



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 166

WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, JANUARY 10, 2020

No. 6

Senate

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Monday, January 13, 2020, at 3 p.m.

House of Representatives

FRIDAY, JANUARY 10, 2020

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CICILLINE).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
January 10, 2020.

I hereby appoint the Honorable DAVID N. CICILLINE to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

Rabbi Barry H. Block, Congregation B'nai Israel, Little Rock, Arkansas, offered the following prayer:

Source of blessing, we come before You today asking Your blessings upon the United States House of Representatives.

At this time of grave division, inspire these Members of the people's House to reach across every kind of aisle, to build new friendships that may grow into opportunities for greater understanding, seeking shared solutions to America's greatest problems.

As the winds of war threaten all humanity, inspire the Members of the people's House to work toward peace, for the ability to wage peace is a greater measure of a nation's strength than the capacity to wage war.

Consecrate this House to perfect the Nation our Founders could not even en-

vision—justice, liberty, freedom from persecution, and discrimination for every person within our borders. Then will this House and our Nation truly be blessed.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois 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.

WELCOMING RABBI BARRY BLOCK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HILL) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, today I rise with my friend JOHN BOOZMAN, former Member of this House and now a Senator from Arkansas, to welcome today's guest chaplain, my dear friend, Rabbi Barry Block of Congrega-

tion B'nai Israel in Little Rock, Arkansas.

Realizing his love for reformed Judaism at a young age, Rabbi Block earned his master of arts in Hebrew letters from Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion before being ordained 3 years following completion of his degree.

Having devoted much of his life to the church, Rabbi Block found his way to Congregation B'nai Israel in my hometown of Little Rock, Arkansas, in 2013, after serving over 20 years at Temple Beth-El in San Antonio, Texas.

He has served Reform Judaism nationally and regionally as a member of the Board of the Central Conference of American Rabbis and chair of its resolutions and nominating committees and as president of the Southwest Association of Reform Rabbis.

He is the loving father of his two sons, Robert and Daniel.

I want to thank Rabbi Block for his gracing us with a wonderful opening prayer and wish him, his family, and his congregation continued success in our community of Little Rock.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CUELLAR). The Chair will entertain up to five further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

□ 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.

H151

MOURNING THE LOSS OF DUSTIN PARKER

(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. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to mourn the tragic death of Dustin Parker.

At 25 years old, Dustin was a loving father, a hard worker, and a generous member of his community in McAlester, Oklahoma. As a man who happened to be transgender, Dustin helped found the McAlester chapter of Oklahomans for Equality.

Sadly, Dustin was shot and killed on New Year's Day. While we do not know who is responsible for Dustin's death, we do know that transgender Americans are disproportionately the victims of violent crimes. Last year, more than two dozen trans and gender nonconforming people were violently killed, that we know of. Every death underscores the Nation's need for urgent action to address this epidemic.

Mr. Speaker, our country lost a champion for equality. As we continue to search for answers following Dustin's death, we must continue to fight to ensure that all Americans are treated with dignity and respect.

My prayers are with Dustin's entire family for their loss, and my heart goes out to our communities bearing this pain.

CELEBRATING NATIONAL MENTORING MONTH

(Ms. FOXX of North Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, since 2002, January has been recognized as National Mentoring Month. We all should recognize the positive impacts that mentoring has on young people.

From our servicemembers stationed at Cherry Point to the volunteers of the Greensboro United Way, the students and staff of Wake Forest University to the Journeymen of Asheville, North Carolinians remain actively engaged in mentoring opportunities across my State.

According to mentoring.org, at-risk youth who were paired with a mentor are 55 percent more likely to enroll in college, 78 percent more likely to volunteer regularly in their communities, and 130 percent more likely to hold leadership positions in their careers.

Mr. Speaker, the numbers speak for themselves. Mentoring is a cornerstone of the growth and development of young people across our country. I commend the individuals involved in being mentors.

ADDRESSING THE URGENT PRIORITIES OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I just returned from overseas. I led a delegation of our colleagues, a bipartisan delegation, to visit our troops during the Christmas holiday; and, of course, we all were struck by the extraordinary service of these brave men and women who are serving our country.

One of the things they shared about was, of course, their concerns about things back at home with their families. It reminded me that the agenda that we develop to address the urgent priorities of the American people remains important: to drive down the cost of healthcare, to raise family incomes and rebuild the crumbling infrastructure of our country, to take on the corruption and self-dealing in Washington, and to get the government working for the people again.

That is what Democrats have been working on in a bipartisan way. We have passed over 400 pieces of legislation; 275 of those bills are bipartisan. Sadly, 80 percent of those bills are stuck on MITCH MCCONNELL's desk.

So, as we return from this trip, I am reminded that this is an opportunity to call on the Senate majority leader. We are working hard to prevent war with Iran. We are working hard to hold the President accountable for his misconduct. But our most important priority is to deliver on those promises we made to the American people: to drive down the cost of healthcare, to raise family incomes, to rebuild the infrastructure of our country, and to get government working for the people again.

It is time for the Senate majority leader to take those bills up and give them a vote. Our men and women deserve nothing less.

OUR MORAL OBLIGATION TO ERADICATE HUMAN TRAFFICKING

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

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Speaker, January is Human Trafficking Awareness Month, so I rise today to renew my resolve to eradicate the horrific injustice that is human trafficking.

Human trafficking is a modern-day form of slavery, as it strips individuals of their freedom and dignity. It has absolutely no place in our society.

In my part of Minnesota, many of the women and children preyed upon by human traffickers are Native American. In fact, Minnesota currently ranks ninth in the Nation for missing and murdered indigenous women.

As a Member of Congress, I believe we have a moral obligation and legislative duty to protect the most vulnerable. That is why I proudly support Savannah's Act, a bill that will empower Tribal law enforcement to address this devastating issue.

I will also ensure that the recently created Federal task force on missing and murdered Native American women

coordinates with State, local, and Tribal officials to more effectively solve unresolved cases and prevent similar violence.

While these are steps in the right direction, our work is far from done. As a father, a former law enforcement officer, and a Member of Congress, I will not stop until human trafficking is eliminated and the criminals who have chosen to exploit others have been brought to justice.

UNITED STATES' RELATIONSHIP WITH IRAN

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

Ms. DEAN. Mr. Speaker, over the last week, our relationship with Iran has fallen to its most difficult period since 1979. The United States killed Major General Qasem Soleimani, a bad man whom we do not mourn, and yet it was a provocative and disproportionate event.

Iran responded with missiles on two of our military bases. I am grateful, thankful that none of our soldiers were in that attack and that tensions between our countries appear to be easing.

I hope we can use this moment to assess where we are, how we got here, and find the better path that lies ahead.

First, I call on the administration to share the intelligence with Congress about the timing and rationale for the strike.

Second, I urge continued de-escalation. We stand less safe in heightened tensions with Iran. It is essential that we emphasize diplomacy once again.

Third, I ask that we treat this moment as an opportunity to redefine our relationships with foes and friends alike and how we act as a nation.

We will always defend America's security, but we should never create needless provocation. As Matthew tells us: "Blessed are the peacemakers: for they shall be called children of God."

HONORING VIC POWER

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. Vic Power, who retired as the owner of Kevin Barry's Irish Pub in Savannah on December 31, 2019.

Kevin Barry's Irish Pub was not only a stalwart of locally owned business in downtown Savannah, but also an excellent representation of Irish heritage in our city.

Although Irish individuals have been calling Savannah home since its founding, the Irish potato famine in the mid-1800s caused an influx of migration to Savannah. By 1860, one in three White households could claim Irish heritage.

Today, Savannah has one of the largest St. Patrick's Day parades in the

world. This is why it is fitting that, when Kevin Barry's Irish Pub opened in Savannah in 1980, it was the first Irish pub south of Washington, D.C., to offer live music 7 days a week.

With its live Irish music, cozy interior, topnotch customer service, and quality food, it quickly became a mainstay. In 2016, Kevin Barry's even won an award for being the most authentic Irish pub outside of Ireland.

With Mr. Power's retirement, Kevin Barry's will be sorely missed.

We congratulate Mr. Power on his retirement. We thank him for letting all Savannahians and visitors, alike, enjoy Kevin Barry's for the last 40 years.

UNJUST IRANIAN AMERICAN DETENTIONS

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

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, America is less safe when the words and actions of our leaders cast unnecessary suspicion on our fellow citizens. America is less safe when families, including children, are targeted by government officials based on their ethnicity or by their country of origin.

Reports of unjust, prolonged detentions of Iranian Americans and permanent residents at our borders should be alarming to everyone. It calls to mind the unjust internment of Japanese Americans during World War II.

My own parents were toddlers in Japanese American internment camps, and they, along with 120,000 others, were unjustly incarcerated, having committed no crimes or acts of disloyalty.

What happened to my family was the result of a failure of political leadership. All of us in this body have a duty to remain vigilant and to defend the dignity of all citizens. To do nothing is to be complicit in violating the spirit of our Constitution and the individual liberties it guarantees.

□ 0915

RURAL AMERICA NEEDS TO BE ACCOUNTED FOR IN UPCOMING CENSUS

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

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call attention to the 2020 Census and to emphasize the importance of ensuring that rural America is accounted for.

Our once-a-decade counting of all Americans is important for numerous reasons. Most importantly, census data provides us with a roadmap for allocating hundreds of billions of dollars annually in government services. These include investments in things like education, roads, and bridges, and other areas of importance to rural districts like mine.

I appreciate the U.S. Census Bureau's efforts to streamline government duties by including an online response option this year. However, I am very concerned that rural areas like Kentucky's First Congressional District could get left behind.

Unfortunately, nearly 30 percent of my district lacks internet access or lacks access to reliable connection. This high number is unacceptable and could have dire consequences, including ensuring that people I serve are accounted for.

This startling lack of internet access in rural America is a call to action for Congress to step up to the plate. My office has worked tirelessly to address this issue, including funding critical programs in the 2018 farm bill. But we must do more to expand internet connectivity so that our voices will not be undercounted and left behind.

Without action, small towns across Kentucky and our entire Nation risk being left behind in the upcoming census, an outcome that should be unacceptable to every member of this body.

CONGRATULATING STATE FOOT- BALL CHAMPIONS NORTH SHORE SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL

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

Ms. GARCIA of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on December 21, 2019, the Galena Park ISD's North Shore Senior High School football team became back-to-back State football champions.

It was a hard-fought win, but they won because they worked together as a team displaying much heart and grit on the field. This win was the culmination of an entire year's worth of practice and hard work under the leadership of Coach Kay.

They took nothing for granted and showed the entire State that with hard work and determination, anything is possible. The North Shore Senior High School football team made all of the North Shore Mustangs and the Galena Park ISD community very, very proud.

As their Congresswoman, I was not there, but I was watching from afar cheering them on, and I am so happy to share their achievement with all of Congress on this floor of the House of Representatives.

Congratulations for an amazing win. I know we can do it again, and we will make it a three-peat.

RECOGNIZING OFFICERS OF UNITED STATES CAPITOL POLICE

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in honor of Law Enforcement Appreciation Day, I rise today to recognize the officers of the United States Capitol Police force for their heroic ac-

tions to save lives as part of their highly trained and committed service to this congressional community throughout 2019.

When they heard the radio call about an unresponsive individual in a car, two officers responded and ultimately saved the life of a man who had suffered a heart attack.

Officers administered tactical combat casualty care to the victim of a shooting and helped get that person to a hospital.

Three officers saved the life of a man who, shockingly, had a heart attack during his visit to this Capitol Building.

These are only a few occasions in an impressive list of heroic actions. We owe our gratitude to all of the officers of the United States Capitol Police force for the hard work they do here.

I thank all of the police force for going the extra mile; not only protecting and defending us here in the congressional community, but for all they do in all of our communities.

PFAS ACTION ACT OF 2019

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. GARCIA of Texas). Pursuant to House Resolution 779 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. 535.

Will the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CUELLAR) 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. 535) to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to designate per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances as hazardous substances under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980, with Mr. CUELLAR (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, January 9, 2020, amendment No. 18 printed in part B of House Report 116-366 offered by the gentlewoman from Iowa (Mrs. AXNE) had been disposed of.

AMENDMENT NO. 19 OFFERED BY MS. TLAIB

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 19 printed in part B of House Report 116-366.

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Speaker, 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 36, line 18, after "a disadvantaged community" insert "or a disproportionately exposed community".

Page 37, after line 13, insert the following new paragraph:

"(3) DISPROPORTIONATELY EXPOSED COMMUNITY.—The term 'disproportionately exposed

community' means a community in which climate change, pollution, or environmental destruction have exacerbated systemic racial, regional, social, environmental, and economic injustices by disproportionately affecting indigenous peoples, communities of color, migrant communities, deindustrialized communities, depopulated rural communities, the poor, low-income workers, women, the elderly, the unhoused, people with disabilities, or youth."

Page 37, line 14, strike "(3)" and insert "(4)".

Page 37, line 18, strike "(4)" and insert "(5)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 779, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. TLAIB) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Michigan.

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Chairman, it is an honor to fight alongside Representatives DINGELL and KILDEE in protecting our water and environment. I also appreciate Chairman PALLONE for working with us on this critical issue to Michigan and the Nation.

The amendment ensures frontline communities like mine who have been directly harmed by the lack of urgency to address the public health impacts due to environmental injustices have a true seat at the table when it comes to addressing this crisis.

I grew up in southwest Detroit which houses the most polluted ZIP Code in the State; where the smell isn't normal; where our kids go to schools that don't have clean drinking water, where our parks are closed down, literally, barred away from residents having access to it because the soil is too contaminated; and where so many of our residents live in fear that the polluting industry nearby is killing them.

Two communities I represent within Wayne County, Michigan, found PFAS contamination. In the recent Metro Times publication, there was a powerful, yet tragic, statement on what residents in 48217 are forced to live with. "Gone are the fruit trees and vegetable gardens. Residents no longer grow produce because the air and the ground are too contaminated with hazardous substances."

The amendment before us clearly defines disadvantaged, exposed communities and ensures that priority for infrastructure funding to combat PFAS go to these frontline communities like our own 48217 and other neighborhoods.

If we are not intentional about where we put our resources to address this crisis, then we are not serious about universal clean air and water. This amendment will ensure that we have equitable funding that goes to neighborhoods that have been ignored for far too long.

I urge you to support the frontline communities amendment and safeguard the health and environmental justice of the neighborhoods that have historically been victim of structural racism and disinvestment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute the gentlewoman from California (Ms.

BARRAGÁN), my good colleague and partner in this fight who is the cosponsor of this amendment.

Ms. BARRAGÁN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Too often our communities of color are left behind. Too often, they are on the front lines of environmental injustice. That is why I am proud to cosponsor this bill with Representatives TLAIB and OCASIO-CORTEZ.

Our amendment makes sure that help gets to the people who need it the most. It requires the newly established PFAS community water systems grant program to prioritize communities that are disproportionately exposed to environmental harms and public health impacts from pollution.

Many of those communities are communities like my very own district. Communities of color and low-income communities are disproportionately exposed to PFAS contamination. They often face a variety of environmental threats, such as: exhaust from congested highways, water runoff or air pollution from toxic chemical facilities, and close proximity to landfills.

When a grant application to address PFAS contamination is under consideration, these communities that have exposure first and worst should get priority. It shouldn't be an afterthought. That is why this is a critical first step to ensuring the Safe Drinking Water Act prioritizes environmental justice.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Chair, again, I support this amendment and thank my colleagues for working on this.

Growing up in southwest Detroit, the stories of the smell, but not only the fact that we didn't understand why parks and certain chemicals and so forth were exposed to us, is so important. That is why this amendment is so critically important; not only for 48217, but the cities of Melvindale, as well as the Delray neighborhood within southwest Detroit, again, have been exposed to PFAS contamination.

These are two communities, literally, steps away from the Detroit riverfront, and that is why it is critically important for us to push forward on addressing the PFAS contamination across this Nation.

I want to thank my colleagues in understanding why it is important for the Great Lakes State of Michigan that we need to be able to take care of our frontline communities first to really be able to ensure that we have access to clean water universally.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, we obviously support the amendment.

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the Safe Drinking Water Act already makes special priority for what is termed "disadvantaged communities" which is based on affordability criteria.

I wish my colleagues who offered this amendment would have been here last night when we passed an amendment to support rich communities who have already funded their cleanup and are allowing them then to dip back into Federal funds to make the payment.

So they may have, if they had a chance to be here for that amendment, voted against communities that have already been able to afford to clean up, but we are going to dip into this money at the expense of poor communities. So that is kind of what occurred last night.

This covers a range of low-income communities that may have trouble paying for infrastructure needs and has been widely supported as an appropriate function of taxpayer support. This amendment creates a broad new category that disproportionately exposes, and which would appear to expand coverage beyond economic factors which may actually undermine the straightforward support for the poor and the disadvantaged already in statute.

I respect the desire to ensure prioritization to communities that may be particularly hard hit with other economic and environmental issues, but the workability of the new definition has not been closely examined and may complicate the provisions of resources to those communities that need it. A better way to do this would be to require a rulemaking to sort out the best approach to prioritize funding to disadvantaged people.

In a letter written by the water communities, one paragraph says—and I would hope my colleagues would listen to this—because in every community we have water companies that are supposed to provide safe drinking water to our citizens. So the water companies have written to us about this bill. And that is the American Water Works Association, the Metropolitan Water Agencies, the National Association of Water Companies, the National Water Resources Association, the National Rural Water Association, and Water Environment Federation.

These are the people who are going to provide clean drinking water to our constituents, and this is what they say about this bill:

"Unfortunately, H.R. 535 would leave municipal water and wastewater system customers subject to financial liability for PFAS cleanup under CERCLA," i.e., the Superfund, "even in cases where the system followed all applicable laws and regulations related to

PFAS disposal. This is in direct contrast to the objective of holding polluters responsible.”

I include their letter in the RECORD.

JANUARY 8, 2020.

Re Opposition to H.R. 535, the PFAS Action Act.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The undersigned organizations representing the nation's drinking water and wastewater utilities are writing to express our opposition to H.R. 535, the PFAS Action Act of 2019. Unfortunately, the legislation fails to protect water system customers from liability for PFAS cleanup costs.

We believe that per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS) should be kept out of our nation's water supplies, and that PFAS polluters should be held responsible. The fundamental mission of water and wastewater utilities is to protect public health and the environment, and in doing so they must also be mindful of affordability and the financial burden borne by their customers and the communities they serve. Utilities are tremendously concerned about what PFAS is doing in their communities and, as they have done with all previous public health and environmental challenges, are committed partners in finding a solution to this problem.

However, Congress must make a distinction between entities that introduced PFAS into the environment, and water and wastewater systems that are on the front lines of cleaning up the contamination. Utilities are not the producers of PFAS, but the receivers of PFAS and must dispose of water and wastewater treatment byproducts containing traces of the chemicals. A water system that follows all applicable laws in its disposal of water treatment byproducts containing PFAS should not be held liable under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) for any further environmental cleanup costs related to these chemicals. Doing so would penalize customers twice: once when they make investments to remove PFAS from their waters, and again when they are forced to pay to cleanup PFAS contamination elsewhere.

Unfortunately, H.R. 535 would leave municipal water and wastewater systems customers subject to financial liability for PFAS cleanup under CERCLA—even in cases where the system followed all applicable laws and regulations related to PFAS disposal. This is in direct contrast to the objective of holding polluters responsible.

It is particularly disappointing that the manager's amendment proposed for H.R. 535 would offer a CERCLA liability shield to airports that are required to use firefighting foam containing PFAS, but fails to extend that same protection to water and wastewater systems who may be required to remove and dispose of PFAS. As receivers of PFAS, water utilities should be afforded the same liability protections that airports are being awarded in the legislation.

Again, we share the goal of keeping the nation's waters free of PFAS and holding accountable those entities that are responsible for environmental contamination. But because H.R. 535 would leave water system customers unprotected against liability for environmental cleanup of PFAS, we have no choice but to oppose the legislation in its current form.

Sincerely,

AMERICAN WATER WORKS
ASSOCIATION.
ASSOCIATION OF
METROPOLITAN WATER
AGENCIES.
NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF
CLEAN WATER AGENCIES.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF
WATER COMPANIES.
NATIONAL WATER
RESOURCES ASSOCIATION.
NATIONAL RURAL WATER
ASSOCIATION.
WATER ENVIRONMENT
FEDERATION.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chair, it is just amazing that last night, the National Journal published an article called: “PFAS Bill Could Spark Tort ‘Bonanza’.”

□ 0930

I will read from that: “An association of U.S. trial lawyers with deep lobbying pockets and the ear of influential Democrats is helping to push a sweeping chemical-regulation package that could pave the way for a prolific legal bumper crop.”

This is not just a forever chemical debate. This is a forever litigation debate, litigation after litigation as Superfund sites get established. They are there for decades, as I quoted last night numerous times. We have Superfund sites that have been identified that are still unremediated 30 to 40 years after they were established.

This bill attempts to use the Superfund as the silver bullet to address this concern. I mentioned last night, but it is a new day: This is the first time in the history of the Superfund legislation that, in the Clean Water Act, we are legislatively identifying a chemical as hazardous not using the scientific process.

For that and all the other reasons, I ask for a “no” vote on this amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. TLAB).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 20 OFFERED BY MR.
MALINOWSKI

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 20 printed in part B of House Report 116-366.

Mr. MALINOWSKI. Mr. 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 46, line 12, strike “or cooking utensil” and insert “cooking utensil, or stain resistant, water resistant, or grease resistant coating not subject to requirements under section 409 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act”.

Page 46, beginning on line 14, strike “or cooking utensil” and insert “cooking utensil, or stain resistant, water resistant, or grease resistant coating not subject to requirements under section 409 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act”.

Page 46, beginning on line 17, strike “or cooking utensil” and insert “cooking utensil, or stain resistant, water resistant, or grease resistant coating not subject to requirements under section 409 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 779, the gentleman

from New Jersey (Mr. MALINOWSKI) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

MODIFICATION TO AMENDMENT NO. 20 OFFERED
BY MR. MALINOWSKI

Mr. MALINOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be modified in the form I have placed at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the modification.

