

that afforded us that right. Democrats couldn't wait on the courts to obtain additional testimony. But Speaker PELOSI continues to hold the articles from the Senate in an attempt to dictate the terms of the trial to Leader MCCONNELL.

The Constitution grants the Senate the sole power to try all impeachments, not the Speaker.

Democrats voted to impeach the President for abuse of power and claim he is a threat to the Constitution, but look at what you are doing. You are trying to take the Senate's constitutional power for your own political gain.

Follow the Constitution you spoke so much about. Transmit the articles to the Senate so that they can undertake their constitutional responsibility.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BRINDISI). Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

IN CELEBRATION OF GEORGE STEVENS' 100TH BIRTHDAY

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, tonight, I rise to celebrate a dear man in northern California from the town of Palo Cedro in Shasta County. George Stevens celebrated his 100th birthday on December 28.

Mr. Speaker, I had the pleasure of being able to stop by and spend time with George and his family at the event at the Palo Cedro Community Center, to celebrate with him and recognize, also, his service to our country, which is pretty amazing.

George is a Pearl Harbor survivor. He was there in the Army at the base there during the Pearl Harbor attack. Later, if that wasn't enough, he ended up being deployed to Europe, where he was at the Normandy invasion later on in 1944. And if that wasn't enough, a few months later in the winter, he fought at the Battle of the Bulge.

None of us would have the freedom we have if it weren't for people like George and all of his comrades who were there in that war preserving freedom for us and so many others with that sacrifice.

He is a true patriot, a great American, and he is a guy that still drives and does his home repairs around his place there in Palo Cedro.

Mr. Speaker, we are really proud of George and wish him a happy birthday. I am glad I got to spend time with him and his family.

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 34 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, consistent with the statement that was

just made about BRIAN FITZPATRICK, I will be missing tomorrow's votes. If I were here, I would vote "no." There is too much good that is being done with the PFAS, and I would vote "no."

But I will be attending the funeral of a former Member of Congress, a great patriot, a friend, just a wonderful person, Michael Fitzpatrick, and it was an honor to serve with him in this body.

Obviously, we have had a lot of discussion about Iran, Soleimani, his death, the death of so many that he caused, and his role in being head of the IRGC, so I thought it would be helpful if we learned a little more for those who haven't.

It helps, I found, profoundly, if people know what they are talking about, and it seems there has been a whole lot of talking and not a lot of knowledge about what is going on with Iran.

Many of us remember, and I sure remember because I was in the Army at Fort Benning at the time, when our Embassy in Tehran was attacked initially, it was said by the Iranian leaders that the students attacked the Embassy; and after days of President Carter doing nothing but begging for them to let our people go, they realized that we were not going to do anything, and so they began to say: We have the hostages.

I always thought at the time, paying close attention to the news back in those days, that by saying the students did this that the Iranian leaders were giving themselves a back door if we had had a President who had put his foot down and said: Either you get them released, or we are going to come get them released ourselves; and if they are harmed, Iran will pay heavily.

I felt that was probably where they would say: Hey, we got them from the students. Here they are.

But that was the first clue after Vietnam that we were still a paper tiger. That is the way we were portrayed around the world. That is what we in the Army heard back in those days: Gee, all you have to do is drag out confrontation like Vietnam and they will turn tail and run.

That appeared to be consistent with us doing nothing about our Embassy, which, under international law, is American soil. It is American property. It is American housing. It was attacked, and we didn't do anything about it for a lengthy time, which sent the message to the new leader in Iran, the Ayatollah Khomeini, that we really were paper tigers. We were toothless. There was no power, no courage, and it encouraged them.

□ 2130

In fact, there was one effort at a rescue but, unfortunately, the military's hands were tied by people at the top.

I was told by a friend in the Army back at the time that the White House was the one that had them cut back the number of helicopters that would go into the desert across, around 500 miles or so of desert, with turbine en-

gines in the helicopters. And they knew, as my friend, General Boykin has confirmed, they had to get six to the landing area. Otherwise, it was an abort. And when it was clear only 5 were going to make it, that the mission was aborted.

