost her life in Charlottesville among the bigots, the KKK, the neo-Nazis, the xenophobes, the homophobes. I will be voting for her.

And here is why I will be voting for all of them: because these Articles of Impeachment will be about bigotry emanating from the Presidency—in policy, I might add, bigotry in policy. There is clear and convincing evidence that we have bigotry in policy. I will be voting for the people who are the victims.

To those who would tell me this is not something that the Congress ought to entertain, here is what I would say. I would say, if the Congress of the United States of America could, in 1868, impeach President Andrew Johnson for speaking ill of Congress, this Congress can impeach for bigotry in policy.

It is just a question of whether 218 people, assuming all are present, will vote for it. That is what it is. It is just a question of whether we have the will to do it. The way is before us.

Article II, Section 4, all of the noted constitutional scholars—maybe there is some exception; there probably is one someplace—have concluded that Article II, Section 4 not only allows a President to be impeached for criminality, a President can also be impeached for misdeeds.

As a matter of fact, those who desire to edify themselves can read Federalist 65, read the words of Hamilton and Madison and Jay. Read their words. Let them communicate with you through the vista of time.

You will find, when you read their writings, that they were prophetic in their thoughts, that they understood that there would be a time such as this, and they have given us the recipe for this time and the means by which we can take corrective action.

When you read, you will find that, without question, they indicate that impeachment is not something that will be done without some degree of turmoil, that impeachment will be something that will sometimes be along party lines. Party lines occur when impeachment is brought before this august body.

By the way, I brought impeachment twice before, so I am talking about something that has occurred and something that will occur again.

So impeachment is something that was anticipated. It is something that is a remedy that is constitutional, and I plan to bring that remedy before this body so that we may take a stand.

Dr. King was a great man and somebody I admire, and I talk about him quite regularly. Dr. King reminded us that the truest measure of the person is not where you stand in times of comfort and convenience, but where you stand in times of challenge and controversy. When you have hard votes to take, where do you stand?

I don’t believe bigotry should be a talking point, something that we use to get the base out at election time. We go out and we talk about, oh, how bad certain people are and we announce that they are racist, that they are bigots. I don’t think it ought to be a talking point. I think it should be an action item.

I am bringing the vote because it is going to be an action item for Congress at last. Again, it will be an action item, not just a talking point. I am going to put the moral imperative to vote for all of these people that I called to your attention and countless others above political expediency.

Political expediency allows us to push this issue to the next generation. Political expediency has allowed us to reach this point in our history where bigotry is rearing its ugly head. It is no longer covert, but it is now overt. We have reached this point in our history. So I refuse to except political expediency as a remedy.

Why not wait? Let’s defeat at the polls as opposed to impeach here in the House.

I don’t buy into that.

Now, there are many who would say let’s wait on the Mueller report. The Mueller report has nothing to do with bigotry. It most likely has to do with criminality associated with obstruction of justice, probably has something to do with emoluments, could have something to do with collusion, which is a layperson’s way of saying conspiracy. It could have something to do with all of these.

But I assure each and every person who is within the sound of my voice by whatever means, it will have nothing

to do with bigotry. So there is no need to wait for the Mueller report because the Mueller report won’t address bigotry. Those who would rather impeach for some other thing, then wait for the Mueller report.

By the way, I don’t plan to get in the way of the Mueller report, but I will say this: The Framers of the Constitution never intended for the executive branch to investigate itself, and that is what is going on.

The Framers of the Constitution understood the implications of having the executive branch investigate itself. One such implication that we see now is that the Mueller report may not be presented to Congress. It is going to the President before it gets to Congress.

The Framers never intended for the executive to investigate itself. That is the responsibility of Congress. That is why I brought Articles of Impeachment.

Pardon me for using a personal pronoun. My mother taught me better.

That is why I brought Articles of Impeachment in a previous Congress when we had Republicans in charge.

I am not going to be hypocritical and conclude now that Democrats are in charge, we don’t have the same duty, responsibility, and obligation. I am not that kind of guy. We are going to go on record. It will be a hard vote, but we are going to go on record.

Some would say: Well, how do you get the proof of the bigotry?

Easy answer—it appears to be a tough question. Easy answer: the same way we got the proof that we brought to the floor of the House for colleagues who had resolutions that were to condemn for bigoted statements. Same way, we get them from news sources.

We have plenty of empirical evidence to show us by clear and convincing evidence as a standard, or whatever standard the House uses, because there is no standard codified in the law for the House. But by whatever standard the House should use, there is plenty of empirical evidence to support bigotry in policy emanating from the Presidency, plenty of them: S---hole countries; and then you go out, by the way, where people of color happen to reside, I might add, and you go out and develop an immigration policy that adversely impacts those people of color, changing the law to adversely impact them.

Bigotry in policy? Ha. I talked about the babies at the border—people of color, I might add—separating them. We didn’t do that at Ellis Island. We didn’t do that when 12 million people came from Europe, Scandinavia. We didn’t do that. We didn’t separate them from their children. We didn’t have a flotilla out there to stop them. We didn’t try to build walls to keep them out. They came.

