



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 165

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, APRIL 4, 2019

No. 59

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:
Dear God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

Bless abundantly the Members of this people's House. During this season of new growth, may Your redemptive power help them to see new ways to productive service, fresh approaches to understanding each other, especially those across the aisle, and renewed commitment to solving the problems facing our Nation.

May they, and may we all, be transformed by Your grace and better reflect the sense of wonder, even joy, at the opportunities to serve that are ever before us.

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.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. CRAWFORD 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.

END SUPPORT TO SAUDI ARABIA

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

Ms. GABBARD. Madam Speaker, right now, the United States continues to support Saudi Arabia's genocidal war in Yemen. This support has been ongoing since 2015 yet has never been authorized by Congress. It must end now.

U.S. support for this war has resulted in dire consequences. Just last week, the Saudi coalition bombed a hospital. They have bombed school buses, weddings, markets, funerals—tens of thousands of Yemen civilians killed. Millions more are in dire need of humanitarian aid, starving and sick, without access to food and water or basic medicine. This has created the worst humanitarian disaster in the world.

We are voting later today on an important resolution to finally end U.S. support for Saudi Arabia's war in Yemen. We need to put politics aside. Lives are at stake. We cannot afford to delay.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to recognize the urgency with which we must act, to vote against any attempts to delay or block this resolution, and to vote to pass S.J. Res. 7 today.

BUDGET

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

Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma. Madam Speaker, I rise today to discuss our Nation's ballooning debt and the

lack of interest across the aisle to address this crisis. We currently face a national debt that exceeds \$22 trillion and a deficit reaching \$1 trillion.

President Reagan's chief economic adviser recently called our Nation's fiscal situation "the most dangerous domestic problem facing America's Federal Government."

The majority party—so, the Democratic Party—is responsible for producing a budget representative of their values and priorities. Despite our grim fiscal reality, Democrats have made the decision to skip their duty of writing a budget, foregoing the only opportunity to look at our entire fiscal picture.

Speaker PELOSI has stated on numerous occasions: Show me your budget, and I will show you your values.

So, since the Democrats refuse to pass a budget, do they truly have any values that represent the American people? These are Speaker PELOSI's own words.

If my businesses spent money like the Federal Government, I would be forced to file bankruptcy. These wasteful habits are encouraged by politicians who do not see Federal dollars for what they are: hard-earned American taxpayer money.

The failure to produce this budget begs the question: Are our friends across the aisle concerned about our national debt? Again, I refer to the Speaker's words: No budget, no values.

VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN

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

Mr. HORSFORD. Madam Speaker, every 16 hours, a woman in this country is shot and killed by a current or former partner.

☐ 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.

H3071

Just last week, an 18-year-old woman in Las Vegas was shot dead by her boyfriend while they sat in their car outside of a neighborhood barbecue.

This country has an epidemic of violence against women, which is why I stand here today to ask this body to reauthorize and expand the Violence Against Women Act.

This bill will provide crucial resources to survivors of domestic violence and sexual abuse. It will invest in education programs that teach young men to stop the cycle of violence. It will provide Tribes with new mechanisms to hold non-Indian predators accountable for preying on Native women. And it will close the boyfriend loophole that allows physically abusive ex-boyfriends and convicted stalkers access to guns.

Madam Speaker, this legislation will save lives, and I urge every Member of this body to support its passage.

HONORING SERGEANT JOSEPH "JOEY" COLLETTE

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

Mr. CRAWFORD. Madam Speaker, I rise this morning to mourn the loss of an explosive ordnance disposal warrior.

On Friday, March 22, EOD Sergeant Joey Collette was killed in action in Afghanistan. At the time, Collette was participating in a joint U.S.-Afghan special operation.

Sergeant Collette deeply wanted to deploy overseas. He did all he could and gave his all to serve his country in Afghanistan. He was loved and respected by his brothers in arms.

He is survived by his wife, Caela, whom he had married only 2 weeks prior to deploying, and by his beautiful young daughter.

I offer my most sincere condolences to Joey's family and friends. I ask the rest of Congress to join me in ensuring that Sergeant Joey Collette and his sacrifice will not be forgotten.

Rest in peace, Sergeant Collette.

VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN

(Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act.

This critical legislation is important not only for survivors, but it impacts all of us. When we are talking about survivors, we need to also look at the root of the problem and the lasting impacts of trauma on the survivors and individuals as a whole. We must acknowledge the impact of adverse childhood experiences, or ACEs.

ACE scores are based on a list of events one can witness or undergo before turning 18, including sexual abuse or death in a family. If a person scores

higher than 4, they are 700 times more likely to develop depression and other negative impacts. Obesity, diabetes, and stroke also become more likely the higher one's ACE score.

Oklahoma's average ACE score is 4.8, significantly higher than the rest of the country. It is no coincidence that we rank at the bottom for health, too.

I am proud of leaders in my own district, like the Palomar Family Justice Center that uses ACE data and addresses trauma in treating survivors. I am thankful for the work of the Potts Family Foundation, which has helped lead the conversation on trauma in Oklahoma and across the Nation.

These models need to be implemented on a wider scale across the country, and I am proud to stand with the reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act today.

VOTE ON BORN-ALIVE ABORTION SURVIVOR PROTECTION ACT

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, on Tuesday, I signed the discharge petition to force a vote on the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act. 193 Members, including two Democrats, have already signed it. A discharge petition has not received such overwhelming support in the first 24 hours in at least 22 years.

I applaud Congresswoman ANN WAGNER for reintroducing this bill and Republican Whip STEVE SCALISE for filing the discharge petition.

The Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act would require that a child who is born alive after an attempted abortion receives treatment and be transferred to a hospital. This legislation penalizes the intentional killing of a child who is born alive.

Unfortunately, we have seen horrific actions in New York and Virginia to allow late-term abortion. It is, essentially, the execution of a defenseless child after birth.

Madam Speaker, this isn't abortion; this is infanticide. Any doctor who would leave a child to die should face the full extent of the law.

Americans deserve to know whether their Representatives stand against infanticide or not. I urge the House to act on this bill. I urge us to choose life over murder.

□ 0915

CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF MS. BESSIE M. SWINDLE

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

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, it is with great pride that I rise today to commemorate and celebrate the life of a great and noble American,

Ms. Bessie Swindle, who will be laid to rest.

Madam Speaker, Ms. Swindle was born in 1939 at a time when she could buy a hat but she couldn't try it on. She was relegated to the balcony of the movie and the back of the bus.

Yet, notwithstanding all of the obstacles that life afforded her, she was a servant to multiple elected officials: two constables and two mayors.

She has been given a day in her honor by Mayor Bill White in 2007.

She was, literally, a commissioner without a commission. She was a council person without a council. She was a lawyer without a license. She was the person who gave hope to the hopeless and help to the helpless.

She lived up to the words of Ruth Smeltzer:

Some measure their lives by days and years,

Others by heartthrobs, passions, and tears.
But the surest measure under God's sun,
Is what for others in your lifetime have you done.

God bless you, dear Bessie. We love you. Your spirit will live forever, and your legacy will continue to change the lives of others.

You made headway when others were making headlines.

We love you.

VOTE FOR THE BORN-ALIVE ABORTION SURVIVORS PROTECTION ACT

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

Mr. HARDER of California. Madam Speaker, I rise to encourage the Speaker of the House to let us vote on H.R. 962, the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act. It is more than common sense; it is common decency legislation being put forth to end the barbaric act of infanticide.

Every day, Kansans watching from back home assume this must already be law. There is no way that, in America, it is legal to murder a child who already has been born.

Sadly, in some parts of this country, it isn't common sense; it isn't common decency. In some parts of the country, it isn't something inherently wrong to kill a child who was born alive.

This is murder. It is appalling that it is being protected. This is murder.

Madam Speaker, let us vote.

HEALTHCARE

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

Mr. WATKINS. Madam Speaker, last week the administration made yet another attempt to strip healthcare away from our families.

Let me be clear: My community in the Central Valley needs more health coverage, not less. We need more doctors; we need more nurses; we need

more mental health services; and we need everyone with a preexisting condition to have coverage.

Each and every one of us in this Chamber has a loved one or a neighbor who would be hurt by this effort. This includes my friend Vicky, from Moxdesto.

She was healthy her whole life until she had her first seizure. She was hospitalized and was having four to five seizures a day until her doctor was able to find a medication that worked. She has to pay \$400 a month even now for this medicine, and she has insurance.

Imagine if this lawsuit goes through. Vicky will completely lose her insurance. There are 100,000 other people in my community with a story just like hers. These are real people who would be hurt.

Folks in my community have been crystal clear on this issue: We need more healthcare for more people.

My community needs us to move this discussion forward, not backwards.

VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2019

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HARDER of California). Pursuant to House Resolution 281 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 1585.

Will the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN) kindly take the chair.

□ 0919

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1585) to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act of 1994, and for other purposes, with Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, April 3, 2019, amendment No. 38 printed in part B of House Report 116-32 offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROSE) had been disposed of.

AMENDMENT NO. 39 OFFERED BY MRS. AXNE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 39 printed in part B of House Report 116-32.

Mrs. AXNE. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 29, strike lines 3 through 7 and insert the following:

SEC. 201. SEXUAL ASSAULT SERVICES PROGRAM.

Section 41601(f)(1) of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12511(f)(1)) is amended by striking "\$40,000,000 to remain available until expended for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018" and inserting "\$60,000,000 to remain available until expended for each of fiscal years 2020 through 2024".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 281, the gentlewoman from Iowa (Mrs. AXNE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Iowa.

Mrs. AXNE. Madam Chair, the Violence Against Women Act expired on September 30, 2018. It is incredibly disappointing that we ever let this landmark bill expire in the first place, but we now have an opportunity to provide additional resources and address gaps in the expired law to better protect women in Iowa and across the land from violence. My amendment will help do that.

I have introduced an amendment that will increase STOP grants to help local law enforcement agencies and community organizations better combat and prosecute violence against women. This funding will help law enforcement agencies develop and strengthen strategies to end domestic and sexual violence.

I have met with local police officers and sheriffs throughout my district, and they all tell me they are under-resourced and they are understaffed. I promised them I would do anything in my power to make sure they get what they need to protect our communities.

STOP grants also provide prosecutors with the proper tools and resources they need to get justice for survivors and prosecute those who commit violence against women.

While we must do everything in our power to stop violence against women, the sad reality is domestic and sexual violence is prevalent in this country. It is prevalent across all socioeconomic backgrounds, and it is something that is not exclusive to any one part of this country. We have it in our own backyard.

For many victims of domestic and sexual violence, recovery can be a life-long process. We need to make sure that we are providing organizations that provide victim services, like the Iowa Coalition Against Sexual Assault, with the resources they need to develop and strengthen programs to help as many survivors as possible.

When I worked at the State of Iowa, I helped the Crime Victims Assistance Unit in the AG's office improve their processes, so I know that in Iowa—I have seen it firsthand—we don't have enough resources to address the needs that we have.

There are simple steps that we can take that have a major impact on the amount of people that we can help, and that is what these grants do. They will help our local law enforcement agencies, our local prosecutors, and local community organizations stop more crimes, prosecute more perpetrators, and provide services to more survivors.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CLINE. Madam Speaker, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CLINE. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment, which increases the authorization of STOP grants from \$40 million to \$60 million. The amendment does not have an offset from any other account.

We had a hearing on this important legislation in committee. The gentlewoman is correct in stating that domestic violence is a problem and we must take action to confront it. It was disappointing that the legislation was taken from what was a bipartisan consensus and turned into a partisan document that went far beyond the underlying legislation which was allowed to expire.

We had a hearing, and no witness that I recall advocated, during committee, for increasing the authorization level for STOP grants.

STOP grants do perform a vital service. In fact, one of my first jobs out of law school was prosecuting under a STOP grant, prosecuting domestic violence cases in Rockingham County in Harrisonburg, Virginia.

In the markup in committee, not a single Democrat offered any amendment to increase the authorization level by an additional \$20 million. There has been no reason given to add an additional 50 percent to this specific program as opposed to any program. So I would urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. AXNE. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), my colleague.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Chair, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Madam Chair, I support this amendment which would increase the sexual assault services program authorization from \$40 million to \$60 million.

This program assists States, Tribes, and territories to provide intervention, advocacy support, and related assistance to victims of sexual assault.

Experts in the field have indicated that this program is underfunded for the depth and the breadth of the work it covers, despite the remarks of the gentleman from Virginia.

It is underfunded. We need more money here. I support the amendment of the gentlewoman.

Now, the gentleman from Virginia says there is no offset. That is true. We do not need an offset.

Of course, we could take it away from President Trump's personal part of the tax, of the \$1.8 trillion tax break that the Republicans voted for for the rich.

But the fact is we don't need an offset. Under the rules, the appropriations bill has to deal with that. This simply makes funds available, and for a very worthy purpose.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. CLINE. Madam Chair, I would state to the esteemed chairman of the committee that we have proceeded without offsets for many, many years

on many, many things, and that is one of the reasons why we are over \$20 trillion in debt right now.

This House must exercise fiscal restraint and bring its budget back into some semblance of order and exercise responsibility. And so an offset is responsible, is appropriate, does not exist, and was never discussed.

The chairman talks about experts. We heard from no expert at the committee level as to the need for the additional \$20 million in STOP grants.

Madam Chair, I ask my colleagues to oppose the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. AXNE. Madam Chair, I appreciate what my colleague across the aisle is saying; however, our debt can be looked at in many ways to amend. However, our local police officers, our local communities, and our organizations that support victims with assistance are in dire need of the additional funding.

I would argue that this administration is the cause of this major debt that we have, and we should not take that out on our local communities that I know are supported across the aisle.

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

Mr. CLINE. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Iowa (Mrs. AXNE).

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 0930

AMENDMENT NO. 40 OFFERED BY MS. TORRES
SMALL OF NEW MEXICO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 40 printed in part B of House Report 116–32.

Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico. Madam Chairwoman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 171, insert after line 2 the following (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 1408. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION REGARDING COMPLIANCE WITH IMMIGRATION LAWS.

Nothing in this Act, or in any amendments made by this Act, shall affect the obligation to fully comply with the immigration laws.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 281, the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. TORRES SMALL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New Mexico.

Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico. Madam Chairwoman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chairwoman, I rise to offer amendment No. 40 to H.R. 1585, the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act.

My amendment is simple. It will ensure that everything in this bill complies with current immigration law. One in three women in the United

States will experience domestic violence. That is unacceptable. It doesn't matter who you are. Domestic violence is unacceptable. This law protects all survivors.

It ensures that our Nation recognizes domestic violence and sexual assault as crimes. It provides crucial protections against domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking. It provides survivors with the support they deserve.

It provides our law enforcement with everything they need to provide justice to these survivors, and it sends a clear message nationwide that our Federal Government will protect all survivors and condemn all domestic and sexual assault offenders.

That is why the reauthorization of VAWA should not be impacted by the current debate on our immigration system. That debate is for another day and it is a debate we should have soon in this Chamber. But I felt it was necessary to offer this amendment to acknowledge that as the House passes this legislation, it is also in accordance with the laws already enacted.

Again, this is all this amendment attempts to do. It is important that funding goes where it is intended. And the eligibility for VAWA grant funding is clear in this bill. VAWA is the cornerstone for safety and justice to survivors of violence and abuse. Our sole focus today should be to keep that cornerstone strong.

All of us know a survivor. She may be our mother, he may be our best friend. It may be ourselves. We, as a country, know what to do and we should do it together. Therefore, I encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this essential legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CLINE. Madam Speaker, I claim the time in opposition, although I am not opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. CLINE. Madam Chairwoman, I would answer the gentlewoman by saying that we are in agreement that domestic violence is a problem, and regardless of who you are in this country, you deserve protection if you are a victim of domestic violence. No matter, woman, man, gay, straight, you deserve protection if you are a victim of domestic violence, and we need to provide adequate protection.

Unfortunately, this bill does not provide that protection when you are allowing environments to be created where victims are at risk of being re-victimized, whether it is through the legal process, or through the shelter process. We have problems with this bill overall. But I commend the gentlewoman for her amendment, because it does ensure that the laws regarding immigration in this country are complied with.

I wish that we had gone further. I offered an amendment on another bill at

committee to ensure that ICE was notified whenever an illegal immigrant committed a crime involving a firearm so that they could be deported quicker. I wish that that had been attempted in this legislation as well. ICE deserves to be notified when someone is convicted of a crime of domestic violence if that defendant is illegal.

So while we could not go further, I thank the gentlewoman for offering the amendment. I do not oppose it, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico. Madam Chairwoman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the Speaker of the House.

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Chairwoman, I thank the gentlewoman for her leadership in presenting the important amendment to the Violence Against Women Act. I thank the distinguished chairman of the committee for his leadership in bringing this VAWA reauthorization to the floor. I commend KAREN BASS, the author of the legislation, the chair of the subcommittee of jurisdiction, and I want to recognize and acknowledge the work of Congresswoman SHEILA JACKSON LEE over the years in terms of ending violence against women.

Again, we take an oath to protect the American people. Nearly 25 years ago, Congress honored that oath when we enacted the bipartisan Violence Against Women Act. It united our communities and our country in a fight against domestic violence in America.

Today, we honor that oath once more by passing strong, bipartisan, long-term VAWA reauthorization that will save lives.

Again, I want to salute KAREN BASS, a champion for women's safety and security as chair of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations, and the many champions of VAWA in the Congress who have made today possible. Again, I acknowledge Congresswoman JACKSON LEE.

We thank all of the survivors, victims, and advocates who have shown the generosity of spirit to tell their stories. Nothing is more eloquent or effective than the stories which show that this is not a legislative fight or an issues fight. It is a personal fight about America's families.

I commend Congresswoman TORRES SMALL for this important amendment that recognizes and ensures that all provisions of the bill comply with current immigration law. This isn't a bill about immigration, but I wanted to make that assertion, and I thank the gentlewoman, Congresswoman TORRES SMALL for this amendment.

We are pleased that the bill is bipartisan. There should be nothing partisan or political about ending the scourge of domestic violence and sexual assault, which one in three women faces today.

Madam Chairwoman, with this bill, we are reinforcing what we did 25 years ago, and what we did in 2013. We are making it stronger with the legislation

today, with lifesaving updates that reflect the voices of victims and survivors and the input of experts.

With this bill, we are empowering law enforcement and making new investments in prevention. We are improving lifesaving services to victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking. We are supporting survivors with protections against discrimination in the workplace and supporting their financial security.

We are closing dangerous loopholes in our laws that right now allow those who have been convicted of stalking or dating violence to obtain firearms. These are commonsense reforms that will save lives and that no one should object to.

We are strengthening protections for Native American women because every woman everywhere has the right to live free from abuse. We thank the Indian Country and the Native American women for their input on this. And aren't we blessed now to have for the first time in American history, two Native American women serving in the Congress of the United States: Congresswoman SHARICE DAVIDS from Kansas, and Congresswoman DEB HAALAND from New Mexico, and they have already made their presence felt.

This bill has historically been bipartisan. We urge all Members to join us in a strong bipartisan vote for this bill, which honors our oath, upholds our values, and saves lives. Again, I urge a "yes" vote.

Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico. Madam Chairwoman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. Madam Chairwoman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

I rise in support of the gentlewoman's amendment. Representative TORRES SMALL's amendment makes it clear that nothing in this bill impacts or changes any obligations or requirements to comply with our immigration laws.

This amendment alleviates any potential concern or confusion about the intent of this legislation. It makes clear that the bill does not change any immigration law, nor does it affect any of the immigration obligations and requirements under current law. It is that simple, and I urge all of my colleagues to support it.

Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico. Madam Chair, I thank the chairman; the authors of this bill, Representative BASS and Representative FITZPATRICK; and the tireless advocates who have worked to bring this bill to the floor today for the safety and justice of all survivors of violence and abuse.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, please support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. TORRES SMALL).

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

Mr. NADLER. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New Mexico will be postponed.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Chair, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico) having assumed the chair, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1585) to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act of 1994, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

□ 0945

DIRECTING THE REMOVAL OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES FROM HOSTILITIES IN THE REPUBLIC OF YEMEN THAT HAVE NOT BEEN AUTHORIZED BY CONGRESS

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 274, I call up the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 7) to direct the removal of United States Armed Forces from hostilities in the Republic of Yemen that have not been authorized by Congress, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN). Pursuant to House Resolution 274, the joint resolution is considered read.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

S.J. RES. 7

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Congress has the sole power to declare war under article I, section 8, clause 11 of the United States Constitution.

(2) Congress has not declared war with respect to, or provided a specific statutory authorization for, the conflict between military forces led by Saudi Arabia, including forces from the United Arab Emirates, Bahrain, Kuwait, Egypt, Jordan, Morocco, Senegal, and Sudan (the Saudi-led coalition), against the Houthis, also known as Ansar Allah, in the Republic of Yemen.

(3) Since March 2015, members of the United States Armed Forces have been introduced into hostilities between the Saudi-led coalition and the Houthis, including providing to the Saudi-led coalition aerial targeting assistance, intelligence sharing, and mid-flight aerial refueling.

(4) The United States has established a Joint Combined Planning Cell with Saudi Arabia, in which members of the United States Armed Forces assist in aerial targeting and help to coordinate military and intelligence activities.

(5) In December 2017, Secretary of Defense James N. Mattis stated, "We have gone in to be very—to be helpful where we can in identifying how you do target analysis and how you make certain you hit the right thing."

(6) The conflict between the Saudi-led coalition and the Houthis constitutes, within the meaning of section 4(a) of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1543(a)), either hostilities or a situation where imminent involvement in hostilities is clearly indicated by the circumstances into which United States Armed Forces have been introduced.

(7) Section 5(c) of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1544(c)) states that "at any time that United States Armed Forces are engaged in hostilities outside the territory of the United States, its possessions and territories without a declaration of war or specific statutory authorization, such forces shall be removed by the President if the Congress so directs".

(8) Section 8(c) of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1547(c)) defines the introduction of United States Armed Forces to include "the assignment of members of such armed forces to command, coordinate, participate in the movement of, or accompany the regular or irregular military forces of any foreign country or government when such military forces are engaged, or there exists an imminent threat that such forces will become engaged, in hostilities," and activities that the United States is conducting in support of the Saudi-led coalition, including aerial refueling and targeting assistance, fall within this definition.

(9) Section 1013 of the Department of State Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1984 and 1985 (50 U.S.C. 1546a) provides that any joint resolution or bill to require the removal of United States Armed Forces engaged in hostilities without a declaration of war or specific statutory authorization shall be considered in accordance with the expedited procedures of section 601(b) of the International Security and Arms Export Control Act of 1976 (Public Law 94-329; 90 Stat. 765).

(10) No specific statutory authorization for the use of United States Armed Forces with respect to the conflict between the Saudi-led coalition and the Houthis in Yemen has been enacted, and no provision of law explicitly authorizes the provision of targeting assistance or of midair refueling services to warplanes of Saudi Arabia or the United Arab Emirates that are engaged in such conflict.