The helicopter pilot may have gotten vertigo. The helicopter tilted. The blade went through a C-130 that was there to equip them for the trip in to rescue our hostages, and Americans were killed and left there in the desert at the staging area.

If there had been an adequate number of helicopters allowed to go in, they would have had sufficient number of six or more to make it. But the number going in was cut back, I was told, by the White House. They didn't want it to look like an invasion.

I am proud we have got a President that is not worried about it. I mean, I have asked him about this before, and he is more concerned about protecting our American treasure, our American military members; and he wants to commit whatever our military needs to get the job done. That is a far cry from where we were in the late 1970s.

In fact, I do recall President Carter, he had turned his back on the Shah. It didn't sound like the Shah was a great person, a great humanitarian at all, but at least Iran and the area were not at war with us at that time.

But when President Carter turned his back on the Shah, it opened the door for him to be overthrown. Apparently, people in the Carter White House did not give adequate thought to what happens when the Shah is gone, because what happened was the Ayatollah Khomeini.

And President Carter, as I recall, welcomed the Ayatollah Khomeini back in charge of Iran—he had not been in charge before—but welcomed him back to Iran, and proclaimed he was a man of peace. It could not have been a more ignorant welcome to the man that would start Iran on the course to be the greatest source of terrorism in the world.

So thank you very much to the Carter administration. Great job. You brought in, allowed in people who have continued to kill Americans at a rate greater than anybody else.

They have helped Afghanistan. That was a shock when we found that out. They have helped Sunnis, they have helped Shia. And normally, that doesn't happen, but they are so dedicated to destroying the Great Satan, America, in their view, and destroying the Little Satan, Israel, that we have to take them seriously. Too many Americans have been killed as a result of ignorance or optimism unjustified.

But this is a study done from the Jerusalem Center for Public Affairs, a very good study done, and it gives us a lot of information about Iran. It points out that Iranian military action, often working through proxies, uses terrorist tactics; has led to the death of well over 1,000 American soldiers in Iraq and

Afghanistan over the last decade and a half.

They point out that the explosively formed penetrators—a lot of people are familiar with the IEDs, but these are EFPs, explosively formed penetrators, a shaped charge designed to penetrate armor—that these are often camouflaged as rocks and were identical to those employed by Hezbollah against Israeli forces.

In 2006, the British Telegraph revealed that three Iranian factories were mass producing the roadside EFP bombs used to kill soldiers in Iraq.

In 2007, American troops discovered over 100 Austrian-made Steyr HS .50, 50-caliber sniper rifles, in Iraq. They can pierce all in-service body armor from up to a mile and penetrate U.S. armored Humvee troop carriers.

I fired a 50-caliber sniper rifle at Quantico. It is amazing how powerful they are.

But, unfortunately, they were found in Iraq, and they had apparently come from an Austrian manufacturer, but they were bought by Iran, and supplied by Iran, apparently, to Iraq to help kill American soldiers.

Iran also paid Taliban fighters \$1,000 for each U.S. soldier they killed in Afghanistan. In fact, the *Sunni Times* reported that a Taliban operative received \$18,000 from an Iranian firm in Kabul as reward for an attack in 2010 that killed several Afghan government troops and destroyed an American armored vehicle.

Iranian President Rouhani's so-called moderation, was displayed when he appointed Brigadier General Hossein Dehghan to be minister of defense. He had played a key role in the October 1983 suicide bomb attacks in Beirut, in which 241 U.S. Marines and 58 French paratroopers were killed.

And of course, Dehghan, apparently was replaced previously, in 1998 with a guy named Soleimani, who is with us perhaps in spirit only now, thanks to our current President and the ability of our United States military.

Anti-Americanism helped fuel the 1979 Islamic revolution in Iran, a violent anti-American doctrine that challenges any role for America in the Middle East, it has been, and remains the central focus of Iranian foreign policy.

Since the revolution, Iran has waged and continues to wage war against the United States and its allies. Unfortunately, though, Iran has been at war with the United States for 40 years now, since 1979, for sure—well, really, since the Ayatollah took over and President Carter welcomed him as a man of peace. He has not been a man of peace. He has been at war with the United States.