The people who are at the border, by the way, are exercising their rights under the law that we promulgated, that we, the United States of America,

put in place that says that they can come up and ask for asylum.

By the way, I do not contend that all who seek asylum should be granted asylum. I do think that the process, the law that we put in place, ought to be honored. And if we don't like the law, then we should change the law. There is plenty of opportunity to do so. There has been plenty of opportunity to do so. Change the law if you don't like the way we have decided to deal with these issues.

There is plenty of evidence that in the past we have accommodated persons who were trying to flee harm's way, bringing their children with them. When those persons were fleeing Castro's Cuba and traversed the shark-infested waters of the Gulf of Mexico—I say “shark-invested” because there are so many people who are saying: Well, we don't want them to do this because they can be harmed along the way.

We didn't say that about the people who were traversing the shark-infested waters of the Gulf of Mexico. We created a policy called wet foot, dry foot. One foot on dry land, and you had a pathway to citizenship. That was the policy of the United States of America, to accommodate.

I am not saying bring the world in. I am saying follow the law. It seems to me that is what we are all about. I believe in the law of the land that I live in and that I love. And I love my country.

So I want to assure persons that we will use the same standard of proof that we have been using on previous occasions.

Now, the next question: Impeachment is like voting to go to war. Casting a vote to impeach is comparable to casting a vote to go to war.

I visit the VA hospital annually, Madam Speaker, and I take flags to every veteran in that hospital. This year, we took 600 flags, and we needed more.

I would ask persons who believe that this is comparable to casting a vote to go to war, go to the place where you can see the price of freedom. Go to the place where you can see what the cost is, where you will see that it is not in silver and gold. Go to a VA hospital, a VA hospital where you will see persons who have lost an arm, lost a leg, no longer have vision. Many of them leave and don't return the way they left. Just go and see what the price of freedom is like.

They fight for our freedom. They are willing to give their lives for our freedom. That is what a vote for war is all about. Many don't ever return. They are the liberators. They accord us our freedom by putting their lives on the line, and it is that freedom that we have that allows us to vote to impeach.

Voting for impeachment is not a vote to go to war. You ask somebody who has lost a leg in those hospitals, talk to them. Oh, you may find one person whom you can use and try to equate

that to the rest of the world, but I assure you, those veterans don't consider impeachment comparable to voting to go to war.

I would also add this: There are those who believe that bigotry is something that the Senate won't take up.

If we use that line of logic, I shouldn't have gone to law school for fear of failure.

If we use that line of logic, we shouldn't have sent H.R. 1 over to the Senate, because it has been prognosticated that the Senate won't take it up in any meaningful way.

□ 1545

If we use that line of logic, there are bills that we send to the Senate quite regularly that we would not send because of a belief that the Senate won't take up these bills. So I don't buy into that logic. But I do believe that we should give the Senate an opportunity to do its job. It ought to have that opportunity.

Remember now, this is not about Mueller, this is about bigotry emanating from the Presidency. This is about having the country, by and through its representatives, go on record in terms of where we stand in this time of challenge and controversy as it relates to bigotry emanating from the Presidency.

Impeachment is something that we all should respect because it is constitutional. It is what the Constitution permits. It is also what I believe I have a duty to bring before the Congress. I will do so.

I don't guarantee more than one vote, and that is my vote. There are people who seem to think that if they can convince me, that the people who voted for it previously won't be voting for it this time. That the people who voted for it previously, they have changed their minds, they are going to be against you. They are not against me. I am not against them. I say to them, vote your conscience. Stand where your convictions are now.

But there are people who seem to think that by convincing me that I will be alone, that somehow this will cause me not to act. My dear brothers and sisters, how you have underestimated me. My dear brothers and sisters, I didn't come here to go along so that I could get along and move along. My dear brothers and sisters, you have grossly underestimated me.

If I stand alone and there is but one vote cast, I assure you that one vote will be cast and I will stand alone. I understand that in the eons to come, people will look back on this time and they will query what was wrong with them. What was wrong with them? How could they tolerate an unfit person holding the highest office in the land? How could they tolerate it? They will want to know what was wrong with them.

But I also know this. They will see that there was at least one person who stood on the ground of righteousness,

who put the moral imperative above political expediency.

And I will know also that the world will know where this country stands on the issue of bigotry. I didn't come here to manage bigotry. That is what we do. We always want to get back to bigotry as usual after it rears its ugly head. Let's put that head down and get back to bigotry as usual. Let it be covert, but not overt.

My guess is some people have said to the President: Mr. President, you can do all of these things without displaying your bigotry. They didn't say it that way, but they probably tried to convince him. You don't have to be raw. Do it the way others have done it and you will be appreciated.

I don't want to get back to bigotry as usual. I think we send a message to the world when we impeach a President for bigotry and policy, and that is what I am talking about: bigotry and policy. Not just his words—I don't think that we ought to have a bigot in office, but not just his words—but for what his words have been transformed into, what they have metamorphosed into: bigotry and policy.