SEC. 2. REMOVAL OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES FROM HOSTILITIES IN THE REPUBLIC OF YEMEN THAT HAVE NOT BEEN AUTHORIZED BY CONGRESS.

Pursuant to section 1013 of the Department of State Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1984 and 1985 (50 U.S.C. 1546a) and in accordance with the provisions of section 601(b) of the International Security Assistance and Arms Export Control Act of 1976 (Public Law 94-329; 90 Stat. 765), Congress hereby directs the President to remove United States Armed Forces from hostilities in or affecting the Republic of Yemen, except United States Armed Forces engaged in operations directed at al Qaeda or associated forces, by not later than the date that is 30 days after the date of the enactment of this joint resolution (unless the President requests and Congress authorizes a later date), and unless and until a declaration of war or specific authorization for such use of United States Armed Forces has been enacted. For purposes of this resolution, in this section, the term "hostilities" includes in-flight refueling of non-United States aircraft conducting missions as part of the ongoing civil war in Yemen.

SEC. 3. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION REGARDING CONTINUED MILITARY OPERATIONS AND COOPERATION WITH ISRAEL.

Nothing in this joint resolution shall be construed to influence or disrupt any military operations and cooperation with Israel.

SEC. 4. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION REGARDING INTELLIGENCE SHARING.

Nothing in this joint resolution may be construed to influence or disrupt any intelligence, counterintelligence, or investigative activities relating to threats in or emanating from Yemen conducted by, or in conjunction with, the United States Government involving—

- (1) the collection of intelligence;
- (2) the analysis of intelligence; or
- (3) the sharing of intelligence between the United States and any coalition partner if the President determines such sharing is appropriate and in the national security interests of the United States.

SEC. 5. REPORT ON RISKS POSED BY CEASING SAUDI ARABIA SUPPORT OPERATIONS.

Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this joint resolution, the President shall submit to Congress a report assessing the risks posed to United States citizens and the civilian population of Saudi Arabia and the risk of regional humanitarian crises if the United States were to cease support operations with respect to the conflict between the Saudi-led coalition and the Houthis in Yemen.

SEC. 6. REPORT ON INCREASED RISK OF TERRORIST ATTACKS TO UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES ABROAD, ALLIES, AND THE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES IF SAUDI ARABIA CEASES YEMEN-RELATED INTELLIGENCE SHARING WITH THE UNITED STATES.

Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this joint resolution, the President shall submit to Congress a report assessing the increased risk of terrorist attacks on United States Armed Forces abroad, allies, and to the continental United States if the Government of Saudi Arabia were to cease Yemen-related intelligence sharing with the United States.

SEC. 7. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION REGARDING NO AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF MILITARY FORCE.

Consistent with section 8(a)(1) of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1547(a)(1)), nothing in this joint resolution may be construed as authorizing the use of military force.

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

The gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to insert extraneous material on S.J. Res. 7.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, it is a little surprising that we find ourselves back on the floor debating this resolution. After all, it has already passed both Chambers with bipartisan support. It has passed the Senate twice.

Opponents of this measure have used every trick in the book to slow it down, to try and derail it, but we have reached the last page in that book, and I am confident that after we vote today, this resolution will head to the President's desk, and the President will have to face the reality that Congress is no longer going to ignore its constitutional obligations when it comes to foreign policy and when it comes to determining when and where our military is engaged in hostilities.

We are taking up this resolution because we see a policy from this administration that has strayed from our values and a crisis that demands moral leadership, which is the war in Yemen.

I fully understand America's security concerns in Yemen. I appreciate the complexities of our interests in the region. The Houthis are trouble. They launch missiles and armed UAVs into Saudi territory and international waters, and that is a direct threat to Americans. They are starving the Yemeni people, diverting assistance, and holding civilians hostage to their political demands.

The Houthis are one of the groups Iran uses to drive instability and gain influence. We all know what a serious threat Iran poses in the region. The regime is the world's prolific state sponsor of terrorism, so it is important that we push back against Iran and those who depend on Iranian support.

But the Saudi-led coalition's response has not grappled with this problem in a responsible way, in a way designed to minimize damage to civilians and the communities where they live, and in a way that could help bring about a political solution to this crisis.

Instead, time after time after time, coalition strikes have resulted in the loss of innocent life, and the violence has set off ripple effects that have contributed to the worst humanitarian crisis in the world.

Madam Speaker, 85,000 children have starved to death and 14 million are on the brink of famine. More than 1 million suffer from cholera, and just last week, the coalition reportedly bombed a hospital run by Save the Children.

In the face of this catastrophe, the administration has demanded no accountability from the Saudis and Emiratis. But Congress won't remain silent.

This brings us, once again, to the resolution we are now considering. This measure would specifically ban aerial refueling of warplanes carrying out airstrikes. The Defense Department has stopped refueling as a matter of policy. This measure would do so as a matter of law.

The Defense Department also says that the United States is not engaged in hostilities when it comes to this

war. Well, the Defense Department is entitled to its opinion, but Congress is a coequal branch of government, and only we say when the United States is at war. We don't look to the executive branch to explain the war powers that reside in this body or for permission to exercise that power, the power the Framers gave to Congress.

This measure is written very narrowly, so it won't tie the hands of the executive branch or set new precedents or cause unintended consequences when it comes to our other security agreements around the world.

It does nothing to expand or modify the authority provided under the Authorization for Use of Military Force this body passed in 2001. Instead, it focuses on this particular tragedy and sends the message that enough is enough, that Congress will no longer abdicate its responsibility when it comes to foreign policy, and that we will push to make sure our values are at the core of how the United States conducts itself around the world.

This resolution is rooted in those values: respect for human rights, for human dignity, and for the belief that all people should be able to live free of fear, oppression, and violence.

I hope the President understands that; and if he uses his veto pen, I hope he understands just what it is he is vetoing.

Let me thank Mr. KHANNA for his hard work and leadership on the resolution we are considering today.

I also want to thank our ranking member on the Foreign Affairs Committee, Mr. MCCAUL. We have an honest disagreement on this one, but he has consistently and forthrightly made his case on the policy. I am grateful to all my colleagues who have contributed so much to this important debate.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, let me first say, at the outset, that the chairman and I work very closely together. There is a recent article that said that Chairman ELIOT ENGEL and Ranking Member MCCAUL forge a rare bipartisan bond, and I think that is the way we like to conduct this committee. It is a national security committee, and it needs to be bipartisan. However, as the chairman mentioned, there are times when we do have policy differences, but we do have respect in those differences.

We did take this up on the floor several weeks ago. I did oppose it then, and I oppose it for the same reasons today, most importantly, because the resolution uses the war powers mechanisms to direct the removal of U.S. troops from hostilities.

The problem is there are no U.S. Forces to remove, and the basic premise of this resolution is that somehow we have forces in Yemen that need to be removed that are engaged in hostilities. As the Department of Defense

has repeatedly confirmed, no United States Forces are conducting hostilities against the Houthis in Yemen.

This resolution abuses a war powers tool to get at a completely different security assistance issue which Congress already has clear tools to address. If Members want to condition or cut off U.S. security assistance to Saudi Arabia, then bring forward a bill to do just that.

But this resolution does nothing to address the humanitarian crisis in Yemen. It does nothing to secure justice for the heinous murder of Jamal Khashoggi. It does not even make real decisions on U.S. security assistance to Saudi Arabia. The only thing it addresses clearly is the midair refueling of coalition aircraft, ended in November of 2018, which is not in danger of restarting.

Meanwhile, this resolution stretches the definition of war powers hostilities to cover non-U.S. military operations by other countries. Specifically, it interprets U.S. support to these countries as “engagement in hostilities.”

This radical reinterpretation has implications far beyond Saudi Arabia. This precedent will empower any single Member to use privileged war powers procedures to force congressional referendums that could disrupt U.S. security cooperation agreements with more than 100 countries around the world.

Just days after Israel was forced to respond to rocket attacks from Gaza, I believe this would be a dangerous precedent to legitimize this abuse of process.

It could also be used to call into question our commitments to NATO members. Let me remind my colleagues that we are celebrating NATO’s 70th anniversary this week, as we saw the Secretary of NATO address a joint session of Congress.

Finally, this one-sided resolution completely ignores the destructive role of the Houthis and their backers in Tehran. The Houthis violently overthrew the Government of Yemen. They are attacking Saudi Arabia with weapons they got from Iran in violation of the U.N. Security Council resolutions. They have killed Saudi civilians and endangered many Americans living there.

Human Rights Watch accused the Houthis of taking hostages and torturing detainees. The United Nations says the Houthis use civilian human shields. The World Food Program has criticized them for illegally stealing urgently needed food aid. The Houthis have targeted ships in the Red Sea.

These realities are ignored in the text of this resolution. The only impact this resolution will have on the Houthis will be to encourage them.

In addition, Madam Speaker, this is very important because, since the last time we debated this on the floor, the Houthis engaged in a propaganda outlet, supported by Hezbollah, actively touting this very resolution online. They used our debate on the floor of

the Congress to advance their propaganda, a proxy of Iran and Yemen.

This is what we are doing here today. I would submit, Madam Speaker, that is very dangerous. It is dangerous, and I believe it is reckless.

This will weaken the hand of the U.N. Special Envoy, as well, to Yemen, whose efforts currently represent the best hope we have of bringing a negotiated end to this conflict and ending the suffering of the people of Yemen.

So, for these reasons, I continue to oppose this pro-Iran, pro-Houthi resolution. I hope that my colleagues will join me in voting against it, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Madam Speaker, the blood of innocents stains this Trump administration. And while the Trump family pals around with Saudi murderers, that blood continues to flow in the world’s worst humanitarian disaster. Only last week, four years after the first Saudi assault on Yemen, they killed another group of children at a hospital, apparently with American bombs.

Just as the Trump administration has aided and abetted war crimes in Yemen, this Congress has aided and abetted the Trump administration in avoiding any accountability.

Last year, Republicans blocked any consideration of a bipartisan Senate resolution to stop U.S. involvement in this war. Most recently, these folks used a devious motion to recommit, whose real purpose was not the very worthy goal of condemning anti-Semitism, but the sole purpose was to obstruct this resolution and ensure it never became adopted by Congress.

Today, we must reject any such motion—no matter how worthy it may be, it can be dealt with in other legislation—in order to halt all American involvement in this travesty.

We are talking about our relations with the Saudis. You know those folks, Madam Speaker. They are the ones with the leader with the bone saw to dismember an opponent and who tortures women for asserting their rights.

Hearts do break for those who are lost and tortured, but until we break with the Saudis in Yemen, the bombing, the starvation, the disease, and the slaughter will continue.

Months, years, hundreds of small graves ago, this Congress should have done its job. Today is a moment of moral clarity, a moment for this Chamber to act as the Constitution requires: to weigh war and peace and, for once, to extract ourselves from a war we did not start and to find a way to make peace the victor.

We can finally place a clean War Powers Act resolution directly on President Trump’s desk, and do so today. Let us do what is right, and let us do so before more young lives are destroyed.

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

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Speaker, first of all, let me thank Chairman ENGEL for yielding and also for his leadership.

Also, I want to just mention Congressmen KHANNA, POCAN, and MCGOVERN. I want to also thank them in addition to Chairman ENGEL for bringing this critical measure to the floor.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of S.J. Res. 7, which, of course, is a joint resolution directing the removal of U.S. Armed Forces from hostilities in Yemen.

This critical resolution, which we are taking now for the second time this Congress, would end America’s unconstitutional participation in the war in Yemen.

Since 2015, the United States has participated in the Saudi-led military campaign in Yemen without authorization from Congress. We have helped create and worsen the world’s greatest and largest humanitarian crisis.

Madam Speaker, 22.2 million Yemenis—that is 75 percent of the population—needs humanitarian assistance.

□ 1000

At least 85,000 children under the age of 5—85,000—have died from war-related hunger and disease.

Our involvement in this war is shameful. That is why this bipartisan and bicameral measure to end the United States’ unconstitutional role in this war is so important.

Yes, Madam Speaker, I voted against that 2001 resolution, because I knew it was open-ended and would set the stage for endless wars. It was a blank check. We see this once again today in Yemen. We must repeal this 2001 blank check for endless wars.

Over the past 18 years, we have seen the executive branch use this AUMF time and time again. It is a blank check to wage war without congressional oversight.

It is past time for Congress to reassert our Constitutional duty to debate on matters of war and peace, and it is past time to end this illegal, horrific war in Yemen.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote “yes” and to support this bipartisan bill to end the United States’ role in Yemen.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from Texas. We may have some agreements because, frankly, I think there is not one person on this floor, in this House and in the Senate, who does not believe that there has been enormous violence in Yemen.

I have been to Yemen. I want to go back. I know that it is, if not the poorest, one of the poorest nations in the world. The children are suffering. There is a humanitarian crisis.

If the United States should be engaged in any aspect of this, let our presence loom large in a humanitarian way.

I think it is important to remind my colleagues of the vicious bombing of an innocent school bus where 40 children died and any number of other incidences where children were involved and died.

Now, these children are suffering from malnutrition and are dying from lack of access to healthcare, as well as no food. We can be a major force, the United States, in providing that humanitarian aid.

But this is a resolution already passed by the other body, the Senate, that indicates that, if we are to be engaged in a war, there must be a debate under the Constitution about taking Americans into war. Because the Americans who offer their sons and daughters clearly are sacrificing. And those who put on the uniform—and we thank them—are willing to sacrifice their lives.

This is a conflict between the Saudis and Houthis. It is a violence that is going to go on and on. And if we are to prop them up—the Saudis—they will never stop. They will never seek reconciliation. They will never stop killing the babies because of an “accident,” they declared: It was a mistake. We don’t know how it happened.

We cannot allow Yemeni children, or any children, to be in the line of fire.

So, this resolution indicates that the Congress must make a determinative, if you will, assessment and engagement through the War Powers Act and its powers to declare war under the Constitution.

Frankly, I believe that this is a must-pass resolution. It must be signed immediately, and can be signed, by the President of the United States, and we can begin to, in an effective manner, withdraw troops and provide humanitarian aid to save the lives of children.

Madam Speaker, I support the resolution, and I thank the Senate for sending it to us. We should vote on it and pass it now.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman for his leadership on this, and I really want to thank Representative RO KHANNA for his continued, steadfast efforts to end this situation.

So, I strongly urge my colleagues to support this resolution and finally end U.S. involvement in the Saudi-led war in Yemen.

If we fail to act today, if we let one more opportunity to end these horrors pass us by, we are telling the world we are okay with another day in which innocent civilians are killed; another day that nearly 20 million people go without basic healthcare, and even more in need of emergency food aid; another day that a child must battle illnesses that could easily have been prevented,

if not for this crisis happening on our watch.

We have an opportunity, as Members of this body, Republicans and Democrats, to tackle the difficult problems and have the debates that others have ignored for too long. This is one of those problems. And this is one of those moments that makes me optimistic that the tide is finally turning.

I want to thank the chairman for making this a top priority. It is long past time for Congress to reassert its role, our role, in foreign policy and exercise our Constitutional duty.

Seeing the level of suffering in Yemen, we cannot wait one more day to do it. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. KHANNA), who has been so instrumental in bringing everyone together to make a change in policy that is much needed.

Mr. KHANNA. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the chairman for his leadership and his entire staff’s leadership for getting us to this point. Let me be very clear. If it weren’t for Chairman ENGEL, we would not have this vote on the floor today.

My motivation for this bill is very simple. I don’t want to see 14 million Yemenis starve to death. That is what Martin Griffith had said at the U.N., that if the Saudis don’t stop their blockade and let food and medicine in, within 6 months we will see one of the greatest humanitarian crises in the world.

That should be a bipartisan issue, that this Congress speak with a moral voice that food and medicine should get to civilians.

Now, as Chairman ENGEL knows, and others know, I am not for the BDS movement. I have supported very strongly resolutions condemning anti-Semitism. But I also don’t think that these tactics should be used as weapons to prevent efforts to stop the greatest humanitarian crisis in the world. That is insulting. It is insulting.

Those issues should be voted on separately, and I will proudly vote, when the time comes, against the BDS efforts.

Madam Speaker, I want to, with that, thank again Chairman ENGEL, Representative MCGOVERN, Speaker PELOSI, and Majority Leader HOYER and their teams for getting us to this point.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF).

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I rise in strong support of S.J. Res. 7 invoking the War Powers Resolution to withdraw U.S. military support for the Gulf coalition in Yemen.

For 4 years, the war in Yemen has ground on, killing tens of thousands of Yemeni civilians, and putting millions at imminent risk of starvation and deprivation.

The cause of the war is complicated and has much to do with Iran’s malign influence.

But our interest today is not in debating the blame for the war, but in bringing it to an end. That is why I urge all Members to support this resolution, because it is in our interest and, above all, in the interest of the Yemeni people to end the war.

U.S. military support for the Saudi coalition has not prevented civilian suffering, and it is my hope that, by withdrawing our support, we will make clear that a diplomatic resolution is the only resolution to the conflict.

Madam Speaker, I urge support for this resolution. I urge Members to oppose any motion to commit, which would have the effect of killing this bill and prolonging the world’s worst humanitarian crisis.

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

As I close, I include in the RECORD a statement of administration policy issued on Monday.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY
S.J. RES. 7—DIRECTING THE PRESIDENT TO REMOVE UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES FROM HOSTILITIES IN THE REPUBLIC OF YEMEN THAT HAVE NOT BEEN AUTHORIZED BY CONGRESS—SEN. SANDERS, I-VT AND 19 COSPONSORS

The Administration strongly opposes passage of S.J. Res. 7, a joint resolution that purports to direct the President to remove United States forces from hostilities in or affecting the Republic of Yemen, with certain exceptions.

The premise of the joint resolution is flawed. Since 2015, the United States has provided limited support to member countries of the Saudi-led coalition, including intelligence sharing, logistics support, and, until recently, aerial refueling, to assist in the defense of United States allies and partners. The provision of this support has not caused United States forces to be introduced into hostilities. Such support is provided pursuant to licenses and approvals under the Arms Export Control Act, statutory authorities for Department of Defense to provide logistics support to foreign countries, and the President’s constitutional powers. Because the President has directed United States forces to support the Saudi-led coalition under his constitutional powers, the joint resolution would raise serious constitutional concerns to the extent it seeks to override the President’s determination as Commander in Chief.

In addition to its erroneous premise, the joint resolution would harm bilateral relationships in the region, negatively affect our ability to prevent the spread of violent extremist organizations—such as al-Qa’ida in the Arabian Peninsula and ISIS in Yemen—and establish bad precedent for future legislation by defining “hostilities” to include defense cooperation such as aerial refueling for purposes of this legislation. While we appreciate that sections 5 and 6 of the resolution acknowledge these serious consequences to some extent, after-the-fact reporting is not an effective means to mitigate them. Our continued cooperation with regional partner nations allows the United States to support diplomatic negotiations to end the conflict, promote humanitarian access, mitigate civilian casualties, enhance efforts to recover United States hostages in Yemen, and defeat terrorists who seek to harm the United States.

If S.J. Res. 7 were presented to the President, his senior advisors would recommend he veto the joint resolution.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Speaker, it really, basically, states yet again that the fundamental premise of this resolution is flawed, because U.S. forces are not engaged in hostilities against the Houthis in Yemen, which is what the War Powers Act requires.

If we want to cut off economic assistance or logistic assistance, security assistance to Saudi, there is a way to do that, but it is not through the War Powers Act.

I think it is unfortunate that we couldn't work that out, but I think we are using the wrong vehicle here. I think this confrontation abuses the War Powers process, and we need to protect the integrity of the War Powers Act that Congress, in its wisdom, passed.

Also, what worries me is the resolution stays silent on the role of Iran. It does not condemn the Houthis, who are responsible for the killings. It tells them both to press on. It also undermines the peace negotiations going on, as I speak. The U.S. envoy is working with the full support of the United States to negotiate a political end to this conflict.

Getting all parties to the table has taken substantial pressure, which I believe this resolution would relieve.

Again, I think the fact that the Houthis are using this resolution as propaganda to advance their cause is concerning and disturbing.

The other side cannot tell us specifically what assistance this resolution would cut off. What I can say for sure is that this resolution says to the Houthis and to Iran to keep going, because you can gain more ground.

It only emboldens the rebels who violently overthrew Yemen's government and the radical regime that backs them. That would be Iran.

So I think this resolution would set a dangerous precedent with respect to the War Powers Act, a dangerous, damaging policy. Once again, Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote against it, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

In closing, let me say this. Everyone who knows me knows that I hold Iran guilty to many nefarious things that are happening in that region. This is not really about Iran. Iran is providing dangerous weapons to the Houthis, and the Houthis have starved the Yemeni people, killed civilians, and diverted assistance. I am not here to defend the Houthis.

The Saudis do have legitimate concerns about the Houthis, and the Houthis are not my vision of good and righteous. Quite the opposite.

But this resolution doesn't empower Iran. Quite the opposite. The longer the conflict goes on, and the longer the United States supports it, the better off Iran is.

We are really doing two things here. We are saying to the administration—and I, frankly, would say this, given my experience over the past two decades—to any administration. There is no blank check for war. We have abrogated our responsibility in the years that I have been here—and I am as guilty as anyone—by allowing administration after administration after administration to conduct wars that this body should have voted on.

Only Congress can declare war. And if we ignore what is happening with the civilian population in this war with the Houthis, then we do so at our own peril. We then say that, because Saudi Arabia does have legitimate concerns—and they do—we are giving them a blank check to do whatever they want.

□ 1015

No blank checks anymore. No blank checks to say the administration can run wars without getting the approval of Congress. And no blank checks to indiscriminately bomb and have innocent civilians and schoolchildren in buses be killed, and people starving in a humanitarian crisis.

We can't just sit back and say: "Well, you know, we have difficulties with Iran, so we are going to look the other way." I have lots of difficulties with Iran, but we can't look the other way when people are starving or when people are being killed. That is what we are doing now.

So we are doing two things. We are saying no more war in which we are complicit, where a population is wholesale starving. We are also saying that this body is not giving a blank check to every administration. And I would be doing this no matter who the President of the United States was.

We need to reclaim our authority. We have fought in war after war after war. As everyone knows, we haven't declared war since before all of us were born, since December 7, 1941, when President Roosevelt stood up right here and declared war. That was the last time.

I hope this will be the start of Congress taking back its constitutional power, not for the sake of having a fight with the executive branch, but for the sake of doing what we are supposed to do.

Congress has the power to declare war. Congress has the power to say what we do when it comes to war. We are taking that back today. We are saying that America will not be complicit in the wholesale beating down of civilian populations and looking the other way.