The report points out the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps, IRGC—people hear that term quite a bit, but that was founded by Ayatollah Khomeini shortly after the overthrow of the Shah at the onset of the Islamic Revolution in 1978–79.

Iran's RGC has morphed from its initial, mainly ideological, composition

into a particularly powerful organ of Iran's political system, the upper echelons of which tend to be drawn from the ranks of the IRGC. They are developing an increasing lethal system such as advanced naval mines, coastal defense, anti-ship cruise and ballistic missiles and attack craft.

The IRGC boasts a paramilitary unit comprised of 10 to 20,000 individuals known as the Quds Force. That was what Soleimani commanded and was using strategically, killing Americans, as many as he could.

The strategic objective of the IRGC-QF is to subvert Iran's enemies and export the Iranian Revolution, a goal it attains largely by facilitating the delivery of weapons to pro-Iranian factions in Lebanon, Iraq, Syria, Persian Gulf States, Gaza, the West Bank, Afghanistan, and central Asia.

In 2007, the Treasury Department designated IRGC-QF as a terrorism-supporting entity.

The report is quite extensive. It goes on to point out many of the efforts, successful efforts to kill Americans, talking about the Khobar Towers in 1996 and many other attacks.

But it points out that in 1998, Major General Qasem Soleimani has led the IRGC-QF, in which time he has created branches focused on intelligence, finance, politics, sabotage and special operations. With a direct independent channel to Khomeini, Soleimani has successfully sought the assassination of political rivals, armed terrorist proxies, and directed a network of insurgent groups in Iraq that killed over 1,000 Americans. And that is just in Iraq. But we know more regarding what they have done in Afghanistan, in Lebanon, in Syria.

Mr. Speaker, I see I am joined by my friend, who has served his country honorably and well and made his way up to the rank of general. He knows a great deal about war in Iraq and Afghanistan.

I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY).

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for taking the time to discuss this with the American people and allowing me to be part of it. I saw the gentleman and I didn't want him to have to carry the freight alone.

There was a lot to be said today, and probably neither he nor I got to say everything we wanted to say about the proceedings over the last couple of weeks. And it frustrates me that our colleagues, right here in the House of the Congress will say, America assassinated General Soleimani.

You can put a general's rank on a puppy dog, or a rabbit, or you name it, on a car or a truck. This guy is a terrorist, no matter what he is wearing. He is a terrorist from a terrorist state, and that is his claim to fame. That is who he is. Responsible for the deaths of hundreds, if not thousands of Americans, and certainly responsible for the deaths and maiming of thousands of Americans.

And when they say, well, this President is starting a war. I wonder to myself, my goodness, where have you been for the last 40 years? Since 1979, right?

The gentleman knows this. LOUIE GOHMERT knows this, right?

We were all present and watched when Iran punched America in the face 40 years ago. It hasn't stopped.

So finally, after 40 years of appeasement—and the gentleman knows this well, because he is a great student of history.

Appeasement didn't work in World War II, right? And the results, the results of appeasement, leading up to World War II, was the untold deaths and untimely deaths and miserable suffering deaths of millions of people across Europe because of appeasement.

Yet, we have tried it with Iran for 40 years. Iran is playing long ball. People say, well, they were complying with the JCPOA and we let them out of it. Well, of course they were complying. There was nothing in it that stopped them from doing everything they wanted to do, which was get to a nuclear armed program where their ballistic missile program caught up to it, right?

So for 10 years all they had to do is not let us inspect their military sites, because we didn't demand or require that in the deal. They could keep on doing whatever they are doing there. Perfect their ballistic missile capabilities so they can deliver the payload to Israel or the United States.

Oh, and in 10 years we will have nothing to say about it because we approved all of this. And then we have a terrorist nation that uses terrorism as statecraft with a nuclear missile.

What is our leverage then? We have none, right? We have got another North Korea, is what we have.

So it befuddles me that—I am sure our well-meaning colleagues on the other side think that this is going to work. Einstein, of course, he described the definition of insanity; it is doing the same thing over and over and over again and expecting a different outcome.

