



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 165

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MARCH 28, 2019

No. 54

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: Merciful God, thank You for giving us another day.

Your care and wisdom are shown to us by the way You extend Your kingdom into our world down to the present day. Your Word reveals every aspect of Your saving plan. You accomplish Your designed purpose in and through the hearts of the faithful who respond to You.

Today, convert our minds and hearts that we may become the great Nation You hope us to be.

Help the Members of this people's House to seek Your presence in the midst of their busy lives. Animate them with Your spirit and help them to perform their appointed tasks to come to solutions that will redound to the benefit of our Nation.

May all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory.
Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

Mr. CROW. Madam Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from California (Mr. HARDER) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. HARDER of California 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

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to five requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

SALARY EQUALITY

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

Mr. HARDER of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today because it is absolutely absurd that in the year 2019, women are still paid less than men, 77 cents on the dollar compared to men, but it is even worse for women of color. Latina women make only 53 cents on the dollar.

That is why I was so proud to support the Paycheck Fairness Act, which included our amendment to specifically support women of color.

There are thousands of Latina women in my district who work hard day in, day out, only to be paid half what their male counterparts get. It hurts them, it hurts their families, and it hurts our Central Valley community.

This is an equality issue, but it is also an economic issue. In fact, almost a quarter of the families in the Central Valley have a woman as their breadwinner.

It is 2019. It is time that women, especially Latina women, are not left behind.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues in the Senate to take up this bill and make sure we are lifting up everyone in our communities.

CONGRESS MUST UPHOLD IDEA PROMISE

(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. Mr. Speaker, in the 1970s, Congress made a commitment to provide a free and appropriate education to students with disabilities.

While we have made tremendous progress, thanks to the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, we have also failed to fully fund the cost of special education that was promised by Congress at that point in time.

Congress promised to cover 40 percent of the extra cost of special education, but we have never come close to fulfilling that promise. In fact, current funding remains only at 14 percent of the targeted amount.

Mr. Speaker, that is shameful.

This means our students and schools suffer, it means that the programs will be cut, it means schools won't be able to recruit and retain qualified teachers, and above all else, it means that students with disabilities will not be able to succeed, not without the appropriate high-quality services they deserve.

That is why I proudly cosponsored the bipartisan IDEA Full Funding Act, which would mandate gradual increases in IDEA funding to reach that full commitment made by Congress of 40 percent by fiscal year 2029 and each subsequent fiscal year.

☐ 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.

H2889

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill and uphold the promise to provide students and schools with the resources they need.

HONORING THE LIFE OF JOHN BERSIA

(Mrs. MURPHY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the life and legacy of central Florida community leader, faculty member, and editorial writer, John Bersia, who recently passed away.

Born and raised in central Florida, John earned a bachelor's degree from the University of Central Florida as well as masters degrees from Georgetown University, American University, and the London School of Economics.

He then returned to our community to begin writing editorials for the Orlando Sentinel. There, he won a Pulitzer Prize for an editorial series that exposed the predatory lending practices of irresponsible payday lenders, leading to legislation that cracked down on that industry.

In 2001, he began teaching at the University of Central Florida, where he helped establish the Center for the Study of Human Trafficking and Modern Slavery. Throughout his career, he inspired his students to pursue a love of travel, new cultures, and humanity-focused work, but his passion spread beyond that campus.

He hosted a weekly TV show on WUCF and chaired different institutions, including the Global Connections Foundation, the World Affairs Council of Central Florida, and the Orlando Area Committee on Foreign Relations.

John sought to broaden people's connections to the outside world while helping us see that global issues can also be local.

For that and much more, he will be truly missed.

CONGRATULATING VINCENNES UNIVERSITY MEN'S BASKETBALL CHAMPIONS

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

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the accomplishment of an outstanding group of young men from Vincennes University in Indiana.

For the first time since 1972 and the fourth time in school history, the Vincennes University Trailblazers captured the National Junior College Athletic Association Men's Basketball Championship.

Led by coach Todd Franklin, the Blazers had a benchmark year, ending the season with a record of 34-2 and defeating Ranger College in the championship game by a score of 87-77.

The team's standout in the finals was freshman forward Kevin Osawe, who scored 22 points and had ten rebounds,

earning the tournament's most valuable player honors.

Athletics provide a set of skills that will be with these young men for the rest of their lives.

The commitment and follow-through required to come together as a team and win a national championship are rare and should be commended.

Congratulations to the Vincennes University Blazers men's basketball team on a job well done, and good luck next year.

HONORING THE LIFE OF STEVE CERNAK

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

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to mourn the passing of a dear friend and remarkable professional, Steve Cernak.

As CEO of Port Everglades in Broward County, Florida, Steve oversaw the largest expansion in the port's history and helped Port Everglades grow to become the number one cruise port in the country.

He had a vision for the port, and he was an incredibly dedicated public servant.

Steve loved his work, community, and family.

He was a loving husband, father, and grandfather, and took any opportunity to share how proud he was of his grandchildren, often sharing photos of them before meetings, to which I can personally attest.

His professionalism was unmatched, and I am grateful for his unwavering commitment to keeping Americans safe.

Although Steve is no longer with us, his legacy will live on through the institution he helped propel into the leading port in our Nation.

Steve Cernak was a selfless, compassionate, and tireless public servant, and he will be profoundly missed, but never forgotten.

HONORING ROCK BRIDGE HIGH SCHOOL BOYS BASKETBALL TEAM

(Mrs. HARTZLER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the Rock Bridge High School Bruins boys basketball team of Columbia, Missouri, for winning the Missouri State Championship Class 5 Basketball Championship in Springfield.

In winning the school's first boys basketball state title, the Bruins exhibited a never-say-die attitude, staging a comeback after being down by eight points heading into the final quarter against Christian Brothers College High School.

The Bruins came close last year, bowing out in the semi-finals, but this year's team would not be denied.

The long hours of practice paid off, as Rock Bridge came roaring back in the

final quarter to win 63-59 and bring home the championship.

This season finale is a testament to the great coaching of Jim Scanlon and the dedication and hard work of all the players, whose determination and teamwork brought home the victory.

So congratulations to the Rock Bridge High School Bruins, state champs from Missouri's Fourth District. We are proud of you and we wish you continued success.

DOUGLAS COUNTY, COLORADO: THE HEALTHIEST COMMUNITY IN THE UNITED STATES

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

Mr. CROW. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate Douglas County, Colorado, being named the healthiest community in the United States by U.S. News and World Report.

With all due respect to all of my colleagues in this body, there is no State like Colorado. We are home to 300 days of sunshine, the Rocky Mountains, and the best breweries and skiing in the country. And it should be no surprise that it helped make us the seventh fastest growing State in the country.

But this year we have added another accomplishment to our list: community health.

With seven of America's top 25 healthiest communities in Colorado, Douglas County tops that list. Home to countless walking trails, community-building events, 63,000 acres of protected land, and innovative infrastructure, Douglas County is truly a great place to live.

Mr. Speaker, I welcome my colleagues to Douglas County and the rest of our incredible district to see for themselves what makes The Centennial State so great.

THE AMERICAN PEOPLE DESERVE THE TRUTH

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, thus far, I have released four transcripts of interviews from the Judiciary Committee into the apparent wrongdoing at the FBI and the Justice Department.

Today, I release the fifth.

The American people deserve transparency, they deserve to know what transpired at the highest levels of the FBI, and the origin of the probe into President Trump's campaign.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I request the link, douglascollins.house.gov/nellieohr be placed in the RECORD so the American people can review the transcript of Nellie Ohr's interview.

I will continue to work to release as many transcripts as possible.

The American people deserve the truth.

□ 0915

DISPARITIES IN PAY

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

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about the disparities in pay between men and women in this country.

Today, women are paid only 80 cents for every dollar paid to men, resulting in a gap of \$10,169 each year. The gap exists in every State, regardless of geography, occupation, education, or work patterns.

This disparity is worse for women of color. On average, Hispanic women are typically paid 53 cents; Native American women, 58 cents; and Black women, 61 cents for every dollar paid to White, non-Hispanic men.

The Paycheck Fairness Act would help to close these punishing gaps by eliminating loopholes in the Equal Pay Act.

The wage gap between America's men and women denies women \$900 billion in income each year. Across the country, this disparity directly affects children. In my district of the Virgin Islands, 32 percent of families with children live in poverty. Of that number, 76 percent are headed by a single mother.

We know that families who live in poverty have higher rates of instability and that children living in poverty perform worse in school than their counterparts. By paying each woman the \$10,000 they lose per annum to the wage gap, we can do the right thing, and the fiscally responsible thing, and raise millions of families above the poverty line.

OPPOSING BAN ON TRANSGENDER MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 252, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 124) expressing opposition to banning service in the Armed Forces by openly transgender individuals, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia). Pursuant to House Resolution 252, the resolution is considered read.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 124

Whereas, on July 26, 2017, President Trump announced via Twitter that the United States Government would reverse the existing policy of allowing transgender servicemembers to serve openly in order to implement a ban on transgender people from serving in the Armed Forces;

Whereas transgender servicemembers have served openly since 2016, bravely defending our Nation with distinction while preserving unit cohesion and contributing to military readiness;

Whereas a 2016 study by the RAND Corporation found that allowing transgender

Americans to serve openly in the Armed Forces would "have minimal impact on readiness and health care costs" and "little or no impact on unit cohesion, operational effectiveness or readiness";

Whereas thousands of transgender Americans currently serve actively in the Armed Forces and in the Reserves throughout all branches and military occupational specialties;

Whereas the American Medical Association, the American Psychological Association, the American Psychiatric Association, and three former military Surgeons General each have affirmed the medical efficacy of transition-related care and have expressed opposition to President Trump's discriminatory ban;

Whereas the claims attempting to justify President Trump's ban are based on flawed scientific and medical assertions;

Whereas the Department of Defense report from 2018 falsely asserts there is "considerable scientific uncertainty" regarding the efficacy of transition-related care;

Whereas there is a global medical consensus that such care is effective, safe, and reliable;

Whereas the Department of Defense has failed to provide evidence the existing policy has impaired morale, unit readiness, or unit cohesion;

Whereas all five military Chiefs of Staff have testified publicly that the existing policy has had no adverse effect on military readiness;

Whereas, on August 1, 2017, fifty-six retired generals and admirals released a statement affirming, "This proposed ban, if implemented, would cause significant disruptions, deprive the military of mission-critical talent, and compromise the integrity of transgender troops who would be forced to live a lie, as well as non-transgender peers who would be forced to choose between reporting their comrades or disobeying policy";

Whereas at least 18 nations allow transgender people to serve openly and effectively in their armed forces;

Whereas transgender members of the Armed Forces have fought in defense of our freedoms with honor and distinction since our Nation's founding and have been bestowed with such commendations and awards as the Bronze Star and Purple Heart for their courage and sacrifices;

Whereas President Trump's ban on transgender members of the Armed Forces targets and stigmatizes a whole class of people; and

Whereas President Trump's ban on transgender members of the Armed Forces would affect all transgender members of the Armed Forces and force them to serve under a policy that stigmatizes and devalues their contributions to our Nation's defense: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) strongly opposes President Trump's discriminatory ban on transgender members of the Armed Forces;

(2) rejects the flawed scientific and medical claims upon which it is based; and

(3) strongly urges the Department of Defense to not reinstate President Trump's ban on transgender members of the Armed Forces and to maintain an inclusive policy allowing qualified transgender Americans to enlist and serve in the Armed Forces.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The resolution shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services.

The gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H. Res. 124.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution is very straightforward. The Department of Defense, in cooperation with the White House, recently issued a policy, which will be implemented in a couple weeks, that would, effectively, bar transgender people from being able to serve in the military. We have this resolution to reject that policy. It is that simple and that straightforward.

We believe the policy that the Pentagon is putting forward is unfair, based on ignorance and bigotry, and will actually harm national security. We ask the House, in this resolution, to express the sense of Congress that we oppose this policy from the Pentagon.

Again, what this policy is primarily based on is ignorance and bias against the transgender community. The policies being implemented will make it virtually impossible for them to serve in the military. This is unfair discrimination, and it is also harmful to national security.

The Army last year failed to meet its recruitment quotas. It is a constant challenge in the military to find the people who have the character, the capability, and the ability to serve in our military.

We have the best military in the history of the world. We need high-qualified people to serve. To single out a particular group of people, to discriminate against them and say that they cannot serve, not because they can't meet the qualifications—it is not because they can't run fast enough or shoot straight enough or work hard enough—to be a member of the military, but because of something that literally has nothing to do with their ability to do their job, is bad for national security and is unfair discrimination.

We have heard a lot from people about how difficult it is for unit cohesion to have transgender people in the military, a whole bunch of arguments. The only problem with that is the military leaders who have actually been responsible for this—and I am just going to read one quote. There are many, and some of my colleagues will say it as well.

Army Chief of Staff Milley, who is about to become the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, last year said

there are precisely zero reports of issues of cohesion, discipline, or morale as a result of transgender people serving.

There is no issue in terms of readiness, despite what the proponents of this policy will say. It is discrimination, pure and simple, and it is unnecessary.

We also hear opponents say that the policy doesn't ban transgender people from serving and, under certain circumstances, they can. But those circumstances, as described, are so limiting and restricting. Worst of all, as I will explain in a minute, in certain parts, it allows them to serve only if they are willing to deny who they are. That amounts to a ban. If you cannot be who you are and serve in the military, then that is a choice nobody should have to make.

Let's start with the fact that, right now, under this policy, anyone who wants to join the military, if they have transitioned to a different gender, either gone through the surgery or began hormone therapy, this ban says they cannot join. Again, this doesn't say anything about their fitness to serve, in terms of their physical ability or anything. If they have simply had transition surgery or gone through hormone therapy, they are barred from serving.

Worse than that, the people who are already in the military who are transgender are, to a certain extent, grandfathered in. In many different places throughout this policy, it says over and over again that they have to serve in their biological sex. A lot of people go: Well, what the heck does that mean? That gets at the essence, at the very heart, of what it means to be transgender.

This is not something that is just in people's minds. It is a physiological condition that people are born into in which they decide they are more comfortable being in the opposite gender. That is one of the cornerstone difficulties that all these people have to go through: Who am I? What gender do I want to be?

Working with therapists and working with other people, they make that determination. They decide: I know who I am, and this is who I am going to be.

This policy now says: Sorry, we don't care what your doctor says. You cannot be the gender that you know that you are. You have to deny who you are in order to stay in the military.

In many places throughout this policy, that is a consistent theme and points out what is so totally and completely wrong about this policy.

You have also heard, undoubtedly, that there are higher healthcare costs for people who are transgender. There are a number of studies out that show that actually isn't true. Yes, healthcare expense is part of people who serve in the military, and, regrettably, people who join the military have all manner of different healthcare expenses that we do have to pick up,

but there is no evidence that this has an increased cost over an average servicemember.

Furthermore, we know that the purpose of this policy is not about cost because one of the first points that I made was about how they are not now going to be allowed to join the military even if they have already gone through transition surgery or hormone therapy. So even if they are all done with that, and there is no additional medical cost to come, this policy says that they are barred and banned from joining the military.

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself an additional 15 seconds.

It makes it perfectly clear that this policy is unfair discrimination based on bigotry and ignorance, and I urge this House to reject it.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, this resolution is a sense of Congress resolution that makes no change whatsoever in law or policy. It is a messaging bill rather than legislation that actually does something on a substantive issue.

So, one may ask, why bother opposing a bill that doesn't do anything? I have a couple answers.

Part of the answer, to me, is that we normally do not bring isolated issues in the jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committee to the floor.

Part of the reason that a national defense authorization bill has been signed into law every year for 58 straight years under Presidents of both parties and Congresses of both parties is that we try to look at national security as a whole as it relates to the Department of Defense. There have been a few isolated instances where something needed immediate attention, but, generally, we try to look at the whole, not bring isolated issues to the floor. I worry that doing so, even with a messaging bill, undermines that bipartisan approach that has been so successful.

Another part of the reason, Mr. Speaker, is that we also normally try to keep our troops above and beyond politics. Bringing a messaging bill that does nothing to law or policy also threatens to undermine that, and I worry about that.

On its face, the resolution, the messaging bill that is before us, includes a number of statements that are just flat wrong. It says that President Trump reversed the prior policy on transgender individuals in a tweet. In fact, well before any Presidential tweet, Secretary of Defense Mattis had put a delay on implementation of the policy that had previously been announced so that there could be a 6-month review. There was a 6-month review with experts, with uniformed and civilian people from all the services,

with medical experts, with a whole variety of folks.

It is serious and thoughtful, despite some of the characterizations that have been made from time to time. I recommend that Members actually read it, because I think they will be impressed. They may not agree with all of the recommendations, but they will see the serious and thoughtful approach that the Department took to this issue.

As a result of this review, the previous policy was modified. It didn't go back to the way it was. Again, those details are in the report.

The resolution before us today says that the Mattis policy is a ban. It is not. The D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals found, on January 4, 2019, that it is factually inaccurate to call it a blanket ban. In reversing the lower court, the court of appeals said: "The district court made an erroneous finding that the Mattis plan was the equivalent of a blanket ban on transgender service."

This resolution before us says that there is a global medical consensus on transgender care. But the World Professional Association for Transgender Health says that they offer flexible clinical guidelines that cannot possibly reflect all the differences and situations which exist.

Mr. Speaker, turning to the substance of the matter for a second, to me, the heart of the issue is contained in the very first sentence to the Department report, which was issued in February 2018. The first sentence says: "It is a bedrock principle of the Department of Defense that any eligible individual who can meet the high standards for military service without special accommodations should be permitted to serve."

Any eligible individual who can meet the standards without special accommodation should be permitted to serve. That is what I believe, Mr. Speaker. I think that is what this policy attempts to achieve.

Now, it is a fair point to say it went too far this way or it didn't go far enough this way. We can have those substantive, serious debates at an appropriate time and place. But a messaging bill is not going to get that job done.

I would say, finally, Mr. Speaker, that our committee heard the day before yesterday a reminder that only 29 percent of Americans aged 17 to 25 are eligible for military service. Only 29 percent meet the physical, mental, and legal requirements to be eligible for military service, even if they want to. That means 71 percent are not eligible, for whatever reason.

There could be, and maybe there should be, a debate that the standards are too high, that we need to lower the standards, that we need to make some changes in the standards so that more people are eligible. But the point is, our view of military service is that anyone who meets those standards should be allowed to serve. If someone

cannot meet those standards, for whatever reason, through no fault of their own, then they are not able to serve. They can serve in a different way, but not in military service.

□ 0930

I think, again, Mr. Speaker, if we were to really be discussing the substance of the issue rather than a messaging bill, then we could talk about the high standards for military service without special accommodation and there would be a substantive discussion. That is not what we are doing today. It is a messaging bill, and that is too bad because there are serious issues that need to be discussed.

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, just briefly, I will agree, this is a messaging bill, and the message is this is a bad policy. That is what the House is doing.

I will also agree that, when it comes to crafting the right policy in this area, it should be done in committee, and it will be done in committee. That is why we didn't bring that out here on the floor.

But I think it is important for the House of Representatives to make it clear how wrong we think this policy is.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY).

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, equal has always been our Nation's North Star.

Endowed by our creator, inscribed by Jefferson in our Declaration of Independence, engraved above the doors to the highest court in our land, codified in our Constitution after a war tore our country apart, it is that pursuit of equality, that journey for a more perfect Union, that sets America apart.

At times, we have stumbled. We have enslaved men, women, and children because of the color of their skin. We have segregated those same families in the first breaths of their freedom.

We have stigmatized fellow Americans based on their race, their ancestry, their god, the nation of their birth, the hand that they hold, and their very identity.

Some willing to die for our freedom fought wars only to meet a government that offered them a handshake and a return to second-class citizenship.

