

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.