The Clerk read as follows:

MODIFICATION TO AMENDMENT NO. 20 PRINTED
IN PART B OF HOUSE REPORT NO. 116-366

OFFERED BY MR. MALINOWSKI OF NEW JERSEY
The amendment is modified to read as follows:

— Page 46, line 12, insert “, or a stain resistant, water resistant, or grease resistant coating not subject to requirements under section 409 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act” before “to meet”.

— Page 46, line 15, insert “, or stain resistant, water resistant, or grease resistant coating” before “does not contain”.

— Page 46, line 18, insert “, or stain resistant, water resistant, or grease resistant coating not subject to requirements under section 409 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act” before “that the Administrator”.

Mr. MALINOWSKI (during the reading). Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the modification.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the original request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is modified.

The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MALINOWSKI. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of H.R. 535, the PFAS Action Act, and my amendment to the bill, which gives manufacturers an opportunity to be transparent with consumers and make clear that their products are indeed free of PFAS.

PFAS chemicals are found in coatings that line products like nonstick pots and pans, waterproof clothing, and grease-resistant and fast-food containers, items that we use every day and rarely think about. We are now well aware of the devastating harm that these chemicals can cause, like growth and learning delays in infants and children, an increased risk of birth defects, weakened immune systems, decreased fertility, and an increased risk of cancer.

Each year, billions of pounds of these products are dumped into landfills or burned in incinerators, releasing PFAS pollutants into the air, water, and soil, contaminating the food we eat and the water we drink. In my district in New Jersey, there are over 133 contaminated sites, more than 30 of which are schools.

Right now, consumers have no way of knowing for sure whether products like

the water-resistant spray that we put on our shoes and jackets or the stain-resistant sprays we put on our furniture, rugs, and carpets are or are not contaminated with PFAS coatings that can harm our health.

My amendment would alleviate this problem. It will add stain-, water-, and grease-resistant coatings to the list of products eligible for a voluntary label indicating the absence of PFAS, which will allow consumers to make safer and more informed decisions about the products that we purchase.

We must start holding polluting companies accountable for the chemicals that they are putting into the products that we bring to our homes and give to our children, but we should also be giving companies that do the right thing and that protect consumers a way to be recognized and a way to be rewarded for responsible behavior.

Mr. Chairman, I look forward to voting for this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MALINOWSKI. Once again, this is simply about greater transparency. It is about giving consumers choice. It is about American companies that have done the right thing that are facing competition often from abroad, often from companies that have not done the right thing, giving them a chance to put a credible label on their products that says: This is safe. This is PFAS-free.

Mr. Chairman, this is a commonsense amendment. I hope that everybody accepts it, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, we addressed an amendment like this last night from the gentlewoman from Maine (Ms. PINGREE). Very similar, and I will raise the same objections.

I have been here a long time, and I actually remember the Alar scare. I also remember BPA, bisphenol A. That is the plastic—it was a kind of the same type—that was going to kill everybody, and we ought to ban it. We went through the scientific process and found out that it wasn't.

In the meantime, did we need the government to offer labeling a “-free” product? The answer in the example of BPA is no.

Bisphenol A was used in baby bottles. Company retailers that made bottles with other substances had no problems. In fact, it was a great marketing attempt for them to say that it was BPA-free.

They didn't need government to do that. They did it because of the advertising and the consumer potential to do that.

There will be, and there are, companies trying to do the right thing. They should take advantage of that opportunity, especially in this environment when we are dealing with 7,866 per- and polyfluorinated compounds. The debate is that every one of those 7,866 compounds is hazardous and destructive to individuals. If you are making a product, this is a perfect time to be able to do that and say that it is PFAS-free.

Why would we have the government do that? Some could argue that this is a corporate perk, that we are incentivizing and rewarding companies through government action to do something that if they are good stewards, they should be able to do on their own. That is why I have some concerns with this.

Mr. Chairman, I include in the RECORD another letter from numerous of these companies—some you would label bad actors; some you would label good actors—as they submitted a letter in opposition to this overall bill.

JANUARY 8, 2020.

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: PFAS are a large and diverse group of chemicals with unique properties that have been used in a broad number of beneficial applications for years. Heightened attention to potential health effects of certain PFAS has led to an increased public concern and interest in new regulatory protections in this area.

We understand these concerns and are committed to working with legislators, regulators, and all stakeholders to establish risk-based standards that protect human health and the environment. We also support the development of a consistent approach and clear timelines for assessing and regulating specific PFAS across all relevant federal agencies to ensure that government regulations, actions, and communications are coordinated for maximum effectiveness.

Any federal action should not address PFAS as a class or with predetermined outcomes, but rather should be based on sound science and the weight of the scientific evidence. Further, Congress should not circumvent existing regulatory authorities. The Environmental Protection Agency, as well as other relevant agencies, should retain their traditional power to study PFAS and determine whether to regulate certain PFAS. Many provisions included in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2020, signed into law at the end of last year, took important steps towards meeting those goals.

We look forward to working with you on this important matter as the legislative process continues. We oppose H.R. 535, the “PFAS Action Act of 2019.”

Sincerely,

U.S. Chamber of Commerce, Advamed, Airlines for America, American Chemistry Council, American Coatings Association, American Forest & Paper Association, American Fuel & Petrochemical Manufacturers, American Petroleum Institute, Associated General Contractors of America, Flexible Packaging Association, Foodservice Packaging Institute.

International Liquid Terminals Association, National Association of Chemical Distributors, National Association of Manufacturers, National Cattlemen's Beef Association, Plastics Industry Association (PLASTICS), Single Ply Roofing Industry, Society of Chemical Manufacturers and Affiliates, Specialty Graphic Imaging Association,

TRSA—The Linen, Uniform and Facility Services Association.

Mr. SHIMKUS. They say in this letter: “Any Federal action should not address PFAS as a class or with predetermined outcomes, but rather should be based on sound science and the weight of the scientific evidence.”

As I said before, this is the first time in the history of the country that we are labeling a chemical formulation as toxic politically using political science, not science.

They go on to say: “Further, Congress should not circumvent existing regulatory authorities. The Environmental Protection Agency, as well as other relevant agencies, should retain their traditional power to study PFAS and determine whether to regulate certain PFAS. Many provisions included in the National Defense Authorization Act”—we talked about that a lot last night—“for Fiscal Year 2020, signed into law at the end of last year, took important steps toward meeting those goals.” There is a list of 30 or 40 organizations. I am not going to read them all this morning.

I appreciate my colleague's amendment. We actually were close when we were thinking about getting a bipartisan bill to bring to the floor. This was one of the provisions that was on the table. My friends, I believe, couldn't say yes, so here we are, fighting this bill that the Senate will not take up, and the President will not sign, and you will have to wait for the next Congress to address this issue.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment, as modified, offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MALINOWSKI).

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 21 OFFERED BY MR. LEVIN OF MICHIGAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 21 printed in part B of House Report 116-366.

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, 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 2, after line 15, insert the following new subsection:

(c) REVIEW.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report containing a review of actions by the Environmental Protection Agency to clean up contamination of the substances designated pursuant to subsection (a).

(2) MATTERS INCLUDED.—The report under paragraph (1) shall include an assessment of cleanup progress and effectiveness, including the following:

(A) The number of sites where the Environmental Protection Agency has acted to remediate contamination of the substances designated pursuant to subsection (a).

(B) Which types of chemicals relating to such substances were present at each site

and the extent to which each site was contaminated.

(C) An analysis of discrepancies in cleanup between Federal and non-Federal contamination sites.

(D) Any other elements the Administrator may determine necessary.

(3) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means the following:

(A) The Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives.

(B) The Committee on the Environment and Public Works of the Senate.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 779, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, my amendment requires, within 5 years, a comprehensive report to Congress by the Environmental Protection Agency, the EPA, regarding the actions the Agency will take to clean up and remediate PFAS contamination sites once we pass the important bill before us into law.

I would like to begin by thanking my friend Chairman PALLONE and his staff for working with me on this, as well as my fellow Michiganders, Congresswoman DINGELL, Congressman UPTON, and Congressman KILDEE, for their bipartisan leadership on this bill.

I am proud that this bill includes my bill cosponsored with Representative KHANNA, the PFAS Safe Disposal Act, which prohibits unsafe incineration of PFAS. We need to ensure that when PFAS chemicals are destroyed by incineration, PFAS particles are not emitted into the air. The monumental effort of PFAS cleanup will be for naught if PFAS is simply transmitted from water and soil into the air we breathe.

We in Michigan know all too well the growing threat that PFAS chemicals pose to our communities and our water resources. They have been linked to cancer, damage to both reproductive and immune systems, developmental issues, and changes in liver, immune, and thyroid functions.

The troubling reality is that both industry and the EPA itself have known about the risks from PFAS chemicals for decades. We know, for example, that industry studies have demonstrated the adverse health effects of these chemicals since as early as 1950. That is 70 years ago. We also know that even though the EPA has recognized the risks of PFAS since at least 1995, the Agency is continuing to allow new PFAS chemicals onto the market to this day.

By passing H.R. 535 into law, we can finally begin to reverse decades of the EPA's failure and finally deliver the protections impacted communities need in both the short and long term. But after decades of the EPA failing to treat this matter with urgency, we need to make sure that the cleanup process that will be set in place, once

we finally designate PFOA and PFAS as hazardous substances, is both timely and effective.

My amendment is a commonsense transparency and accountability measure that requires the EPA to submit a comprehensive review to Congress after 5 years of cleanup efforts. The report required by my amendment will include the number of sites that have to be remediated, the types of PFAS chemicals present at each site, an analysis of discrepancies and cleanup between Federal and non-Federal contamination sites, and more.

For the sake of our constituents and after so many years of inexcusable threats to their health, Congress must ensure that EPA's PFAS cleanup efforts are effective.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition.

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Ms. PELOSI), who is the Speaker of the House.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding and congratulate him on his important amendment. I hope this important study will be part of that legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to come to the floor to join our colleagues, the distinguished chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee and the former chair, Mr. UPTON, in their bipartisan support of this legislation.

I salute Congresswoman DEBBIE DINGELL, a crusader in this urgent mission to protect our communities from PFAS chemicals.

I also thank Mr. TONKO, the chair of the Environment and Climate Change Subcommittee of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

The list goes on and on, and I will name some more.

Last year, our Members worked relentlessly to pass bold legislation to tackle the PFAS crisis. We salute the Members whose bills were included in the bipartisan National Defense Authorization Act agreement reached by the House.

□ 0945

Unfortunately, at the end of the year, the Senate GOP refused to join the House to secure full, robust protections against PFAS chemicals, and key provisions were cut from the NDAA, the National Defense Authorization Act. The Senate GOP obstruction is why we are here today.

We are also here today because our distinguished chairman, Mr. PALLONE, promised that we would have a chance to vote on robust legislation after the first of the year. I thank the chairman.

PFAS chemicals are a serious public health threat, contaminating the water

we drink, the air we breathe, and the food we eat. These forever chemicals—which do not break down easily—are exposing millions of Americans to liver disease, asthma, thyroid dysfunction, multiple forms of cancer, and further health threats.

Today, nearly all Americans, including newborn babies, expectant mothers, and children, have PFAS in their blood; and up to 110 million people may be drinking tainted water, including, as our colleagues from Michigan have indicated, the challenge in their State indicated by the leadership and demonstrated on the floor in a bipartisan way on this issue.

Our colleague from Hoosick Falls, New York, Mr. DELGADO, has been a champion on this issue. Their contamination from a plastics factory raised the level of PFAS chemicals in residents' blood to 100 times the national average, Mr. SHIMKUS.

In Chincoteague, Virginia, near Maryland, where I grew up, contamination from NASA Wallops Flight Center forced the local community to find an entirely new drinking water supply. And we thank Congresswoman LURIA for her leadership in all of this.

And Mr. PAPPAS, also with ANNIE KUSTER, has a situation in Portsmouth, New Hampshire, where contamination from Pease Air Force Base poisoned the drinking water of thousands of residents, including children and infants.

Mr. Chair, before we won the majority, we had a hearing. It really was about a number of issues, environmental justice being one of them. Reverend Barbera brought people from all over the country to talk about this. I particularly remember our conversations in the testimony of Peggy Price.

She came and told the story of her family and how they were affected by what was happening at Camp Lejeune in North Carolina. It was a very sad story. Their families suffered, the parents, the children—just a horrible situation. They were serving our country at Camp Lejeune, and they were victimized by the water supply there.

Particularly egregious, is the epidemic of contamination on military sites, as I mentioned just now, and more than 400 sites across the United States are affected. It is unacceptable that our men and women who sacrifice to keep us safe around the world face this danger in their health at home.

Sadly, some big corporations and the EPA have known about the risks from PFAS chemicals for decades, but they have failed to prevent the spread of contamination. The Trump administration's EPA is breaking its own promises every day that it delays and puts polluters ahead of the American people.

In stark contrast, the House is taking action. We are cleaning up communities by designating PFAS as a hazardous substance by the EPA, which is the key barrier to cleaning up military and industrial sites.

We are also creating new, robustly funded grants, in partnership with States, to help with cleanup and remediation efforts. Hopefully, we will be adding this important study that Mr. LEVIN is proposing to this legislation.

And we are helping stem the tide of further contamination with tough, new testing reporting and monitoring requirements, strict limits on the introduction of new PFAS chemicals, limits on air emissions, and banning unsafe incineration—strong measures to hold contaminating companies accountable.

Last month, the Senate GOP fought to prevent many of these lifesaving measures from becoming law in the NDAA. Now, Senator MCCONNELL will have to explain once again to the American people why he is blocking our bipartisan action to clean up contaminated communities.

I urge a strong vote on this legislation to keep the American people healthy and safe and, again, salute all of those who have worked so hard to bring this legislation to the floor in a bipartisan way.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time I have remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Michigan has 45 seconds remaining.

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to close, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, while people may have all kinds of opinions on the underlying issue, this amendment is simply about sunshine. It simply is about good government: Will our Federal agencies tell our Article I body here what they are up to? I think it just makes all kinds of sense to ask them to give us a comprehensive report after a reasonable period of time, so I hope everyone can support this amendment.

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am happy to follow the Speaker, and I do have great respect for her. It gets me in trouble in my district every now and then when I talk about our relationship, but it has to be said that I can't allow a revisionist history to report on what occurred, especially on the Safe Drinking Water Act and in the final negotiations.

It is well-reported that there was a three-corner agreement. One corner couldn't get there, and that is why we didn't have it. I won't name names. I won't point fingers. But to point this over at our friends in the other side of the building where they had come to an agreement, that is just not accurate.

I would also point out that, in this bill, we are exempting airports from Superfund liability. We are not exempting medical devices. We are not exempting military contractors. We are not exempting water companies. We are exempting airports who use,

probably the most toxic of all these chemicals: firefighter foam. Somehow, they were able to get a carve-out where other companies, industries, could not.

The only other organization that benefited was the Trial Lawyer Association. I want to mention that again. It is amazing, the article came out last night. I am not sure how that happened, but it states in the article:

An association of U.S. trial lawyers with deep lobbying pockets and an ear of influential Democrats is helping to push a sweeping chemical regulation package that could pave the way for a prolific legal bumper crop.

Now, where would that happen in this bill? Well, it would happen in the Killee amendment that we passed last night, which would federalize information publication that States should handle. We can get that at the Federal level, then the trial bar could go through this information. The Pappas amendment had unrealistic deadlines, so they had this litigation based upon not being able to meet a deadline.

Then you have section 2 of the Superfund designation without science and unrealistic review deadlines.

Section 4, toxic labeling of unrealistic risks without a review.

Section 15, Clean Air Act designation without science and unrealistic review deadlines.

And the Brindisi amendment, we passed, that makes it marginally better, but, of course, not good enough for us to be able to accept that—or at least me—in the vote on the floor.

So, if this colleague of mine would amend this amendment and say let's have transparency on the class action lawsuits, then the litigation and the legal costs of doing this—we know that Superfund designation is not a silver bullet to cleanup, and I used this numerous times last night.

Old Springfield, Vermont, was added on the Superfund list, September 8, 1983. Guess where it is 36 years later? Still on the Superfund list.

Colbert Landfill, Spokane, Washington, added September 8, 1983. Guess what it is? Still a Superfund site 36 years later.

We should do a transparency look at how much litigation and money has been spent, both by the government and lawyers, on these Superfund sites. And, if we want to talk about transparency, I think that would also be a good way. Maybe we could have a bipartisan agreement on timelines and remediation, but also follow the money. Where is the money going?

So this amendment does not require informing Congress of private-sector actions to clean up PFAS under Superfund and is unclear how much cleanup is being done by other Federal agencies. Plus, this is something that the Government Accountability Office or the congressional committees could do without such expense to the Federal Government.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 22 OFFERED BY MS. SLOTKIN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 22 printed in part B of House Report 116-366.

Ms. SLOTKIN. Mr. 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 47, after line 15, insert the following:

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, in consultation with the head of the U.S. Fire Administration and other relevant Federal departments or agencies, shall report to Congress on the efforts of the Environmental Protection Agency and other relevant Federal departments and agencies to identify viable alternatives to firefighting foam and other related equipment containing any PFAS.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 779, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. SLOTKIN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Michigan.

Ms. SLOTKIN. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of my amendment to the PFAS Action Act, which would require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, in consultation with other relevant government agencies, to report to Congress on efforts to identify viable alternatives to PFAS firefighting foam and other related equipment containing PFAS.

PFAS contamination hits particularly close to home for me and my constituents. We in Michigan are confronting widespread PFAS contamination in our water, chemicals that we know are linked to cancer and other diseases.

This past summer, I toured Strawberry Lake, part of Livingston County's beautiful chain of lakes in my district, where foam resulting from PFAS buildup is visible in plain sight.

I held a forum focused on PFAS contamination in Pinckney, Michigan, a community that has been under a "do not eat fish" advisory for over a year and a "do not touch foam" advisory for many months. The more than 200 attendees expressed deep concern about the impact of PFAS contamination on their health, safety, and livelihoods, and had simple questions about how to know whether their water is safe to drink, eat fish from, or even touch.

In September, I met with Brighton Fire Chief Michael O'Brien and fire chiefs from across Livingston County and discussed their concerns about exposure to firefighting foam that contains high concentrations of PFAS.

PFAS presents alarming health risks. According to the CDC, exposure to PFAS can affect growth, learning, and behavior in infants and older children; lower a woman's chance of getting pregnant; increase the risk of cancer; and impact the immune system. In

fact, one of my constituents, who spent his career as an auto mechanic and was exposed to PFAS-contaminated materials on a daily basis, is now connecting his diagnosis of MS, or an autoimmune disease, to his exposure to PFAS at work.

In Michigan, the high levels of PFAS have been detected in 34 sites, including at Diamond Chrome Plating in my district.

In addition, these chemicals have been found at some level in municipal drinking water serving more than 2 million people across the State.

PFAS has been detected in 54 Michigan schools, including 5 schools in my district.

Last summer, the Michigan Department of Health and Human Services issued an emergency “do not eat” advisory regarding all fish from sections of the Huron River in my district after fish from Kent Lake were discovered to contain very high levels of PFAS.

Let me be clear: I believe that access to clean water out of your tap is a right and not a privilege.

□ 1000

I believe that environmental security is homeland security. If it is threatening the safety and security of your family and preservation of your way of life, that is homeland security.

When Michigan families can't be confident that the water they are giving their children to drink won't make them sick or give them a learning disability; when they can no longer fish the rivers or hunt in the areas they have hunted for years with their families, that is a threat to our security, to our way of life.

It doesn't matter if you are a Democrat, or a Republican, or an Independent, if you are going to hand your child a glass of water, you should be confident it won't cause cancer or other lifelong health issues. That is your family, and that is their safety.

My amendment would simply require the EPA to report to Congress on efforts to identify viable alternatives to products and equipment containing PFAS, including firefighting foam used on our military bases.

The PFAS Action Act of 2019 does a great deal to meet the threat of PFAS contamination with robust legislation that responds to it. And my amendment will hold Federal agencies accountable for finding viable alternatives to prevent further PFAS contamination.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, although I do not believe I will oppose the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLOTKIN. Mr. Chair, I have no speakers and I am prepared to close after the gentleman closes.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois has the right to close. The gentlewoman from Michigan is recognized.

Ms. SLOTKIN. Mr. Chair, I ask for the bill to be supported, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the gentlewoman brings up an issue about firefighter foam. She talks about military installations. She does not talk about commercial aviation and waterway issues which are exempted in this bill.

Again, I am not sure why we are wanting to clean up all PFAS contamination, the world is ending, but we exempt airports. We don't exempt medical devices.

Let me hold up this. This was used last night. This is a medical device that is inserted into a child, maybe an unborn child, to close a hole in the heart. FDA said this is safe to insert into a heart. You want to talk about daily exposure? Here is daily exposure in an infant child.

So the nexus between the gentlewoman's amendment and this debate is that maybe when we are investigating firefighter foam for alternatives, maybe we are going to investigate alternatives for this type.

FDA has approved this. So why are we going to possibly ban chemicals?

We also mentioned last night that the Food and Drug Administration has claimed PFAS lining for food packages is safe. So we already have government entities that have investigated portions of the PFAS world.

Remember, we are talking about 7,866 different permutations; not one chemical, not two chemicals, but 7,866. And this is the first time in the history of our Nation that, without science and due diligence, we are going to label a chemical as toxic. That is part of the objection.

Let's use real science. I get beat up all the time, being a science-denier, climate change.

Here, my friends on the Democrat side aren't ready to rely on science to address each of these 7,866 different applications. In fact, they are trying to, in this legislation, cause a rush to judgment, create an inability for the EPA to make a decision. So then, the companies can be sued because there is no way they can meet the timelines based upon this bill.

I would like to also read from the American Council of Engineering Companies letter, a letter that I will ask, at the appropriate time, to submit to the RECORD; and it says this: “By designating certain PFAS chemicals as hazardous substances under CERCLA,” which is the Superfund, “as called for in H.R. 535, we are concerned that such action could upset the progress already made to address this challenge, divert resources away from more pressing

threats to water quality, and impose significant costs and liability on our water utility clients and the ratepayers they serve.”