Let me say that again. Iran has fueled this conflict through its support for the Houthis, but the longer this conflict rages, the better it is for Iran. Iran thrives on every misstep of the Saudi-led coalition. A vote for this resolution is a vote to end the United States' involvement in this war, a war which helps Iran.

Let me say again, for Congress, this is an important step in reclaiming our

role in foreign policy, by debating where and when the United States military is engaged abroad. With the humanitarian crisis in Yemen, it is critical that we act now. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting it.

Before I yield back, I want to, again, tell Mr. MCCAUL that we don't always agree on things. I think we agree on things more than we don't. But I do appreciate his earnest attempts with me to try to make foreign policy as bipartisan as we can. I think that is what we need to do.

We need to show unity in strength. In unity, there is strength. We are all Americans. We may disagree from time to time, but I think we are not going to be disagreeable. So I thank Mr. MCCAUL.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of S.J. Res. 7, which directs the removal of United States Armed Forces from hostilities in the Republic of Yemen that have not been authorized by Congress.

The passage of S.J. Res. 7 would mark the first time in the 45 years since the enactment of the War Powers Act that the House of Representatives successfully invoked the statute's removal mechanism to compel the Executive Branch to remove American troops from harm's way.

I support this resolution because, Congress has the sole power to declare war under Article I, Section 8, Clause 11 of the United States Constitution.

Madam Speaker, Congress has not declared war with respect to, or provided a specific statutory authorization for, the conflict between military forces led by Saudi Arabia, including forces from the United Arab Emirates, Bahrain, Kuwait, Egypt, Jordan, Morocco, Senegal, and Sudan (the Saudi-led coalition), against the Houthis, also known as Ansar Allah, in the Republic of Yemen.

Since March 2015, members of the United States Armed Forces have been introduced into hostilities between the Saudi-led coalition and the Houthis, including providing to the Saudi-led coalition aerial targeting assistance, intelligence sharing, and mid-flight aerial refueling.

The United States has established a Joint Combined Planning Cell with Saudi Arabia, in which members of the United States Armed Forces assist in aerial targeting and help to coordinate military and intelligence activities.

Madam Speaker, the conflict between the Saudi-led coalition and the Houthis constitutes, within the meaning of Section 4(a) of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1543(a)), either hostilities or a situation where imminent involvement in hostilities is clearly indicated by the circumstances into which United States Armed Forces have been introduced.

Section 5(c) of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1544(c)) states that, "at any time that United States Armed Forces are engaged in hostilities outside the territory of the United States, its possessions and territories without a declaration of war or specific statutory authorization, such forces shall be removed by the President if the Congress so directs."

Most importantly, no specific statutory authorization for the use of United States Armed

Forces with respect to the conflict between the Saudi-led coalition and the Houthis in Yemen has been enacted.

Also, no provision of law explicitly authorizes the provision of targeting assistance or of midair refueling services to warplanes of Saudi Arabia or the United Arab Emirates that are engaged in such conflict.

For this reason, the resolution directs that the President remove United States Armed Forces from hostilities in or affecting the Republic of Yemen, except United States Armed Forces engaged in operations directed at al-Qaeda or associated forces, by not later than the date that is 30 days after the date of the enactment.

The resolution makes clear that the term “hostilities” includes in-flight refueling, non-United States aircraft conducting missions as part of the ongoing civil war in Yemen.

Madam Speaker, Yemen is the largest humanitarian crisis in the world right now. The Yemen crisis began in the Arab Spring of 2011, when an uprising forced the country’s long-time authoritarian president, Ali Abdullah Saleh, to hand over power to his deputy, Abdrabbuh Mansour Hadi.

Since 2015, Saudi Arabia has launched an estimated 18,000 air strikes on Yemen, attacking hospitals, schools, water treatment plants, funerals, markets and even farms.

The Saudis also imposed a blockade on food, fuel and medicine from freely entering the country in what can only be described as a deliberate effort to starve the civilian population into submission.

More than 14 million Yemenis are steps away from starvation and at least 85,000 children under the age of five have perished from war-related hunger and disease.

The United States has supported the Saudi led air campaign with mid-air refueling support, intelligence and targeting assistance, and other support.

Yemen is experiencing the world’s worst famine in 100 years, with 12 million to 13 million innocent civilians at risk of dying from the lack of food within months.

Madam Speaker, too many lives hang in the balance to allow American involvement in Yemen war to continue.

I ask all members to join me in supporting S.J. Res. 37.

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

Pursuant to the rule, the previous question is ordered on the joint resolution.

The question is on the third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of S.J. Res. 7 is postponed.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 10 o’clock and 18 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1045

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN) at 10 o’clock and 45 minutes a.m.

ARMY SPECIALIST THOMAS J. WILWERTH POST OFFICE BUILDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and passing the bill (H.R. 829) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1450 Montauk Highway in Mastic, New York, as the “Army Specialist Thomas J. Wilwerth Post Office Building”.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The question was taken. The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the yeas have it.

Ms. HILL of California. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered. The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 423, nays 0, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 151]
YEAS—423

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Allred
Amash
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Axne
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Bergman
Beyer
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bost
Boyle, Brendan
Brady
Brindisi
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Bustos

Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Chu, Judy
Ciilline
Cisneros
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Cline
Cloud
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Conaway
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Cummings
Cunningham
Curtis
Davids (KS)

Davidson (OH)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Davis, Rodney
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Duffy
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Espallat
Estes
Evans
Ferguson
Finkenauer
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fletcher
Flores
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx (NC)
Frankel
Fudge
Fulcher
Gabbard
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gallego
Garamendi

Garcia (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez (OH)
Gonzalez (TX)
Gooden
Gosar
Gottheimer
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Green (TX)
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Haaland
Hagedorn
Harder (CA)
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings
Hayes
Heck
Hern, Kevin
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Higgins (NY)
Hill (AR)
Hill (CA)
Himes
Holding
Hollingsworth
Horn, Kendra S.
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson (TX)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamb
Lamborn
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Lesko
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loeb sack

Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marshall
Massie
Mast
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCarthy
McCaull
McClintock
McCollum
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McNerney
Meadows
Meeks
Meng
Meuser
Miller
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Mullin
Murphy
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newhouse
Norcross
Norman
Nunes
O’Halloran
Ocasio-Cortez
Olson
Omar
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Posey
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Riggleman
Roby
Rodgers (WA)
Roe, David P.
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose (NY)
Rose, John W.
Rouda
Rouzer
Roy
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush

Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scalise
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schraeder
Schrier
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill
Shimkus
Simpson
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Soto
Spanberger
Spano
Speier
Stanton
Stauber
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stevens
Stewart
Stivers
Suozi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Timmons
Tipton
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small
(NM)
Trahan
Trone
Turner
Underwood
Upton
Van Drew
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Waltz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watkins
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Wexton
Wild
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Wright
Yarmuth
Yoho
Young
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—8

Clark (MA)	Kustoff (TN)	Rutherford
Cook	McEachin	Ryan
Granger	Rooney (FL)	

□ 1113

Mr. RUSH changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”
So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DIRECTING THE REMOVAL OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES FROM HOSTILITIES IN THE REPUBLIC OF YEMEN THAT HAVE NOT BEEN AUTHORIZED BY CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CARSON of Indiana). Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 7) to direct the removal of United States Armed Forces from hostilities in the Republic of Yemen that have not been authorized by Congress, will now resume.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

MOTION TO COMMIT

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to commit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the joint resolution?

Mr. MCCAUL. I am in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to commit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. McCaul moves to commit the joint resolution S.J. Res. 7 to the Committee on Foreign Affairs with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

At the end of section 1, add the following new paragraph:

(11) It is in the national security interest of the United States to condemn and oppose—

(A) the Global Boycott, Divestment, and Sanctions Movement (BDS Movement) targeting Israel, including efforts to target United States companies that are engaged in commercial activities that are legal under United States law; and

(B) all efforts to delegitimize the State of Israel.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, let me first say that the Yemen resolution before us here today is pro-Iran and anti-Israel.

I rise today to offer a motion stating that it is in the national security interest of the United States to oppose the global movement to boycott the State of Israel. This motion will not kill the joint resolution or send it back to the committee. If adopted, the resolution will immediately proceed to final passage.

As we heard from the powerful speech of the Secretary of NATO yesterday, it is in our national interest to work with our allies to counter our shared threats and promote our shared values.

Since its founding in 1948, the United States has stood shoulder to shoulder with Israel against enemies that want to destroy it.

Let’s be clear about the BDS movement: It is yet another enemy of Israel. It wants to exclude, isolate, and, ultimately, destroy Israel.

The founder of the BDS movement has stated: “We oppose a Jewish state in any part of Palestine. No Palestinian . . . will ever accept a Jewish state in Palestine.”

The BDS movement is not about equality. It is not about peace. It is about undermining negotiation between Israel and the Palestinians, and it is about placing all of the blame on one party, and that is Israel.

We do not support a movement that demands concessions from one party alone. We do not stand with a movement that seeks to isolate and shame our strongest ally in the Middle East.

By weakening Israel, the global BDS movement endangers American security. When foreign entities like the U.N. foster boycotts against Israel, they are interfering with the United States’ foreign policy.

The Senate passed a bill, S. 1, in its wisdom, 2 months ago with overwhelming bipartisan support to tackle BDS, better support Israel and Jordan, and sanction Assad’s brutal regime. Sadly, the House Democratic leadership won’t let that bill or a House version of that bill to this floor for a vote.

Mr. Speaker, I want to close with this: As the son of a World War II veteran, a B-17 bombardier who bombed the Nazis and was part of the D-day air campaign, it saddens me that we are still struggling here today with the same issues that the Greatest Generation defeated.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this motion, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with solemn responsibility. I carry the legacy of the history of the Jewish people, a history of persecution, of discrimination, of scapegoating, but also a history of perseverance and survival. The embodiment of that perseverance is the establishment of the State of Israel, the home of the Jewish people.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly condemn the Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions movement, economic warfare against the State of Israel, and there is no one in this Chamber—no one—who would question my commitment to opposing BDS or fighting anti-Semitism or supporting our ally, Israel. But I also

strongly reject what my colleagues are doing here today.

My colleague, my friend from Texas, is right. There has been a long and bipartisan history of support for Israel, and it has been so strong because of that bipartisanship.

This is not a motion to commit about BDS. We have seen this play out before. The last time this resolution came up, my colleagues introduced a resolution condemning BDS and anti-Semitism and supporting Israel, and we all voted for it until it was time to actually go on the record, and almost every one of them voted against it.

This is about politics. This is about trying to drive a wedge into this Caucus where it does not belong. That is what they are trying to do today.

Mr. Speaker, the Jewish community also has a history of standing up against atrocities like the humanity crisis in Yemen. My colleagues are trying to block us from standing in support of our human rights and American values to condemn what is happening there. That is what this is about. That is why I am opposed to it, and we should all oppose it.

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I have taken no backseat to my support for Israel for half a century. I rise in opposition to this cynical, political ploy.

We are about to vote on a resolution concerning U.S. involvement in the conflict in Yemen and how to promote an end to a humanitarian crisis in a country that threatens the lives of 22 million people. They are hungry. They are displaced. They are scarred by a war and violence. This resolution is about them and about what we as a nation can do to put a stop to that conflict.

The gentleman is incorrect. The gentleman did not tell us the truth. This kills this resolution.

In an effort to prevent Congress from taking action on such an important issue, however, House Republicans are trying to make this a vote about something else; and in doing so, they risk undermining the long history of bipartisan consensus supporting our ally, Israel.

How shameful. How sad.

The American people will not be fooled or misled by this tactic. Our fellow supporters of Israel will not be fooled. No one can accuse me of failing to defend the U.S.-Israel partnership and strongly opposing BDS.

Mr. Speaker, I will be voting against this motion, and I urge all of my colleagues to do so as well. I urge every single one of them to do so.

And I urge every Republican who believes that using Israel as a partisan cudgel is dangerous, cynical, and harmful to Israel to join me in voting against this motion.

Mr. Speaker, none of the major organizations supporting Israel have any illusions about what this motion seeks

to do. Its intention is not to unite, but to divide. Its intention is not to support our ally, but to sabotage our resolution about the conflict in Yemen. This vote on this motion is a vote to kill this joint resolution through a cynical and dishonest tactic.

So let's move past this charade of a motion. Let's stop playing games with this very important and serious issue in support of Israel. Reject "gotcha" politics.

Let me be clear: For as long as I am majority leader, House Democrats will never waiver in our party's steadfast support for a strong Israel relationship. Vote "no."

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

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, will the majority leader schedule S. 1, a vote on this floor with his commitment to Israel and his commitment to ending BDS?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has not stated a proper parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MCCARTHY. First, the gentleman did not answer my last. But this one, Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman was not stating a proper parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MCCARTHY. The minority only has one ability to bring something to the floor in an MTR. This body wants to have a vote on S. 1.

Will the majority leader schedule on this floor a vote on BDS?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is not stating a proper parliamentary inquiry.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, as a staunch supporter of the U.S.-Israel relationship, I am disgusted by the Republicans' ongoing attempts to politicize serious issues related to anti-semitism and support for the U.S.-Israel partnership. The vast majority of members on both sides of the aisle in this chamber oppose BDS. But that's not what this vote today on the motion to recommit was really about.

What actually occurred here today was a political stunt to sink a bill addressing the world's worst humanitarian crisis, which is why I voted against the Motion to Recommit. Twenty four million—let me repeat: 24 million—desperate Yemenis are in need of humanitarian assistance.

Families are displaced. Children are starving. Lives are in imminent danger.

But instead of working with Democrats to stop U.S. support for the Saudi and Emirati

coalition that is perpetuating this suffering, Republicans politicized the U.S.-Israel relationship in a vote intended to ensure this bill cannot pass in the Senate and reach the President's desk.

We know it would kill the bill, of course, because the Senate already rejected a similar measure attached to this bill the first time we considered it. That measure sought unsuccessfully to create political division among Democrats based on anti-semitism. It is particularly heinous to politicize hate given the rise in all forms of bias-based violence in recent years.

I have consistently worked to combat BDS and will partner with House leadership to ensure that real legislation opposing this divisive political movement is brought to the House floor. But I will not give legitimacy to these Republican attempts to threaten bipartisan support for the U.S.-Israel relationship and leave millions of men, women, and children in danger of starvation and death.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to commit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to commit.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 194, noes 228, answered "present" 1, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 152]

AYES—194

Abraham	Collins (NY)	Guest
Aderholt	Comer	Guthrie
Allen	Conaway	Hagedorn
Amodei	Crawford	Harris
Armstrong	Crenshaw	Hartzler
Arrington	Cunningham	Hern, Kevin
Babin	Curtis	Herrera Beutler
Bacon	Davidson (OH)	Hice (GA)
Baird	Davis, Rodney	Higgins (LA)
Balderson	DesJarlais	Hill (AR)
Banks	Diaz-Balart	Holding
Barr	Duffy	Hollingsworth
Bergman	Duncan	Hudson
Biggs	Dunn	Huizenga
Bilirakis	Emmer	Hunter
Bishop (UT)	Estes	Hurd (TX)
Bost	Ferguson	Johnson (LA)
Brady	Fitzpatrick	Johnson (OH)
Brindisi	Fleischmann	Johnson (SD)
Brooks (AL)	Flores	Jordan
Brooks (IN)	Portenberry	Joyce (OH)
Buchanan	Foxx (NC)	Joyce (PA)
Buck	Fulcher	Katko
Bucshon	Gallagher	Kelly (MS)
Budd	Gianforte	Kelly (PA)
Burchett	Gibbs	King (IA)
Burgess	Gohmert	King (NY)
Byrne	Gonzalez (OH)	Kinzinger
Calvert	Gooden	LaHood
Carter (GA)	Gosar	LaMalfa
Carter (TX)	Gottheimer	Lamborn
Chabot	Graves (GA)	Latta
Cheney	Graves (LA)	Lesko
Cline	Graves (MO)	Long
Cloud	Green (TN)	Loudermilk
Cole	Griffith	Lucas
Collins (GA)	Grothman	Luetkemeyer

Luria	Rice (SC)	Thompson (PA)
Marchant	Riggleman	Thornberry
Marshall	Roby	Timmons
Mast	Rodgers (WA)	Tipton
McCarthy	Roche, David P.	Turner
McCaul	Rogers (AL)	Upton
McClintock	Rogers (KY)	Van Drew
McHenry	Rose, John W.	Wagner
McKinley	Rouzer	Walberg
Meadows	Roy	Walden
Meuser	Scalise	Walker
Miller	Schweikert	Walorski
Mitchell	Scott, Austin	Waltz
Moolenaar	Sensenbrenner	Watkins
Mooney (WV)	Shimkus	Weber (TX)
Mullin	Simpson	Webster (FL)
Newhouse	Smith (MO)	Wenstrup
Norman	Smith (NE)	Westerman
Nunes	Smith (NJ)	Williams
Olson	Smucker	Wilson (SC)
Palazzo	Spano	Wittman
Palmer	Stauber	Womack
Pence	Stefanik	Woodall
Perry	Steube	Wright
Posey	Steubert	Yoho
Ratcliffe	Stivers	Young
Reed	Taylor	Zeldin
Reschenthaler		

NOES—228

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

Takano Trahan Wasserman
Thompson (CA) Trone Schultz
Thompson (MS) Underwood Waters
Titus Vargas Watson Coleman
Tlaib Veasey Welch
Tonko Vela Wexton
Torres (CA) Velázquez Wild
Torres Small Vislosky Wilson (FL)
(NM) Yarmuth

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Gaetz

NOT VOTING—8

Clark (MA) Kustoff (TN) Rutherford
Cook McEachin Ryan
Granger Rooney (FL)

□ 1136

So the motion to commit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 247, noes 175, answered "present" 1, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 153]

AYES—247

Adams Cunningham Himes
Aguilar Davids (KS) Hollingsworth
Allred Davidson (OH) Horn, Kendra S.
Axne Davis (CA) Horsford
Barragán Davis, Danny K. Houlihan
Bass Dean Hoyer
Beatty DeFazio Huffman
Bera DeGette Jackson Lee
Beyer DeLauro Jayapal
Biggs DelBene Jeffries
Bishop (GA) Delgado Johnson (GA)
Blumenauer Demings Johnson (TX)
Blunt Rochester DeSaulnier Jordan
Bonamici Deutch Kaptur
Boyle, Brendan Dingell Keating
F. Doggett Kelly (IL)
Brindisi Doyle, Michael Kennedy
Brown (MD) F. Khanna
Brownley (CA) Engel Kildee
Buck Escobar Kilmer
Bustos Eshoo Kim
Butterfield Espaillat Kind
Carbajal Evans Kirkpatrick
Cárdenas Finkenauer Krishnamoorthi
Carson (IN) Fletcher Kuster (NH)
Cartwright Foster Lamb
Case Frankel Langevin
Casten (IL) Fudge Larsen (WA)
Castor (FL) Gabbard Larson (CT)
Castro (TX) Gaetz Lawrence
Chu, Judy Gallego Lawson (FL)
Cicilline Garamendi Lee (CA)
Cisneros Garcia (IL) Lee (NV)
Clarke (NY) Garcia (TX) Levin (CA)
Clay Gohmert Levin (MI)
Cleaver Golden Lewis
Cloud Gomez Lieu, Ted
Clyburn Gonzalez (TX) Lipinski
Cohen Gosar Loebsack
Connolly Gottheimer Lofgren
Cooper Green (TX) Lowenthal
Correa Griffith Lowey
Costa Grijalva Lujan
Courtney Haaland Luria
Cox (CA) Harder (CA) Lynch
Craig Hastings Malinowski
Crist Hayes Maloney,
Crow Heck Carolyn B.
Cuellar Higgins (NY) Maloney, Sean
Cummings Hill (CA) Massie

Matsui Pocan Smith (WA)
McAdams Porter Soto
McBath Posey Spanberger
McCollum Pressley Speier
McGovern Price (NC) Stanton
McNerney Quigley Stevens
Meadows Raskin Titus
Meeks Rice (NY) Suozzi
Meng Richmond Swalwell (CA)
Mooney (WV) Rose (NY) Takano
Moore Rouda Thompson (CA)
Morelle Roy Thompson (MS)
Moulton Roybal-Allard Titus
Mucarsel-Powell Ruiz Tlaib
Murphy Ruppertsberger Tonko
Nadler Rush Torres (CA)
Napolitano Sánchez Torres Small
Neal Sarbanes (NM)
Neguse Scanlon Trahan
Norcross Schakowsky Trone
O'Halleran Schiff Underwood
Ocasio-Cortez Schneider Van Drew
Omar Schrader Vargas
Pallone Schrier Veasey
Panetta Schweikert Vela
Pappas Scott (VA) Velázquez
Pascarell Scott, David Wasserman
Payne Serrano Schultz
Pelosi Sewell (AL) Waters
Perlmutter Shalala Watson Coleman
Peters Sherman Welch
Peterson Sherrill Wexton
Phillips Sires Wild
Pingree Slotkin Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—175

Abraham Graves (GA) Pence
Aderholt Perry Graves (LA)
Allen Ratcliffe Graves (MO)
Amodei Reed Green (TN)
Armstrong Grothman
Arrington Guest
Babin Guthrie
Bacon Hagedorn Riggleman
Baird Harris Roby
Balderson Hartzler Rodgers (WA)
Banks Hern, Kevin Roe, David P.
Barr Herrera Beutler Rogers (AL)
Bergman Hice (GA) Rogers (KY)
Bilirakis Higgins (LA) Rose, John W.
Bishop (UT) Hill (AR) Rouzer
Bost Holding Scalise
Brady Hudson Scott, Austin
Brooks (AL) Huizenga Sensenbrenner
Brooks (IN) Hunter Shimkus
Buchanan Hurd (TX) Simpson
Bucshon Johnson (LA) Smith (MO)
Budd Johnson (OH) Smith (NE)
Burchett Johnson (SD) Smith (NJ)
Burgess Joyce (OH) Smucker
Byrne Joyce (PA) Spano
Calvert Katko Stauber
Carter (GA) Kelly (MS) Stefanik
Carter (TX) Kelly (PA) Steil
Chabot King (IA) Steube
Cheney King (NY) Stewart
Cline Kinzinger Stivers
Cole LaHood Taylor
Collins (GA) LaMalfa Thompson (PA)
Collins (NY) Lamborn Thornberry
Comer Latta Timmons
Conaway Lesko
Crawford Long
Crenshaw Loudermilk
Curtis Lucas
Davis, Rodney Luetkemeyer
DesJarlais Marchant
Diaz-Balart Marshall
Duffy Mast
Duncan McCarthy
Dunn McCaul
Emmer McClintock
Estes McHenry
Ferguson McKinley
Fitzpatrick Meuser
Fleischmann Miller
Flores Mitchell
Fortenberry Moolenaar
Foxx (NC) Mullin
Fulcher Newhouse
Gallagher Norman
Gianforte Nunes
Gibbs Olson
Gonzalez (OH) Palazzo
Gooden Palmer

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Amash

NOT VOTING—9

Clark (MA) Kustoff (TN) Rutherford
Cook McEachin Ryan
Granger Rooney (FL) Vislosky

□ 1145

Mr. POSEY changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2019

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 281 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 1585.