Today, this House has a chance to not repeat the mistakes of our past, to move one step closer to that sacred promise by telling brave trans men and women in uniform that they cannot be banned from military service because of who they are—because that is the very foundation for this policy: targeted discrimination against transgender Americans.

Supporters will say otherwise. It is about unit cohesion, they say—except for the fact that the five chiefs of staff for the military branches have testified that they are aware of exactly zero in-

stances of a transgender servicemember negatively impacting discipline or morale.

It will degrade our military, they say—except that 56 retired generals and flag officers told us that it is the ban that would degrade readiness, “even more than the failed Don't Ask, Don't Tell policy” did.

It is science, they say—except that the Department of Defense relied on data nearly half a century old and ignored plenty of other studies.

Just ask the American Medical Association, the American Psychology Association, the American Psychiatric Association.

It is about cost, they say—except that the military spends ten times more annually on erectile dysfunction medication than we have on trans-related care in the past 3 years combined.

It is not a ban, they say. Ask any one of the brave transgender servicemembers or veterans in the gallery today exactly what this ban means.

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Massachusetts an additional 1 minute.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, in a country that celebrates freedom, this policy tells our servicemembers that they do not have the freedom to be who they are. Where is the freedom in that?

Mr. Speaker, I ask all Members of the House to support this resolution.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER).

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, let me tell you about a sharp, young patriot from my district.

She worked hard, earned straight A's, and was accepted into law school to join the JAG Corps. She, however, was denied entry into the military because she had bunions on her feet.

She is an amazing woman and a long-distance runner, but DOD's policy was clear that, due to the risk of future surgery, she could potentially be temporarily undeployable and, so, was denied entrance into military service. She did not meet the physical-mental-medical standards.

Another constituent was denied service because he had asthma. He, too, wanted to serve his country, but the health risk outweighed the benefits to the military. He did not meet the physical-mental-medical standards.

DOD's military exception standards state:

Individuals must be free of medical conditions or physical defects that may require excessive time lost from duty for necessary treatment or hospitalization.

Our all-volunteer military is the greatest military force in the world, and we must allow it—we must allow it—to make the best medical and military judgment about what medical conditions should qualify or disqualify an individual from serving. We should not carve out exceptions for an entire population.

Military service is a privilege, not a right. That is why Secretary Mattis reviewed and issued a new policy on transgender service and the medical condition of gender dysphoria.

The policy is not a ban, and it allows transgender servicemembers to serve in their biological sex. The Mattis policy does not kick anyone out of the military for being transgender, nor does it give preferential treatment to transgender persons. All persons, unless grandfathered or granted a waiver, must serve in their birth gender.

It is a fair policy, allowing transgender individuals to serve openly as long as they are willing to serve in their biological sex and they can meet the medical behavioral standards.

This resolution we are voting on today is riddled with inaccuracies. First, as I just stated, the policy is not a ban.

Second, it claims there is a global medical consensus that transgender care is effective, safe, and reliable. That is not true. RAND, the Mayo Clinic, CMS, and others have all determined that there is not enough quality evidence to be able to say that. And there are valid concerns.

There are costs as well. The Department of Defense announced already that they have spent \$8 million on those individuals who have identified as transgender last year, and that money has been spent on psychotherapy, on sex change operations. That is money that could have been spent on bullets, body armor for our troops.

Third, the resolution claims there is not an adverse effect on military readiness. This is false. The individual readiness of those undergoing treatment for gender dysphoria will be impacted. It takes over 260 days just to recover from the surgery.

Individual readiness directly impacts the readiness of our forces, so the diagnosis and treatment for transgender personnel takes them away from their jobs for an indeterminate amount of time. This lost deployment time means someone else will have to step forward and go in their place. This is unfair.

The military has valid reasons for excluding people with certain medical conditions from service. It is not the job of Congress to dictate what medical conditions the military should accept.

We should not degrade the efficiency and lethality of our Armed Forces. This resolution is riddled with false claims, and I urge my colleagues to oppose its passage.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the Speaker of the House.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairman for yielding time and, really, for his leadership on this very important issue as to who we are as a nation, how we honor our oath to protect and defend the American people, and, in doing so, recognizing the contribution of all who want

to serve our country. I thank the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) for his leadership.

I also acknowledge the leadership of our colleague JOE KENNEDY, sponsor of this legislation, for his relentless leadership and his forming and chairmanship of the Transgender Caucus that has been so important in making clear, in our policy, that we respect the dignity and worth of every person.

Mr. Speaker, the men and women who step forward to serve in the U.S. military are patriots, all of them, people of great strength and courage whose sacrifice keeps us safe. We owe those heroes our most humbled gratitude and our most steadfast support, and I want to thank our trans friends for their service, their courage, their patriotism in serving our country.

Instead of honoring their service, the President continues to insist on his cruel transgender servicemember ban. This is an act of cruelty.

Let us all salute, again, Congressman JOE KENNEDY, a champion for equality, fairness, and dignity in this Congress, for his firm, moral leadership on this resolution to oppose the President's bigoted ban.

The resolution that our distinguished chairman, Mr. SMITH, and our colleague, JOE KENNEDY, are putting forth is bipartisan because protecting transgender servicemembers is a matter of patriotism and it transcends politics.

The President's ban, as I said, is cruel and arbitrary, a decision designed to humiliate the transgender Americans who are risking and giving their lives for the United States of America.

There is no moral justification for this ban, which violates every value of our American democracy and betrays our fundamental belief in fairness, dignity, and respect.

There is no medical justification for this ban, which the American Medical Association, the American Psychological Association, and the American Psychiatric Association all oppose.

And there is no military justification for this ban which would undermine our military readiness and make America less strong and safe, and that is according to our own military.

After the President first unleashed his ban, 56 retired generals and flag officers issued a statement asserting that the ban "would cause significant disruptions, deprive the military of mission-critical talent, and compromise the integrity of transgender troops who would be forced to live a lie, as well as non-transgender peers who are forced to choose between reporting their comrades or disobeying policy. As a result," they go on to say, "the proposed ban would degrade readiness even more than the failed Don't Ask, Don't Tell policy."

Other military leaders have spoken out to denounce this ban: Former Joint Chief of Staff, Mike Mullen; Army Chief of Staff, General Mark Milley; Commandant of the United States

Coast Guard, Karl Schultz; Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Jon Richardson; Commandant of the Marine Corps, General Robert Neller.

Yet the President has chosen to ignore the expertise of these military leaders, making clear that prejudice, not patriotism, drives his decisions.

The President's ban, again, is cruel. No one with the strength and bravery to serve in the U.S. military should be turned away because of who they are.

The House will continue to fight this discriminatory action, which has no place in our country. We will never allow hate and prejudice to dictate our national security. I hope we have a resounding "yes" vote to reject the President's ban today.

Again, I thank the distinguished chairman, Mr. SMITH, and our colleague JOE KENNEDY for his leadership and courage.

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry, at some point someone has got to tell me what "engaging in personalities" means. I have served in this body for a long time. I still don't know what that means.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS).

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in solidarity with our transgender servicemembers and to stand against President Trump's proposed ban of transgender people serving in the military.

Transgender troops have been serving openly since 2016—at home, overseas, and in combat zones—without incident.

□ 0945

When I met with transgender servicemembers last month, I was impressed to learn that by serving openly—I want to make a note of that—by serving openly, the quality of their service improved, and, in fact, the obstacles—and there are many obstacles, Mr. Speaker—the obstacles they have overcome informed their greater ability to do their job. Their impressive records speak for themselves, and there is no doubt that each of the servicemembers I met with have served their country with distinction.

As already stated, this ban is blatant discrimination poorly disguised as concerns over readiness, unit cohesion, and medical costs associated with transitioning. We already know that there have been zero reports of issues regarding unit morale or cohesion since the ban was lifted in 2016, a fact that has been supported by the chief of staff of every service. The cost of medically transitioning has also been proven to have minimal impact on the military's healthcare budget.

This administration is resorting to misinformation; misinformation to exclude capable, qualified people from service to their country.

At a time when the Army is failing to meet recruitment goals, and the Navy and Air Force opted to lower their quota in order to reach their own recruitment goals, we cannot be turning away dedicated, able-bodied recruits simply because they happen to be transgender.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER).

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support this resolution with vigor.

Last month, the Subcommittee on Military Personnel within the Armed Services Committee held a hearing. It was the first time in the history of this Congress that five transgender members of the military were allowed to testify.

Four of them are trans female. One of them is trans male. All five of them have served our country with distinction. All five of them have served more than 12 years in the military. One of them is a West Point graduate. All of them have served either in Iraq, Afghanistan, multiple deployments, and in submarine service.

To the servicemember, all I saw was pride to be in the military, pride to serve their country, pride to put themselves on the line.

The testimony from the administration was like a twisted pretzel. They offered a weak and dithering defense of their cruel policy. Two things became clear at this hearing:

First, the administration policy is a ban. Make no mistake about it. Those who are in the military and serving as transgender can continue to do so. No one can come into the military who is transgender. If you are in the military and transgender and have not identified, you cannot identify. So it is a ban.

Captain Alivia Stehlik put it best:

Currently, soldiers are allowed to seek care no matter what, trans related or not. If the policy changes, soldiers will no longer be able to seek care, because if you say, I am trans and get a diagnosis of gender dysphoria, regardless of your job performance, you are ineligible and will be terminated.

The policy is a solution in search of a problem. Worse, it discriminates against our servicemembers.

Second, the hearing demonstrated resoundingly that the last 2½ years of open service have been unequivocally successful.

Mr. Speaker, let me say, transgender servicemembers have been there for us. It is time for us to be there for them.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the distinguished majority leader.

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding. I thank the ranking member for his service, and his leadership as chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to reject the President's executive order and to support this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the resolution introduced by my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY). His resolution simply states what millions and millions of Americans know to be true, that the Trump administration's ban on transgender people serving their country in our military is discriminatory. It reflects bias. It reflects prejudice. Indeed, it reflects bigotry.

Martin Luther King tried to teach us that what we said in the Declaration of Independence, we ought to live out. He said that all of us—and, certainly, he would have included women as we did yesterday in our Paycheck Fairness Act—are created equal in the image of God.

Martin Luther King said that we ought to judge one another on the content of our character. The President's order does not do that. The President's order is based upon a prejudiced view of somebody because of a distinction that is not the content of their character nor the quality of their performance.

I was proud to be a sponsor of and brought to this floor as majority leader, the repeal of the Don't Ask, Don't Tell legislation. That has enhanced our national security, not diminished it.

The President's resolution states what millions and millions of Americans know to be true: that the Trump administration's ban on transgender people serving their country in our military is discriminatory; that it denigrates the service of patriotic Americans. That is a facet of their character. They are patriotic, and they want to serve, and the service judges them able to do so.

This resolution, millions of Americans understand, undermines our national defense at a time of serious global threats. This resolution rightfully calls on the Trump administration not to implement such a ban on April 12. To do so would be a blow to our country and the principles it represents.

Let me remind my colleagues that there was a time when we said African Americans ought not to serve with White Americans together because that would undermine morale and undermine the security of our country. That was a manifestation of prejudice and bigotry, not of intellectual honesty, content of character.

Have we not yet learned that lesson? Are we not big enough to live out the premise that all men and women are created equal? This resolution seeks to redeem the best of America's principles, not the worst of our discriminatory past.

I was proud to bring legislation to the floor as majority leader that ended Don't Ask, Don't Tell, and it was overwhelmingly supported in this House

and in the Senate, and passed. It has been a benefit, not a detriment.

In the years since, we have seen our military strengthen by the open service of many LGBT Americans who have contributed a great deal to keeping America safe and advancing our national security interests around the world.

To say to transgender servicemembers in uniform that they must leave their units, not because they are not performing well, not because they are not needed, but because of who they are, not the content of their character, not their service, not their performance, but because of who they are, would be a shameful action for our country and deprive us of their talent and contributions.

To deny transgender Americans the opportunity to put on that uniform and wear the flag of the country they wish to serve—as I do every day—would be to diminish that flag, that Declaration of Independence, that Constitution of the United States of which we are so proud.

I hope my colleagues in this body will join in sending a clear message that the House, not Republicans or Democrats, that the people's House reflects the values, the service, and patriotism of our transgender fellow Americans.

Let us today reflect the best of our values, not the worst of our values. Pass this resolution. Make America proud of its Declaration of Independence and its Constitution, and of Martin Luther King, Jr.'s admonition to make our judgments based upon content of character.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CARBAJAL).

Mr. CARBAJAL. Mr. Speaker, as a veteran, I rise in support of this resolution. When this country first debated the possibility of African Americans, women, or LGBT people serving in our military, the same doubts, the same reports, and the same concerns were raised regarding their service.

One of these misleading claims is that allowing transindividuals to serve could harm our military readiness. Mr. Speaker, allowing patriotic Americans who are willing, capable, and ready to serve their country does not harm readiness.

I will tell you what does: diverting military personnel and billions of dollars in military construction funding to build an unnecessary wall to respond to a nonmilitary fabricated emergency.

I want to ask my friends who support this shameful service ban whether they believe they have the right to deny an individual their right to be who they are, to limit opportunities because of their gender identity? Are these the values America was founded upon?

We as a nation are much better than this. During the repeal of Don't Ask,

Don't Tell, critics invoked fear upon America saying that it would disrupt unit morale and readiness. Today, 9 years later, we have the most powerful and capable military in the world.

For almost 3 years, transgender troops have been able to serve openly. During that time, there has been no evidence of lack of military readiness or unit cohesion. Unfortunately, in return for their service, we are requiring they suppress their identity. This is absolutely unacceptable and discriminatory.

I believe former chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Dempsey responded best when he stated:

"The service of the men and women who volunteer and who meet our standards of service is a blessing, not a burden."

□ 1000

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BROWN).

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my vehement opposition to banning service in the Armed Forces by openly transgender individuals because the Trump administration considers transgender identity to be some medically disqualifying condition. Gender identity is not a medical condition; it is who we are as individuals.

Since President Truman desegregated the military, we have torn down barriers to the equal treatment and opportunity of every American to serve. Women now serve in combat roles defending our Nation as Rangers, infantrymen and submariners. Gay, lesbian, and bisexual Americans serve our country openly and with distinction.

In 2016, the Pentagon lifted the ban on transgender Americans, allowing them to serve without having to hide their true identity. The fact that thousands of transgender servicemembers are currently serving, meeting, and exceeding standards and are deployed worldwide speaks volumes about their dedication and contributions to our Nation. We need their skills, their experience, their courage, and their patriotism.

In 1948, many Americans agreed that racial segregation in the Armed Forces was right, but history shows all of us today that they were wrong. Former Defense Secretary Gates said: "No aspect of Black Americans' quest for justice and equality under the law has been nobler than what has been called the 'fight for the right to fight.'"

My 30 years in the Army leads me to believe that all Americans who want to serve and who can meet our standards should be given the right to fight. My deep belief is shared by General Dunford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, who reiterated that very belief to me just 2 days ago.

We have an obligation to allow transgender Americans the right to

fight for our Nation. We cannot, Mr. Speaker, settle for this discriminatory policy.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CISNEROS).

Mr. CISNEROS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Mr. KENNEDY for his leadership on this issue and the members and staff on the House Armed Services Committee for helping bring this important resolution to the House floor.

I served in the Navy during the time of Don't Ask, Don't Tell. Too many were forced to live their lives in secret, unable to be true to themselves. In 2016, transgender servicemembers were allowed to serve openly in the United States military, individuals like Lieutenant Commander Blake Dremann, who is still currently on Active Duty and who has deployed 11 times.

During his testimony in the Military Personnel Subcommittee, he stated that his transition meant that he was no longer compartmentalizing parts of his life. He also stated that his decision to transition made him a better officer and a better leader. He has proven it by receiving the Navy Batchelder Award, which is given to Navy top Supply Corps officers.

My support for Lieutenant Commander Dremann and all our transgender servicemembers is unequivocal. They have shown tremendous courage, and it is why I fight for inclusion and equality for the LGBTQ community.

The President's policy is taking not only our military, but our country, backwards. It is unnecessary, and it is purely a discriminatory action against a group of individuals who want to do nothing more than serve their country.

It is a disgusting attack on a community that he once swore to protect. He is attacking servicemembers who have already proven their ability to meet strategic needs and who pose no risk to unit cohesion or military readiness.

As far as I am concerned, any person who has the courage, spirit, and commitment to serve our country in uniform when so many choose not to should be allowed to do so.

I will vote to pass this resolution, and unlike the President, I will continue to advocate for and protect our LGBTQ community. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote in support of this resolution and denounce the President's hateful policy toward our servicemembers.

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

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution and in opposition to the administration's ban on openly transgender individuals in the armed services.

Throughout history, each time we expand who may join the armed services to better reflect the diversity of our Nation, the same tired and disproven arguments are brought back: that any individual within a new group, regardless of their ability, is unfit to serve and that they will disrupt unit cohesion. We heard these arguments with respect to Black and Latino men; women; and gays, lesbians, and bisexuals.

But we know that is simply untrue. There are no issues with transgender individuals serving in our military. You don't have to take my word for it. The service chiefs of all five branches of our military have testified that there have been zero instances of transgender servicemembers hurting cohesion or readiness since the ban was first lifted.

The conservative obsession with targeting and attacking transgender individuals in all areas of American life is cruel and immoral. It is astonishing that, after years of "support our troops" demagoguery from my colleagues across the aisle, they would choose to turn their backs on Active-Duty servicemembers and vote to specifically deny them medically prescribed care.

After 2½ years of transgender servicemembers serving with no issues, there is one reason and one reason alone for this administration to be bringing back a ban on transgender servicemembers: to force a bigoted agenda on the military that they cannot force on the rest of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, much of the history of this country is the history of expanding our understanding of whom the Declaration of Independence meant when it said that all men are created equal. It didn't mean, in 1776, Black men; it certainly didn't mean women; it didn't mean Native Americans; and it didn't mean LGBTQ people. We have come to the point where we understand, at least aspirationally, it means all of those things.

This resolution gives us a choice:

Do we join the march? Do we continue the march to expand the meaning of the Declaration of Independence to declare equality for everyone regardless of specific characteristics, or do we join that dreary procession of slavers, confederates, racists, and misogynists who have dragged this country through the mud and have besmirched the ideals of the Declaration of Independence?

That is our choice today. Let's take the right one.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gen-

tleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution expressing opposition to President Trump's decision to ban transgender individuals from serving in the Armed Forces. I am proud to be a cosponsor of this resolution, and I thank my friend, Mr. KENNEDY, for his extraordinary leadership on this issue.

The President's decision in 2017 to prohibit transgender individuals from military service is disgraceful and wrong. Not only is the decision based on ignorance and bigotry, but the evidence shows there is absolutely no need for this discriminatory policy.

America has the strongest and most effective military in the history of the world, and that is because of the brave individuals who serve in uniform. Excluding an entire group of highly qualified and skilled individuals from service undermines our national security.

In 2016, the Obama administration removed the ban on transgender individuals after thoroughly and carefully studying how it would impact the military and military readiness. A year later, President Trump announced he would resume prohibiting transgender individuals from serving in a tweet and didn't even bother to tell his Secretary of Defense about it.

The National Center for Transgender Equality estimates that over 15,000 trans people are currently serving in the military. In 2016, a study by RAND Corporation found that service by transgender individuals does not adversely affect readiness, and, in fact, many military leaders have acknowledged that the ban will degrade military readiness.

This cruel ban seeks to force transgender members of our military back into the closet or out of service. It is a policy that is not based on any factor or any careful deliberation, but merely an attempt to score points with the hard right faction of his political base. By doing this, the President is hurting our military, making our country less safe, and making our country less just.

Transgender individuals who serve our country in the Armed Forces are American heroes. They deserve our thanks, and they deserve more than to be used as a political prop by their Commander in Chief. We as a country are better than this.