Mr. Chairman, I include the letter I just referenced in the RECORD.

AMERICAN COUNCIL OF
ENGINEERING COMPANIES,
Washington, DC, January 9, 2020.

Hon. FRANK PALLONE,
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Commerce,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. GREG WALDEN,
Ranking Member, Committee on Energy and
Commerce, House of Representatives, Wash-
ington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN PALLONE AND RANKING MEMBER WALDEN: On behalf of the American Council of Engineering Companies (ACEC)—the business association of the nation's engineering industry—we wish to express our concerns over H.R. 535, the PFAS Action Act. While we agree that aggressive steps are needed to protect water resources from per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS) contamination, we believe that ongoing efforts at the federal level to develop risk-based regulations offer a more effective approach to address this problem.

ACEC represents over 5,500 engineering companies and thousands of engineering professionals who work on a daily basis to improve the nation's water infrastructure and protect human health and the environment. While PFAS chemicals have been in wide use for many decades, concerns have emerged in recent years regarding the health effects of certain types of PFAS. In response to this, federal and state regulators, as well as water supply, wastewater and other stakeholders are working together to define the public health risks of the PFAS chemicals as well as consideration of technologies to cost-effectively mitigate those risks.

The Council supports this deliberative, consistent and data-driven approach to developing risk-based PFAS standards. By designating certain PFAS chemicals as hazardous substances under CERCLA (Superfund), as called for in H.R. 535, we are concerned that such action could upset the progress already made to address this challenge, divert resources away from more pressing threats to water quality, and impose significant costs and liability on our water utility clients and the ratepayers they serve.

We would respectfully urge the House to reconsider this approach, and instead work to support and where necessary enhance the existing regulatory framework and action plan.

Sincerely,

LINDA BAUER DARR,
President & CEO.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, I already asked for inclusion in the RECORD a letter from the local municipal water plants, or the rural water associations, or the for-profit-owned water companies who said this makes it more difficult for us to clean up the water. We are going to be held to Superfund liability. We have to pay the court costs.

Now we have exempted airports. We haven't exempted the water companies. That is really just a pass-through. They are receiving, they are cleaning up, and then they are disposing, but we are not going to exempt them. We are going to exempt airports.

We are not going to exempt medical device manufacturers who are saving

the lives of unborn children who have daily exposure of PFAS; and this is a lifesaving application.

This is just one of many. I could pull up heart stents. Last night we also talked about F-16s and our defense industry.

Maybe, with this amendment, we will do due diligence and find a suitable chemical formula that will replace this. So I applaud it. I think it is well thought of. It is meaningful.

I would also like to, in the end, because this will probably be my last time to be able to talk on this. We, on both sides of the aisle, really need to thank legislative counsel, because of the short timeframe they had in the amendment offerings, their response to the majority's concerns and writing. And actually, obviously, we are probably more difficult because we are trying to really dig in and find the fallacies of the coming amendments.

So my personal thanks to legislative counsel and professional staff who worked tirelessly on behalf of both sides.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. SLOTKIN).

The amendment was agreed to.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part B of House Report 116-366 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. BURGESS of Texas.

Amendment No. 6 by Mr. BALDERSON of Ohio.

Amendment No. 13 by Mr. PAPPAS of New Hampshire.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. BURGESS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes 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 vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 161, noes 247, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 9]

AYES—161

Abraham	Arrington	Banks
Allen	Babin	Barr
Amash	Bacon	Bergman
Amodei	Baird	Biggs
Armstrong	Balderson	Bilirakis

Bishop (NC)	Hagedorn	Pence	McCarthy	Reed	Stefanik
Bishop (UT)	Harris	Perry	McCollum	Rice (NY)	Stevens
Bost	Hartzler	Peterson	McEachin	Richmond	Suozi
Brooks (AL)	Hern, Kevin	Ratcliffe	McGovern	Rooney (FL)	Swalwell (CA)
Brooks (IN)	Herrera Beutler	Reschenthaler	McNerney	Rose (NY)	Takano
Bucshon	Hice (GA)	Rice (SC)	Meeks	Rouda	Thompson (CA)
Budd	Higgins (LA)	Riggleman	Meng	Rouzer	Thompson (MS)
Burchett	Hill (AR)	Roby	Moore	Roybal-Allard	Titus
Burgess	Hollingsworth	Rodgers (WA)	Morelle	Ruiz	Tlaib
Byrne	Johnson (LA)	Roe, David P.	Moulton	Ruppersberger	Tonko
Calvert	Johnson (OH)	Rogers (AL)	Mucarsel-Powell	Rush	Torres (CA)
Carter (GA)	Johnson (SD)	Rogers (KY)	Murphy (FL)	Ryan	Torres Small
Chabot	Jordan	Rose, John W.	Napolitano	Sablan	(NM)
Cheney	Joyce (OH)	Roy	Neal	San Nicolas	Trahan
Cline	Joyce (PA)	Rutherford	Neguse	Sánchez	Trone
Cloud	Katko	Scalise	Norcross	Sarbanes	Turner
Cole	Keller	Schweikert	Norton	Scanlon	Underwood
Collins (GA)	Kelly (MS)	Scott, Austin	O'Halleran	Schakowsky	Upton
Comer	Kelly (IA)	Sensenbrenner	Ocasio-Cortez	Schiff	Van Drew
Conaway	King (PA)	Shimkus	Omar	Schneider	Vargas
Cook	Kinzinger	Smith (MO)	Pallone	Schrader	Veasey
Crenshaw	Kustoff (TN)	Smith (NE)	Panetta	Schrier	Vela
Curtis	LaHood	Spano	Pappas	Scott (VA)	Velázquez
Davidson (OH)	LaMalfa	Stauber	Pascrell	Scott, David	Visclosky
Davis, Rodney	Lamborn	Steil	Perlmutter	Sewell (AL)	Wasserman
DeJarlais	Latta	Steube	Peters	Shalala	Schultz
Diaz-Balart	Lesko	Stewart	Phillips	Sherman	Waters
Duncan	Long	Stivers	Pingree	Sherrill	Watson Coleman
Dunn	Lucas	Taylor	Plaskett	Sires	Webster (FL)
Emmer	Luetkemeyer	Thornberry	Pocan	Slotkin	Welch
Estes	Marshall	Timmons	Porter	Smith (NJ)	Wexton
Ferguson	Massie	Tipton	Posey	Smith (WA)	Wild
Fleischmann	McAdams	Wagner	Pressley	Soto	Wilson (FL)
Flores	McCaull	Walberg	Price (NC)	Spanberger	Yarmuth
Foxx (NC)	McClintock	Walder	Quigley	Speier	Young
Fulcher	McKinley	Walorski	Raskin	Stanton	Zeldin
Gaetz	Meadows	Waltz			
Gianforte	Miller	Watkins			
Gibbs	Mitchell	Weber (TX)	Aderholt	González-Colón	McHenry
Gonzalez (OH)	Moolenaar	Wenstrup	Brady	(PR)	Meuser
Gooden	Mooney (WV)	Westerman	Buchanan	Granger	Nadler
Gosar	Mullin	Williams	Buck	Hunter	Payne
Graves (GA)	Murphy (NC)	Wilson (SC)	Carter (TX)	Johnson (GA)	Radewagen
Graves (LA)	Newhouse	Wittman	Crawford	Kind	Serrano
Graves (MO)	Norman	Womack	Evans	Kirkpatrick	Simpson
Griffith	Nunes	Woodall	Fitzpatrick	Lewis	Smucker
Grothman	Olson	Wright	Gohmert	Loudermilk	Thompson (PA)
Guest	Palazzo	Yoho		Marchant	Walker
Guthrie	Palmer				

NOES—247

Adams	Daids (KS)	Horsford
Aguilar	Davis (CA)	Houlahan
Allred	Davis, Danny K.	Hoyer
Axne	Dean	Hudson
Barragán	DeFazio	Huffman
Bass	DeGette	Huizenga
Beatty	DeLauro	Hurd (TX)
Bera	DelBene	Jackson Lee
Beyer	Delgado	Jayapal
Bishop (GA)	Demings	Jeffries
Blumenauer	DeSaulnier	Johnson (TX)
Blunt Rochester	Deutch	Kaptur
Bonamici	Dingell	Keating
Boyle, Brendan F.	Doggett	Kelly (IL)
Brindisi	Doyle, Michael F.	Kennedy
Brown (MD)	Engel	Khanna
Brownley (CA)	Escobar	Kildee
Bustos	Eshoo	Kilmer
Butterfield	Españat	Kim
Carbajal	Finkenauer	King (NY)
Cárdenas	Fletcher	Krishnamoorthi
Carson (IN)	Fortenberry	Kuster (NH)
Cartwright	Foster	Lamb
Case	Frankel	Langevin
Casten (IL)	Fudge	Larsen (WA)
Castor (FL)	Gabbard	Larson (CT)
Castro (TX)	Gallagher	Lawrence
Chu, Judy	Gallego	Lawson (FL)
Ciulline	Garamendi	Lee (CA)
Cisneros	Garcia (IL)	Lee (NV)
Clark (MA)	Garcia (TX)	Levin (CA)
Clarke (NY)	Golden	Levin (MI)
Clay	Gomez	Lieu, Ted
Cleaver	Gonzalez (TX)	Lipinski
Clyburn	Gottheimer	Loeback
Cohen	Green (TN)	Lofgren
Connolly	Green, Al (TX)	Lowenthal
Cooper	Grijalva	Lowey
Correa	Haaland	Lujan
Costa	Harder (CA)	Luria
Courtney	Hastings	Lynch
Cox (CA)	Hayes	Malinowski
Craig	Heck	Maloney
Crist	Higgins (NY)	Carolyn B.
Crow	Himes	Maloney, Sean
Cuellar	Holding	Mast
Cunningham	Horn, Kendra S.	Matsui
		McBath

NOT VOTING—28

	González-Colón	McHenry
	(PR)	Meuser
	Granger	Nadler
	Hunter	Payne
	Johnson (GA)	Radewagen
	Kind	Serrano
	Kirkpatrick	Simpson
	Lewis	Smucker
	Loudermilk	Thompson (PA)
	Marchant	Walker

□ 1033

Ms. JAYAPAL, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. COOPER, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. POSEY, Mrs. AXNE, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Messrs. ESPAILLAT and VAN DREW changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Chair, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 9.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. BALDERSON

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BALDERSON) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes 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 170, noes 239, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 10]

AYES—170

Abraham Gosar
 Allen Graves (GA)
 Amash Graves (LA)
 Amodei Graves (MO)
 Armstrong Green (TN)
 Arrington Griffith
 Babin Grothman
 Bacon Guest
 Baird Guthrie
 Balderson Hagedorn
 Banks Harris
 Barr Hartzler
 Bergman Hern, Kevin
 Biggs Hice (GA)
 Bilirakis Higgins (LA)
 Bishop (NC) Hill (AR)
 Bishop (UT) Holding
 Bost Hollingsworth
 Brooks (AL) Hurd (TX)
 Brooks (IN) Johnson (LA)
 Buck Johnson (OH)
 Bucshon Johnson (SD)
 Budd Jordan
 Burchett Joyce (OH)
 Burgess Joyce (PA)
 Byrne Katko
 Calvert Keller
 Carter (GA) Kelly (MS)
 Chabot Kelly (PA)
 Cheney King (IA)
 Cline Kinzinger
 Cloud Kustoff (TN)
 Cole LaHood
 Collins (GA) LaMalfa
 Comer Lamborn
 Conaway Latta
 Cook Lesko
 Crenshaw Long
 Curtis Lucas
 Davidson (OH) Luetkemeyer
 Davis, Rodney Marshall
 DesJarlais Massie
 Diaz-Balart McAdams
 Duncan McCarthy
 Dunn McCaul
 Emmer McClintock
 Estes McHenry
 Ferguson McKinley
 Fleischmann Meadows
 Flores Miller
 Foxx (NC) Mitchell
 Fulcher Moolenaar
 Gaetz Mooney (WV)
 Gianforte Mullin
 Gibbs Murphy (NC)
 Gonzalez (OH) Newhouse
 Gooden Norman

NOES—239

Adams Connolly
 Aguilar Cooper
 Allred Correa
 Axne Costa
 Barragán Courtney
 Bass Cox (CA)
 Beatty Craig
 Bera Crist
 Beyer Crow
 Bishop (GA) Cuellar
 Blumenauer Cunningham
 Blunt Rochester Davids (KS)
 Bonamici Davis (CA)
 Boyle, Brendan Davis, Danny K.
 F. Dean
 Brindisi DeFazio
 Brown (MD) DeGette
 Brownley (CA) DeLauro
 Bustos DelBene
 Butterfield Delgado
 Carbajal Demings
 Cárdenas DeSaulnier
 Carson (IN) Deutch
 Cartwright Dingell
 Case Doggett
 Casten (IL) Doyle, Michael
 Castor (FL) F.
 Castro (TX) Engel
 Chu, Judy Escobar
 Cicilline Eshoo
 Cisneros Espallat
 Clark (MA) Finkenauer
 Clarke (NY) Fletcher
 Clay Fortenberry
 Cleaver Foster
 Clyburn Frankel
 Cohen Fudge

Nunes
 Olson
 Palazzo
 Palmer
 Pence
 Perry
 Ratcliffe
 Reed
 Reschenthaler
 Rice (SC)
 Riggleman
 Roby
 Rodgers (WA)
 Roe, David P.
 Rogers (AL)
 Rogers (KY)
 Rose, John W.
 Rouzer
 Roy
 Rutherford
 Scalise
 Schrader
 Schweikert
 Sensenbrenner
 Shimkus
 Smith (MO)
 Smith (NE)
 Spano
 Stauber
 Stefanik
 Steil
 Steube
 Stewart
 Stivers
 Taylor
 Thornberry
 Timmons
 Tipton
 Wagner
 Walberg
 Walden
 Walorski
 Waltz
 Watkins
 Weber (TX)
 Webster (FL)
 Wenstrup
 Westerman
 Williams
 Wilson (SC)
 Wittman
 Womack
 Woodall
 Wright
 Yoho
 Zeldin

Kildee
 Kilmer
 Kim
 King (NY)
 Krishnamoorthi
 Kuster (NH)
 Lamb
 Langevin
 Larsen (WA)
 Larson (CT)
 Lawrence
 Lawson (FL)
 Lee (CA)
 Lee (NV)
 Levin (CA)
 Levin (MI)
 Lieu, Ted
 Lipinski
 Loeb sack
 Lofgren
 Lowenthal
 Lowey
 Luján
 Luria
 Lynch
 Malinowski
 Maloney,
 Carolyn B.
 Maloney, Sean
 Mast
 Matsui
 Mc Bath
 McCollum
 McEachin
 McGovern
 McNerney
 Meeks
 Meng
 Moore
 Morelle
 Moulton
 Mucarsel-Powell
 Murphy (FL)
 Napolitano
 Neal

Aderholt
 Brady
 Buchanan
 Carter (TX)
 Crawford
 Evans
 Fitzpatrick
 Gohmert
 González-Colón
 (PR)

NOT VOTING—27

Granger
 Scott, Austin
 Kind
 Kirkpatrick
 Lewis
 Loudermilk
 Marchant
 Meuser
 Nadler
 Payne

□ 1038

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. VAN DREW. Mr. Chair, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 10.

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. PAPPAS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. PAPPAS) 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 242, noes 168, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 11]

AYES—242

Adams
 Aguilar
 Allred
 Axne
 Barragán
 Bass
 Beatty
 Bera
 Beyer
 Bishop (GA)
 Blumenauer
 Blunt Rochester
 Bonamici
 Boyle, Brendan
 F.
 Brindisi
 Brown (MD)
 Brownley (CA)
 Bustos
 Butterfield
 Carbajal
 Cárdenas
 Carson (IN)
 Cartwright
 Case
 Casten (IL)
 Castor (FL)
 Castro (TX)
 Chu, Judy
 Cicilline
 Cisneros
 Clark (MA)
 Clarke (NY)
 Clay
 Cleaver
 Clyburn
 Cohen
 Green, Al (TX)
 Grijalva
 Haaland
 Harder (CA)
 Hastings
 Hayes
 Heck
 Herrera Beutler
 Higgins (NY)
 Himes
 Horn, Kendra S.
 Horsford
 Houlihan
 Hoyer
 Huffman
 Hurd (TX)
 Jackson Lee
 Jayapal
 Jeffries
 Johnson (GA)
 Johnson (TX)
 Kaptur
 Keating
 Kelly (IL)
 Kennedy
 Khanna
 Kildee
 Kilmer
 Kim
 King (NY)
 Krishnamoorthi
 Kuster (NH)
 Lamb
 Langevin
 Larsen (WA)
 Larson (CT)
 Lawrence
 Lawson (FL)
 Lee (CA)
 Lee (NV)
 Levin (CA)
 Levin (MI)
 Lieu, Ted
 Lipinski
 Loeb sack
 Matsui
 McAdams
 McBath
 McCollum
 McEachin
 McGovern
 McKinley
 McNerney
 Meeks
 Meng
 Moore
 Morelle
 Moulton
 Mucarsel-Powell
 Murphy (FL)
 Napolitano
 Neal
 Neguse
 Norcross
 Norton
 O'Halleran
 Ocasio-Cortez
 Omar
 Pallone
 Panetta
 Pappas
 Pascrell
 Perlmutter
 Peters
 Peterson
 Phillips
 Pingree
 Plaskett
 Pocan
 Porter
 Posey
 Pressley
 Price (NC)
 Quigley
 Raskin
 Reed
 Rice (NY)
 Richmond
 Rooney (FL)
 Rose (NY)
 Rouda
 Rouzer
 Roybal-Allard
 Ruiz
 Ruppertsberger
 Rush
 Ryan
 Sablan
 San Nicolas
 Sánchez
 Sarbanes
 Scanlon
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Schneider
 Schrader
 Schrier
 Scott (VA)
 Scott, David
 Sewell (AL)
 Shalala
 Sherman
 Sherrill
 Sires
 Slotkin
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (WA)
 Soto
 Spanberger
 Speier
 Stanton
 Stevens
 Suozzi
 Swalwell (CA)
 Takano
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Titus
 Tlaib
 Tonko
 Torres (CA)
 Torres Small
 (NM)
 Trahan
 Trone
 Turner
 Underwood
 Upton
 Vargas
 Veasey
 Vela
 Velázquez
 Visclosky
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Waters
 Watson Coleman
 Welch
 Wexton
 Wild
 Wilson (FL)
 Yarmuth
 Young

NOES—168

Barr
 Bergman
 Biggs
 Bilirakis
 Bishop (NC)
 Bishop (UT)
 Bost
 Brooks (AL)
 Brooks (IN)
 Buck
 Bucshon
 Budd
 Burchett
 Burgess
 Byrne
 Calvert
 Carter (GA)
 Chabot
 Cheney
 Cline
 Cloud
 Cole

Comer	Johnson (LA)	Riggleman
Conaway	Johnson (OH)	Roby
Cook	Johnson (SD)	Rodgers (WA)
Crenshaw	Jordan	Roe, David P.
Curtis	Joyce (OH)	Rogers (AL)
Davidson (OH)	Joyce (PA)	Rogers (KY)
Davis, Rodney	Katko	Rose, John W.
DesJarlais	Keller	Roy
Diaz-Balart	Kelly (MS)	Rutherford
Duncan	Kelly (PA)	Scalise
Dunn	King (IA)	Schweikert
Emmer	Kinzing	Sensenbrenner
Estes	Kustoff (TN)	Shimkus
Ferguson	LaHood	Smith (MO)
Fleischmann	LaMalfa	Smith (NE)
Flores	Lamborn	Spano
Fortenberry	Latta	Staubert
Fox (NC)	Lesko	Stefanik
Fulcher	Long	Steil
Gaetz	Lucas	Steube
Gallagher	Luetkemeyer	Stewart
Gianforte	Marshall	Stivers
Gibbs	Massie	Taylor
Gonzalez (OH)	McCarthy	Thornberry
Gooden	McCaul	Timmons
Gosar	McClintock	Tipton
Graves (GA)	McHenry	Wagner
Graves (LA)	Meadows	Walberg
Graves (MO)	Miller	Walden
Green (TN)	Mitchell	Walorski
Griffith	Moolenaar	Waltz
Grothman	Mooney (WV)	Watkins
Guest	Mullin	Weber (TX)
Guthrie	Murphy (NC)	Webster (FL)
Hagedorn	Newhouse	Wenstrup
Harris	Norman	Westerman
Hartzler	Nunes	Williams
Hern, Kevin	Olson	Wilson (SC)
Hice (GA)	Palazzo	Wittman
Higgins (LA)	Palmer	Womack
Hill (AR)	Pence	Woodall
Holding	Perry	Wright
Hollingsworth	Ratcliffe	Yoho
Hudson	Reschenthaler	Young
Huizenga	Rice (SC)	Zeldin

NOT VOTING—26

Aderholt	Granger	Radewagen
Brady	Hunter	Scott, Austin
Buchanan	Kind	Serrano
Carter (TX)	Kirkpatrick	Simpson
Crawford	Lewis	Smucker
Evans	Loudermilk	Thompson (PA)
Fitzpatrick	Marchant	Walker
Gohmert	Meuser	
González-Colón	Nadler	
(PR)	Payne	

□ 1044

Mr. VAN DREW changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 11 and “yea” on rollcall No. 10.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. CLAY). There being no further amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CUELLAR) having assumed the chair, Mr. CLAY, 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. 535) to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to designate per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances as hazardous substances under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980, and, pursuant to House Resolution 779, he reported the bill, as amended by that resolution, back to the House with sundry further amendments 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 further amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were 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

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

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

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. I am in its current form.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mrs. Rodgers of Washington moves to recommit the bill H.R. 535 to the Committee on Energy and Commerce with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

Page 10, line 14, insert “, including any unborn child (as defined in section 1841(d) of title 18, United States Code)” before the period at the end.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Washington is recognized for 5 minutes in support of her motion.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, this motion is the last opportunity to amend the bill, and it does so without delay in passage.

We all agree that PFAS chemicals that present health risks to the public should be cleaned up as quickly as possible, but it should be done according to the best available science.

The majority often likes to claim that they are the party of science. Unfortunately, this bill ignores science and facts for scoring political talking points by grouping together an entire class of PFAS chemicals. Some of these chemicals are essential to life-saving medical devices; others provide for cutting-edge technologies in aerospace that are critical to our national security.

By ignoring scientific evidence, this bill would kill innovations that could help further lift people's standard of living and save lives.

I understand and share frustrations for slow cleanup of the dangerous PFAS chemicals. In my own district, Fairchild Air Force Base and Airway Heights, Washington, are dealing with PFAS. However, we just passed bipartisan legislation based on science

through the NDAA that will ensure that affected communities are cleaned up quickly. This bill would ignore those efforts.

It is unprecedented that Congress would unilaterally classify chemicals under CERCLA. By doing so, Congress will designate communities like Airway Heights a Superfund site, significantly harming their ability to attract new investments and hurting property values.

Instead of trying to score political points, we should be proud of the bipartisan achievement of the NDAA and continue to work to clean up our communities and get results.

This amendment is a good faith effort to improve this legislation in a way that enhances its efforts to protect all Americans from harmful chemicals.

Section 5 of H.R. 535 seeks to guarantee protection of vulnerable populations from potential PFAS dangers in their drinking waters. It states that the new rules “shall be protective of the health of subpopulations at greater risk.”

The Safe Drinking Water Act already identifies pregnant women as an at-risk group. However, there is not just one. When it comes to pregnant women who are at risk, there are two people at risk: the pregnant woman and the unborn child.

The science is clear. Technology today allows us to look inside the womb. We see the baby's development day by day, week by week. That person is the most vulnerable population that should be protected.

This motion to recommit is simple; it is clear; it is direct. It clarifies that the protection of vulnerable populations must include any unborn child.

Yesterday, Chairman PALLONE recognized the potential harm these chemicals can have on child development. Today, Speaker PELOSI reiterated the importance of protecting expectant mothers. By rejecting this amendment, you would be further denying the science of the development of a child in the womb.

This motion is consistent with policy that EPA itself has employed: considering the impact of chemical exposures to babies in the womb. For example, in 2011, the EPA, under President Obama, decided to regulate certain chemicals in drinking water based in part on the impacts to the in utero person.

Congress also passed bipartisan legislation, a law in 2004, the Unborn Victims of Violence Act, recognizing the personhood of an unborn child.

This motion makes a small but vital improvement to this bill. It is an improvement that is necessary to preserve the central goal of the bill's sponsors: protecting vulnerable populations.

If that is the majority's goal, then this amendment should be accepted. It does not strike or delay anything in the bill. It only clarifies what is considered a vulnerable population based

on the same language in the bipartisan 2004 act.

Most importantly, it protects the unborn child, something that I hope everyone in this room can agree should be one of our greatest priorities: to protect people before they are born and at every stage of their life.

I urge my colleagues to support science by supporting my motion to recommit.

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

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CLAY). The gentlewoman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I have great respect for my colleague, but I oppose this amendment because it is really nothing more than a political stunt.

This bill will protect communities across this country. The drinking water standard in this bill will be protective of the health of populations at greater risk, what we generally call vulnerable populations.

That requirement was opposed by the Republicans. Mr. SHIMKUS had an amendment to strike that provision of the bill. He opposed protecting vulnerable populations. I deeply respect my colleague, but he opposed it every step of the way; and yesterday, he withdrew that amendment.

If Republicans want to protect vulnerable populations, including pregnant women, infants, and children, they should support this bill.

Let's be very clear: PFAS is an urgent health and environmental threat, period, and no one can deny that.

The number of contamination sites, nationwide, is growing at an alarming rate, including our military bases—almost 400 military installations in this country.

Developed in the 1940s, PFAS is a forever chemical. It is in the blood of more than 99 percent of Americans. It poses potential health risks. We know it. EPA has known the risk for decades and allowed this contamination to spread.

EPA is not going to take care of this problem. Congress needs to act. The longer we wait, the worse the contamination becomes. The time is now to act on the PFAS Action Act. We have got to do it together. The American people count on us.

The bill is a strong and serious package, and it is supported by some Republicans. It will jump-start cleanups. It will get PFAS out of our drinking water. It will limit PFAS in the air. It will limit PFAS in our rivers and streams. It will drive and require comprehensive testing for PFAS, and it will give our first responders and consumers tools to protect themselves.

I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on this motion to recommit and urge Members to support the underlining bill so we can work together to enact laws that protect the American people.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 5-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by a 5-minute vote on passage of the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 187, noes 219, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 12]

AYES—187

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

NOES—219

Adams	Garcia (TX)	Omar
Aguilar	Golden	Pallone
Allred	Gomez	Panetta
Axne	Gonzalez (TX)	Pappas
Barragán	Gottheimer	Pascarella
Bass	Green, Al (TX)	Perlmutter
Beatty	Grijalva	Peters
Bera	Haaland	Phillips
Beyer	Harder (CA)	Pingree
Bishop (GA)	Hastings	Pocan
Blumenauer	Hayes	Porter
Blunt Rochester	Heck	Pressley
Bonamici	Higgins (NY)	Price (NC)
Boyle, Brendan	Himes	Quigley
F.	Horn, Kendra S.	Raskin
Brindisi	Horsford	Rice (NY)
Brown (MD)	Houlihan	Richmond
Brownley (CA)	Hoyer	Rose (NY)
Bustos	Huffman	Rouda
Butterfield	Jackson Lee	Roybal-Allard
Carbajal	Jayapal	Ruiz
Cárdenas	Jeffries	Ruppersberger
Carson (IN)	Johnson (GA)	Rush
Cartwright	Johnson (TX)	Ryan
Case	Kaptur	Sánchez
Casten (IL)	Keating	Sarbanes
Castor (FL)	Kelly (IL)	Scanlon
Castro (TX)	Kennedy	Schakowsky
Chu, Judy	Khanna	Schiff
Cicilline	Kildee	Schneider
Cisneros	Kilmer	Schrader
Clark (MA)	Kim	Schrier
Clarke (NY)	Krishnamoorthi	Scott (VA)
Clay	Kuster (NH)	Scott, David
Cleaver	Lamb	Sewell (AL)
Clyburn	Langevin	Shalala
Cohen	Larsen (WA)	Sherman
Connolly	Larson (CT)	Sherrill
Cooper	Lawrence	Sires
Correa	Lawson (FL)	Slotkin
Costa	Lee (CA)	Smith (WA)
Courtney	Lee (NV)	Soto
Cox (CA)	Levin (CA)	Spanberger
Craig	Levin (MI)	Speier
Crist	Lieu, Ted	Stanton
Crow	Loebach	Stevens
Cunningham	Lofgren	Suozi
Davids (KS)	Lowenthal	Swalwell (CA)
Davis (CA)	Lowe	Takano
Davis, Danny K.	Lujan	Thompson (CA)
Dean	Luria	Thompson (MS)
DeFazio	Lynch	Titus
DeGette	Malinowski	Tlaib
DeLauro	Maloney	Tonko
DelBene	Carolyn B.	Torres (CA)
Delgado	Maloney, Sean	Torres Small
Demings	Matsui	(NM)
DeSaulnier	McBath	Trahan
Deutch	McCollum	Trone
Dingell	McEachin	Underwood
Doggett	McGovern	Vargas
Doyle, Michael	McNerney	Veasey
F.	Meeks	Vela
Engel	Meng	Velázquez
Escobar	Moore	Visclosky
Eshoo	Morelle	Wasserman
Espallat	Moulton	Schultz
Finkenauer	Mucarsel-Powell	Waters
Fletcher	Murphy (FL)	Watson Coleman
Foster	Napolitano	Welch
Frankel	Neal	Wexton
Fudge	Neguse	Wild
Galleo	Norcross	Wilson (FL)
Garamendi	O'Halleran	Yarmuth
Garcia (IL)	Ocasio-Cortez	

NOT VOTING—24

Aderholt	Gohmert	Meuser
Brady	Granger	Nader
Buchanan	Hunter	Payne
Carter (TX)	Kind	Serrano
Crawford	Kirkpatrick	Simpson
Evans	Lewis	Smucker
Fitzpatrick	Loudermilk	Thompson (PA)
Gabbard	Marchant	Walker

□ 1105

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

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 passage of the bill.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 247, nays 159, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 13]

YEAS—247

Adams	Gomez	Ocasio-Cortez
Aguilar	Gonzalez (TX)	Omar
Allred	Gottheimer	Pallone
Axne	Green, Al (TX)	Panetta
Barragan	Grijalva	Pappas
Bass	Haaland	Pascarella
Beatty	Harder (CA)	Perlmutter
Bera	Hastings	Peters
Beyer	Hayes	Peterson
Bishop (GA)	Heck	Phillips
Blumenauer	Herrera Beutler	Pingree
Blunt Rochester	Higgins (NY)	Pocan
Bonamici	Himes	Porter
Boyle, Brendan	Holding	Posey
F.	Horn, Kendra S.	Pressley
Brindisi	Horsford	Price (NC)
Brown (MD)	Houlihan	Quigley
Brownley (CA)	Hoyer	Raskin
Bustos	Hudson	Reed
Butterfield	Huffman	Rice (NY)
Carbajal	Huizenga	Richmond
Cárdenas	Hurd (TX)	Rooney (FL)
Carson (IN)	Jackson Lee	Rose (NY)
Cartwright	Jayapal	Rouda
Case	Jeffries	Rouzer
Casten (IL)	Johnson (GA)	Roybal-Allard
Castor (FL)	Johnson (TX)	Ruiz
Castro (TX)	Kaptur	Ruppersberger
Chu, Judy	Katko	Rush
Cicilline	Keating	Ryan
Cisneros	Kelly (IL)	Sánchez
Clark (MA)	Kennedy	Sarbanes
Clarke (NY)	Khanna	Scanlon
Clay	Kildee	Schakowsky
Cleaver	Kilmer	Schiff
Clyburn	Kim	Schneider
Cohen	King (NY)	Schrader
Connolly	Krishnamoorthi	Schrier
Cook	Kuster (NH)	Scott (VA)
Cooper	Lamb	Scott, David
Correa	Langevin	Sewell (AL)
Costa	Larsen (WA)	Shalala
Courtney	Larson (CT)	Sherman
Cox (CA)	Lawrence	Sherill
Craig	Lawson (FL)	Sires
Crist	Lee (CA)	Slotkin
Crow	Lee (NV)	Smith (NJ)
Cuellar	Levin (CA)	Smith (WA)
Cunningham	Levin (MI)	Soto
Davids (KS)	Lieu, Ted	Spanberger
Davis (CA)	Lipinski	Speier
Davis, Danny K.	Loebach	Stanton
Dean	Lofgren	Stefanik
DeFazio	Lowenthal	Stevens
DeGette	Lowe	Stivers
DeLauro	Lujan	Suozy
DelBene	Luria	Swalwell (CA)
Delgado	Lynch	Takano
Demings	Malinowski	Thompson (CA)
DeSaulnier	Maloney	Thompson (MS)
Deutch	Carolyn B.	Titus
Dingell	Maloney, Sean	Tlaib
Doggett	Mast	Tonko
Doyle, Michael	Matsui	Torres (CA)
F.	McBath	Torres Small
Engel	McCollum	(NM)
Escobar	McEachin	Trahan
Eshoo	McGovern	Trone
Espallat	McKinley	Turner
Finkenauer	McNerney	Underwood
Fletcher	Meeks	Upton
Fortenberry	Meng	Van Drew
Foster	Moore	Vargas
Frankel	Morelle	Veasey
Fudge	Moulton	Vela
Gabbard	Mucarsel-Powell	Velázquez
Gallagher	Murphy (FL)	Visclosky
Galleo	Napolitano	Wasserman
Garamendi	Neal	Schultz
Garcia (IL)	Neguse	Waters
Garcia (TX)	Norcross	Watson Coleman
Golden	O'Halleran	Welch

Wexton
Wild

Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

Young
Zeldin

NAYS—159

Abraham	Gibbs	Murphy (NC)
Allen	Gonzalez (OH)	Newhouse
Amash	Gooden	Norman
Amodei	Gosar	Nunes
Armstrong	Graves (GA)	Olson
Arrington	Graves (LA)	Palazzo
Babin	Graves (MO)	Palmer
Bacon	Green (TN)	Pence
Baird	Griffith	Perry
Balderson	Grothman	Ratcliffe
Banks	Guest	Reschenthaler
Barr	Guthrie	Rice (SC)
Bergman	Hagedorn	Riggleman
Biggs	Harris	Roby
Billirakis	Hartzler	Rodgers (WA)
Bishop (NC)	Hern, Kevin	Roe, David P.
Bishop (UT)	Hice (GA)	Rogers (AL)
Bost	Higgins (LA)	Rogers (KY)
Brooks (AL)	Hill (AR)	Rose, John W.
Brooks (IN)	Hollingsworth	Roy
Buck	Johnson (LA)	Rutherford
Bucshon	Johnson (OH)	Scalise
Budd	Johnson (SD)	Schweikert
Burchett	Jordan	Scott, Austin
Burgess	Joyce (OH)	Sensenbrenner
Byrne	Joyce (PA)	Shimkus
Calvert	Keller	Smith (MO)
Carter (GA)	Kelly (MS)	Smith (NE)
Chabot	Kelly (PA)	Spano
Cheney	King (IA)	Staubert
Cline	Kinzing	Steil
Cloud	Kustoff (TN)	Steube
Cole	LaHood	Stewart
Collins (GA)	LaMalfa	Taylor
Comer	Lamborn	Thornberry
Conaway	Latta	Timmons
Crenshaw	Lesko	Tipton
Curtis	Long	Wagner
Davidson (OH)	Lucas	Walberg
Davis, Rodney	Luetkemeyer	Walden
DesJarlais	Marshall	Walorski
Diaz-Balart	Massie	Waltz
Duncan	McAdams	Watkins
Dunn	McCarthy	Weber (TX)
Emmer	McCaul	Wenstrup
Estes	McClintock	Westerman
Ferguson	McHenry	Williams
Fleischmann	Meadows	Wilson (SC)
Flores	Miller	Wittman
Foxx (NC)	Mitchell	Womack
Fulcher	Moolenaar	Woodall
Gaetz	Mooney (WV)	Wright
Gianforte	Mullin	Yoho

NOT VOTING—24

Aderholt	Granger	Nadler
Brady	Hunter	Payne
Buchanan	Kind	Serrano
Carter (TX)	Kirkpatrick	Simpson
Crawford	Lewis	Smucker
Evans	Loudermilk	Thompson (PA)
Fitzpatrick	Marchant	Walker
Gohmert	Meuser	Webster (FL)

□ 1119

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. BRADY. Mr. Speaker, due to unforeseen circumstances, I could not attend the vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 13.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I was absent today due to a medical emergency. Had I been present, I would have voted: "no" on rollcall No. 9, "no" on rollcall No. 10, "yea" on rollcall No. 11, "no" on rollcall No. 12, and "yea" on rollcall No. 13.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. SMUCKER. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 9, "yea" on rollcall No. 10, "nay" on rollcall No. 11, "yea" on rollcall No. 12, and "nay" on rollcall No. 13.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, for personal reasons, I was unable to vote today. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 5—Prev. Question, "nay" on rollcall No. 6—H. Res. 781, "nay" on rollcall No. 7—H. Con. Res. 83, "yea" on rollcall No. 8—H.R. 5078, "yea" on rollcall No. 9—Burgess of Texas Part B Amdt. 2, "yea" on rollcall No. 10—Balderson of OH Part B Amdt. 6, "nay" on rollcall No. 11—Pappas of NH Part B Amdt. 13, "yea" on rollcall No. 12—MTR, and "nay" on rollcall No. 13—H.R. 535.

ADJOURNMENT FROM FRIDAY, JANUARY 10, 2020, TO MONDAY, JANUARY 13, 2020

Mr. HOYER. Mr. 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 (Mr. HARDER of California). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

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. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of inquiring of the majority leader the schedule for the week to come, and I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

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

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

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

On Thursday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business, with last votes of the week expected no later than 3 p.m.

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

The House will consider H.R. 1230, the Protect Older Workers Against Discrimination Act. This bill ensures that victims of age discrimination in the workplace can enforce their rights so that older Americans are able to strengthen our economy by continuing to contribute their talents to the workforce, a proposition that I personally believe is very important.

In addition, the House will consider H.J. Res. 76, a Congressional Review Act resolution of disapproval of the Department of Education's borrower defense to repayment rule that leaves student loan borrowers who were defrauded by their educational institutions with little or no recourse.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the majority leader going

through those bills. There were a few bills that the Speaker had referenced earlier this week that would also be considered. Congresswoman LEE's resolution to repeal the 2002 AUMF, and there was also some legislation by Congressman KHANNA that would eliminate the ability for the administration to use certain funds related to Iran.

I wanted to ask if those two bills were going to be part of that package for next week, and I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. That is a possibility, but they have not yet been scheduled.

Mr. SCALISE. As it relates to the War Powers Act, obviously, we had a heated debate on the floor yesterday.

We have had a robust debate for years in this House on whether or not to modify and make changes to the 2002 AUMF. It has been a constant debate.

There has been a lack of an ability to form consensus, clearly, on both sides. I know the gentleman is aware there are a number of Members on our side who have brought up this issue before, as well as Members on your side.

Yesterday, we were literally in the middle of a crisis. We had just taken out one of the worst and most brutal terrorists that we have seen, in Soleimani. I haven't seen a lot of disagreement that he was a brutal terrorist. The Obama administration designated him as the head of a terrorist organization, and he was in violation of international law that prohibited him from being in Iraq.

In the time of crisis, instead of having a conversation separate from that on actual changes to the AUMF, if that is where my friend's majority would like to go—clearly, again, on our side, there were people who were interested in having that debate. It was disappointing that, instead, we went into what turned out to be more of an effort to take a cheap shot at the administration by bringing a resolution that had absolutely no effect of law.

If the AUMF is going to be changed, it has to be an act of Congress. I know the gentleman is aware of that. On our side, we are aware of that, too. Instead of trying to engage in that kind of conversation, debate, and negotiation, it was just a resolution that everyone recognizes would not have made any changes to the AUMF.

Why, during this time that we are in right now, was that the path to go, as opposed to trying to have a sincere debate on whether or not real changes to the AUMF should take place?

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

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

As to the issue of authorizations of military force consistent with the War Powers Act and consistent with the Constitution of the United States, which sets forth clearly that it is the Congress and only the Congress that can declare war, we believed and still believe it was necessary to move as quickly as possible to clarify that the

expectation of the Congress of the United States is that it would be included in any conversation, discussion, and debate with reference to whether or not we ought to take an act of war.

Without getting into the complexities, I would call your attention to an extraordinarily good article that was in today's paper by Jim Webb, the former Secretary of the Navy and a Navy Cross awardee who fought in Vietnam and who served in the United States Senate, with reference to whether or not legally the action that was taken by the President was justified.

□ 1130

Let me say something, Mr. Speaker. I would hope this debate—and I said this yesterday during the course of the debate—would not descend into demagoguery.

I was very disappointed with a remark that was made by one of the Republican Members of this House when he said, they are “in love with terrorists,” referring to the Democrats, presumably, who were proponents of assuring that the War Powers Act would be honored by the President and with the constitutional requirement that we are the ones, and only ones, who declare war. Not one of us loves terrorists.

He went on to say: “We see that they mourn Soleimani more than they mourn our Gold Star families.”

Now, that is interesting from, frankly, a member of a party whose President criticized very, very sharply and directly a Gold Star family, the Khans. It is ironic coming from a party whose President—our President, but of the Republican Party—said he didn't respect John McCain, one of America's great war heroes, who showed such courage.

So my point to the gentleman is that I would hope—Proverbs 19:5 says this: “A false witness will not go unpunished, and he who speaks lies will not escape.”

I would hope the gentleman that uttered these comments would apologize to every Member of this side of the aisle. The gentleman correctly, just now, I thought, made a very calm and correct statement with respect to that we ought to have a substantive debate.

I have criticized this Congress, others have criticized this Congress, from both sides of the aisle, for not, over the last 30 years, passing Authorizations for Use of Military Force. The last one we did, of course, was in 2001 and 2002.

The gentleman asked whether those bills may come to the floor. We voted on them, as you know, previously. Those amendments passed. They were in the National Defense Authorization Act to directly address the issue of authorization of military forces and the expenditures of funds in military action. Nobody laments the loss of Mr. Soleimani, who did, in fact, not only plan, but execute and fund terrorist actions that resulted in the loss of American life.

Having said that does not absolve us from the responsibility for policies which are akin to or are acts of war. Without going further into that, let me refer to what we did yesterday, and let me read from this War Powers Act, Mr. Speaker.

Congressional Action, paragraph (c): “Concurrent resolution for removal by President of United States Armed Forces.

“Notwithstanding subsection (b), at any time that United States 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 by concurrent resolution.”

That is what we passed yesterday. Many Republicans, Mr. Speaker, said, well, this is an act that has no consequence. I would hope that none of us believes that the expression of opinion by the Congress of the United States by majority vote in each House has no consequence. If that is the case, we are in a bad time in our democracy.

So, what we did yesterday was consistent with section (c) of section 1544 regarding congressional action, and it is exactly what we did yesterday.

It will go to the Senate. It will have, as we understand from the Parliamentarians in the Senate, privileged status, meaning that the Senate will have to consider that, and also meaning that it can be passed or defeated by a majority vote.

This is a serious time. Taking the kind of military action we took was a serious step. Many of us were not very pleased with the lack of substantive information that we received at the briefing this week. Obviously, many Members of the United States Senate were not pleased as well.

So I would say to my friend, Mr. Speaker, it is important that this body, confronted with one of its most important and serious and consequential decisions—that is, the declaration of war and military action against another nation—that it be debated seriously without pejoratives being projected at either side, without invective similar to the one that I just read, and without the aspersions that somehow, if you believe the Constitution of the United States requires the Congress to act before we can take actions of war, that somehow that implies that you are in bed with or temporizing about or favorable to those who commit terror.

That is a McCarthy tactic. It is highly offensive. And, if said on this floor, would be subject to the words being taken down and the Member not being allowed to speak again on this floor during that day.

Mr. Speaker, let me, in closing on this response, simply say to the Republican whip that I agree with his premise that we ought to have a careful, adult, substantive discussion about policies that may plunge this Nation into war. That is our duty. That is what our citizens expect of us.

I think we had that yesterday. Strike that. I think in some instances we had a serious discussion, but in some instances there was too much invective that we were giving aid and comfort to terrorists.

That is a slippery slope if we cannot discuss what posture the United States ought to be in and exercise our constitutional duties to decide whether this Nation ought to go to war with a foreign country, with another nation. Hopefully, we can have that in the future, because it is one of the most consequential debates that this body ever has.

Mr. Speaker, I will tell the gentleman, again, that we may be taking up additional legislation consistent with the War Powers Act. I believe the Senate, hopefully, will, next week or—at the latest, I think they have 15 days or 10 days to consider it and put it on the Senate floor for a vote so that we can transmit to the President of the United States Congress' view on how carefully we ought to approach these issues.

Very frankly—I will say, sadly—there is much sentiment on this side of the aisle that the Commander in Chief does not address these issues carefully and thoughtfully and in concert with his advisers and the advisers in the Congress of the United States. We had no consultation. We didn't even have a notice, much less consultation of this action.

No one, I would close with, laments the loss of a life who has sponsored, funded, and advocated terrorism. But this is not about him. It is about us. It is about our Constitution. It is about our responsibility. It is about how these decisions ought to be made.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, to start with, the comment that the gentleman referenced on the floor yesterday, I will read from a statement from the gentleman who made that comment yesterday: "Let me be clear: I do not believe Democrats are in love with terrorists, and I apologize for what I said earlier this week."

So the gentleman has apologized for that statement.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that, and I thank the gentleman for calling that to my attention.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I point that out and that that not be used for any kind of justification for the other disagreements and issues and concerns we had with what happened on the floor yesterday.

Frankly, there were statements made on the gentleman's side as well that I think ought to be addressed, apologized for.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would call my attention to those statements and the speakers of those, I would be happy to oblige and talk to them.

I really do believe, Mr. Speaker, this issue should be handled in the most responsible and respectful way possible, because it is one of the most serious, if

not the most serious, issues with which we will deal. And we ought to deal with one another based upon the intellectual arguments, the constitutional premises, and the law, not on personalities or assertions of malintent.

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

First of all, to start with, it is the President's not just authority, but it is the President's responsibility under the Constitution as our Commander in Chief to keep this country safe. President Trump has made it very clear that he is going to protect this country from terrorists or people who want to do us harm domestically or abroad.

In the case of Soleimani, there was a redline issued a long time ago.

I know, in the past, previous administrations have issued redlines and then let those lines be blown through without taking any action, and I would argue that makes our country less safe when people don't think we are going to back up our words with actions as not just the greatest military force in the world, but the greatest defender of freedom throughout the world, anyone who seeks freedom, including people in Iran who seek freedom today from this oppressive regime.

They have one place they can look to, and that is the United States of America. That is what makes us such a great nation is that we don't shed our blood to conquer more land; we shed our blood to keep people safe, not just here in America, but to provide freedom all around the world to anyone who seeks it.

The fact that President Trump maintained a redline that was crossed is something we all should applaud.

And I would say this. You can go back to when President Obama was in office and Osama bin Laden had been the number one target of this country since the September 11 attacks, and President Obama made the decision. It was his call to take out bin Laden when they thought—they weren't positive, but they thought—they might have a real intelligence understanding of where he was. And the President made that call.

We had a lot of disagreements with President Obama during that time on policy, but we applauded that decision. We united behind that decision because it was the right thing to do to take out a terrorist who had been a major threat to our country.

By the same token, I understand that your side has a lot of differences with the President. I just wish in a time like that, when everyone acknowledges how brutal a terrorist he was and he crossed a redline—he was in Iraq plotting to kill more Americans. We don't have to wonder if he was going to do it, because he has a decades-long history of killing Americans. The blood of hundreds of our men and women in uniform were on his hands, and no one disputes it.

And so he is taken out by a call that I think is the right call by our President to take him out in Iraq, which the

2002 AUMF gives him the authority to do, the Constitution gives him the authority to do.

Again, if there are some that didn't want the President to have that legal authority, that debate should happen here under the guise of changing the law, but the law gives the President that authority. Congress gave that authority to the President in 2002. I wasn't here. I know the gentleman was. It was heavily debated.

□ 1145

But ultimately, that law was passed, and that law is still on the books today. If there is a desire to change the law, that debate should happen, not through a resolution in the middle of this conflict, where missiles are being fired back and forth, but where we can actually talk about changing the law in a responsible way that focuses on the longer-term objective; not just to try to undermine the President in the middle of him acting out his duties as Commander in Chief under the Constitution and under all legal authority.

There are Obama administration officials, multiple Obama administration officials who, just in the last few days, very publicly said that President Trump had the full legal authority to take the action he did.

Now, we can debate whether or not you think he should have done it. I think he should have. I am glad that Soleimani is no longer on this planet plotting to kill more Americans, which is what he was doing illegally in Iraq. And that, ultimately, is something that we can debate.

But a lot of us felt it was inappropriate to be bringing a resolution, not to change the War Powers Act, not to have this serious discussion about whether or not the 2002 AUMF should still be in place as it was; but to just take a cheap political shot at the President in the middle of this.

There was a Presidential candidate just yesterday, Democrat Presidential Candidate, a major candidate for President, who said innocent civilians are now dead because they were caught in the middle of an unnecessary and unwarranted military tit-for-tat.

So, in essence, equating the killing of one of the most brutal terrorists, who killed hundreds of Americans, and plotting to kill more, equating that to Iran shooting down an airplane and another 176 people dead because of Iran's actions, the two of those are not on the same level.

Those kinds of comments are unnecessary as well. I am not sure what is unwarranted about taking out Soleimani, if that is what he is suggesting, and others have suggested it too.

So, again, we can have that disagreement. But the legislation was not only untimely, but it wouldn't even achieve the purpose that many on both sides of the aisle would like to see, and that is a real discussion about whether the War Powers Act operates properly.

Frankly, there are many scholars who suggest the War Powers Act may be unconstitutional. We have never challenged it in the courts. On a number of fronts there were times when President Obama took action, many times, using drone strikes, using other attacks, where he never notified us.

I surely wasn't notified in advance of the Bin Laden killing. I am not sure if the gentleman from Maryland was notified by President Obama in advance of the Bin Laden killing, and I am okay with that. I don't think the President needed to get permission. He notified us afterwards, which is what the law requires, by the way. The law does require notification after.

I think it would be irresponsible to require the President to notify Congress prior to the taking out of a terrorist every time they are trying to take out a terrorist.

Again, President Obama used that authority multiple times to take out terrorists without prior notification of Congress, but clearly meeting other legal requirements along the way. If those legal requirements should be changed, let's have that debate.

I haven't seen that legislation come forward. Maybe the gentleman is going to bring the legislation to the floor next week that would repeal the AUMF. I think that would be an unwise move to do, but let's have that debate, if that is where the majority wants to go. But yesterday wasn't that debate because it wasn't a change of law.

A 1983 U.S. Supreme Court decision made it clear that measures do not have the force of law unless they are formally presented to the President; and we all know that that, even if it were to pass the Senate, which I doubt highly it would, it doesn't go to the President. It doesn't change the law.

So typically, when we have conflicts like this, Congress comes together behind our Commander in Chief to stand up for America against terrorists. A lot of us felt that that wasn't the case yesterday, it was disappointing.

Again, the gentleman from Georgia made his comments apologizing for that comment he made, but in the broader context of what happened yesterday, it was just disappointing that, instead of having a sincere debate about whether the 2002 AUMF should stay in place as is or be changed, which is a longer negotiation; that resolution just took a swipe at the President and tried to limit his ability. I mean, literally language that says directing the President to do certain things is disingenuous when the resolution doesn't have the effect of law.

You can't direct the President to do something. You can't call him on the phone and say I direct you to do something. You could pass a law to direct him to do something, but that is not what happened yesterday, and that is the point and the concern.

Again, as the gentleman knows, there is strong interest on both sides to revisit, maybe to keep it in place. But

the 2002 AUMF has been a topic of conversation for a long time and will continue to be one.

But if there is going to be a sincere effort to change it and a desire to change it, then it ought to happen through the proper course of legislation, and that wasn't what happened yesterday.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Simply to focus on the RECORD and to make clear the RECORD, the 2002 Authorization for Use of Military Force to which the gentleman refers authorizes the use of force: One, to defend against Iraq, not Iran; and two, to enforce United Nations Security Council resolutions regarding Iraq.

For counsel or the administration to argue that the 2002 Authorization for Use of Military Force authorized the action that was taken, I think, is incorrect. That is what they do argue. It hasn't been resolved by a court, but I believe, and I think many on my side of the aisle and, frankly, I think many scholars around the country have opined, that the 2002 authorization did not authorize that particular act.

Again, no one laments the loss of Soleimani. Everybody agrees that he sponsored, paid for and ordered committed acts of terrorism. And we will continue to believe that the Congress needs to speak.

Whether or not a court would hold that the section that I just read with reference to the President would have to take action in the event that the Senate and the House adopt the concurrent resolution that we passed yesterday, and that is now at the Senate and under the War Powers Act will have to be considered by the Senate, and will be subject to a majority vote, not a 60-vote threshold for passage.

I would hope that if Congress did that, that the President would certainly take that into consideration and consult with the Congress on any further action that he might take; unless, of course, and as the War Powers Act authorizes, the President can and should, and the military can and should take any actions necessary to defend itself in the face of imminent threat and/or actual threat.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, finally, to talk about where we are on the impeachment resolution that was passed last year, at the end of last year by the House. Ultimately, it is typically an administrative duty to send papers over to the Senate if legislation passes, obviously impeachment managers would then need to be named.

There is breaking news that the Speaker is announcing that she has asked Chairman NADLER to be prepared to bring impeachment managers to the floor next week. I am not sure if that is ongoing, or if that is something that had already been in the works.

But does the gentleman expect that legislation to come to the floor next

week? And does that mean that the papers either have been transmitted to the Senate or would be transmitted to the Senate within the next few days?

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, in answer to the gentleman's question, the expectation is that we will have, consistent with the letter just sent to all of our Members, and instructions to Mr. NADLER, or suggestions to Mr. NADLER, we do expect there to be legislation on the floor next week with reference to what we call supplemental legislation for the appointment of managers, the funding of the effort. And we expect the papers will be sent sometime soon.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, of course we have been seeing a chorus of Democrat Senators in the recent days expressing concern that the papers should be sent over. Obviously, on our side, we felt that there was no case, there was no crime, and it was clear I think in so many areas of this.

But ultimately, if the House passes legislation, any legislation, whether the Speaker voted for it or against it, it is not some power of the Speaker, exclusively and dictatorially, to hold onto that if the Speaker doesn't want to send it to the Senate. Ultimately, for the ability to function as a legislative body, if the House passes legislation, it goes to the Senate so that the Senate can take it up and do whatever they are going to do with it.

But this idea that one person out of 435 can make a decision that even if the House passes legislation and the motion to reconsider is tabled, then it goes to the Senate.

Hopefully, that is resolved by next week and that charade ends, and we finally get true justice where it is disposed of, which I think everybody acknowledges that will happen once it goes over to the Senate.

But let us get back to the business of doing the people's work. And hopefully, we can then get to some of the broader bipartisan legislation that has been in the works for a long time to address real issues like lowering drug prices, like securing our border, like so many other things that Republicans and Democrats actually in the middle of all of this are working on together to try to accomplish.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

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

As the gentleman knows, of course, we have 275 bipartisan bills which have been sent from the House to the Senate involving very, very serious issues, dealing with the environment, dealing with wages, and dealing with jobs, dealing with making our communities safer, dealing with violence against women, dealing with equal pay for equal work, which was something that John Kennedy signed in 1963, but is, today, not a reality, unfortunately. So there are many issues I could name. Obviously, a lot more, because there

are 275 and we sent over 400 bills to the Senate and they sit untended.

Why? Because the Senate has been confirming judges.

Why? So they can put in judges that agree with their positions. That is the irony of a party that was so intent, in my political life, in making sure that judges acted only on the law. What philosophical imprimatur has to be given to judicial appointments nowadays? And by a majority leader who refused a President of the United States who submitted a nominee, Mr. Garland, for 11 months.

It is inconceivable to me that any Founding Father thought, for 11 months—now, it has been a few days since we passed impeachment that we have sent those papers up.

For 11 months, a President of the United States, pursuant to his constitutional authority and responsibility, sent a nominee to the United States Senate; 11 months before the election. And the majority leader said, tough. We are not going to consider it. We are not going to allow the committee to consider it. We are not going to allow it to be reported out to the floor and there is going to be no vote on it.

So, yes, there has been some delay, because in that context and in the context of the majority leader working hand-in-glove with the defendant, or the respondent, however you want to call it, in a civil case, criminal case, hand-in-glove.

By his own admission he was not going to do anything that the President didn't want him to do. It is like the prosecutor saying—or the juror saying, I am not going to do anything that the defendant doesn't want me to do.

So, yes, we have been very concerned, and are concerned to this day. An honest trial—and that is what is the responsibility of the United States Senate. An honest trial tries to elicit from both sides all of the relevant evidence.

We are concerned that it appears that the Senate, certainly at this juncture has made no decision to receive all the relevant evidence. We think that is inconsistent with their responsibilities under the Senate rules and to the American people. We lament that fact and we have been trying to get from the Senate what are the rules?

Mr. Speaker, the other side talked a lot about process, about how they needed to have this avenue, that avenue, and the other. That is all we were asking because this is the trial, not the time when you have, essentially, a grand jury deciding whether or not there is probable cause that the President of the United States has abused his power.

□ 1200

That is especially what our role is, as an analogy to a criminal case. But there was no expression from the Senate that a normal process to determine the truth of the allegation was going to

be pursued in the United States Senate.

The Speaker simply wanted to have that assurance. We have not gotten it. The American people have not gotten it.

What has happened since we passed that resolution? A number of people have come forward. Mr. Bolton, in particular, said that he will testify. Other people have been identified as having relevant, pertinent, firsthand knowledge, not hearsay, firsthand knowledge of the allegations that are included in the Articles of Impeachment I and II.

I am hopeful that, in fact, the Senate, both Republicans and Democrats, will come to an agreement that all the fact witnesses will raise their hand to tell the whole truth and nothing but the truth.

The Senate is going to raise their hand under Senate rules and say they swear to be impartial in consideration of the evidence, yet they will not allow the evidence, apparently, at this point in time at least, to be elucidated. I am hopeful that changes.

I expect, as I said earlier, Mr. Speaker, to the Republican whip, that those papers will be transferred in the near term. I don't know specifically when but in the near term to the Senate.

I am hopeful the American people will get what they deserve from the United States Senate serving as essentially jurors and will be sworn in as such by the Chief Justice, not by the Vice President presiding over the Senate but the Chief Justice presiding over a quasi-legal, quasi-political process.

I will tell my friend that a letter has been sent. I do expect legislation to be considered next week, which is necessary to proceed with the process. I hope the process proceeds, Mr. Speaker, in a judicial, fair way that allows all the evidence on both sides, from the President's side and the House's side, which will carry the argument justifying the Articles of Impeachment and the finding of fact that those articles are, in fact, worthy of having the President of the United States removed for abuse of power.

That is the issue. It ought to be argued fairly on both sides, and the evidence ought to be adduced on both sides.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, it is interesting that the gentleman talks about fairness in the trial. It is quite rich of the Speaker to call for fairness in the Senate when she denied fairness in the House.

You can look at House rules that require the minority gets a day of hearings on impeachment, and that rule was thrown out the window.

The gentleman said an honest trial tries to elicit all the evidence. Of course, we had multiple witnesses we wanted to bring forward that were denied. Clearly, all the evidence didn't get out.

I guess, by definition, it was not an honest trial in the House. I am confident they will have an honest and fair

trial in the Senate. In fact, there are negotiations to make sure it will be fair.

By the way, I want to make this point because when the impeachment proceedings were moving forward with President Nixon, it was a Democratic Congress that negotiated with the Nixon administration, with the Nixon White House, to determine a fair set of rules, and the House adopted those rules. That was a Democratic conference.

Then, fast forward to the Clinton impeachment where you had a Democratic President and a Republican House. The House negotiated with the White House to come up with fair rules. Ultimately, they adopted the Nixon standard because everybody agreed that was a fair process.

Whether or not you like the outcome is one thing, but it was a fair process. That never happened here. This House didn't make an effort to try to negotiate a fair set of rules with us in the minority or with the White House.

Again, House rules actually require a minority day of hearings, and that was broken and not allowed. We didn't get that minority day of hearings. We requested it multiple times to try to get some fairness to elicit facts from all sides, but we weren't given that opportunity.

The Senate now has a case that was sent over to them. By a lot of estimates, it is an inadequate case, and it is a weak case. I think the majority must acknowledge that, which is why they are holding the papers and hoping for more things, which is what this was all about anyway.

It seems like every week we would hear more rumors that, next week, the big witness is going to come out and everything is going to be exposed, and then that witness would testify under oath that, no, they didn't see a crime. But don't worry, next week, there is going to be another one.

This will go on forever. It is like a Groundhog Day of impeachment. At some point, I would hope the majority says enough is enough, that they will actually let the people of this country decide, which they will. It is going to be the people of the country that decide the President at the end of this year in the election.

This President, obviously, has a very strong case to make with what he has done to get this economy back on track, to rebuild this military, to protect America, to secure our border, and all the other things that he will have a case to make to the people.

Of course, the gentleman is going to have a nominee who is going to make their case, however far left that case will be. We will see through the primaries. But the people will, ultimately, make that decision.

Our job should be to focus on doing the work of the American people, and hopefully, that happens. The Senate is going to have their opportunity. I am confident they are going to have a fair

trial. I wish that would have been the case here in the House.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

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

First of all, the Constitution does not provide for a trial in the House of Representatives, period.

However, Mr. Speaker, the minority continues to make the analogy of what is done in the House: impeachment, analogous to an indictment, making a charge and determining that there is probable cause.

Secondly, in the Nixon administration, there was a Democratic Congress, and there was discussion back and forth. Guess what? The President's witnesses came forward.

What happened in this case? The President said nobody can testify to the Congress. I believe that was obstruction of justice, but that is for the Senate to decide—certainly, obstruction of the Congress.

In the Clinton administration, the same thing happened. Witnesses came forward, including, I believe, the Chief of Staff of the White House. So it was a very different situation.

In addition, in both the Nixon and Clinton administrations, the minority shoves aside the fact that there were special prosecutors that had depositions of all the witnesses and were available in the United States Senate at the time of the trial. So the Senate had full information.

Thirdly, the gentleman does not either remember or assert, Mr. Speaker, that the Judiciary Committee said to the White House counsel that you can participate. There is time for you to come down. There is time for you to call witnesses. There is time for you to make your case. Mr. Cipollone, the White House counsel, notified the committee they were not interested. Why were they not interested? Because, in my opinion, their expectation is they were going to go to the Senate and have the case dismissed without any evidence being adduced.

Mr. Speaker, I think that is unfortunate, but those are the facts. That is what happened. If you make a further analogy of the grand jury, the defendant plays no role in the grand jury, none, zero, zip, no counsel, no witnesses in the room. The jury decides if there is probable cause to believe that X committed an offense worthy of going forward. That is what happens. There is no participation.

There was participation here. The President had opportunities here. All the Republicans participated and could cross-examine the witnesses that did, in fact, come forward in the Judiciary Committee, Oversight and Reform Committee, Intel Committee, Foreign Affairs Committee, and Financial Services Committee.

I would hope that would happen in the Senate. If you want to know the truth, Mr. Speaker, that is what ought to happen.

If it is just presenting information that is not relevant in this trial, i.e., "I did a good job on the economy. I did a good job on foreign policy. I did a good job on protecting our borders." That is the President's argument in a political sense. I understand that. But that is not legally relevant information as to whether or not he abused his power in particular in the phone call with the Ukrainians in which he withheld money appropriated by the Congress of the United States to help protect an ally, Ukraine, against incursion by Mr. Putin. I am sure Mr. Putin was very pleased that that money did not go to President Zelensky and the Ukrainian forces.

We think that was an abuse of power. My friend the Republican whip thinks it was not. I get that. That is what makes the world go around, differences of opinion.

It is now in the Senate. That is where a trial is provided for in the Congress. That is where witnesses should be provided. That is where both sides ought to be able to make their arguments before the jury, the United States Senate. Then and only then should the United States Senate make a determination whether or not the allegations had merit and warrant the consequences.

I tell my friend, when you make these analogies of what happened here in the House, it is done. The whip may think it is bad, Mr. Speaker. The whip may think it wasn't done correctly. But the proof in the pudding will be: Is he urging the Senate to do what everybody in America thinks of as a trial? That is what the Senate under the Constitution is: the trier of the facts and law, presided over by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States.

I would hope the gentleman would be urging as strenuously in the Senate, where trial and proper procedures should be followed, as they did here in the House.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, clearly, as the gentleman knows, it is the Senate's job to try the House's case. If the House failed to make its case, that is the House's fault. To suggest that the Senate needs to mop up the mess that was done here because there was not fairness, because both sides didn't get the opportunity, if one side wants to say, "I have a case to make. I am going make my case, but I am not going to let them make theirs, and I am not going to let them call their witnesses," and we had a long list of witnesses we wanted to call that we were denied.

You are in the majority. You get to make the rules. If that is what you want to call fair, you can, but it is not.

The Senate has it, but it was all done according to the majority out of urgency. That is the word we heard over and over again. If the gentleman wanted to have other people come to testify, the President and every President exerts executive privilege, so if the standard is a President exerting execu-

tive privilege equates to obstruction of Congress, then you would have to retroactively go back and impeach every President, including George Washington.

Exerting executive privilege is not an obstruction of Congress. Congress can have a disagreement with the President. We have surely had disagreements with previous Presidents exerting executive privilege when we were in the majority. You fight those out in the courts. The gentleman is well aware of that. Maybe the courts will say yes, and maybe the courts will say no, but that attempt wasn't made. Why? Because according to your own leader, Speaker PELOSI, "urgent"; Chairman SCHIFF, "The timing is driven by the urgency"; Chairman NADLER, "The threat is urgent." They rammed it through, and other facts and other witnesses that they didn't want, they discarded.

The actual rule of the House, clause 2(j)(1) of rule XI requires—not allows but requires—the minority to have a day of hearing. That was denied because there was urgency. They didn't want all the facts to get out. They were concerned about urgency.

Lo and behold, it passes, and all of a sudden, what happened to the urgency? The Speaker says we are going to hold the papers. You had Democratic Senators: I think it is time to send the impeachment to the Senate. Let MITCH MCCONNELL be responsible for the fairness of the trial. He ultimately is.

Other Senators said very similar things. At some point in time, if it was urgent and then it happened, and then you don't send it over because now all of a sudden you realize it is a weak case and you are hoping something else pops up, you are hoping maybe the Senate can do the things that weren't done here because it was an urgency, it was expediency, appeasing a political base.

□ 1215

There was no crime. Every other impeachment started with a crime, not the hope of a crime. You can listen to a phone call and suggest something.

Interestingly, I never saw any attempt to impeach President Obama because he didn't give that aid to Ukraine. If the aid was so important that it was impeachable not to give it, Obama didn't give it. We didn't try to impeach him. It was bad foreign policy that he didn't provide Javelin missiles to Ukraine. It wasn't impeachable.

But President Trump did give the aid, President Trump did sell the Javelin missiles to help Ukraine stand up to Putin.

President Obama didn't help Ukraine stand up to Putin. If that is who you are most concerned about, then maybe the impeachment would have been in the other direction.

But, again, that was bad foreign policy that President Obama didn't give Ukraine the tools that they asked for and were denied by the Obama administration, but it wasn't impeachable.

Here you might have a disagreement with President Trump's foreign policy. You might have a disagreement that he did sell the Javelin missiles, maybe you agreed with it. But ultimately the President did send that aid. There was no investigation and he sent the aid. But impeach him for it anyway because you disagree with other things. I think that became very clear.

At some point, if it is focused on personality, I think that is what people are most fed up with.

If there were facts, then both sides would have been able to present all of the evidence, both sides would have been able to call all of the witnesses.

If the majority had confidence in their case, they would have said, Okay. You can call your witnesses, because our witnesses are better. We have higher confidence in our case. But that didn't happen.

We were denied what the rules of the House requires: a minority day of hearing. We wanted it, we asked for it, the rules required it, but they blew through it, they threw that away.

That is not fairness. But the Senate will conduct a fair trial based on a weak case. If the case was stronger, regardless, the Senate's job is to try the case that was made in the House, whether it was a strong or a weak case, and that ought to happen. Justice is being denied every day it is not.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman, I don't know what analogy he is using to process, but what he just said would effectively say, if the witnesses weren't called and presented in the grand jury, then the defense attorney can't call them, then the prosecutor can't call them.

That is absolutely untrue. I could use a harsher word of how lacking in substance I think that representation is.

The Senate is now trying the case. The grand jury has sent the case over there strong enough to have a significant majority of the House vote for it, by the way, in a partisan sense, not a single Republican. Well, there was a single Republican. As a matter of fact, there are three or four who have talked to me privately—I will not mention their names—but they didn't vote, as they talked to me.

But the fact of the matter is, what the gentleman's proposition is is that if you didn't call the witnesses in the House, then you can't call them in the Senate.

Now, the reason for that is because they don't want the witnesses called, which is why the President told them, Don't testify in the House.

They were asked to testify. And what happened when we asked them to testify? No, you have to have a subpoena.

What happened when we had subpoenas when we talked to Mr. McGahn? He went to court. And when he lost, he appealed, and they were going to appeal to the Supreme Court. That takes forever.

The fact of the matter is there was certainly, from our perspective, overwhelming evidence, not that he withheld money, but the reason he withheld money.

Obviously in the cases cited by the minority whip, Congress had not appropriated and directed that money to be sent to Ukraine. And, in fact, President Obama gave significant aid. He didn't give them missiles, but he gave significant aid and assistance to the Ukrainians. But the fact of the matter is, we didn't direct him to send the money.

We directed this President to send the money. Why? As we have done before on Russian sanctions very early on with Mr. MCCARTHY and I cosponsoring legislation which directed the President to impose the sanctions on Russia because we weren't confident that he would do so on his own.

But the analogy that the gentleman continues to make as a rationalization for why the Senate does not appear to be going to have a fair, open trial-like, as the Constitution requires, with swearing to be impartial, meaning they want to get at the facts and make a judgment on the facts, he has not, Mr. Speaker, explained why he is not recommending the same fairness that he wanted to have here.

He wasn't in charge. He says he didn't get it. I get that. But they are in charge over there. And I would urge the minority whip to urge the majority leader to have a trial as we would expect to have a trial if either of us were under indictment. We would expect to be able to call witnesses, and we would understand that the prosecution would call such witnesses as they believe necessary and are relevant to the case.

That is a very important phrase I want to emphasize, "relevant to the case," because so many of the witnesses, like the whistleblower, who is protected by our laws that we have passed from being exposed to adverse actions, and the President says, Bring us the whistleblower. The Republicans say, Bring us the whistleblower. The whistleblower doesn't have any knowledge to testify on. They are correct: it was hearsay.

He heard from somebody that the guy down the street committed a crime. I didn't see it. He told me. So what do I do? I call up the police and say, Joe Doe told me a crime is being committed down the street. You better go see.

So I emphasize, Mr. Speaker, hopefully in closing, that we have passed—Republicans all voted "no," I get that. But the House of Representatives believed by a majority vote that we had made a case for probable cause. And under those circumstances, the Constitution says the Senate will then try that case to determine whether or not, in fact, the probable cause was accurate.

All we are asking is that it be done in a fair, open, and complete manner. Because there was no Special Prosecutor, there was no way to compel some of

those witnesses who refused to come testify, who now, John Bolton being the specific example, are saying, Yes, I will testify.

Personally, I don't believe that the Senate majority leader wants John Bolton to testify, but he clearly has firsthand knowledge, not the whistleblower, not somebody told me, but firsthand knowledge. By the way, when he heard about it, apparently he called it a drug deal.

So I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the whip will urge the Senate to do what he wanted done here, or perhaps take the position, they are wrong means we can be wrong. Maybe two wrongs will make a right. That is not the way we usually think of it, but I am hopeful that not only will the minority whip, the Republican whip do that, I hope the minority leader will do that. It would be good for the country.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman wants to talk about how the process works, I have made it clear. The gentleman is in the majority. They get to make the rules however they want.

But to say, as the gentleman said earlier, an honest trial tries to elicit all of the evidence, no one can make the argument that all of the evidence was presented.

Again, we called and asked for multiple witnesses and were denied. We were denied the ability to have the witnesses we asked for.

Now, they are in the majority. They said no, and they were able to roll over that because they had the votes. But don't say it was fair. Don't say it was an honest trial, when by their own definition, all of the facts in evidence have to come out.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for just one second so I can clarify?

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, we did not have a trial. The Constitution does not require a trial. We are not the trial forum. The Senate is the trial forum.

Certainly the gentleman has watched enough television trials, maybe been in trials for all I know, I am a lawyer, so obviously I have been in trials. That is the place where you call witnesses. That is where the defendant has the right.

He has no right in the grand jury to call witnesses. He has no right in the grand jury to be there. He has no right to have his lawyer in the grand jury room.

Now, we afforded the President of the United States that right, and he rejected it. His lawyer sent a letter to Mr. NADLER and said, Thank you, but no thanks. We are not going to play.

So, Mr. Speaker, in my view, the minority leader, minority whip continues to conflate the responsibility we had here in the House and the responsibility the Senate has.

The Senate is the trier of facts, not the House. The House is the determinant of whether there is probable

cause, and we did that and it is over in the Senate, and it is their responsibility and duty.

They lift their hands to swear they will be impartial, to get all the relevant evidence—relevant evidence, relevant evidence—not just some fishing expedition on either side, the prosecution or defense.

And with that, I hope we can end this debate, because it will be endless if we do not, simply because we are not going to agree, Mr. Speaker.

We have, obviously, very different perceptions as to what the duty of the House was and very different perceptions that if we thought what we did in the House was wrong, we ought to repeat it in the Senate.

I think the papers will be going to the Senate. The Senate will decide what it is going to do. I hope the Senators comport themselves as the Founders and the people would expect.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, let's be clear. Probable cause is not the standard in the Constitution.

To remove a sitting President, the Constitution is very specific: treason, bribery, or other high crimes and misdemeanors, not probable cause. That would be in the Constitution if that is what the Framers intended for impeachment to be used for, but that is not what impeachment is to be used for.

There were witnesses called, multiple witnesses.

There were tryouts, by the way, in secret that Chairman SCHIFF had prior to asking the President at the last minute, after all of this innuendo and you would hear leaks and leaks and this is going to happen, and then they would have a secret hearing where witnesses were sworn in, but none of us could find out what was happening in those secret hearings.

And as we talked to Members that were there, all of the leaks and innuendos turned out to be disproven. We couldn't find that out, because the chairman closed those hearings to the public, closed those hearings to most Members of Congress.

But ultimately the Senate's job is to try the case that was made in the House, weak or strong. And clearly it was weak, because the urgency that was talked about, it would already be going on if it was a strong case. But even if it is a weak case, it is not the Senate's job to mop up that mess.

It is the Senate's job to go and hear the case that was made in the House with one side presenting their witnesses.

And, again, the majority got to have that opportunity. We didn't have the opportunity to present witnesses we wanted to bring forward. And there were witnesses. They were sworn in. I don't know if you would call them something different, but that is what they were. They were there to present facts.

Many gave innuendo, but when asked under oath, Can you name the crime?

No.

Was there bribery?

No.

But let the Senate do their job, and hopefully they get that next week. I would encourage that the House get that done next week. It should have been done a while back.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman if he has anything else.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I have nothing else at this time.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Miss Kaitlyn Roberts, one of his secretaries.

□ 1230

CONGRATULATING NATHAN KIRSCH, MILKEN EDUCATOR AWARD WINNER

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Whitehaven High School math teacher Nathan Kirsch. He won the Milken Educator Award. This award is given to only 40 early- and mid-career teachers across the United States, and there was only one in Tennessee who won it.

Mr. Kirsch was surprised with the award at a school assembly Wednesday morning, where the entire student body applauded him for being the only teacher in Tennessee to receive the national distinction, which some have called the Oscar award for teaching. It could be the Nobel Prize for teaching.

In accepting the award, Mr. Kirsch called it one "for all of my students," past, current, and future.

The Whitehaven High School community is rightly proud of this accomplishment, and I am, too.

It is very encouraging that a program known for being an athletic powerhouse is also recognized for its excellence in academics. The principal at Whitehaven, Vincent Hunter, posts the names of the scholars, the ones who have gotten the best scores and the most scholarship offers, on the wall outside of his office—not athletic awards, of which there are a plethora, but academic awards.

Mr. Kirsch embodies both traditions that Whitehaven has—as a coach of teams and a great teacher who has raised their calculus scores.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Mr. Kirsch and all the Whitehaven Tigers on this exceptional achievement.

RECOGNIZING DR. MARTHA HUGHES CANNON

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

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, my family tree on both sides is full of prominent women who served in elected office. The most notable of these is my wife's great-grandmother, Dr. Martha Hughes Cannon, a pioneer in both government and heritage.

123 years ago, she was sworn into the Utah State Senate, becoming the first woman in the country to hold that office. My wife is quick to remind me that she won that office by defeating her husband.

Utah is home to some of the most capable and influential female leaders in the Nation, and I am fortunate to have these impressive women help advise me on all issues, and specifically those that impact Utah women.

Because of the initiative of Martha Hughes Cannon, thousands of women have followed in her footsteps and served in State legislatures and as local and national leaders.

I am excited and proud to introduce a resolution dedicating January 11, 2020, as National Martha Hughes Cannon Day and honor the path that she paved for the many women who serve today.

SWEEPING ACTION TO ADDRESS PFAS CONTAMINATION

(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. Mr. Speaker, today the House took sweeping bipartisan action to address PFAS contamination that has proliferated across communities in America. These forever chemicals have been linked to negative health effects, including cancer, impaired child development, and even infertility.

Granite Staters have already seen the harmful consequences of PFAS contamination, and I am pleased that the legislation we passed today will safeguard communities, clean up contaminated sites, and protect public health.

Importantly, the bipartisan bill we passed today includes language I authored to turn off the tap for new PFAS chemicals being approved by the EPA. Enough is enough. There are already too many dangerous PFAS chemicals in our environment, and the last thing Americans need is more of these forever chemicals.

The PFAS Action Act also included a bipartisan amendment offered by my good friend and colleague CHRIS PAPPAS and myself, which would authorize significant grant funding to public water treatment facilities to safeguard our drinking water.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Senate to take up this important bill.

RECOGNIZING LIEUTENANT COLONEL DANIEL DAUBE

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

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize an extraordinary three-war veteran, Lieutenant Colonel Daniel Daube.

Colonel Daube is a highly decorated veteran, having served in World War II, Korea, and Vietnam, amassing over 5,000 flight-hours between the Navy and the Air Force. He flew the P-51 Mustang, multiple fighter jets, and heavy metal. He even served in the space program. His name is enshrined on the Wall of Honor in the Smithsonian Air and Space Museum.

Colonel Daube's record of service is emblematic of why we all revere the Greatest Generation. Now, at 95 years old, he is still the cheerful warrior. He lives in Callaway, Florida, near his son, Dr. Skip Daube, who has been my friend for over 25 years.

I was honored to serve them both Thanksgiving dinner at Tyndall Air Force Base this year, and it was a time of great comradery.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in saluting a living hero from our father's generation, Colonel Daniel Daube.

HONORING THE DONUT DOLLIES OF THE VIETNAM CONFLICT

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

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the 627 brave civilian women who served as Donut Dollies for the Red Cross' Supplemental Recreational Activities Overseas Program during the Vietnam conflict between 1965 and 1972.

The name Donut Dollies was coined during World War II to describe the Red Cross volunteers who passed out hot coffee and donuts from the backs of military vehicles. While the women who volunteered in Vietnam did so much more than hand out donuts and coffee, the name Donuts Dollies was applied to them.

The young women of the Donut Dollies were stationed throughout Vietnam, from Saigon up to Quang Tri. They lived in tents and abandoned villas. They endured incoming fire, and they flew over enemy territory just like our military personnel.

These brave women quickly became to be known as angels in a combat zone for their bright smiles and powder blue uniforms that lifted the spirits at every base they toured.

The Donut Dollies hosted daily recreational events at large bases, such as pool tournaments, fashion shows, and various contests to provide fun and relaxation for off-duty military personnel. They helped serve food in chow lines, and they brought Kool-Aid to the night sentries working in perimeter towers.

Others were assigned to the Clubmobile program, which toured more remote bases, often requiring heli-

copter transport to reach them. They would gather the troops, usually beside a bunker or tank, to play competitive audience participation games.

For the hour or so that they were there, the Donut Dollies brought laughter and a sense of lightheartedness that was deeply missed in the war zone. Because death was so close, the laughter was healing, funny things were funnier, and their laughter helped join everyone together. One soldier once said it was the miracle of making the war disappear for a little while.

The approximately 1,500 visits of the Clubmobile program logged over 2.1 million air miles. Their primary goal on these visits and at the events at larger bases was to boost morale and to provide the men with a sense of home before going out in the field.

Mr. Speaker, the contributions of the Donut Dollies represented a changing role of women to serve their country at a time when women had previously been limited to noncombat roles. Their patriotism helped bring warmth, light, and laughter to the darkness of war-time.

My wife, Gina, and I are honored to recognize the women of the Donut Dollies and to thank them for their important and sacrificial contributions that they made for our country during the Vietnam conflict.

As I close today, I urge all Americans to continue praying for our country, for our military men and women who protect us, and for our first responders who keep us safe at home.

HONORING CHRIS AND PEGGY OSBORNE OF
BRYAN-COLLEGE STATION, TEXAS

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the 33 years of service and ministry of Chris and Peggy Osborne to Central Baptist Church and to the community of Bryan-College Station, Texas.

Central Baptist Church was founded in 1925 as a mission-minded ministry dedicated to sharing a passion for God's Word. Today, Central Baptist Church has become an integral part of the Bryan-College Station community, where a strong sense of discipleship has led to the creation of many outreach programs, children's ministry events, and college ministry groups.

Even as the church has grown, Central Baptist Church remains committed to their original mission-minded goals, and through the efforts of the congregation, thousands of people have found the joy, peace, and contentment that spring from a fulfilling and personal relationship with Jesus Christ.

For the past 33 years, Pastor Chris and his wife, Peggy, have been a source of light and encouragement and joy for the entire Central Baptist Church community. Under the leadership of Pastor Chris, Central has seen significant change and growth. The relocation of its church to its current 3,500-seat worship center and the more recent addition to the children's wing have provided members of the Central Baptist

family with ever-increasing opportunities for worship and community.

Chris's commitment to outreach and involvement have made him a pillar of the Bryan-College Station community, serving as chaplain for the police department, hosting cook-offs and baking competitions, and participating in charity golf tournaments.

Pastor Chris' dedication to service has not gone unnoticed, and hundreds of members of his congregation have experienced life change from his encouraging and supportive approach.

On January 26, 2020, Central Baptist Church will say good-bye to Pastor Chris and to his wife, Peggy, as they begin the next chapter of their lives in Fort Worth, Texas, where Chris will continue to spread the Word of God as a professor at Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary.

As members of the Central Baptist Church congregation, my wife, Gina, and I have both grown in Christ because of the impact of the church under the leadership and friendship of Chris and Peggy.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize and thank both Chris and Peggy for their down-to-earth and positive leadership of this congregation and for their impact of spreading the good news of Jesus Christ.

I have requested that a United States flag be flown over our Nation's Capitol to honor the lives and legacies of Chris and Peggy Osborne.

As I close today, I urge all Americans to continue praying for our country, for our military men and women who protect us, and for our first responders who keep us safe at home.

RECOGNIZING THE 140TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE
ASSOCIATION OF FORMER STUDENTS OF TEXAS
A&M UNIVERSITY

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the recent 140th anniversary of The Association of Former Students of Texas A&M University.

The Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas, now known as Texas A&M University, was founded as a land-grant college by the State of Texas in 1871, pursuant to the Morrill Act. The college was the first public institution of higher education in Texas and started classes on October 4, 1876.

On June 26, 1879, with the Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas still in its infancy, 11 former cadets hosted a reception in Houston, initiating the first formal organization of A&M former students. The persons at that meeting included:

William Sleeper, class of 1879;
William Trenckmann, class of 1878;
Pinckey Downs, class of 1879;
Edward Fitzhugh, class of 1879;
Edward Cushing, class of 1880;
George Hardy, class of 1879;
David Alexander, class of 1879;
William Small, class of 1882;
Robert Chatham, class of 1877;
William Brown, class of 1882; and
Thomas Fuller, class of 1881.

It was decided at that first meeting to endeavor to keep a record of all

former cadets who attended the A&M College of Texas, thus promoting and maintaining fellowship. The Ex-Cadets Association was reorganized to form the Alumni Association in 1888.

Developing throughout the years in tandem with the Alpha Phi Fraternity, which was founded in the 1890s and included former students who had not graduated, a coalition was formed in 1919 to formally reorganize and adopt the name The Association of Former Students.

This name was written into the charter granted by the State of Texas in 1925. In this charter, the association committed to “support of benevolent, charitable, and educational undertakings by extending financial and other aid to students at Texas A&M; by promoting social, literary, and scientific pursuits; by perpetuating and strengthening the ties of affection and esteem formed in university or college days; by promoting the interests and welfare of Texas A&M University and education generally in the State of Texas.”

Since its first day of class over 143 years ago, with six professors and 40 students, the university has grown to become one of the largest Tier 1 research and education institutions in the United States, with almost 70,000 students, thousands of faculty and staff, and close to a billion dollars of annual research activity.

□ 1245

Through its existence, the Association of Former Students has continued to grow rapidly. Today it serves more than 508,000 former students of Texas A&M University and generates an impact of almost \$14 million annually for university support through scholarships, student activities, and long-revered traditions, such as the Aggie Ring Program.

As the university has grown and developed, the Aggie Network—as the organization is commonly referred to today—has evolved but has always maintained its core values and commitments to the university, its current students and its former students. Together, the association and the university collaborate to maintain six core values of: loyalty, integrity, excellence, leadership, selfless service, and respect. These are the core values that unite all Texas A&M students and by which all Aggies strive to live.

As former chairman of the board of the Association of Former Students during 2007, I am honored and humbled to be able to recognize the accomplishments of the organization over the past 140 years. The Aggie Network is truly the glue that unites our current students, former students, and our responsibilities to live our core values every day.

Mr. Speaker, in recognition of the recent 140th anniversary of the Association of Former Students of Texas A&M University, I applaud the organization's ongoing commitment to all

Texas Aggies and to the core values of our beloved institution.

I have requested that the United States flag be flown over our Nation's Capitol to honor the 140 years of legacy and the impact of the worldwide Aggie Network.

As I close today, I urge all Americans to continue to pray for our country, for our military men and women who keep us safe, and for our first responders who protect us at home.

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

REFLECTIONS ON THE WAR POWERS DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) is recognized for the remainder of the hour as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, throughout the debate yesterday on the so-called War Powers Resolution, fundamental misunderstandings surfaced that I think need to be addressed.

The first misunderstanding is that the justification for the attack that killed Soleimani was that he was an evil terrorist responsible for the deaths of hundreds of Americans. Well, there are a lot of evil terrorists out there, and that does not give the President authority to launch attacks on foreign countries to kill them.

But what did give the President authority in this case, was the fact that Soleimani was acting as an armed combatant against U.S. forces in a war zone in which the Congress had authorized the President to take military action through the Authorization for the Use of Military Force in Iraq in 2002.

Now, I hate to shock my woke colleagues, but killing active enemy combatants is what war is all about, and it is a war that Congress started with that act.

That act of Congress provides: “The President is authorized to use the Armed Forces of the United States as he determines to be necessary and appropriate in order to defend the national security of the United States against the continuing threat posed by Iraq.”

The very nature of this authority includes combating hostile militia and armed proxies acting within Iraq against American forces. That is exactly what the President did.

The authorization to use military force did not end with the defeat of Saddam Hussein any more than the President's military authority in Japan and Germany ended with the defeat of Hirohito and Hitler.

In those cases, the President's authority didn't terminate until 1952 and 1955, respectively, and the President's military authority in Iraq remains in effect until the President and Congress terminate it.

Now, the second misunderstanding is that the President's action was an at-

tack on Iran. It most certainly was not. It was carried out in the theater of war defined by Congress against a combatant who was commanding hostile forces against American troops.

Not only did the President act entirely within his legal authority as Commander in Chief, but within his moral responsibility to protect American military and diplomatic personnel and American citizens in Iraq.

The third misunderstanding is that the War Powers Act is applicable in this circumstance. The War Powers Act governs only those circumstances when the President responds without congressional authority to an attack upon the United States, its territory or possessions, or its Armed Forces. In this case, the President already had congressional authority.

The fourth misunderstanding is that the attack on Soleimani was equivalent to President Obama's attack on Libya. The two are entirely different matters. The attack on Libya had no congressional authorization and the War Powers Act did not apply because Mr. Obama's military attack was not in response to an attack on the United States, its territory or possessions, or its Armed Forces.

It was an entirely unprovoked attack, entirely unauthorized and, accordingly, it was entirely illegal.

I think as we go forward, we need to get back to some basic, fundamental understandings about the constitutional parameters of war powers.

The American Founders made a sharp distinction between starting a war and waging a war for some very good reasons. They understood that this most solemn and lethal decision should not be entrusted to one individual whose authority would be greatly augmented by it.

The decision to start a war was given exclusively to Congress to assure that every voice in the country was heard, and that Congress, once having taken that stand, would be obligated to put the resources of the country behind that war and those fighting it.

But once the war has begun, the Founders wanted a single Commander in Chief directing it with clear and unambiguous authority. There is no surer path to military disaster than having 535 squabbling prima donnas second-guessing every decision being made.

Thus, the President can wage war but cannot declare it, and the Congress can declare war but cannot wage it.

The Founders debated these principles thoroughly during the Constitutional Convention. They recognized that the President did need certain residual military power to repel an attack when Congress couldn't act. And I believe the War Powers Act faithfully defines these circumstances and establishes a framework to contain them.

But the War Powers Act does not give the President the authority to

launch military attacks except in response to a direct attack on our country, nor can it limit the President's authority as Commander in Chief once Congress does authorize war.

I believe the 2002 Authorization for the Use of Military Force in Iraq was a colossal mistake. It created a dangerous power vacuum. It was never supported with the full resources of the United States, and it was without provocation.

But there should be no rewriting of history here. It might have been George W. Bush who advocated for the war and Bush, Obama, and now President Trump who have waged it, but it was Congress' adoption of the AUMF that formally started it.

And once started, only the President can wage it. President Trump inherited this mess and history will judge how well he handles it. Certainly, in this instance, the President not only had clear and unambiguous authority to order the attack, he had a moral imperative to do so.

What is crystal clear from the debate yesterday is that if the Democrats had had their way, Soleimani would be alive today, and the attack on American troops that he was in the final stages of planning would have unfolded. We would likely, today, be mourning very many American casualties.

If the President, knowing that this attack was coming and in full possession of the opportunity and the authority to stop it, had taken the Democrats' advice and done nothing, he would have been deeply culpable for the loss of these Americans. It is shocking to me, and perhaps to the country as well, that even in hindsight this is the course the Democrats have made clear that they prefer.

That brings me to the nature of the resolution that the House passed yesterday. The separation of war powers between the legislative and executive branches has been badly blurred in recent decades, and I do believe that we need to reestablish not only the constitutional principles that separate the declaring of war from the waging of war, but also the American tradition that we only go to war when we have been attacked.

When we must go to war, we have the utmost obligation to put the entire might and resources and attention of the Nation behind it, and to get it over with just as quickly as possible.

Now, that is a legitimate debate to have, but that is not what the House did yesterday. Yesterday, it deliberately and recklessly undermined the position of the United States Government and the United States Armed Forces that we sent to Iraq, shredding the tradition that politics stop at the water's edge.

In a perilous moment, the House refused to stand behind the war that it had authorized in 2002, refused to protect the men and women that it placed in harm's way, and it gave a hostile

foreign power a major propaganda victory.

That is yet another stain upon the honor of this House, and one which should be deplored and condemned through the ages to come.

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

IMPOSING SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO ADDITIONAL SECTORS OF IRAN—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 116-94)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Financial Services and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 *et seq.*) (IEEPA), I hereby report that I have issued an Executive Order (the "order") with respect to Iran that takes additional steps with respect to the national emergency declared in Executive Order 12957 of March 15, 1995.

The order takes steps to deny Iran revenue, including revenue derived from the export of products from key sectors of Iran's economy, that may be used to fund and support its nuclear program, missile development, terrorism and terrorist proxy networks, and malign regional influence.

The order blocks the property and interests in property of persons determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary of State:

to operate in the construction, mining, manufacturing, or textiles sectors of the Iranian economy, or any other sector of the Iranian economy as may be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary of State;

to have knowingly engaged, on or after the date of the order, in a significant transaction for the sale, supply, or transfer to or from Iran of significant goods or services used in connection with a sector of the Iranian economy specified in, or determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary of State, pursuant to, section 1(a)(i) of the order;

to have materially assisted, sponsored, or provided financial, material, or technological support for, or goods or services to or in support of, any person whose property and interests in property are blocked pursuant to the order; or

to be owned or controlled by, or to have acted or purported to act for or on behalf of, directly or indirectly, any person whose property and interests in property are blocked pursuant to the order.

The order also authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation

with the Secretary of State, to impose correspondent account and payable-through account-related sanctions on a foreign financial institution upon determining the foreign financial institution has, on or after the date of the order, knowingly conducted or facilitated a significant financial transaction:

for the sale, supply, or transfer to or from Iran of significant goods or services used in connection with a sector of the Iranian economy specified in, or determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary of State, pursuant to, section 1(a)(i) of the order; or

for or on behalf of any person whose property and interests in property are blocked pursuant to section 1 of the order.

I have delegated to the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary of State, the authority to take such actions, including adopting rules and regulations, to employ all powers granted to the President by IEEPA as may be necessary to implement the order.

I am enclosing a copy of the order I have issued.

DONALD J. TRUMP.
THE WHITE HOUSE, January 10, 2020.

WEAPONIZATION OF LANGUAGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) for 30 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to be recognized to address you here on the floor of the United States House of Representatives.

I come to the floor today, Mr. Speaker, because this is the 1-year anniversary of the date that a disparaging misquote in *The New York Times* was posted, January 10 of 2019, this being January 10 of 2020.

I am hopeful that this new year we have, 2020, will bring about some clarity of vision on the part of my colleagues, the American people, and I don't know that I have as much hope for the press. But this day, a year ago today, I was misquoted by *The New York Times*. The *Times* alleged that I had used three terms and asked, why does that language become offensive?

Well, the truth is that it was a 56-minute telephone interview, a call on my cell phone. I didn't have a way to tape it. But I have a practice over the years, I have done interviews with any kind of media I can think of, and if I don't have a means to tape what I say to them, I make it a point not to repeat anything, say anything that I haven't already said to the press. That way, there is nothing new out there for them to take and manipulate it in the article.

□ 1300

When that phone rang that morning on the 5th of January, 2019, if that is a

Friday morning, about 8:35 in the morning, I took the call. I would have preferred to have done it in the office, but sometimes you need to get some work done and move on to other things, and that was part of the incentive.

The reporter for The New York Times told me that he had been assigned by his chief editor to write an article about how it is that the immigration policy that I have advocated for at least since the first days I came to this Congress and years before that, so sometime around 2000 or so, that that immigration policy of build the wall, end birthright citizenship, enforce the rule of law, end the sanctuary cities, and the list of other things that have been part of what I have championed along the way here in this Congress, he was assigned to write an article about how it was that our President Donald Trump had adopted my immigration positions and gotten elected on those immigration positions, and now the national debate was surrounding the very topics that I had talked about for so long.

So we embarked upon a 56-minute interview. He didn't have a tape, and I didn't have a tape. I know he didn't have a tape for a couple of reasons. One of them was that, on an occasion or two, he asked me to carefully repeat the statement I had made so that he could type it down and get it accurate. That told me that was one he is going to quote. It wasn't the one of controversy, however.

Then the second piece of it was that we asked him on the telephone the following week: Do you have a tape?

His answer was: Why do you want to know?

In that phone call, he would not answer the question as to whether he had a tape. We found out later on that he had admitted that there was no tape. So we asked for his notes. He wouldn't release his notes. We asked him for the question that he had posed to me, and he wouldn't even speculate as to what the question was that he had posed to me in this 56-minute interview.

He did assert that he can type as fast as anyone can talk, that he is highly trained on that and so skilled that the words would be perfect and so would the punctuation be perfect.

Now, I am here on the floor of this House of Representatives. We have some of the best stenographers in the world here. They get more practice in the House than anywhere else, and they talk slower in the Senate. I have asked them: About how fast can you type?

A lot of them are about 130 words a minute on a conventional typewriter, and when they get to what I call the magic keyboard here, Mr. Speaker, then those words may go up to as many as 260 words a minute.

Then I asked them: Can you keep up with me when I am on a roll?

They say: No. We are always glad when you pause and let us catch up.

These are the best there are anywhere. I can't believe that a reporter for The New York Times with a conventional and not a magic keyboard can outpace the people on this floor to keep up with these fast-talking people in the House of Representatives, the very best there are in the world. That is not his skill set anyway.

So when he asserts that he could type it up accurately with utter precision and the punctuation would be correct, even when I asked the best in the world what about the punctuation, if that comes out to be perfect, too, they will say: No, I have to go back and listen to the tape to make sure we get that part of it right. We get the words right, but the punctuation may be in question.

I have great respect for the skill sets here. I do not respect the response that he gave in defense because it is not believable that a reporter can be on a telephone on the other end typing at a speed with the kind of precision necessary to settle the kind of cases that we have here.

Nonetheless, when that story came out on the 10th of January, things blew up here in this Congress, and I immediately put out a statement that should have shut all that criticism down. I put it out with clarity. I clearly rejected more emphatically than anyone in this House of Representatives has, including the resolution that passed the following week, more clearly than anyone else has the idea of the odious ideologies of white nationalism and white supremacy.

Those are ideologies that didn't exist in my environment anywhere that I was in all of my growing up, in my formative years, my adult years, and my time here in the Congress.

When our minority leader, KEVIN MCCARTHY, asked for a meeting with me on the following Monday, it was his assertion that it has always meant the same thing. I said I don't know how we know, if it is language that has not been used or utilized. How do we know what it meant to people? You couldn't look up an ideology that is two words, not one, in this huge dictionary over here. You won't be able to look up "white nationalism" or "white supremacy" there because that is a phrase. It is an ideology that ties two words together with a meaning that perhaps could be different.

So in an interview with DAVE PRICE of WHO-TV on October 20, 2018, he had asked me the question: What is a white nationalist?

I said it might have meant something different 1 or 2 or 3 years ago, but today it implies racist. I knew that because I have been paying attention to the weaponization of language. This is what the left has been doing. They have been calling people racist for 20, 25 years, and they have watched as Republicans—especially Southern conservative Republicans—curl up away from that kind of accusation because it shuts them down.

I recall the conversation that I related, actually, to The New York

Times reporter in that 56-minute interview. In my answer to the question, whatever it was that he asked me: What had happened in February 2013?

That was an immigration meeting down the hallway over toward the Senate side where we had a discussion about immigration with four or five Senators, five or six House Members, and some nongovernment representatives who were also there at the table and around the table.

It was the first time that I had met Senator TED CRUZ. He had made a statement that we need to be very careful with the language we use, especially on immigration, because if we are not, if we use any language that is offensive, they will use it against us.

I listened to that, and I thought that I had better respond. I said: Well, Senator, I agree with what you said, but we also need to keep in mind that if we let them define that which is offensive, then whatever language is effective will be defined as offensive.

I waited for his answer, which was essentially a nod, which I took to mean an agreement with me, and I believe it was because it was certainly a logical statement, and it was objective.

I set this up this way, Mr. Speaker, so that when I lay out this case, it is going to be clearly understood by all who are paying attention. It says: I am just going to take the term "white nationalist," that is what KEVIN MCCARTHY was so concerned about and believing that it confirmed some kind of a hidden ideology in me that no one had been able to discover in personal contact with me that had been discovered by The New York Times reporter over the telephone. He argued that the response I gave, that it might have meant something different 1 or 2 or 3 years ago, exposed that I didn't know that it was a negative connotation that had to do with white nationalism. And somehow or another, he assigned another belief system to me, which is generally what the left does.

I asked for 24 hours to disprove this. He said you have 1 hour and walked out of the room—1 hour. Well, it takes a lot of digging. I just proved it clearly but not in an hour.

So what I have here, what I would like to show you, Mr. Speaker, is this: What did the term "white nationalism" mean in the year 2000, when it was virtually unused, or in any year prior to that, when it was also virtually unused? What did it mean in 2001, 2002, and 2003? All the way up, you can see that it was virtually unused, and it never even starts to move until 2016.

This is a LexisNexis search of the term "white nationalism" or "white nationalist," derivatives of this term. LexisNexis, Mr. Speaker, goes into blogs, web postings, newspaper print, and magazine print. You name it, if it is in print out there, then LexisNexis is very likely to have it all. This is the only objective way you can quantify the utilization of this term.

“White nationalism” is virtually unused all the way up until 2016, actually. There, it jumped up to 10,000 times a year. It was virtually unused, and all of a sudden, in 2016, there it goes to 10,000 times a year; in 2017, 30,000 times; and in 2018, it is still up there at 20,000 times.

How did it happen that a terminology that had been virtually unused all of a sudden becomes used multiple times, up to 30,000 times a year, when 1 to 200 times a year is this virtually unused definition down here?

How did it happen that this is the word that gets tagged on me? Is that an accident, Mr. Speaker? I don’t think so. In fact, any objective person looking at the data couldn’t come to that conclusion either.

This is the annual utilization: virtually unused up to 2016, then up to 10,000 times a year, and then up to 30,000 times the next year. It is still at 20,000 the following year.

This is a weaponized term created by the left to attack conservatives with. It is one of their weaponized terms. They have multiple weaponized terms now because they wore out the term “racist” and needed to make up new terms that they could be offended by.

How did this happen, that 2016 was the year that the term “white nationalist” was used 10,000 times in that year? I asked them to break this thing down, LexisNexis’ utilization of “white nationalist,” month by month throughout the year 2016. That is the jump year down here.

Here is the data. From November and December, it is down here, used a little more, perhaps you could still call it virtually unused, but there is a little blip in August. Then it jumps up in November, and it is still up there in December.

What happened in 2016 that brought about the use of the term “white nationalist” as an almost always pejorative term? It is almost always used to attack conservatives. What happened? Well, there is the circumstance that Donald Trump was elected President of the United States on November 8, 2016.

When that happened, there was already a gathering for the hierarchy of the Democratic Party to gather together at the Mandarin Occidental Hotel here in Washington, D.C. Their agenda was to best plan how they were going to utilize what they expected would be a Hillary Clinton Presidency. They admitted that they had to change their agenda when they got the surprise of Donald Trump winning the election as opposed to Hillary. They did change their agenda at the Occidental Hotel.

By the way, it was led by George Soros. His face is on the front cover here of Politico’s article that tells about this. There are several other articles, Mr. Speaker, but George Soros led on this.

There, they planned how they were going to deal with a Trump Presidency

and how they were going to try to handcuff, tie down, refuse, and resist.

Mr. Speaker, if we remember what happened, that came into our verbiage also. I didn’t run the LexisNexis numbers on this, but I am certain I am right. “Resist,” “resistance movement” would be also, probably, a little more used than “white nationalist,” but we might be able to define that as virtually unused until the conference at the Mandarin Occidental Hotel in Washington, D.C., that started on Sunday, November 13, the Sunday after Trump was elected President.

There, they planned how they were going to deal with the Trump Presidency and how they were going to handcuff him, tie him down, resist, resist, and resist. The resistance movement was born in this hotel by Democratic leadership led by George Soros and no doubt funded by George Soros. The executive director position that was managing over all this was a former Soros staff person.

They planned their resistance movement, and out of that also came some words to be weaponized: white nationalist, white supremacist, Nazi, and fascist.

That is what I was talking about in my interview with Trip Gabriel as what had happened to weaponize language and how it was being used against people. We should never forget that we have the left in this country in particular—and I hope it is to a lesser degree, and I believe it is, from the other side—that assigns a belief system to people and then attacks them for the belief system that they have assigned. They use the words that they have been assigned to use to assign to people for the belief system that they have assigned.

So what we have is virtually unused “white nationalist” here throughout all these years until we come to 2016. Then we have the events of November 13, 14, and 15, checking out on the morning of Wednesday the 16th of November. That was taking place at the Mandarin Occidental Hotel. Clearly, somebody said: We are going to start using “white nationalist” against conservatives. Get to it.

They were at it while they were in the hotel, and it showed up some 5,000 times in that little window of time there.

Now, if you wonder, well, maybe I am not right on the date, Mr. Speaker, I had them break down the month of November 2016. Here is the month of November. The 1st, 2nd, kind of virtually unused, under 100 times in any given day. Until you get to they checked in here, the 13th of November, and, zing, all the way we go up to here to the top and back, this peak right here represents the times that they were in that hotel, making the decision and activating the weaponization of a number of terms but certainly the term “white nationalism.”

□ 1315

So, they all knew what they were doing. They were in that hotel, and they knew what they were doing.

I am just not convinced that the people in the leadership on the Republican side knew what was being perpetrated against our ideology, Mr. Speaker. And it seemed as though a number of my own leadership decided that they were going to jump on the bandwagon, too, with no chance for self-defense.

I would reflect that, even if you go back through all of Christianity, if you go back through Judeo-Christianity, if you go back through Western civilization, if you go back through the foundation of American culture and civilization—you can go back to Jesus; you can go back to St. Paul—everybody accused had a right to face their accusers and had, also, the presumption of innocence until proven guilty. I can find no exceptions in anybody’s framework. That is the standard. That is the civilizational standard.

I have listened as our minority leader, KEVIN MCCARTHY, has aggressively and effectively, I believe—and I am glad he is doing it—defended our President of the United States and said that he deserves due process and he deserves a fair process and that he is innocent until proven guilty. I agree with all of that.

But KEVIN MCCARTHY doesn’t seem to agree that should be in a manner that I would be treated. I believe that I deserve due process and I deserve innocent until proven guilty.

And I would point out that there is no evidence to make the case against me—no evidence, no real evidence. I have put out the fact-check document. It is on my website. It went on in March of last year. It is about six pages. No one has poked a hole in any of that rationale.

And here is another “no one,” Mr. Speaker.

Even though Brett Kavanaugh had about six or seven or so accusers, and I believe Brett Kavanaugh was unjustly accused in every one of those cases, but at least he had an opportunity to face his accusers and at least one of them came forward to testify and could be examined by the panel of the Committee on the Judiciary that was there.

Brett Kavanaugh, I believe, was exonerated from those charges. He is now seated on the United States Supreme Court, and I believe that he will go on to be a stellar Justice on our United States Supreme Court. But he had a chance to face his accusers, and he had them.

In my case, Mr. Speaker, not only did I not have a chance to face my accusers, neither do I have the presumption of innocence until proven guilty. But on top of that, I don’t have any accusers—not one. Of the tens of thousands of people that I have dealt with face to face in my years in public life—roughly, a quarter of a century in public life, and we have been in the construction business dealing with people clear back

to 1975—there is not one individual who has come forward and said that I have treated them in any kind of disrespectful, disparaging, or racist way of any kind whatsoever.

I don't have an accuser to face, not one, unless it might be hearsay. And even the hearsay doesn't seem to be out there.

This is the analysis of the weaponization of language and the eager embracement of it by my own leadership who has denied me any due process.

So, here I am, the fourth Member of Congress in all of history to be removed from my committees—only the fourth, Mr. Speaker. And the other three, fairly modern history: James Traficant, who stood on this floor and said, “Beam me up, Scotty.” He was convicted of something like nine different Federal felonies and he ran for reelection from prison.

We lost a couple of Republicans in this Congress, one from Buffalo and one from California, either convicted or confessed to Federal felonies. I regret that. But that is three of four are Federal felons.

And then there is me. I am treated like a Federal felon by my own leadership in this House of Representatives because somebody called the hit from up the chain above them, and they decided that they needed to do that under the command of the individual or individuals that called that hit.

So only four people removed from all their committees in the history of this Congress, three are either convicted or confessed Federal felons, and there is me. And there is not even a rule that I violated, let alone a law, let alone a Federal violation, a felony, to be treated like a Federal felon by my own leadership for a made-up story that doesn't hold up, cannot hold up under the scrutiny of history, and it must be rectified.

So, on top of that, I have heard our esteemed minority leader say that there is no constitutional charge against Donald Trump for impeachment, that they are made-up charges on the part of the Democrats, and that it is either treason, bribery, high crimes, or misdemeanor, and the President has violated none of those.

And I agree with him. That is true. None of those reasons for impeachment of a President exists in the activities that have been examined here in this House of Representatives, even down in the secret bunker of ADAM SCHIFF. They don't exist.

So they made up a couple of charges, and one of them was obstruction of Congress, and the other one was about putting our Nation at risk.

Well, that is a judgment call, and I think the President made the right judgment call on Soleimani; he has made a lot of right judgment calls up and down the line.

But because you disagree with the President is not a reason to impeach him. There is no statute, no law, no

rule that the President is guilty of, or at least has been proven to be guilty of. There is no substantive information that supports that allegation.

They impeached the President of the United States in this House of Representatives on December 18 because they don't like Donald Trump. And then part of what they cooked up in the Mandarin Hotel on the following week after he was elected President in 2016, those are some of the reasons.

The biggest reason is they need a shield from prosecution in the investigations and prosecutions that are taking place now in the Department of Justice and the FBI looking into the weaponization of our Federal Government for political purposes, for going in and misrepresenting information to the FISA court, for perhaps duping a FISA judge or maybe having a FISA judge that should have been a little more alert. How many times did James Comey sign a FISA request when he knew the information was false? You can go on and on.

If that comes forward and indictments are brought forward on that, that is going to crush the other side. They need this impeachment as a shield, and that is the biggest reason why they decided to move forward.

But I believe the foundation was laid in that Mandarin Hotel on that weekend starting on Sunday, November 13, 2016, and concluding on Wednesday when they checked out that morning. I believe that is when much of the strategy was put together.

And I would go further, Mr. Speaker, and that is that we had the Mueller investigation that tied this country up for nearly 2 years. The strategy on that, I believe, was discussed in that hotel room. That is just too close to the pattern of things that flowed out of there that we do know of.

And we know from the own words of James Comey that he went in to interview the President, to brief the President on whether or not there was the existence of an investigation that the President was under; and, out of that, he typed up his notes and handed them over to a professor at Columbia University with the directions or understanding that they would be leaked to The New York Times, with the objective of the leakage of those notes that were written up by James Comey to bring about a special counsel to investigate Donald Trump for alleged nefarious activities in Russia and that the special counsel was to be Robert Mueller.

All of that was known before James Comey went in to brief Donald Trump. All that was known before to James Comey.

As that flowed out and Mueller is named as the special counsel, we went, then, through 2 years, and we had the investigators that went from 13 up to 18, built-in bias in most of them and perhaps all of them, and they came up empty. And that was about May 7 of last year.

Then they had to look for another reason to impeach this President. They thought the Mueller report was going to do it, and it didn't. They couldn't make the case. They tried. And afterwards, some of them tried again. They tried to resurrect it again and again. Finally, the house of cards on the Mueller investigation collapsed, and they had to come up with something new.

Well, then there is the phone call of July 25 of last year, which I have read through the transcript of that multiple times, Mr. Speaker. Never do I see anything in there that troubles me.

And I believe Professor Jonathan Turley, in his testimony before the House Committee on the Judiciary, when he said, to the effect that, if you had told George Washington that he could be impeached for a conversation he had, that his powdered wig would catch on fire. That is what we are dealing with.

So these very, very thin excuses for impeachment, but the calendar was turning pages over and they needed to get this done, so they took the thinnest of excuses and turned that into what was a show for the American people that I think will live in infamy throughout history.

In my case, Mr. Speaker, I have clearly proven that these allegations are false. There is no rule that I have violated. There is nothing that is pointed to. There is nothing in history that says that there is a pattern in this Congress that the freedom of speech of a Member of Congress, whether he is accurately quoted or not, can be disciplined by the will or whim of a leader in this House of Representatives.

Everyone in this country has to have the First Amendment right, freedom of speech, religion, and the press, and all of the rest of the rights that we have in the Bill of Rights.

But the chilling effect of the actions taken by the leader here of the minority in the House of Representatives chills the freedom of speech of everybody in here—at least on the Republican side—and everybody that is either running as a candidate in, potentially, a primary or aspires to run for office.

The most principled people we have in this country will not want to submit to censorship by a leader that may or may not have enjoyed their support to get elected to that leadership position.

This is a chilling, chilling effect, and the history of this is not going to go down very well as people examine what happened. There is much, much more to come out.

Mr. Speaker, as I watch the clock tick down, I make the point that I have introduced a resolution here, and I will have a number early next week, but it has just gone in in the last few hours. I have been waiting to drop this resolution. I am dropping it and introducing it on the anniversary of the misquote that got dropped on me 1 year ago today for The New York Times that allegedly launched this firestorm that

has brought about these things that I have talked about.

This resolution makes the case clearly that The New York Times could not be right and that I could not be wrong, and the balance of this was people wanting it to be true and so they wrote it up.

So this disproves The New York Times quote; and, additionally, Mr. Speaker, I delivered that quote on the floor of the House of Representatives the following Tuesday in the fashion that I would have said it if I had actually said it.

In other words, I would never tie together white nationalism, white supremacy, and Western civilization. No, Mr. Speaker, I would never do that, because they don't fit at all together.

The pejorative terms were: Nazi, fascist, white nationalist, white supremacy. And I made the point there would be a distinct pause, and I would start from the beginning and say, But Western civilization, how did that language become pejorative? Why I did sit in classrooms while all of that time being taught about the merits of our civilization?

And this CONGRESSIONAL RECORD misquoted me exactly the same way that The New York Times did. This amendment fixes that.

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. LEWIS (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today.

Mr. ADERHOLT (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today and the balance of the week on account of a death in the family.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 28 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, January 13, 2020, 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:

3484. A letter from the Acting Principal Director, Defense Pricing and Contracting, Defense Acquisition Regulations System, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's interim rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Covered Defense Telecommunications Equipment or Serviced (DFARS Case 2018-D022) [Docket: DARS-2019-0063] (RIN: 0750-AJ84) received January 3, 2020, 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.

3485. A letter from the Acting Principal Director, Defense Pricing and Contracting, Defense Acquisition Regulations System, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Demonstration Project for Contractors Employing Persons with Disabilities (DFARS Case 2018-D058) (RIN: 0750-AK19) received January 3, 2020, 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.

3486. A letter from the Acting Principal Director, Defense Pricing and Contracting, Defense Acquisition Regulations Systems, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Review of Defense Solicitations by Procurement Center Representatives (DFARS Case 2019-D008) [Docket: DARS-2019-0034] (RIN: 0750-AK43) received January 3, 2020, 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.

3487. A letter from the Acting Principal Director, Defense Pricing and Contracting, Defense Acquisition Regulations System, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Trade Agreements Thresholds (DFARS Case 2019-D035) [Docket: DARS-2019-0069] (RIN: 0750-AK75) received January 3, 2020, 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.

3488. A letter from the Acting Principal Director, Defense Pricing and Contracting, Defense Acquisition Regulations Systems, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Contractor Purchasing System Review Threshold (DFARS Case 2017-D038) [Docket: DARS-2019-0024] (RIN: 0750-AJ48) received January 3, 2020, 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.

3489. A letter from the Acting Principal Director, Defense Pricing and Contracting, Defense Acquisition Regulations Systems, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Restriction on the Acquisition of Certain Magnets and Tungsten (DFARS Case 2018-D054) [Docket: DARS-2019-0016] (RIN: 0750-AK15) received January 3, 2020, 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.

3490. A letter from the Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's joint final rule — Community Reinvestment Act Regulations (RIN: 3064-AF20) received January 3, 2020, 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.

3491. A letter from the Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, Legal, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Regulatory Capital Treatment for High Volatility Commercial Real Estate (HVCRE) Exposures (RIN: 3064-AE90) received January 3, 2020, 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.

3492. A letter from the Acting General Counsel, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Credit Union Bylaws (RIN:

3313-AE86) received December 17, 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.

3493. A letter from the Acting General Counsel, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Delay of Effective Date of the Risk-Based Capital Rules (RIN: 3133-AF01) received January 3, 2020, 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.

3494. A letter from the Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rules — Rule Amendments and Guidance Addressing Cross-Border Application of Certain Security-Based Swap Requirements [Release No.: 34-87780; File No.: S7-07-19] (RIN: 3235-AM13) received January 3, 2020, 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.

3495. A letter from the Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Risk Mitigation Techniques for Uncleared Security-Based Swaps [Release No.: 34-87782; File No.: S7-28-18] (RIN: 3235-AL83) received January 3, 2020, 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.

3496. A letter from the Deputy Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Allocation of Assets in Single-Employer Plans; Valuation of Benefits and Assets; Expected Retirement Age received January 3, 2020, 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.

3497. A letter from the Deputy Bureau Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Protecting Against National Security Threats to the Communications Supply Chain Through FCC Programs [WC Docket No.: 18-89]; Huawei Designation [PS Docket No.: 19-351]; ZTE Designation [PS Docket No.: 19-352] received January 3, 2020, 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.

3498. A letter from the Director, Office of Financial Reporting and Policy, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's FY 2019 Agency Financial Report, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3515(a)(1); Public Law 101-576, Sec. 303(a)(1) (as amended by Public Law 107-289, Sec. 2(a)); (116 Stat. 2049); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

3499. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Ocean Perch in the Bering Sea Subarea of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 180713633-9174-02; RTID 0648-XY056] received January 3, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3500. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Halibut Deck Sorting Monitoring Requirements for Trawl Catcher/Processors Operating in Non-Pollock Groundfish Fisheries Off Alaska; Correction [Docket No.: 191203-0100] (RIN: 0648-BI53) received January 3, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121,

Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3501. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act Provisions; Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Essential Fish Habitat [Docket No.: 191212-0110] (RIN: 0648-BJ45) received January 3, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3502. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's notice — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Summer Flounder Fishery; Quota Transfer From NC to VA [RTID: 0648-XX030] received January 3, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3503. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's notification of a quota transfer — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Bluefish Fishery; Quota Transfer From NC to RI [Docket No.: 181010932-9124-02; RTID: 0648-XX028] received January 3, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3504. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — International Fisheries; Western and Central Pacific Fisheries for Highly Migratory Species; Limited Reopening of the 2019 U.S. Pelagic Longline Fishery for Bigeye Tuna in the Western and Central Pacific Ocean [Docket No.: 180209155-8589-02; RTID: 0648-XP005] received January 3, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3505. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Magnuson-Stevens Act Provisions; Fisheries Off West Coast States; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery; Seabird Bycatch Avoidance Measures [Docket No.: 191204-0101] (RIN: 0648-BI99) received January 3, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3506. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Magnuson-Stevens Act Provisions; Fisheries Off West Coast States; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery; Annual Specifications and Management Measures for the 2019 Tribal and Non-Tribal Fisheries for Pacific Whiting, and Requirement To Consider Chinook Salmon Bycatch Before Reapportioning Tribal Whiting; Correction [Docket No.: 191125-0091] (RIN: 0648-BI67) received January 3, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3507. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Magnuson-Stevens Act Provisions; Fisheries Off West Coast States; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery; Pacific

Whiting; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery Management Plan; Amendment 21-4; Catch Share Program, 5-Year Review, Follow-On Actions [Docket No.: 191211-0107] (RIN: 0648-BI35) received January 3, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3508. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries Off West Coast States; Coastal Pelagic Species Fisheries; Biennial Specifications [Docket No.: 191125-0089] (RIN: 0648-BJ22) received January 3, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3509. A letter from the Deputy Chief Financial Officer and Director for Financial Management, Office CFO and Assistant Secretary for Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Civil Monetary Penalty Adjustments for Inflation [Docket No.: 191216-0114] (RIN: 0605-AA54) received January 3, 2020, 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.

3510. A letter from the Attorney, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — 2013 Liquid Chemical Categorization Updates [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0423] (RIN: 1625-AB94) received December 20, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3511. A letter from the Assistant Administrator, Diversion Control Division, Drug Enforcement Administration, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule — Technical Correction to Regulation Regarding Registration [Docket No.: DEA-511] received December 20, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and the Judiciary.

3512. A letter from the Assistant Administrator, Diversion Control Division, Drug Enforcement Administration, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's temporary rule — Schedules of Controlled Substances: Extension of Temporary Placement of FUB-AMB in Schedule I of the Controlled Substances Act [Docket No.: DEA-472a] received December 20, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); jointly to the Committees on the Judiciary and Energy and Commerce.

3513. A letter from the Assistant Administrator, Diversion Control Division, Drug Enforcement Administration, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final amendment — Schedules of Controlled Substances: Placement of Cyclopropyl Fentanyl, Methoxyacetyl fentanyl, ortho-Fluorofentanyl, and para-Fluorobutyl Fentanyl in Schedule I [Docket No. DEA-507] received December 20, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); jointly to the Committees on the Judiciary and Energy and Commerce.

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. GRIJALVA: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 560. A bill to amend section 6 of the Joint Resolution entitled "A Joint Resolution to approve the Covenant To Establish

a Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands in Political Union with the United States of America, and for other purposes"; with an amendment (Rept. 116-373, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GRIJALVA: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 1492. A bill to update the map of, and modify the maximum acreage available for inclusion in, the Yucca House National Monument; with an amendment (Rept. 116-374). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 4737. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to require the Under Secretary for Science and Technology of the Department of Homeland Security to research and evaluate existing Federal research regarding approaches to mitigate climate change on homeland security to identify areas for further research within the Department, research and develop approaches to mitigate the consequences of climate change on homeland security, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 116-375). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on the Judiciary discharged from further consideration. H.R. 560 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. WILLIAMS (for himself, Mr. GOODEN, Mr. JOHN W. ROSE of Tennessee, Mr. BARR, Mr. LOUDERMILK, and Mr. BUDD):

H.R. 5574. A bill to repeal the small business loan data collection requirement established by section 1071 of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. UNDERWOOD (for herself and Ms. SCHRIER):

H.R. 5575. A bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act, and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require group health plans and health insurance issuers offering group or individual health insurance coverage to provide for 3 primary care visits and 3 behavioral health care visits without application of any cost-sharing requirement; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Education and Labor, and 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. ARRINGTON (for himself, Mr. REED, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. FERGUSON):

H.R. 5576. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to prevent concurrent receipt of unemployment benefits and Social Security disability insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROOKS of Alabama (for himself, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. WRIGHT, and Mr. BUDD):

H.R. 5577. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to exclude from creditable

wages and self-employment income wages earned for services by aliens illegally performed in the United States and self-employment income derived from a trade or business illegally conducted in the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 5578. A bill to provide for the mandatory recall of drugs regulated by the Food and Drug Administration; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GIANFORTE (for himself, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. CRAWFORD, and Mr. MCCLINTOCK):

H.R. 5579. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to provide for improved precision in the listing, delisting, and downlisting of endangered species and potentially endangered species; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. GOSAR (for himself, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. GIANFORTE, and Mr. NEWHOUSE):

H.R. 5580. A bill to codify certain rules issued by the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Commerce relating to endangered species and threatened species, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. JAYAPAL (for herself, Mr. NADLER, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. NORTON, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. KILMER, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUSH, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ):

H.R. 5581. A bill to clarify the rights of all persons who are held or detained at a port of entry or at any detention facility overseen by U.S. Customs and Border Protection or U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina (for himself, Mr. BANKS, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. LATTA, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. BABIN, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. RUTHERFORD, and Mr. HARRIS):

H.R. 5582. A bill to amend titles XIX and XXI of the Social Security Act to require hospitals and certain other participating providers under Medicaid or the Children's Health Insurance Program to disclose the provider's policy on parental consent for the provision, withdrawal, or denial of life-sustaining treatment for minors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. SCANLON (for herself and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 5583. A bill to amend the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act to provide for better protections for children raised in kinship families outside of the foster care system; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. STEUBE:

H.R. 5584. A bill to require the Secretary of Transportation to modify regulations concerning hours of service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. GRIFFITH (for himself, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. HICE of Georgia, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio, Mr. CLOUD, Mr. CARTER of Georgia,

Mr. BUDD, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. BUCK, Mr. PERRY, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. CLINE, and Mr. ROY):

H. Res. 788. A resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the Office of the Speaker of the House is vacant; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KING of Iowa:

H. Res. 789. A resolution raising a question of the privileges of the House; to the Committee on House Administration.

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. 5574.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. UNDERWOOD:

H.R. 5575.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. ARRINGTON:

H.R. 5576.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 1 provides Congress with the power to "lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States."

By Mr. BROOKS of Alabama:

H.R. 5577.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 5578.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8; U.S. Constitution

By Mr. GIANFORTE:

H.R. 5579.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GOSAR:

H.R. 5580.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. JAYAPAL:

H.R. 5581.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina:

H.R. 5582.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution (known as the Taxing and Spending Clause) which gives Congress

Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Impost and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States.

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution (known as the Necessary and Proper Clause), which gives Congress 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.

By Ms. SCANLON:

H.R. 5583.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section VIII.

By Mr. STEUBE:

H.R. 5584.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

To borrow money on the credit of the United States;

To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;

To establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization, and uniform Laws on the subject of Bankruptcies throughout the United States;

To coin Money, regulate the Value thereof, and of foreign Coin, and fix the Standard of Weights and Measures;

To provide for the Punishment of counterfeiting the Securities and current Coin of the United States;

To establish Post Offices and Post Roads;

To promote the Progress of Science and useful Arts, by securing for limited Times to Authors and Inventors the exclusive Right to their respective Writings and Discoveries;

To constitute Tribunals inferior to the supreme Court; and Offenses against the Law of Nations;

To declare War, grant Letters of Marque and Reprisal, and make Rules concerning Captures on Land and Water;

To raise and support Armies, but no Appropriation of Money to that Use shall be for a longer Term than two Years;

To provide and maintain a Navy;

To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces;

To provide for calling forth the Militia to execute the Laws of the Union, suppress Insurrections and repel Invasions;

To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining, the Militia, and for governing such Part of them as may be employed in the Service of the United States, reserving to the States respectively, the Appointment of the Officers, and the Authority of training the Militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress;

To exercise exclusive Legislation in all Cases whatsoever, over such District (not exceeding ten Miles square) as may, by Cession of particular States, and the acceptance of Congress, become the Seat of the Government of the United States, and to exercise like Authority over all Places purchased by the Consent of the Legislature of the State in which the Same shall be, for the Erection of Forts, Magazines, Arsenals, dock-Yards, and other needful Buildings; And

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of

the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 219: Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. GOODEN, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. MULLIN, and Mr. STEUBE.
 H.R. 847: Mr. LONG.
 H.R. 1043: Mr. GOODEN and Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.
 H.R. 1049: Mr. HECK and Mr. KEATING.
 H.R. 1128: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
 H.R. 1367: Mr. MOULTON, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, and Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma.
 H.R. 1398: Mrs. LURIA.
 H.R. 1400: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.
 H.R. 1766: Mr. HASTINGS.
 H.R. 2062: Mr. PHILLIPS.
 H.R. 2086: Mr. COHEN, Mr. SCHNEIDER, and Mr. TRONE.
 H.R. 2199: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. SOTO, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. CLAY, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. BERA, Ms. WATERS, and Mr. CORREA.
 H.R. 2200: Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. MORELLE, and Ms. DELBENE.
 H.R. 2201: Mr. STANTON.
 H.R. 2218: Mr. MITCHELL and Mr. SMUCKER.
 H.R. 2270: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.
 H.R. 2271: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.
 H.R. 2279: Mr. GREEN of Tennessee.
 H.R. 2328: Mr. CISNEROS.
 H.R. 2350: Mr. UPTON and Mr. ROSE of New York.
 H.R. 2416: Mr. BALDERSON.
 H.R. 2477: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. RUSH, and Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.
 H.R. 2491: Mr. McEACHIN.
 H.R. 2616: Ms. HAALAND.
 H.R. 2694: Ms. ESHOO, Mr. CISNEROS, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, and Ms. BASS.

H.R. 2778: Ms. STEVENS.
 H.R. 2815: Mr. MOOLENAAR and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
 H.R. 2831: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.
 H.R. 2895: Mr. COSTA and Mr. SOTO.
 H.R. 2977: Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. FUDGE, and Ms. TITUS.
 H.R. 2986: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina and Ms. BARRAGÁN.
 H.R. 2999: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
 H.R. 3208: Mr. PHILLIPS.
 H.R. 3388: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
 H.R. 3497: Mr. ARMSTRONG.
 H.R. 3502: Mr. PENCE.
 H.R. 3503: Mr. HASTINGS.
 H.R. 3524: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
 H.R. 3657: Mr. STAUBER, Mr. CORREA, Mr. LEVIN of California, and Mr. DEUTCH.
 H.R. 3659: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.
 H.R. 3789: Ms. HOULAHAN.
 H.R. 3796: Mr. CURTIS and Mr. McADAMS.
 H.R. 3814: Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, and Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.
 H.R. 3849: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER and Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.
 H.R. 3971: Mr. RIGGLEMAN.
 H.R. 4022: Mr. SUOZZI.
 H.R. 4091: Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. DESAULNIER, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. WALTZ, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. BALDERSON, Mr. WOODALL, and Mr. FLEISCHMANN.
 H.R. 4092: Mr. LUJÁN.
 H.R. 4107: Mr. TRONE.
 H.R. 4305: Mr. HECK, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, and Mr. DIAZ-BALART.
 H.R. 4346: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
 H.R. 4705: Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER.
 H.R. 4821: Ms. JAYAPAL.
 H.R. 4881: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 5002: Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. GOODEN, and Mr. RIGGLEMAN.
 H.R. 5104: Mr. RASKIN.

H.R. 5170: Ms. LOFGREN and Mr. GRIJALVA.
 H.R. 5227: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
 H.R. 5260: Mr. COURTNEY.
 H.R. 5289: Mr. BIGGS.
 H.R. 5312: Mr. DESAULNIER and Mr. CISNEROS.
 H.R. 5337: Ms. NORTON and Mr. DIAZ-BALART.
 H.R. 5339: Mr. HARDER of California.
 H.R. 5376: Mr. JOYCE of Ohio.
 H.R. 5448: Mr. NADLER.
 H.R. 5450: Mr. BERA.
 H.R. 5453: Mr. HILL of Arkansas, Mr. WESTERMAN, and Mr. HECK.
 H.R. 5463: Mr. GRIJALVA.
 H.R. 5466: Ms. NORTON.
 H.R. 5494: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.
 H.R. 5543: Ms. DELAULO, Ms. WATERS, and Ms. CLARKE of New York.
 H.R. 5546: Mr. TAYLOR and Ms. CLARKE of New York.
 H.R. 5552: Mrs. DAVIS of California.
 H.J. Res. 2: Mr. McEACHIN, Mr. CLYBURN, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, and Ms. WEXTON.
 H. Res. 38: Mrs. TORRES of California, Mr. BEYER, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. COSTA, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. BERA, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Ms. WATERS.
 H. Res. 452: Mr. CÁRDENAS.
 H. Res. 784: Mr. GOHMERT.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS— ADDITIONS AND WITHDRAWALS

The following Member added his name to the following discharge petition:

Petition 1 by Mr. SCALISE on House Resolution 102: Mr. Van Drew.