I think that we would send a positive message to the world in terms of where we stand, and we would also send a message to many of the people in this country as to how much we care about them, those who suffer from bigotry on a daily basis. If you take out the head bigot, you will send a message to the bigots along the way at the lower end of the ladder.

Now, about the people who are suffering; they have elected us time and time again, many of them, on the belief that this time they are going to take up racism. This time they are going to take up homophobia, xenophobia, Islamophobia, anti-Semitism, and nativism. This time they are going to take up the issues that impact my life on a daily basis. Yes, it is still here. The glass ceiling exists because of bigotry. There is a glass ceiling. Yes, it is still here.

There are people who have jobs of color and they have to train persons of a different hue to take the job that they have and become their supervisor. It still happens. It is still occurring in the United States of America. The country I love, by the way.

You can love your country and want to see it improve. That is what all of these bills are about here. Everybody that is filing a bill wants to improve the country. That is all I want to do, too. The unfortunate circumstance for a good many people is I want to deal with an issue that we have, for too long, placed on the back burner of our contemporary agenda. I am going to place it on the front burner. There will be a vote.

How do you know there will be a vote? Well, the rules allow it. The rules allow any Member of this august body to come forward with a privileged resolution.

Now, if you want to change the rules, you can do so. Republicans didn't do it

when they were in control of the House. But you can do it. Let's let history show that because one Democrat wanted to bring articles of impeachment, that a Democratic Party did what a Republican Party did not do. Let history reflect that. Change the rules. You have to live with the history. I don't. I am going to be on the right side of the history.

Now, someone would say: But, Al, you will be on the wrong side of politics. Do you know what? The people that I know suffered, the people who lived and died so that I could have this opportunity, the people who found out what a billy club hits like, found out what a 90-pound German Shepherd bites like, found out what a high pressure water hose stings like, the people who lost loved ones to a cause so that I could have this opportunity, I don't know that they want me to be on the right side of politics. I think they want me to be on the right side of history. But I also believe that they want me to be on the right side of this moral issue of our time, and that is whether we will tolerate bigotry emanating from the Presidency.

So to everyone, understand this is not going to be about obstruction of justice. I came to the floor and called that to the attention of the country. There is evidence to move forward on obstruction of justice, but I choose not to do so. It is not going to be about conspiracy. There is evidence, but I choose not to do so.

This is going to be about bigotry, and it is going to be about where do you stand? The truest measure of the person is not where you stand in times of comfort and convenience, but where do you stand in times of challenge and controversy? Where do you stand when bigotry is the issue that you have to vote on?

And to all of my colleagues, I want you to know I love you. It doesn't matter what side of the aisle you are on. I respect you. And I only say to you, vote your conscience. Decide what side of bigotry, what side of history, what side of righteousness you are going to be on.

I know where I will stand. I will hold my head up high, notwithstanding all of the slings and arrows that are going to come against me. They are coming. They are going to demean me in every way. My mother probably wouldn't know who I am when they are done with me. I understand it.

Gandhi gave us the formula. First they ignore you. These are the words of Gandhi. Then they laugh at you. Then after they have ignored you and they have had a moment of laughter and they see that you are not going away, then they fight you. Then they demean you. I understand.

So do what you may. Say what you may. But I know, within me, that I am doing the right thing.

I know that Gandhi is right. He said that after they have ignored you, after they have laughed and had their mo-

ment of pleasure about it, then they fight you, but then, Gandhi reminded us, then you win.

I am prepared to suffer through until victory. I won't give out. To quote my good friend, Mr. LEWIS, who crossed the Edmund Pettus Bridge on Bloody Sunday, "I won't give up. I won't give in." I will do that which my ancestors call upon me to do. I pray to God that this House will vote its conscience. Vote your convictions.

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

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

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 56 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 14, 2019, at 9 a.m.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. CICILLINE (for himself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mrs. CRAIG, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, Ms. HILL of California, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. POCAN, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. ALLRED, Mrs. AXNE, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. BASS, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BERA, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BLUNT ROCH-ESTER, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. BRINDISI, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. CASE, Mr. CASTEN of Illinois, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. CISNEROS, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. COOPER, Mr. CORREA, Mr. COSTA, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. COX of California, Mr. CRIST, Mr. CROW, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. DEAN, Mr. DEFazio, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. DELGADO, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. DEUTCH, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. ESCOBAR, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. EVANS, Ms. FINKENAUER, Mrs. FLETCHER, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. FRANKEL, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. GOLDEN, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. HARDER