Appeasement is dangerous. It is provocative. It encourages despots to be despots. And so far, for 40 years, that is what we have watched.

And finally, the President gave them warning after warning. They said, well, it wasn't warranted. We didn't have enough intelligence.

There was open source reporting. They told us what they were going to do. Do you remember the 9/11 attacks, where there was open source reporting? And then, after the fact, everybody said, where were the intelligence and law enforcement agencies? Why weren't they talking?

Here, our enemy, who says they are going to kill the Great Satan and the Little Satan—that's what they say, right?

□ 2145

They tell us what they are going to do, yet it is not enough for some of my

colleagues who would have then said: Mr. President, what did you know and when did you know it? And why didn't you do something about it?

You know this, right?

Mr. GOHMERT. In fact, it took me too long to get around to reading Winston Churchill's books on World War II, but he points out that when Hitler first moved into the Sudetenland, they were so disorganized that it was a disaster, that if there had been any resistance put up at all instead of Chamberlain waving a piece of paper that this means peace in our time and we are going to let him go in and move in and take over this land, that if there had been any resistance at all because of all the material breakdowns, mechanical failures—Hitler was furious.

He said any resistance would have caused the defeat of the Germans moving in, and then the Germans would have been humiliated. They would have, in all likelihood, gotten rid of Hitler because he got too ambitious and exposed them to defeat. He would have been gone, and the world would have been spared the tens of millions of people who died as a result of trying to placate the man.

Just supporting what my friend the Congressman is pointing out, it doesn't usually work well, and it hasn't worked well. I know there are people who say all we were doing was giving Iran their money back when we gave them all that money. Money is fungible. We say maybe that specific money enabled them to continue supporting Hezbollah and terrorists who would attack and kill Americans.

Mr. PERRY. You are absolutely right. There is the moral equivalency. If we would just give the criminal, the terrorist, the murderer their money back, it is legitimate. It is theirs. Just disregard the fact that these are killing, murdering terrorists.

There is no moral equivalence. You don't give murdering terrorists money, whether it is theirs or anybody else's. You throw them in jail.

These people should probably legitimately be in The Hague for crimes against humanity, not getting their money back. Among all the things that frustrate me, that is one of them. The other one, of course, is this whole war powers thing.

We have had a year in this Congress, a year of escalation of Iran attacking American targets. In November and December alone, 24 or 25 times, over two dozen times, attacking American targets, but it was never an issue.

You know when else it wasn't an issue? The kind gentleman from Texas, it wasn't an issue for 8 years when almost 4,000 people under the Obama administration, terrorists, rightly were killed by drone strikes. You know what came from the other side of the aisle regarding the War Powers Act? Nothing.

We agree with President Obama on that. We didn't agree on many things as Republicans with President Obama,

but we agreed that eradicating terrorists was a good thing. He did it not in the war zone of Iraq, as approved by this Congress. He did it in Yemen, Somalia, and Pakistan, sovereign nations. The United States was going and killing people, including American citizens, outside the combat zone, but not a peep.

Yet today, with Iran watching, with our enemies watching, today is the day that we have to revise the War Powers Act and rein in a wayward President because he is trying to defend the country.

The good Representative from Texas, it has nothing to do with the War Powers Act. This resolution that is never going to go to the President was all about campaign messaging.

It is also messaging our enemies that we are divided in this country. We are not divided. We might be divided in this House, but we are not divided in this country.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I have an article here from January 2017, and the title from The Guardian is "America dropped 26,171 bombs in 2016. What a bloody end to Obama's reign."

I remember specifically because I had been to Libya, but as our Defense Secretary Bob Gates said in a live interview, Libya is not in our vital interest. We didn't have a real dog in that fight is what I am saying.

In fact, Qadhafi did have blood on his hands. He wasn't a good guy. But since the U.S. went into Iraq, he opened his doors and said: You tell me what weapons I can keep. I won't pursue nukes anymore.

He had not been a problem for us from that time forward, yet President Obama, without any authority from here, decides basically to go to war with Libya and with Qadhafi and dropping bombs on them. Why? Because he said NATO needs us to do this.