Mr. Speaker, quite simply, it is un-American and immoral to deny transgender individuals who want to serve our country in uniform the right to do so simply because of who they are, and I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

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

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman SMITH for his leadership and for yielding time.

I also want to recognize Congressman KENNEDY for his tremendous leadership on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 124, rejecting the President's discriminatory ban on openly transgender servicemembers in the military.

Transgender servicemembers have served with honor and distinction in the defense of our country for decades, yet President Trump announced on Twitter that transgender servicemembers would no longer be allowed to serve, despite the fact that many military leaders concluded that being transgender does not impact our readiness. President Trump's own Chief of Staff said he hadn't received any reports of problems with unit cohesion or morale regarding transgender servicemembers.

The President's cowardly ban makes it clear that prejudice, not patriotism, guides his decisions.

As the daughter of a career military officer who served in a segregated military, I know what it is like for our country to betray our American values. As a person of faith, I was taught to treat everyone equally. As an African American woman, I will fight discrimination wherever it surfaces.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this resolution.

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

Mr. THORNBERRY. I continue to reserve the balance of my time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman and the ranking member managing this bill, and I thank Mr. KENNEDY for his insight.

We are reminded that we have nothing to fear but fear itself. Franklin Delano Roosevelt offered those great words on the precipice of World War II, the victory with the United States troops standing side by side, some of them African Americans who lived and served in the uniform but in a segregated way. But their blood was the same, and they shared their blood in the same way; they died in the same way.

Do we want victory or defeat?

Let me be very clear. Allowing transgenders to serve and brushing them out is a travesty.

Do you realize that it is clear that the RAND report found that healthcare coverage for transgender military personnel would increase the military total account by less than zero?

In addition, when all of this was banned by the Obama administration, we recognized it is honored, the sacrifices of selfless transgender servicemembers who have endured exclusion,

silence, and persecution due to discriminatory policies and attitudes against LGBT and military personnel such as Don't Ask, Don't Tell, which was rightfully struck down under the Obama administration.

We must be against these destructive practices.

Do we want victory or defeat?

There is nothing to fear but fear itself.

Support this resolution to stand with those who want to serve and die for their country.

I rise in support of H. Res. 124.

Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, July 26, 2017, the fears of the LGBTQ community were confirmed.

In an unexpected move that immediately sent shockwaves through the media and LGBTQ+ community, the President tweeted Wednesday morning that "the United States Government will not accept or allow Transgender individuals to serve in any capacity in the U.S. Military."

Scores of individuals, civil rights groups, and military personnel on all sides of the political spectrum unanimously condemned the President's announcement as an intolerant and irrational violation of the sacred right of Transgender Americans to valiantly serve their country.

In his tweets, the President claimed that "our military . . . cannot be burdened with the tremendous medical costs and disruption that transgender in the military would entail."

This statement directly contradicts the wealth of rigorous evidence indicating the exact opposite:

According to a 2016 study by the RAND Corporation, allowing transgender individuals to serve openly in the military poses "little to no impact on unit cohesion, operational effectiveness, or readiness."

Furthermore, RAND found that health care coverage for transgender military personnel would increase the U.S. military's total annual health care expenditures by a mere 0.04 to 0.13-percent.

The President's illogical ban on transgender military personnel reverses a previous policy set forth by Former Defense Secretary Ash Carter in June, 2016 that allowed transgender troops to serve openly.

This policy under Obama was a significant step forward that made our armed services more inclusive.

It honored the sacrifices of selfless transgender service members who have endured exclusion, silence, and persecution due to discriminatory policies and attitudes against LGBTQ+ military personnel such as "Don't Ask, Don't Tell," which was rightfully struck down under the Obama administration.

Numerous advocacy groups that focus on LGBTQ+ service members and veterans organizations have decried the President's transgender ban announcement and criticized the hypocrisy and poor leadership of the White House.

Officials at OutServe, which provides legal assistance to LGBTQ+ troops and recruits, said Trump's "pseudo-policy-by-twitter" demonstrated "blatant disregard for transgender service members."

The group then turned the President's hateful rhetoric back on itself: "The disruptive burden to the military comes from indecision in a

White House which itself is not focused on victory if it's targeting service members.

The readiness, effectiveness, and lethality of the Armed Services comes from the commitment of our troops—not the vagaries and bigotry of exclusionary policies."

The Palm Center, an advocacy group for transgender service members, denounced the President's comments as "creating a worse version of don't ask, don't tell" policy.

Vote Vets, an organization dedicated to opening U.S. military services to diverse Americans, correctly assessed that "removing [transgender service members] weakens our country and our military."

There are approximately 15,000 transgender service members currently serving in the U.S. military.

The President's announcement offers no clarity on the status of these troops who continue to serve their country with honor, dignity, and excellence.

However, if the President's expression of intent to "not accept or allow Transgender individuals to serve" entails the removal of these service members from the ranks of the U.S. military—this can only be understood as a direct violation of the rights and principles laid down in the Constitution.

Angela Davis once said, "If they come for me in the morning, they will come for you in the night."

Americans of all races, ethnicities, origins, sexual preferences, and gender identities must realize that the reverse is also true: If the President comes for them in the morning, he will come for me in the night.

To the brave transgender individuals who have served, currently serve, or dream of serving in the military: I recognize your commitment to protecting this nation with your very lives.

I oppose the President's unlawful agenda of discrimination. I will not stop until your sacrifices are regarded as equal under the law of the United States.

To all members of the transgender community: I stand with you. I am fighting for you. I will not allow your rights to be stripped away by bigoted men who have lost sight of what it means to be American. That is why I support H. Res. 124.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the Chair whether the gentleman from Washington, the chairman, has any further speakers other than himself.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I am prepared to close at this time, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the current House leadership seems rather consumed by Presidential tweets. As a matter of fact, just a few moments ago, the Speaker of the House, herself, was one of those Members who had to be reminded that it is a violation of the rules of the House to disparage the character of the President.

I guess we could do this every day. The President could tweet, and we would have a sense of Congress to comment on it, and the President would tweet. But generally, Mr. Speaker, I think there is a higher and better purpose for this House to work on the

problems that confront the American people.

As I mentioned a few moments ago, this is a messaging bill. It changes no law. It changes no policy. It could also be done down in the House radio-television correspondents' gallery. Somebody could give a speech, and there could be a press conference. It would have the same effect as having this resolution on the floor.

I don't have the time to correct all of the misstatements in the resolution or that have been made on the floor today. I will say this, Mr. Speaker: If we are going to do messaging, then my primary message is that every individual who serves our Nation in the military is entitled to respect and our appreciation—every single individual—and I am among those who are very impressed, by the way, by the transgender individuals who testified in front of our Military Personnel Subcommittee just a few weeks ago.

But on the substance of this issue, I believe the principle for the Department of Defense is that any eligible individual who can meet the high standards for military service without special accommodation should be permitted to serve.

□ 1015

Any eligible individual who can meet the standard without special accommodation should be permitted to serve.

I think that is the standard. That is not exactly what we have been talking about today, but that is the standard, and it should be the standard.

There may be some differences about what a special accommodation is, about various medical diagnoses and conditions. I understand that. But the standard is, if you meet the standard without special accommodation you should be permitted to serve.

And those who serve deserve our respect and our appreciation. That is the point. But that is not really the point of this resolution.

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

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

Let's remember one important point. There was no problem. This was not an issue. It was not talked about until the President decided that, in his words, he wanted to ban transgender people from serving in the military.

I hope that is not engaging in personalities. It is simply saying what he said and did. He sent out a tweet saying we should ban people who are transgender. Then the military has had to backfill that tweet with a policy. I feel bad for the members of the military who have had to do that, who have had to waste their time for the last year trying to accommodate the ignorance and bigotry of this presidential policy.

There was no problem. Every single service chief testified there is no impact on unit cohesion. We weren't talking about that until the President de-

clared that he wanted to discriminate against transgender people.

I think the ranking member of the Armed Services Committee is 100 percent correct. Every eligible person who can perform the duties should be allowed to serve.

This policy violates that principle in a whole bunch of different ways, but I will simply mention two.

Even if you have already transitioned, even if you have already gone through all of the healthcare needs and have fully transitioned to a new gender, this policy says you will not be allowed to serve if you are transgender.

That means that fully qualified people—not ones who have potential future surgery or anything—are being banned from serving.

It also says, if you are serving now, you cannot be who you are. And this is where the ignorance comes in.

Wow. What do you mean?

You have got to be the gender you were born in.

That is not the way it works. That is ignorance talking. This policy saying that, No, sorry, you have to be in your "biological sex" means you have to deny who you are. And that will also ban people from serving who are otherwise 100 percent qualified.

Without question, trans men and women who are fully qualified to serve in the military will be banned by this policy.

We have already seen the other two arguments: Well, the healthcare costs will go up.

No, they won't. The stats, the evidence, the facts show that transgender people have no greater healthcare costs than the average person serving in the military.

And the unit cohesion argument is an absolute joke. This debate, this policy, prompted by the President, inserting discrimination where it did not belong, is the only thing that has caused any of this issue.

As General Milley said: zero evidence of any unit cohesion issue.

So, let's be 100 percent clear here. This policy is based on ignorance and bigotry.

And why are we doing it on the House floor instead of down in some press conference somewhere? Because the vote of this House matters more than just the individual words of a few Members.

I, as a Member of the United States House and as a citizen of the United States of America, want my Congress to go on record that we will not stand for ignorance and bigotry in our military or anywhere else.

A vote of this House makes it clear just how wrongheaded this policy is. And make no mistake about it, this is not the military that wanted this. The President drove it, and he is causing problems that do not need to be caused. We should reject this policy.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 252, the previous question is ordered on the resolution and the preamble.

The question is on adoption of the resolution.

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on adoption of H. Res. 124 will be followed by a 5-minute vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 238, nays 185, answered "present" 1, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 135]

YEAS—238

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

Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Soto

Spanberger
Speier
Stanton
Stevens
Suozi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small
(NM)
Trahan

Trone
Underwood
Van Drew
Vargas
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NAYS—185

Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bergman
Biggs
Billirakis
Bishop (UT)
Bost
Brady
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Conaway
Cook
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
Davidson (OH)
Davis, Rodney
Duffy
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Estes
Ferguson
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Fox (NC)
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gonzalez (OH)
Gooden

Gosar
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harris
Hartzler
Hern, Kevin
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill (AR)
Holding
Hudson
Huizenga
Hunter
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
Lesko
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Marchant
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
Meadows
Meuser
Miller
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Newhouse
Norman
Nunes
Olson

Palmer
Pence
Perry
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Riggleman
Roby
Rodgers (WA)
Roe, David P.
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rooney (FL)
Rose, John W.
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spano
Stauber
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Timmons
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Waltz
Watkins
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Wright
Yoho
Young
Zeldin

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Amash

NOT VOTING—8

Abraham
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart

Granger
Palazzo
Ryan

Veasey
Wilson (SC)

□ 1047

Messrs. MEADOWS and GONZALEZ of Ohio 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.

Stated for:

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to vote today because I was in my District with the Vice-President. I support anyone willing and capable of serving in the U.S. armed forces, including transgender individuals. If I had been present, I would have voted "yea" for H. Res. 124.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, due to unforeseen circumstances on Thursday, March 28, 2019, I was not present to cast my vote on the question of Agreeing to H. Res. 124, a resolution expressing opposition to banning service in the Armed Forces by openly transgender individuals. I agree in the strongest terms with the resolution's denunciation of the ban, and had I been present my vote would have been yea on rollcall 135.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 216, nays 179, answered "present" 1, not voting 35, as follows:

[Roll No. 136]

YEAS—216

Adams
Aderholt
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Bacon
Baird
Banks
Barr
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bergman
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady
Brown (MD)
Budd
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cooper
Courtney
Crist
Curtis
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean

DeGette
DeBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Españillat
Evans
Finkenauer
Fleischmann
Fortenberry
Poster
Frankel
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Gianforte
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Griffith
Grijalva
Haaland
Hastings
Hayes
Heck
Hill (CA)
Himes
Hollingsworth
Horn, Kendra S.
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Hudson
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Kaptur
Keating

Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luján
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
McBath
McCarthy
McClintock
McColum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meadows
Meeks
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Murphy
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal

Neguse
Newhouse
Norcross
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Perry
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Reschenthaler
Richmond
Rodgers (WA)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Rutherford

Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrier
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Shalala
Sherman
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Soto
Speier
Stanton
Stauber
Steil
Stewart
Stivers
Swalwell (CA)

Takano
Taylor
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tipton
Titus
Tlaib
Torres Small
(NM)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Vargas
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Waltz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watkins
Welch
Wenstrup
Wilson (FL)

NAYS—179

Aguilar
Allen
Allred
Amash
Axne
Balderson
Bera
Biggs
Bishop (UT)
Bost
Brindisi
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burchett
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Cisneros
Cline
Cloud
Cole
Collins (NY)
Comer
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Correa
Costa
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crow
Cuellar
Cummings
Cunningham
Davids (KS)
Davidson (OH)
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
Duffy
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Estes
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fletcher
Flores
Fox (NC)
Fudge
Fulcher
Gallagher

Gibbs
Golden
Gonzalez (OH)
Gooden
Gosar
Gottheimer
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harder (CA)
Harris
Hartzler
Hern, Kevin
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill (AR)
Holding
Huizenga
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kilmer
Kim
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
Lesko
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Maloney, Sean
Massie
Mast
Matsui
McAdams
McCaul
McHenry
McKinley
Meng
Meuser
Miller
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mucarsel-Powell
Mullin

Norman
Nunes
O'Halleran
Olson
Palmer
Panetta
Pappas
Peterson
Porter
Posey
Reed
Rice (NY)
Riggleman
Roby
Roe, David P.
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rooney (FL)
Rose (NY)
Rose, John W.
Rouda
Rouzer
Roy
Ruiz
Scalise
Schrader
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sewell (AL)
Sherrill
Shimkus
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smucker
Spanberger
Spano
Steube
Stevens
Suozi
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Timmons
Turner
Upton
Van Drew
Walberg
Walden
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Westerman
Wexton
Wild
Williams
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Wright
Young
Zeldin

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Tonko

NOT VOTING—35

Abraham
Babin
Brownley (CA)
Collins (GA)
DeLauro
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart

Gabbard
Gaetz
Gohmert
Granger
Green (TN)
Green (TX)
Grothman

Herrera Beutler
Higgins (NY)
Lamb
Marchant
Marshall
Palazzo
Peters

Ratcliffe
Rice (SC)
Ryan
Simpson
Stefanik

Torres (CA)
Veasey
Wagner
Walker
Walorski

Webster (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Yarmuth
Yoho

□ 1059

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to attend votes due to circumstances beyond my control. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 135 and "yea" on rollcall No. 136.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. PALAZZO. Mr. Speaker, due to a family commitment, I was not present and therefore unable to vote on Thursday, March 28, 2019. Had I been present I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 135 and "nay" on rollcall No. 136.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF
COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE,
AND TECHNOLOGY

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 27, 2019.

Speaker NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: This letter is to inform you of my intention to resign my seat on the House Committee on Science, Space, and Technology; effective immediately.

I appreciate your assistance with this request and the opportunity to serve on the Committee in the 115th Congress.

If I may ever be of any help, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

NEAL P. DUNN M.D.,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted. There was no objection.

ELECTING MEMBERS TO A CERTAIN
STANDING COMMITTEE OF
THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the House Republican Conference, I send to the desk a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 264

Resolved, That the following named Members be, and are hereby, elected to the following committee of the House of Representatives:

COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY: Ms. Herrera Beutler, Miss González-Colón of Puerto Rico.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CLARIFICATION OF GRADE AND
PAY OF PODIATRISTS OF THE
DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs be discharged from further consideration of the bill (S. 863) to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify the grade and pay of podiatrists of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 863

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. CLARIFICATION OF GRADE AND PAY OF PODIATRISTS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

(a) GRADE.—The list in section 7404(b) of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking "PODIATRIC SURGEON (DPM)" and inserting "PODIATRIST"; and

(2) by inserting after the item relating to "Physician and surgeon grade." the following new item:

"Podiatrist grade."

(b) PAY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 7431 of such title is amended—

(A) by striking "physician and dentist" each place it appears and inserting "physician, podiatrist, and dentist";

(B) by striking "physicians and dentists" each place it appears and inserting "physicians, podiatrists, and dentists";

(C) by striking "physician or dentist" each place it appears and inserting "physician, podiatrist, or dentist";

(D) by striking "physicians or dentists" each place it appears and inserting "physicians, podiatrists, or dentists";

(E) by striking "Physician and Dentist" each place it appears and inserting "Physician, Podiatrist, and Dentist"; and

(F) in subsection (e)(1)(A), by inserting "podiatrists and" before "dentists."

(2) ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS.—Section 7433 of such title is amended by striking "physicians and dentists" each place it appears and inserting "physicians, podiatrists, and dentists".

(3) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The heading of subchapter III of chapter 74 of such title is amended by inserting ", PODIATRISTS," after "PHYSICIANS".

(4) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 74 of such title is amended by striking the item relating to subchapter III and inserting the following new item:

"SUBCHAPTER III—PAY FOR PHYSICIANS, PODIATRISTS, AND DENTISTS".

(5) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—Section 7433 of such title is further amended—

(A) by striking subsection (b);

(B) in subsection (a)—

(i) by striking "(1) The Secretary" and inserting "The Secretary"; and

(ii) by redesignating paragraph (2) as subsection (b); and

(C) in subsection (b), as so redesignated—

(i) by striking "In prescribing" and inserting "RECOMMENDATIONS AND VIEWS.—In prescribing"; and

(ii) by striking "this paragraph" and inserting "this subsection".

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

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

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 962, the Born-Alive Abortion 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. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, if the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained, on behalf of the human beings, babies who leave their mother's—

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

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, if this unanimous consent request cannot be entertained, I urge the Speaker—

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

COMMUNICATION FROM THE
REPUBLICAN LEADER

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable KEVIN MCCARTHY, Republican Leader:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 27, 2019.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to Section 1652(b) of the John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019, I am pleased to appoint the following Member to the Cyberspace Solarium Commission:

The Honorable Mike Gallagher of Wisconsin

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

KEVIN MCCARTHY,
Republican Leader.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) for two important reasons. One is to inquire of the majority leader the schedule for the coming week, and also to inquire of the majority leader the score of the LSU-Maryland basketball game from last week.

I yield to my good friend from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I anticipated this was going to be an extraordinarily hostile colloquy.

Louisiana was so incredibly lucky. However, it cost me, I admit to the world, I guess. I hope I don't get in legal trouble. But the Republican whip and I had a little sort of side bet, so I owe the Republican whip a crab dinner for four people. That is the bad news.

The good news is the minority whip will now be eating the best crab in America, not Louisiana crab. It will be Maryland crab that I will be giving him for dinner.

Mr. Speaker, if my friend would like to ask some questions about the schedule—or he did ask me, I am told. But I knew that game was coming.

Mr. SCALISE. I will be happy to ask both questions again.

I look forward to the Maryland crab dinner. I think, as the gentleman from Maryland knows, a lot of times when you go to places and they say it is Maryland crab, it is really Gulf of Mexico crab, because they want the best quality to offer the patrons.

We were excited to see the buzzer beater. I know both of us were waiting in those last 12 seconds to see which team would walk away with the Sweet 16 banner. I am proud that my mighty Fighting Tigers of LSU were in that number. But we will come to D.C., and, hopefully, the gentleman will now be rooting for us so that he can say he rooted for the eventual national champion, LSU Tigers, to win the Final Four.

I yield to the gentleman to hear about the schedule for the coming week in Congress.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I think it keeps getting worse. In any event, we will move on to the schedule.

I congratulate LSU. They played an excellent game, as did Maryland. It was a really good game. There has to be one winner and one loser, and we lost.