of California, Mr. HASTINGS, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. HECK, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. HIMES, Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma, Mr. HORSFORD, Ms. HOULAHAN, Mr. HOYER, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KATKO, Mr. KEATING, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KILMER, Mr. KIM, Mr. KIND, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. LAMB, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Ms. LEE of California, Mrs. LEE of Nevada, Mr. LEVIN of California, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. LUJÁN, Mrs. LURIA, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. MALINOWSKI, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MCADAMS, Mrs. MCBATH, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MENG, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, Mrs. MURPHY, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NEAL, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. NORCROSS, Ms. NORTON, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Ms. OMAR, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. PETERS, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. PHILLIPS, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. PLASKETT, Ms. PORTER, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RASKIN, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. ROSE of New York, Mr. ROUDA, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. SAN NICOLAS, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SCANLON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. SCHRAEDER, Ms. SCHRIER, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Ms. SHALALA, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. SHERRILL, Mr. SIREs, Ms. SLOTKIN, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. SOTO, Ms. SPANBERGER, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. STANTON, Ms. STEVENS, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. TITUS, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. TONKO, Mrs. TORRES of California, Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. TRONE, Ms. UNDERWOOD, Mr. VAN DREW, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. VELA, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. VIS-CLOSKY, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. WATERS, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. WELCH, Ms. WEXTON, Ms. WILD, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mr. YARMUTH):

H.R. 5. A bill to prohibit discrimination on the basis of sex, gender identity, and sexual orientation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Education and Labor, Financial Services, Oversight and Reform, and House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MCCAUL (for himself, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. YOHIO):

H.R. 1704. A bill to foster commercial relations with foreign countries and support

United States economic and business interests abroad in the conduct of foreign policy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ (for herself, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. COHEN, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. MOORE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SERRANO, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. DEAN, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. CUMMINGS, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. RUSH, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. FRANKEL, Mr. SOTO, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. TAKANO, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. LOFGREN, Mrs. MCBATH, Mr. CRIST, Mr. CISNEROS, Mr. NADLER, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. LEVIN of California, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. VARGAS, and Mr. KENNEDY):

H.R. 1705. A bill to prevent the purchase of ammunition by prohibited purchasers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself, Mr. KINZINGER, Mr. MCCAUL, and Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 1706. A bill to limit assistance for areas of Syria controlled by the Government of Syria or associated forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COURTNEY (for himself, Mr. AGUILAR, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. CISNEROS, Mr. COHEN, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. DEGETTE, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. FINKENAUER, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. HILL of California, Mr. HIMES, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KILMER, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. LEE of California, Mrs. LOWEY, Mrs. LURIA, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. MOORE, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. NORCROSS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. RASKIN, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Ms. SCANLON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. TITUS, Mr. TRONE, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. WELCH, Ms. WILD, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. PHILLIPS, and Ms. DELAURO):

H.R. 1707. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide for the refinancing of certain Federal student loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SCHIFF (for himself, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. BARRAGAN, Ms. HILL of California, and Mr. LOWENTHAL):

H.R. 1708. A bill to adjust the boundary of the Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area to include the Rim of the Valley Corridor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. TONKO (for himself, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. STEVENS, and Mr. LOWENTHAL):

H.R. 1709. A bill to amend the America COMPETES Act to establish certain scientific integrity policies for Federal agencies that fund, conduct, or oversee scientific research, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Ms. SEWELL of Alabama (for herself and Mr. UPTON):

H.R. 1710. A bill to require a study of the well-being of the United States automotive industry and stay the implementation of tariffs until the study is completed, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DOGGETT (for himself, Ms. BARRAGAN, Ms. BASS, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DEFazio, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. EVANS, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LAMB, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. LYNCH, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MOORE, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NORCROSS, Ms. NORTON, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. POCAN, Ms. PORTER, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SIRE, Mr. SOTO, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. TITUS, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. TONKO, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. WATERS, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. WELCH, Mr. YARMUTH, and Mr. LEWIS):

H.R. 1711. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for current year inclusion of net CFC tested income, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOGGETT (for himself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. COHEN, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DEFazio, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. LEE of

California, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MOORE, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NORTON, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. TONKO, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. WILD, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. LEWIS, and Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois):

H.R. 1712. A bill to end offshore corporate tax avoidance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SAN NICOLAS (for himself, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, and Mr. PALLONE):

H.R. 1713. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for a presumption of service-connection for certain veterans exposed to certain herbicides while serving in the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia (for himself, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. PRESSLEY, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. HAALAND, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. BEYER, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. EVANS, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. MOORE, Ms. OMAR, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. NADLER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. SERRANO, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. AMASH, Ms. BASS, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. CLAY, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. POCAN, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. WATERS, Ms. BARRAGAN, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. TONKO, Mr. DEFazio, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. COHEN, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Ms. LOFGREN):

H.R. 1714. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Defense to make certain limitations on the transfer of personal property to Federal and State agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KIND (for himself and Mr. WENSTRUP):

H.R. 1715. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the deductibility of charitable contributions to certain organizations for members of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. PINGREE (for herself, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. THOMPSON of California):

H.R. 1716. A bill to direct the Secretary of Commerce, acting through the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, to conduct coastal community vulnerability assessments related to ocean acidification, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. RYAN (for himself, Mr. MARSHALL, and Mr. MCEACHIN):