Mr. PERRY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOHMERT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PERRY. What I have heard on this House floor today is the President is capricious, irresponsible, doesn't have a plan, doesn't have a strategy. If the gentleman will please tell the audience, under the Obama administration and under Secretary Clinton, what was the strategy in Libya?

Mr. GOHMERT. There was no strategy in Libya other than to take out Qadhafi. Just like President Carter turning his back on the Shah and welcoming Ayatollah Khomeini in, when President Obama took out Qadhafi and, yes, he bombed him into oblivion.

We have seen reports that Qadhafi was begging, look, we will just go into exile, and he sent word to the President, if you will just let me leave in peace, I won't ever come back to Libya. Let's leave the country not destroyed, stop the bombing, and I will just leave, but never heard back from Washington.

The problem is that President Obama created a failed state in Libya, and it

has been the source of destabilizing all of North Africa. I don't know if there is any Member of Congress who has been allowed to have 2½ hours with the head of intelligence in Egypt as I have, but Egypt is paying heavily for President Obama's wrongheadedness in taking out Qadhafi and completely destabilizing North Africa.

Mr. PERRY. I wasn't in Congress. I didn't have the honor to be in Congress at that time. Maybe you were, or maybe you were more attuned to things, but I am just wondering, at that time, without a strategy, without a plan, firing on a sovereign nation, killing their leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Actually, President Obama had our forces, NATO forces, but they were American. They bombed his convoy as he was leaving Libya. That allowed the locals—

Mr. PERRY. It facilitated, yes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Then he was assassinated there.

Mr. PERRY. So to make the correction absolutely clear, the United States did not kill the leader of Libya, but we helped facilitate it, in some respects.

Mr. GOHMERT. In criminal terms, he was certainly an accessory. He could not have been killed without President Obama's help.

Mr. PERRY. Because if you were present, did somebody in this House say that this President is reckless, that he is destabilizing the region, that we are assassinating or aiding and abetting the assassination of leaders of foreign countries? Was any of that occurring in this House?

Mr. GOHMERT. Yes, it was, but only on one side of the aisle, and that was this side because we were okay with President Obama defending Americans and American interests. But as Bob Gates said, that did not include Libya. Now, he walked that back some, but it was clear it was not in our vital interests.

What really got me, though, is I am hearing so many people who were here back then. They didn't offer one peep about the illegality of what President Obama was doing. Many of us did, but they didn't say a word. And that was outside our interests.

Killing Soleimani, that was protecting American lives. Going after Qadhafi didn't protect any American lives, and in fact, it has caused total disruption.

Mr. PERRY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOHMERT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PERRY. Did we have an Authorization for Use of Military Force in Libya?

Mr. GOHMERT. No.

Mr. PERRY. Was Libya an American combat theater?

Mr. GOHMERT. No.

Mr. PERRY. So when our good colleagues on the other side of the aisle say that this was illegal and unconstitutional, meanwhile knowing that the

Authorization of Use of Military Force, whether we agree with it or not it is in statute right now, in a combat theater where we are authorized to be by that AUMF, by votes of Congress, signed by a President, with an armed combatant who, by the way, as you probably know, is listed on the terrorist list by the United States and others and is not supposed to be out of Iran, his home country.

Mr. GOHMERT. Right.

Mr. PERRY. Yet, he was traveling to Syria and then through Iraq as a combatant and as a terrorist on the terrorist list. What is the point of putting terrorists on the list if you are not going to do anything about the terrorist on the list?

Mr. GOHMERT. Back to Libya momentarily, what President Obama did cost American lives, including at Benghazi. If he doesn't decide unilaterally whether NATO wanted it or not, he decided for America without any consent from Congress to go to war with Libya to take out their leader. It destabilized the country. It put American lives at risk that were not at that time, and it actually cost American lives.

I have an article here, and I have seen on Facebook some comments, but an "Iranian American activist outraged by 'propaganda machine' glorifying Soleimani."

There are so many Iranians who are speaking up now going: What is wrong with you people? This guy was a terrorist. He was killing Iranians. He was killing Americans. He was just merciless.