We have the fourth youngest team in the NCAA, so we will be back next year. Maybe we will be able to play LSU again, if they make it.

On Monday, the House will meet at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business, with votes postponed until 6:30 p.m.

On Tuesday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate and noon for legislative business.

On Wednesday, Mr. Speaker, the House will meet at 9 a.m. and recess immediately. The House will reconvene at 11 a.m. for the purpose of receiving a joint meeting with the Senate. His Excellency Jens Stoltenberg, the Secretary General for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, will address us. Members are advised to be on the House floor and seated no later than 10:30 a.m. for the joint meeting.

Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business, with last votes no later than 3 p.m. We will consider several bills under suspension of the rules. The complete list of suspension bills will be an-

nounced by the close of business tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, the House will also consider a major piece of legislation, H.R. 1585, the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2019. Frankly, that bill should have been reauthorized prior to September 30 of last year in the last Congress. We extended it until February 15 of this year, at which time it lapsed. We are very hopeful and expect that this will pass this next week.

It is sponsored by Representative KAREN BASS. I am pleased to bring this bipartisan bill to the floor, in response to our Nation's crisis of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking.

The Violence Against Women Act officially expired on September 30. As I said, it was extended. It is way overdue that we consider a long-term authorization of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, it is possible that we will bring to the floor legislation regarding the crisis that is occurring in Yemen. There are 22 million people at risk of starvation—22 million people at risk of starvation—noncombatants, women, and children.

We also may consider other legislation, if it comes from the Senate.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the schedule update.

I would like to inquire, we know that there are only 7 legislative days left for Congress to meet its required deadline to provide a budget, the April 15 deadline. What troubles me is that there has been no budget brought through the House Budget Committee. In fact, there have been reports that your majority doesn't plan to bring a budget at all.

Obviously, the budgets are very important to show the priorities of our Congress, to show the priorities of each of our majorities, as we did in 7 of the 8 years we were in the majority, not only doing a budget, but then, this last year, we were able to reach a 2-year budget agreement, so we were able to know with certainty what the budget numbers were that we would actually be working on to draft our appropriations bills. Again, the bills carry out the priorities of Congress, to show the country how we are going to properly fund government at the levels that we, as a Congress, set, which is what the budget does.

As I have seen, there is no current budget agreement negotiation going on that is yielding anything. So, without a budget agreement, does the gentleman plan to at least provide and bring a budget to the House floor?

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. It is a very interesting question, Mr. Speaker, that the minority whip asked me.

I would ask, in response, a question: Does the minority whip remember when last year, when you were in charge, you brought the budget to the floor?

Mr. SCALISE. I will be happy to walk through the last 8 years.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I asked the gentleman a simple question. He asked me about when the budget was coming, and I asked him when did he bring the budget to the floor last year.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, last year, as the gentleman knows, we were working under a 2-year budget agreement. Typically, we don't have a 2-year budget agreement. You bring one budget, and that is the budget for that year.

For fiscal year 2012, the House passed a budget. In our majority, we passed a budget to establish those numbers to then start the appropriations process.

In 2013, we passed through the House a budget to establish the 2013 budget numbers to work off of.

In 2014, we passed a budget through the House to establish the budget for that fiscal year.

In 2015, we passed a budget through the House to establish a budget for that year.

In 2016, we actually got an agreement, both between the House and the Senate, and passed the budget, of course, through the House and the Senate.

In fiscal year 2017, we passed a budget through the House and the Senate and got a full agreement to do an appropriations process.

In fiscal year 2018, as the gentleman knows, we actually agreed to a 2-year budget agreement to not only set the fiscal year numbers for 1 year, but for 2 years, which was tremendously helpful in making sure that our Nation's defense, which many times had been used as bargaining chips for other budget negotiations, we took that off the table. We made sure our men and women in uniform had the certainty of a 2-year budget agreement, which doesn't happen often. Frankly, it should happen more often, and we should strive toward that, so we achieved that.

In 2019, as the gentleman knows, we passed a budget out of the House Budget Committee, but we already had a budget agreement to work through the appropriations process because we had done a 2-year budget the prior year.

□ 1115

We don't have even a 1-year budget agreement right now. And as the gentleman knows, there are no fruitful negotiations to get a 1- or 2-year budget agreement, so there is no budget number to work off of, which is why you produce a budget.

Last year, we did bring a bill out of committee, but we didn't need to pass a budget because we already had the budget number agreed to from the 2-year deal prior.

And so with that, is the gentleman willing to engage in or come to an agreement on at least a 1- or 2-year budget agreement so that we can actually have an appropriations process that works for the country and shows the priorities of this Nation?

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. I appreciate, Mr. Speaker, a lot of words of the minority whip. He didn't pass the budget last year. There was no fiscal year 2019 budget. He is correct that we had reached a caps deal. That is not the budget, Mr. Speaker.

A budget is a plan that is reported out and brought to the floor and passed and sent to the Senate, and the Senate passes it and we have a budget that is in the same position on each side of the aisle. That is a budget. That has rarely been done in the last 8 years.

A caps deal has been reached. I would like to see a caps deal reached.

I have been talking to Mr. MCCONNELL, who wants a caps deal reached; I have talked to Mr. SHELBY—both of those, Republican leaders. I have talked to the White House about a caps deal.

Unfortunately, I don't think Mr. Mulvaney wants to reach a caps deal. He wants to use it as leverage as opposed to allowing us to proceed in the regular order.

But a budget is a different kettle of fish, I will tell my friend, than a caps deal. A caps deal does, in fact, set the 302 level of discretionary funding for both defense and nondefense spending.

Yes, we reached the 2-year cap deal. I have been trying for the last 2 months to get meaningful negotiations underway to do the same. I have not been successful, largely because the President, apparently, and Mr. Mulvaney are not interested in reaching such a deal. I regret that.

But the Budget Committee is meeting this week—it is going to meet next week, and we are going to be reporting out what will be what the minority whip refers to as a budget. It will certainly speak to the levels of funding that we need to spend.

I want to pass the appropriation bills by June 30. That has never been done, but I want to do it. I think we can do it, Mr. Speaker, and I am going to work towards that objective. It will require reaching what numbers are going to be for discretionary spending.

Unfortunately, the budget that the President of the United States sent down to Congress is totally unreasonable and irrational, and there is not a single person, I think, on this floor who will support his budget.

I will tell the minority whip that I will be glad to give his party the opportunity to vote on the President's budget. If he asks me, I will have it put on the floor.

Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that we are not able to get to a budget caps deal. We passed and began, in my view, an irrational—and I voted for it, and I am sorry that I voted for it—Budget Control Act, creating the sequester.

“Sequester” is a complicated word which starts with S, which I tell my people in my district and town, many, stands for “stupid.” It was an irrational document that took numbers out of the air without regard to our responsibilities and our opportunities.

But I am hopeful, and I tell the Republican whip, my friend, that we are going to try to—hopefully, working with his party—establish some reasonable, rational numbers for defense and nondefense discretionary funding so that we can move ahead with doing what really makes the difference, and that is the adoption of appropriation bills on this floor; send them to the Senate; have the Senate consider them; and we will have a conference, and we will pass those bills and send them to the President of the United States.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I, too, am hopeful that we are able to start an appropriations process and, ideally, to complete it by summer—well in advance of the September 30 government funding deadline—because we shouldn't be operating under deadline after deadline, where we go until the midnight hour.

But as the gentleman knows, you can't start an appropriations process until you actually set what are known as the 302 numbers, the 302(a) and (b) numbers, so that we know what each appropriations bill can target in terms of its overall spending number, to have that caps limit.

Ideally, it would be done through a budget with the April 15 deadline, but maybe the gentleman is going to be able to work with the committee to get a budget passed out of committee before the deadline and, if not, as the gentleman urges, a hopeful desire to get a caps deal. I would like to get a caps deal as well.

I supported the last caps deal because it gave us 2 years of certainty. It was bipartisan. It was an agreement that, while we may disagree on top-line numbers—and we want more money for defense, and some on your side might want more for nondefense discretionary—we finally came to an agreement. That did give tremendous certainty to our men and women in uniform. So over 70 percent of this Federal Government was fully funded for the fiscal year.

Clearly, we had a difference on border security, and that remaining area of our budget wasn't funded. But at least the 70-plus percent of the people of this country who rely on those services and want a strong defense were able to see us achieve that. Hopefully, we can do something like that again well before the deadline. That is the objective.

Mr. HOYER. Will my friend yield simply for clarification?

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I would be happy to yield.

Mr. HOYER. I want the public, Mr. Speaker, to understand that a caps deal is not a budget. They are two separate items:

A budget is a plan for expenditure on defense and nondefense objectives. A caps deal is to simply set not necessarily those priorities per se, but to set a top level of discretionary spending. That is why it is called a cap.

It has been about \$1.1 trillion or \$1.2 trillion—now, it is going to be a little

over that this year, I presume—for discretionary spending. Most of the budget, of course, is not discretionary spending. Two-thirds of the budget is either mandatory spending or debt payment.

I just want to clarify that we are talking about two separate items. One is a budget, which is a budget plan which can, in fact, include caps within it, but a caps deal is a separate deal.

As the gentleman has pointed out, we have usually made them now for 2 years since the sequester would otherwise have gone into effect. The reason we made that deal is both sides—both sides—are unwilling to follow the sequester because we think the sequester does not make rational sense for the security of our country and for the investments our country needs to make.

The President doesn't want to do that either. The difference is, he wants to borrow an additional \$180 billion—plus to fund defense and leave domestic discretionary spending largely at 2010 or 2009 levels. We think that doesn't make sense.

But I will clarify for the gentleman again that the Budget Committee is, in fact, considering what legislation they should bring to the floor in order to facilitate us, as the caps deals did, to facilitate us achieving the ability to mark up our appropriation bills, send them to the Senate, and try to reach agreement between the Senate and the House prior to September 30, and certainly to avoid the historic and very harmful shutdown that occurred at the end of the last Congress and continued into this Congress.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, as I pointed out earlier, you have two methods within which to set those caps: You can do it through the budget—which 7 of the 8 years we were in the minority we did—or you can do it through a separate caps deal, which 2 years ago we were able to do for a 2-year period, which is why we didn't do a budget last year. We passed it out of committee and at least showed what our priorities are, but we didn't need to pass a budget to get a caps deal because we had a caps deal in place from the prior year.

The other 7 years there was no caps deal, so the budget laid out that number, and the gentleman's majority has done neither. You don't have a caps deal or a budget, and so at some point you are going to have to produce the number to show what we are going to start the appropriations process using.

The other part of the budget, which isn't talked about as much but is equally important, is the establishment of the priorities for that majority. How do we get back to a balanced Federal budget, for example? We laid that out in our budget multiple times.

We have programs like Medicare. Medicare is going bankrupt if we do nothing. It would be irresponsible for us to let Medicare go to bankruptcy. Actual reports show it could go bankrupt in the next 8 years, which we

think is irresponsible. That is why we put, in our budget, a plan to save Medicare from bankruptcy.

Whatever the gentleman's plan would be to save Medicare from bankruptcy, I would urge him to show it. Show the American people what the priorities are. But they haven't done that.

And why? Why haven't they done that? Because they have spent the last 2 years trying to impeach the President, trying to lay out this foundation that there was collusion.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCALISE. The gentleman will yield in a moment.

But let's be clear, for the last 2 years we heard this clarion call that there was some collusion between the President or his family and Russia. We heard all this talk about impeachment and everything on down from the highest levels, including, now, the chairman of the House Intelligence Committee, who went multiple times on national TV and said there was more than credible evidence of collusion.

Finally, everybody was waiting on the Mueller report. Many were hanging their hat, saying it is going to show all these things. There is going to be a list of indictments. Go look at all the tapes from every national TV show you can imagine of some of the most outlandish claims that were made. And now the Mueller report comes out, and it is clear those claims are baseless. There was no collusion.

Mr. HOYER. The Mueller report is not out, Mr. Whip.

Mr. SCALISE. There was no collusion.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield?

The Mueller report is not out. The only report that is out is the Barr four-page letter report.

Mr. SCALISE. We will see the full Mueller report.

Mr. HOYER. I hope you are right, Mr. Whip.

Mr. SCALISE. Clearly, we have seen assessments of it. If the gentleman thinks it is going to show something differently, then please share it, but they made it clear there was no collusion and there will be no further indictments.

In fact, the Attorney General of the United States said this: "But as noted above, the special counsel did not find that the Trump campaign, or anyone associated with it, conspired or coordinated with the Russian Government in these efforts, despite multiple offers from Russian-affiliated individuals to assist the Trump campaign."

So multiple times they were offered, they never even came close. There was no collusion.

These conspiracy theories, the witch hunts, it is time for it to end. There was no collusion.

If you or any of your colleagues have proof of collusion, as your chairman of the House Intelligence Committee claims, they need to show that to the

Attorney General of the United States, because it completely contradicts what the Attorney General has now said based on the findings of the Mueller report.

There was no collusion.

And so when Chairman SCHIFF says, "more than circumstantial evidence"—that he has seen—"that associates of President Trump colluded with Russia"—in August, "I think there is plenty of evidence of collusion or conspiracy in plain sight."

And even now that the Attorney General makes it very clear there was no collusion, the chairman of the Intelligence Committee will not recant his previous statements that have been discounted.

Today, as the gentleman knows, this morning, every member of the minority party on the House Intelligence Committee called for the chairman of the Intelligence Committee to step down, every member.

So I would ask the gentleman: Will you call for the chairman of the Intelligence Committee to step down as chairman after losing so much credibility in the wild and vicious claims that he has made that have been disputed by the Attorney General of the United States based on this Mueller report after 22 months and over \$20 million of taxpayer money that found no collusion?

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, what it found is six of the President's closest associates—his campaign manager, his deputy campaign manager, his foreign policy adviser, his national security adviser, his lawyer and counsel for over a decade—all committed crimes. All were either convicted or pled to crimes.

Mr. SCALISE. Crimes of collusion?

Mr. HOYER. You had a lot to say. I have something in response.

There is not a person on our side of the aisle who doesn't believe the letter that you issued regarding Mr. SCHIFF isn't totally a partisan distraction from what you hope is not found. There has been no Mueller report yet that we have received.

The gentleman, Mr. Speaker, voted to have the Mueller report, as did every other member on his side of the aisle and every member on our side of the aisle, to be disclosed. Hopefully, it will be.

□ 1130

Hopefully, it will not be just a four-page letter from the Attorney General of the United States appointed by Mr. Trump. Hopefully, we will get Mr. Mueller's full report. That is what the Congress voted to get. That is what we expect to get, and that is what we hope to get.

Let me assure the gentleman that there is not a person on my side of the aisle that believes that Mr. SCHIFF has done anything but act in the highest interest of our government, of the In-

telligence Committee, and of full knowledge for the American people, unlike his predecessor who worked hand-in-glove with the White House, not as an independent coequal branch of government, but as an advocate for the White House's position, who clearly should have been removed and was not.

Mr. Speaker, I say to the minority whip that Mr. SCHIFF is a member of the highest integrity, highest intellect, and has great responsibility. I expect him to pursue his responsibilities as chairman of the Intelligence Committee to assure that neither Russia nor any other country will in the future be able to interfere in the elections of the United States, as Mr. Mueller concluded the Russians have.

Now, the President hasn't concluded that, but almost every American understands that the Russians tried to, on behalf of the President of the United States, affect the elections. So I tell my friend, I hope that we can have the debate. Let's look at the Mueller report.

Very frankly, there are other investigations that are going on, as the gentleman knows, in the Southern District of New York, as well as in the Government Operations Subcommittee, as well as in the Foreign Affairs Committee, as well as in the Financial Services Committee, as well as in the Intelligence Committee.

We still pale in insignificance in the number of investigations that we have had or oversight hearings that we have had when compared to the oversight hearings the Republicans had of the Obama administration and Mrs. Clinton in trying to undermine their credibility, an administration that, by the way, I don't think anybody was put in legal jeopardy and there were no scandals in the Obama administration.

There were disagreements, but I would think the gentleman ought to be very reserved, very frankly, in terms of making conclusions based upon a four-page letter before we have seen the Mueller report, before we have seen the actions of the Southern District of New York, and before we have seen the results of the oversight hearings that are continuing.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, there are a number of items that need to be addressed in what the gentleman just said.

First of all, to claim that there was any collusion as you said, "on behalf of the President of the United States with Russia" goes in complete contradiction to the findings that were delivered to us by the Attorney General of the United States, and I am going to read it one more time.

As we noted above, the special counsel did not find that the Trump campaign or anyone associated with it conspired or coordinated with the Russian Government.

Anyone who would make a claim to the contrary is either being irresponsible or ought to show the evidence. If there is evidence that the chairman of the Intelligence Committee has, and

let's be clear, he has tweeted things out, here is what we know. This is from Chairman SCHIFF. In 2017, here is what we know: The Russians offered help. The campaign accepted help. The Russians gave help. The President made full use of that help. He has claimed, again, that he has more than circumstantial evidence that there was collusion.

Yet, the Attorney General of the United States, after reviewing the entire Mueller report, which we hope we all see, obviously, within the confines of the law—the law makes it clear how something like that gets reported—I hope the gentleman understands and wouldn't suggest that classified information should be disclosed—but the report ought to be disclosed and show the American people what they have found. But we have seen the summary of it, and, of course, we are going to look at the entire thing.

And maybe then after reviewing the entire thing, if the gentleman does see, as the report summary shows, that there was no collusion with the President of the United States, then maybe this gentleman and all of the other people who have made outrageous claims that the President was in collusion, will maybe acknowledge they were wrong, will maybe offer an apology. Who knows. We can hold out hope for that.

But let's be clear about the statements that were made and the things that were alluded to that aren't true, that weren't the case. Maybe it was wishful thinking and it shouldn't have been. No one should hope that the President of the United States, any President, conspired with a foreign government.

But to suggest it over and over again for 2 years, and then for all of this 22 months of investigation, thorough investigation, multiple countries visited, over \$20 million of taxpayer money, more than our committees have to run all of their oversight operations to thoroughly investigate, they found there was no collusion.

Sure, the Russians tried to meddle with elections and they have done it before, and we ought to make sure that it doesn't happen again, and we can work together on that. But to suggest that the President of the United States colluded when he didn't, is irresponsible. And it has happened over and over, and it continues to this day. It has got to stop.

This idea that maybe some other attempt to go and harass the President and his family is going to find something else, it gives credence to the claims it was a witch hunt. It is time for us to focus on the real problems of this country.

It is also time for us to hold people in our intelligence agencies accountable, those who showed up at their job with a partisan agenda.

The FBI, CIA, or any intelligence agency is no place for you to bring your political agenda. We all have po-

litical views. But if someone puts that badge on and accepts that responsibility, and then uses that position to abuse power, we all ought to call on it to be rooted out, and I hope it is rooted out.

If there were abuses of the FISA process, which is a very important court that has a very narrow focus to protect the national security of this country, if the FISA court was abused by people in positions of power because they wanted to carry out a political agenda because they didn't like the results of the 2016 Presidential election, that is not the place for it.

The ballot box next year is the place to go carry it out, not wearing the badge and being a member of law enforcement in this country. So I hope that is rooted out, because we want to see the integrity of those institutions like the FBI restored. I want the country to have full faith and confidence that the people working there are carrying out the national security interests of the country, not their own political interests.

There are a lot of questions raised over whether or not that happened. But in the end, when we review the report—we have seen the summary. If people are still hoping that there is some mystery indictment out there—they said there are no further indictments. They said there was no collusion with the Presidential campaign.

So at what time is the gentleman's side going to acknowledge it didn't happen? If you want to change the results of the Presidential election, the results are changed at the ballot box. That is how we resolve it in America. We don't try to go find something on a President that doesn't exist.

We have done oversight. You have done oversight. The Mueller investigation was the ultimate oversight for 22 months and it rooted out and found there was no collusion between the President and the Russians. Maybe some people are disappointed to hear it.

We should all celebrate that as a country, but we all ought to be concerned that no President of the United States is targeted by an intelligence agency, or by a Congress, or a majority, or a minority because they don't like the results of the election, so they are going to abuse power to go and try to take them down. That is not the way we do it.

I hope we can finally focus on the real problems of this country and not continue to use these committees even after they didn't find what they were looking for to keep finding something that is not there.

The former chairman that was alluded to, Mr. NUNES, did a very impeccable job of carrying out his duties to find the facts. It was always about the facts. And if you go and look at how he carried himself and managed his committee, the entire time it was about finding the facts. They looked and we looked. There was no conclusion that we found.

If someone has proof of that conclusion that they keep alluding to, it is time for them to show it. Show the American people what you have. Don't run around hiding saying you have something when the Attorney General says it is not there.

If someone knows about collusion, they owe it to the country to show it. But if it is not there, stop saying it. It is irresponsible, and, hopefully, everybody heeds those words and we get back to focusing on what is important for this country. Express our political differences.

Obviously, if there is a political difference that we have with each other, with the President, with a Cabinet Secretary, we have all kinds of forums to express that opposition to correct it, to bring legislation to the floor.

But if we just don't like somebody personally, that is not what we are here to do. And I hope we can get beyond that.

I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I don't think I will respond to all of that, time being of the essence, I suppose.

The gentleman represents a party who held eight hearings, all headed by Republicans, on Mrs. Clinton. All eight reached the same conclusion, but the first one wasn't enough. The second one wasn't enough. The third one wasn't enough. The fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh weren't enough. So the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. Gowdy) was appointed to do one more because it was pretty close to the election then, Mr. Speaker.

The majority leader, now the minority leader of this House, said: Oh, no, they accomplished something. They accomplished the political objective. He said that on television, roundly criticized by his party. Why did you say that? Why did you admit that?

But for the minority whip to say that the Mueller report instigated X millions of dollars spent for political purposes, Mueller was appointed by a Republican, not by a Democrat, and the Attorney General recused himself so the Deputy Attorney General, Mr. Rosenstein, was the one that appointed him.

Why did he recuse himself? Because he had been involved, contrary to what he testified to in his nomination hearing, with the Russian Ambassador. I don't know if there was anything of substance in this conversation because we don't fully know what that conversation was.

But the fact of the matter is, for the minority whip to be talking about political hearings or oversight, and then to say he has had an opportunity to review the Mueller report, the gentleman has had more than I have had.

He reviewed the four pages of the Barr letter, appointed by Mr. Trump, and what we know is Barr's reading and his conclusion. But, frankly, we knew that before, because he sent a 19-page letter months ago that he thought

this investigation would not reach any conclusion, and that it should not, and that the President could not be held accountable, in any event. That was Justice Department policy.

So I listened to a long discussion, in my view, with all due respect, I tell my friend, the whip, at odds with the performance of their administration and the eight hearings they had in trying to bring Mrs. Clinton down and never finding—never, eight hearings, all led by Republicans—a conclusion that led to anything.

So we will see what the Mueller report says, I hope. And I am pleased that the whip and his party voted to have the Mueller report fully disclosed. He is correct. There are some national security interests that will properly restrict some of that, so we don't out sources or ways and means of discovering information.

But having said that, I say to the whip that we will have a time to debate this. We will have a time to debate it when we have the information. We will have a time to debate it, perhaps months from now, when all of these investigations are through.

But I wouldn't take too much solace in what the Mueller report did. It led to, as I said, the indictment and conviction of the President's campaign manager. It led to the indictment and conviction, either through plea or trial, of five other individuals to date.

That is not something to be very proud of in terms of the President of the United States being so close to and so involved—Mr. Cohen, in particular, brings that information forth to a hearing, and he was apparently his closest legal adviser for over a decade. We will see. But I don't think now, Mr. Speaker, is the time to debate it. Because the time to debate it will be to see when we see, and the American people see the Mueller report.

I want to say to my friend, so he understands, I am pleased that we don't have a finding that the President of the United States colluded, as he said he did not do. Colluded, of course, is not a legal term. Conspiracy is the gravamen or the essence of a criminal activity, a conspiracy to commit something that is illegal.

But we have a time to debate that and discuss it. And the American people, hopefully, are going to have an opportunity to reach their own conclusion, which, obviously, in the final analysis, will be the most important conclusion.

But the good news is, we are continuing to do the substantive business of the people of the United States. We are continuing to focus on jobs. We had numerous hearings this week on jobs, on wages.

We had numerous hearings on healthcare, and the costs of healthcare, and the costs of prescription drugs. We passed one of the most far-reaching reform bills that we have seen on the floor of this House, H.R. 1. Every Democrat voted for it. Almost every Republican voted against it.

□ 1145

We have passed some rational and reasonable controls on people with criminal records who are on the no-fly list or with mental health problems from not getting weapons to hurt a lot of people quickly. We have seen the tragedy here and around the world.

So we have done a lot of very substantive legislation in a relatively short time, and, very frankly, we would have done more if the Republicans hadn't let the government shut down and repeatedly voted against opening it up for the first month of our session.

Mr. Speaker, this is obviously about scheduling, and we are going to continue to bring substantive bills to the floor to respond to the needs of the American people. Yes, we can do oversight as well, but that will not preclude us from pursuing, as the majority, the agenda that we think the American people sent us here to Washington and made us the majority to do.

I hope that my Republican friends will join us in that effort and offer substantive amendments when they think there are differences that they have with that legislation, consider those, and send them to the Senate, because that is really what the people want us to do.

To the gentleman's observation about impeachment, I know he has been here. I know he has voted on efforts by some to move ahead on impeachment, and surely I know that he knows the overwhelming majority of Democrats voted "no." I know that he must have heard Speaker PELOSI say that we are not pursuing impeachment and that we want to focus on the needs of the American people. I am sure he heard that, Mr. Speaker, but he tends to reference otherwise on that. I think that is not accurate.

The American people ought to understand that we are pursuing their agenda: their jobs, their healthcare, and the welfare of their families. That is what our duty is, that is what our responsibility is, and that is what we are doing.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, whether or not there is an ultimate move towards something like impeachment, which I hope wouldn't come, and with all the things we know—there are no high crimes or misdemeanors and there is not even collusion—there are still committee chairmen in the gentleman's own party who are talking about impeachment. It is not something made up. There are leaders in the gentleman's party talking about it.

The chairman of the Judiciary Committee issued more than 80 subpoenas. Again, the majority can keep looking. Look at the summary of the Mueller report—2,800 subpoenas, more than 500 search warrants, and interviews of approximately 500 witnesses. So the gentleman can talk about people who were indicted who have nothing to do with the collusion and nothing to do with any ties to the President. Maybe somebody had filed a false tax return, then go throw the book at him.

Mr. Cohen came and lied to Congress, and he deserves to go to jail for it. What did the majority do? They brought him back as their star witness, a man who was already guilty of lying to Congress. He came, swore himself in, and likely lied to Congress again. So, again, throw the book at him.

But in terms of what the basis of the investigation was, it was to find collusion, and they found none: no further indictments; no evidence of collusion; in fact, saw the Trump campaign pushing back and even offers for help.

Foreign governments like Russia trying to interfere with our elections clearly happened—not just Russia, other countries too—and we all ought to be concerned about it. We all want to make sure that our defenses are as high as we can make them so that they are not able to collude.

We have seen companies in America that were taken advantage of during that campaign season, and they have taken corrective actions, too, so that Russia can't use social media companies in this Nation to try to take advantage of our electoral system.

But in terms of collusion with the President of the United States and a foreign government, it didn't happen. If anybody has evidence to the contrary, then show it to the American people. Stop alluding behind some cloak-and-dagger conspiracy theory that it happened still to this day when the Mueller investigation concluded it didn't happen.

We will get the full report. I look forward to reviewing it just as the gentleman from Maryland is looking forward to reviewing it, and maybe we will continue this conversation.

But if all of the findings that the Attorney General gave us in his summary are accurate, which I don't discount they will be—I think they will be at the highest level of confidence that the Attorney General's summary is accurate. If it is not, then clearly we will take that up separately. But if it turns out to be accurate, then I think we all ought to celebrate, number one, the fact that there was no collusion, but then move on.

The people who made accusations that turned out to be baseless ought to apologize and recognize there are people's personal lives and integrity that were being questioned. If it turned out they were wrong in making those accusations, then they ought to hold themselves accountable and to a higher standard. Those are the points that I was making.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I would ask my friend: Is he at all concerned that somebody that he didn't mention, Mr. Flynn, was, in fact, indicted and convicted of lying about his relationship with the Russians and his having clients in Europe, in Ukraine, which he failed to disclose?

He was appointed to one of the highest offices, the National Security Advisor to the President, and he lied about

his relations with the Russians to law enforcement, which is a crime, and was convicted and, in fact, pled.

I understand what Mr. Barr has said in a 4-page letter after some 48 hours of review of all of the documents, all of the evidence, that was adduced. None of us really knows. I am not going to make a conclusion until I have an opportunity to review the report. I hope we will have a full debate on that.

All of us are concerned, Republicans and Democrats, about the extraordinary number of people very close to the President—and, most importantly, Flynn, who was the National Security Advisor to the President—who were convicted of lying to law enforcement, some not paying their taxes and cheating the American people and all of us by not paying their fair share of what was due. I think that ought to be of concern to all of us.

These weren't just some people. They were the President's campaign chairman. They were one of the President's foreign policy advisers, Mr. Papadopoulos. It was his personal attorney for 10 years, a so-called fixer, did anything he was told or implied to do. We all ought to have concern about that.

But we ought to also be happy that, hopefully, correctly, Mr. Mueller found that we were not in a conspiracy with—I don't know about that, but colluding with—I don't really know what that exactly means; I have a sense, but it is not a legal issue—that the President did not, because any President who did collude with a foreign government that was clearly not our friend and, indeed, for the most part, our competitor and, yes, enemy, that would be something, I think, of which all of us would be extraordinarily concerned. I am glad that Mr. Mueller didn't find that.

But to think that, as the President says, this was a whitewash and no problems when five or six of your closest allies and friends have been or are about to be sent to jail, that is not something to be happy about.

It wasn't that Mueller didn't find wrongdoing. What Mueller didn't find was, beyond a shadow of a doubt, there was criminal behavior on which he believed he could act. That is what Barr said. And, in fact, Mr. Mueller, in Barr's letter, concluded that the President could not be exonerated or indicted on the basis of obstruction of justice. He made a conclusion that there was not sufficient evidence.

We don't know the answer to that question, but Mr. Mueller says that he could not find beyond a reasonable doubt and, therefore, made no assessment as to whether he did or did not.

In any event, we need to move on, as I said, Mr. Speaker, with the people's business: jobs, healthcare, integrity in government, safety in our neighborhoods, education of our children, and the health of our people.

Mr. Speaker, I want to tell the whip that I look forward to working with him on such an agenda for the people.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I share the gentleman's concern about addressing those important issues.

I will say, for the five people whom the gentleman referenced, anybody who broke the law ought to be held accountable. But after 500 witnesses are interviewed and over 2,800 subpoenas, all looking to find collusion with the Russian Government, not one of the people the gentleman mentioned had anything to do with colluding with the Russian Government.

If they made misstatements or if they didn't pay their taxes, after 2,800 subpoenas, then make sure that they are held accountable for the things they did, but don't suggest that it had anything to do with collusion with Russia, because it didn't.

Again, Mr. Speaker, go pull 500 names out of the phonebook, and if you put the full weight of the United States Government and 2,800 subpoenas into looking into 500 random people, I am sure not one of them will have done anything wrong—and hopefully not. But if they did and it had nothing to do with what you were initially looking for, let's not try to suggest it had anything to do with collusion, because it didn't.

We will see the full report. We look forward to seeing that. Again, hopefully, if the full report shows what we have already seen in the summary, that there was no collusion, then people who have been claiming there was collusion will also hold themselves accountable and maybe apologize, maybe recant, but surely stop continuing any kind of witch hunt and then focus on these important issues like getting our economy even stronger; working with this President to solve big problems which we have the opportunity to do to get a real trade agreement with our neighbors Mexico and Canada, all of whom want to have better trade relationships with us and help benefit our economy, create more jobs, and have fairer labor standards; something we have in front of us, an opportunity to do in a bipartisan way, maybe get a budget agreement so that we can have, certainly well before the September 30 deadline, how we are going to fund our government in a responsible way, make sure our men and women in uniform don't have to wonder whether or not they are going to get paid while they are deployed in a foreign country; make sure we can focus on lowering healthcare costs; and immigration reform that can solve some of the big problems on border security and some of the other areas.

So, hopefully, we can find agreement on that, and I am sure, in the coming weeks, we will on some, if not all, those issues. I look forward to working with the gentleman to do that.

I appreciate, while we go back and forth sometimes, we can have a little fun with our hobbies, but we also have big, important tasks; and I know that the gentleman carries out his role in the most responsible way to promote

the agenda that he thinks is best for this country, as do I, and, ideally, we can find a lot of intersection where we can work together to get really good things done for the American people.

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

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW, AND ADJOURNMENT FROM FRIDAY, MARCH 29, 2019, TO MONDAY, APRIL 1, 2019

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 2:30 p.m. tomorrow, and further, when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet at noon on Monday, April 1, 2019, for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1200

RECOGNIZING JOHN OSTENBURG OF PARK FOREST, ILLINOIS

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

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in recognition of Mayor John Ostenburg of Park Forest, Illinois: son, husband, father, grandfather, mayor, trustee, legislator, leader, collaborator, author, teacher, speaker, editor, reporter, environmentalist, unionist, merchant, director, adviser, lecturer, painter, reader, traveler, neighbor, humanitarian, and ubiquitous friend.

"We do not exist for ourselves," his mentor once said.

When theologian Thomas Merton uttered those simple words, it likely tickled the eardrums and, certainly, the fancy of our friend, John Ostenburg.

To be clear, John enjoys his various vocations, but it just so happens that many endeavors share a common thread: to serve others for the greater good.

He makes sure everything he does, every role he plays, positively impacts others. That is who he is.

A perpetual student of mankind and relentless advocate of Chicago's Southland, John's omnipotence comes complete with the genuine chuckle of a friend, the wise grin of a mediator, the dignified humility of a monk.

With career highlights too long to list and colleagues too numerous to count, I commend and thank John Ostenburg for his longtime service to residents across the Second Congressional District of Illinois.

On their behalf and on behalf of the Congress of the United States, I wish Park Forest Mayor John Ostenburg Godspeed as he retires from elective office, if not from public service.

HONORING ELAINE EIGEMAN

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

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Elaine Eigeman.

In Congress, every day we have people who come to the Nation's Capitol to advocate for important issues facing people in every community across our country. However, few do this as tirelessly and with as much passion and grace as Elaine.

As the board chair of the Lymphedema Advocacy Group, Elaine has given a strong voice to lymphedema patients all across the country.

She was the driving force behind the Lymphedema Treatment Act, which we will introduce in the House this week, to require Medicare to cover an essential part of lymphedema treatment.

Elaine developed lymphedema in 1999. Throughout her journey, she has made it her mission to support others and to be a voice for all suffering from this disease.

Thank you, Elaine, for your leadership and for creating a vibrant community for patients in the Northwest and beyond. I am proud to be your friend.

HONORING NATIONAL DEAF HISTORY MONTH

(Mrs. BEATTY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor National Deaf History Month, celebrated March 13 through April 15 each year.

What started as a very small observation at a Washington, D.C., library has grown to a 32-day-long celebration recognizing the countless contributions of deaf and hard-of-hearing Americans and honoring deaf culture.

I was so pleased when one of my constituents, Dawn Watts, an advocate for the deaf community, approached me with an idea of introducing a resolution recognizing Deaf History Month in Congress for the very first time.

I want to thank Dawn, as well as the National Association of the Deaf and the American Library Association, for their insight and support for this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage all Americans to take time this month to learn more about deaf Americans who helped shape our country, and I am honored to be able to have introduced this resolution.

EQUAL PAY FOR EQUAL WORK

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

Ms. DEAN. Mr. Speaker, America is built on some core values that everyone should have an equal voice in our

democracy, that everyone deserves equal opportunity, and that equal work should mean equal pay.

Right now, however, equal work doesn't mean equal pay. According to the United States Census Bureau, on average, women earn just 80 cents for every dollar earned by men. This wage gap hurts women, of course, but it also hurts their families and our economy as a whole.

Yesterday, we took a major step toward addressing this challenge by passing H.R. 7, the Paycheck Fairness Act. This bill will help close the wage gap by holding employers accountable for discriminatory practices and making it easier for workers to seek redress.

If we believe that Americans deserve equal pay for equal work—and I believe that as deeply as I believe anything—then this bill is how we put our values into action.

I thank Representative DELAURO for her decades of leadership on this issue, and I urge the Senate to take up this bill. What better way to conclude Women's History Month than by making history for women and for all Americans?

SUPPORTING TRANSGENDER TROOPS

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

Ms. HAALAND. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of our transgender troops.

The United States is stronger and safer when our military reflects our Nation's diversity. This administration's transgender ban makes a mockery of that commitment. And let's be clear: This is a ban.

We must not ask transgender service-members to go back in the closet or tell them: You are less than other Americans.

I wholeheartedly support every single American who wants to serve our country. My father was a 30-year career marine, and he would never judge another marine on anything other than their ability to complete their mission. Why should there be another standard?

Trans servicemembers meet the same standards as every servicemember, and this was confirmed during a subcommittee hearing when trans troops testified as witnesses. These transgender troops were highly decorated and earned recognition on the basis of the quality of their work.

As all military personnel do, transgender troops deserve our respect. I challenge anyone who favors this kind of discrimination to look at their transgender constituents and tell them they are not fit to serve.

I thank my colleagues for taking a stand for all of our servicemembers today.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE BRIAN J. MAST, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable BRIAN J. MAST, Member of Congress:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 27, 2019.

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

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I, the Honorable Brian J. Mast, have been served with a subpoena for testimony in a criminal trial issued by the United States District Court for the Southern District of Florida.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the privileges and rights of the House.

Sincerely,
BRIAN J. MAST,
Member of Congress.

COMMUNICATION FROM LEGISLATIVE CORRESPONDENT, THE HONORABLE BRIAN J. MAST, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Stephanie Cope, legislative correspondent, the Honorable BRIAN J. MAST, Member of Congress:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 27, 2019.

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

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I, Stephanie Cope, have been served with a subpoena for testimony in a criminal trial issued by the United States District Court for the Southern District of Florida.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the privileges and rights of the House.

Sincerely,
STEPHANIE COPE,
Legislative Correspondent,
Office of Congressman Brian Mast.

ISSUES OF THE DAY

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, at this time, it is my honor to yield to my friend from New Jersey, not just a friend, but a brother, ardent pro-life advocate who I have seen has compassion for every baby child.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

AN IMPORTANT MESSAGE AMERICA NEEDS TO HEAR

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend and

colleague for yielding and for his leadership on behalf of human rights. We have worked on issues in Sudan and other issues over the years. I want to thank him for being such a compassionate person.

Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday evening, I attended a premiere of the new film, "Unplanned," which opens this weekend in over 1,000 theaters. The movie is extraordinarily well written, well directed, and well acted. Ashley Bratcher is spectacular as Abby Johnson, the key character in the film.

"Unplanned" tells a largely untold story, a very difficult story, and is packed with insight and a profoundly important message that America and the world needs to hear.

Based on the life of Abby Johnson and her book, "Unplanned," the film chronicles Ms. JOHNSON's work at Planned Parenthood as a student activist, followed by almost 8 years at a large Planned Parenthood clinic in Texas, where over 20,000 abortions were performed.

Working as a counselor and then as actual director of that clinic, Abby says that 10 minutes of participation in an ultrasound-guided abortion shook the foundation of her values and changed the course of her life. She writes in the book, which is powerfully portrayed in the film:

"The details startled me. At 13 weeks, you could clearly see the profile of the head, both arms and legs, and even tiny fingers and toes. With my eyes glued to the image of this perfectly formed baby, I watched as a new image emerged on the video screen."

"The cannula, a straw-shaped instrument attached to the end of a suction tube, had been inserted into the uterus and was nearing the baby's side. It looked like an invader on the screen, out of place. Wrong. It just looked wrong."

She goes on to write, and you can see this portrayed on the screen:

"My heart sped up. Time slowed. I didn't want to look, but I didn't want to stop looking either."

"At first, the baby didn't seem aware of the cannula. The next moment was the sudden jerk of a tiny foot of the baby as it started kicking, as if trying to get away from the probing invader. As the cannula pressed in, the baby began struggling to turn and twist away."

"And then the doctor's voice broke through, startling me. 'Beam me up, Scotty,' telling the assistant to turn on the suction."

The abortion clinic director went on to write:

"I had a sudden urge to yell, 'Stop,' to shake the woman and say: 'Look what is happening to your baby. Wake up. Hurry. Stop.'"

"But even as I thought those words, I thought of my own hand and saw my own hand holding the probe. I was one of them, performing this act of abortion."

Again, her eyes shot back to the screen, and she writes:

"The cannula was already being rotated by the doctor, and now I could see the tiny body violently twisting with it. For the briefest moment, it looked as if the baby was being wrung like a dishcloth, twirled and squeezed. And then the little body crumpled and began disappearing into the cannula before my eyes."

"The last thing I saw was the tiny, perfectly formed backbone sucked into the tube, and then everything was gone."

Abby Johnson writes:

"The image of that tiny, dead baby, mangled and sucked away, kept replaying in my mind."

"What was in this woman's womb just a moment ago was alive. It wasn't tissue. It wasn't cells. This was a human baby fighting for life, a battle it lost in the blink of an eye."

She writes in the book:

"What I have told people for years as a Planned Parenthood leader, what I believed and taught and defended, is a lie."

Mr. Speaker, someday—someday—future generations of Americans will look back on us and wonder how and why such a rich and seemingly enlightened society, so blessed and endowed with the capacity to protect and enhance vulnerable human life—the weakest and the most vulnerable—could have so aggressively promoted death to children by abortion.

They will demand to know why dismembering a child like the one that Abby Johnson witnessed—pulverizing an infant with suction or chemically poisoning a baby with any number of toxic chemicals failed to elicit empathy, mercy, or compassion for these victims.

□ 1215

No one is expendable or a throwaway, Mr. Speaker. Every human life has infinite value. Birth is merely an event; it is not the beginning of life. Abortion is violence against children and it is violence against women.

The movie "Unplanned" not only moved me, as I believe it will move others, but it also inspired me, as I believe it will inspire others, to care even more for both victims of abortion, the mother, and the child, to love them both, to reach out to post-abortive women. And there are ministries all over this country that say, Yes, an abortion has been procured, but we love you and we want to see you reconcile and find peace and joy again.

This movie makes clear that we need to continue to reach out to the people inside the abortion industry, in the sincere hope that they, like Abby Johnson, will recognize that there is nothing compassionate, benign, or nurturing about abortion.

Abby Johnson has formed a ministry, a nongovernmental organization. It is called And Then There Was None. It is designed to assist abortion clinic workers out of the industry. To date, approximately, 500 abortion clinic work-

ers have left that field of work including seven abortion doctors who now nurture life, rather than kill it.

Abby Johnson is a courageous, selfless woman who spreads truth and compassion. She speaks truth to power. "Unplanned" is a truly amazing movie.

Mr. GOHMERT. Will the gentleman stay for a question.

Mr. Speaker, I am deeply moved and touched by everything my friend from New Jersey has had to say. But at one point, my friend said, he really believed that some day Americans will look back on this point in history. And one of my great concerns, because of the love I know is shared between us both for this country; and desperately wanting this country, our children, grandchildren, great grandchildren, someday to enjoy our freedoms, one of my biggest concerns is that it won't be Americans that look back; that if we stay on this road where we dismember and kill babies, it may not be Americans that look back, it may be historians in some other country after the United States no longer exists in its present condition that look back and say, Wow, look how degenerate they had gotten, and it just seemed so accepted.

Does the gentleman from New Jersey, my friend, have any concerns that, perhaps, if we don't address this problem that it may not be Americans that look back and see this problem area?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I do believe that there are deep concerns about the loss of life and what it means demographically, both here and all over the world. I mean, in places like China, sex selection abortion has claimed the lives of so many of the girl children that there are tens of millions of men who will never marry because the women simply have been exterminated through sex selection abortion.

I have held a number of congressional hearings—I have chaired them—where we have talked about the disparity between boys and girls. One estimate posited there are 62 million missing girls in China alone.

One of my witnesses said that if you look at all the women that have been killed in Asia through sex selection abortion alone, and it is worldwide, it equals, equates with the number of all the women and girl children living in the United States of America. I mean, that is a horrific crime, in my opinion, against women. And the disparity in male to female that is a consequence leads to other horrific consequences, like human trafficking.

As my good friend knows, I am the prime author of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act and four other laws that combat human trafficking, including the most recently signed, the Frederick Douglass anti-human trafficking law signed by President Trump just a few months ago. I am the author

of those bills; and we watch very closely what is happening all over the world.

In places like China, trafficking has increased because of the missing daughters who have been killed, simply because they happened to be girls and women, young women, young females.

On this floor of the House, as the gentleman knows, because he voted, as did I, we had a bill to ban sex selection abortions. And to this day, I am shocked and dismayed how many of our colleagues—and I respect our colleagues on both sides of this issue—didn't see that discrimination begins in the womb, when a woman is singled out, a girl, girl child, simply because she is a girl and is killed for that reason.

Sex selection abortion is almost never—although it is occasionally for the boy child, it is the girl child who suffers. So when we look back, when our future generations look back, they will also note that discrimination. Why did that bill not become law?

It seems to me there are at least 20 nations around the world where there are disparities; India and China are among the worst, but it is a huge problem. And we need to look at protecting unborn children as a human rights issue.

Killing an unborn child in the womb is the only human rights abuse that dares call itself a human right; and there are people, purveyors of abortion, who do that on a regular basis. They keep saying it is a right; a right to dismember a child; the right to chemically poison a child.

As the gentleman knows, because he was, again, one of the sponsors of the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, which I have re-introduced in this Congress—Trent Franks had introduced it in previous—passed three times here on the House floor. It says that children at least 20 weeks, and maybe earlier, but at least at 20 weeks, need to be protected because they suffer excruciating pain when they are being dismembered, for a couple of minutes. We are not sure exactly how long, but the evidence is very, very clear that they suffer as they are being killed by abortion.

And that legislation passed with good numbers, good—a large number of Members of the House, but it is not law yet.

So, you know, I think when we look back, we are going to say we had all these opportunities. And now the most recent—and I appreciate my friend from Texas yielding this time—the most recent outrage is what is happening with regards to children who are born alive and then are killed after birth.

We just had the mayor—not the mayor—the Governor of New York eviscerating protections for children who survive abortions.

Years ago, the Philadelphia Inquirer did a piece, a big piece, a big article called “The Dreaded Complication.”

And the dreaded complication were those children who somehow evaded the dismemberment process or some other part of that process and emerged alive. It was usually a hysterotomy abortion in most cases, but other cases as well, to go on and breathe and gasp and cry. And these very weak and vulnerable children should be protected.

We have a bill that has been introduced, the Born-Alive Protection Act. We have asked, as just a few hours ago from this floor many times—I did it as well—asking that our friends in the majority would allow this bill to come up, so at least when these children are born alive, the same regimen of care, the same due diligence would be given to that boy or girl, gasping for breath, to ensure that they are protected and get resuscitation.

Why, in these abortion clinics, are they allowed to die due to exposure, or sometimes to additional effort to just kill them?

This legislation has had a large number of cosponsors in the House and Senate. The Senate had an opportunity to take it up and it was voted down, sadly, by other friends on the other side of the aisle. And again, we reach out to our friends on the other side of the aisle to say this is a human rights issue.

Born alive? I did a speech in 2012 on what is called after-birth abortion. Two ethicists wrote this piece—and I would invite anyone who wants to, read it; it is on my website.

Two ethicists wrote this piece about how we ought to kill babies after birth because, really, they are not really different than the child before birth. They can't dream; they can't talk; they don't have cognitive abilities that say, a 4-year-old or a 5-year-old might have.

You know, birth is an event that happens to all of us. It is a continuum of life, and abortion is violence against children. But after-birth abortion also is violence against children.

Let me just conclude. Many people, like Alveda King, Dr. Martin Luther King's niece, she has had two abortions. And she has said, how can the dream survive—that is to say, her great uncle's dream, I have a dream—if we kill the children and hurt and wound the women?

The pro-life movement, and I have been in it for 47 years, care for both, mother and child; love them both. And, again, this new movie, “Unplanned,” chronicles a woman, Abby Johnson, who was right there with the strongest of the pro-abortion activists in this country, including counseling women to get abortions.

And then she was director of a clinic in Texas, as I said earlier, in the gentleman's home State. Then, when she saw that child killed, in real time, on an ultrasound, it shattered the myth that somehow that child is not human and not alive, and she walked out the door and never came back.

There were people praying for her from the 40 Days for Life, a very, very

humane organization of men and women who pray for the clinic personnel; they pray for the babies; they pray for the moms. That is their agenda, care, love, compassion.

She then, later on, and as depicted in the movie, was at—you know, trying to reach out to some women as well, so they wouldn't make this irreversible decision.

So I want to thank the gentleman again. But, you know, someday we will recognize that these children—and you know, this millennial generation and others that are coming along, you know, first baby pictures now for parents and grandparents are of ultrasound imaging of their children. That is what goes on the refrigerator. The newborn pictures go on, too, with great smiles and great joy when the child is born. But we now know, before birth when he or she is a girl or a boy. We know just so much, and we have that picture, which is the first baby picture.

And to think—and this is what got to Abby Johnson—she watched as that child was dismembered right in front of her. She was holding the probe; and it just dawned on her, the blind spot was lifted, and she realized, I am participating in the killing of a baby. And she left that clinic, and now she is one of the most courageous pro-life leaders in the country and the world.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I really appreciate those words from my friend, CHRIS SMITH, and I look forward to seeing that movie.

I was very moved watching the movie “Gosnell”. It just—I thought about the poets, the inhumanity to man. It is tragic.

Having talked to people that have taught in China, you know, it is a human crisis what is going on with the abortion of so many women. And like my friend, CHRIS SMITH, I can't help but wonder why that is not considered a war on women when you kill a baby in utero simply because the child is female. But apparently, in China, since couples are only allowed normally to have one child, many couples think, well, we would rather have a boy. Discrimination against girls.

As a father who has three girls, they have brought joy to my life in so many ways. I just cannot fathom the thought of ever doing anything to have prevented those girls from being born.

But there are far-reaching implications when you have a gendercide. But as was pointed out by a teacher in China, first of all, the boys don't have as much opportunity to have female friends, making it more difficult to find a heterosexual partner.

But more than that, because it is restricted to one child, you have two sets of grandparents and two parents, six people who have one child to focus on, and it actually—

One of the greatest disciplined groups of children in the world used to be considered from China.

□ 1230

More and more, you have doting grandparents and parents. Since they only have one child to dote on among the six of them, more and more of those Chinese children are being spoiled rotten. It is much more difficult to maintain order, because now that there is one child to spoil among six people, the teacher is never right. The child is always right.

It is interesting, seeing all the far-reaching ramifications of this gendercide against women. I hope and literally do pray that things will change, and babies will no longer be killed just simply because they are female.

FRAUD ON FISA COURT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, there are four other topics I wanted to touch on.

One, I was greatly surprised to find out about a motion and order by the Obama administration in 2012 before the FISA court, because being on the Judiciary Committee—I wasn't there when the PATRIOT Act was passed; I have been there for reauthorization—I have grave concerns about some of the civil rights there.

My colleagues across the aisle on the Judiciary Committee, many of them had extremely grave concerns when they were in the minority about civil rights and civil liberties, and those seem to have taken a backseat while the President was President Obama.

I am hopeful that, now that there is not a Democrat in the White House, we can get some bipartisan concern again about civil liberties, after the Obama administration really did run roughshod over so many.

One of the things we were assured in reauthorizing the FISA court, the procedures and all, is that no American, and this was in the PATRIOT Act as well, but no American would be caught up in any foreign surveillance or surveillance by our U.S. entities, whether CIA, NSA, whatever, unless the American citizen was engaged in a conversation with a known terrorist, foreign terrorist, or an agent of a known terrorist organization.

Then through this colonoscopy, figuratively speaking, that the Trump campaign and administration were getting, we come to find out things were far more loose in protecting civil liberties and privacy rights.

On the FISA court, unfortunately, we have at least one or more FISA judges that really don't care about the Constitution. They don't care about Fourth and Fifth Amendment rights. They have allowed the Justice Department to run roughshod over those.

I am very concerned about how far this goes back. Did it go back before the Obama administration? Is it a newer invention? Just how many activities once considered unthinkable by the Federal Government are now just ho-hum to FISA judges?

The fact is that we now know the FISA court, at least one, perhaps more

courts, were lied to. Since this is basically a Star Chamber where the public is not allowed to know what went on—things are held in secret. The transcripts are held in secret, unless you get them released by WikiLeaks, as the application for warrant, the affidavit on which it was based, and the order regarding Verizon some years back—WikiLeaks released that.

That was the eye-opener for me, because as just an ardent historian when it comes to so many things American, and that includes First Amendment rights, I was shocked, Fourth Amendment, Fifth Amendment.

We know the Constitution is very clear. You can't just say: Give me all the information you have.

It is required that you have some kind of probable cause here, and you have to describe with particularity the area to be searched or the thing to be searched and the specific thing that is being sought for which there is a warrant.

I was overwhelmed to see an affidavit saying: Well, for America's protection, we just need every bit of information that Verizon has on every one of their customers.

I am going, oh, my gosh. During my days as a felony judge in Texas, if an officer had come with an affidavit and an application signed, sworn to, and given that to me, that we need a warrant, I am going, you have got to be kidding. There is no particularity here. It is just saying give me everything you have on every customer this company has.

Are you kidding? You need to go back to school. I am not sure I need to be signing any more warrants for you if that is the way you consider constitutional rights.

Yet, it was just ho-hum for the Justice Department, ho-hum for the FISA court judges.

I mean, unless there is some FISA judge that signed these four warrants regarding the Trump campaign, and individuals with it, who has just completely lost his or her mind and doesn't know what is going on, that judge, or judges, has to be aware they were lied to. There was fraud upon that court.

The fact that we have Federal judges who were confirmed by the U.S. Senate after being appointed by a U.S. President who would not be bothered that the United States Department of Justice and the FBI had people who would come before that judge and lie to that judge, and the judge is not bothered—"oh, well."

I remember after a bankruptcy hearing many years ago, I really liked this judge, but he said: Louie, you seem bothered that the person who filed bankruptcy got caught in a huge lie. That seemed to bother you. But, Louie, they all lie. You just got to get used to it.

Well, I have still not gotten used to the idea that somebody can come in and lie under oath before a judge without any ramifications coming from that.

The fact that we have one or more FISA judges who are not bothered, have done nothing, and have put no one in jail for the fraud committed in the FISA court tells me we have to either get rid of the FISA courts—go back to the way it was before, when if you had a matter of national security, it was treated differently, but we didn't have special Star Chambers where you came and had secret hearings. You just went to a normal judge and handled things in camera, if necessary. We have to either do that, get rid of the FISA courts, or we have to have some safeguards to make sure that Americans' rights are protected.

But there is a motion and order here. The motion, it was secret, classified, before the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court. This is from April 23, 2012. It has now been declassified. I had no idea that the Obama administration, the Justice Department, had sought this and gotten it, but apparently, as broadly spread as information was about American citizens whose names were unmasked and about what they were saying when it didn't necessarily involve any foreign terrorist organization—I am still not over the fact that some of us were lied to, in order to get some of the PATRIOT Act reauthorized. That was not the Obama administration I am talking about.

But this is a motion, and the title is: "Government's Submission of Amendments to Standard Minimization Procedures." That is the procedure where, if it is an American citizen who is caught up in a phone surveillance, phone conversations that are being surveilled by our intelligence, the minimization is what the law requires where you mask the name. You minimize the conversation so that the identity and other information is not available for review, because the Constitution protects American citizens and gives them Fourth Amendment and Fifth Amendment rights that otherwise would be abused.

But this says: "For FBI Electronic Surveillance and Physical Search Conducted Under the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, and Submission of Revised Minimization Procedures for the National Counterterrorism Center, and Motion for Amended Orders Permitting Use of Amended Minimization Procedures."

Then I see that it was classified by Tashina Gauhar, Deputy Assistant Attorney General. She answered directly to Rod Rosenstein, I guess still does.

My understanding is, and I was told, that she is one of the key people who was telling Jeff Sessions that he needed to recuse himself. This is an attorney, Deputy Assistant Attorney General, who was loyal to Sally Yates, is still loyal to Sally Yates, even though she refused to do her constitutional duty to defend a constitutional act by President Trump. She didn't care for the President, so she wasn't going to carry out her constitutionally mandated duty.

Fortunately, Sally Yates is no longer there, and we have at least some people there who are willing to carry out their obligation under the Constitution.

But when my friend Jeff Sessions was saying he has talked to career people and they have encouraged him, told him he needed to recuse himself, I had heard that Tashina Gauhar was one of those people. You can call her a career person. I hope her career is about ended, at least in the Justice Department.

I also had understood she was someone who was trying to make Jeff Sessions look bad. As the National Security Council liaison, the notices of NSC meetings would go to her for the Attorney General. I was told she would sit on those and not get them to the Attorney General. He would get his notices late. He would be, therefore, the least prepared at the NSC's critical meetings. Sometimes, he would have conflicts because she didn't get him the notices early enough. Yet she, I was told, is one of those who said: Oh, yeah, you have to recuse yourself.

Her loyalties were more to President Obama and Sally Yates than they appear to be, at least to me, to the Constitution itself. Yet she is the one who is also pushing to change the minimization requirements.

What really got me as I read through this lengthy motion, I think this is really the crux of it, over here at page 64.

□ 1245

Over here on page 64—so, obviously, it is a long motion on behalf of the U.S. Government by Tashina Gauhar—it says:

“The following underlined text will be inserted into the first sentence: ‘The FBI may disseminate FISA-acquired information concerning United States persons, which’”—and then here is the underlined part—“‘reasonably appears to be’”—and then not underlined—“‘foreign intelligence information’”—more underlining—“‘is necessary to understand foreign intelligence information or assess its importance, or is evidence of a crime being disseminated for a law enforcement purpose.’”

Look, when you get language like this that could allow the massive distribution of what we were assured during reauthorization of these type procedures—oh, no, it is so restricted.

See, here are the regulations. This is who can find out about an American citizen who was surveilled electronically. It is protected. If somebody—an American citizen—happens to be captured just because of who they are talking to, you know, we have the minimization—nobody gets to know who that person is. The requirements are so tough to reveal the name.

Oh, no, not in this that was filed by Tashina Gauhar, if it reasonably appears it is necessary to understand some intelligence. Good grief, that throws the door wide open. You could justify giving this constitutionally pro-

TECTED information to basically anybody. Well, I think this will be important to help them understand some other intelligence information. This is an outrage.

And I had no idea—I don't know of anybody who did know back in 2012—that the Obama Justice Department was throwing this door open with this kind of vague and ambiguous terminology: Oh, well, if it helps them understand other information, well, then they can see and hear and get all of what otherwise should be constitutionally protected information where the U.S. Government has been spying on U.S. citizens.

As I have said before, I mean, it is becoming more and more clear that the only thing that Orwell got wrong was the year. It wasn't 1984. But here, oh, yeah, anything that our DOJ, our intelligence, want to disseminate to their friends, even if it is somebody that may be working at the U.N., we will disclose it to anybody, because it will help them understand other information better.

For everyone's sake, this is such an outrage. And here it is, 7 years—yeah, next month—7 years since this motion and order was filed in order to allow the government to pass around top-secret information that should be not only classified, it should never have been obtained in the first place.

And then, through the investigation of the Donald Trump campaign, we find out that, actually, you don't have to be a terrorist or a member of a known terrorist organization. If you happen to be an ambassador, which, I would imagine, most all of the Members of the House and Senate have met with ambassadors and have talked to ambassadors of foreign countries. And it had never crossed my mind that our Justice Department, or our NSA, CIA, or FBI, that they may say: Oh, here is a Senator or a U.S. Congressman who is having a conversation with a foreign ambassador, so we get to surveil this Member of Congress or Senate.

But, it turns out, if you have a conversation with an ambassador, you can't be sure anymore that you don't have the FBI's electronic intelligence community noting and logging and checking everything that you are doing and saying. That is incredible. That is just almost unfathomable, due to the protections that used to be observed for American citizens. I thought we made progress.

The days when Attorney General Kennedy authorized a wiretap of Martin Luther King, Jr., and Hoover were surveilling so many people that never should have been allowed to be surveilled, I thought we had gotten beyond that. Some of those activities were unconstitutional, were illegal. I thought we had progressed to the point that Members of the House and Senate, both sides of the aisle, should be deeply offended to find out that their government may be spying on them, perhaps when they talk to an ambassador. Even

if it is not a terrorist country, it is just extraordinary what we have been finding out in the last 2 years about the extent of abuses of Americans' privacy rights.

I am hoping, though, that we can work across the aisle to rein in some of these abuses, since the Obama administration is no longer there and the protection that seems some of my colleagues were trying to afford them, even though, in my mind, it meant really abuses of Americans' constitutional rights.

And then, somewhat related, my friend RAND PAUL, down the hall, this story from Paul Bedard, yesterday, notes that, “Senator RAND PAUL escalated his demand for an investigation into former Obama officials who ‘concocted’ the anti-Trump Russia scandal, revealing that former CIA director John Brennan was the key figure who legitimized the charges and discredited ‘dossier’ against the President.”

And it is interesting. This term “dossier” everybody is using now because of the former MI6, a former FBI informant who became no longer trusted by the FBI, no longer usable, because he was untrustworthy by the FBI, which was never conveyed to the FISA judge, that allowed the judge to keep signing warrants based on this untrustworthy person, but now to have this. As Senator PAUL was reporting in a tweet, he said that he had heard from a high-level source that Brennan helped to validate the dossier in intelligence reports.

“A high-level source tells me it was Brennan who insisted that the unverified and fake Steele dossier be included in the intelligence report . . . Brennan should be asked to testify under oath in Congress ASAP,” Senator PAUL tweeted.

In an earlier tweet Wednesday, Senator PAUL called for wide investigation into former President Barack Obama and his team. “Time for Congress to investigate. What did President Obama know and when? How did this hoax go on for so long unabated?”

It goes on to say:

“Brennan has denied in the past that he included the salacious dossier. . . . But at least two other top intelligence officials said he did.”

And we do know, sort of parenthetically here, it is not in the article, but we know Brennan has admitted being untruthful under oath before the Senate. He has admitted perjuring himself when it suited what he wanted to accomplish. And this is a guy that was overrunning the Trump campaign, Donald Trump and his campaign—then Donald Trump, now President Trump—just abusing his position as head of an intelligence agency.

This says, “And Washington Post editor Bob Woodward also said that Brennan endorsed the dossier from Christopher Steele when he”—Bob Woodward—“got a copy in late 2016. Woodward said that Brennan felt it matched the Russia collusion charges he had heard.”

And I can't help but wonder now if where Brennan heard this was when it came out of his own mouth.

"The dossier was never considered true until it was recognized in intelligence assessments and only after the late Senator John McCain and top Obama officials helped circulate it, said Paul."

"The dossier was underwritten by the Democratic National Committee and Hillary Clinton's campaign. By indicating the Kremlin interfered in the election, it helped to fuel false allegations of foreign collusion with the Trump campaign, leading to 2 years of nonstop investigations."

"I'm very concerned that it's becoming more clear that the Obama administration was able to obtain a FISA warrant to spy on our campaign based on phony opposition research from the Clinton campaign. Having Federal law enforcement spy on a Presidential campaign based on phony campaign research is really distressing and the true untold story," he said."

This is a problem. I know others may feel otherwise.

I like ADAM SCHIFF. He was put in charge of—back when he was in the Judiciary Committee where I was serving, we actually impeached two Federal judges who needed to be impeached, who needed to be removed, and my colleague, ADAM SCHIFF, did a wonderful job in handling that effort. As far as I am concerned, he developed great credibility with me in his professionalism in the way he handled the impeachment of those two Federal judges.

But, over the last 2 years, as he has continued to say we know there was collusion between the Trump administration and Russia and we have evidence and on and on, his credibility when it comes to intelligence matters has now been done great harm, not only here, but abroad. So I think it is time to have a different chairman of intelligence.

It is too important that we have someone who is a chairman that hasn't spent 2 years saying something was true that it turned out wasn't. We need to have a Democrat who has credibility with foreign governments, as well as here in the House, as well as in the Senate, and there are people like that. There are people like that on both sides of the aisle that have that kind of credibility that we know just would not be spreading something that wasn't absolutely true.

So I agree with my friends that are on the Intelligence Committee, and I appreciate my fellow Texan, MIKE CONAWAY, for pointing out this is now a problem and it needs to be addressed.

□ 1300

This article points out something I very much appreciate. The article is from Gregg Re with FOX News. "President Trump, in an exclusive, wide-ranging interview Wednesday night with FOX News' Hannity"—and that

was a great interview my friend Sean Hannity had with the President, really enjoyable, last night. But anyway, it says, "... to release the full and unredacted Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act warrants and related documents used by the FBI to probe his campaign, saying he wants to 'get to the bottom' of how the long-running Russia collusion narrative began.

"Trump told anchor Sean Hannity that his lawyers previously had advised him not to take that dramatic step out of fear that it could be considered obstruction of justice. 'I do, I have plans to declassify and release. I have plans to absolutely release,' Trump said. 'I have some very talented people working for me, lawyers, and they really didn't want me to do it early on. . . . A lot of people wanted me to do it a long time ago.'" I was one of those people.

He says: "I'm glad I didn't do it. We got a great result without having to do it, but we will. One of the reasons that my lawyers didn't want me to do it is, they said, if I do it, they'll call it a form of obstruction."

Last fall, when I was in the Oval Office along with the President talking for a while, and then his personal attorney came in, it seemed clear to me that his personal attorney was very concerned about declassifying the documents, that it was not the time to do it.

But there is no reason not to do it now, for sure. These things need to come out. We need to see just how badly abused this system was.

My friend JERRY NADLER is chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary. I remember my first term. There was no more vocal advocate on behalf of civil liberties and privacy rights. I really hope that our chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary will join in with Republicans to try to correct this situation.

Clearly, there are still many people who are working in the Trump administration who don't want President Trump to succeed, don't want the President to succeed with what he is trying to do, what he promised he would do.

I don't think anybody has to worry about President Trump being abusive secretly of somebody's rights. But if this isn't handled now, even though Republicans are not in the majority, if we don't clamp down on what we see are clear abuses within the DOJ, within the intelligence community, with the FISA courts, then we are easily headed for a time when somebody else will come in there and they will see how the system was abused during the Obama administration.

I don't know whether that will be a Democrat or a Republican, but I am telling you, if we don't clamp down on it now, the abuses will allow the arising of a Chavez. It will allow the arising of these people who got elected and then became totalitarian.

I think there is a great deal to the poster that circulated: "The problem

with socialism is, you can vote your way into it, but you have to shoot your way out of it."

That is what they found in Venezuela. They voted it in, but in order to have true socialism, you have to move toward totalitarian. You have to have such a powerful government. You can take from those who have earned and who have worked and give to those who are more desirable to have it, according to the government.

It is interesting that we have billionaires who are contributing massive amounts of money to move toward socialism. Obviously, they don't know their history well enough to know, that, yeah, they are considered good friends of the movement—thank you; you are a hero—but then when you move either toward communism—which true communism means there is no government. Everybody just shares and shares alike out of the goodness of their heart. You never can get there. You got to have a totalitarian government. That is why communism doesn't work.

Socialism, they welcome the help of all the rich people. But once you move toward real, true socialism, most of the time, the billionaires, they are going to end up in prison or dead and their money confiscated.

So I am amazed that so many billionaires don't realize they are just lackeys who are being appreciated now, but some day, they are going to go under the bus, and their money is going to be relieved from them.

It is a very critical time. As the Mueller investigation has finally concluded, having questioned Mr. Mueller numerous times, having done so much research on the man I feel like I know him very well—obviously, not as well as Eric Holder, who thought he would end up with an indictment to keep going.

I can't help but wonder if we have a new Attorney General who came in and realized there is nothing here. After all these subpoenas, tens of millions of dollars, it is time to wrap it up.

I really do think Mueller, left to his own devices, would have just kept an investigation going until every potential limitation on anything he had done wrong had run out.

But it is time to reform FISA courts, time to reform DOJ, time to reform our intelligence communities so the kind of abuses that have just gone on will not continue and Presidents in the future, whether Democrat or Republican, will not be tempted to abuse the system, as it is now appearing to have been done.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the indulgence. At this time, I yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 6 minutes p.m.),

under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, March 29, 2019, at 2:30 p.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

524. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Protected Resources — Headquarters, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Taking and Importing Marine Mammals; Taking Marine Mammals Incidental to National Park Service's Research and Monitoring Activities in Southern Alaska National Parks [Docket No.: 180411364-9092-02] (RIN: 0648-BH90) received March 21, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

525. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Class E Airspace for the following Alaska Towns; Hooper Bay, AK; Kaltag, AK; King Salmon, AK; Kodiak, AK; Manokotak, AK; Middleton Island, AK [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0347; Airspace Docket No.: 17-AAL-3] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received March 21, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

526. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's interim final rule — External Marking Requirement for Small Unmanned Aircraft [Docket No.: FAA-2018-1084; Amdt. No.: 48-2] (RIN: 2120-AL32) received March 21, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

527. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0902; Product Identifier 2018-NM-047-AD; Amendment 39-19543; AD 2019-01-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 21, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

528. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0581; Product Identifier 2018-NM-029-AD; Amendment 39-19547; AD 2019-01-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 21, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

529. A letter from the Ombudsman, Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — ELD/DT; Commercial Driver's License Upgrade from Class B to Class A [Docket No.: FMCSA-2017-0371] (RIN: 2126-AC05) received March 21, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

530. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Direc-

tives; Safran Helicopter Engines, S.A., Turboshift Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0949; Product Identifier 2018-NE-20-AD; Amendment 39-19484; AD 2018-22-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 21, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

531. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Pratt & Whitney Division (PW) Turboprop Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0826; Product Identifier 2018-NE-27; Amendment 39-19553; AD 2019-03-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 21, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

532. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0554; Product Identifier 2018-NM-064-AD; Amendment 39-19569; AD 2019-03-17] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 21, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

533. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0788; Product Identifier 2018-NM-004-AD; Amendment 39-19544; AD 2019-01-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 21, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

534. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters Deutschland GmbH (Previously Eurocopter Deutschland GmbH) Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2017-1126; Product Identifier 2017-SW-125-AD; Amendment 39-19587; AD 2019-05-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 21, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

535. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0793; Product Identifier 2018-NM-057-AD; Amendment 39-19545; AD 2019-01-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 21, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

536. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2016-9189; Product Identifier 2016-NM-114-AD; Amendment 39-19578; AD 2019-03-26] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 21, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

537. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31240; Amdt. No.: 3841] received March 21, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-

121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

538. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0162; Product Identifier 2017-NM-116-AD; Amendment 39-19542; AD 2019-01-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 21, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

539. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 31241; Amdt. No.: 3842] received March 21, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

540. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Viking Air Limited (Type Certificate Previously Held by Bombardier, Inc.; Canadair Limited) Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0638; Product Identifier 2018-NM-016-AD; Amendment 39-19552; AD 2019-02-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 21, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

541. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Flippin, AR [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0952; Airspace Docket No.: 18-ASW-16] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received March 21, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

542. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revocation of Class E Airspace; Beeville-Chase Field, TX [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0917; Airspace Docket No.: 18-ASW-14] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received March 21, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

543. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters Deutschland GmbH (Type Certificate Previously Held by Eurocopter Deutschland GmbH) Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0555; Product Identifier 2010-SW-047-AD; Amendment 39-19537; AD 2014-05-06 R2] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 21, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

544. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Williston, ND [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0250; Airspace Docket No.: 17-AGL-3] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received March 21, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

545. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes [Docket No.:

FAA-2018-0556; Product Identifier 2018-NM-015-AD; Amendment 39-19555; AD 2019-03-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 21, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

546. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bell Helicopter Textron Canada Limited Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0647; Product Identifier 2017-SW-083-AD; Amendment 39-19557; AD 2019-03-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 21, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

547. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Engine Alliance Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2019-0048; Product Identifier 2018-NE-19-AD; Amendment 39-19556; AD 2019-03-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 21, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

548. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Zodiac Aerotechnics Oxygen Mask Regulators [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0505; Product Identifier 2017-NE-15-AD; Amendment 39-19472; AD 2018-21-14] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 21, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

549. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Army, Civil Works, Department of Defense, transmitting the Corps' report on San Joaquin River Basin, Lower San Joaquin River, CA: Integrated Interim Feasibly Report, Environmental Impact Statement, and Environmental Impact Report for February 2018 (H. Doc. No. 116—24); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and ordered to be printed.

550. A letter from the Regulation Development Coordinator, Office of Regulation Policy and Management, Office of the Secretary (OOREG), Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — VA Acquisition Regulation: Construction and Architect-Engineer Contracts (RIN: 2900-AQ18) received March 21, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

551. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Services IRB only rule — 2019 Calendar Year Resident Population Figures [Notice 2019-19] received March 21, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

552. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Distributions of Stock and Securities of a Controlled Corporation (Revenue Ruling 2019-9) received March 21, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk

for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 1598. A bill to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to issue a strategy to improve hiring and retention of U.S. Customs and Border Protection personnel in rural or remote areas, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 116-22). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 1639. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to improve U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) identification of staffing needs, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 116-23). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 1589. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear intelligence and information sharing functions of the Office of Intelligence and Analysis of the Department of Homeland Security and to require dissemination of information analyzed by the Department to entities with responsibilities relating to homeland security, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 116-24). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 1593. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish a school security coordinating council, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 116-25). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 1433. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to improve morale within the Department of Homeland Security workforce by conferring new responsibilities to the Chief Human Capital Officer, establishing an employee engagement steering committee, requiring action plans, and authorizing an annual employee award program, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 116-26). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 1590. A bill to require an exercise related to terrorist and foreign fighter travel, and for other purposes (Rept. 116-27). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

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. CUNNINGHAM (for himself, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. VAN DREW, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. ROUDA, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. GALLEGO, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. HILL of California, Mr. PANETTA, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. BEYER, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. SHALALA, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. KIM, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. CASE, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. LEVIN of California, Mr. SOTO, and Mr. COX of California):

H.R. 1941. A bill to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to prohibit the Secretary of the Interior including in any leas-

ing program certain planning areas, and for other purposes to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. AMASH (for himself and Ms. LOFGREN):

H.R. 1942. A bill to repeal the authority to access on an ongoing basis business records for foreign intelligence and international terrorism investigations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select), 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. CLYBURN (for himself, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. PAYNE, Mrs. DEMINGS, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. OMAR, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. BASS, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. RUSH, Mr. COX of California, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. BARRAGAN, Ms. GABBARD, Ms. HILL of California, Mr. NADLER, Mr. SAN NICOLAS, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. SIRES, Mr. SOTO, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. CISNEROS, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. MCEACHIN, Ms. NORTON, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEWIS, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. COHEN, Mr. SABLAN, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. CLAY, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. PETERS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. MOORE, Mr. CASE, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. EVANS, Mr. LEVIN of California, and Ms. BLUNT ROCH-ESTER):

H.R. 1943. A bill to provide funding for Federally qualified health centers and the National Health Service Corps; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. LESKO (for herself and Mrs. LEE of Nevada):

H.R. 1944. A bill to require directors of medical facilities of the Department of Veterans Affairs to submit annual pamphlets to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs on the status of such facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia (for himself, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Ms. MOORE, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. FOSTER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. OMAR, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. RUSH, Mr. TONKON, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LYNCH, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. POCAN, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. HIMES, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. BEYER, Mr. KIND, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. TED LIEU of California):

H.R. 1945. A bill to suspend United States security assistance with Honduras until such time as human rights violations by Honduran security forces cease and their perpetrators are brought to justice; 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 Ms. GABBARD (for herself and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 1946. A bill to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to require voting systems used in elections for Federal office to produce a voter-verified paper ballot of each vote cast on the system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on 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. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee (for himself and Mr. BRINDISI):

H.R. 1947. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to exempt transfers of funds from Federal agencies to the Department of Veterans Affairs for nonprofit corporations established under subchapter IV of chapter 73 of such title from certain provisions of the Economy Act; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY (for herself, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. WELCH, Mr. GIANFORTE, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. MOORE, Ms. GABBARD, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. RODGERS of Washington, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. HOLDING, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. VELA, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. RUSH, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. GRJALVA, Ms. HILL of California, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. TONKO, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. COHEN, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. SUOZZI, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. HECK, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. COLE, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. KIND, Mr. ROSE of New York, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. KATKO, Mr. STEWART, Mr. GRIFFITH, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. RYAN, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. SCHRIER, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. COOPER, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. HURD of Texas, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. MORELLE, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. POSEY, Mr. LAMBORN, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. PALAZZO, and Mr. MITCHELL):

H.R. 1948. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for Medicare coverage of certain lymphedema compression treatment items as items of durable medical equipment; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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. WESTERMAN:

H.R. 1949. A bill to authorize the court to depart from a statutory minimum in the

case of a juvenile offender, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WESTERMAN:

H.R. 1950. A bill to authorize the court to impose a reduced sentence for a youthful victim offender, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WESTERMAN:

H.R. 1951. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to authorize a court to reduce the term of imprisonment imposed on certain defendants convicted as an adult for an offense committed and completed before the defendant attained 18 years of age, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLINS of Georgia (for himself and Mr. LANGEVIN):

H.R. 1952. A bill to amend the Intercountry Adoption Act of 2000 to require the Secretary of State to report on intercountry adoptions from countries which have significantly reduced adoption rates involving immigration to the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CLEAVER (for himself, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. COMER, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, and Ms. BROWNLEY of California):

H.R. 1953. A bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the female telephone operators of the Army Signal Corps, known as the "Hello Girls"; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on 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. KUSTOFF of Tennessee (for himself and Mr. TIMMONS):

H.R. 1954. A bill to provide that the Federal Communications Commission may not prevent a State or Federal correctional facility from utilizing jamming equipment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire (for herself, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Ms. WATERS):

H.R. 1955. A bill to require the Administrator of the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services to conduct a study on antipsychotic prescribing practices in non-nursing home settings under the Medicare program, 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. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee (for himself, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. KHANNA, and Mr. THOMPSON of California):

H.R. 1956. A bill to authorize the Department of Labor's voluntary protection program; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LEWIS (for himself, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. NEAL, Mr. BRADY, Ms. DELBENE, Mrs. WALORSKI, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. WENSTRUP, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. MOORE, and Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 1957. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modernize and improve the Internal Revenue Service, 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. MCCAUL:

H.R. 1958. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to authorize provision to a foreign government of financial assistance for foreign country operations to address individuals who may pose a national security, border security, or terrorist threat to the United States before such a threat reaches the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Homeland Security, 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. GRIFFITH (for himself and Mr. CUELLAR):

H.R. 1959. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to compounding pharmacies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BEYER:

H.R. 1960. A bill to cap the emissions of greenhouse gases through a requirement to purchase carbon permits, to distribute the proceeds of such purchases to eligible individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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. BLUMENAUER (for himself, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. PANETTA, and Mr. WALDEN):

H.R. 1961. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that kombucha is exempt from any excise taxes and regulations imposed on alcoholic beverages; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOST (for himself, Mr. HARDER of California, Mr. CRIST, and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois):

H.R. 1962. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to use on-site regulated medical waste treatment systems at certain Department of Veterans Affairs facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. BROWNLEY of California:

H.R. 1963. A bill to expand the research and education on and delivery of complementary and integrative medicine to veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BUTTERFIELD (for himself and Mr. HUDSON):

H.R. 1964. A bill to provide for the recognition of the Lumbee Tribe of North Carolina, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SOTO (for himself and Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico):

H.R. 1965. A bill to set forth the terms for the admission of the territory of Puerto Rico as a State of the Union; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CUMMINGS (for himself, Mr. SARBANES, and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER):

H.R. 1966. A bill to direct the Comptroller General of the United States to complete a study on barriers to participation in federally funded cancer clinical trials by populations that have been traditionally underrepresented in such trials; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, and Veterans' 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. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois (for himself and Ms. DELBENE):

H.R. 1967. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to enhance the Child and

Dependent Care Tax Credit and make the credit fully refundable; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JEFFRIES (for himself, Mr. CLYBURN, Ms. WATERS, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. ALLRED, Ms. BASS, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. BRINDISI, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CASTEN of Illinois, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CISNEROS, Mr. COHEN, Mr. COX of California, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, Ms. DEAN, Mr. DELGADO, Ms. DELAURO, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. FUDGE, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Ms. HILL of California, Ms. NORTON, Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma, Mr. HORSFORD, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. KING of New York, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Ms. LEE of California, Mrs. LEE of Nevada, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. LOWEY, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mrs. MCBATH, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. MORELLE, Mrs. MURPHY, Mr. NADLER, Mr. NEGUSE, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. PLASKETT, Ms. PRESSLEY, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. ROSE of New York, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SAN NICOLAS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. STANTON, Mr. SUOZZI, Ms. TITUS, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. TRONE, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. TONKO, Ms. UNDERWOOD, Mr. VAN DREW, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. CLEAVER, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. SPEIER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. GABBARD, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. MALINOWSKI, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. MENG, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, and Mrs. HAYES):

H.R. 1968. A bill to posthumously award a Congressional gold medal to Shirley Chisholm; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on 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. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois (for himself and Mr. WENSTRUP):

H.R. 1969. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to cover screening computed tomography colonography as a colorectal cancer screening test under the Medicare program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. OLSON, Mr. KIND, Mr. GIANFORTE, Mr. SARBANES, and Ms. SEWELL of Alabama):

H.R. 1970. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for payment for services of radiologist assistants under

the Medicare program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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. GALLEGO (for himself, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. O'HALLERAN, and Mr. STANTON):

H.R. 1971. A bill to direct the Secretary of Education to carry out a grant program to make grants to eligible entities to carry out full-day kindergarten programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GIANFORTE:

H.R. 1972. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1100 West Kent Avenue in Missoula, Montana, as the "Jeannette Rankin Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. HIGGINS of New York (for himself and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 1973. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide authority to add additional vaccines to the list of taxable vaccines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HORSFORD:

H.R. 1974. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the mine rescue team training credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KATKO (for himself, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mr. LIPINSKI):

H.R. 1975. A bill to establish in the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency of the Department of Homeland Security a Chief Information Security Officer Advisory Committee; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, 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 Mr. KILDEE (for himself, Mr. BERGMAN, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. DEAN, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. PAPPAS, Ms. STEVENS, Mr. WELCH, Ms. SLOTKIN, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. DELGADO, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, and Ms. TLAIB):

H.R. 1976. A bill to require the Director of the United States Geological Survey to perform a nationwide survey of perfluorinated compounds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. KIND (for himself, Mr. REED, and Mr. COURTNEY):

H.R. 1977. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend for 2 years the exclusion from gross income of discharges of qualified principal residence indebtedness; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TED LIEU of California (for himself, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. PETERS, Mr. CORREA, Mr. HARDER of California, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. COSTA):

H.R. 1978. A bill to fight homelessness in the United States by authorizing a grant program within the Health Resources and Services Administration for housing programs that offer comprehensive services and intensive case management for homeless individuals and families; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. TED LIEU of California (for himself and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H.R. 1979. A bill to improve the management of driftnet fishing; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York (for herself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mrs. WAGNER, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Ms. FRANKEL, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. WILD, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. DEAN, Ms. HAALAND, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. BARR, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. HURD of Texas, Mr. TURNER, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. MCNERNEY, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico, Mr. HORSFORD, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. SWALWELL of California, and Mr. ZELDIN):

H.R. 1980. A bill to establish in the Smithsonian Institution a comprehensive women's history museum, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committees on Natural Resources, 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. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York (for himself, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. NORTON, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. CRIST, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. COHEN, Mr. KILMER, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, Mr. GOMEZ, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RYAN, Mr. CICILLINE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. TONKO, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. POCAN, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. TITUS, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mr. HIMES, Mr. RUSH, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. KILDEE, Mrs. CRAIG, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. PETERS, Ms. OMAR, Ms. WEXTON, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. NADLER, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. WILD, Mr. HECK, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. PANETTA, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, and Mr. BROWN of Maryland):

H.R. 1981. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to prohibit payments under the Medicaid program for conversion therapy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MORELLE (for himself, Ms. MOORE, Ms. MENG, and Mr. REED):

H.R. 1982. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in recognition and celebration of the National Women's Hall of Fame; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on 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. O'HALLERAN (for himself and Ms. STEFANIK):

H.R. 1983. A bill to reauthorize and extend funding for community health centers and the National Health Service Corps; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. CISNEROS, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mr. HARDER of California, Ms. HILL of California, Mrs. MCBATH, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. ROUDA, Mr. TONKO, and Mr. WEBER of Texas):

H.R. 1984. A bill to amend chapter 11 of title 31, United States Code, to require the Director of the Office of Management and Budget to annually submit to Congress a report on all disaster-related assistance provided by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. PORTER (for herself and Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER):

H.R. 1985. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the exclusion for employer-provided dependent care assistance including the limitation on dependent care flexible spending arrangements; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RATCLIFFE (for himself, Miss RICE of New York, and Mr. HURD of Texas):

H.R. 1986. A bill to amend section 175b of title 18, United States Code, to correct a scrivener's error; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SÁNCHEZ (for herself and Mr. REED):

H.R. 1987. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a tax incentive for the installation and maintenance of mechanical insulation property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia (for himself, Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. LEVIN of California, and Mr. BARR):

H.R. 1988. A bill to clarify seasoning requirements for certain refinanced mortgage loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' 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. STEUBE (for himself and Mr. RESCENHALER):

H.R. 1989. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to modify the provisions that relate to family-sponsored immigrants; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TURNER (for himself and Mrs. BEATTY):

H.R. 1990. A bill to amend the National Aviation Heritage Act to reauthorize the National Aviation Heritage Area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. ADAMS:

H.J. Res. 54. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States recognizing and securing the fundamental right to life, liberty, and property, which includes housing, health care, education, and nutrition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. CHENEY:

H. Res. 264. A resolution electing Members to a certain standing committee of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE (for herself, Ms. BASS, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mrs. MCBATH, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mrs. HAYES, Ms. PLASKETT, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. MENG, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. HARDER of California, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mrs. TORRES of California, Ms. SHALALA, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CLAY, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, and Mrs. LAWRENCE):

H. Res. 265. A resolution commemorating the life and legacy of Sojourner Truth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CÁRDENAS (for himself, Mr. AGUILAR, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. BROWN

of Maryland, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. CISNEROS, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CORREA, Mr. COX of California, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. ESPALLAT, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. HORSFORD, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. KHANNA, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. LUJÁN, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. MOORE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PETERS, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. SABLÁN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SIREs, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. STANTON, Mr. TAKANO, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. VELA, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. NEAL, Mr. GALLEGRO, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. LEVIN of California, Mr. SOTO, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. HILL of California, and Mrs. TRAHAN):

H. Res. 266. A resolution recognizing March 31 as "César Chávez Day" in honor of the accomplishments and legacy of César Estrada Chávez; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Ms. CLARKE of New York:

H. Res. 267. A resolution supporting the designation of March 2019 as National Kidney Month; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. GOSAR:

H. Res. 268. A resolution expressing support for the designation of Cesar Chavez's birthday, March 31, 2019, as National Border Control Day; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LATTA (for himself, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. STEFANIK, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. GREEN of Tennessee, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. COX of California, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. TURNER, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. CISNEROS, Mrs. AXNE, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. BYRNE):

H. Res. 269. A resolution expressing support for the designation of March 2, 2020, as "Gold Star Families Remembrance Day"; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' 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 Ms. SÁNCHEZ (for herself, Mr. COOK, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. BUDD):

H. Res. 270. A resolution expressing support for designation of a Welcome Home Vietnam Veterans Day; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

11. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of South Dakota, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 8, requesting Congress to lawfully change the Medicaid eligibility requirements to give states the option to provide Medicaid services to persons in jail pending disposition; which was referred to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Mr. NEGUSE introduced a bill (H.R. 1991) for the relief of Jeanette Vizguerra-Ramirez; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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 Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H.R. 1941.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. AMASH:

H.R. 1942.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the implied power to repeal laws that exceed its constitutional authority as well as laws within its constitutional authority.

By Mr. CLYBURN:

H.R. 1943.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. LESKO:

H.R. 1944.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia:

H.R. 1945.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

By Ms. GABBARD:

H.R. 1946.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The U.S. Constitution including Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee:

H.R. 1947.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY:

H.R. 1948.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. WESTERMAN:

H.R. 1949.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1, with respect to the power to "lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts, and Excises," and to provide for the "general Welfare of the United States." Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution gives Congress the power to "regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes."

By Mr. WESTERMAN:

H.R. 1950.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1, with respect to the power to “lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts, and Excises,” and to provide for the “general Welfare of the United States.” Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution gives Congress the power to “regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.”

By Mr. WESTERMAN:

H.R. 1951.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1, with respect to the power to “lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts, and Excises,” and to provide for the “general Welfare of the United States.” Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution gives Congress the power to “regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.”

By Mr. COLLINS of Georgia:

H.R. 1952.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clauses 4 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CLEAVER:

H.R. 1953.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 1 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee:

H.R. 1954.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article I, Section 8, the Necessary and Proper Clause. Congress shall have power to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution for the foregoing Power and all Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire:

H.R. 1955.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section VIII

By Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee:

H.R. 1956.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. LEWIS:

H.R. 1957.

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 of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. McCAUL:

H.R. 1958.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. GRIFFITH:

H.R. 1959.

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 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BEYER:

H.R. 1960.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 1961.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. BOST:

H.R. 1962.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Ms. BROWNLEY of California:

H.R. 1963.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution

By Mr. BUTTERFIELD:

H.R. 1964.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution, Congress has the power to collect taxes and expend funds to provide for the general welfare of the United States. Congress may also make laws that are necessary and proper for carrying into execution their powers enumerated under Article I.

By Mr. SOTO:

H.R. 1965.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, and Article 4, Section 3, of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CUMMINGS:

H.R. 1966.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 1967.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I of the Constitution and its subsequent amendments and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. JEFFRIES:

H.R. 1968.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18, to make all laws, which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers.

By Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 1969.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I of the Constitution and its subsequent amendments and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 1970.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

[Page H2754]

By Mr. GALLEGRO:

H.R. 1971.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. GIANFORTE:

H.R. 1972.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. HIGGINS of New York:

H.R. 1973.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. HORSFORD:

H.R. 1974.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. KATKO:

H.R. 1975.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 Clause 1: Congress shall have the power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imports and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States.

By Mr. KILDEE:

H.R. 1976.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. KIND:

H.R. 1977.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. TED LIEU of California:

H.R. 1978.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. TED LIEU of California:

H.R. 1979.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section VIII

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 1980.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 1981.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. MORELLE:

H.R. 1982.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 5: “To coin Money, regulate the Value there of, and of foreign Coin, and fix the Standard of Weights and Measures;”

By Mr. O'HALLERAN:

H.R. 1983.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. PETERS:

H.R. 1984.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Ms. PORTER:

H.R. 1985.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. RATCLIFFE:

H.R. 1986.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. SANCHEZ:

H.R. 1987.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8

By Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia:

H.R. 1988.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. STEUBE:

H.R. 1989.

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; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

To borrow money on the credit of the United States;

To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;

To establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization, and uniform Laws on the subject of Bankruptcies throughout the United States;

To coin Money, regulate the Value thereof, and of foreign Coin, and fix the Standard of Weights and Measures;

To provide for the Punishment of counterfeiting the Securities and current Coin of the United States;

To establish Post Offices and Post Roads;

To promote the Progress of Science and useful Arts, by securing for limited Times to Authors and Inventors the exclusive Right to their respective Writings and Discoveries;

To constitute Tribunals inferior to the supreme Court;

and Offenses against the Law of Nations;

To declare War, grant Letters of Marque and Reprisal, and make Rules concerning Captures on Land and Water;

To raise and support Armies, but no Appropriation of Money to that Use shall be for a longer Term than two Years;

To provide and maintain a Navy;

To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces;

To provide for calling forth the Militia to execute the Laws of the Union, suppress Insurrections and repel Invasions;

To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining, the Militia, and for governing such Part of them as may be employed in the Service of the United States, reserving to the States respectively, the Appointment of the Officers, and the Authority of training the Militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress;

To exercise exclusive Legislation in all Cases whatsoever, over such District (not exceeding ten Miles square) as may, by Cession of particular States, and the acceptance of Congress, become the Seat of the Government of the United States, and to exercise like Authority over all Places purchased by the Consent of the Legislature of the State in which the Same shall be, for the Erection of Forts, Magazines, Arsenals, dock-Yards, and other needful Buildings; 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. TURNER:

H.R. 1990.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. NEGUSE:

H.R. 1991.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Ms. ADAMS:

H.J. Res. 54.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 9: Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. PINGREE, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. KEATING, Mr. SARBANES, Mrs. DINGELL, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Ms. HILL of California, and Mr. YARMUTH.

H.R. 20: Mr. PERRY and Mr. GOODEN.

H.R. 38: Mr. TAYLOR.

H.R. 61: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.

H.R. 95: Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. STEIL, Mr. NORCROSS, and Ms. DELBENE.

H.R. 101: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Ms. FRANKEL.

H.R. 141: Ms. JAYAPAL and Ms. HILL of California.

H.R. 434: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mrs. MCBATH, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mrs. HAYES, Ms. PLASKETT, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. MENG, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. YARMUTH, Mrs. TORRES of California, Ms. SHALALA, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. RICHMOND, Mrs. LAWRENCE, and Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 500: Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. COLE, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. POSEY, Mr. HAGEDORN, Mr. CARTER of Texas, and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.

H.R. 510: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. KEVIN HEERN of Oklahoma, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, and Mr. GALLEGO.

H.R. 535: Ms. TLAIB.

H.R. 550: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri and Mr. RICHMOND.

H.R. 553: Mr. COMER and Mrs. ROBY.

H.R. 569: Mr. ROSE of New York.

H.R. 587: Mr. SMUCKER, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, and Ms. SPEIER.

H.R. 612: Mr. GOSAR.

H.R. 647: Mr. SIRES and Mr. TURNER.

H.R. 759: Ms. HAALAND.

H.R. 779: Ms. CHENEY, Mr. FULCHER, and Ms. STEFANIK.

H.R. 784: Mr. GOODEN.

H.R. 808: Mr. COLE and Mr. HURD of Texas.

H.R. 830: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 836: Mr. SPANO.

H.R. 864: Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 865: Mr. HIGGINS of New York.

H.R. 961: Mr. CISNEROS, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. VAN DREW, Ms. LEE of California, and Mrs. CRAIG.

H.R. 962: Mr. WOODALL.

H.R. 1006: Mr. WALBERG.

H.R. 1035: Mr. PALAZZO.

H.R. 1049: Ms. SCANLON.

H.R. 1073: Ms. HILL of California.

H.R. 1086: Mr. HECK.

H.R. 1175: Mr. STAUBER.

H.R. 1182: Ms. KELLY of Illinois.

H.R. 1183: Ms. KELLY of Illinois.

H.R. 1243: Mr. COSTA, Ms. HILL of California, Mr. VAN DREW, and Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 1254: Ms. HILL of California.

H.R. 1260: Ms. OMAR.

H.R. 1266: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 1279: Mr. ROSE of New York.

H.R. 1287: Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. CASOR of Florida, and Mr. ROUDA.

H.R. 1377: Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 1379: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 1380: Mr. NEGUSE.

H.R. 1383: Mr. CORREA.

H.R. 1386: Mr. VAN DREW.

H.R. 1425: Mr. VAN DREW.

H.R. 1426: Mr. O'HALLERAN.

H.R. 1471: Mr. WELCH, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. OMAR, and Ms. CLARKE of New York.

H.R. 1540: Mr. PASCARELL.

H.R. 1553: Ms. HILL of California.

H.R. 1570: Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. KINZINGER, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. ALLRED, Mr. GUEST, Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania, and Mr. LUETKEMEYER.

H.R. 1572: Ms. PINGREE.

H.R. 1579: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, and Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 1622: Mr. KATKO, Mr. RIGGLEMAN, Mr. CÁRDENAS, and Mr. CUMMINGS.

H.R. 1629: Mr. RASKIN.

H.R. 1644: Mr. STANTON, Ms. WEXTON, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. CARBAJAL, and Mrs. LURIA.

H.R. 1653: Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. ROSE of New York, Mr. HARDER of California, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, and Ms. SCHKOWSKY.

H.R. 1674: Mr. GOSAR.

H.R. 1684: Ms. TLAIB.

H.R. 1709: Mr. SUOZZI and Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H.R. 1717: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 1735: Ms. NORTON and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 1739: Mr. WEBER of Texas.

H.R. 1741: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. GIANFORTE, Mr. BRADY, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. STEIL, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. RIGGLEMAN.

H.R. 1765: Ms. MOORE and Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 1781: Mr. VAN DREW.

H.R. 1837: Mr. KATKO, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. RYAN, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. POSEY, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Miss RICE of New York, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. VAN DREW, and Mr. ZELDIN.

H.R. 1854: Mr. COLE and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 1855: Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana and Mr. ARMSTRONG.

H.R. 1857: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 1869: Mr. CISNEROS, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. RYAN, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. O'HALLERAN, and Mr. HUNTER.

H.R. 1889: Mr. CÁRDENAS.

H.R. 1931: Mr. CORREA.

H.R. 1933: Mr. PAPPAS.

H.J. Res. 38: Ms. STEVENS and Mr. NEGUSE.

H.J. Res. 48: Ms. ADAMS.

H. Res. 33: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. HORSFORD, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mrs. CRAIG, and Ms. JAYAPAL.

H. Res. 54: Mrs. CRAIG, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. JAYAPAL, and Mr. DEUTCH.

H. Res. 106: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.

H. Res. 129: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.

H. Res. 214: Mr. FITZPATRICK and Mr. PAYNE.

H. Res. 246: Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. POSEY, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. VAN DREW, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. CORREA, and Mrs. MURPHY.

H. Res. 255: Mr. LONG, Mr. KILMER, and Mr. ZELDIN.