H.R. 1717. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish a new tax credit and grant program to stimulate investment and healthy nutrition options in food deserts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FOSTER (for himself and Mrs. RODGERS of Washington):

H.R. 1718. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for clarification regarding the children to whom entitlement to educational assistance may be transferred under the Post-9/11 Educational Assistance Program; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 1719. A bill to amend regulations relating to the eligibility of Federal employees, during a Government shutdown, for supplemental vision and dental coverage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. BUCK, and Mr. SENSENBRENNER):

H.R. 1720. A bill to amend the National Emergencies Act to provide that a national emergency declared by the President terminates 30 days after the declaration unless a joint resolution affirming such declaration is enacted into law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, and Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. BROWNLEY of California:

H.R. 1721. A bill to direct the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct reviews of certain budget requests of the President for the medical care accounts of the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. BROWNLEY of California:

H.R. 1722. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to require congressional approval before the appropriation of funds for the Department of Veterans Affairs major medical facility leases; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. JUDY CHU of California (for herself and Mr. MARSHALL):

H.R. 1723. A bill to amend the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 to make institutions of higher education eligible for assistance for community food projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts (for herself, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. LANDEVIN):

H.R. 1724. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to improve the financial aid process for homeless and foster care youth; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself and Mr. RATCLIFFE):

H.R. 1725. A bill to promote neutrality, simplicity, and fairness in the taxation of digital goods and digital services; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLINS of New York (for himself, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. LATTI, and Mr. YOUNG):

H.R. 1726. A bill to amend title 11 of the United States Code to include firearms in the types of property allowable under the alternative provision for exempting property from the estate; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONNOLLY (for himself, Mr. TONKO, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr.

PETERS, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. CARTWRIGHT):

H.R. 1727. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against income tax for qualified conservation contributions which include National Scenic Trails; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GRAVES of Missouri:

H.R. 1728. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to end speculation on the current cost of multilingual services provided by the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana:

H.R. 1729. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish the Office of Biometric Identity Management, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. HIGGINS of New York (for himself, Mr. GUTHRIE, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. KILMER, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. NADLER, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. OLSON, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. HURD of Texas, Mr. BERA, Mr. COLE, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. MCCAUL, and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 1730. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to require group and individual health insurance coverage and group health plans to provide for cost sharing for oral anticancer drugs on terms no less favorable than the cost sharing provided for anticancer medications administered by a health care provider; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HIMES (for himself, Mr. HECK, and Mr. MEEKS):

H.R. 1731. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to promote transparency in the oversight of cybersecurity risks at publicly traded companies; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota:

H.R. 1732. A bill to amend the Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 to specify that the waiver authority under such Act includes the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 and the Endangered Species Act of 1973 for purpose of construction of physical barriers along border, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MOULTON (for himself, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. KILMER, Mr. EMMER, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mrs. MURPHY, Mr. HIMES, Mr. RYAN, Mr. O'HALLERAN, and Mr. LAMB):

H.R. 1733. A bill to direct the Secretary of Labor to enter into contracts with industry intermediaries for purposes of promoting the development of and access to apprenticeships in the technology sector, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 1734. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to prohibit the use of questions on citizenship, nationality, or immigration status in any decennial census, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. PASCRELL (for himself, Mr. BEYER, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. GRIJALVA,

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SUOZZI, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. RYAN, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. COHEN, Mr. POCAN, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. NADLER, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. MOORE, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. COURTNEY, and Mr. DEFAZIO):

H.R. 1735. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the proper tax treatment of personal service income earned in pass-thru entities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. QUIGLEY (for himself, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. NORTON, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESSTER, Mr. POCAN, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. CASTEN of Illinois, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. COHEN, Mr. SOTO, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. LUJÁN, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. CLAY, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. SIREN, and Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 1736. A bill to require the disclosure of certain visitor access records; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. RICHMOND (for himself, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. MOORE, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. PRESSLEY, Ms. WILD, Mr. POCAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. COHEN, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. KENNEDY, and Ms. BONAMICI):

H.R. 1737. A bill to make housing more affordable, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, the Judiciary, Education and Labor, and Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 1738. A bill to protect children through eliminating visa loopholes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SMUCKER (for himself, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. BUDD, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mrs. LESKO, and Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee):

H.R. 1739. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against tax for charitable donations to nonprofit organizations providing workforce training and education scholarships to qualified elementary and secondary students; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMUCKER (for himself, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, and Mr. STEUBE):

H.R. 1740. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for an H-2C nonimmigrant classification, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Oversight and Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. STEFANIK (for herself, Mr. HURD of Texas, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. STIVERS):

H.R. 1741. A bill to reauthorize Department of Justice programs that combat violence against women, and for other purposes; to

the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Natural Resources, and Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TAKANO (for himself and Mr. COLLINS of New York):

H.R. 1742. A bill to make innovative technology loan guarantee support available for battery storage technologies; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TAKANO (for himself and Mr. COLLINS of New York):

H.R. 1743. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy to carry out an energy storage research program, loan program, and technical assistance and grant program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TAKANO (for himself and Mr. COLLINS of New York):