Mr. PERRY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOHMERT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PERRY. I just happened to notice on CNN about the time of the attack that they had the spokesperson for the Iranian Government during the hostage crisis speaking on CNN. NPR did something very similar. It is not just Iranian Americans who are unhappy with the situation, the propaganda not only by elected officials but by our media that is taking up the side of the enemy that wants to destroy America. It is disgusting.

Mr. GOHMERT. It really is, and it is just a shame that at a time when we ought to come together because, unlike Libya, we do have an interest in protecting American lives. We do have an interest in stopping people who want to destroy America. We ought to be united on this.

This is not a time to come in and try to condemn and belittle the President who did a good thing in taking out a terrorist.

One other thing, I don't remember anybody on the other side of the aisle here that made a peep when the President of the United States, President Obama, gave the order to kill al-Awlaki and his 16-year-old son. So al-Awlaki, he was an American citizen. Why, because his parents came over on

a visa, a student visa, had him, took him back, and taught him to hate America, but he got an American passport. He is an American citizen.

He had worked with some in the Obama administration, apparently worked with some in the Bush administration. But he was really an enemy of America.

President Obama gave the order not to take out a terrorist like Soleimani, who was in the process of stirring up terrorism and killing Americans, but this was an American citizen, and he gave the order to take him out with a drone strike, take out his 16-year-old son. Regardless of what al-Awlaki had done, his son was not a criminal, but President Obama just ordered him taken out and not one word from the other side of the aisle.

I would have thought we could have come together on that: Wait, before we take out American citizens, should we give them a trial or should we just let a President decide?

Now, I was okay with somebody that they had the evidence and that was in the process of being at war with us, but for heaven's sake, the people didn't raise not one peep about that.

Mr. PERRY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOHMERT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PERRY. Was there a briefing? Was there a consultation from the President to the leaders of Congress or to Congress? Was there adequate information substantiating the imminence of an attack? Was there any of that, or was there any human outcry that there was none of that and then a rush to judgment on the President's authority to do that from our good friends on the other side of the aisle?

Mr. GOHMERT. Well, the media helped them out. This is just an incredible time, and it is a time when free people ought to be able to come together and unite together in the cause of freedom.

As Natan Sharansky pointed out, people didn't think he and his wife would be getting back together after he was released from prison in Russia because she was more religious and he wasn't, and he said that is ridiculous. I got along with the guy for 12 years in my cell, and the only thing we had in common was a desire for freedom. That ought to bring us together here.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of medical emergency.

Mr. SIMPSON (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for January 7 through January 10 on account of recovery from knee replacement surgery.

EXPENDITURES BY THE OFFICE OF GENERAL COUNSEL UNDER HOUSE RESOLUTION 6, 116TH CONGRESS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, DC, January 9, 2020.

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

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to section 302(c) of House Resolution 6 (116th Congress) I hereby submit the attached statement "setting forth the aggregate amounts expended by the Office of General Counsel on outside counsel and other experts pursuant to this title on a quarterly basis" for the quarter beginning on October 1, 2019 and ending on December 31, 2019, for publication in the Congressional Record.

Sincerely,

ZOE LOFGREN,
Chairperson.

AGGREGATE AMOUNT EXPENDED ON OUTSIDE COUNSEL OR OTHER EXPERTS—H. RES. 6

January 1–March 31, 2019	\$0.00
April 1–June 30, 2019	0.00
July 1–September 30, 2019	0.00
October 1–December 31, 2019	0.00
Total	0.00

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1611. An ACT to ensure appropriate prioritization, spectrum planning, and inter-agency coordination to support the Internet of Things; to the Committee of Energy and Commerce.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Cheryl L. Johnson, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 2476. An ACT to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to provide funding to secure nonprofit facilities from terrorist attacks, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Cheryl L. Johnson, Clerk of the House, reported that on January 6, 2020, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills:

H.R. 1424. To amend title 38, United States Code, to ensure the Secretary of Veterans Affairs permits the display of Fallen Soldier Displays in national cemeteries.

H.R. 2385. To permit the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish a grant program to conduct cemetery research and produce educational materials for the Veterans Legacy Program.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 p.m.), the House adjourned