Will the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN) kindly resume the chair.

□ 1147

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1585) to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act of 1994, and for other purposes, with Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, a request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 40 printed in part B of House Report 116-32 offered by the gentlewoman from New Mexico, Ms. TORRES SMALL, had been postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 40 OFFERED BY MS. TORRES SMALL OF NEW MEXICO

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, the unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. TORRES SMALL) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 425, noes 0, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 154]

AYES—425

Abraham Arrington Bass
Adams Axne Beatty
Aderholt Babin Bera
Aguilar Bacon Bergman
Allen Baird Beyer
Allred Balderson Biggs
Amash Banks Bilirakis
Amodei Barr Bishop (GA)
Armstrong Barragán Bishop (UT)

Blumenauer Flores
Blunt Rochester Fortenberry
Bonamici Foster
Bost Foxx (NC)
Boyle, Brendan Frankel
F. Fudge
Brady Fulcher
Brindisi Gabbard
Brooks (AL) Gaetz
Brooks (IN) Gallagher
Brown (MD) Gallego
Brownley (CA) Garamendi
Buchanan Garcia (IL)
Buck Garcia (TX)
Bucshon Gianforte
Budd Gibbs
Burchett Gohmert
Burgess Golden
Bustos Gomez
Butterfield Gonzalez (OH)
Byrne Gonzalez (TX)
Calvert Gooden
Carbajal Gosar
Cárdenas Gottheimer
Carson (IN) Graves (GA)
Carter (GA) Graves (LA)
Carter (TX) Graves (MO)
Cartwright Green (TN)
Case Green (TX)
Casten (IL) Griffith
Castor (FL) Grijalva
Castro (TX) Grothman
Chabot Guest
Cheney Guthrie
Chu, Judy Haaland
Cicilline Hagedorn
Cisneros Harder (CA)
Clarke (NY) Harris
Clay Hartzler
Cleaver Hastings
Cline Hayes
Cloud Heck
Clyburn Hern, Kevin
Cohen Herrera Beutler
Cole Hice (GA)
Collins (GA) Higgins (LA)
Collins (NY) Higgins (NY)
Comer Hill (AR)
Conaway Hill (CA)
Connolly Himes
Cooper Holding
Correa Hollingsworth
Costa Horn, Kendra S.
Courtney Horsford
Cox (CA) Houlihan
Craig Hoyer
Crawford Hudson
Crenshaw Huffman
Crist Huiזenga
Crow Hunter
Cuellar Hurd (TX)
Cummings Jackson Lee
Cunningham Jayapal
Curtis Jeffries
Davids (KS) Johnson (GA)
Davidson (OH) Johnson (LA)
Davis (CA) Johnson (OH)
Davis, Danny K. Johnson (SD)
Davis, Rodney Johnson (TX)
Dean Jordan
DeFazio Joyce (OH)
DeGette Joyce (PA)
DeLauro Kaptur
DelBene Katko
Delgado Keating
Demings Kelly (IL)
DeSaulnier Kelly (MS)
DesJarlais Kelly (PA)
Deutch Kennedy
Diaz-Balart Khanna
Dingell Kildee
Doggett Kilmer
Doyle, Michael Kim
F. Kind
Duffy King (IA)
Duncan King (NY)
Dunn Kinzinger
Emmer Kirkpatrick
Engel Krishnamoorthi
Escobar Kuster (NH)
Eshoo LaHood
Españillat LaMalfa
Estes Lamb
Evans Lamborn
Ferguson Langevin
Finkenauer Larsen (WA)
Fitzpatrick Larson (CT)
Fleischmann Latta
Fletcher Lawrence

Lawson (FL) Rose (NY)
Lee (CA) Rose, John W.
Lee (NV) Rouda
Lesko Rouzer
Levin (CA) Roy
Levin (MI) Roybal-Allard
Lewis Ruiz
Lieu, Ted Ruppertsberger
Lipinski Rush
Loebsack San Nicolas
Lofgren Sánchez
Long Sarbanes
Loudermilk Scalise
Lowenthal Scanlon
Lowe Schakowsky
Lucas Schiff
Luetkemeyer Schneider
Luján Schrader
Luria Schrier
Lynch Schweikert
Malinowski Scott (VA)
Maloney, Carolyn B. Scott, Austin
Maloney, David Scott, David
Maloney, Sean Sensenbrenner
Marchant Serrano
Marshall Sewell (AL)
Massie Shalala
Mast Sherman
Matsui Sherrill
McAdams Shimkus
McBath Simpson
McCarthy Sires
McCaul Slotkin
McClintock Smith (MO)
McCollum Smith (NE)
McGovern Smith (NJ)
McHenry
McKinley
McNerney
Meadows
Meeks
Meng
Meuser
Miller
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Mullin
Murphy
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newhouse
Norcross
Norman
Norton
Nunes
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Olson
Omar
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Posey
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Riggleman
Roby
Rodgers (WA)
Roe, David P.
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)

Smith (WA) Vargas
Smucker Veasey
Soto Vela
Spanberger Velázquez
Spano Visclosky
Speier Wagner
Stanton Walberg
Stauber Walden
Stefanik Walker
Steil Walorski
Steube Waltz
Stevens Wasserman
Stewart Schultz
Stivers Waters
Suzuki Watkins
Swalwell (CA) Watson Coleman
Takano Weber (TX)
Takano Webster (FL)
Taylor Welch
Thompson (CA) Wenstrup
Thompson (MS) Westerman
Thompson (PA) Weston
Thornberry Wild
Timmons Williams
Tipton Wilson (FL)
Titus Wilson (SC)
Tlaib Torres (CA)
Tonko Torres Small
Torres (CA) (NM)
Trone Trahan
Turner Wright
Underwood Yarmuth
Upton Yoho
Van Drew Young
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—12

Clark (MA) Kustoff (TN) Rutherford
Cook McEachin Ryan
González-Colón Plaskett Sablan
(PR)
Radewagen
Granger Rooney (FL)

□ 1155

Mr. DUNCAN changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. SABLAN. Madam Chair, had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 154.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas) having assumed the chair, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1585) to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act of 1994, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 281, she reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole?

If not, the question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. STEFANIK. Madam Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the bill?

Ms. STEFANIK. I am, in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Stefanik moves to recommit H.R. 1585 to the Committee on the Judiciary with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

Page 1, strike line 4 and all that follows and insert the following:

SEC. 2. STOP GRANTS.

Section 1001(a)(18) of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10261(a)(18)), by striking “through 2018” and inserting “through 2020”.

SEC. 3. GRANTS TO ENCOURAGE ARREST POLICIES AND ENFORCEMENT OF PROTECTION ORDERS.

Section 1001(a)(19) of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10261(a)(19)) is amended by striking “through 2018” and inserting “through 2020”.

SEC. 4. LEGAL ASSISTANCE FOR VICTIMS.

Section 1201(f)(1) of the Violence Against Women Act of 2000 (34 U.S.C. 20121(f)(1)) is amended by striking “through 2018” and inserting “through 2020”.

SEC. 5. GRANTS TO SUPPORT FAMILIES IN THE JUSTICE SYSTEM.

Section 1301(e) of the Violence Against Women Act of 2000 (34 U.S.C. 12464(e)) is amended by striking “through 2018” and inserting “through 2020”.

SEC. 6. SEX OFFENDER MANAGEMENT.

Section 40152(c) of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12311(c)) is amended by striking “through 2018” and inserting “through 2020”.

SEC. 7. COURT-APPOINTED SPECIAL ADVOCATE PROGRAM.

Section 219(a) the Crime Control Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 13014(a)) is amended by striking “through 2018” and inserting “through 2020”.

SEC. 8. RURAL DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, DATING VIOLENCE, SEXUAL ASSAULT, STALKING, AND CHILD ABUSE ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE.

Section 40295(e)(1) of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12341(e)(1)) is amended by striking “through 2018” and inserting “through 2020”.

SEC. 9. GRANTS FOR ENHANCED TRAINING AND SERVICES TO END ABUSE LATER IN LIFE.

Section 40801(b)(5) of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12421(b)(5)) is amended by striking “through 2018” and inserting “through 2020”.

SEC. 10. CREATING HOPE THROUGH OUTREACH, OPTIONS, SERVICE, AND EDUCATION FOR CHILDREN AND YOUTH GRANTS.

Section 41201(f) of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12451(f)) is amended by striking “through 2018” and inserting “through 2020”.

SEC. 11. GRANTS TO COMBAT VIOLENT CRIMES ON CAMPUSES.

Section 304(e) of the Violence Against Women and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005 (34 U.S.C. 20125(e)) is

amended by striking “through 2018” and inserting “through 2020”.

SEC. 12. STUDY CONDUCTED THROUGH THE CENTERS FOR DISEASE CONTROL AND PREVENTION.

Section 402(c) of the Violence Against Women and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 280b-4(c)) is amended by striking “through 2018” and inserting “through 2020”.

SEC. 13. SAVING MONEY AND REDUCING TRAGEDIES THROUGH PREVENTION.

Section 41303(f) of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12463(f)) is amended by striking “through 2018” and inserting “through 2020”.

SEC. 14. ADDRESSING THE HOUSING NEEDS OF VICTIMS OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, DATING VIOLENCE, SEXUAL ASSAULT, AND STALKING.

(a) **COLLABORATIVE GRANTS TO INCREASE THE LONG-TERM STABILITY OF VICTIMS.**—Section 41404(i) of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12474(i)) is amended by striking “through 2018” and inserting “through 2020”.

(b) **GRANTS TO COMBAT VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN IN PUBLIC AND ASSISTED HOUSING.**—Section 41405(g) of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12475(g)) is amended by striking “through 2018” and inserting “through 2020”.

SEC. 15. NATIONAL RESOURCE CENTER ON WORKPLACE RESPONSES TO ASSIST VICTIMS OF DOMESTIC AND SEXUAL VIOLENCE.

Section 41501(e) of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12501(e)) is amended by striking “through 2018” and inserting “through 2020”.

SEC. 16. GRANTS FOR TRIBAL JURISDICTION OVER CRIMES OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE.

Section 204 of Public Law 90-284 (25 U.S.C. 1301 et seq.) (commonly known as the “Indian Civil Rights Act of 1968”) is amended by striking “through 2018” and inserting “through 2020”.

SEC. 17. ANALYSIS AND RESEARCH ON VIOLENCE AGAINST INDIAN WOMEN.

Section 905(b)(2) of the Violence Against Women and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005 (28 U.S.C. 534 note) is amended by striking “through 2018” and inserting “through 2020”.

SEC. 18. STALKER DATABASE.

Section 40603 of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12402) is amended by striking “through 2018” and inserting “through 2020”.

SEC. 19. FEDERAL VICTIM ASSISTANCE REAUTHORIZATION.

Section 40114 of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (Public Law 103-322; 108 Stat. 1910) is amended by striking “through 2018” and inserting “through 2020”.

SEC. 20. GRANTS FOR STRENGTHENING THE HEALTHCARE SYSTEM'S RESPONSE TO DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, DATING VIOLENCE, SEXUAL ASSAULT, AND STALKING.

Section 399P(g) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280g-4(g)) is amended by striking “through 2018” and inserting “through 2020”.

SEC. 21. TRAINING AND SERVICES TO END VIOLENCE AGAINST PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES.

Section 1402(e) of division B of the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000 (34 U.S.C. 20122(e)) is amended by striking “through 2018” and inserting “through 2020”.

SEC. 22. SEXUAL ASSAULT SERVICES PROGRAM.

Section 41601(f)(1) of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12511(f)(1)) is amended by striking “through 2018” and inserting “through 2020”.

SEC. 23. RAPE SURVIVOR CHILD CUSTODY.

Section 409 of the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act of 2015 (34 U.S.C. 21308) is amended by striking “through 2019” and inserting “through 2020”.

Ms. STEFANIK (during the reading). Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the House reading.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes in support of her motion.

Ms. STEFANIK. Madam Speaker, in the United States, 1 in 3 women have experienced some form of physical violence by an intimate partner; 1 in 7 women have been injured by an intimate partner; 1 in 10 women have been raped by an intimate partner; and 1 in 7 women have been stalked.

Let those numbers sink in for a moment. These are more than just numbers. These are our mothers, sisters, daughters, friends, and colleagues in this Chamber.

Today's motion to recommit would extend the Violence Against Women Act through 2020 in order to continue critical services that protect millions of women, girls, and children across our country.

I have a proven track record of supporting VAWA, and today I am continuing the fight by standing up for the victims and survivors to make sure their voices are heard.

Last year, I introduced legislation that would extend the Violence Against Women Act; and then just last month, I introduced another bill that would reauthorize this program.

We all know, in this Chamber, that the bill Speaker PELOSI has put on the floor today will not pass the Senate and be signed into law. However, my bill, this motion to recommit, could pass the House, the Senate, and be signed into law this week.

This extension gives Republicans and Democrats time to work together to pass a truly bipartisan, long-term reauthorization of VAWA, just as Congress has done many times before.

Sadly, there has been very little effort from my Democratic colleagues to meaningfully engage in a process to reauthorize VAWA that could pass with broad bipartisan support.

The Democratic bill, H.R. 1585, was referred to seven House committees, but was only reported out of the Judiciary Committee on a party-line vote. It politicizes VAWA, and could put women, girls, and children at potential risk in the future.

Ending violence against women and protecting women and children should not be a partisan issue. But, unfortunately, Speaker PELOSI and House Democrats have made it a partisan issue. They have refused to work with Republicans in a meaningful way to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act every chance they got, including

most recently in February during spending negotiations.

House Democrats are the reason this law has lapsed, putting lives in jeopardy, and leaving victims, survivors, and families at risk. Every single minute that this critical, lifesaving program goes unauthorized is another minute that women who need help can't get it.

I ask my colleagues today; can we stop playing political games at the expense of vulnerable women?

We must. Voting “yes” on this motion to recommit is the only opportunity to extend current law. Voting “no” on this motion to recommit means that you are voting to end the Violence Against Women Act and, instead, knowingly voting for a partisan bill that will never see the light of day in the Senate. This will collect dust in the Senate.

Once again, the Democratic bill on the floor today will collect dust in the Senate. Scoring political points, we should never prioritize that over the millions of women and children in this country.

Let's pass this clean extension today to extend the Violence Against Women Act. Fight for millions of women in this country. Fight for survivors. Fight for victims.

I am asking you to vote “yes” on the motion to recommit, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. DINGELL. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to this motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. DINGELL. Madam Speaker, I have nothing but great respect for my colleague who offered this; and I do wish that we could do this together and not politicize it. But that is exactly what we are doing.

This motion to recommit would just totally undermine this bill because it is a short and incomplete reauthorization; and it undermines the Violence Against Women Act and this important effort to reauthorize it.

This bill takes out things that have become so basic, like the Rape Prevention Fund, testing of rape case kits, which is a horror across this country in how many haven't been tested.

It takes away child abuse training. None of that is in this motion to recommit.

And what makes me really sad is that this bill is one of the most successful laws this House has passed. In the 25 years since it was enacted, violence against women by a spouse, or an intimate partner, has dropped by 65 percent. We need to build on that progress.

Since then, victims, survivors, and the communities where we live have relied on the Congress to help provide resources needed to prevent and investigate these crimes and to assist survivors.

I remember what it was like. I remember what it was like when you

called the police and they didn't come because your father was an important man in town.

I remember what it was like when someone on our college campus was raped, and the police came to them and said: "It's your fault" and would do nothing.

And I don't want anybody in this House to forget that Michigan State University, with hundreds of victims, was only brought to the forefront last year, when hundreds of victims tried to tell people something was happening, and nobody would listen. We cannot go back to those days. Since the original passage of this bill, we have learned from experience and from the unfortunate continued perpetuation of these crimes.

This House, together, on a bipartisan basis, we authorized VAWA in 2000, 2005, and 2013. This bill builds on our progress and success. We must not only reauthorize it, but make its programs even more effective, and help survivors of sexual assault, domestic violence, and other forms of harm with issues that they face.

Women are staying in these situations because they need to go to the doctor and they can't afford healthcare; they can't find a place to live; they don't have economic security. These are among the issues that this bill is trying to address.

This motion to recommit would kill the bill, and it leaves victims vulnerable.

I do volunteer work at these domestic—at places where people go for domestic abuse.

Have you talked to anybody there? Do you know how scared they are because funding is already being impacted?

Stepping back means looking the other way when victimization is taking place; and they are counting on us to do something. That is why we cannot undermine this important law.

And I am going to say one other thing. Do not let the NRA bully you. This is not a poison pill. The provision in this bill—don't forget who I was married to. John Dingell was on the NRA board. Hell, he helped start it. But all this does—we are not taking away due process. All this does is say that if someone has been convicted, convicted, as an intimate partner, that they would not have access to a gun. And if someone has been convicted of stalking—

You know what I would say to all of you?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman from Michigan has expired.

Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. STEFANIK. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 185, noes 237, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 155]

AYES—185

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

NOES—237

Adams	Boyle, Brendan	Castor (FL)
Aderholt	F.	Castro (TX)
Aguilar	Brindisi	Chu, Judy
Allred	Brooks (AL)	Cicilline
Axne	Brown (MD)	Cisneros
Barragán	Brownley (CA)	Clarke (NY)
Bass	Bustos	Clay
Beatty	Butterfield	Cleaver
Bera	Byrne	Clyburn
Beyer	Carbajal	Cohen
Bishop (GA)	Cardenas	Connolly
Blumenauer	Carson (IN)	Cooper
Blunt Rochester	Cartwright	Correa
Bonamici	Case	Costa
	Casten (IL)	Courtney

Cox (CA)	Kelly (IL)	Pressley
Craig	Kennedy	Price (NC)
Crist	Khanna	Quigley
Crow	Kildee	Raskin
Cuellar	Kilmer	Rice (NY)
Cummings	Kim	Richmond
Cunningham	Kind	Roby
Dauids (KS)	Kirkpatrick	Rogers (AL)
Davis (CA)	Krishnamoorthi	Rose (NY)
Davis, Danny K.	Kuster (NH)	Rouda
Dean	Lamb	Roybal-Allard
DeFazio	Langevin	Ruiz
DeGette	Larsen (WA)	Ruppersberger
DeLauro	Larson (CT)	Rush
DelBene	Lawrence	Sánchez
Delgado	Lawson (FL)	Sarbanes
Demings	Lee (CA)	Scanlon
DeSaulnier	Lee (NV)	Schakowsky
Deutch	Levin (CA)	Schiff
Dingell	Levin (MI)	Schneider
Doggett	Lewis	Schrader
Doyle, Michael	Lieu, Ted	Schrier
F.	Lipinski	Scott (VA)
Engel	Loeb sack	Scott, David
Escobar	Lofgren	Serrano
Eshoo	Lowenthal	Sewell (AL)
Espallat	Lowe y	Shalala
Evans	Lujan	Sherman
Finkenauer	Luria	Sherrill
Fitzpatrick	Lynch	Sires
Fletcher	Malinowski	Slotkin
Foster	Maloney,	Smith (WA)
Frankel	Carolyn B.	Soto
Fudge	Maloney, Sean	Spanberger
Gabbard	Matsui	Speier
Gallego	McAdams	Stanton
Garamendi	McBath	Stevens
Garcia (IL)	McCollum	Suozzi
Garcia (TX)	McGovern	Swalwell (CA)
Golden	McNerney	Takano
Gomez	Meeks	Thompson (CA)
Gonzalez (TX)	Meng	Thompson (MS)
Gottheimer	Moore	Titus
Green (TX)	Morelle	Tlaib
Grijalva	Moulton	Tonko
Haaland	Mucarsel-Powell	Torres (CA)
Harder (CA)	Murphy	Torres Small
Hartzler	Nadler	(NM)
Hastings	Napolitano	Trahan
Hayes	Neal	Trone
Heck	Neguse	Underwood
Higgins (NY)	Norcross	Van Drew
Hill (CA)	O'Halleran	Vargas
Himes	Ocasio-Cortez	Veasey
Horn, Kendra S.	Omar	Vela
Horsford	Pallone	Velázquez
Houlahan	Panetta	Visclosky
Hoyer	Pappas	Wasserman
Huffman	Pascrell	Schultz
Jackson Lee	Payne	Waters
Jayapal	Perlmutter	Watson Coleman
Jeffries	Peters	Welch
Johnson (GA)	Phillips	Wexton
Johnson (TX)	Pingree	Wild
Kaptur	Pocan	Wilson (FL)
Keating	Porter	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—9

Clark (MA)	Kustoff (TN)	Rooney (FL)
Cook	Long	Rutherford
Granger	McEachin	Ryan

□ 1216

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 263, noes 158, answered "present" 1, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 156]