H.R. 1744. A bill to provide for the consideration of energy storage systems by electric utilities as part of a supply side resource process, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California:

H.R. 1745. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide that persons subject to firearm restraining orders and persons convicted of violent misdemeanors are prohibited from possessing firearms, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTZ:

H.R. 1746. A bill to direct the President to establish a unified United States Space Command; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WITTMAN (for himself and Mr. VEASEY):

H.R. 1747. A bill to encourage partnerships among public agencies and other interested persons to promote fish conservation; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H.R. 1748. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to provide for the minimum size of crews of freight trains, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. ZELDIN (for himself, Ms. STEFANIK, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. COLLINS of New York, and Mr. KING of New York):

H.R. 1749. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to make grants to State and local entities to carry out peer-to-peer mental health programs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ZELDIN (for himself, Ms. STEFANIK, and Mr. SUOZZI):

H.R. 1750. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to make permanent the authority of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide financial assistance for supportive services for very low-income veteran families in permanent housing; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself, Mr. MCCAUL, Mrs. LOWEY, and Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky):

H. Res. 220. A resolution recognizing the interdependence of diplomacy, development, and defense as critical to effective national security; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself and Mr. MCCAUL):

H. Res. 221. A resolution reaffirming the importance of upholding democracy, human rights, and the rule of law in United States foreign policy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself, Mr. MCCAUL, Ms. SLOTKIN, and Mr. WALTZ):

H. Res. 222. A resolution emphasizing the importance of alliances and partnerships; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. YOHIO, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi):

H. Res. 223. A resolution affirming the historical relationship between the United States and the Kingdom of Morocco, condemning the recent provocative actions of the Polisario Front and its foreign supporters, and encouraging efforts by the United Nations to reach a peaceful resolution of the Western Sahara conflict; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. BEATTY (for herself, Ms. NORTON, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. MOORE, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, and Mrs. LURIA):

H. Res. 224. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Deaf History Month; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FORTENBERRY (for himself, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, and Mr. BACON):

H. Res. 225. A resolution recognizing the 150th anniversary of the University of Nebraska-Lincoln; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. LOFGREN:

H. Res. 226. A resolution electing Members to the Joint Committee of Congress on the Library and the Joint Committee on Printing; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PRICE of North Carolina (for himself and Ms. MATSUI):

H. Res. 227. A resolution recognizing the contributions of AmeriCorps members and alumni to the lives of the people of the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. WATERS:

H. Res. 228. A resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on Financial Services in the One Hundred Sixteenth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mrs. DINGELL:

H.R. 1751. A bill for the relief of Emilio Gutiérrez Soto and Oscar Emilio Gutiérrez Soto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STAUBER:

H.R. 1752. A bill for the relief of David Beasley; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

## CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Ms. BASS:

H.R. 1686.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 1 of the United States Constitution, providing "All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives."

By Mr. CICILLINE:

H.R. 5.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8

By Mr. MCCAUL:

H.R. 1704.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ:

H.R. 1705.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. ENGEL:

H.R. 1706.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution.

By Mr. COURTNEY:

H.R. 1707.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. SCHIFF:

H.R. 1708.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Rim of the Valley Corridor Preservation Act is constitutionally authorized under and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, the Necessary and Proper Clause. Additionally, the Preamble to the Constitution provides support of the authority to enact legislation to promote the General Welfare.

By Mr. TONKO:

H.R. 1709.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause I

Provides Congress with the power to "lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises" in order to "provide for the . . . general Welfare of the United States."

By Ms. SEWELL of Alabama:

H.R. 1710.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. DOGETT:

H.R. 1711.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. DOGETT:

H.R. 1712.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SAN NICOLAS:

H.R. 1713.



Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia:

H.R. 1714.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

United States Constitution—Article 1 Section 8

By Mr. KIND:

H.R. 1715.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1

By Ms. PINGREE:

H.R. 1716.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 1717.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8: "To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof."

By Mr. FOSTER:

H.R. 1718.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 1719.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 18 allows Congress to make all laws "which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution" any of Congress's enumerated powers.

By Mr. BIGGS:

H.R. 1720.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Ms. BROWNLEY of California:

H.R. 1721.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

By Ms. BROWNLEY of California:

H.R. 1722.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

By Ms. JUDY CHU of California:

H.R. 1723.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8:

"The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States."

By Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts:

H.R. 1724.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution and Amendment XVI of the United States Constitution

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 1725.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. COLLINS of New York:

H.R. 1726.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1, of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CONNOLLY:

H.R. 1727.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of section 8 or article I of the Constitution, and clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. GRAVES of Missouri:

H.R. 1728.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 gives Congress the power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, and to pay the debts levied by such expenses.

By Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana:

H.R. 1729.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution

By Mr. HIGGINS of New York:

H.R. 1730.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. HIMES:

H.R. 1731.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, as this legislation provides for the general welfare of the United States.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota:

H.R. 1732.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

By Mr. MOULTON:

H.R. 1733.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 1734.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 3 of section 2 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. PASCRELL:

H.R. 1735.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. QUIGLEY:

H.R. 1736.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. RICHMOND:

H.R. 1737.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is introduced pursuant to the powers granted to Congress under the General Welfare Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 1), the Commerce Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 3), and the Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 18).

Further, this statement of constitutional authority is made for the sole purpose of compliance with clause 7 of Rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives and shall have no bearing on judicial review of the accompanying bill.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 1738.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 4

By Mr. SMUCKER:

H.R. 1739.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution

By Mr. SMUCKER:

H.R. 1740.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of section 8 of article 1 of the Constitution

By Ms. STEFANIK:

H.R. 1741.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. TAKANO:

H.R. 1742.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. TAKANO:

H.R. 1743.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. TAKANO:

H.R. 1744.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. THOMPSON of California:

H.R. 1745.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I

By Mr. WALTZ:

H.R. 1746.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. WITTMAN:

H.R. 1747.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 6 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. YOUNG:

H.R. 1748.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to Article 1, Section 8, clauses 3 and 18, Congress shall have the power: to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes; and to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

By Mr. ZELDIN:

H.R. 1749.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. ZELDIN:

H.R. 1750.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. DINGELL:

H.R. 1751.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.



Mr. STAUBER:

H.R. 1752.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

#### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 4: Mr. YARMUTH, Mrs. LEE of Nevada, Mr. KIM, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. ROSE of New York, Mr. PAYNE, Mrs. LURIA, and Mrs. AXNE.

H.R. 6: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. PHILLIPS, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. RYAN.

H.R. 45: Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 99: Mr. STAUBER.

H.R. 101: Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. SOTO, and Ms. SHALALA.

H.R. 125: Mr. COOPER.

H.R. 141: Ms. DELBENE.

H.R. 155: Mr. FULCHER.

H.R. 195: Ms. HAALAND.

H.R. 216: Mr. WATKINS, Mr. FLORES, Mr. LATTI, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. NORMAN, and Mr. COMER.

H.R. 218: Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. HICE of Georgia, Mr. GOODEN, and Mr. KINZINGER.

H.R. 230: Mr. SCHNEIDER and Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 257: Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. PORTER, and Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY.

H.R. 286: Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL.

H.R. 339: Mr. RYAN.

H.R. 366: Ms. JOHNSON of Texas and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 372: Mrs. LEE of Nevada and Ms. HAALAND.

H.R. 394: Ms. HAALAND.

H.R. 500: Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. MENG, Mr. MAST, Mr. TURNER, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. HUDSON.

H.R. 513: Mr. YOHIO, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. BABIN, Mr. DUNN, and Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee.

H.R. 530: Ms. OMAR.

H.R. 553: Mr. GOODEN, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Ms. FINKENAUER, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mr. LEVIN of California.

H.R. 555: Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. GALLAGHER, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, and Mr. LYNCH.

H.R. 597: Mr. RYAN, Ms. MOORE, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. COHEN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. SIREs, Ms. NORTON, Mr. KILMER, Mr. POCAN, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

H.R. 613: Ms. FINKENAUER.

H.R. 615: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 649: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 686: Mr. NORCROSS.

H.R. 689: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 693: Mr. HUFFMAN and Ms. SLOTKIN.

H.R. 716: Mr. TIPTON.

H.R. 728: Mr. MOULTON.

H.R. 748: Mr. GOLDEN.

H.R. 794: Mr. VEASEY and Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 806: Mr. LATTI and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.

H.R. 808: Mr. KIND.

H.R. 810: Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, and Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 830: Mr. BOST.

H.R. 854: Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 871: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. LEE of California, and Mr. HORSFORD.

H.R. 881: Mr. DESJARLAIS.

H.R. 884: Mr. POCAN, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. COOPER, and Ms. MOORE.

H.R. 945: Mr. RUSH, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Ms. FINKENAUER.

H.R. 991: Mr. CHABOT.

H.R. 997: Mr. BABIN.

H.R. 1024: Ms. PINGREE.

H.R. 1042: Ms. LOFGREN and Ms. SHALALA.

H.R. 1049: Ms. SLOTKIN and Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 1054: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 1073: Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. PAPPAS, and Mrs. LEE of Nevada.

H.R. 1078: Mr. KHANNA, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. HAALAND, and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 1098: Mr. SMUCKER.

H.R. 1108: Mr. MCADAMS, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Ms. STEFANIK.

H.R. 1135: Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.

H.R. 1137: Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 1154: Mr. STAUBER, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. NORTON, Mr. BOST, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. PAPPAS, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. FINKENAUER, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. DEGETTE, Mrs. LEE of Nevada, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. PERLMUTTER, and Mr. KHANNA.

H.R. 1155: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 1223: Mrs. LEE of Nevada.

H.R. 1225: Mr. LOESACK and Mr. PETERSON.

H.R. 1243: Mr. QUIGLEY and Ms. MENG.