AYES—263

Adams	Gonzalez (OH)	Panetta
Aguilar	Gonzalez (TX)	Pappas
Allred	Gottheimer	Pascrell
Axne	Green (TX)	Payne
Balderson	Grijalva	Perlmutter
Barragán	Haaland	Peters
Bass	Harder (CA)	Phillips
Beatty	Hastings	Pingree
Bera	Hayes	Pocan
Beyer	Heck	Porter
Bishop (GA)	Herrera Beutler	Pressley
Blumenauer	Higgins (NY)	Price (NC)
Blunt Rochester	Hill (CA)	Quigley
Bonamici	Himes	Raskin
Bost	Horn, Kendra S.	Reed
Boyle, Brendan	Horsford	Rice (NY)
F.	Houlahan	Richmond
Brindisi	Hoyer	Rose (NY)
Brooks (IN)	Huffman	Rouda
Brown (MD)	Hurd (TX)	Roybal-Allard
Brownley (CA)	Jackson Lee	Ruiz
Burchett	Jayapal	Ruppersberger
Bustos	Jeffries	Rush
Butterfield	Johnson (GA)	Sánchez
Carbajal	Johnson (TX)	Sarbames
Cárdenas	Joyce (OH)	Scanlon
Carson (IN)	Kaptur	Schakowsky
Carter (TX)	Katko	Schiff
Cartwright	Keating	Schneider
Case	Kelly (IL)	Schrad
Casten (IL)	Kennedy	Schrier
Castor (FL)	Khanna	Scott (VA)
Castro (TX)	Kildee	Scott, David
Chu, Judy	Kilmer	Serrano
Cicilline	Kim	Sewell (AL)
Cisneros	Kind	Shalala
Clarke (NY)	King (NY)	Sherman
Clay	Kinzinger	Sherrill
Cleaver	Kirkpatrick	Simpson
Clyburn	Krishnamoorthi	Sires
Cohen	Kuster (NH)	Lamb
Cole	Langevin	Slotkin
Connolly	Larsen (WA)	Smith (WA)
Cooper	Larsen (CT)	Soto
Correa	Lawrence	Spanberger
Costa	Lawson (FL)	Speier
Courtney	Lee (CA)	Stanton
Cox (CA)	Lee (NV)	Staubert
Craig	Levin (CA)	Steil
Crist	Levin (MI)	Stevens
Crow	Lewis	Stivers
Cuellar	Lieu, Ted	Suoizzi
Cummings	Lipinski	Swalwell (CA)
Cunningham	Loeb	Takano
Davids (KS)	Loeb	Takano
Davis (CA)	Lofgren	Thompson (CA)
Davis, Danny K.	Lowenthal	Thompson (MS)
Davis, Rodney	Lowe	Titus
Dean	Lujan	Tlaib
DeFazio	Luria	Tonko
DeGette	Lynch	Torres (CA)
DeLauro	Malinowski	Torres Small
DelBene	Maloney,	(NM)
Delgado	Carolyn B.	Trahan
Demings	Maloney, Sean	Trone
DeSaulnier	Marchant	Turner
Deutch	Matsui	Underwood
Diaz-Balart	McAdams	Upton
Dingell	McBath	Van Drew
Doggett	McCaul	Vargas
Doyle, Michael	McCollum	Veasey
F.	McGovern	Vela
Engel	McNerney	Velázquez
Escobar	Meeks	Visclosky
Eshoo	Meng	Wagner
Espallat	Moore	Walden
Evans	Morelle	Walorski
Finkenauer	Moulton	Waltz
Fitzpatrick	Mucarsel-Powell	Wasserman
Fletcher	Murphy	Schultz
Foster	Nadler	Waters
Frankel	Napolitano	Watson Coleman
Fudge	Neal	Welch
Gabbard	Neguse	Wexton
Gallego	Norcross	Wild
Garamendi	O'Halleran	Williams
Garcia (IL)	Ocasio-Cortez	Wilson (FL)
Garcia (TX)	Olson	Yarmuth
Golden	Omar	Young
Gomez	Pallone	Zeldin

NOES—158

Abraham	Amodei	Bacon
Aderholt	Armstrong	Baird
Allen	Arrington	Banks
Amash	Babin	Barr

Bergman	Grothman	Palmer
Biggs	Guest	Pence
Bilirakis	Guthrie	Perry
Bishop (UT)	Hagedorn	Peterson
Brady	Harris	Posey
Brooks (AL)	Hartzler	Ratcliffe
Buchanan	Hern, Kevin	Reschenthaler
Buck	Hice (GA)	Rice (SC)
Bucshon	Higgins (LA)	Riggleman
Budd	Hill (AR)	Roby
Burgess	Holding	Rodgers (WA)
Byrne	Hollingsworth	Roe, David P.
Calvert	Hudson	Rogers (AL)
Carter (GA)	Huizenga	Rogers (KY)
Chabot	Hunter	Rose, John W.
Cheney	Johnson (LA)	Rouzer
Cline	Johnson (OH)	Roy
Cloud	Johnson (SD)	Scalise
Collins (GA)	Jordan	Schweikert
Collins (NY)	Joyce (PA)	Scott, Austin
Comer	Kelly (MS)	Sensenbrenner
Conaway	Kelly (PA)	Shimkus
Crawford	King (IA)	Smith (MO)
Crenshaw	LaHood	Smith (NE)
Curtis	LaMalfa	Smith (NJ)
Davidson (OH)	Lamborn	Smucker
DesJarlais	Latta	Spano
Duffy	Lesko	Stefanik
Duncan	Loudermilk	Steube
Dunn	Lucas	Stewart
Emmer	Luetkemeyer	Taylor
Estes	Marshall	Thompson (PA)
Ferguson	Massie	Thornberry
Fleischmann	Mast	Timmons
Flores	McCarthy	Tipton
Foxx (NC)	McClintock	Walberg
Fulcher	McHenry	Walker
Gaetz	McKinley	Watkins
Gallagher	Meadows	Weber (TX)
Gianforte	Meuser	Webster (FL)
Gibbs	Miller	Wenstrup
Gohmert	Mitchell	Westerman
Gooden	Moelnaar	Wilson (SC)
Gosar	Mooney (WV)	Wittman
Graves (GA)	Mullin	Womack
Graves (LA)	Newhouse	Woodall
Graves (MO)	Norman	Wright
Green (TN)	Nunes	Yoho
Griffith	Palazzo	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

NOT VOTING—9

Clark (MA)	Kustoff (TN)	Rooney (FL)
Cook	Long	Rutherford
Granger	McEachin	Ryan

□ 1233

So the bill was passed.
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.
 A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, due to a conflict on Thursday, April 4, 2019, I was not present to cast my vote on the Republican Motion to Re-commit on H.R. 1585 and Final Passage of H.R. 1585, the Violence Against Women Re-authorization Act of 2019.

As a cosponsor of H.R. 1585, I wholeheartedly support reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA). Had I been present my vote would have been NAY on Roll Call 155 and YEA on Roll Call 156.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of proceedings is in violation of the rules of House.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN EN-GROSSMENT OF H.R. 1585, VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2019

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the engrossment of H.R. 1585, the Clerk be authorized to correct section numbers, punctuation, spelling, and cross-references and to make such other technical and conforming changes as may be necessary to reflect the actions of the House, including the changes now at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the changes.

The Clerk read as follows:

In amendment number 7 offered by Ms. Waters of California, modify the amendatory instruction to read:

"Page 39, line 6, insert after 'efforts.' the following:"

In amendment number 9 offered by Ms. Johnson of Texas, modify the ninth amendatory instruction to read:

"Page 62, beginning on line 1, strike 'internal emergency transfers' and insert 'internal transfers'"; modify the tenth amendatory instruction to read:

"Page 62, line 3, strike 'external emergency transfers' and insert 'external transfers'"; and modify the twenty-second amendatory instruction to read:

"Page 80, line 24, strike 'external emergency transfers' and insert 'external transfers'".

In amendment number 13 offered by Mr. Grijalva of Arizona, modify the amendatory instruction to read:

"Page 134, strike line 3 and all that follows thru page 135, line 5, and insert the following:"; and add at the end the following amendatory instruction:

"Strike page 135, lines 16 through 18."

Mr. NADLER (during the reading). Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the changes be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the original request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

PRIVILEGED REPORT ON RESOLUTION OF INQUIRY TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. NADLER, from the Committee on the Judiciary, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 116-33) on the resolution (H. Res. 243) of inquiry requesting the President and directing the Attorney General to transmit, respectively, certain documents to the House of Representatives relating to the actions of former Federal Bureau of Investigation Acting Director Andrew McCabe, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REMOVAL OF MEMBERS AS COSPONSORS OF H.R. 1904

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Representatives MARK AMODEI of Nevada,

SCOTT TIPTON of Colorado, KEN BUCK of Colorado, TORRES SMALL of New Mexico, and SUSIE LEE of Nevada be removed as cosponsors of H.R. 1904.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. WALTZ. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 962, the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

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

Mr. WALTZ. Madam Speaker, I urge the Speaker to immediately schedule this important bill.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to sections 5580 and 5581 of the revised statutes (20 U.S.C. 42-43), and the order of the House of January 3, 2019, of the following Member on the part of the House to the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution:

Mr. SHIMKUS, Illinois

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), my friend, the majority leader of the House for the purpose of inquiring about the week to come.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend, Mr. SCALISE, for yielding. I also thank him for not mentioning the LSU-Maryland game one more time.

Mr. SCALISE. Only because we are no longer in the mix as well.

Mr. HOYER. We are both lamenting that fact.

On Monday, Madam Speaker, the House will meet at 12 p.m. 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 12 p.m. for legislative business. On Wednesday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business.

On Thursday and Friday, no votes are expected in the House.

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

Madam Speaker, the House will also consider H.R. 1644, Save the Internet Act of 2019. This bill will reverse the administration's repeal of critical net neutrality protections, which will empower the FCC to prohibit unjust, unreasonable, and discriminatory practices and ensure consumers can make informed decisions when shopping for internet plans. This bill also enacts authorities to support expanding broadband to rural communities and struggling Americans.

In addition, Madam Speaker, it is possible the House will take action to set the budget levels for discretionary spending for the next 2 fiscal years.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I look forward to a robust debate on the unapplied bill, "Save the Internet." I think a lot of people shiver at the thought of the Federal Government saving us from the internet.

The title II regulation that would be imposed would allow the internet to be regulated like a utility. This is not the phone company of the 1970s. This is probably one of the greatest innovations that America has produced for the world, allowing us to be a world leader, dominant leader, in a growing technology field. Primarily because the government hasn't figured out how to regulate it, it has been able to grow so robustly.

I would hope that we have that full debate and people are very aware of the negative connotations and, ultimately, the damaging effects of a Federal regulation of the internet that could slow down that dramatic innovation that we have seen with the Federal Government not regulating it. It will be a robust debate.

Hopefully, we debate a number of other issues. I know we had a robust debate on the floor just a little while ago on the BDS movement. It is a growing concern for all of us who feel passionately about Israel's right to exist as a Jewish State.

I know the leader has been a leader in this Congress and a leader throughout this country in an incredibly bipartisan way standing up for that unique relationship, but we have seen threats from other countries. You have seen heavy debate in Europe.

You have seen debate in areas in Palestinian circles that want to undermine Israel's right to exist as a Jewish State by trying to boycott products made in Israel, to crush Israel's economy. That is why it is so important that we stand up against this BDS movement.

While we weren't successful in the motion to commit, there is legislation that is incredibly bipartisan.

S. 1, a bill that has come over from the Senate, unfortunately, hasn't been referred to committee, nor, also, H.R.

336, similar legislation that would allow us to help support our friends around the world who want to stand up against the BDS movement and stand with our good friend Israel.

Madam Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman, is there any plan to allow either or both of those bills to come to the floor so we can send a strong message to our friends around the world and to enemies of Israel, as well, that we are not going to support this BDS movement.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, as the gentleman knows, we share views, as he has expressed, and we are awaiting committee action. When the committee acts, we will make a determination of how to go forward.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, if I could further inquire, S. 1 has not been referred to committee. Is there a plan to refer the bill to committee and, ultimately, to allow it to move through the process, as it has been incredibly bipartisan but also incredibly timely, that we as the United States Congress stand with our friend Israel and stand against what is a growing movement that should be of concern to all of us?

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, as I said, I agree with the gentleman's objective and position with respect to BDS. The committee has legislation before it and is considering it.

As you know, Mr. SCHNEIDER and Mr. NADLER, I think, are the cosponsors of that legislation. I expect the committee to consider it, and then, at that point in time, we will make a decision how to move forward.

□ 1245

Mr. SCALISE. That is correct. And I know those pieces of legislation are just resolutions, not actual policy.

And, ultimately, if we are going to make the stand, it has to be legislation with teeth, with actual authorizing language and with the ability for us to give true support to our friends—not just words, but actions as well.

So, hopefully, we can move both, and I would just continue to urge.

And the gentleman from Maryland's support for Israel is unquestioned and has been admired by people on both sides. I would just urge that we, as a House, move those bills, one or both of the actual substantive bills, to the floor as quickly as possible, as they have already moved through the Senate.

S. 1 had 77 votes in support—so, strongly bipartisan—coming out of the Senate, but still no referral in the House. Hopefully, we can get that expedited.

And with that, on the idea of legislating by resolution, I know that has been a growing trend in this Congress of this majority to move, instead of substantive bills to deal with things like lowering healthcare costs or helping create more jobs.

There have been a lot of bills that are just press releases, resolutions that

don't actually change law or help change policy or work in a bipartisan way to get bills to the President's desk that can address the growing issues that our country faces.

Are we going to see a continued trend in this majority of just resolutions, or are we going to finally get to bipartisan policy on some of these big issues?

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Well, of course, as the gentleman well knows, we have, Madam Speaker, passed many substantive pieces of legislation. We have sent to the Senate H.R. 1, a very broad-reaching reform bill trying to ensure voting rights and access for everybody, trying to ensure fair redistricting throughout the country, trying to make sure that dark money does not control our elections, and making sure that we are operating both in the executive and the legislative agency with ethical conduct.

That passed unanimously on our side. I forget exactly how many.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, opposed unanimously on our side, if I can point out.

Mr. HOYER. Today's vote, obviously, we had two very substantive pieces of legislation, one of which is going now to the President, and the other of which—the Violence Against Women Act—had a signature bipartisan vote, as the gentleman knows, passed the House.

We have done the Land and Water Conservation Fund, which had been pending for some period of time in making that a permanent piece of legislation.

We made sure that women—in 1963, we passed the Equal Pay Act. John Kennedy signed it. Unfortunately, we are still struggling to make sure that that promise is realized and that women are, in fact, paid based upon what they do, not based upon what their gender is.

So I would say to my friend, we have passed a lot of legislation we had pending, and we are doing a lot of hearings. We are dealing with infrastructure. We are dealing with drug prices. We made it a big issue in the campaign. We are moving ahead to make sure the Affordable Care Act works in a way that it was designed to work.

So I would say to my friend that we have pursued, both on the floor and in committee, the substantive legislation that we have talked to the American people about.

I also feel very strongly that we want to avoid what happened to us at the end of the last Congress, when you were in the majority. We shut down the government.

I am going to be working hard, hopefully on both sides of the aisle. I don't think anybody wants to see that as an objective, so I am hopeful that we can work together.

I am working with your ranking member on the Appropriations Com-

mittee, KAY GRANGER, with whom I have served for some period of time, and Mrs. LOWEY to make sure that we get the appropriation bills done in a timely fashion and send them to the Senate.

I am hopeful that that will occur, and I am hopeful that we can fund the government in a rational way and not shut down government, which was so irrational and so harmful to our country and so costly to our taxpayers.

So those are some of the things that we have done, are doing, and will do; and, hopefully, we can, to some degree, work on this in as bipartisan a fashion as possible.

In particular, the President has said he wants to bring the cost of prescription drugs down. We share that view. I am hopeful that we can work together.

The President said he wants a substantial infrastructure piece of legislation. We share that view. We hope we can work together on that.

So we have been pursuing, on a weekly basis; and this was, from our perspective, a pretty good week. I know we disagree on the net neutrality bill, but we do agree that it is a major piece of legislation, and I expect to pass that next week as well.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

It was heavily debated in the Energy and Commerce Committee, as it should be, and I am sure it will be heavily debated on the floor.

A number of these other issues that the gentleman mentioned, you know, we litigated those on the floor. The ones that went over to the Senate, some with only Democratic votes, you know, H.R. 1, for example, the Senate majority leader made it very clear that bill will not get any time on the Senate calendar. There are a lot of others that we would like to see real movement on.

I know there was concern of a lot of people that there were three different committees in the House this week that spent the bulk of their time going after the President personally again.

We have got the Mueller report coming. The summary has already been laid out and made it clear there was no collusion with Russia. There was no obstruction of justice. We will see the report.

What we talked about was that the report be filed in compliance with law, and the law makes it very clear that things like classified information aren't released. That is the law. I think we agreed that that is how it should be, that you don't release classified information. You release the pertinent date.

I look forward to seeing that, and we will see that. But, then, it seemed like a continued assault in three different committees continuing to focus on harassing the President personally, as opposed to focusing on some of those policies.

But one of the policies that should be coming out of the House where there is a real deadline is the budget. April 15 is the deadline.

I know, over and over again, Members of the Democratic leadership, including the Speaker, herself, said: Show me your budget. Show me your values.

There is no budget. And we have been concerned that the agenda doesn't follow—the priorities in the budget are really what you lay out. Those are your values. Those are your priorities.

While they are moving a bill that lays out caps, it is not bipartisan. But, ultimately, when we get a caps agreement, the gentleman knows it is going to have to be a bipartisan agreement.

Last night, the Budget Committee produced only a partisan, one-corner deal—barely a one-corner deal. Typically, they have what are called four-corner deals where the House, Senate—Republicans and Democrats—come together and say: We are going to agree on what those spending levels need to be so that we can then write our appropriation bills, set the priorities of the country, and avoid a government shutdown.

That didn't happen in the Budget Committee. It was a very partisan bill that was moved out; but, more importantly, it was not a budget.

I would hope that with the little bit of time that is remaining to meet that legal deadline that the majority would try to actually produce a budget and follow through on those over-and-over again quotes: "Show me your budget." "Show me your values."

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

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

Of course, there was no budget last year until very, very late in the year.

What was done was what we will certainly make sure we do very early on, which is to try to establish the numbers, which, of course, a caps deal would do. And our objective will be to show our values in the appropriation bills as they come to the floor—hopefully, in a timely fashion—and our main objective would be not to shut down the government but to do our work on time.

I am confident that, working together, we can reach that objective.

Mr. SCALISE. Hopefully, we can get a bipartisan agreement on what those levels need to be to properly fund our defense, to properly do the other things the government should do and limit the ways it can possibly be carried out, and then, ultimately, to be able to get the bills that follow it passed in time, well before the September 30 deadline.

One of the areas that there is very productive movement on is the new trade deal between the United States, Mexico, and Canada, USMCA. I know there are bipartisan working groups. The White House has been in negotiations with the majority, the Speaker and your team.

Can the leader give any insight into where the conversations are going in the House to get a timetable for when we can start having a plan for that?

You look at Canada's House of Commons, they have their own deadline of when they rise, and, obviously, we want to be aware of our other partners that are included in this negotiation.

Is there talk of a timeline yet, if the leader could share where those conversations are going.

I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, as the gentleman may know, the Speaker invited Mr. Lighthizer to address members of the Democratic Caucus on where we stood.

As you know, that agreement has not been submitted. The Speaker said the other day that, in order to consider that in a positive way, the Mexicans, whom the President has been somewhat critical of through the years, take certain actions which make sure that our workers and their workers are treated fairly so we are competing on an even keel.

But we certainly are in discussions. There are a number of items of concern, which have historically been of concern, regarding the environment, regarding workers' rights, regarding the availability of prescription drugs for people, as well as enforcement, dispute resolution.

So those are being discussed. The conversations are ongoing, and I believe that the administration will make a determination when they believe it is timely to submit that document to us. As the gentleman knows, once they do so, there is a timeframe in which the House and Senate must act. The committees must act within, essentially, a 3-month period of time.

So we are in discussions. We are waiting on the administration's judgment as to when to submit. And I am sure they are discussing with us as to when we think that is timely as well, but there are still substantive matters that are being discussed.

I would presume some of those are on your side as well.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

I am encouraged by the conversations that both I have been in as well as the conversations that I am aware are going on on your side as well, because this is a bipartisan win for the country.

This agreement would help ensure that, as we all support free trade, we also want more fair trade, and this agreement, in many different categories and many different industries, would help create more American jobs and help American workers get treated even more fairly by our neighbors to the north and south.

Finally, if I may inquire of the gentleman, we have talked a number of times about the Born-Alive Act, the bill that we have made multiple unanimous consent requests to bring up the discharge petition moving through the process. There are other means to bring it up even quicker, and one would be if the gentleman would schedule the bill for the floor.

I would just inquire: Is there any plan to schedule the Born-Alive Act on the floor through a direct means versus some of these other tools that are being considered?

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

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

As the gentleman knows, Madam Speaker, the House voted on this bill during the last two Congresses. The most recent time it was brought to the floor, the gentleman and his party were in control of the House, the Senate, and the Presidency. That bill was not brought up in the Senate.

The gentleman mentioned, earlier, H.R. 1 and that Mr. MCCONNELL has said that wouldn't be brought up. In fact, when it passed this House, it went to the Senate, and it was not brought up by Senator MCCONNELL. So there are no plans at this point in time for us to bring this up.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's candor.

We will continue to pursue other tools that we have available as the growing momentum around the country builds, as people saw what happened in New York with a law ushered in that allows babies to be murdered after they are born alive, the Virginia Governor gruesomely describing what he hopes to be a similar law in his State, other States taking those same kinds of actions. So there is a growing bipartisan interest that feels very strongly that we need a Federal law to protect babies who are born alive outside the womb.

So we will continue to pursue all of those tools that are available and look forward to the workweek ahead next week as we finish our work prior to the Easter recess.

Does the gentleman have anything else?

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I have nothing further to say. I thank the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Maryland, and I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1300

ADJOURNMENT FROM THURSDAY, APRIL 4, 2019, TO MONDAY, APRIL 8, 2019

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday next, when it shall convene at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MCBATH). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland? There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE
REPUBLICAN LEADER

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following commu-

nication from the Honorable KEVIN MCCARTHY, Republican Leader:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, April 3, 2019.

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

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to 36 U.S.C. §101, I am pleased to appoint the following Members to the United States Semiquincentennial Commission:

The Honorable George Holding of North Carolina

The Honorable Robert B. Aderholt of Alabama

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

KEVIN MCCARTHY,
Republican Leader.

HONORING ABBY CURRAN
HORRELL FOR HER SERVICE

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

Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire. Madam Speaker, I rise to congratulate and thank my chief of staff, Abby Curran Horrell.

Abby is an original member of Team Kuster, dating back to the 2012 campaign in the 113th Congress when I was first elected. She has been my tireless coach and confidant throughout my 6-plus years in Congress. Through it all, she has become a very dear friend.

I rise to thank Abby for her dedicated service to our team and for her service to everyone in New Hampshire's Second Congressional District.

Abby embodies our Team Kuster motto, "Radical Hospitality," cultivating a culture of respect and inclusion. Because of her leadership, our staff feel empowered to succeed and grow as they take on new challenges. Through her respect for each member of our staff, Abby has created a collaborative culture, connecting our Washington and New Hampshire offices into a cohesive Team Kuster family.

As Abby grew the Team Kuster family, we all enjoyed watching her grow her own, juggling two maternity leaves as she and Chad welcomed Daniel and Eliza, and all of this while balancing the fast-paced environment of Congress.

Abby, we are all amazed by you. We are proud to know you, and we know you will do amazing things for America. You will be missed.

VOTE ON DISASTER
SUPPLEMENTAL FUNDING

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

Mr. DUNN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to demand a vote on disaster supplemental funding.

Next Wednesday will be the 6-month anniversary of Hurricane Michael and 6

months with absolutely no supplemental disaster funding, no serious action on the part of Congress to help the victims of Florida, Georgia, Alabama, the Carolinas, and even the California wildfires.

Every time I am in Florida, I discover new destruction. That debris has become firewood and is leading to massive wildfires. One just took out 700 acres. That debris is also clogging our stormwater system, and flooding will be our next disaster.

One of the strongest hurricanes in the history of the United States ravaged Florida and left a path of destruction across the South, and yet, here we are with only 3 legislative days before Easter and no relief in sight.

The Senate again failed to pass a disaster bill this week, and the House appears to have given up. This is shameful. The lack of action is a disgrace to the American people.

Madam Speaker, American citizens are hurting. We must pass a disaster relief bill and do it now.

HONORING THE LIFE OF SHERIFF'S DEPUTY PETER JOHN HERRERA

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

Ms. ESCOBAR. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of a father, son, and public servant, Sheriff's Deputy Peter John Herrera, who passed away at the age of 35 on Sunday, March 24, after being fatally shot at a traffic stop.

A lifelong El Pasoan, Sheriff's Deputy Herrera proudly served the El Paso County Sheriff's Office for 11 years. His leadership was exemplary. He was widely commended by his fellow officers for always wearing his badge with pride. He was the epitome of a public servant who loved his community and demonstrated it every day.

He was highly respected, supported, and loved by many as a devoted father, husband, brother, and friend. The community of El Paso mourns his untimely death, but we are endlessly thankful for his unwavering service and contributions to our community. It was a privilege to stand alongside so many El Pasoans last week as he was laid to rest.

Sheriff's Deputy Peter Herrera's memory will live on among us for dedicating his life to protecting and serving with integrity and purpose.

HONORING THE LIFE OF ED WESTCOTT

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

Mr. FLEISCHMANN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor an east Tennessee icon, Ed Westcott.

Those who knew Ed would tell you that his ability to capture a story through images was evident at an early

age. At just 20 years old, Ed became the 29th individual hired by the Clinton Engineer Works to begin to capture images at Oak Ridge. Ed was the sole photographer of the Manhattan Project—the Manhattan Project, now well known, then a secret.

His images lifted the veil off the secret city and gave Americans a glimpse into the lives of those who helped our Nation win World War II.

From the alpha racetrack at Y-12 to the images of daily life, we had Ed to thank for over 15,000 photographs. His work is proudly displayed in east Tennessee and in Washington at the National Archives.

To honor his contributions, I joined with my colleagues in the Senate to nominate him for the Presidential Medal of Freedom.

On March 29, Ed Westcott passed away, but his legacy will live on through his images.

MOVING FORWARD TO PROTECT WOMEN

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, today, we finished one stop of a journey, and that is the journey to pass the Violence Against Women Act.

I have had the privilege to see and shepherd this bill throughout my congressional tenure, having stood alongside senior Members many years ago in the first reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act. This bill was started today in 2016. We began to work and reach across the aisle to do what is right for the victims of so many horrific crimes.

We wanted children to be protected, immigrant women to be protected. We wanted to make sure that Native American women were protected.

We wanted law enforcement and prosecutors to have the tools. We wanted to stop the backlog in rape kits that had not been processed.

We did that today with a collective group of Republican and Democratic Members on a bill that should be non-partisan.

We worked hard, and I was gratified that we wound up giving a bill to the Senate and that they must ask the question: Are they not going to support a bill that was bipartisan?

Madam Speaker, I thank Monalisa Dugue, Milagros Cisneros, Joe Graupensperger, Amy Rutkin, and Chairman NADLER. I thank KAREN BASS and all those women who worked together, including the outstanding work that was done on the MTR with DEBBIE DINGELL.

Madam Speaker, we are thanking them because we are moving forward to protect women in this country, including against sex trafficking, which was in the bill.

CONGRATULATING THE UNIVERSITY OF MONTANA WESTERN WOMEN'S BASKETBALL TEAM

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

Mr. GIANFORTE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the remarkable women's basketball team from the University of Montana Western in Dillon.

The Bulldogs recently captured the NAIA Division I national title to close out a stellar season. The team's convincing 75-59 victory over the nine-time national champion, Oklahoma City Stars, brought the national title to Dillon, Montana.

The school's first national title in women's basketball brought well-deserved recognition to senior Brianna King, a two-time All-American and NAIA National Player of the Year.

Ms. King, however, was not alone on the court. Fellow All-American Britt Cooper won the tournament's Hustle Award and Tori Anderson made All-Tournament First Team.

The Bulldogs' head coach, Lindsay Woolley, led the team to the national title and was named the 2019 NAIA Coach of the Year.

Congratulations to all the players and coaches. Your school and State are proud of you.

All Montana is Bulldog Nation.

SPECIAL EDUCATION FUNDING

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

Mrs. CRAIG. Madam Speaker, as mother of four, the wife of an educator, and the daughter of a teacher, I know that we should never underestimate the power of a high-quality education.

In the nearly 40 years since the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act was passed, the Federal Government has not fulfilled its funding promise to our special education students. Not once.

This failure leaves our schools with extreme budget cuts that impact every student and forces them to turn to our communities to bear the burden through local tax levies.

That is why I am so proud to work with Representative JARED HUFFMAN and Minnesota Congressman PETE STAUBER on a bipartisan basis for IDEA full funding, to make sure that every student, including those with special needs, receives a high-quality education in their neighborhood.

Providing a high-quality education to all of our students is something that we can all agree on, and we must work together to get this done on behalf of our communities.

TEXAS TECH HEADS TO FINAL FOUR

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

Mr. ARRINGTON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Red Raiders of Texas Tech and a new standard of excellence in west Texas.

Sports teaches us a lot about the game of life. It teaches us that anything worth doing is worth working hard for. It teaches us the virtue of competition, the value of setting ambitious goals, and the necessity of making sacrifices to achieve them.

Through sports, we learn how to work as a team, how to be resilient in the face of adversity, and how to display grace in victory as well as defeat.

No one embodies these traits better than Coach Beard and the Texas Tech men's basketball team who have earned their first trip to the Final Four.

Coach Beard says the tough times pass, but the tough people last. Let me tell you, these Red Raiders are as tough as west Texas.

To the team, listen to the coach: Four to one, four parts mental, one part physical.

To my fellow Americans, get your guns up because Texas Tech is in Minneapolis, and we are coming home with the national championship.

Go Tech.

CELEBRATING REAUTHORIZATION OF THE VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN ACT

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

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Madam Speaker, I rise to celebrate the bipartisan reauthorization today of the Violence Against Women Act.

In 2013, this legislation was one of the first votes I took as a new Member of Congress. This year, I was proud to be an original cosponsor of the bill to ensure survivors have access to essential services and justice.

It is a sad fact that VAWA remains critically important. Despite some progress, the rate of domestic violence remains far too high.

I recently acquired a painting created by a survivor of domestic violence. It is a beautiful scene of a woman standing in a field of sunflowers with a blue sky. But upon a closer look, you see the broken chains at her feet, chains representing her former prison of domestic abuse.

While the woman in the painting was fortunately able to break free, so many others cannot. Today's legislation helps both groups.

I am particularly glad that this year's bill makes improvements to help the victims of dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking, and increases resources available to vulnerable populations, including Native American women and the LGBTQ community.

In our communities, there are many local organizations doing amazing work to help women escape situations of domestic violence and rebuild their

lives, including A Safe Place in my district. I commend their work and the work of all groups like this across the Nation, and I hope this legislation will provide additional support and resources for their important mission.

□ 1315

HUMANITARIAN CRISIS AT SOUTHERN BORDER

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

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Madam Speaker, this week, as the humanitarian and security crisis at our southern border worsens, my colleagues across the aisle have failed to act. Instead, House Democrats chose to focus on issuing illegal subpoenas for the Mueller report, including its underlying evidence, investigative sources, and grand jury materials. House Democrats are effectively demanding that Attorney General Barr break the law.

For nearly 2 years, Democrats misled the American people about the special counsel's investigation. Now that it is clear that there was absolutely no collusion with Russia, my colleagues across the aisle are grasping at straws and completely ignoring the crisis at our southern border.

Daily border crossings at our southern border have hit levels that we have not seen in decades. Adding to the complexity and gravity of this crisis is the dramatic increase in the number of unaccompanied children and family units.

Customs and Border Protection apprehended more than 100,000 family unit aliens in 2018. That is up 600 percent since 2013. The overwhelming surge of migrants has stretched our facilities to a breaking point.

Madam Speaker, I ask that my colleagues across the aisle end the partisan showmanship and work with us to address this crisis.

HONORING REV. DR. ROBIN WEINSTEIN

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

Mr. VAN DREW. Madam Speaker, I am grateful for the opportunity to honor an outstanding member of south Jersey. Rev. Dr. Robin Weinstein is a true believer in human potential and harnesses that power through extensive work and his community involvement.

In addition to being an associate professor at Wilmington University, he started the M25 Initiative to find ways to alleviate suffering, feed the hungry, end poverty, reduce crime, and revitalize the community.

Dr. Weinstein is also a cofounder of the Cumberland County Code Blue Coalition, which provides emergency winter shelter to those who are very much in need.

On top of all of these things, Dr. Weinstein serves as the founding pastor

of Bethany Grace Community Church in Bridgeton, New Jersey. Under his leadership, the church has started a weekly soup kitchen, monthly food pantry and clothing closet, showers for the homeless, and many other programs that provide for the people of south Jersey who so desperately need them.

His tireless efforts make an impact on the community that is felt far and wide.

The people of south Jersey appreciate all you do, Dr. Weinstein.

BORDER SECURITY

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to highlight some pretty disturbing numbers released by Customs and Border Protection that help put our border crisis into perspective.

In 2018, Customs and Border Patrol agents and officers seized more than 1.7 million pounds of narcotics, including 1 million pounds of marijuana; 280,000 pounds of cocaine; 248,000 pounds of methamphetamine; 6,500 pounds of heroin; 2,400 pounds of fentanyl, which is enough doses to kill everyone in the United States; and 139,000 pounds of other illicit drugs.

It is also a humanitarian crisis. Border Patrol agents rescued from trafficking 4,300 men and women near the border last year. There is no telling how many more have been caught up in human trafficking that slipped through the cracks.

Border Patrol says nearly every sector across the Southwest border has exceeded their capacity. Each day, nearly half the agents on the Southwest border are diverted away from border security missions to instead care for, transport, and process family units and unaccompanied children.

Even former Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security Jeh Johnson of the Obama administration said that we have a crisis with these huge numbers.

Madam Speaker, we need to do our job and get this border crisis solved.

HONORING STEPHEN "POPS" CULVER

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

Mr. PANETTA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor the life and legacy of Stephen "Pops" Culver.

Pops, as he was fondly known, lived his life to serve his country during the Vietnam war; his students as an elementary schoolteacher; and his community as an advocate for suicide prevention and awareness, something that was personal to him after the tragic loss of his son.

It was that sense of service that guided Pops on an epic 10,000-mile motorcycle ride across this great country to raise money for the brand-new Central Coast Veterans Cemetery on the former Fort Ord. During this trip, Pops and his fellow American Legion brothers of Post 31, Crash and Phin, the group known as the Black Sheep, carried an American flag, which you see here in this photo, from the Central Coast Veterans Cemetery to Arlington National Cemetery, where that flag was flown over the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier.

Now on Memorial Day each year, that flag is flown over the Central Coast Veterans Cemetery to honor those who served and sacrificed.

Based on Pop's service, he was honored as the 2017 Veteran of the Year in Monterey County.

Today, we here in Congress honor Pops Culver not just as a veteran but as an American who not only served but understood and lived up to his obligation to serve those who served us.

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. Madam Speaker, the bill that was entitled the Violence Against Women Act was passed in the House today, and I deeply regret it was not the kind of bipartisan bill that I feel like we should have had.

I don't know anybody in this Chamber who supports violence against women or who does not want to do what we can to stop it. We battled this out verbally in the Judiciary Committee.

It is so clear to me, having prosecuted sexual assaults of women who were battered and beat up badly by their husbands or partners, that it is such an egregious thing. I heard over and over as a felony judge in Texas about how traumatized the women were and potentially would be for the rest of their lives. I heard that, with counseling, they could work to avoid having the triggers that put them right back in the place where they were so badly abused.

More recent literature indicates that women who have been sexually assaulted seem to have a much higher percent—a number of times, apparently—more post-traumatic stress disorder after having been sexually abused than even soldiers have after combat. One suggestion in a study indicates that because soldiers are trained for what they go through, perhaps that reduces the amount of PTSD. There is no adequate training to prepare a woman for the kind of abuse that so many have suffered.

One of the triggers that I have heard about as a judge that could trigger this trauma, reliving the experience all

over again, is a woman being in a confined space and having a biological man come in to that confined space. We have heard of women assaulting men who have done that, some who may have been through sexual assault before.

I understand the idea of my colleagues across the aisle who want to help avoid hurting the feelings of biological men who think they are women, or according to the latest rendition of DSM-5, they are suffering from gender dysphoria, which is kind of the opposite of euphoria, but it basically is a confusion or a discomfort with one's biologically assigned gender.

So I get it. You don't want to make them feel bad. You don't want to hurt their feelings. So to avoid hurting their feelings, we would put so many women at risk.

A lot of folks I have heard say that one in four women will be sexually assaulted. If that is true, then that means that those who voted for this bill today would seek to punish again and again and again women who have suffered the outrageous and egregious assault sexually or being battered with no way out.

When my friend across the aisle, DEBBIE DINGELL, speaks of those fears and terrors as a child and abuse going on in the home, my heart goes out to her and anybody who has suffered like that.

But this is the United States Congress. Can't we have a bill that doesn't have a political aspect and that just tries to do the right thing by women who have suffered from sexual assault or being battered, and let them have a confined space without a biological man being forced into their traumatized world? Couldn't we agree on that? The answer is no.

DEBBIE LESKO, my friend and colleague also on the Judiciary Committee, has been such a victim. She had amendments. She spoke brilliantly about the suffering and what needed to be done to fix the bill. And yet, it was a political matter. It is too important that we not hurt the feelings of men who think they are women. Therefore, we are just going to let those women have to suffer. They just need to get over their trauma, their PTSD, their reliving the nightmare of a sexual assault over and over again. There is more regard for somebody's hurt feelings than someone else's. A woman's terror forces them over and over through such terror time and time again.

I read a story about a woman seeing a man and freaking out and started to assault him. If a woman has been through a sexual assault before, my heart goes to her, not for the guy who walks in and traumatized her so.

Yet if the majority here has their way, that bill would become law. Those traumatized women would be condemned to be traumatized repeatedly at the demand of the Democratic majority in Congress, in the House here.

□ 1330

I really would have hoped we could have had a bill that we could all, of one accord, say: This is right. This is the thing to do by women.

But we can't get a bill to the floor to try to protect unborn women, unborn girls.

In China, the abortion rate of girls is dramatically higher than that of boys, because they think—they haven't been like me and had three girls. They don't know how wonderful it is. So they think: Gee, if I am only going to be allowed to have one child, I prefer it be a boy.

And there is outrageous discrimination—a real, true war on women—going on in China. And China has yet to feel the destructive results of what they have required.

But that is a war, killing an unborn child because she happens to be biologically female. But we haven't heard condemnation about such practice in this Congress, and that is a legitimate war on women, children who were never given the chance to live simply because—not to live outside the womb simply because they are biologically women. It's very tragic.

I hope the Senate will use some common sense and have a heart for the women who have been victims of assault. And I know. I have seen it. I have heard it. As a prosecutor, I was frustrated by it, when a woman would come in, beat to a pulp, black and blue, all bruised up and scarred. You want to put her husband in prison forever, doing that to anybody, and especially a woman who could not defend herself.

And, time and again—too often, the experts will tell you, those who prosecute a lot—the woman will come back and say: You know what, now that everything has healed, it is really my fault.

And they have this idea that somehow they deserved that kind of beating when they didn't at all. As a judge, there were so many times that I told young children—you could tell they blamed themselves for a sexual assault—without the jury around, you need to understand this was not your fault. You didn't deserve this. You never did anything to deserve it. This was a crime committed against you. You were the victim, and don't ever think that you deserved it, or you are the guilty party.

Because it is amazing. Some men have the ability to make their victims think they are the ones at fault.

Yet, for those who suffer the trauma again, having a man confront them in a very confined space, they are going to be condemned to relive it over and over again. It is very unfortunate.

Hopefully, wisdom will win out and the Senate will help us have a bill that really considers the women and the damage done by the full complement, if you want to call it that, of this Violence Against Women Act, as it was labeled.

We have also heard repeatedly: There is no crisis on the border. It is not a national emergency. This is a manufactured emergency.

We have heard that over and over. We have seen the montages of the mainstream media saying: Manufactured crisis. Manufactured crisis.

Apparently Jeh Johnson, former Secretary of Homeland Security, didn't get the memo that he was supposed to come forward and lie, so he actually said: Yes, it is a crisis on the border.

It is a humanitarian crisis. It is a crisis for our Nation's security. And it is so out of hand.

I keep hearing every day from people whose jobs it is to protect America and to protect Americans, protect people who are legally here. But they are so busy having to get names, whether they are fictitious or not. Most of the time there is no proper identification. You have to take the person's word, take the information on where they say they have relatives.

I have pointed it out before, but I have been there when, while they are going through questions with one end of the group, at the other end, they are moving kids: Why don't you take this kid. You take this kid, claim it is yours. Oh, here. You take my address. I'll take your address.

These were addresses, apparently, where the drug cartels needed them to operate or work in either their drug trafficking or sex trafficking. So, under the laws the way they exist now, as the border patrolmen have said, you know, the cartels say: We're the logistics. The drug cartels get paid, and they hire some person to bring them across the border.

And the drug cartels, as I have heard them say out there in the middle of the night, when it is not on their list of questions to ask, but often it gets asked: How much did you pay to be brought into this country?

And when the question is asked: Where did you get that kind of money—\$5,000, \$6,000, \$7,000, \$8,000. You don't have that. Where did you get that money?

Well, we got so much here, so much there, some sent from the U.S.

Well, what about the rest?

They are going to let me work it off when I get where I am going.

So then, our own Homeland Security, our own HHS, they ship the drug cartels' future employees to the place that the cartels want them to work.

So, I would hope that, as people read stories: Oh, no, another meth lab busted, and this guy is part of the Mexican drug cartel, and it is not in Texas, then that is when people should remember: Oh, yeah, that's right. We use tax money to send the cartels' future employees to the cities where they want them to work in sex trafficking or drug trafficking.

I mean, an advanced civilization cannot continue to reach its potential when we are bringing in the people and paying to put them where they can de-

stroy the city, the State, and ultimately our country. This is a crisis.

As I understand, down in the quadrant of Texas, especially down south of McAllen, where I have spent so many nights, one was saying: We process 1,200 a day, process 13,000 in about 10 days—one area.

It is incredible. How can an intelligent civilization keep doing that to itself in the name of helping our country and helping our neighbors, when the fact is that the most compassionate thing Americans could do for our neighbors in Mexico is to secure the border completely. Nothing comes in, like drugs or women being sex trafficked. And, no, the drug cartels are not going to take lightly to it.

But, you shut down the tens of millions of dollars every year that are flowing from the U.S. into Mexico that fund the mass corruption in Mexico, then Mexico, in my opinion, would become a top-ten economy in the world.

They have got some of the best natural resources in the world, a better geographic location than the United States because they are between two continents and two oceans. Their trade ought to be astounding.

And they have got some of the hardest-working people in the world. So why aren't they a top economy? It is because of all the money that flows across from the United States to the drug cartels in Mexico.

And, now, a huge source of revenue for them is the money they get from sending people across by the thousands each week. It is insane.

We can't prolong this little experiment in self-government when we are providing corrupt drug cartels with the method to take us down and to keep Mexico subjugated to their evil intentions.

An article from CNS News by Terence Jeffrey, April 3 of this year, points out that the five Federal district court districts that sit along the U.S.-Mexico border were the top five districts in the country for the number of defendants they convicted and sentenced to imprisonment in fiscal year 2018, according to the data published by the Administrative Office of U.S. Courts.

I have a rather interesting chart here. You see the Western District of Texas has had 7,126 individuals convicted as criminals and sentenced to prison; the Southern District of Texas, 5,939 people convicted as criminals, sentenced to prison; Southern District of California, very close, 5,470 convicted criminals sentenced to prison. So, it isn't just a wrist slap. Sentenced to prison.

You have got the District of Arizona, 4,378; District of New Mexico, 3,923. Of course, Florida is behind them. And there are a lot of people coming in illegally there, but it drops off so dramatically. So, you see a bigger number of these 30 top sentencing courts have 700 or less, and the Western District of Texas has 7,000.

So why is this? It is because they are border courts, and they are dramatically affected by criminals coming across our border.

As I understand it, one of the MS-13ers that was caught—supposedly, for every person we catch coming in illegally, there are many times that many that are coming in that we don't catch. No reason to doubt that that is true about gang members, gangsters, part of MS-13.

But, why are we allowing this to go on for ourselves?

The old saying in Washington is: No matter how cynical you get, it is never enough to catch up. And, the more you hang around this town, the more you see there is something to that.

Could it be that a majority in the House don't want to stop this because the thinking is: These may be our future hope for being in the majority and electing a President?

Heaven help us if that were the case, that power is more important than preserving a union where freedom once abounded.

□ 1345

Of course, it could never adequately abound as there was slavery.

I just finished a book about the miracle of Yorktown, focused largely on George Washington. And we know he ended up, though he was from a State that prohibited the freeing of slaves, he freed the slaves in his will.

But it wasn't until Martin Luther King, Jr., JOHN LEWIS, and others, withstood tremendous oppression in order that a White Christian boy like me could grow up and treat my brothers and sisters like brothers and sisters. So we have made great progress.

And then it seemed like, just as we get to the sixties, and the Constitution finally is meaning what it says, we start moving in a direction that most civilizations, when you read their history, actually were moving them to the dustbin of history.

Here we accomplished so much, and freedom for—we spread it around. The Civil Rights Act helped with that. And now we are going to punish women who have been victims of assault by forcing them to endure men coming into their private spaces.

We are going to take a country where a massive amount of crime is occurring on our border and our border areas—we are overwhelmed with people that don't understand that it is a lot of education and a lot of work involved in order to preserve self-government.

So it is not unusual to see socialism become so popular as an idea. It sounds wonderful. Everybody's going to share and share alike.

But then you dig down, and you find out historically, you can't have socialism; you can't have communism unless you have a big, powerful government, strong enough that it can take from those who earn things and give it to those who didn't, without their permission, and punish them if they try to object. That takes a big, strong government.

And our Founders found actually, if you let people keep what they earn, put a small tax on it so you keep order in the country, that that is far more productive. That is how the United States has been the greatest economy, and still is, in the world.

But those freedoms are going away. We are no longer ranked as the freest country in the world. And as those freedoms diminish, it shouldn't be a big surprise that freedoms are diminishing as people that don't understand what it takes to preserve liberty and self-government come in, unabated, virtually. We are not stopping people from coming in.

I am hopeful, prayerful, I hope that we will be able to have our government do what has not been done, as far as I know, since Woodrow Wilson, and that is, have people on the border, use non-lethal means, and say, you are not coming in to our country illegally.

We ought to have a bipartisan bill passed pretty easily with regard to asylum that says, You can't come into the United States and claim asylum. You have got to go to the nearest embassy or an American embassy, somewhere to claim asylum.

But if you come into the country illegally, and your first act in America involves breaking the law, then we are not going to allow you to apply for asylum. And you would see these massive caravans stop overnight. That is why there is such fluctuation.

Earlier last year, numbers were way down. People in other countries thought Trump was going to stop them; that we had a President that wanted to do all he could to stop illegal immigration, secure the border.

But by the time they found out that his party was not going to be in the majority in the House, and that people said they want to eliminate all barriers and let people in, anybody that wanted to come here, not just the over 1 million that we give visas to, then the numbers picked up.

And when they got word that if you have a child, whether it is yours or somebody else's, it doesn't matter, that gets you into the country, and keeps you in the country, get a child. Bring a child. That is the thing to do.

It is really outrageous what that has done to children. Now they are an important commodity to the drug cartels. Make sure, whoever you are, wherever you are coming from, even if you are an MS-13er, bring a kid with you, bring a child; because the United States made such a big deal about we won't separate children from parents, even though, to American citizens, we separate children from parents every single day of the year because, in America, at least in the past, we didn't believe in putting children in confinement for crimes their parents committed.

As a judge, I don't know how many warrants I signed, but I would never allow a child to be incarcerated because of the alleged crime of their parents. We don't do that. So we separate

children from their parents every day in America, in every county in America, in every State in America. It happens all the time, because we don't punish the children for the sins of their parents.

But once word got out that if you come to America illegally with a child, you have got a good chance of staying in, claim asylum, the courts are backed up, and you have got a good chance of staying for years; and once you are here a number of years, just don't show up for your asylum hearing, and they won't know where you are, and you will be in good shape.

It has got to stop. The American people expect us to protect them, protect the Constitution, and we have not done a good job of that because there seems, so often, right here in this room, more devotion to people that hate America, that still want to come here, than there is to those who are legally here, that are saying, I don't want to be a victim of a crime; would you please protect me from people coming in illegally that may commit a crime against me.

And it shouldn't even have to be said, but because we have so many "lame stream" media folks who either are liars by trade, or simply that ignorant—no, all immigrants are not criminals or people looking to commit crimes such as robbery, rape, destruction, murder; but they do happen.

When you look at the percentages of people in our Federal prison who are in the country illegally, an objective bystander looking on would go: Wow, why is this country doing that?

Why are they letting all these people in illegally, when they may have 20, 25 percent in their prison who are there because they are in the country illegally? Why are they letting that go on?

And the only answer from an accurate cynic would be, Well, it is for politics. They think it is good for one political party, so they keep it up.

That is so dramatic, such a dramatic demonstration of where the real problems are in this country.

And I have heard my friend, now Senator MARSHA BLACKBURN, point out, every city in America is now a border city, because of all of the illegal aliens that they are having to take care of.

But an article in the *Federalist*, by John Daniel Davidson, April 4—it is actually his testimony before the Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee—but he says: "I visited a migrant respite center in McAllen, Texas, run by Catholic Charities of the Rio Grande Valley, the charitable arm of the Diocese of Brownsville. Sister Norman Pimentel helped establish the center in 2014, at the height of the unaccompanied minor crisis, when Immigration and Customs Enforcement was overwhelmed with thousands of children and teenagers turning themselves in to U.S. Border Patrol agents.

"At that time, the center was receiving between 60 and 120 migrants a day,

nearly all of them families from Central America. Here's how it worked: Every afternoon, ICE dropped off the families at the Greyhound bus station downtown, about a mile from the respite center. Greyhound employees would call the center to let them know the migrants were there, and the center would send vans to pick them up.

"Once at the center, the children would be sent to a separate room for a hot meal while the parents took turns working with volunteers to get in touch with friends and family members all over the country."

Or, as we have seen, sometimes those are not friends and family; they are people to which the drug cartels have ordered them.

"The goal was to get them all bus tickets and get them on their way that same day, usually later that evening, because the next day there would be another group of families coming in, and there simply wasn't space for more than a couple dozen people to spend the night there.

"This wasn't some gleaming facility. The center occupied one half of a run-down commercial building, consisting of a large multipurpose room, a bathroom and a shower, a small kitchen, and a separate room for the makeshift cafeteria. There was an area in a corner of the main room cordoned off for young children to play and a large stack of blue plastic mattresses in another corner."

Anyway, "in December, the diocese moved the center to a larger location, a former nursing home, about 16,000 square feet. . . . that's because the number of migrants skyrocketed. Today, the new respite center is receiving about 800 people a day"—800 people a day—"sometimes more. Last Sunday, 1,300 people were dropped off there and at other shelters around town."

I mean, this is what is going on on our border, when we are the most generous country in the world.

Some people even in this room will shout: You know, we are a Nation of immigrants. That is right. And that is why we are so—we are the most generous country in the world when it comes to giving free passes into America. Nobody gives a million or more visas for legal entry into their country. Nobody. Not these countries that are geographically bigger. Not countries that have a number of times the population. No, nobody is that generous as we are with letting immigrants in.

So it is outrageous to say, because we want to limit those coming in to the very—the most generous number in the world, that we say come in legally, what is wrong with that?

As has been said before, a nation with no borders will not be a nation much longer. Not for long.

But, we find out, yeah, it is a moneymaker. It is a moneymaker for the drug cartels. Some people profit off the people coming in here illegally. The people that work here, either from

drugs or legitimate businesses, they send an awful lot of money home, and that is the kind of people we want, people that care about their families, want to help them provide, make their way. That is a very noble thing to send money home to family. Unfortunately, that is not all the people that are coming in these days.

I want to touch on one other matter, and that's with regard to the special counsel. I know there are people, the House and Senate, that say, Oh, you know, Robert Mueller is the gold standard when it comes to prosecutor. I submit that is some pretty tarnished gold with an awful lot of impurities, speaking metaphorically.

□ 1400

So I wasn't surprised when we learned that the Mueller report indicated, really, there is plenty of evidence Russians were trying to get the Trump campaign to conspire with them; no evidence they did conspire with the Russians.

Through the years of questioning Robert Mueller in our committee and doing a lot of research on the man, it would explain why I was so upset when he was appointed as special counsel, because I wanted somebody who would be fair and investigate all parts. But when we look back now, we see all the indictments that came as a result of having a special counsel, not one single one of the indictments involved a conspiracy of any kind between anybody at the Trump campaign, including our President, and Russia.

What we have learned from all the evidence we have gleaned in committee and in public is that there was a conspiracy, and it involved top people at the Department of Justice; it involved top people at the FBI; it involved the Clinton campaign; it involved Fusion GPS; it involved a foreign agent named Steele. He is a foreign agent.

And, by the way, our great Justice Department, such as it is—or was in the last couple years—never bothered to tell the FISA court: This man has no credibility with the FBI. We have stopped using him as an agent of our government, the foreign agent that he is, because he is not trustworthy.

Never bothered to tell the judge that.

And I don't know if it was one FISA judge or more, but the fact is that the FISA judges, nobody has punished any of the applicants, or affiants, that have come in and sworn before them that this is true to the best of their knowledge.

That was a lie. They didn't give the judge the best of their knowledge. It was a lie and they knew it, and they did it four times.

I have lost respect for whoever in the FISA court would not call those lawyers in, or the FBI agents, and say: You lied to me when you didn't tell me the full truth. You committed a fraud on my court, and now I need to decide how long I am putting you in jail.

They haven't done that. That tells me we either need to get rid of the

FISA courts or we need to have such a big overhaul because they have gotten too comfortable in that star chamber.

And I know all of them haven't, because I know there are some good judges who have been nominated, confirmed by the Senate, and sit on Federal benches. I know there are plenty of good ones. I have got too many good friends not to know that. But we at least have some who don't care when they are lied to if it furthers their own political ideas, because that is the bottom line.

Why would the FISA court or courts that have been lied to, had fraud against the court, why would they not have already punished the people who committed the fraud against their court?

It seems to me it has got to be one of two reasons:

They must be dishonest people; therefore, they don't mind being lied to; or

They were so politically aligned with the people who were committing the fraud upon their court that they are fine with the fraud because it helped accomplish their political agenda as well as the ones who committed the fraud.

We need to do something about the FISA courts. It is a real problem.

I know there are a lot of people who think: Well, no, it is not really a problem because it has only been abused against Republicans, and we hate Donald Trump, didn't want him to be President, and so it is okay for them to abuse the FISA court system and the warrant system and the First and Fourth and Fifth and Sixth Amendments. It is okay to abuse those because we don't like the people being abused.

But there is a reason that we have an adversarial system. With all its flaws, it is the best there has ever been anywhere when it comes to justice. We are not supposed to allow the kind of thing that has now happened.

I was not surprised when Mueller couldn't help himself, Weissmann couldn't help himself: Yeah, the evidence is not there to prosecute anybody, but we want you to know we are not exonerating him.

Well, that is not a prosecutor's job. If a prosecutor learns that a crime has most likely—has probably been committed and that a person has probably committed it and they find out a crime has been committed, they look for a person who probably committed the crime. That is the job.

When you find the person, you gather enough evidence that you can have probable cause that they committed the crime. You get them indicted. You pursue them, prosecute them, convict them, sentence them. That is how it is supposed to work.

A prosecutor is not supposed to ever go into something to exonerate somebody. You don't go into it looking for evidence that exonerates somebody. You are looking for evidence that

shows they are guilty. And if you don't find evidence that establishes they are guilty, then you are supposed to move on; although, Mueller has had a problem with that.

We also have seen the history, whether it was Comey admitting that—it sounded like he admitted a crime, because he leaked information that he knew should not have been disclosed to a professor so that he would get it to The New York Times so that they could have a justification for appointing a special prosecutor. Wow.

You have got 18 U.S.C. 1905, disclosure of confidential information. That is a general provision. It is a felony to disclose confidential information. You have got other laws.

Well, this from the DOJ, their own regulations. If you look at 1-7.110, it says: "It is against the law to disclose classified information to someone not authorized to receive it."

But that has gone on during the years Mueller was head of the FBI.

We have had FBI agents make clear: No way we could prosecute a Member of Congress without the knowledge and okay of the Director of the FBI.

That would be Mueller when they were pursuing Ted Stevens, Senator. They fabricated a case against the man. He had evidence he was not just not guilty, but completely innocent.

But you do your investigation. You gather up all the evidence that would show somebody is innocent, completely innocent, 100 percent innocent, and you don't let them have all their stuff back and you manufacture evidence. You threaten a witness to get them to lie so you can convict somebody. That happened to Ted Stevens.

When I first heard, gee, he had added a \$700,000 addition to his home, something like that, I am going, well, he should have known better than that. Surely you are going to try a guy for that.

Well, it turns out he overpaid. He even told the contractor: Just cash my checks. I have to overpay, because they are watching everything I do, and I have got to keep my nose clean.

They still went after him and convicted him immediately before an election that he narrowly lost.

Thank God there was an FBI agent with a conscience who did an affidavit so the judge found out that the prosecutor, the FBI, had framed Ted Stevens for a crime he didn't commit.

Those people should have been disbarred. They should have been thrown out of the FBI. But the only guy forced out was the one who did the affidavit, because Mueller—obviously, it had to be done with his knowledge, that you run the guy off that had a conscience and reported it to the court and you keep on the FBI agent that helped fabricate the case against the longest serving Republican in the Senate at the time.

He wouldn't have been on that plane where he was killed if it hadn't been for Mueller's FBI and the framing of

Ted Stevens. So he lost his seat in the Senate, even though he was later exonerated.

And, of course, you know, we have these repeated examples. I am not even going to go back into the Whitey Bulger situation when Mueller was in Boston.

But, you know, Curt Weldon, serving here in the House, he was giving speeches right here over and over about the FBI could have stopped 9/11.

I didn't know what he was saying, whether it was true or not. He talked about a program Able Danger, but I sure did feel like Mueller needed to respond, because this was a serious allegation against his FBI.

Unbeknownst to me, he was going to respond, but not with a statement that Curt Weldon was wrong. No. What they did, and I put the story—I have got a lot of examples. I was doing an op-ed so people would know some about Mueller that I know and had found out and read about.

Anyway, I started an op-ed. I let my friend Sean Hannity know: I am doing an op-ed on Mueller, and normally papers only want 500, 800 words, max, for an op-ed, and I am already at 2,000.

Sean said: Just do it.

And, you know, it doesn't make me a dime in my case as a Member of Congress, but I felt like the story needed to get out. So Sean said: Well, yeah, we can put it up on the Internet. People can download it.

It ended up being 48 pages, but one of the things I brought out was Curt Weldon's situation.

So I will read from the story that I included. This was from an article by WND: "Each of Weldon's 10 previous re-elections had been by sizeable margins. Polls showed he was up by five to seven points in the fall of 2006. Three weeks prior to the election, however, a national story ran about Weldon based upon anonymous sources"—they had to have come from the FBI—"that an investigation was underway against him and his daughter, alleging illegal activities involving his congressional work."

A week after the news story broke, alleging a need to act quickly because of the leak—and, see, this is typical for Mueller and his crime team. They leak information and then tell the judge: We have got to do something quick because this information is getting out.

Yeah. You leaked it.

Just like when they used this dossier. I used to have respect for dossiers. Now it is a pejorative. But it was prepared by a foreign agent named Christopher Steele, hired by the Clinton campaign, using Fusion GPS, using others like Nellie Ohr, wife of FBI top official Bruce Ohr, and they used this guy's dossier. Information from Christopher Steele's dossier, as fabricated as it was, was provided to a reporter who did a story about it.

It was one of the other frauds upon the court. They tell the court: See, not only do we have this information from

Christopher Steele, a foreign agent that is untrustworthy—unfortunately, they didn't tell the judge that. They knew it, but they didn't tell it.

And they said: And look here. Here is a story that also has this information that corroborates Christopher Steele—not bothering to tell the judge, actually, that is Christopher Steele corroborating Christopher Steele. And he didn't even—he just talked to people in Russia.

□ 1415

So, you got a foreign agent using foreign agents. Who knows who they worked for. Maybe Putin. So a foreign agent using foreign agents in Russia, as he worked for the Clinton Foundation, Fusion GPS, to prepare opposition research that was not true against the opposing campaign for president.

So they didn't bother to tell the judge then here in Curt Weldon's case. It must have been somebody from the FBI leaked that they were going after Curt Weldon that helped them get the media involved and a judge to sign off on a warrant.

And, gee, when they show up early in the morning at 7 a.m., before business on a Monday morning—local TV and print media had all been alerted about the raid—well, who would have done that, but the FBI agents or maybe Mueller or one of his minions. They leaked to the media: They are all out there and they were in position to cover the story.

Within hours, Democratic protestors were waving "Caught Red-Handed" signs outside Curt Weldon's district office. But it turns out there was no follow-up, there were no questions, no grand jury investigation, nothing.

That is why they later called Curt Weldon's family and said: Hey, all that stuff we got in our raid, you know, you can come get it. Apparently, we didn't use it in a grand jury investigation.

No, they just used it to defeat Curt Weldon.

So, it shouldn't be a surprise when Mueller's report said: We didn't have evidence of a crime by the Trump administration or Trump campaign regarding collusion or any of that, but we didn't exonerate him.

Well, no, that is not your job. Of course, you don't exonerate somebody.

But as special counsel—it sure seemed just like Comey, these guys that were all in tight. You know, Comey, there was a great article some years back about basically he and Mueller are joined at the hip.

What a great gift for Mueller, though. He is begging President Trump to appoint him again back to being director of the FBI after Comey was fired based on Rosenstein's memo. And the President said: No, I am not going to give you a job.

Twenty-four hours later, he grabs a job that will allow him to go after the man who wouldn't hire him as FBI director.

Mueller, if he had any sense of decency, he would have told Rosenstein:

Look, you and I, Rosenstein, Rod, we were involved in the original Russia investigation when we know Russia was trying to get uranium illegally. We really shouldn't be involved in this Russia investigation. It may bleed over. And the President is supposed to investigate. He wouldn't hire me yesterday. That will look bad.

But you would have thought a man of decency would have recused himself, which Mueller did not do. There are so many reasons for both him, Rosenstein, and certainly Weissman—they were all involved in that original Russia investigation on uranium that they put a lid on so that the sale could go through, because, let's face it, the Clinton Foundation wouldn't have gotten that \$145 million from the people profiting from the uranium sale of U.S. uranium, ultimately to Russia. It wouldn't have happened.

But Mueller not only did not recuse himself, he accepted the job and immediately went about hiring people that hated Trump like he did. That is not the mark of a real man of justice, a real person of justice.

And he had a policy, when he was FBI director, the 5-year up-or-out policy, that caused us to lose, as was previously reported, thousands and thousands of years of experience. Why? If you got people experienced, they can tell you when you are screwing up, doing something wrong as FBI director. He just wanted young people who would salute the flag and do whatever he said. Very unfortunate.

So he brought down Ted Stevens. He brought down Curt Weldon. And what about Dr. Steven Hatfill? I mean, the story was that President Bush called him in—There is no evidence that Hatfill had anything to do with this anthrax. Why are you still after it? Are you sure he is the guy? And Mueller said: I am 100 percent certain; is what was reported.

And that is because, as the saying goes, normally Mueller—well, I guess the saying is: Often wrong, but never in doubt.

He tells President Bush: I am 100 percent certain. Yes, Hatfill is the guy.

He wasn't the guy. And that is why it cost the government a \$6 million or such settlement for destroying his life.

If you look at Scooter Libby, Scooter Libby was framed, let's face it. And there is a great story explaining all that, in fact, how Judith Miller was manipulated. That poor person suffered as a result of trying to do the right thing. But she was ultimately persuaded that Scooter Libby said something he didn't. And she later, as it said, when Miller read Plame's own memoir, in there discovered that Plame had worked at a State Department bureau as a cover for a real CIA role. That discovery, in Miller's words, left her cold. The idea that the bureau, in her notebook, meant CIA had been planted in her head by Fitzgerald or the FBI. It was a strange word to use for the CIA. Reading Plame's memoir,

Miller realized that bureau was in brackets because it related to her work at the State Department. In other words, she shouldn't have testified against Scooter Libby. She was set up and manipulated and, as a result, a good man's life was destroyed.

But you will find, Mueller never apologizes when he always gets his man. It is just sometimes it is wrong. It needs more investigation. Not the Trump administration, but Mueller.

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

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 22 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, April 8, 2019, at noon for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

609. A letter from the Secretary, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission's interim final rule — Margin Requirements for Uncleared Swaps for Swap Dealers and Major Swap Participants (RIN: 3038-AE85) received April 3, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

610. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Division of Swap Dealer and Intermediary Oversight, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Department's final rule — De Minimis Exception to the Swap Dealer Definition—Swaps Entered into by Insured Depository Institutions in Connection with Loans to Customers (RIN: 3038-AE68) received April 3, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

611. A letter from the Chief, Officer Accessions Policy Branch [G1/DMPM], Department of the Army, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Schools and Colleges [Docket ID: USA-2018-HQ-0018] (RIN: 0702-AA89) received April 3, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Armed Services.

612. A letter from the Acting Principal Deputy, Defense Pricing and Contracting, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Repeal of DFARS Clause "Oral Attestation of Security Responsibilities" (DFARS Case 2019-D006) [Docket: DARS-2019-0014] (RIN: 0750-AK41) received April 3, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Armed Services.

613. A letter from the Acting Principal Deputy, Defense Pricing and Contracting, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Repeal of Congressional Notification for Certain Task-and-Delivery-Order Contracts (DFARS Case 2019-0007) [Docket: DARS-2019-0007] (RIN: 0750-AK45) received April 3, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec.

251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Armed Services.

614. A letter from the Acting Principal Deputy, Defense Pricing and Contracting, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Consent to Subcontract (DFARS Case 2018-D065) [Docket: DARS-2019-0006] (RIN: 0750-AK24) received April 3, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Armed Services.

615. A letter from the Acting Principal Deputy, Defense Pricing and Contracting, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Repeal of Certain Defense Acquisition Laws (DFARS Case 2018-D059) [Docket: DARS-2019-0013] (RIN: 0750-AK20) received April 3, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Armed Services.

616. A letter from the Acting Principal Deputy, Defense Pricing and Contracting, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Modification of DFARS Clause "Utilization of Indian Organizations, Indian-Owned Economic Enterprises, and Native Hawaiian Small Business Concerns" (DFARS Case 2018-D051) [Docket: DARS-2019-0012] (RIN: 0750-AK06) received April 3, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Armed Services.

617. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility (Alabama: Adamsville, City of, Jefferson County, et al.) [Docket ID: FEMA-2019-0003; Internal Agency Docket No.: FEMA-8571] received April 3, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

618. A letter from the Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's Major final rule — Delay of Effective Date; Regulatory Capital Rule: Implementation and Transition of the Current Expected Credit Losses Methodology for Allowances and Related Adjustments to the Regulatory Capital Rule and Conforming Amendments to Other Regulations (RIN: 3064-AE74) received April 3, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

619. A letter from the Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's interim final rule — Margin and Capital Requirements for Covered Swap Entities (RIN: 3064-AF00) received April 3, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

620. A letter from the Deputy General Counsel, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Opportunities and Responsibilities for State and Local Report Cards Under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, As Amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act received April 3, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

621. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — 2-methyl-2-[(1-oxo-2-propenyl)amino]-1-propanesulfonic acid monosodium salt polymer with 2-propenoic acid, 2-

methyl-, C12-16 alkyl esters; Tolerance Exemption [EPA-HQ-OPP-2018-0058; FRL-9988-62] received April 2, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

622. A letter from the Chief Administrative Officer, transmitting the quarterly report of receipts and expenditures of appropriations and other funds for the period January 1, 2019, to March 31, 2019, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 104a (H. Doc. No. 116-26); to the Committee on House Administration and ordered to be printed.

623. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule — Adjustment of Civil Monetary Penalty Amounts for 2019 [Docket No.: FR-6139-F-01] (RIN: 2501-AD90) received April 3, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

624. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Offering a Lump-Sum Payment Option to Retirees Currently Receiving Annuity Payments under a Defined Benefit Plan [Notice 2019-18] received April 2, 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.

625. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Permitted disparity in employer-provided contributions or benefits (Revenue Ruling 2019-06) received April 2, 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.

626. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Announcement and Report Concerning Advance Pricing Agreements [Announcement 2019-03] received April 2, 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.

627. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final regulations — Chapter 4 Regulations Relating to Verification and Certification Requirements for Certain Entities and Reporting by Foreign Financial Institutions [TD 9852] (RIN: 1545-BL96) received April 2, 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.

628. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final regulations — Reportable Transactions Penalties under Section 6707A [TD 9853] (RIN: 1545-BK62) received April 2, 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. NADLER: Committee on the Judiciary. House Resolution 243. Resolution of inquiry requesting the President and directing the Attorney General to transmit, respectively, certain documents to the House of

Representatives relating to the actions of former Federal Bureau of Investigation Acting Director Andrew McCabe; with an amendment (Rept. 116-33). Referred to the House Calendar.

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. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 2079. A bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act to prohibit certain member banks from using discount window lending programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. SEWELL of Alabama (for herself, Mrs. MCBATH, Ms. HOULAHAN, Mr. PETERS, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. BERA, Ms. SPANBERGER, Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma, Mr. PHILLIPS, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Ms. SLOTKIN, and Miss RICE of New York):

H.R. 2080. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide for a Federal, cost-of-living based minimum wage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. VELA, Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania, and Mr. CUELLAR):

H.R. 2081. A bill to amend the Animal Health Protection Act to establish a grant program for research on chronic wasting disease, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GOHMERT (for himself and Mr. WRIGHT):

H.R. 2082. A bill to provide for parental notification and intervention in the case of an unemancipated minor seeking an abortion; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORREA (for himself, Mr. MAST, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. PAPPAS, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi):

H.R. 2083. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 regarding the procurement of certain items related to national security interests for Department of Homeland Security frontline operational components, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. ADERHOLT (for himself and Mr. VARGAS):

H.R. 2084. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to raise the minimum age restriction with respect to the sale of tobacco products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY (for herself, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. NORTON, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. MOORE, and Mr. COHEN):

H.R. 2085. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish a public health insurance option, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California (for himself and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 2086. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a refundable tax credit against income tax for the purchase of qualified access technology for the blind; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOGGETT (for himself and Mr. BUCHANAN):

H.R. 2087. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require certain manufacturers to report drug pricing information

with respect to drugs 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. STANTON (for himself and Mr. VEASEY):

H.R. 2088. A bill to amend the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 to reauthorize the Energy Efficiency and Conservation Block Grant Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. FINKENAUER (for herself, Mrs. AXNE, Mr. KIND, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Ms. DELAURO, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. LAHOOD, Mrs. CRAIG, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. PASCARELL, and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut):

H.R. 2089. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend for 2 years tax credits with respect to biodiesel and renewable diesel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER (for himself and Mr. POCAN):

H.R. 2090. A bill to clarify the status of the North Country, Ice Age, and New England National Scenic Trails as units of the National Park System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. SPEIER (for herself, Miss RICE of New York, Ms. MOORE, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. GALLEGRO, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. POCAN, Mr. BERA, Mr. PASCARELL, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. HIMES, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. NADLER, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MENG, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. WELCH, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. KILMER, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RYAN, Mr. AGUILAR, and Ms. TITUS):

H.R. 2091. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to ensure that members of the Armed Forces and their families have access to the contraception they need in order to promote the health and readiness of all members of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. DEGETTE:

H.R. 2092. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to set a health-protective numerical emission limitation for hydrogen cyanide under section 112 of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7412), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. GAETZ, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. COHEN, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Ms. NORTON, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. CORREA, Mr. BUCK, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. ARMSTRONG, Mr. CRIST, Mr. RIGGLEMAN, Ms. TITUS, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. RYAN, and Mr. NEWHOUSE):

H.R. 2093. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to provide for a new rule re-

garding the application of the Act to marijuana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, 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 Ms. BROWNLEY of California:

H.R. 2094. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the maximum age for children eligible for medical care under the CHAMPVA program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DESAULNIER:

H.R. 2095. A bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services, for the purpose of addressing public health crises, to require the manufacturers of covered products to develop, maintain, and update a plan to mitigate the effects of such products on public health, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Ms. SANCHEZ):

H.R. 2096. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax credits for energy storage technologies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DUFFY (for himself, Mr. MCCAUL, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, and Ms. SPEIER):

H.R. 2097. A bill to recognize the Hmong, Khmer, Laotian, and other ethnic groups commonly referred to as Montagnards, who supported and defended the Armed Forces during the conflict in Southeast Asia, authorize assistance to support activities relating to clearance of unexploded ordnance and other explosive remnants of war, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 2098. A bill to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to establish a veterans visa program to permit veterans who have been removed from the United States to return as immigrants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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. HASTINGS (for himself, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. COHEN, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. VELA, Ms. NORTON, Ms. BARRAGAN, Mr. SOTO, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. RASKIN, and Mr. SERRANO):

H.R. 2099. A bill to expand the workforce of veterinarians specialized in the care and conservation of wild animals and their ecosystems, and to develop educational programs focused on wildlife and zoological veterinary medicine; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HIMES (for himself, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, and Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio):

H.R. 2100. A bill to promote the creation of State anonymous school threat reporting programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUFFMAN (for himself and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 2101. A bill to provide for restrictions on recently appointed Federal employees and recently separated Federal employees with

respect to lobbying activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILDEE (for himself, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. SLOTKIN, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. DELGADO, Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. DEAN, Mr. COHEN, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. STEVENS, Mrs. TRAHAN, and Mr. KIM):

H.R. 2102. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to furnish hospital care and medical services to veterans and dependents who were stationed at military installations at which the veterans and dependents were exposed to perfluorooctanoic acid or other per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances, to provide for a presumption of service connection for certain veterans who were stationed at military installations at which the veterans were exposed to such substances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LAMB (for himself, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RYAN, Mr. BRINDISI, Mr. POCAN, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. MENG, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Mr. GARAMENDI):

H.R. 2103. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow workers an above-the-line deduction for union dues and expenses and to allow a miscellaneous itemized deduction for workers for all unreimbursed expenses incurred in the trade or business of being an employee; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LATTA (for himself and Mr. WELCH):

H.R. 2104. A bill to clarify that no express or implied warranty is provided by reason of a disclosure relating to voluntary participation in the Energy Star program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LATTA (for himself, Mr. COLE, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. RYAN, and Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia):

H.R. 2105. A bill to establish the Wildlife and Hunting Heritage Conservation Advisory Committee to advise the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture on wildlife and habitat conservation, hunting, recreational shooting, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LATTA (for himself, Mr. COLE, Mr. RYAN, and Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia):

H.R. 2106. A bill to amend section 100905 of title 54, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to require annual permits and assess annual fees for commercial filming activities on Federal land for film crews of 5 persons or fewer, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. NEGUSE (for himself and Mr. DEFAZIO):

H.R. 2107. A bill to expand the use of open textbooks in order to achieve savings for students and improve textbook price informa-

tion; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PALMER (for himself and Mr. GOSAR):

H.R. 2108. A bill to allow individuals to choose to opt out of the Medicare part A benefit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Miss RICE of New York (for herself and Mr. COOK):

H.R. 2109. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, in awarding a contract for the procurement of goods or services, to give a preference to offerors that employ veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Washington (for himself, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. NADLER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. VAN DREW, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. GALLEG0, and Ms. SLOTKIN):

H.R. 2110. A bill to amend the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 to eliminate the section 251A sequestrations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ (for herself, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. DEUTCH, and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 2111. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for a Reducing Youth Use of E-Cigarettes Initiative; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN (for herself and Mr. HILL of Arkansas):

H.R. 2112. A bill to establish the Refund to Rainy Day Savings Program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. MATSUI (for herself and Mr. GUTHRIE):

H. Res. 290. A resolution supporting increased awareness of sepsis and the importance of early diagnosis and appropriate intervention; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. FRANKEL (for herself, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. KEATING, Mr. SUOZZI, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. BERA, Mr. GALLEG0, Ms. SHALALA, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. HOULAHAN, Mr. COHEN, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. COSTA, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. RUSH, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. CROW, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. SIRES, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. HILL of California, Mr. PANETTA, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. VELA, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. HIMES, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. SLOTKIN, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Mr. MALINOWSKI):

H. Res. 291. A resolution recognizing that contributions of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization are vital to United States national security; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HASTINGS (for himself and Mr. WATKINS):

H. Res. 292. A resolution celebrating the heritage of Romani Americans; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

16. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 3029, urging Congress to pass a federal prohibition on abortions performed 20 weeks postfertilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

17. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Iowa, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 10, recognizing the importance of multilateral trade agreements to Iowa's economy and urging Congress to enact legislation to implement a multilateral trade agreement between the United States, Canada, and Mexico; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

18. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, relative to Senate Concurrent Memorial 1002, urging the United States Congress to provide full, timely and sustainable long-term funding for the Payment in Lieu of Taxes Program; jointly to the Committees on Natural Resources and Agriculture.

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. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 2079.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. SEWELL of Alabama:

H.R. 2080.

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. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 2081.

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 which gives Congress the power "to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several states, and within the Indian Tribes."

By Mr. GOHMERT:

H.R. 2082.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

"The Congress shall have Power . . . 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."

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

Congress shall have Power . . . "To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes."

By Mr. CORREA:

H.R. 2083.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

(1) The U.S. Constitution including Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. ADERHOLT:

H.R. 2084.

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, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY:

H.R. 2085.

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. THOMPSON of California:

H.R. 2086.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I

By Mr. DOGGETT:

H.R. 2087.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. STANTON:

H.R. 2088.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8

By Ms. FINKENAUER:

H.R. 2089.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1:

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.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 2090.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department thereof.

By Ms. SPEIER:

H.R. 2091.

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 Ms. DEGETTE:

H.R. 2092.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 3 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 2093.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. BROWNLEY of California:

H.R. 2094.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution

By Mr. DESAULNIER:

H.R. 2095.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 2096.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Sections 7 & 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution and Amendment XVI of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. DUFFY:

H.R. 2097.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 2098.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Const. art. I, §§1 and 8.

By Mr. HASTINGS:

H.R. 2099.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

By Mr. HIMES:

H.R. 2100.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, as this legislation provides for the general welfare of the United States.

By Mr. HUFFMAN:

H.R. 2101.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: 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 office thereof.

By Mr. KILDEE:

H.R. 2102.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. LAMB:

H.R. 2103.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 2104.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 2105.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2

The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States

Amendment II

A well regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed.

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 2106.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2

The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations and among the several States

By Mr. NEGUSE:

H.R. 2107.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. PALMER:

H.R. 2108.

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, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof

By Miss RICE of New York:

H.R. 2109.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. SMITH of Washington:

H.R. 2110.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 7

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, 2, 18

By Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ:

H.R. 2111.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution

By Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN:

H.R. 2112.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1: 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.

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Office thereof.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 6: Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 9: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. CLAY, and Ms. SPEIER.

H.R. 20: Mr. MITCHELL.

H.R. 35: Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 40: Mr. COOPER.

H.R. 95: Ms. WEXTON and Mr. NEWHOUSE.

H.R. 101: Mr. ALLEN, Mr. HICE of Georgia, and Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 218: Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. KATKO, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. EMMER, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. TURNER, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, and Mr. ARRINGTON.

H.R. 303: Mr. RASKIN.

H.R. 307: Ms. MENG.

H.R. 336: Mr. MARSHALL.

H.R. 446: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 497: Mr. CICILLINE and Mr. BANKS.

H.R. 530: Mr. AGUILAR and Mr. CROW.

H.R. 534: Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 535: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 555: Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. WITTMAN, and Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 586: Mr. BYRNE.

H.R. 594: Mr. RUSH and Mr. HOLDING.

H.R. 598: Mr. KEATING.

H.R. 641: Ms. SCANLON and Mr. NEGUSE.

H.R. 647: Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mr. VAN DREW.

H.R. 737: Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PENCE, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. TURNER, and Mr. UPTON.

H.R. 759: Mr. ALLRED.

H.R. 838: Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, and Mr. LAMALFA.

H.R. 858: Mrs. LURIA.
 H.R. 874: Ms. SCANLON, Ms. FRANKEL, and Mr. NADLER.
 H.R. 965: Mr. COURTNEY and Mr. ALLRED.
 H.R. 976: Ms. WATERS.
 H.R. 996: Mr. RUSH.
 H.R. 1006: Mr. CHABOT and Mr. WITTMAN.
 H.R. 1025: Mr. KING of New York, Mr. ROSE of New York, and Ms. CLARKE of New York.
 H.R. 1042: Mr. LIPINSKI.
 H.R. 1043: Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas and Mrs. AXNE.
 H.R. 1044: Mr. JEFFRIES.
 H.R. 1049: Ms. MENG.
 H.R. 1066: Mr. RASKIN.
 H.R. 1080: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. HARDER of California, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. GOLDEN, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, and Ms. SÁNCHEZ.
 H.R. 1133: Mr. LAMB.
 H.R. 1154: Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. TITUS, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. DEFAZIO.
 H.R. 1197: Mr. GARAMENDI.
 H.R. 1224: Mr. POSEY, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. VAN DREW, Ms. DELBENE, and Ms. PINGREE.
 H.R. 1225: Ms. MATSUI, Mr. HIMES, and Mr. RIGGLEMAN.
 H.R. 1228: Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. UPTON, and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
 H.R. 1243: Mr. RYAN.
 H.R. 1287: Ms. PINGREE.
 H.R. 1327: Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. LUJÁN, and Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.
 H.R. 1400: Mr. HIMES.
 H.R. 1410: Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota and Mr. VAN DREW.
 H.R. 1471: Mr. HUFFMAN.
 H.R. 1489: Mr. GARAMENDI.
 H.R. 1499: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Mr. PAPPAS.
 H.R. 1503: Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. VAN DREW, and Mr. WALDEN.
 H.R. 1520: Mr. WALDEN.
 H.R. 1568: Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. CASTEN of Illinois, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. BUCHANAN, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. NEGUSE.
 H.R. 1579: Mr. PALLONE.
 H.R. 1595: Mr. RESCHENTHALER.
 H.R. 1610: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
 H.R. 1628: Mr. CASE.
 H.R. 1629: Mr. WITTMAN.
 H.R. 1641: Mr. BYRNE, Mr. GOLDEN, Mr. GOODEN, Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma, Mr. LAMB, Mr. VAN DREW, and Mr. ESPALLAT.
 H.R. 1644: Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. BERA, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. GOMEZ, Mrs. TORRES of California, Ms. BASS, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. ALLRED, Mr. HECK, Mr. KILMER, and Mr. QUIGLEY.
 H.R. 1675: Mr. KHANNA.
 H.R. 1680: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. GIBBS, and Mr. STIVERS.
 H.R. 1706: Mr. PERRY.
 H.R. 1709: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Ms. MENG, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
 H.R. 1730: Mr. BUCSHON and Mr. RASKIN.
 H.R. 1741: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. SMUCKER, Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. BURCHETT, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, and Mr. NEWHOUSE.
 H.R. 1753: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.
 H.R. 1759: Ms. NORTON.
 H.R. 1791: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
 H.R. 1830: Mr. SHERMAN and Mr. YOUNG.
 H.R. 1837: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. OLSON, Mr. HURD of Texas, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. COLE, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Ms. DEAN, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. PASCRELL, and Mr. KILMER.
 H.R. 1857: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.
 H.R. 1863: Mr. COLE, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 1865: Mr. TONKO, Mr. COX of California, Mr. WALBERG, Ms. SPANBERGER, Mr. HASTINGS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, and Ms. LOFGREN.
 H.R. 1869: Mr. WALKER, Mrs. MURPHY, Mr. BALDERSON, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. CUELLAR, and Mr. CLAY.
 H.R. 1873: Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
 H.R. 1895: Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee and Ms. NORTON.
 H.R. 1896: Mr. CISNEROS.
 H.R. 1903: Mr. MEEKS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
 H.R. 1911: Mr. TIMMONS, Mr. RIGGLEMAN, and Mr. SPANO.
 H.R. 1933: Mr. GALLAGHER.
 H.R. 1938: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
 H.R. 1957: Mr. WATKINS and Ms. NORTON.
 H.R. 1987: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
 H.R. 1992: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
 H.R. 1995: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
 H.R. 2000: Mr. CROW.
 H.R. 2009: Mr. RUSH.
 H.R. 2010: Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. ABRAHAM, and Mr. GAETZ.
 H.R. 2048: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
 H.R. 2062: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana and Mr. BURCHETT.
 H. Con. Res. 29: Mr. RUSH.
 H. Con. Res. 30: Ms. ESHOO, Mr. POCAN, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
 H. Res. 23: Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania.
 H. Res. 49: Mr. ALLRED and Ms. OMAR.
 H. Res. 54: Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania.
 H. Res. 60: Mr. MEEKS, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, and Ms. HILL of California.
 H. Res. 127: Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. PERRY, and Mr. CASTRO of Texas.
 H. Res. 222: Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. ALLRED, Mr. BEYER, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. BALDERSON, and Ms. BARRAGAN.
 H. Res. 246: Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. STANTON, Ms. SLOTKIN, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. PAPPAS, Ms. SHERRILL, Mr. BRADY, Mr. MCCAUL, Ms. STEVENS, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. MAST, Mr. CROW, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. GOLDEN, Mr. HORSFORD, Mrs. LEE of Nevada, Mr. ARMSTRONG, Mr. KILMER, and Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL.
 H. Res. 273: Mr. PENCE, Mr. HAGEDORN, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. PERRY, and Mr. CASTRO of Texas.
 H. Res. 277: Mr. COOPER.
 H. Res. 279: Ms. KELLY of Illinois and Mr. HARDER of California.
 H. Res. 287: Mr. COSTA, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. FLETCHER, Ms. MENG, and Ms. GARCIA of Texas.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 1904: Mr. AMODEI, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. BUCK, Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico, and Mrs. LEE of Nevada.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII, petitions and papers were laid on the clerk's desk and referred as follows:

5. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Council of the District of Columbia, relative to Resolution 23-47, declaring the sense of

the Council that the District of Columbia is committed to promoting the human rights and well-being of all its residents, workers, and visitors; and to call on the federal government to prevent nuclear war; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

6. Also, a petition of Mr. Gregory D. Watson, a citizen of Austin, TX, relative to urging Congress to enact legislation that would prohibit Members of Congress and State Legislators from serving as delegates to a convention the purpose of which would be to ratify an already-drafted and already-proposed amendment to the United States Constitution, pursuant to the Constitution's Article V, if Congress specifies the convention mode of ratification, as occurred in the year 1933; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XV, the following discharge petition was filed:

Petition 1, April 2, 2019, by Mr. SCALISE on House Resolution 102, was signed by the following Members: Mr. Scalise, Mrs. Wagner, Mrs. Hartzler, Ms. Foxx of North Carolina, Ms. Cheney, Mrs. Walorski, Mrs. Roby, Mrs. Brooks of Indiana, Mr. Collins of New York, Ms. Granger, Mr. Brady, Mr. Hudson, Mr. Bost, Mr. McKinley, Mr. Burgess, Mr. Ratcliffe, Mr. McCarthy, Mr. Newhouse, Mr. Balderson, Mr. Baird, Mr. David P. Roe of Tennessee, Mr. Timmons, Mr. Johnson of Louisiana, Mr. LaMalfa, Mr. Johnson of Ohio, Mr. Olson, Mr. Sensenbrenner, Mr. Calvert, Ms. Herrera Beutler, Mr. Long, Mr. Babin, Mr. Chabot, Mr. Womack, Mr. Joyce of Pennsylvania, Mr. Johnson of South Dakota, Mr. Weber of Texas, Mr. Cloud, Mr. Fulcher, Mr. Crenshaw, Mr. Byrne, Mr. Davidson of Ohio, Mr. Estes, Mr. Smith of New Jersey, Mr. Hice of Georgia, Mr. Green of Tennessee, Mrs. Rodgers of Washington, Mr. Bucshon, Mr. Armstrong, Mr. Ferguson, Mr. Stauber, Mr. McClintock, Mr. Marshall, Mrs. Lesko, Mr. Higgins of Louisiana, Mr. Norman, Mr. Hagedorn, Mr. Carter of Georgia, Mr. Aderholt, Mr. Flores, Mr. Meuser, Mr. Wenstrup, Mr. Thompson of Pennsylvania, Mr. Dunn, Mr. Latta, Mr. Loudermilk, Mr. Walberg, Mr. Kustoff of Tennessee, Ms. Stefanik, Mr. Watkins, Mr. Mitchell, Mr. Gianforte, Mr. LaHood, Mr. Smith of Nebraska, Mr. Allen, Mr. Westerman, Mr. Williams, Mr. Pence, Mr. Jordan, Mr. Gonzalez of Ohio, Mr. Diaz-Balart, Mr. Bishop of Utah, Mr. Wittman, Mrs. Miller, Mr. Kelly of Pennsylvania, Mr. Amash, Mr. Gibbs, Mr. Bacon, Mr. Arrington, Mr. Moolenaar, Mr. Budd, Mr. Reschenthaler, Mr. John W. Rose of Tennessee, Mr. Kevin Hern of Oklahoma, Mr. Griffith, Mr. Joyce of Ohio, Mr. Burchett, Mr. Spano, Mr. Hill of Arkansas, Mr. Rogers of Alabama, Mr. Gaetz, Mr. Biggs, Mr. Wright, Mr. Gosar, Mr. Cook, Mr. Palmer, Mr. Duncan, Mr. Riggleman, Mr. Wilson of South Carolina, Mr. Bergman, Mr. Emmer, Mr. Comer, Mr. Webster of Florida, Mr. Meadows, Mr. Guest, Mr. Holding, Mr. Simpson, Mr. Hurd of Texas, Mr. Gooden, Mr. Crawford, Mr. Conaway, Mr. Stewart, Mr. Massie, Mr. Brooks of Alabama, Mr. Smith of Missouri, Mr. Rice of South Carolina, Mr. Graves of Georgia, Mr. DesJarlais, Mr. Fortenberry, Mr. Austin Scott of Georgia, Mr. Walker, Mr. Banks, Mr. Cole, Mr. Gallagher, Mr. Yoho, Mr. Mooney of West Virginia, Mr. Taylor, Mr. Buchanan, Mr. Thornberry, Mr. Woodall, Mr. Cline, Mr. Walden, Mr. Steil, Mr. Huizenga, Mr. Waltz, Mr. Stivers, Mr. Turner, Mr. Tipton, Mr. Smucker, Mr. Zeldin, Mr. Guthrie, Mr. Grothman, Mr. Luetkemeyer, Mr. Steube, Mr. Fleischmann, Mr. Lamborn, Mr. Posey, Mr. Reed, Mr. Nunes, Mr. Buck, Mr. Curtis, Mr. Kinzinger, Mr. Marchant, Mr. Lucas, Mr. Rogers of Kentucky, Mr. Perry, Mr. Barr, Mr. Collins of

April 4, 2019

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

H3103

Georgia, Mr. Mullin, Mr. Kelly of Mississippi, Mr. Katko, Mr. Hunter, Mr. Harris, Mr. Young, Mr. Rodney Davis of Illinois, Mr. Bilirakis, Mr. Palazzo, Mr. Gohmert, Mr. Hollingsworth, Mr. King of Iowa, Mr. Carter of Texas, Mr. McCaul, Mr. Fitzpatrick, Mr. Mast, Mr. Schweikert, Mr. Amodei, Mr. Shimkus, Mr. Graves of Louisiana, Mr. Lipinski, Mr. McAdams, Mr. Roy, Mr. McHenry, Mr. Graves of Missouri, Mr. Duffy, Mr. Rouzer, Mr. Upton, Mr. Abraham, Mr. King of New York, Mr. Peterson.