H.R. 1255: Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. KILMER, Mr. TURNER, Mr. BRINDISI, and Mr. PAPPAS.

H.R. 1256: Mr. TURNER, Mr. BRINDISI, Mr. PAPPAS, and Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 1260: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 1297: Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 1309: Ms. MENG, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. SCANLON, and Mrs. CRAIG.

H.R. 1316: Ms. NORTON and Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 1320: Mr. NORMAN.

H.R. 1322: Mr. VAN DREW.

H.R. 1327: Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PERRY, Mr. PETERS, Ms. SLOTKIN, Mr. SOTO, Mr. RYAN, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mrs. MURPHY, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. LOESACK, Ms. TLAI, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. BERA, and Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY.

H.R. 1337: Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, and Mr. CASTEN of Illinois.

H.R. 1339: Mr. SPANO, Mr. WALDEN, and Mr. TIMMONS.

H.R. 1351: Ms. TITUS.

H.R. 1357: Mr. PERLMUTTER and Mr. LEWIS.

H.R. 1370: Mr. LEWIS and Ms. FINKENAUER.

H.R. 1374: Mr. TAYLOR and Mr. BRINDISI.

H.R. 1383: Mr. CISNEROS.

H.R. 1393: Ms. PINGREE and Mr. LEWIS.

H.R. 1432: Ms. BASS and Ms. MENG.

H.R. 1433: Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico, and Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 1435: Ms. MATSUI and Mr. THOMPSON of California.

H.R. 1450: Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, and Mr. COSTA.

H.R. 1466: Mr. BRINDISI.

H.R. 1497: Ms. FINKENAUER and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 1528: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 1542: Mr. TIPTON.

H.R. 1549: Ms. MOORE and Mr. LAMB.

H.R. 1551: Mr. KHANNA.

H.R. 1556: Mr. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 1560: Mr. CASE.

H.R. 1568: Mr. MAST and Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 1570: Mr. CRIST, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. WELCH, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. MARCHANT, and Mr. SMITH of Missouri.

H.R. 1585: Mrs. AXNE, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Ms. SHALALA, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. CISNEROS, Mr. CLAY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MCEACHIN, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Ms. DEAN, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. TITUS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. ROUDA, Mrs. LEE of Nevada, Ms. WEXTON, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. MENG, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. CASE, Ms. UNDERWOOD, Mr.

CICILLINE, Mr. HARDER of California, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. WILD, Mr. WELCH, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. HILL of California, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. OMAR, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. LYNCH, and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 1587: Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 1588: Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 1590: Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. MCCAU, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, and Mr. PALAZZO.

H.R. 1595: Mr. BERA, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. PETERS, Mr. STANTON, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HARDER of California, Mr. SAN NICOLAS, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. GOLDEN, and Mr. CASE.

H.R. 1597: Mr. WITTMAN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. POCAN, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. FUDGE, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. TITUS, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. DOGGETT.

H.R. 1598: Mr. CRENSHAW.

H.R. 1603: Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 1605: Mr. TAYLOR.

H.R. 1629: Ms. SCANLON.

H.R. 1630: Mr. COOPER.

H.R. 1643: Ms. MOORE and Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 1646: Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. ROUDA, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. LOESACK, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. GOLDEN, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Mr. PANETTA.

H.R. 1676: Mr. CASTEN of Illinois.

H.R. 1680: Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. HOLDING, and Mr. RUTHERFORD.

H.R. 1682: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. NADLER, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. PETERS, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 1684: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 1690: Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mrs. BUSTOS, Ms. LEE of California, and Ms. JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 1694: Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. BONAMICI, Mrs. CRAIG, Mr. CORREA, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, and Ms. JAYAPAL.

H.J. Res. 2: Mr. GARCIA of Illinois.

H.J. Res. 7: Ms. LOFGREN and Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.J. Res. 23: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.J. Res. 38: Mrs. CRAIG.

H. Con. Res. 24: Mr. CRIST, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. CICILLINE.

H. Res. 33: Mr. BERA.

H. Res. 54: Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. HILL of California, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. STAUBER, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. CISNEROS, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Mr. SCHIFF.

H. Res. 98: Mrs. LEE of Nevada.

H. Res. 107: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina and Mr. STEUBE.

H. Res. 119: Ms. FINKENAUER and Ms. MENG.

H. Res. 124: Ms. LEE of California, Mrs. MURPHY, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. VEASEY, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. KIM, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. VAN DREW, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. SCHRADER, and Mr. CASTEN of Illinois.

H. Res. 173: Mr. KIND and Mr. KENNEDY.

H. Res. 174: Mr. WALKER and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

H. Res. 177: Mr. STEUBE.

H. Res. 179: Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. BERA, Mr. NADLER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. COHEN, Mr. SERRANO, and Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H. Res. 190: Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H. Res. 209: Mr. COHEN and Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H. Res. 214: Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. RASKIN, Mr.  
MCGOVERN, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr.  
BANKS, and Ms. GABBARD.

**DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM  
PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS**

H.R. 1146: Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana.

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors  
were deleted from public bills and reso-  
lutions, as follows: