



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 166

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JANUARY 14, 2020

No. 8

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CUELLAR).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,

January 14, 2020.

I hereby appoint the Honorable HENRY CUELLAR to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2020, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with time equally allocated between the parties and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

104TH PENNSYLVANIA FARM SHOW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, recently, I had the pleasure of kicking off the new year by attending the 104th Pennsylvania Farm Show in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, the largest indoor agriculture exposition in the world.

The Pennsylvania Farm Show dates back to 1917, when the first event showcased 44 commercial exhibitors fea-

turing the latest in farm machinery and 440 competitive exhibitors. Since then, the Pennsylvania Farm Show has become the largest indoor agriculture exhibition in the world.

Dr. Milton Eisenhower, Penn State University president at the time and brother of President Dwight Eisenhower, dubbed the Pennsylvania Farm Show "always the greatest show on Earth" during his 1955 visit.

Thanks to the sustained dedication by Pennsylvania farmers and farm families, tens of thousands of volunteers, and generations of agribusiness owners, the Pennsylvania Farm Show continues to be the greatest show on Earth. Today, the Pennsylvania Farm Show has grown to approximately 6,000 animals, 12,000 exhibits, and 600,000 visitors throughout the week.

Each year, I host a congressional listening session at the farm show to hear directly from farmers, industry experts, and the agriculture advocates about their priorities as well as their concerns.

I want to say thank you to Representatives JOHN JOYCE, FRED KELLER, and DAN MEUSER, as well as Senator BOB CASEY and Pennsylvania Agriculture Secretary Russell Redding, for joining me for the 2020 congressional listening session at the farm show.

Even after more than a decade of serving on the House Agriculture Committee, there is no experience that replaces the value of meeting with our farmers, ranchers, and producers face-to-face.

With the right policies and good investments, rural America can be just as strong as the hardworking men and women who call it home. A robust rural America is not possible without a strong rural economy, and thanks to the passage of the United States-Mexico-Canada trade agreement and a soon-to-be-signed agreement with China, new market opportunities for agricultural exports are on the horizon.

New markets are the key to economic growth and stability for our farm families.

Stability also means having reliable safety net programs in place when times are particularly tough and when the weather is threatening our ability to feed ourselves. Over the years, technology has advanced and the economy has diversified, and keeping up with the demands of a new era is necessary to compete in the modern marketplace.

With connectivity, broadband, and, specifically, 5G, rural businesses will be better equipped to compete. Connectivity also expands opportunities for the next generation in rural America, helping signal to younger people that rural America is a great place to call home, to start a business, and to raise a family.

After spending several days at the Pennsylvania Farm Show, I am increasingly confident that the future of rural America is bright.

RECOGNIZING CHRISTINE KUSTELSKI

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. EMMER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Christine Kustelski, the Southside unit director of the Boys & Girls Club of Central Minnesota, for her recent induction into the Youth Intervention Hall of Fame. This prestigious honor, one that only 86 individuals have received over the last 21 years, is given to members of our community who go above and beyond just working with our Nation's youth.

Since 1997, Christine has worked in youth development at the Boys & Girls Club of Central Minnesota, serving nearly 1,200 K-12 youth. Christine assists a range of students, working with children living in foster care or with incarcerated parents or those who have experienced abuse, neglect, and severe poverty.

☐ 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.

H211

I thank Christine for meeting the needs of the youth in our community and for her service to others in need. I congratulate her on earning her place in the Youth Intervention Hall of Fame.

RECOGNIZING THE ANOKA COUNTY HUMAN SERVICES STAFF

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the Human Services staff in Anoka County, Minnesota, for receiving the Local Government Innovation Award. These Innovation Awards highlight counties, cities, townships, and schools that have found ways to make a bigger impact in their communities.

Anoka County developed a new apprenticeship program called the Empowers Program. This volunteer initiative provides employment and training opportunities to the workforce of tomorrow.

In a nation struggling with workforce shortages and a growing skills gap, this program helps young people identify what they want to do with their career. The program assists the participants with job searches, individual career planning, paid training, and achieving technical and occupational certificates. The program can even assist with basic needs like a bus pass, clothing for work, or books for school.

Anoka County deserves to be recognized for its efforts to prepare our young people to join the workforce. With 7 million open jobs in this country, our young people need to be equipped to join our growing economy. I congratulate Anoka County.

RECOGNIZING ELK RIVER AREA SCHOOL DISTRICT'S EXCELLENCE IN TECHNOLOGICAL EDUCATION

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Elk River Area School District. As we closed out 2019, Elk River received an award for the district's efforts to lead in educational approaches involving technology. Sourcewell Technology's annual Impact Education Conference named technology specialists and leaders from the Elk River Area School District as the 2019 Technology Team of the Year.

Elk River earned this prestigious award because of the work the district's technology team undertook to expand the services they provide to their students. Elk River now provides on-demand courses for teachers as well as online resources and training for students and families. In total, the Elk River Area School District has implemented e-learning options that are now available for nearly 14,000 students.

We are fortunate for such incredible educators dedicated to innovating for their learners. I congratulate all the educators and administrators at Elk River Area School District for winning this well-deserved award.

RECOGNIZING RIVERS OF HOPE, NEIGHBORHOOD HEROES HELPING VICTIMS OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Rivers of Hope, a

community-coordinated response to domestic violence.

In the summer of 1989, a group of neighbors concerned about an increase in domestic violence banded together to create Rivers of Hope to provide victims with care and support from their community.

Today, Rivers of Hope has expanded its scope of service, offering legal advocacy, education, support groups, referrals, and a 24/7 free and confidential crisis line for victims of domestic violence. The organization also operates a youth program and a criminal justice intervention program.

In addition, Rivers of Hope has grown beyond the neighbors who founded the organization to now include corporate professionals, business leaders, public servants, public servants from Wright and Sherburne Counties, and other community leaders.

I thank everyone who offers their time and effort to Rivers of Hope, making it the vital resource for victims in our communities. We are grateful for their dedication to making the Sixth Congressional District a better place to live and a safe place for everyone.

LOST JOBS AT WHITE MESA URANIUM MILL AND THE LA SAL URANIUM MINE COMPLEX

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CURTIS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the hardworking Utahns in the uranium industry in San Juan County, and especially those who have recently lost their jobs at the White Mesa uranium mill and the La Sal uranium mine complex.

Unfortunately, foreign subsidization of uranium production has had a devastating impact on North American production and has affected the mill's operation; and, as a result, roughly 30 percent of the employees had to be let go at our Nation's last operating uranium mill.

In addition to producing critical minerals, this mill has provided families with good incomes and generated tax dollars to help the local infrastructure. In fact, this facility is the largest private employer in San Juan County.

Since my election to Congress, I have had the privilege to spend significant time in the rural parts of Utah, including San Juan County. I appreciate rural Utah's sense of community and desire to help their neighbors during a time of need.

Unlike the more urban parts of Utah with a business hiring on every corner, rural areas often have fewer economic opportunities. However, the hardworking and entrepreneurial spirit among the residents of San Juan County make me confident they will be successful in their fight through this difficult time and, ultimately, come out stronger for it.

Additionally, I am committed to creating new economic opportunities in

rural areas. Rural Utahns deserve the same quality of life that their urban friends have, including access to broadband, quality medical care, and good-paying jobs. I will continue to work in Congress to bring these vital services to rural Utah.

While it has been a difficult week for many in San Juan County, I know the community will be resilient and persevere.

REMEMBERING THE LIFE OF GEORGIA STATE REPRESENTATIVE JAY POWELL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember the life of Georgia State Representative Jay Powell, who passed away in late November at the age of 67.

At the time of his passing, Representative Powell had served in the Georgia General Assembly for 10 years and had dedicated his time in public service to helping the rural areas of our State. His colleagues remember him as a straightforward talker and remember that, if he said he was going to do something, he did it.

A testament to his honest character, during his tenure, he rose to be one of the most powerful members of the assembly as the chairman of the Rules Committee. There, he played a large part in deciding which bills came up for a vote.

One of his most important priorities included introducing a bill that would require small fees collected by the State, like police fines, to be spent exactly where taxpayers are told they would be spent.

Representative Powell is going to be deeply missed in Georgia and throughout rural Georgia. His family and friends will be in my thoughts and prayers during this most difficult time.

RECOGNIZING PETTY OFFICER 2ND CLASS NATHAN NEWBERG

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Petty Officer 2nd Class Nathan Newberg for being named USO Coast Guardsman of the Year for 2019.

Stationed in Savannah, Georgia, I am so proud that the USO recognized Officer Newberg for his brave efforts to rescue the crew of an overturned cargo ship off the coast of the First Congressional District of Georgia.

In early September, Officer Newberg responded to a 3 a.m. call about the *Golden Ray* cargo ship capsizing. In early September, he was subsequently lowered from a helicopter, crossed along the side of the ship, and descended inside to rescue the *Golden Ray*'s captain and a bar pilot. His effort, along with the rest of the Coast Guard, rescued all 24 of the ship's crew.

In addition to his work with the *Golden Ray*, he has helped evacuate individuals with health conditions from cruise ships, worked to recover coastguardsmen's bodies that were missing

in action since World War II in Greenland, and completed over 125 aerial flight-hours in support of Coast Guard missions.

I thank Officer Newberg for his service to our country. I congratulate him on being named USO Coast Guardsman of the Year for 2019.

RECOGNIZING NATIONAL PHARMACIST DAY 2020

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize National Pharmacist Day 2020, which was celebrated on January 12.

According to Census data, there are over 200,000 pharmacists across the U.S., with another 25,000 pharmacy aides. Every day, these pharmacists are providing vaccines for a number of illnesses and carefully counseling patients on prescriptions to help heal sickness and reduce pain. Through this work, pharmacists are considered one of the three most trusted professions in America.

Today and throughout the rest of the year, I encourage everyone to visit their pharmacist, ask questions about their prescriptions, and get to know the people who provide their medicine and work to keep them healthy.

As the only pharmacist currently serving in Congress, I am proud to recognize the work these individuals are doing every day to serve their local communities around the country.

□ 1015

A DAY OF RECKONING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Still I rise, Mr. Speaker, because I love my country and I love the people in this country. I love them because we are all created from a common Creator. I love the people of this country.

Not all of the people in the United States, those who are citizens, live within the continental United States. A good many of them live in Puerto Rico. I rise today to speak on behalf of the people of Puerto Rico who are suffering because moneys that have been appropriated by the Congress of the United States of America have not been given to the people of Puerto Rico and have not been delivered to the people of Puerto Rico.

I cannot understand how Congress can appropriate—bills signed, money available—yet we cannot get it to the people who need it. I am told that hospitals are closed. I am told that some people are sleeping in the street. I am told that there is suffering. I haven't been there to see it myself, but the reports are available for all of us.

There is suffering taking place in Puerto Rico, and we in this House would allow what we have signed, sealed, not to be delivered?

What is wrong with us?

People are suffering. We can help. At some point we will have to pay for this, and we are not going to have to pay for

it by losing a congressional office. That is easy. That is not the kind of punishment we are going to get for the way we are treating people. There is going to be a day of reckoning for all of this, knowing that people are suffering and you withhold the money.

The chief executive officer of this country knows what is going on, and we who are here in Congress are aware of what is being denied. All it takes is for the chief executive officer to send it, and it will be done. But it is not taking place.

So I appear today, and I rise because I love my country. I love the people of Puerto Rico. They are Americans by the way, citizens by the way. I love them and I refuse to allow this to happen on my watch without my at least standing here and calling it to the attention of the American public.

I have a duty, a responsibility, and an obligation to say something about this type of behavior, especially when there are 435 of us who could do something about it and have done something about it, but there is one person who declines to allow justice to be done.

Mr. President, what is wrong with you?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair and not to a perceived viewing audience.

DE FACTO VETO SETS A DANGEROUS PRECEDENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) for 5 minutes.

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

I come before you this morning to remind this House and to speak about the procedure that is pending in the Senate and some activities that need to take place in this House before that is likely to happen, and that, of course, is the impeachment of the President of the United States.

It took place December 18, and we will have been waiting nearly a month before the Articles of Impeachment would be transferred over to the United States Senate which would then begin the enactment of a trial—hopefully a fair trial—with an opportunity for the President to defend himself over in the United States Senate.

I was here in this city for 3 days of the impeachment hearings before the House Judiciary Committee in 1998 and I was able to observe the activities here in this House and how people acted. I will say the people who were defending Bill Clinton were not serious outside the camera and in the House Judiciary Committee.

Here we have an impeachment that has been brought forward on two different charges and we have watched as from the beginning, from clear back in November of 2016, this discussion about

impeaching the President of the United States began. It began on November 9 when the first Democrat stepped up and said: We are going to impeach this President.

We had people who ran for office to get into this Congress who announced: We are going to impeach the—I can't put those words into this CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Mr. Speaker.

So this has been a driven agenda and it began as soon as the other side realized that Donald Trump was the duly elected and legitimate President of the United States.

There are two reasons that this impeachment is taking place here. One of them is because there is a deep, visceral hatred for Donald Trump among the hardcore left in this country that is driving the caucus on that side.

Another reason is because the investigations came about because of the weaponization of the executive branch of the United States. I mean particularly the Department of Justice and within it the FBI, some of the State Department, and much of the intelligence community working together to surveil President Trump's campaign operations and then President-elect Donald Trump's inauguration activities and communications before that and surveillance afterwards.

Also I mean the circumstances that came about when James Comey took information that was proprietary and many say classified and leaked it to a professor of Columbia University with directions to leak it to The New York Times with the objective of creating a special counsel that needed to be Robert Mueller who couldn't have been changed differently by then-Attorney General Jeff Sessions because he had recused himself from Russia.

This is the backdrop of this. Impeachment puts a cloud up in front of the activities that took place that should appall this Nation at the highest level.

So what I ask, Mr. Speaker, is this: Let's get these Articles of Impeachment done in this House this week, let's send them down across the rotunda to the United States Senate, and let's ask the Senate then to go ahead and work your will under your rules.

But my ask is this: having lived through this as a witness back in 1998, we didn't get a clean verdict in the United States Senate. I am going from memory here, I didn't look up these articles and the actual vote, but I remember this: the public never knew from each Senator whether they believed that President Clinton was guilty of the various charges that were brought before him. All wrapped in one question was: If he is guilty, is he worthy of being removed from office?

When you package those things together and you had Democratic Senators defending Bill Clinton, they said: Well, I didn't have to wonder if he was guilty because if he was, it didn't rise to the level to remove him from office.

I would like to know, I think the public wants to know, and I think it is

the constitutional duty of the United States Senate to give us a verdict:

Did the President actually obstruct Congress?

Did he actually abuse power?

What were the definitions of those things?

They are not crimes.

What were the definitions?

Let's find out the judgment of these Senators, yes or no, guilty or not guilty, and then the next question is: Should he be removed from office?

I say not. I didn't see the evidence here. I don't see any crimes, and there have been no crimes.

All it amounts to also is in delaying these Articles of Impeachment if the Speaker can block a majority action from the House of Representatives, then the Speaker can block every action from the floor of the House of Representatives. It is not a sustainable position for the Speaker to refuse to message and have a de facto veto because that would make the Speaker of the House all-powerful with a veto for any piece of action that would come through the floor of the House of Representatives.

Let's get this done this week, and I encourage the Senate to get it done quickly. I would like to see the President stand here before us at the State of the Union address February 4 and be able to announce to the world that he has been exonerated by the United States Senate.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 23 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: Almighty God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

You have promised, O God, that You are with us wherever we are and whatever we are doing—to heal and to help, to give strength and make us whole.

We pray that the Members of this assembly especially, and all of us, will be receptive to Your promises and receive them with confidence and conviction, that, armed by Your spirit, they will be able to forge good legislation which promotes justice, equity, and truth.

May we be mindful that all are created in Your image. Help us to see Your spirit in those who are different from us in age, color, religion, and all

other ways, including in politics, and engage each other with goodwill and respect.

May all that is done today be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUDD) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. BUDD led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. Under clause 5(d) of rule XX, the Chair announces to the House that, in light of the resignation of the gentleman from California, Mr. HUNTER, the whole number of the House is 430.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

HONORING THE LEGACY OF MAMIE KIRKLAND

(Mr. HIGGINS of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Madam Speaker, last month Buffalo's oldest resident, Mamie Kirkland, passed away at the age of 111. Mamie made Buffalo her home in 1923 after spending a lifetime outsmarting racism in Mississippi, Illinois, and Ohio. She fled rioting, burning of homes, and the shooting of residents by an angry racist mob. She witnessed the Ku Klux Klan burn a cross on the lawn of her family home.

Through these memories she inspired the creation of both the Legacy Museum and National Memorial for Peace and Justice.

Four years ago Ms. Kirkland was honored at a gala by the Equal Justice Initiative. When asked to speak on her journey, she said: "I left Mississippi a scared little girl of 7 years old. Now I am 107—and I am not afraid anymore."

I rise to honor the fearless legacy of Ms. Kirkland for the citizens of Buffalo, a city honored to be Mamie's home.

IRAN PROTESTS

(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, the amazing capabilities of our men and women in uniform, combined with decisive action by President Trump, inspired thousands of civilians throughout Iran to take to the streets over the weekend to protest their government. These individuals braved the threat of live fire, teargas, and further damage to show the Ayatollah and his thugs that enough is enough.

It is a shame that in sharp contrast, House Democrats last week buckled to the Iranian regime and passed a concurrent War Powers Resolution attempting to tie the President's hands and obstruct his already successful Iranian strategy. Furthermore, the Speaker yesterday sadly attempted to downplay these nationwide protests as just "students" upset about the downed airliner.

To the protesters in Tehran, Shiraz, and elsewhere: I say the Speaker of this House does not speak for all of us. We do not downplay your courage, and we stand with you.

DRUG PRICING

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

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as a professional registered nurse in Congress, I must say how crucial it is for essential medications to be affordable and accessible.

In 2017, 42 percent of Texas residents stopped taking medications as prescribed simply due to cost according to AARP. Over 2.6 million Texans have diabetes, and they must have daily access to affordable and quality insulin.

Mr. Speaker, huge investments from taxpayers go into the development of quality medications, yet just in the first days of 2020 multiple pharmaceutical companies have increased prices on over 400 drugs by 5 percent of the taxpayers' money.

We must do more to protect the vulnerable members of our communities, especially our seniors and the uninsured. With support of this House and Senate, we must continue to work together to lower the cost of prescription drugs for our constituents.

ANTI-SEMITISM

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

Mr. BUDD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to condemn the increasing anti-Semitic violence that has spread in recent months, including the recent stabbing that happened last month in New York.

Mr. Speaker, anti-Semitic and anti-Israel attitudes often emerge because

of a lack of understanding of the painful history directed at the Jewish people and the horrors of the Holocaust.

For this reason, I introduced H. Res. 782 alongside Representatives ZELDIN and KUSTOFF that encourages public schools to design and teach a curriculum about the history of anti-Semitism and the Holocaust and it calls on Federal law enforcement to hold the perpetrators of these attacks accountable.

Our Jewish community is feeling rattled, frightened, and unsafe. We cannot allow these feelings to fester. So in support of this community, I am proud to lead a resolution that will help increase understanding and rid our country of all anti-Semitic hatred.

CONGRATULATING THE UNITED WAY OF CENTRAL MASSACHUSETTS

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the United Way of Central Massachusetts as they celebrate their 100th birthday this month and to thank the incredible staff, interns, fellows, volunteers, and community partners who allow this amazing institution to make a difference for so many people.

When I think of organizations that change lives, organizations that mobilize and unite our community to inspire change and create a better world, organizations that look out for the least among us by giving families the tools and stability they need to break the cycle of poverty and get back on their feet, I think of the United Way of Central Massachusetts.

I am so proud and grateful for the work they do every day and the positive impact they have on the folks I am privileged to represent.

On behalf of my constituents and with thanks from the entire United States Congress, congratulations to the United Way of Central Massachusetts for a century of awe-inspiring work, and here is to many more.

HONORING THE LIFE OF FRANK MITCHELL

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

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of a trailblazer and Springfield, Illinois, native, Frank Mitchell, who on Christmas Day at age 70, unfortunately passed away after a fight with lung cancer.

In the spring of 1965 Frank made history right here in the House of Representatives when he became the first African American page since Reconstruction. Nominated by the late Congressman Paul Findley, who represented what makes up much of the

18th Congressional District today, Frank was appointed by then-House Republican leader and future President, Gerald Ford.

As a page, Frank answered calls in the Republican Cloakroom, worked on the House floor, and witnessed many historic events, including the civil rights movement and the debate on the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

Frank's historic appointment was long overdue, and he blazed a path for those who followed him with his work ethic and compassion for everyone he encountered. Frank often said that he couldn't fail because the door of opportunity had to remain open. Frank succeeded in every respect, keeping that door of opportunity open for generations to come.

Our thoughts and prayers are with the Mitchell family, and may Frank rest in peace.

SUPPORTING IRANIAN PROTESTERS

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the people of Iran have taken to the streets in defiance of their oppressive regime and refuted the lies that Soleimani was a beloved general. Already 1,500 people have been killed while protesting the authoritarian regime.

The Epoch Times of January 7 is correct: "The protesters' central demand in Iran is for the mullahs' regime to step down, stop its terrorist adventures abroad, and end its massive corruption at home."

This is why I am cosponsoring H. Res. 791, introduced by Leader KEVIN MCCARTHY that supports the protesters of Iran. I am thankful for the courageous leadership of President Donald Trump and his support for the Iranian people.

He tweeted in Farsi: "To the brave, long-suffering people of Iran: I've stood with you since the beginning of my Presidency, and my administration will continue to stand with you. We are following your protests closely and are inspired by your courage."

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

EARTHQUAKES IN PUERTO RICO AND SUPPORT FOR EMERGENCY DECLARATION

(Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico. Mr. Speaker, today I rise on behalf of every single one of my constituents impacted by the ongoing seismic activity in Puerto Rico.

According to the U.S. Geological Survey, the southwestern coast of the island has been the epicenter of over

1,000 earthquakes since December 28 of last year.

On January 7 the island experienced a 6.4 magnitude earthquake that has triggered consequent aftershock tremors that are felt in the entire island, mainly in the municipalities of Guanica, Guayanilla, Yauco, Penuelas, and Ponce.

Mr. Speaker, I urge President Trump to approve the major disaster declaration requested by the Governor of Puerto Rico. This should be the next step to ensure proper and timely recovery efforts on the island as we push through yet another natural disaster.

□ 1215

CONGRATULATING LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY TIGERS

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

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am here to congratulate the LSU Fighting Tigers for winning the national championship last night, the fourth national championship, a record-setting year, 15-0, 726 points. Joe Burrow is the Heisman Trophy winner, a record-breaking quarterback with 60 touchdowns this year.

LSU alumni are especially proud of what they did last night in the national championship.

I was honored to fly down with President Trump to attend the game. The cheers and standing ovation he got in the Louisiana Superdome was just phenomenal and well deserved, the fifth time the President has been to Louisiana this past year, and rightly so. Our State leads with seafood, oil and gas industry, forestry, and agriculture. You name it, we have got it in Louisiana, and we are very, very proud.

This football team, our baseball team, and our other sports lead the Nation and will continue to do so.

Please join me in congratulating the LSU Fighting Tigers football team for winning the national championship last night.

SUPPORT GRANDPARENTS IN PRIMARY CAREGIVER ROLES

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 5583, the Help Grandfamilies Prevent Child Abuse Act. I am proud to cosponsor this legislation with my colleague, Congresswoman MARY GAY SCANLON of Pennsylvania's Fifth District.

All children deserve a loving and safe home. Sadly, due to the Nation's growing opioid crisis, more and more children are being left without structure, without safety, and, in some cases, without parents. As a result, grandparents have become the primary caregivers for many children.

The Help Grandfamilies Prevent Child Abuse Act will provide resources to assist grandparents in raising their grandchildren and, most importantly, help prevent these children from entering the foster care system.

This bill ensures grandfamilies and kinship caregivers are eligible for services under the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act, or CAPTA. It also provides support to meet the needs of children who have experienced trauma; for example, those exposed to substance misuse. Lastly, the bill calls for training and resources to assist caregivers in navigating the complicated childcare system.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5583 is a good bill. It is a bipartisan bill, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CUELLAR) laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 14, 2020.

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

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on January 14, 2020, at 11:16 a.m.:

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 434.

That the Senate agreed to Relative to the death of the Honorable Jocelyn Burdick former United States Senator for the State of North Dakota S. Res. 468.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

CHERYL L. JOHNSON.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1230, PROTECTING OLDER WORKERS AGAINST DISCRIMINATION ACT; PROVIDING FOR CON- SIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 76, PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF RULE SUB- MITTED BY DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION RELATING TO "BOR- ROWER DEFENSE INSTITU- TIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY"; AND PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM JAN- UARY 17, 2020, THROUGH JANU- ARY 24, 2020

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 790 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 790

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1230) to amend the Age Discrimination in Employment Act

of 1967 and other laws to clarify appropriate standards for Federal employment discrimination and retaliation claims, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Education and Labor now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116-46 shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as the original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the five-minute rule and shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such further amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such further amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill, as amended, to the House with such further amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 76) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Education relating to "Borrower Defense Institutional Accountability". All points of order against consideration of the joint resolution are waived. The joint resolution shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the joint resolution are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 3. On any legislative day during the period from January 17, 2020, through January 24, 2020—

(a) the Journal of the proceedings of the previous day shall be considered as approved; and

(b) the Chair may at any time declare the House adjourned to meet at a date and time, within the limits of clause 4, section 5, article I of the Constitution, to be announced by the Chair in declaring the adjournment.

SEC. 4. The Speaker may appoint Members to perform the duties of the Chair for the duration of the period addressed by section 3 of this resolution as though under clause 8(a) of rule I.

SEC. 5. Each day during the period addressed by section 3 of this resolution shall

not constitute a legislative day for purposes of clause 7 of rule XV.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 790, providing for consideration of two measures: H.R. 1230, the Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act, and H.J. Res. 76, providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Education relating to "Borrower Defense Institutional Accountability."

The rule provides for consideration of H.R. 1230 under a structured rule, with 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the Committee on Education and Labor. It makes in order five amendments and provides one motion to recommit.

The rule provides for consideration of H.J. Res. 76 under a closed rule, with 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and the ranking member of the Committee on Education and Labor, and it provides one motion to recommit.

Finally, the rule provides for standard district work period instructions from January 17 through January 24, 2020.

Mr. Speaker, since taking the majority a year ago, Democrats have made it a priority to protect our Nation's students and workers. As a member of the Committee on Education and Labor, I am proud that I have played a role in passing legislation that will provide students and workers the support they need to thrive. We have that opportunity once again this week with these bills, both of which I am proud to co-sponsor.

First, we are taking a stand against the Department of Education's deliberate disregard for students who have been defrauded by institutions. In 2019, student loan debt reached an all-time high in the United States of \$1.41 trillion. Our Nation is truly in a student debt crisis.

Even more significantly impacted by this crisis are students who have been defrauded by predatory for-profit colleges. On top of their crushing debt, they have useless degrees and none of

the job opportunities that they were promised.

In 2016, following the collapse of two major predatory for-profit institutions, President Obama established the borrower defense rule to help students access relief from their student loans. Instead of helping students, Secretary DeVos modified the rule, creating an intentionally complicated process that restricts how much relief defrauded students can receive.

According to The Institute for College Access and Success, the new rule would forgive only about 3 cents on every dollar borrowed. Even in cases where schools clearly violate the law, this new rule denies students relief if they can't prove the school intentionally defrauded them, can't file their claim fast enough, or can't document exactly how much financial harm they have suffered due to fraud.

Although we don't have the full picture because their investments are shrouded in secrecy, Secretary DeVos' connections to the for-profit college industry led me to believe that her siding with the industry is not a coincidence.

The bill we will consider this week would bring us back to the Obama-era rules that put students first and profit second.

Second, we will bring to the floor the Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act. One in four adults age 65 and older are part of the workforce, and that number is still growing. While some of the reasons behind this shift in the labor force are positive, like better health and job satisfaction, many older Americans must keep working because they are not financially prepared for retirement.

Sadly, aging American adults have a median savings of just over \$150,000 for retirement. If a person is fortunate enough to live a long, healthy life and has 30 years of retirement, that would leave them with just \$5,000 a year, a sum no one could retire on anywhere in this country.

Unfortunately, older workers suffer disproportionately from long-term unemployment and age discrimination in the workforce. Six out of 10 older workers have experienced age discrimination, but a 2009 Supreme Court ruling has made it harder for them to prove it. The decision upended decades of precedent, making it more difficult for older workers to get justice through the courts.

This legislation restores workplace protections for older Americans, paving the way for a more inclusive and diverse workforce.

Taken together, these bills honor our commitment to students and workers and offer us the opportunity to reverse two misguided and harmful policies.

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. DESAULNIER) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, today's rule provides for consideration of two measures, a bill that seeks to protect older Americans from discrimination in the workplace and a Congressional Review Act resolution to overturn a Department of Education rule on borrower defense to repayment. While both pieces of legislation appear to protect vulnerable Americans, they likely have no chance of becoming law.

First, H.R. 1230, the Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act, adds a section to the Age Discrimination in Employment Act that shifts the burden of proof in age discrimination cases to allow a plaintiff to show that any practice by the employer for which age may be an involved factor, not the sole factor, is covered by the act.

□ 1230

This changes congressional intent and disregards case law.

In 1967, Congress enacted the Age Discrimination in Employment Act to protect applicants and employees over 40 years of age from discrimination on the basis of age in employment matters. It is enforced by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

In 2009, the Supreme Court held that, in the case of *Gross v. FBL Financial Services, Inc.*, the standard of proof for a claim under the Age Discrimination in Employment Act requires that age stand alone as the cause of the adverse employment action rather than in conjunction with other factors.

In 2013, the Supreme Court also ruled in the *University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center v. Dr. Naeel Nassar* that the plaintiff must prove that a retaliatory motive was the decisive cause of adverse employment action.

H.R. 1230 would reverse these Supreme Court decisions by allowing mixed-motive claims in Age Discrimination in Employment Act cases, clarifying that age need only be a motivating factor for discrimination, even though other factors also motivated the action unfavorable to the employee. This would actually make it more difficult to prove discrimination because an employer would simply have to show that they would have taken the same action in the absence of age as a motivating factor, which will be more easy to show under the mixed-motive legal framework.

Congress previously rejected amendments to add age discrimination to the Civil Rights Act, resulting in the passage of the Age Discrimination in Employment Act using a different legal procedure. Lowering the standard would apply the legal procedure of the Civil Rights Act to the Age Discrimination in Employment Act. In addition, a lower standard is likely to lead to increased litigation that, in fact, only benefits the plaintiffs' bar.

Other provisions of H.R. 1230 prohibit a court from awarding damages or requiring any employment activity other than injunctive relief. This means that

discriminated parties are precluded from actually receiving monetary relief, and the only true beneficiaries of this law will be trial lawyers.

The Supreme Court stated in the *Nassar* case that "lessening the causation standard could . . . contribute to the filing of frivolous claims, which would siphon resources from efforts by employers, administrative agencies, and courts to combat workplace harassment."

Republicans are committed to eliminating discrimination in the workplace, including for older Americans. Discrimination of any kind is already against the law.

Let me rephrase that. Discrimination of any kind is already against the law through the Age Discrimination in Employment Act, the Americans with Disabilities Act, the Rehabilitation Act, and the Civil Rights Act.

Now, the second measure included in this rule is the Congressional Review Act resolution to overturn a 2019 Department of Education rule called Borrower Defense Institutional Accountability.

In 1994, the Department of Education issued the Borrower Defense to Repayment regulation. In 2015, the Department of Education began considering borrower defense claims prior to default or collection proceedings, prompting a significant increase in applications for loan relief.

On November 1, 2016, the Department of Education published a Borrower Defense to Repayment regulation that did not distinguish between intentional fraud and a simple mistake by an institution of higher education. These regulations went after institutions rather than working to help students. Offending institutions suffered significant financial penalties, resulting in a taxpayer cost of \$42 billion and the loss of access to higher education for millions of students.

These Obama administration regulations were, in fact, overly broad, with the intent of loan forgiveness, despite taxpayer cost.

The Trump administration's Department of Education subsequently issued a notice of proposed rulemaking and reviewed over 30,000 comments prior to publishing a final rule in September of 2019 to revise these 2016 regulations.

And let me just remind you, these 2016 regulations actually came about right at the end of the previous administration. The 2019 regulations, those that were derived after the 30,000 comments, the 2019 regulations will apply only to loans disbursed after July 1, 2020. So existing loans will remain subject to the 1994 or the 2016 rules, depending upon the issue date.

The new regulations will provide loan relief to those students who have been lied to and suffered financial harm. They will also hold institutions accountable, grant due process to all parties, allow for the use of arbitration, and expand the closed school look-back period from 120 to 180 days.

If this rule is not allowed to take effect, the 2016 regulations will remain. The definition of misrepresentation under the 2016 regulation is so broad that nearly everyone will eventually receive loan forgiveness, so this may, in fact, have the effect of making college free.

Now, free college sounds like a great benefit to society, but it is not practical, and it would force those who can't or won't go to college to pay for those who do.

In addition, eliminating the cost to higher education will limit the competitiveness of institutions, reducing the superiority of American colleges and universities.

Now, we heard last night in the Rules Committee that this Congressional Review Act is important to combat for-profit colleges, but the rules apply to all institutions. This means that even those institutions that inadvertently make a mistake, such as not updating a graduation rate on a flyer, will suffer financial penalties and, in fact, may have to close, despite no intentional wrongdoing.

The 2019 borrower defense rule is a significant improvement over the 2016 regulations and will save the taxpayer money, ensure due process, and hold fraudulent higher education institutions accountable.

Mr. Speaker, I urge opposition to the rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

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

I want to thank Congresswoman SUSIE LEE and Chairman BOBBY SCOTT for their leadership on advocating for America's students.

In the economy that we are in today, some kind of postsecondary training, whether it is an associate's degree, an apprenticeship program, or a 4-year program, is necessary in order to get the skills that are required in order to support a family and earn a decent living, and that is what education should be about in this country.

Sadly, in order to get that education, too many young people and people transitioning into their next job are taking on mountains of debt. Student debt is now \$1.3 trillion, more than credit card debt in this country.

As a result, these students, these graduates, often, or some who drop out are holding back from making other necessary investments to support their families, holding back on buying a home, and holding back on starting families and putting away money for their retirement because they are so saddled with debt.

One of the contributors to this huge increase in student debt has been the effect of predatory for-profit colleges. They have exploited potential students with false promises of high-paying jobs; and, particularly shameful, they have recruited the most vulnerable low-in-

come individuals: first-generation students, veterans. They have recruited them into junk programs.

Education should always be a vehicle to opportunity. Instead, these students are left with a bag of promises and crushing student debt.

This is a real problem. This is a real issue. That is why President Obama's Department of Education enacted the borrower defense rule to outline a clear, transparent process for student loan relief and to institute protections for those students and protections for taxpayers as well, because we are often talking about taxpayer-backed loans. The Obama borrower defense rule would help defrauded students get the loan debt relief that is owed to them under the law.

Secretary DeVos, however, has refused to implement this rule, and as of December 2019, 240,000 defrauded borrowers are still waiting for her to act on their claims. That includes 6,000 people from my home State. This rule further underscores why Secretary DeVos is unsuited for this position.

We have to protect students from these for-profit colleges that have defrauded them, and I encourage my colleagues to join me in supporting this rule and the legislation that will be coming to the floor.

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

Soon we will vote on the previous question, and if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to require the House to immediately proceed to consideration of H. Res. 791, a resolution supporting the protestors in Iran.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of this amendment into the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), the Republican leader, to explain the amendment.

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

Mr. Speaker, over the weekend, the world saw powerful images coming out of Tehran. Iranian protestors, many of them students, braved gas and gunfire to gather in the streets and speak out against their oppressive government for lying to its people. We saw video footage of people putting their personal safety at risk so their fellow citizens and the countries of the world could know the truth about what was going on inside Iran.

The Iranian protestors are showing incredible courage, standing up to a government that kills and brutally silences its own people. To get a sense of how brave their actions are, think about this: When Iranians took to the streets to protest late last year, many of them were shot and killed by their

own country's security forces. Death tolls show Iran's Government killed 1,500 people during the 2-month demonstration.

According to experts, this is the bloodiest crackdown on protestors since the Islamic Revolution of 1979. It came after the Supreme Leader of Iran gave a chilling order to "do whatever it takes to end it."

Sadly, attacks on innocent civilians have been all too common in Iran. This is just another horrifying chapter in their long history of harming their own citizens.

What is happening in Iran is a reminder that here in the United States there should never be any hesitation to stand with people in their calls for freedom. From the beginning, America has been a shining beacon of hope for those seeking a free society. Our task is to embrace that identity and the responsibility that comes with it.

Especially now, we cannot shrink from the sources of our national greatness. That is why I stand here today: to ask you to lend freedom your voice and unconditional support.

The resolution I introduced yesterday accomplishes three things:

It condemns the Government of Iran for shooting down Ukraine International Airlines flight 752, which killed 172 innocent civilians;

It expresses unequivocal support for the Iranian protestors; and

It calls on the Iranian regime to not use force against its own people, as it has done so many times before.

This resolution sends a strong message that the United States stands with the Iranian people and we are with them in their demands for free and honest government.

But the resolution also intends to amplify the voice of the Iranian protestors. It does not call for anything Iranians have not already demanded themselves.

This is an issue on which Congress should and must speak with one voice. We already passed similar measures supporting Hong Kong protestors by substantial bipartisan margins. It should not be difficult for us to pass this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I have been thinking a lot about what the Iranian protests mean today and in the future, and two things come to mind: a story and a quote.

□ 1245

The story is a small one. It happened a couple days ago at a university in Tehran. It is about a group of students and two big flags.

The Iranian Government had painted large American and Israeli flags in the middle of the street, as a sign of disrespect expecting people to walk over them. But a group of Iranian students courageously defied the regime's wishes. They would not walk on the flag and booed those who did. Some reported that the students were chanting "our enemy is in Iran, not America."

There are moments in time of history that the craving for freedom gets displayed, be it a young, lone man standing in front of tanks in Tiananmen Square, or be it some students in Tehran with fear just a few months before of being murdered, but not willing to walk on the American flag. A small moment with big meaning, for the students, for Iran and for us. It reminds me of the Hong Kong protestors who waved American flags and sang our national anthem.

The quote I have been thinking of comes from an anthology of speeches that Frederick Douglass read as a young man. The quote is this, "Let it be remembered, there is no luxury so exquisite as the exercise of humanity, and no post so honorable as his, who defends the rights of man."

Mr. Speaker, America is more than a country. We are an idea, an inspiration for those who yearn to be free and have the ability and dignity to determine their own destiny.

So many times in this body as these moments rose around the world, be it the shipyard workers of Poland, be it the craving of the Berlin Wall collapsing and becoming one, be it those in Hong Kong that want just freedom of speech.

Let us not be the Congress that misses the opportunity. Let us not be the Congress that takes 1 week earlier and sends a message to the Iran Government that is much different, that we are divided, that we would not stand up if they murdered their own people again, or we would not stand up if those who are young students who rose and would not walk across an American flag and booed those who would, those who would stand up in Iran and say "the enemy is in Iran, not in America." Let us not be that Congress.

Let us take this moment in time where history has shown that we are right when we stand with anyone who craves freedom. This resolution is the right way to amplify the call for freedom in Iran.

It is not just those on C-SPAN who are watching, it is the world who is watching. The world is much smaller today than at those other times. We will not have to wait for days or hours for the news to come across. It will be in a tweet, it will be in a text, or it will be in an Instagram.

There are important issues in this Nation, but there are none more important than whether we stand for freedom. I do not want this Congress to walk in shame that they missed this window. I do not want historians to look back in a few decades and see civilians were killed because they stood for freedom and America stood quiet. That is why I am asking that we vote "no" on this PQ. This resolution deserves to be heard, but more importantly, the world deserves to hear this Congress act.

Do you agree that America is more than a country; that America is an

idea, that it could be so great of an inspiration, it would move the students to crave what we fought for? Let's take this moment in time to tell them we hear them, we stand with them, and this America will always defend freedom here and around the world.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to respond to the comments from my friend from California.

We know the Government of Iran admitted to mistakenly shooting down the Ukraine International Airlines flight. It was a tragedy, and tragedies led to tragedy. The people of Iran stood up and demanded accountability and are standing up from their government today.

This Congress supports those who have stood up to their government demanding transparency and fighting for their rights. That is why the concurrent resolution we passed last week reaffirmed that it is in our national interest to support the people of Iran and other Middle Eastern countries who demand an end to government corruption in violation of basic human rights.

As of this morning, the Foreign Affairs Committee is holding a hearing to examine our policy with Iran. While the Foreign Affairs Committee is hearing from experts on Iran, the House is taking action to protect students and protect Americans from discrimination in the workplace, and that is what this rule is about.

Make no mistake, defeating the previous question is not a vote on the McCarthy resolution, it is a vote to hand over control of the House floor to the minority.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the previous question so we may proceed to these critical pieces of legislation without delay.

I might add, just on a personal note, I would ask my colleagues to help—and I am sure they have had some cases of this—the Iranian Americans who have come to my office in my district with very troubling stories about their relatives who regularly have come to visit them in this country who are unable to come right now because of the travel ban by this administration.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN), a distinguished member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I have been a professor of constitutional law for 29 years, so I know the relationship between universities and students is sacred. We pledge to teach young people everything we know in order to propel them to become engaged citizens, educated human beings, and effective actors in the economy and society.

When I hear about for-profit colleges and universities ripping off young people and their families and plunging them into debt for unconscionable get-rich-quick schemes, it infuriates me as a professor, as a father, and as a Member of the House of Representatives representing the people of Maryland.

These rip-off institutions like Corinthian Colleges and ITT Technical Institute, which collapsed last year, leaves students with crushing debt, degrees that are not worth the paper they are printed on, and broken promises for the future.

The Obama administration adopted the borrower defense rule to authorize the Department of Education to provide debt relief to student borrowers who have been defrauded by these predatory, low-rent higher ed rip-off academies.

In Maryland, we have 3,754 students waiting for the Department of Education to review their borrower defense claims and relieve them of millions of dollars in loans that the American government disbursed to predatory colleges. Secretary Betsy DeVos, who is to education what Attorney General Barr is to justice, is not only keeping the Department of Education from processing 240,000 defrauded borrower claims nationwide, but she has drafted a new rule to make it nearly impossible for students to obtain relief from fraudulent colleges as of June 2020.

Secretary DeVos wants to replace a system of higher ed with a new system of higher debt. Under the old rule, groups of students defrauded by a predatory college would have received an automatic loan discharge of the debt from the rip-off institution. Under the new rule, defrauded students would have to submit individualized evidence to the satisfaction of the department that rip-off colleges intentionally misrepresented degree program outcomes, quality of instruction, or job placement opportunities. So even where these Bonnie-and-Clyde schools clearly violated the law en masse, students can still be denied relief if they can't prove that they were individually and intentionally deceived, if they can't file their claim fast enough, or if they can't document how much financial harm they have personally suffered.

Billionaire Secretary DeVos, the patron saint of the rip-off academies, is basically telling working class kids across America that life isn't fair, and now she is making that the law. Most victims of the higher debt industry will never fully recover from the lost time and opportunity, but by allowing these miseducation hucksters to rip them off, we are implicated as a Nation, and we must not fail them again. We must fully forgive every penny that the students were taken on a ride for. We must overrule the DeVos rule.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. TLAIB).

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding. I appreciate this time to speak on behalf of my congressional district, which I lovingly call the "13th District Strong."

Mr. Speaker, instead of working on behalf of students, Secretary DeVos is enriching predatory for-profit colleges that leave students with crushing debt

and useless degrees, and I rise today because we have to stop it.

If you want to see harm caused by the legacy of the DeVos-led policies, look no further than my district. In fact, students in Michigan will suffer for years to come because of Secretary DeVos' consistent record of putting for-profit interests first. And who are Secretary DeVos' latest targets, student borrowers who were defrauded by large for-profit colleges. Scams, Mr. Speaker.

I heard from one constituent in my district who was deceived by a for-profit college that suddenly, with no notice closed its doors 6 months into her 1-year program. Now she is burdened with thousands of dollars in loans and nothing to show for them, not even a certificate or a diploma. She did apply for the forgiveness program through the Department of Education but was denied.

If we don't stop this latest DeVos rule, we will guarantee that my constituent will bear the burden of unfairly paying for a diploma she has never received.

It is outrageous that our residents are the ones being punished instead of protected from this type of fraud and abuse. Sometimes I think these words "fraud and abuse" are just not strong enough. These are scams, criminal activity by these corporations coming in and targeting communities like mine that the majority are people of color.

Look at the advertisement, they are targeting specific communities where I have a number of single mothers who want to go back to school and better their lives or other folks who are non-traditional students are who they target. Again, these are the most vulnerable communities that we all represent.

We need to stop Secretary DeVos from this relentless effort to protect the bottom line for corporations at the expense of our residents, the students.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding.

I rise in opposition to this rule and primarily in opposition to H.R. 1230, that is one of the subjects of this combined rule that we have.

The legislation that is coming before, the Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act, reaches way too far. I am one of the people in this Congress that has met payroll clear back to 1975. I haven't kept track of all the people we hired, but we hired them across the full range that we had the opportunity of their age, whether it was on the young side or whether they stopped showing up on the other side. We want people that can do the job, and we want to take good care of those folks. We want to build a reputation that we are a good place to work. I want to have all of those workers come together at the Christmas party and

join together like family, and that is what happened just this past week with King Construction.

I think about what the impact of this proposed legislation does, and it works in the reverse of what many of the proponents would like to have it do. Certainly, when you take the definition of age discrimination and you expand it to mean if it is only the preponderance of the evidence—what we have in current law is a preponderance of evidence and the but-for language.

In other words, if an employee alleges they have been discriminated against because of age, there could be multiple other factors that were involved in that decision. Yet, as long as age is a component and it could be asserted effectively that that age was a but-for component, then that would be satisfactory as far as the legislation is concerned.

I think what happens instead is employers make prudent decisions, and when they do the hire, they are going to think, I have this applicant before me that is 62 years old. Picking an age, it could be 72 or 75 or less. That employer is going to have to make the calculation, what if this person is just setting me up? Or what if this person can't do the job and I have to remove them or terminate them? You are setting yourself up as an employer for potential liability, and that decision gets made at the hiring end, which means there will be a lot of seniors that don't have an opportunity to work because of the concern about the litigation that could be brought forward.

We have protection now, Mr. Speaker, in law and in state law, and that is where it needs to stay. It is a problem that doesn't exist and doesn't need to be solved.

□ 1300

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

Mr. Speaker, before I recognize the gentleman from Connecticut, I want to mention, like the previous speaker, I am a Member of this House who made payrolls for over 35 years in the restaurant business. I have a different perspective.

I wanted to hire the most talented person in front of me, and I wanted my managers to do the same thing. I don't think this rule, these kinds of laws, will inhibit that.

I understand the intuitive perspective, but if you believe in hiring the best person, I don't think you have to be afraid of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY).

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Rules Committee's motion and passage of the underlying bill, H.J. Res. 76, which will block Secretary Betsy DeVos' antistudent borrower defense rule.

Over the last 5 years, for-profit college chains have, without warning,

closed their doors on enrolled students who had paid their tuition—Corinthian College, ITT Tech, Dream Center, and Education Management Corporation—as have smaller schools like Ridley-Lowell in New London, Connecticut, which shut its doors midterm without notice on a school day 2 years ago.

In 1993, Congress created the borrower defense rule through the Higher Education Act to relieve student loan debt for student victims of fraud. Now, we have a Secretary of Education who wants to gut that law by making students whose classes, diplomas, and certificates have been terminated have to jump through a ridiculous maze of hoops before they can get what Congress intended back in 1993 and what the Obama administration was actually implementing—namely, justice—a complete discharge of student loan debt on the basis that students were victims of fraud.

The convoluted explanation that the DeVos Department used to deny discharge is a smokescreen for the administration's blatant bias in favor of for-profit colleges.

One group that sees the harm that the Education Department will do with the new rule is, surprisingly to some, The American Legion, America's oldest and largest veterans organization. As the National Commander stated recently, thousands of student veterans have been targeted and defrauded over the years by some of these rip-offs and have lost precious GI Bill benefits as a result.

As the commander states: "The rule, as currently written, is fundamentally rigged against defrauded borrowers of student loans, depriving them of the opportunity for debt relief that Congress intended to afford them under the Higher Education Act."

Mr. Speaker, this Chamber should heed The American Legion, stand up for student veterans and all students, and vote for H.J. Res. 76.

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

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. SHALALA), a distinguished member of the Rules Committee.

Ms. SHALALA. Mr. Speaker, the 2016 borrower defense rule created a process for student loan borrowers to demonstrate that their loans did not need to be repaid due to their school's misleading, fraudulent, or otherwise illegal conduct.

Many of those that closed their doors left thousands of students with no credible recourse. Instead of working to protect students and taxpayers, however, the Education Secretary and the Department have repeatedly sided with these bad actors.

By rewriting the borrower defense rule to favor those institutions, the Secretary has made it harder for borrowers to get relief and shifted the cost of providing debt relief from the schools to the taxpayer.

Several independent reports have concluded that this rewrite is fundamentally rigged against defrauded borrowers, depriving them of the opportunity for assistance promised them under the Higher Education Act. According to an analysis based on the Department's data, the changes to the financial triggers in the 2019 rule will result in institutions repaying only 1 percent of the eligible loan debt.

Mr. Speaker, I have led three institutions of higher education. The Secretary has created a bureaucratic nightmare. Even I, after reading the regulation carefully, could not figure out all the information that was necessary to apply for relief.

The Federal Government should be putting students and taxpayers first rather than helping financially irresponsible schools stay afloat.

Mr. Speaker, nearly 20,000 students in my State are currently seeking relief because they were cheated by predatory colleges. I did not come to Congress to protect corporations that seek to take advantage of low-income students, veterans, and taxpayers.

Until we take a definitive stance on for-profit schools, they will continue to defraud students.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the gentleman from California (Mr. DESAULNIER) how many more speakers he has.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, I have one more speaker.

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

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a September 3 Institute for College Access and Success article titled "Defrauded Students Left Holding the Bag Until Final 'Borrower Defense' Rule."

[From The Institute for College Access & Success, Sept. 3, 2019]

DEFAUDED STUDENTS LEFT HOLDING THE BAG UNDER FINAL "BORROWER DEFENSE" RULE

Claiming to protect students and hold colleges accountable, on Friday the Department of Education finalized its so-called borrower defense rule. The rule allows students to seek to cancel student loans connected to fraud and other illegal activity by their colleges. "If a school defrauds students, it must be held accountable," said Secretary of Education Betsy DeVos in the press release.

Yet the Trump Administration's proposal would do virtually nothing to hold schools accountable for their misdeeds or to protect students who were wronged. To really understand the impact of the rule, you have look at page 669 of the notice where—in a table titled "Assumptions for Main Budget Estimate Compared to PB2020 Baseline"—the Department published its own estimates of the likely impact of the rule:

Borrowers will be required to repay the vast majority of loans resulting from colleges' wrongdoing. Only about 3 cents of every dollar borrowed will be forgiven under the borrower defense rule.

Colleges, on the other hand, will rarely face any questions. They will repay only about a penny for every dollar of loans stemming from misconduct.

The Department expects substantial amounts of illegal activity by colleges. In 2021 alone, the Department expects nearly

200,000 borrowers to suffer from colleges' illegal conduct, but their rule would leave borrowers to repay 97 percent of the resulting \$2.5 billion in debt.

Source: TICAS analysis of data provided by the U.S. Department of Education, "U.S. Department of Education Finalizes Regulations to Protect Student Borrowers, Hold Higher Education Institutions Accountable and Save Taxpayers \$11.1 Billion Over 10 Years," August 30, 2019. Available at <https://bit.ly/21POWdk>.

Methodology: Figures derived from U.S. Department of Education's publication of the unofficial text of the final rule on its web site on August 30, 2019. U.S. Department of Education, "U.S. Department of Education Finalizes Regulations to Protect Student Borrowers, Hold Higher Education Institutions Accountable and Save Taxpayers \$11.1 Billion Over 10 Years," August 30, 2019. Available at <https://bit.ly/21POWdk>. Because Table 3 provides the data by sector, we used other Department data on loan volume by sector to produce a weighted average, on the assumption that these figures are consistent over time. U.S. Department of Education, "Fiscal Year 2020 Budget Proposal," March 11, 2019, page Q-30, <https://bit.ly/21XI7Xm>. To translate these percentages into the number of affected students, we used other Department data on the number of students borrowing federal loans, again assuming that these figures are similar from year to year. Federal Student Aid Data Center, "Aid Recipients Summary," April 2019, <https://bit.ly/12MGL5wc>. To translate these percentages into dollar terms, we used projected loan volume in year 2021 from the Congressional Budget Office. Congressional Budget Office, "Student Loan Programs—CBO's May 2019 Baseline," May 2019, <https://bit.ly/21A5juo>. We examined fiscal year 2021, the first full year of the rule's implementation.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, according to the Institute for College Access & Success, the DeVos rule would forgive just 3 cents of every dollar borrowed by students. That means those scammed by bad actors and fly-by-night institutions would be forced to repay the vast majority of their loans for degrees they didn't get, often through no fault of their own.

We need to help defrauded borrowers, not defend for-profit colleges. That is what this resolution is all about.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. STEVENS).

Ms. STEVENS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.J. Res. 76 because we can no longer allow the denial of debt relief to students defrauded by predatory colleges.

We can no longer allow a system that looks to line the pockets of the failed for-profits at the expense of students. We can no longer allow Secretary DeVos to ignore a court order as she attempts to turn over every action of the previous administration at the expense of the American taxpayer and the American public.

People have been defrauded; people have been robbed; and we need justice.

Nearly 8,000 Michigan borrowers are waiting for relief from paying their Federal student loans, including Erica Maupin, who was going to school to become a paralegal until she was defrauded by a Corinthian College. Erica had to abandon her dream, and now she

doesn't know how she is going to provide for her family and pay off her debt because the Federal Government isn't keeping its promise.

I am glad that the House is taking this step today. We should all be proud that the House is taking this action. However, we should also recognize it comes at the expense of a great step backward of the current administration.

Because of the step backward that they took, we now have to take another two big steps forward to right this wrong and to bring justice to people like Erica, to people like the Michiganders who are waiting for their justice are are waiting for their debt relief, and for our For the People Agenda.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close, and I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, the underlying measures do not protect vulnerable Americans as intended.

H.R. 1230 would make it more difficult to prove age as a motivating factor in adverse employment actions. Republicans remain committed to eliminating all forms of discrimination and ensuring a productive and competitive workforce, but this bill ignores Supreme Court decisions and will place opportunities in the hands of trial lawyers rather than hardworking Americans.

H.J. Res. 76 is simply another partisan attempt to deny President Trump any success, even if it means harming American students.

Mr. Speaker, I remember when President Bush signed a Congressional Review Act overturning some of the ergonomic rules that the Clinton administration issued literally days before that President left office.

At the time, I ran a medical practice. I was a business owner wondering how I was going to pay for and comply with these new rules that seemed burdensome, complicated, and confusing. The repeal of these rules relieved what was sure to be a heavy burden on my shoulders and, certainly, many other small businesses.

Congressional Review Act resolutions have consequences, and we should fully evaluate the effect that they will have on Americans rather than just play politics.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on the previous question, a "no" vote on the rule, and a "no" vote on the underlying measures.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, these two issues are extremely important to the American public.

When I think of the comments from my friend from Iowa and the comments about having made a payroll, I reflect on my career making those obligations. He neglected to say that doing

what he suggested employers would do is discriminatory on its face.

I knew that when I instructed my managers and when I interviewed prospective employees, I was not to discriminate based on certain Federal and State categories. So by taking the lead that he assumed that some employers might do, that you wouldn't hire somebody who is older because you might find yourself in court, that would in itself be discriminatory.

What we are doing with this legislation is just bringing this to an equal perspective with other categories. You shouldn't discriminate based on ethnicity, gender, or sexual preference. Why should you have any different performance standards or adhere to the same level for older people?

Given that baby boomers, people of my generation, find they have to work longer and harder, and given the issues around retirement, I would think that all of us would want to make sure that they were protected and that the economy would get the benefit of their wisdom and experience, and not have them discriminated against.

On the second subject, Ben Franklin once famously said at the beginning of this country that an investment in education is always the best investment.

Sadly, with this administration, Mr. Franklin might not say that because young people who are encouraged to get degrees, to get undergraduate degrees and graduate degrees to be part of a knowledge-based economy, to take that access to the best educational system in the world in higher education in this country, it would end with them in debt and with a degree that is worthless in the open marketplace.

I would think that all Members of Congress would want to protect both aging workers and students who are defrauded.

Mr. Speaker, as you can see, we are on the floor this week to restore justice to those who need our help. Struggling students and workers deserve our support, not for us to turn our backs on them.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote on the rule and the previous question.

The material previously referred to by Mr. BURGESS is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 790

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 6. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall proceed to the consideration in the House of the resolution (H. Res. 791) condemning the actions of the Government of Iran and supporting the protesters in Iran, their demands for accountability, and their desire for the Government of Iran to respect freedom and human rights. The resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and preamble to adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of House Resolution 791.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 226, nays 191, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 16]

YEAS—226

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

Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small (NM)

Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman
Schultz

Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NAYS—191

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

NOT VOTING—12

Aderholt	Gabbard	Marchant
Byrne	Kirkpatrick	McClintock
Clay	Lesko	Richmond
Crawford	Lewis	Walker

□ 1343

Messrs. POSEY and SMITH of New Jersey changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

Mr. BURGESS. 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 216, nays 200, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 17]

YEAS—216

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

NAYS—200

Abraham	Banks	Brooks (AL)
Allen	Barr	Brooks (IN)
Amash	Bergman	Buchanan
Amodei	Biggs	Buck
Armstrong	Bilirakis	Bucshon
Arrington	Bishop (NC)	Budd
Babin	Bishop (UT)	Burchett
Bacon	Bost	Burgess
Baird	Brady	Calvert
Balderson	Brindisi	Carter (GA)

Carter (TX)	Horn, Kendra S.	Roby
Case	Hudson	Rodgers (WA)
Chabot	Huizenga	Roe, David P.
Cheney	Hurd (TX)	Rogers (AL)
Cline	Johnson (LA)	Rogers (KY)
Cloud	Johnson (OH)	Rooney (FL)
Cole	Johnson (SD)	Rose, John W.
Collins (GA)	Jordan	Rouzer
Comer	Joyce (OH)	Roy
Conaway	Joyce (PA)	Rutherford
Cook	Katko	Scalise
Crenshaw	Keller	Schrader
Cunningham	Kelly (MS)	Schweikert
Curtis	Kelly (PA)	Scott, Austin
Davidson (OH)	King (IA)	Sensenbrenner
Davis, Rodney	King (NY)	Sherrill
DesJarlais	Kinzing	Shimkus
Diaz-Balart	Kustoff (TN)	Simpson
Duncan	LaHood	Smith (MO)
Dunn	LaMalfa	Smith (NE)
Emmer	Lamborn	Smith (NJ)
Estes	Latta	Smucker
Ferguson	Long	Spano
Fitzpatrick	Loudermillk	Staubert
Fleischmann	Lucas	Stefanik
Flores	Luetkemeyer	Steil
Fortenberry	Marshall	Steube
Foxx (NC)	Massie	Stewart
Fulcher	Mast	Stivers
Gaetz	McAdams	Taylor
Gallagher	McCarthy	Thompson (PA)
Gianforte	McCaul	Thornberry
Gibbs	McHenry	Timmons
Gohmert	McKinley	Tipton
Golden	Meadows	Turner
Gonzalez (OH)	Meuser	Upton
Gooden	Miller	Van Drew
Gosar	Mitchell	Wagner
Granger	Moolenaar	Walberg
Graves (GA)	Mooney (WV)	Walden
Graves (LA)	Mullin	Walorski
Graves (MO)	Murphy (FL)	Waltz
Green (TN)	Murphy (NC)	Watkins
Griffith	Newhouse	Weber (TX)
Grothman	Norman	Webster (FL)
Guest	Nunes	Wenstrup
Guthrie	Olson	Westerman
Hagedorn	Palazzo	Williams
Harris	Palmer	Wilson (SC)
Hartzler	Pence	Wittman
Hern, Kevin	Perry	Womack
Herrera Beutler	Posey	Woodall
Hice (GA)	Ratcliffe	Wright
Higgins (LA)	Reed	Yoho
Hill (AR)	Reschenthaler	Young
Holding	Rice (SC)	Zeldin
Hollingsworth	Riggleman	

NOT VOTING—13

Aderholt	Kirkpatrick	Richmond
Byrne	Lesko	Velázquez
Clay	Lewis	Walker
Crawford	Marchant	
Gabbard	McClintock	

□ 1352

Mr. VAN DREW changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I was absent today due to a medical emergency. Had I been present, I would have voted: “yea” on rollcall No. 16, and “yea” on rollcall No. 17.

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

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Democratic Caucus, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 793

Resolved, That the following named Member be, and is hereby, elected to the fol-

lowing standing committee of the House of Representatives:

COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES: Mr. Garcia of Illinois.

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

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

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF INDIVIDUALS TO BOARD OF FEDERAL JUDICIAL CENTER FOUNDATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 629(b), and the order of the House of January 3, 2019, of the following individuals to the board of the Federal Judicial Center Foundation on the part of the House for a term of 5 years:

Ms. Elizabeth J. Cabraser, Sebastopol, California

Mr. Peter A. Kraus, Dallas, Texas

PRAISE FOR NEWARK MENTORING MOVEMENT

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to praise the Newark Mentoring Movement, an organization that wants to turn Newark into “Mentor City.”

Unlike most mentoring organizations, they do not supply mentors. Instead, they do a more valuable thing. They connect politicians with organizations who support mentoring so they can discuss how to increase mentoring opportunities in the future.

The importance of mentors in America has never been greater. Today, more than 30 percent of children come from single-parent homes, and it is incredibly difficult to raise children alone. Mentors give these parents a helping hand. They give their children a role model. They can help increase their grades and increase their self-esteem. In addition, they can put students on a better path and keep them on a positive trajectory.

We need to dedicate more time and resources to provide mentors for children across this great Nation. Every child must be given a chance to succeed.

HONORING FALLEN OFFICER PAUL DUNN

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

Mr. SPANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor one of Lakeland Police Department's finest. Officer Paul Dunn was a United States Marine Corps veteran and worked in law enforcement

for over 20 years. He started with Lakeland P.D. in 2013 and epitomized courage and sacrifice.

Officer Dunn sadly passed away following a tragic on-duty traffic crash on January 9. He leaves behind a devoted wife, who is a detective with Lakeland P.D. and five children.

This is the second officer Lakeland P.D. has lost over a 5-week period, and their losses have a wide impact on the surrounding communities. Yet the thin blue line that Officer Dunn was a part of continues to serve, continues to protect, and continues to allow us peace of mind.

I am grateful for him and for all of those who don the uniform with dignity, fairness, and justice. I thank them from the bottom of my heart.

Mr. Speaker, our prayers are with the family of Officer Dunn. He was treasured in our community.

□ 1400

HONORING THE LIFE OF JODY WILSON

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

Mr. O'HALLERAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay my respects to Jody Wilson, a veteran who passed away last month.

Jody was dearly loved by her friends, family, and community. She served bravely in the United States Army for 9 years.

After her military service, Jody served her community as a clerk, a nurse, and later as a letter carrier for the United States Postal Service. Her kindness, sense of humor, and infectious smile were sources of joy for those who knew and loved her.

Arizona has lost an incredible community member, veteran, and public servant.

Pat and I are keeping Jody's family, friends, and community in our prayers as we mourn her passing.

CELEBRATING INDIANA UNIVERSITY'S BICENTENNIAL

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

Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH. Madam Speaker, on January 20, Hoosiers will celebrate a big milestone. Indiana University will turn 200 and share those 200 years of academic excellence and notable achievements with the whole world.

For 200 years, Indiana University has provided top learning opportunities to Hoosiers and out-of-staters alike, with countless job opportunities to those in the Bloomington area. It is world-renowned for programs like the Jacobs School of Music, the Kelley School of Business, and Hoosier basketball.

Since its establishment in 1820, Hoosiers have graduated from IU and gone off to change the world. Indiana's faculty and alumni include Rhodes schol-

ars, Nobel laureates, Olympic medalists, and Pulitzer Prize winners, just to name a few.

IU's bicentennial will be celebrated on campus in Bloomington by alumni across the globe and through immense contributions every single day that the Hoosiers at Indiana University make.

Big Red 200 is a new supercomputer whose name reflects our bicentennial and the common "Go Big Red" cheer played at football and basketball games. Big Red 200 is the fourth in IU's Big Red computer series and is on pace to become the fastest university-owned supercomputer in the Nation.

As a member of the House Financial Services Task Force on Artificial Intelligence, I have seen the exciting opportunities America has to invest in AI transform a number of sectors like healthcare and financial services through that continued data sciences research, and I am confident that IU will be at the forefront.

Madam Speaker, I extend congratulations on 200 years, and I look forward to the next 200 years of academic excellence.

REAFFIRM BIPARTISAN SUPPORT FOR UKRAINE

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, as co-chair of the Bipartisan Congressional Ukraine Caucus, I rise to introduce a resolution reaffirming the House's bipartisan support for Ukraine, our ally.

This time-sensitive measure proclaims the United States' vital strategic interest in preserving liberty and democracy in Ukraine and across Europe.

In 2014, Vladimir Putin's Russia invaded Ukraine without provocation. Over 5 years later, Ukraine remains engaged in a heroic struggle to defend its freedom and sovereignty.

Today, Ukraine represents the scrimmage line for liberty on the European Continent and globally.

This resolution makes clear that we in Congress recognize the sacrifice that Ukrainians make each day to defend liberty in Europe. As our ally, we support her continued defense, growth, and success.

Madam Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to join this timely resolution.

SUPPORT PRO-LIFE MEASURES

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

Mrs. WALORSKI. Madam Speaker, I rise today to mark 47 years since the Roe v. Wade decision and to affirm my commitment to defending the unborn.

The discovery last year of thousands of fetal remains in the garbage of Ulrich Klopfer, Indiana's most prolific abortionist, was a tragic reminder of the terrible cost of abortion.

After this shocking event, I introduced the Dignity for Aborted Children

Act, which would require the dignified burial or cremation of aborted fetal remains, with a strong reporting requirement to hold abortion providers accountable.

I also signed a discharge petition to bring the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act to the House floor for a vote. This commonsense bill would ensure a child born alive after a failed abortion attempt would receive the same kind of medical care any other child would.

Madam Speaker, as we mark 47 years since Roe v. Wade, we have a lot of work to do to stop a radical agenda and stand up for the sanctity of life. Congress can start by passing these two pro-life bills without delay.

RECOGNIZING HISPANIC HERITAGE YOUTH AWARDS

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

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Madam Speaker, right here in Washington, D.C., I had the honor of speaking to families and to 15 beautiful youth, American citizens of the United States of America who are going to be the future doctors, researchers, and teachers of this great United States of America.

What did they have in common? They were all Hispanic youth from this region on the East Coast of the United States, 15 young people who are talking about their dreams for curing cancer, their dreams of becoming teachers to inspire the youth of America. These are the kinds of young people who make this America great.

Another thing that they had in common: most of their parents' primary language was Spanish. But let me tell you, people of this great Nation, the parents whom I met last night love this country so much and appreciate all the opportunities that their wonderful American citizen children have the opportunity to aspire to and to achieve.

Again, we have a great, eclectic Nation, and I was so pleased to meet those 15 young people who already are leaders in our great Nation and will be the leaders of today and tomorrow because this country is great.

CONGRATULATING JOHN P. GILL

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

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize John P. Gill of Little Rock, Arkansas, who is being honored with Preserve Arkansas' 2019 Parker Westbrook Award for Lifetime Achievement.

This award recognizes significant individual achievement in historic preservation and is Preserve Arkansas' only award for achievement in preservation over a long period of time.

Throughout his career, both as an attorney and as a historian, John's passion for preservation was evident by his service in a number of capacities throughout central Arkansas, including sitting on the board of Little Rock Visitor Information Center Foundation and leading the efforts to preserve and restore Curran Hall. He also was president of the board of Preserve Arkansas in 2010.

John has demonstrated his passion for preservation through his commitment to service and leadership. I congratulate my friend John Gill on receiving this year's Parker Westbrook Award for Lifetime Achievement.

RECOGNIZING NATIONAL HUMAN TRAFFICKING AWARENESS MONTH

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize National Human Trafficking Awareness Month.

In my home State of California, human trafficking is a massive and dangerous industry, with 375 reported cases of trafficking involving minors in 2018. This must end.

That is why I am a cosponsor of H.R. 836, the Interdiction for the Protection of Child Victims of Exploitation and Human Trafficking Act, introduced by my colleague, Mr. MCCAUL from Texas.

This bill would establish a pilot program to provide training to Federal, State, and local law enforcement officers on identifying child victims of trafficking, exploited children, and missing children.

Indeed, the cues are out there, if we can see them. If our law enforcement is able to identify victims of human trafficking more quickly, it would lead to a safer environment, and identifying them a lot sooner would save more of the individuals.

Our most vulnerable populations need our help in order to keep them safe from this truly heinous and disgusting crime.

RECOGNIZING PABLO CUEVAS

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

Mr. CLINE. Madam Speaker, if you were to attend any public event in Rockingham County, it is likely that you would have the privilege of meeting Pablo Cuevas.

Today, I rise to recognize Pablo because, after seven terms and a 30-year tenure on the Rockingham County Board of Supervisors, he has recently retired.

Cuevas encapsulates the meaning of public service. An immigrant from Cuba, Mr. Cuevas has not taken lightly the privilege it is to live in America. Over the years, Pablo has given back to his community by not only serving on

the board of supervisors but also on the Broadway Town Council, the Broadway Planning Commission, the Rockingham County Planning Commission, and the James Madison University Board of Visitors.

Some of his greatest accomplishments include constructing new school buildings and expanding industries important to the area, such as agriculture. His dedicated service on the board of directors at the Virginia Poultry Growers Cooperative was invaluable to our region.

His passion for making his community a better place for all who live and visit the valley is going to be sorely missed on the board of supervisors. However, I am sure his wife, Elaine, and his daughter, Erika, will welcome the opportunity to have such a good man back home.

Madam Speaker, I wish Pablo a happy retirement and thank him for sharing his wealth of knowledge and passion for community service with Rockingham County for the past 30 years.

RECOGNIZING EAGLE SCOUT ANDREW ROCK

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

Mr. VAN DREW. Madam Speaker, today, I recognize Andrew Rock from south New Jersey on his attainment of the Eagle Scout rank.

Eagle Scout is the highest rank attainable from the Boy Scouts of America. Only 4 percent of Boy Scouts ever achieve this prestigious recognition.

Eagle Scouts are more likely to dedicate their life to service of all kinds, becoming future leaders in military, business, or politics.

I was proud to attend Andrew's beautiful outdoor ceremony on the lake this past November. The ceremony also highlighted the beautiful traditions of the American Indian people.

Madam Speaker, I congratulate Andrew. We look forward to big things from him in the future. I am proud of him; south Jersey is proud of him; and the United States of America is proud of him.

TALKING DEBT AND DEFICITS

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

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Madam Speaker, to our stenographer, if I start talking too fast, just give me that horrible look because my staff was telling me last week that I was sounding like a machine gun.

Madam Speaker, this is something I try to do at least half an hour every week. It is basically to have a little bit

of honesty about math and a little optimism about what policy can do to make things work.

Once again, I have a couple of my old slides here. I am sorry that I haven't been able to update them because there are some new numbers, but it is a really simple concept. Let's walk through it.

How many times do you hear Members from both the right and the left get on television and talk about things? Why does no one talk about the debt and deficits? I can tell you why we don't talk about the debt and deficits, because to tell the truth of what is driving the debt and deficits is really uncomfortable.

We are going to try to do a little bit of that math honesty because it is demographics. It turns out, demographics are not Republican or Democratic. It is just math.

We continue to exist in this pretend world, saying: Well, if we would tax rich people more, if we get rid of waste and fraud—none of those.

I have brought these charts here before. There are fractions of fractions of variance.

Why is it so hard for us to tell the truth? Why is it so hard for us to own calculators? We basically are a math-free zone.

This slide is a few months old, and I am sorry about that because there is optimism on the tax cuts in the revenues. As you all know, last fiscal year, we broke over 4 percent revenue growth in a time with lower rates, which none of us modeled. The economy is doing really well there.

□ 1415

Demands on social services have fallen fairly dramatically because of the incredibly robust labor environment. Discretionary spending, turns out the caps that that line is about, the benefits we were getting from the caps, when we did the budgetary deal functionally in September and October, we blew up the caps. So this line is bigger; this line is smaller.

But the punch line here is really, really simple: 90 percent of rising debt deficits between 2019, so last fiscal year, and 2029—90 percent Social Security and Medicare.

Now, those are earned entitlements. We have a societal obligation to keep our promises. But it is mostly Medicare. So we can't have an honest conversation here about debt unless you are willing to actually have an honest conversation about medical costs, healthcare costs.

We are going to pull some slides here that I am just incredibly optimistic that we could actually have a revolution in healthcare costs, but the only way that happens is this place has to grow up intellectually and join this century of technology and opportunities because, once again, let's go back a decade.

The ACA, ObamaCare, what was it really? It was a financing mechanism.

It was who got subsidized and who had to pay.

What did we, as Republicans, do? I still think ours was much better. It wasn't who got subsidized and who had to pay; it was who had to pay and who got subsidized.

We basically debate about healthcare financing. We do not have honest conversations about how to crash the price, because it is a really uncomfortable conversation because the things that would crash the price often actually make us have to have very uncomfortable conversations with our constituencies.

The different groups that are wandering the hallways right across the street right now lobbying us for this or that, they believe in their causes. They are wonderful people. But there is a disruption of technology.

So let's sort of walk through the math once again so we understand that we could have this amazing future if we could just focus on the facts.

This is a slide I have been showing almost for a year. If you and I remove Social Security and Medicare out of the 30-year projection, we have \$23 trillion in the bank. If we pull Social Security and Medicare—and this chart is not inflation adjusted, so you could remove about a third of it if you want to do constant dollars and you will see the difference of what is actual spending and then the financing costs, the interest on those. But if you pull Social Security and Medicare back into that number, we are \$103 trillion in debt.

So think about that difference: 23 cash positive, \$103 trillion in debt.

For those of you who care about your Medicare, you care about Social Security, you actually want these to exist, we must be honest about the math, because if we don't get our act together, we are going to get squeezed and there are no more dollars.

It is math. It is not Republican math; it is not Democratic math; it is demographics.

We have 73 million of us who are baby boomers. We are about halfway through retirement. That is what is driving the future debt.

So the next time you hear someone walk behind a microphone and say, "I am very concerned about the excess spending; I am very concerned about debt and deficits," if their next sentence isn't, "And I am going to work on a revolution to change the costs of healthcare and the things we provide," they are not being honest about how we save this society or how we save this country.

So, one more time, just to get our heads around the scale of the problem, and then we are going to actually talk about solutions.

This is a 2024 chart, so it is only what? Now, that is 3 fiscal years from now.

Nondefense, this is discretionary. This is what we get to vote on. This is defense. Everything you see in a blue shade there is on autopilot.

Do you notice something? The vast majority of spending is on autopilot. We don't vote on it. We don't do policy on it, and it is consuming everything.

So get our heads around something. Just the growth, just the growth of Social Security, Medicare, and the healthcare entitlements, over the next 5 years, just the growth portion equals one of these wedges. It functionally equals the entire Defense Department spending.

So, if you are someone who walks in the door and says, "Well, we spend too much money on defense; get rid of it," do you realize you just took care of only 5 years of the growth? What do you want to do with everything else? Over 10 years, it equals all the discretionary spending.

Once again, it is demographics.

Why is this place so uncomfortable to talk about that? Because it violates the pitches we go home and tell our voters. But it is math and it is honest, and if we keep avoiding the subject, the future becomes incredibly ugly. If we take it on, there is a path where things work.

So every week I come behind this microphone and I say, here is where the problem is, but here are solutions. And the very last slide is the one we do all the time, where we believe we have a formula where you grow the economy very aggressively. You do things from tax policy to immigration policy to trade policy that maximize economic velocity, and you are seeing some of that right now.

If I had come to this room a couple of years ago and said we are going to live in a time where we have more jobs than available workers, where the bottom 10 percent, the working poor in our society, have had the fastest growing wages in modern times, basically double what the mean is—it is working.

We should be, actually, as Republicans and Democrats, trying to figure out what is working, particularly for those quartiles—and I hate that term—those quartiles in our population that we were writing off a couple of years ago: You don't have a high school degree, you don't have skills, we are writing you off. You are part of the permanent underclass.

That was brutal. It was arrogant. It was vicious. It was wrong.

We know, right now, over the last couple of years, the movement of wages for those very people we were writing off 3 years ago, it is working.

How do we keep that going?

If you love and care about people, we need to keep this going, because, in my lifetime, there has never been a period of this type of economic growth and stability. Let's keep it going.

But let's not pretend that our future isn't buried in debt. Once again, if we take a look at it, it is substantially the growth of Medicare.

I intend that this Congress is going to keep its promises, but, mathematically, we are not going to keep our

promises unless we actually deal with the reality.

So when we have come in here, we have tried to show that there is a path, but beyond the economic growth issues.

We have labor force participation. You can't grow the economy unless our brothers and sisters are working, and those are folks who are both older, but we still have a problem with millennial men.

We had a miracle begin a year ago, December, where millennial females started entering the labor force in droves. The math right now says there are more females in the labor market than there are males.

Those are good things, because when we did tax reform, the joint tax folks, you know, the 50 of them who are all freaky smart, said your two problems of continuing the economic expansion will be capital stock—and I know I am getting a little geeky, and I am sorry—but capital stock, available capital for lending, for borrowing, for the growth, and people, available labor.

It turns out they were completely wrong on the capital stock. We have had hundreds and hundreds of billions of dollars more in what we call repatriation come back into the country than we had originally modeled. People are saving much more of their tax savings from tax reform than we ever modeled.

So the United States now is flush with cash. This is working over here. We have great capital stock, and you see it in our interest rates.

Our biggest fragility right now for continued economic expansion is actually labor participation. Now, there are miracles there.

Sure, because we are all really geeky, we all ran and looked at the U-6 unemployment numbers last Friday—not the top line, not where we stayed at 3.5, but the actual, what we used to talk about for years, "What is the real unemployment?" and you saw now we are in the sixes. We broke below 7 percent of real unemployment.

These are the folks who had become and we wrote off as discouraged workers, not participating; their skill sets are outdated. All of a sudden, they are entering the labor force.

We need public policy that continues to encourage that. How do you do that? How do you take someone who says, "I am older, but I am still a skilled worker; yeah, I might need an employer that is willing to make some accommodations for me," how do we create policies that incentivize that?

For our millennial males, how do we create policies that incentivize them? Because if we don't have that labor participation, we can't grow the economy.

The other things that also get uncomfortable, and we are going to talk about those today, is: How do you have a disruption, a disruption in the cost of healthcare?

I want to argue and I am going to make you an argument that we are living on the cusp of miracles.

On one hand, we have technology. Many of you are carrying it in your pocket. That cell phone, that super-computer, and the new sensors and other things, the ability to stay healthy, the ability to know when you have a problem.

Then, on the other side, the miracle cures, the single-shot cure for hemophilia that will be here this year, the experiment that is going on that cures sickle cell anemia. We are in the time of miracles.

Why this side is so important on my little upside-down bell curve is 5 percent of our population is the majority of our healthcare spending. It is our brothers and sisters who have chronic conditions.

What happens if we could get our act together and, through a series of financing and policy and licensing, these new biologic drugs, these new small-molecule drugs, these new things we are learning, get them to market and we are curing people who are part of that 5 percent of chronic conditions? Even if we can cure parts of their struggles, it is wonderful for society, and it is also really good for the cost of healthcare.

So we are going to touch base on just some things that I find fun, because it is part of the—and I know I overuse this term—thought experiment of what is coming.

So we now have almost complete miracles of technology. This is something that was just shown last week at the Consumer Electronics Show. This is a defibrillator you can carry in your purse. You can almost carry it in your pocket. It is just handheld.

This type of technology, as you now know, with the new types of pacemakers, the new abilities to help someone manage everything from hypertension to arrhythmia to now actually being able to restart a heart, this is at the Consumer Electronics Show.

We need to think about these types of disruptions.

Here is one. It turns out, if you were to take a look at how many Americans will lose their life to heart disease, to a heart attack, we now have the ability to monitor, with just almost a single pod like this in your home, just a single patch you put on, talking to your phone. These concepts crash the price of that disease if we could get them adopted.

It means we, as policymakers, have to figure out everything from the elegance of the licensing mechanisms—which the FDA does get some credit. They have been trying to create some kind of a third rail.

If you wear one of the Apple watches, you realize parts of that are coming on a new third rail of: Is it technology? Is it a health device?

These things are coming, and we are building models now that show they can help crash the price of keeping people healthy.

One of the slides I did not bring today but we have talked to the pro-

fessor, the thing that looks like a big kazoo. I am sorry. This is the best way we have to describe it.

You blow into it, and it instantly knows if you have the flu, instantly can bounce off your medical records if you are carrying them on your phone and instantly can order your antivirals.

So this could be in your medicine cabinet at home. You blow into it. They think the future version will be able to pick up bacterial infections, and the one a couple of years in the future will pick up as many as 20 different cancer proteins.

And it is a kazoo. You blow into it. We call it a flu kazoo in our office. People laugh at me for that, but they remember it.

Do you know that technology is illegal?

Think about that. The thing you would blow into that instantly knows you have the flu, that instantly can ping your medical records, knows that you are not allergic or are allergic to this particular antiviral, orders that antiviral and that Lyft or Uber or somehow gets it to your door an hour later, that process right now is illegal under many of our State laws under the way we reimburse under the Social Security Act because an algorithm is writing the prescription.

Should Congress, a few years ago, have slowed down the internet to protect Blockbuster video from Netflix?

You have got to understand, we have these disruptions in our society; we live with them all the time; but we sometimes need to step back and say: Okay. I like going home and hitting a button on my television and seeing all those movies instead of going and getting the little silver disc.

□ 1430

Apparently, Blockbuster Video didn't have armies of lobbyists walking up and down the hallways here in Washington, D.C. trying to protect their portion of the business model.

The technology is here that could crash the price of healthcare. Is that Republican or Democrat? I am going to argue it is just necessary. We do not have a choice. Do you remember the earlier boards? They were about if we don't have a revolution in healthcare costs.

So part of that same thought experiment, over that next 30 years you saw the majority of the debt and deficits are driven by Medicare. Thirty percent of that spending is just diabetes. What happens if—and I accept diabetes I and II are incredibly complex, there are autoimmune issues, there are lifestyle issues, it is complex, but just as part of the thought experiment—the single biggest impact you could have on future deficit spending is a cure for diabetes. Does that help sort of put it into perspective?

Let's actually walk through a couple of these. It turns out, remember how I said I think it is sort of an upside-down

cure? On this side is the use of technology to keep us healthy to be able to manage our health issues, if you need a pharmaceutical get it quickly, get it through use of technology; over here is the curative.

It turns out we are now coming across some studies that are talking about some of the new gene therapies that are crazy expensive, except the model is because of the cures they are producing, it will save billions of dollars in the future because you are cured. The miracles are coming.

Have you seen what we are able to do now in what we call CAR T? That is where we find out the type of cancer you have, we see what types of proteins it is producing, what T cells would properly attack it, and we set your body's immune system to attack. Some of the companies that are producing this technology actually give you a guarantee that if it doesn't work, you don't pay.

We just had a breakthrough a couple weeks ago, it turns out that we may be able to not only grow these in a petri dish, but we may be able to grow parts of those first immune responses to these types of diseases in an agnostic fashion before it is customized to you, so the price is about to crash. What is the value of curing your cancer instead of trying to find a way where you live with it for decades?

This place needs to think through the benefits of: How do we finance the cures? And this is where it gets a little political. I am sorry I am going to hurt some people's feelings, but there is a bill that has moved through this House called H.R. 3. It was a drug pricing bill. If you will be honest and sit and read it in detail, it is basically the keep Big Pharma protected bill because what it does is it wipes out all the small biologic, small molecule companies that are the disrupters.

These are the ones, you know, the product clearance is really simple. The drug that cures hemophilia is here. It is going to be like a million-and-a-half bucks a shot, but in many parts of the country hemophilia A may be a half a million dollars a year for the clotting factor and everything that goes with that. A million-and-a-half dollars a shot is a great investment. You are back in the money after 3 or 4 years. Our discussion should be financing that and getting those rolled out into society really fast.

But if H.R. 3 had existed when they were starting to research that drug, that drug would not be here. In a perverse way, the incentives are, without that drug, the ways of pharma and the infrastructure around that disease, they don't have a disruption. They are not put out of business by a cure.

H.R. 3, I know some of my brothers and sisters on the Democratic side, we have worked on it, we have talked about it, they mean well. There are actually some good things in the bill. But the basic reference pricing mechanisms that come with it, importing the European model, which in Great Britain a

year of healthy life is worth, I think \$38,000. So if the drug costs more than \$38,000, even though it gives you a year of healthy life, they don't buy it. And that is what this bill does, it imports that pricing mechanism into our market.

It is absurd because we should be looking at both pricing mechanisms that crash the price where we can, but cure. How do we cure our brothers and sisters who are part of that 5 percent who have chronic conditions that are the drivers?

We just passed a bill through this body that basically protects Big Pharma's current monopolies and wipes out the disrupters that were going to take their market share. They did it with glee because I think the hatred of Big Pharma blinded from understanding who actually won and who gets to just change their business model a little bit and stay protected and who you just wiped out, because that would wipe out those miracles that are coming.

I know that is partisan, and I don't mean to hurt anyone's feelings, but it is the math of the legislation. So these are important.

Another thought, if you want to have a real disruption that you could do before the end of this year, half the pharmaceuticals that will be picked up today at pharmacies will not be used or will not be used properly. Our model says it is a half a trillion dollars a year from not using your pharmaceuticals properly. The person that doesn't take their hypertension pills and ends up having an aneurism, the person over here that takes too many, or the person over here gets confused. Half a trillion dollars a year for noncompliance with pharmaceutical regimes, and half the pharmaceuticals that will be picked up today will not be used or will not be used properly.

The thought experiment is really simple. Go look in your own medicine cabinet. Take a look, and what is sitting in there? What is the value of what is sitting in there? Let's be honest. Almost all of us, if we go, yes, I probably do have hundreds of dollars of value sitting there. Let's just go after one small portion, the efficacy, the person who, if they really take their hypertension pill every morning, and there is a miracle, we think there might be a one- or two-shot-a-year system about to come that may actually intervene instead of having to take the daily pill—but I don't mean to take us down that side.

How about a pill bottle that pings you and says, Hey, Bob, you didn't take your hypertension pill this morning. Don't forget, this is really important. It turns out, just that \$20 piece of technology would save billions of dollars of healthcare costs and stop many tragedies in our families.

I have actually brought the board here that is actually for seniors that looks a little bit like a dome that drops the pills into a little cup and then noti-

fies you, because some people have regimes where they need to take this one in the morning, this one during lunch, these three before going to bed to stay stable. And how many of us have ever had that moment saying, Now did I take it? Did I remember? This technology exists. We need to think about making those as part of our formulary, so we are reimbursed. Because it turns out in those cases it is not the price of the pharmaceutical, it is our efficacy of how we take them. Half a trillion dollars a year, because we don't stay on our regimes of our pharmaceutical prescriptions properly.

If you wanted to have a disruption in healthcare costs tomorrow, make high-value pharmaceuticals, put them in a double blister pack, put them in a cartridge so they stay sterile, and make them returnable. Use technology like this so we take our pharmaceuticals as we are supposed to. Make it so it could also talk to family members or even the physicians' assistants to call in and say, Betty, we are getting a notice that you haven't been opening your pill bottle. The technology is here. Why do we fight it?

Here is also a level of disruption that was being shown at the consumer electronics show, but I need to put this a little more in context.

In the Phoenix area we have an experiment going on. I am blessed, I represent, I truly believe, the greatest congressional district you could ever imagine. I have north Phoenix and Scottsdale, and I have a lot of freaky-smart people in our community and moving into our community. And there is this one business, a couple autonomous automobile engineers got together and said, Hey, we have made a lot of money, we want to take on the biggest issue in our society, which is the cost of healthcare. Let's try an experiment. Let's see if we can create autonomous healthcare clinics.

Think of this, you walk into a Safeway grocery store—it is a little unfortunate, they are in former Theranos spots, but you all get that joke—but you walk in the door, you pick up the iPad, you sign in. You take a picture of your driver's license, a picture of your insurance card. You walk into a booth alone. The instructions pop up on the screen. You put your arm in this, you hold this up, you follow an avatar, you shine this in your mouth, your nose, your ears, you do this, you look into this, and it turns out the algorithm is stunningly accurate. And I believe they have had a couple of their algorithms now certified by the FDA. And there are a dozen clinics now or they have a dozen clinics in a dozen grocery stores.

Are we willing to make that technology legal? Because at the end they have to bring a doctor on the screen to meet the laws. Well, what would happen if that autonomous—what they call in some of the literature, they now refer to them as sensor clinics or sensor healthcare, but we need to think about this. This is here. It is coming very fast.

It turns out at the electronics show last week they were showing one that is a micro size that you could have in your medicine cabinet that does many of those very same types of tests and the algorithm apparently is freaky accurate and can do all sorts of diagnostics. Are we ready for this?

Last year I came and showed a box—that actually is sort of what Theranos had promised, but it actually now exists—it is from an Israeli company, it is certified in the EU, that does all sorts of blood tests. The technology now exists. It is not being offered here because it is too hard to hit our market at this point.

Go back to the beginning slides. The debt and deficit are functionally being driven by our demographics. The cost of those demographics is our healthcare. Are we going to continue to have the absurd debate around here of financing options, which may have effects? There are parts of it that are good, but they don't have a disruption. Are we going to find a way to promote, legalize the next-generation technology that can crash the price of healthcare and make us healthier and cure many of the diseases that crush our brothers and sisters?

So back again—the slide we either start with or end with—we believe to take on the debt-ridden future and keep us from breaking through that 95 percent debt-to-GDP it is not a single solution. Today we just did healthcare technology disruption. But it is everything. It turns out it is economic policies that grow because if we don't grow the math, you can't get anywhere.

Population stability, how do we incentivize family formations? How do you build an immigration system that is much more talent-based, because—let's be brutally honest—since 1971, the United States has been below replacement rate in our birth rates. The last few years we have actually had fairly stable economic times, the last 2 years, great economic times, and our birth rates are still falling.

There is a paper I have in my office that says, in about 8, 9, 10 years, two workers, one retiree. The math doesn't work. So what do you do to encourage family formation? For some Republicans we are going to have to really step up and think about that.

But also for immigration, you need to move to a talent-based system. The elegance of that is you don't care about someone's religion, their race, who they cuddle with, or where they come from. But what you do care about is what they bring to our society to maximize economic expansion. In many ways it is a much more honest and elegant system than this carve-out system that we have today.

Changing the way or creating benefits incentives within the benefits of Social Security and Medicare to stay in the labor force or to come back into the labor force or become a part-time entrepreneur, we need to fix the way we tax certain benefits, the way we

crush people if they are still saving when they are older. We need to deal with the reality of how much longer baby boomers are going to be living. And we have got to get our labor force participation numbers up. It turns out all these things tie together. You can't do one without doing the others to get the economic benefits of it.

And that is what terrifies me about our place here: Are we capable of doing complex policy, when over here I am doing immigration issues, and over here I am doing tax reform issues, and over here I am doing trade issues, and over here I am doing healthcare technology issues; and understanding they are all sympathetic to each other, they all tie together to create the economic philosophy and the changes in our cost structure together? When what we have here is a place where we fight over the naming of a post office.

I understand we are living in a time of political rage, and that is how so many people raise money, how they hold office.

□ 1445

I have a 4-year-old daughter. I am 57 with a 4-year-old daughter. My wife, the same.

You know I am pathologically optimistic, but I am optimistic because I get to get behind this microphone and advocate for what I believe is an actual path that saves us from a debt-ridden future.

I have been doing this now for a year, saying here is the problem, but also offering the steps of a solution.

I will go back to my office now, and the phones won't ring. There won't be any text messages or emails from even fellow Members, let alone the world, saying: Hey, DAVID, can you tell me about this technology? Can you tell me about this? How do we help?

If we don't have that revolution, I am terrified.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY) for the purposes of a colloquy.

Mr. ROY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arizona for highlighting a number of different issues, starting, of course, with spending and talking about the future that we are going to deal with from a fiscal standpoint in our country, particularly the extent to which Medicare and our entitlement situation is going to drive that, but, importantly, getting to the point of disruption, technology, and the ways that we can totally transform healthcare in a way that will both fix our fiscal situation as well as provide the best healthcare in the world.

As the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT) knows, I am a cancer survivor. I am a father, as well, of a 10-year-old and an 8-year-old.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Madam Speaker, I wish he would tell that story more.

Mr. ROY. Madam Speaker, I do, and I try to talk about it. There are others of us in this body who have gone through that sort of thing.

This is what is so critically important, what we are talking about: We have the ability at our fingertips to transform our healthcare system and to save our country from the depths of \$23 trillion, \$24 trillion, \$30 trillion, \$40 trillion of debt. This is where we are headed if we don't go down this road.

I know there is a bipartisan thirst for this, but we have to stop having our leadership in two corners, with shirts and skins squabbling instead of focusing on these kinds of roll-your-sleeves-up solutions.

The question I would ask my friend from Arizona is, what does he see as the obstacles to what we are talking about here, in terms of the current situation with insurance oligopolies and the government bureaucracies that get in the way of innovation, technology, and direct primary care and going to the doctors of your choice, and being able to get that kind of innovation?

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Madam Speaker, look, in some ways, telling the truth is like soaking yourself in kerosene and running around with a lighter.

Congress has functionally become a protection racket. The armies in our hallways, both with Democrats and Republicans, say, "We like this technology, but," and the "but" always happens to be, "you are going to blow up my business model."

How do we as policymakers stop having the arrogance of thinking we know what the future is and, instead, design the rules, reimbursements, licensing, and mechanisms that all go with that so the best technology is constantly winning and today's winner, it turns out, gets crushed tomorrow because a better one comes along?

Today the way we do it is we build walls of protection that say, "This is good. Yeah, there is something incredibly good over here, but."

That is why I use that Blockbuster video example. We all sort of accepted that, hey, we used to go get the little silver disk and shove it in the machine. The creepy guy would give us movie recommendations. He was creepy, but his movie recommendations were really good.

Today, we go home and hit a button. We just lived through that, and the world didn't come to an end.

When it comes to healthcare technology particularly—and I do a similar presentation on environmental technology. There is stunning stuff that could revolutionize those issues. If you are concerned with global warming or greenhouse gases, the technology is here, yet we don't talk about it because we know what we know. The problem is, much of what I and others know is a decade out of date.

Mr. ROY. Madam Speaker, I would ask the gentleman, does he agree with me that when we are talking about this kind of disruption, that this is not a partisan problem, that this is a problem of this body not sitting down and rolling up its sleeves to try to address using innovation and finding how to

break through and not getting into the trap of this town where the power brokers make all the decisions and the lobbyists are driving a lot of what we are doing so powerful insurance companies or powerful government entities are making decisions for you instead of you and your doctor, and technology and innovation?

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Madam Speaker, we have to be a little careful because I find there are certain insurance companies that are ready to offer a technology, sensor-based healthcare, but it is illegal.

There are hospitals I have worked with that desperately want to do an outreach in the community, where they are using data and algorithms to keep people healthy and to know when there is an issue coming.

It is not only us as Members of Congress and what we know and don't know, and the arrogance of how we often do pieces of legislation where we don't future-proof it to use it, and also the incentives that are built in to surviving election, raising money, everything there, I will also argue our bureaucracies have become calcified.

The bureaucracies now have become incredible barriers when they say: "Well, we don't see that in the rules; therefore, you can't do it. Yes, it would help society. Yes, it would make us healthier. Yes, it would."

Mr. ROY. Madam Speaker, by that, government and private sector bureaucracies, and State and Federal.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Exactly, Madam Speaker. States are going to be a real issue, and then different lobbying organizations and different constituencies.

Guess what? We don't have a choice. The single biggest threat to our Nation is the massive wave of debt that is here.

One of our charts, in just a decade or two, we are running \$2½ trillion, almost approaching \$3 trillion, deficits. It is almost all solely driven by our demographics. We have gotten older.

Mr. ROY. Madam Speaker, I would just like to thank the gentleman. I appreciate his time and his dedication to this. Let's do this again.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Madam Speaker, I enjoyed it.

Madam Speaker, there is a path. Will we step up and understand that the path turns out to be complicated? We are going to make some of our constituencies just elated with the opportunity to change. We are also going to terrify some of our constituencies.

There is a way to get there, and believe it or not, it is technology. It is not Republican technology. It is not Democratic technology. It turns out it is math, and the math will always win.

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

STILL I RISE: SENATE IMPEACHMENT TRIAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentleman from Texas

(Mr. GREEN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, and still I rise.

I rise because I love my country, and I rise today to talk about impeachment and the trial thereof, the trial associated with impeachment.

Madam Speaker, there is much to be said. However, I assure all that I will not say it all.

I do want to call to the attention of those who are paying attention that we are now about to embark upon a trial in the Senate.

Impeachment was a function of the House of Representatives pursuant to Article I, Section 2 of the Constitution, and the trial is a function of the Senate pursuant to Article I, Section 3 of the Constitution. The trial is to take place in the Senate. The House has done its job.

The House acts similar, not the same, but it behaves in a fashion similar to that of a grand jury—similar but not the same. The House determines whether there is enough evidence for a trial to take place, simply put—similar but not the same as a grand jury.

Then it becomes a function of the Senate to have a trial. The Senate is the only place on planet Earth where a President can be tried.

The President will not be punished at this trial, assuming that the President is found guilty. There is no punishment. The President can be removed from office, but there won't be any punishment similar to what we call punishment, as it were, with a court, for example, wherein you might be fined or accorded some sort of incarceration. None of that has to do with removal from office.

There was a big debate about this trial of the President. In Federalist Paper No. 65, Alexander Hamilton speaks at great length about the trial of the President.

It was contemplated in making a final decision that perhaps the Supreme Court would be the place to try the President. With much debate, without going into the nuances, the details, this was not concluded to be the appropriate place for a trial of the President.

It was finally concluded that the trial would take place in the Senate but that, in doing this, there would be a presiding officer, and this person would be the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. The Senate tries the case with the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court presiding.

In Federalist Paper No. 65, there was much talk about this trial and how it might move forward. Clearly, the Framers of the Constitution contemplated that the trial would receive evidence, that there would be evidence received. Clearly, a fair reading of Federalist Paper No. 65 would cause one to conclude that.

Of course, the Federalist Papers, as it were, there was a conclusion drawn that in this trial, there would be evi-

dence presented. The evidence would be presented, of course, by the House. We call the persons presenting the evidence managers. They will act as lawyers. The Senate will receive this evidence.

It was anticipated, in my opinion, after perusing Federalist Paper No. 65, that the trial could consist of evidence beyond what the House might present because at a trial, it is expected that one might call witnesses and present documents, present additional evidence.

It is my opinion that this is especially true, and I believe a good many constitutional scholars agree with me, this is especially true if it is known that there are witnesses who have evidence that would be of great value, witnesses who have evidence, material evidence that is relevant, would be of great value in coming to a just conclusion, a trial that would have a just conclusion, a trial that would afford not only the accused to have witnesses to testify but also the managers to have witnesses to testify.

You see, the country, the United States of America, is entitled to a fair trial. The President should have a fair trial, but the people should have a fair trial.

If the trial is to be fair in the Senate and there are witnesses available, then those witnesses ought to be called. If the witnesses are not called, and it is known that there are witnesses, then the question becomes: What are we doing? What is the Senate doing? I say "we"; I mean as a country. I am not a Senator, obviously.

What is the Senate doing? If there are witnesses who are available and are willing to testify, and the Senate decides to simply dismiss the case, what is the Senate doing?

Before I answer that question, let me just share this with you. The truth be told, not only will the President be on trial but also the Senate would be on trial. I will answer what the Senate is doing, but I must say first that the Senate is on trial.

People are watching not only here in the United States of America but across the globe. The world wants to see the kind of justice that the United States of America accords. The world wants to know whether the United States of America will pursue justice such that witnesses who are material and relevant will have the opportunity to testify.

□ 1500

What is the Senate doing if the Senate declines to hear from these relevant witnesses? The Senate is having something less than a trial. No question, because a trial contemplates witnesses and evidence.

If the Senate is going to have what may amount to a briefing, then there is no need to have Chief Justice Roberts. The Framers constituted a trial. They contemplated a trial with the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court presiding.

If we are going to have only a briefing, why have the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court present? This would be tantamount to a briefing, to simply call the Senate to order, receive some comments, some statements, and perhaps whatever the House has sent over. But knowing that a witness is available—multiple witnesses, I might add—and not call any of the multiple witnesses would be tantamount to a briefing.

If the Senate but engages in a briefing, what would we call the results of a briefing? In my opinion, justice delayed, if not denied—justice delayed, if not denied.

The Framers of the Constitution contemplated a trial. Federalist Paper No. 65 contemplates a trial.

The Senate acts as the triers of fact. They conclude with their findings with the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court presiding.

One can easily conclude that the simple dismissal of a case, wherein others are available to give testimony, would cause something less than a trial and, quite frankly, will be an embarrassment to the Senate, to the country, and to our sense of justice. It would be an embarrassment to do such a thing.

As I have read in various publications, this is being contemplated, to simply dismiss the case knowing that there are additional witnesses to be heard.

Could it be that in so doing, whether by accident or with intent, whether by accident or design, if this occurs, could it be that we are now seeing a coverup, a coverup if you know that there are witnesses who are available and who would testify but you denied them the opportunity to testify by simply dismissing the case? Are you participating in a coverup?

I pray that there are enough Senators who will say: "I will not participate in what appears to be a coverup," and will ask for witnesses to testify. If a majority of the Senators should so ask, there will be testimony presented.

We live in a world where it is not enough for things to be right. They must also look right. It would not and will not look right if the Senate knows that there are witnesses available and declines to call them. It won't look right.

Some would say it is right because the Constitution doesn't have strict guidelines, in terms of how the Senate is to perform. But I assure you, the Framers contemplated a trial.

If there is no trial, a simple dismissal, there are many people who will say that the Senate has engaged in a coverup because evidence that should be revealed has been concealed, has been covered, has been pushed aside.

The Senate, in my opinion, will do our country a disservice if it simply dismisses this cause.

It is my belief that the Senate will not dismiss the cause summarily. It is my belief that the Senate consists of honorable people who are going to take

an oath, and they are going to abide by the oath that they will take.

I was a judge of a small claims justice court. I will tell you that I marveled at how people, after taking the oath as jurors, would rise above the many things that would ordinarily influence them and see to it that justice was done. It is a wonderful thing to see how people take an oath and take that oath seriously.

I believe that a majority of the Senators will take the oath seriously, and I believe that there will be witnesses, or at least one, called to testify.

I believe that this will happen because I think that the Senators who will do this will understand that justice is in their hands and that this justice has much to do with what the witness will say, but it also has much to do with the balance of power that they are there to protect.

The Senators are there to protect the balance of power as it relates to the cause that has been presented to them. The Senators will have to decide whether or not the House of Representatives is going to become less than a coequal branch of government because one of the articles deals with the fact that the President has blocked the appearance of witnesses in the House and has blocked the presentation of certain evidence, documents, if you will, in the House.

Now it is left up to the Senate to determine whether or not they are going to allow a President to block the presentation of evidence and walk away without some consequence.

Blocking evidence without consequence, that is going to be one of the considerations before the Senate. Will you protect the balance of power? Will you assure this country that no one is above the law?

Madam Speaker, I assure you that if the Senators do not take this cause seriously and simply dismiss it out of hand, they are simply saying that the President is above the law.

The President deserves a trial. The country deserves a trial. We ought to have witnesses presented.

There ought to be some degree of deliberation. The Senate acts as the trial jury, the petit jury, if you will, similar to a petit jury, a trial jury, but not the same. It is not the same because they can make decisions about whether evidence will be presented.

I had a constituent ask me whether or not the Chief Justice could decide to receive the evidence, and I had to tell the truth. The response is that the ultimate judge of whether evidence will be received will be 51 Senators. The Chief Justice can make rulings, but the Senators can overrule the Chief Justice with a vote.

The world is watching, and the House of Representatives hangs in the balance, as it relates to the balance of power.

If this Senate simply dismisses out of hand, we will have a President with no guardrails. There will be no guardrails.

It doesn't matter how you feel about the President. The question is: How do you feel about the country that we love? How do you feel about the notion that no one is above the law, a very bedrock principle in this country? How do you feel about this?

What happens once can happen twice, and what happens twice can happen multiple times.

We should not allow this to take place. My clarion call to my brethren, my friends, the ladies and gentlemen of the Senate, is: Do more than have a briefing. Do more than simply dismiss the cause out of hand.

There will have to be 51 who will conclude that there will be more than a briefing, that there will be a trial.

I assure you that there are many of us who are waiting to see what will happen. Some of us will traverse great distances across the country to be in Washington, D.C., to make it clear that they want to be a part of this history for various and sundry reasons.

The world is watching. We have a duty, a responsibility, and an obligation to the country to have a fair trial, a trial where witnesses are called and witnesses are examined.

This is not unusual. This is what every person in this country anticipates if he or she is charged with an offense. Why would we have the President be above this basic premise of calling witnesses to have a fair trial? Why would we have one person in the country who is above this, above the law? Every person is subjected to the law in this country.

Madam Speaker, I will close with these words: It is not enough for things to be right. They must also look right.

If the Senate does this simply because it has the power, meaning if the Senate simply dismisses because it has the power and doesn't call witnesses, that won't look right, and in my opinion, it won't be right.

The Senate has a responsibility to have a trial, and witnesses must be called. I do believe that witnesses will be called.

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

IMPEACHMENT TIMELINE

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

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, my eloquent friend so ably made his case, and I would suggest that it is undercut in some respects when one introduces and discusses impeachment the day after the election in 2016, before President Trump even came to office.

That isn't protecting the country, is it? What that is suggesting is that one knows more than the voters of this country.

I am also always intrigued when the complaint comes up about the majority

in the Senate, when the majority in the Senate is going to determine the rules for the trial in the Senate because the Constitution says that the Senate holds the trial.

We just heard that there have to be 51 votes over in the Senate. Oddly enough, I didn't hear complaints when the majority in the House controlled the inquiry. In fact, the term "cover-up" was used preemptively regarding the Senate, but what I saw in the House was a coverup.

We didn't get to introduce all of our witnesses. I sit on the Judiciary Committee. Who did we get as witnesses? We got three or four law professors who came in. That is who got to come in to testify before the Judiciary Committee.

We didn't have the witnesses who had factual evidence come in. We requested. We gave lists. We were told we couldn't have them. That is part of the problem.

Adding to this hypocrisy, we heard over and over again that we must impeach the President of the United States because it is an imminent danger for him to continue in his office. But once that vote was taken, the Speaker held the Articles of Impeachment and would not transmit them. Here we sit, 27 days following that vote, with no transmittal.

We hear that there is going to be a transmittal tomorrow. I am interested to see if that really takes place.

Madam Speaker, I am joined today by a number of my colleagues, and I am grateful to have them here.

I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DAVIDSON).

Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise today one last time to ask the House to drop these charges against our duly elected President, if, for no other reason, because the process that they have used has been the exact partisan process that was just condemned on the floor by people who were the first to call for impeaching the President, the Speaker of this body.

This is a 2.5-year endeavor, in spite of it being only a few months after the call to Ukraine that is supposedly the abuse of power that the President engaged in.

As for the other charge, they say that it was obstruction of justice, but the House didn't even bother to enforce its own subpoenas.

The impeachment process boldly broke with that of Presidents Nixon and Clinton. The urgency was so great that the House declined to enforce its subpoenas and relied on shaky evidence, trying to move swiftly so they didn't lose the momentum.

□ 1515

Now, when they realize they haven't made the case—not just that it will be needed in the Senate, but for the American people, first and foremost—they

want to strong-arm the Senate into adopting the same unfair partisan course charted here in the House.

Fortunately, it doesn't work like that. Voters deserve better from our House of Representatives, but it is not the House's prerogative to dictate the rules of the Senate.

This partisan impeachment should be dropped today. This political charade is a waste of taxpayer dollars. It is unfair to the President of the United States or anyone else to be treated beneath the law. Certainly no one is above the law, but the President of the United States is certainly not beneath the law.

Rather than give in to our worst partisan inclinations, Congress should strive to work together on real policies that will benefit all of the American people.

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY).

Mr. ROY. Madam Speaker, I point out that, in Article I, Section 2, Clause 5, it says: "The House of Representatives shall choose their Speaker and other officers; and shall have the sole power of impeachment."

I would note, also, that in Section 3, when we talk about the Senate: "Judgment in cases of impeachment shall not extend further than to removal from office," et cetera.

Clause 6: "The Senate shall have the sole power to try all impeachments."

This is what the Constitution says. This is not unclear. The United States Senate has the power to try impeachments, yet the Speaker of this body has tried to impose her will on the United States Senate.

If the Speaker is so interested in what is going on in the Senate, maybe the Speaker should run for the Senate.

But what we have today is a body, the House, that acted; and the leader of this body, the Speaker, is refusing to do her duty to transmit the articles to the Senate and has done so despite a lot of rhetoric over the course of the year about the urgency of running impeachment through this body, which now, I think, the vast majority of the American people have seen it for what it was: a political action, a political stunt, to target the President of the United States, to demean the office of the President of the United States, to target him very specifically for political purposes rather than the solemn duty that impeachment is supposed to be reserved for.

So we should now be getting this to the Senate so that the President can have his day to defend himself, his day in court, as it were. He should have his day in the United States Senate. He should be able to defend himself and have lawyers defend against what is being charged against him from this wrongful impeachment out of this House.

So I am hopeful that we will finally get that movement this week and that the President will have the time due

him in the United States Senate and that the United States Senate can get through this in an expedited way so that we can get back to the business the American people sent us here for: dealing with debt, dealing with spending, dealing with open borders, and dealing with men and women in uniform and what they need.

I appreciate the gentleman from Arizona for arranging this.

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona, (Mr. GOSAR).

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Speaker, Speaker PELOSI and the House Democrats rushed through the weakest impeachment in American history. Devoid of any evidence of wrongdoing by President Trump, Speaker PELOSI and her Caucus allowed their hatred of President Trump to triumph at all costs.

Now House Democrats are demanding the Senate hold a trial dictated by their terms, including witness testimony they failed to obtain themselves.

Since House Democrats want more witnesses, I will gladly offer some names for the Senate to consider.

How about Joe and Hunter Biden? Together, they peddled the influence of the Vice President's office for Hunter Biden's personal financial gain. It is plainly on video.

How about ADAM SCHIFF? He spent 2 years severely misleading the American people about Russian collusion, held secret hearings at the Capitol basement, and was caught redhanded coordinating with the alleged whistleblower.

Ah, yes, why don't we hear from the alleged whistleblower? Reports indicate he worked for Joe Biden, coordinated with ADAM SCHIFF, and has deep anti-Trump views. President Trump deserves to face his secret Democratic accuser.

How did we end up in this impeachment mess? The simple truth is the abuse of the FISA court to spy on the Trump campaign.

Yes, you heard it: the weaponization of the Federal Government against the people. This is the insidious inbreeding of the swamp, corruption, plain and simple. The President and others are victims of a crime.

It is said that those who don't learn from history are doomed to repeat it, and look what is happening with the FISA court now. Just this week, the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court appointed David Kris, an Obama-era DOJ lawyer, to review the abuse of the FISA court, a person who is already engaged in FISA denialism.

Yes, let me be clear, perfectly clear: A FISA abuse denier is now in charge of tackling the FISA abuse. I guess, America, only in the Washington, D.C., swamp.

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, this is an important time. We have got people who are demanding that the Senate

do what they hypocritically refused to do here in the House, and that is to have a fair investigation and have fair hearings.

And, in fact, we know the majority is the majority; they can change the rules anytime they want to. But they didn't even bother to change the rules. They just said: Do you know what? Even though the rules say that the minority can have a minority witness day, we are going to just ignore that and move on, because time is of the essence.

So we didn't need any evidence to show that our friends were not being completely genuine with their comments, no, because we heard: Clear and present danger; urgent; urgency; got to happen now; we can't wait; we can't follow the rules; we can't hear witnesses here in the House; we have got to have this impeachment done.

And then they sit on it for over a month. Seriously, that says what anybody needs to say.

This was never serious to begin with in the respect that there was a serious charge. There was no serious charge. It is supposed to be about treason, bribery, high crimes, misdemeanors. All of those are crimes, including misdemeanors.

Look at the charges: abuse of power, obstruction of Congress. Those are the two charges that those pushing impeachment are guilty of, not this President.

Madam Speaker, this is a scam. It is a shame.

The Senate should just go in and have a trial, follow the Clinton rules, and that is it. Let's get this done. Let's get it over with. A proper verdict is not guilty, not removed.

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CLOUD).

Mr. CLOUD. Madam Speaker, as I sat in the basement of this Capitol listening to deposition after deposition, it was very clear that this impeachment shenanigan was never about a real search for truth.

House leadership wanted us to believe, the American people to believe, that this impeachment process began as a result of a July phone call when, in reality, Speaker PELOSI said that this began 2½ years ago. They wanted us to believe that the evidence was irrefutable, when the truth is they polled to figure out, to see what to charge the President with.

The way this is supposed to work in an investigation is that there is a crime that produces evidence that leads to a verdict. When this started with the verdict, it was a search for evidence that was never found, and yet we are sending impeachment articles to the Senate.

This is crazy.

And, of course, it has taken over 4 weeks to get what was urgent—the Speaker said this was urgent. She said this is urgent, so we will be bringing the articles. It has been 4 weeks to get

the articles from here across to the Senate.

This is a straight line. You go straight through this door, walk about 90 seconds and you will be in the Senate; yet, it has taken 4 weeks.

This is crazy and should not happen.

Senator FEINSTEIN said the longer it goes on, the less urgent it becomes. So, if it is serious and urgent, send them over; if it isn't, don't send them over.

I will be voting appropriately on this and the fact that it is not urgent and we haven't sent them over.

Let's get back to the work we were elected to do: keeping this Republic and ensuring the blessings of liberty for future generations.

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY).

Mr. PERRY. Madam Speaker, we have watched our colleagues on the other side of the aisle since, literally, the week the President was inaugurated say it is time to start the impeachment. They have made that a policy consideration, a policy goal for the whole rest of their time since that time in Congress, working diligently day by day, no matter what the President did, no matter what he said. Whether it was comments about other Members of Congress, whether it is comments in foreign policy, you name it, it was worthy of impeachment.

Madam Speaker, they have cheapened impeachment.

We were told—rightly so—how solemn it is, the most important thing, other than declaring war, that Members of Congress would ever embark on. Yet, during the vote on the floor of the House, when the numbers came through that they had indeed passed impeachment and Members on the other side began to cheer, the Speaker gave them a look and admonished them because, of course, they said it was the most solemn thing that they would do. Yet, we all know, in their hearts, it was what they had desired all along.

I understand disagreements with the President of the other party—I have had my own—but this is about doing the business of the work of the people and the work of this country.

If you disagree, there is a process for that in this country, and that is the election process, where all Americans get to decide whether whatever the President says is too much, whether whatever the President does is too little or too much.

But this is seeking to remove a President from office early because of a disagreement over policy, a disagreement about how one comports himself or not, a disagreement with the President that is personal.

This is beneath the decorum of this establishment and the business that we should be doing. It is disappointing. It is disrupting. It should be voted “no,” accordingly, because it is a fool's errand based on no facts, not based on the Constitution and not based on our best will and best judgment.

Madam Speaker, I urge a “no” vote for the Articles of Impeachment to be transmitted.

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOHO).

Mr. YOHO. Madam Speaker, let's take a look at the chronological timeline since Donald Trump won the primary. I mean, this movement started immediately after that.

You can go to Mark Zaid, the attorney for the whistleblower. You can go on and hear the Members of this body saying: We are going to impeach him.

The vile words that came out of one of the Members from Michigan, saying: We are going to impeach this m-effer.

Those people shouldn't even be allowed to serve in here with that kind of an attitude and hatred. They set a goal to impeach this President. They didn't have a reason, but they set a goal, and then they searched for that goal.

It was the Steele dossier that was completely fabricated, paid for by the Clinton campaign and DCCC, completely dispelled as false, but yet they went down this. They dispelled the Mueller report. They kept going to find something.

And then ADAM SCHIFF said: We have irrefutable evidence that this President colluded with the Russians. That turned out to be false. The whistleblower, and the second whistleblower, and I could go on, but you guys have heard enough of that stuff.

I want to come back to what our Founding Fathers said. This is Washington's warning to this Republic 223 years ago.

The Constitution rightly sets a high bar for impeachment, but the integrity of the process also depends on the ability of legislators to vote their minds independent of party politics. Removing a President is too important, and lawmakers are given too much latitude to define high crimes and misdemeanors for it to be any other way; otherwise, excessively partisan politicians could overturn an election simply because the President is a member of the opposing party.

It is in regards to this impeachment process that George Washington forewarned us of this moment in history when political parties “may now and then answer popular ends,” but “they are likely, in the course of time and things, to become potent engines by which cunning, ambitious, and unprincipled men” and women “will be enabled to subvert the power of the people and to usurp for themselves the reins of government. . . .”

That is what we have here.

□ 1530

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN).

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, impeachment didn't start with Ukraine. It started before he was elected. It started on July 31, 2016, when the FBI opened an investigation and spied on

four American citizens associated with the President's campaign. That is when it started. It continued after he was elected before inauguration when they go up to Trump Tower and they brief the President on the dossier. The dossier that they already knew was false, the dossier that Michael Horowitz said when they took it to the FISA court they lied to the court 17 times. It continued after inauguration with the Mueller investigation and those 2 years that we went through.

Why are the Democrats so focused on getting to the President?

Why are they so focused about going after the President?

Because they don't like what this guy is getting done. They don't like the fact that he is shaking up this town. They don't like the fact that he is doing what he said he would do. They don't like the fact that he is draining the swamp, and when you drain the swamp, the swamp fights back. And that is exactly what we are seeing from the Democrats in this entire impeachment escapade we have lived through now for 4 months that has needlessly divided our country.

Here is the good news: the American people get it. They understand it. They know the four key facts. They have got the call transcript, there was no quid pro quo. The two individuals on the call, President Trump and President Zelensky have repeatedly said: There was no pushing, no pressure, and no linkage of an investigation to any type of security assistance money. We know the Ukrainians knew at the time of the call that aid wasn't even on hold at the time of the call. Most importantly, they took no action to get the money released.

The American people get the facts. They know the facts are on the President's side, and that is why this whole thing is wrong. They get the facts, and they understand.

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Ohio's comments.

I want to add one comment. When you consider the aid that was the subject of this issue where people said that he withheld aid as a quid pro quo, the one thing that America has not heard enough of is this: the aid was released in perfect compliance with the law. It was released in the time constraints required by the law. In fact, it was released 3 weeks prior to its being required to have been released. That has not been said enough, nor has it been understood enough. So that charge has always been bogus.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GRIFFITH).

Mr. GRIFFITH. Madam Speaker, we have heard today several times that we were told this was urgent and that things must move quickly. And yet it has been 26 days since it was passed on the calendar, 15 working days, and 10 legislative days have gone by, and yet the Senate has not yet been informed of the Articles of Impeachment.

Now, Madam Speaker, let me get boring. Most politicians won't admit that, but that is what I am going to do because it is important that we understand the process.

So what happens is the Articles of Impeachment were passed by the House. We were told later this week that we are going to vote on managers who will then present the Articles of Impeachment at the bar of the Senate. That is their job. That means to prosecute the case. But the annotations to Jefferson's Manual—that is Jefferson's Manual of Parliamentary Practice and Procedure, for all of you policy-and-procedure wonks back home—we are told in there that the managers who are elected by the House or are appointed by the Speaker in obedience to a resolution of the House take this to the bar of the Senate, the House having previously informed the Senate.

Now, the problem is the House has not previously informed the Senate. And what we are going to do now is we are going to say: well, that is okay, but my summary look at the past indicates that the times that these have been separated, the notice to the Senate that impeachment resolutions were coming and the actual sending over of the managers to present the articles at the bar, the longest previously has been 4 days. Here it has been 26 calendar days, 15 working days, and 10 legislative days, and the Speaker of the House indicates to us that this is all fine and normal.

Madam Speaker, we should all be concerned, not just because we have what appears to be a trumped up—pun not intended—impeachment policy by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, but because if the Speaker can hold up H. Res. 755, the Articles of Impeachment, from being sent over to the Senate thus notifying them that managers will be coming to prosecute or present these impeachment articles at the bar of the Senate, then the Speaker can hold up anything the Speaker doesn't want the Senate having.

There are 435 Members of the United States House. While I do not agree with the impeachment articles, the House voted on them, and the Senate should have had those promptly. It takes a couple of days to get it through the process where all the i's are dotted and t's are crossed. This Speaker did not do that. It is a dangerous precedent because if H. Res. 755 can be held up, then I submit to you, Madam Speaker, anything can be held up. And if a Speaker suddenly decides that he or she does not agree with the will of this House, can they really stick it in their back pocket?

Can they really do a pocket Speaker veto of actions of this House?

Nothing of this nature has ever been contemplated, but that is what the actions of Speaker PELOSI tell us she is trying to do or at least tried to do if she didn't get her way in the Senate. It is unconscionable and against the principles of a democratic republic.

Be warned, be alert, and pay attention. Let's guard our Republic with every ounce of our energy.

Mr. BIGGS. I would ask the Speaker how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Arizona has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, I appreciate those who shared their thoughts on this matter, and I want to just cover a couple of things that I think are absolutely critical to remember. They have been touched on, but not emphasized enough for me, and that is this: when we start looking at how this began and we look at the timeline, you will see that this began before President Trump was elected, it proceeded after he was elected but before he was sworn into office, and then the day he was sworn in, the media said: Let the impeachment begin.

Ten days later the attorney for the whistleblower said:

Let the impeachment begin, let the coup begin, more power to the attorneys.

That is what they were talking about, a search, as one of my colleagues said earlier, for a *modus vivendi* for impeachment. That is really what this was about.

Or you get in a phone conversation, and in that phone conversation there is an amicable discussion of numerous things. That phone conversation has been misquoted, and it has been deliberately fabricated by the person who no doubt will be one of the House managers going over to the Senate. This is the chairman who basically out of whole cloth created a dramatic reading that was not representative in any way of the actual transcript. This is the same individual who promised us we would get to interview and depose the whistleblower because where this engine got started is with the whistleblower. That never happened.

So along the way, as witnesses were subpoenaed to talk and the President exercised his executive privilege, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle said that we do not have time to go to the court and determine whether that executive privilege is being exerted in an overly broad manner, whether we can narrow it, or whether it is completely inappropriate. We just don't have time. Because do you know why? We have got to impeach this President tomorrow because it is as if he is an absolute destructive force and an immediate danger to this Republic.

The reality is they got their vote, and here we sit. Here we sit, a total of 27 days since the day of the vote. That day was there. We were told it was going to go tomorrow. My colleague from Virginia has very ably explained that there is a distinction between informing the Senate procedurally and having the vote on House managers. But the point he was making, and I wish to also join in, is this: you simply have seen a process that has been devoid of the normal rules of precedent in this House.

When we see these amorphous charges, these articles, passed by this body, it tells you two things that make this a supreme danger to the Republic going forward. All I am pointing to is what my colleague from Florida said, is the danger that the impeachment process will be misused for political purposes.

And that is this: Number one, process matters. Process always matters. It is why we have these wonderful folks who sit in front of us to make sure that we are following the rules of the House and to make sure that we are following the rules of precedent. It is not unlike international law, quite frankly, where all you are relying on is precedent, and you just change it very simply. If you don't have those rules and you don't have integrity to the rules, then the minority rights are abused.

When the minority rights are abused in this place, that means the right of representation of tens of millions of Americans is diffused and abused. So you have that problem.

Then you have the fundamental idea of trying to impeach on things like obstruction of Congress. Well, I just told you how Congress was not obstructed. Congress had a remedy. You cannot have obstruction if you have a remedy. The remedy was to go to the other branch and resolve it. They chose not to.

These are the two problems in the most virulent way.

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

PAYING TRIBUTE TO RICHARD BARNETT

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

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to come to the floor at this time.

I come to pay tribute to a person who is not easy to describe. As a matter of fact, he has been called many things, has been many things, and will always be many things. As a matter of fact, his name is Richard Barnett. He held no title and he held no office. As a matter of fact, he never ran for public office, to my knowledge. But he probably helped more individuals get elected to judgeships in Cook County than anybody in the history of the county.

As a matter of fact, he also happened to have been the manager of my first campaign for public office which was about 40 years ago. After the campaign was over, he went into the hospital. He had taken ill but would not go into the hospital until after the election was done. He finally did go after we had won, and he looked as though he only weighed about 90 pounds which means that he was just that sick, he was just that ill. But he bounced back and went back to work at his actual job which was that of a postal clerk.

He went back and worked until retirement. Then he became very actively engaged in the election of Harold Washington for mayor of the city of Chicago. He took a job and worked for the city until he quit that after Harold had passed away, because he really was not looking for a job or didn't want a job.

He became significantly important because we have all heard the term political machine. We don't hear it as much now as we did in the past, but political machines have been described in many different ways, sometimes good, sometimes not so good, and sometimes bad.

□ 1545

One definition that people generally accept as being fairly common is that a political machine is a political group in which an authoritative leader or small group commands the support of a core of supporters and businesses, usually campaign workers, who receive rewards for their efforts. The machine is based on the ability of the boss or group to get out the vote for their candidate on election day.

The term "political machine" dates back to the 20th century in the United States. In the late 19th century, large cities in the United States—Boston, Chicago, Cleveland, Kansas City, New York, Philadelphia, St. Louis, and others—were accused of forming, building, and making use of political machines.

Chicago, being one of those, emerged as one of the big cities with a strong political machine. The machine was known to totally dominate and control all the machinery of government, especially in the immigrant and Black communities.

When I came to Chicago in 1961, Chicago was seriously segregated, as it is today, and seriously politically organized, much more than it is today. These were what was called the movement years.

This is the period when Dr. Martin Luther King came into Chicago. This is the period when we experienced the War on Poverty, great efforts to reduce and work on some of the issues plaguing individuals who were at the bottom of the socioeconomic scale.

That was when I met Richard Barnett. He was part of a small group of activists who felt and believed that the machine could be defeated.

Notables like Leon Despres, Richard Barnett, himself, and others worked in ways to try to undercut the power and influence. People were meeting a great deal in Chicago, and there were meetings all the time, almost every day. We were young activists and would almost be looking for meetings.

People would talk about everything. They talked about race issues. They would talk about poverty. They would talk about the need for programs. But very seldom would they talk about electoral politics.

Richard was one of the persons who would, and he kind of checked people

out at the meetings. When there was a campaign going on, he might call you up.

I never will forget, he called me and asked me if I would be a poll watcher. I said, what am I going to watch? Am I going to watch the polls?

He said, well, that is not exactly what it means, because I really did not know. I mean, I would go to the meetings and all.

He said: No, you are going to go and watch to make sure that the election is fair.

And I am trying to figure out how in the world can I make sure that an election is fair by watching the poll.

The next time he called, he says: Would you like to be a LEAP judge?

I said: Leap judge? Does that mean I am going to jump over somebody?

He laughed and said: Well, that is not quite exactly what that means either. That means "legal elections in all precincts," and we are working to try to make sure that the elections are fair and that the votes are accurate.

That was Richard. Richard always had a telephone book and a bunch of names, and he was most effective with that.

I also say that it was him and some other folk who got me to run for the city council. I had no intention of running, but I did agree to be chairman of a committee to help find a candidate. But we couldn't find anybody; nobody would run. We broke up the committee, and I ran into the person we were going to run against. He started to do what we call sell wolf tickets.

He says: You guys have been talking about what you are going to do to me, and you can't even find a candidate.

I went home that evening and said to my wife: I think I am going to run for the city council.

She said: Who, you?

I said: Well, yeah, me.

She said: You can't run for no city council. You are not even a precinct captain.

And I said: Well, I didn't know you had to be one to run.

At any rate, I called Richard, and Richard said: Well, if you decide you are going to run, I will help you.

That is exactly what he did, and he has been helping me ever since. He has been helping me every time I run. He has been helping other people every time they run. Never to my knowledge have I known him to get 1 cent for working a campaign or working in anybody's campaign.

He became sort of an icon to those of us who believe in what we called independent politics, meaning independent of bossism, independent of not being able to make up your own mind and make your own decisions.

I guess when I went to his funeral on Saturday, the individuals who were there, they were just down the line, down the line. I think some of what I experienced with Richard, I am sure that you experienced some of it also.

Madam Speaker, I am delighted that Mr. RUSH came over to join me as we

talk about this community icon from our city. I might also add that BOBBY's district was the first district that an African American won after African Americans were all put out or left or didn't come back at the end of the 18th century.

Madam Speaker, I yield time to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH), the Representative from the First District in Illinois.

Mr. RUSH. Madam Speaker, I thank my good friend, the dynamic part of the dynamic duo, my brother who is known far and wide as being a voice of inspiration, a voice of reason, and a mighty voice of valor, my friend and colleague for many, many years, Congressman DANNY K. DAVIS from the great Seventh Congressional District in the State of Illinois.

I thank Congressman DAVIS for honoring the legacy of his friend and mine, Mr. Richard Barnett, who was a true visionary, whose outstanding efforts helped bring Chicago's local government and the State of Illinois' government closer to the people who consented to be governed, to the people who know governments are supposed to serve.

Madam Speaker, Richard Barnett was a man of enormous talents, skills, and abilities. Integral to his vision, though, was a focus on enfranchising those who had been intentionally excluded from the political process by Chicago's political elite.

Richard was a courageous voice for the left out, for the locked out, and for those who were forced to live on the margins of political power in the city of Chicago.

I guess the clearest example of this was the critical role that Richard Barnett played in the election of Chicago's first African American mayor, Harold Washington, and the defeat of Chicago's vaunted Democratic machine.

But we can't look at one election and summarize Richard's contribution by just one election. Richard Barnett's transformative role in Chicago politics would come years earlier, following the untimely assassination of my dear friend and colleague, Fred Hampton.

The story goes that after then-Cook County State's Attorney Edward V. Hanrahan led the political assassination of Hampton, who was chairman of the Illinois chapter of the Black Panther Party, Richard Barnett encouraged all African Americans, all minorities, all good people in the city of Chicago, all those who cared about civil rights, law and order, and justice in our city, to refuse to vote for Edward Hanrahan in the upcoming general election.

□ 1600

That was the election in 1972. This was in spite of the fact that Richard was a Democrat, and most of the African American community was Democrat. We vote with the Democratic machine.

We refused to just be ignored and disrespected, and we defeated the Democratic machine in Chicago in the election of 1972 for Cook County State's attorney but, for the first time in the history of the city of Chicago, elected a Republican as the State's attorney of Cook County, Bernard J. Carey. The evil Edward V. Hanrahan would lose the general election, mostly because of Richard Barnett's political acumen and activism.

This defeat by the Cook County Democratic machine would ignite a political awakening in Chicago that would begin with the 1983 election of Harold Washington. But it would go even beyond that and would go on to inspire African Americans all across the country to run for public office, including yours truly.

Barnett's work elected strong political voices, committed political voices, dedicated, passionate political voices up and down the ballot, year in and year out. Richard Barnett helped elect scores of members of the city council, aldermen, appellate court judges, judges in the circuit court, State representatives, State senators, Members of Congress, other elected officials.

I guess, personally, for me, Richard Barnett's legacy was centered around his strategic and informed advice. I mean, you would just marvel, sitting in a political education class, where Richard Barnett would take a group of—not an organization, but just well-meaning individuals from different places, some Ph.D.'s and some GEDs and no Ds, bring them into a room, spend time telling them about not only how to win an election, but why they should win an election.

Barnett would tell us how to use the very tactics that precinct captains had been using for decades and use it against those same precinct captains. He would teach us how to canvass an election.

The first time I ever heard anything about a canvass, it flowed from Richard Barnett's lips: how to take a poll sheet and go from house to house and building to building and floor to floor asking people would they vote for your candidate, and then summarize that by either putting a plus or a minus.

If they were going to vote for your candidate, they were a plus voter; if they were going to vote against your candidate, then they were a minus voter; and if they were undecided, then you put a zero. And you just didn't stop there. The minuses, you left them alone, but the zeroes, you went back to them.

Richard Barnett told us all of that every day from the announcement to the decision day in an election, and that was election day, and how you had to really be prepared for election day because, as Congressman DAVIS indicated, we didn't have poll watchers in the polls, passing 100 feet outside of the polls. If you didn't go and locate your plus voters and get them to the polls, then you would not win that election.

So Richard Barnett taught us the strategy and the discipline of how to win an election.

Barnett shaped a lot of community leaders, politicians, and activists through his example and through those political education classes. The list is prominent, exalted, endless: Congressman DANNY K. DAVIS; yours truly, Congressman BOBBY L. RUSH; Congressman CHUY GARCÍA; former Congressman Luis Gutierrez. We all sat at Richard Barnett's knee and learned how to win elections from this eminent political strategist and teacher.

Even Barnett's charisma, his character, his teaching transcended into the mindset, the strategies of the former President of the United States.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, the gentleman just talked about Representative GARCÍA, who has just joined us and come in. I think we have got about 5 minutes left.

Mr. RUSH. Certainly, Congressman DAVIS. I just wanted to add my voice to the Richard Barnett story that the Nation must know about.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GARCÍA). We call him "Chuy" in Chicago, but everybody knows him that way.

Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I am delighted to be on the floor this afternoon and to join the gentlemen in honoring the life and the memory and the legacy of Richard Barnett.

Richard was a neighbor of Chicago's Lawndale community. He lived just a few blocks from my house. He worked as a U.S. Postal Service employee prior to his retirement in 1982. He was very devoted to his wife and his children and was involved in his local community—in the schools, in the parks, and in the churches—and every aspect of civic life as a good community resident.

But Richard was also a mentor to me in my earliest days as a candidate for political office. From the early 1980s, when I first stepped up, I learned how to organize in communities of color so that they could become politically empowered at the local, State, and Federal level.

He helped enrich my understanding of the Voting Rights Act and how the Federal law could help Chicago's Latino communities in the early 1980s elect people to Chicago's city council, to the State general assembly, to the Cook County board, and, yes, even to the Federal Government, a position that I can say I hold, in part, because of the mentorship of Richard Barnett.

Richard was deeply committed to dismantling the infamously corrupt and discriminatory and exclusionary Chicago political machine with new political movements that were rooted in Chicago neighborhoods, and he wanted to usher in an era of equitable and honest government.

Richard was instrumental in bringing together multiracial, multiethnic, and

faith coalitions across Chicago to advance progressive public policies.

He helped me in my elections to the Chicago City Council, to the Illinois Senate, to the Cook County board, and to Congress. I will be eternally grateful for all of his assistance and mentorship and friendship over nearly a period of four decades in the city of Chicago.

Richard was a true son of his community, his people, and people all over Illinois and across the country because he sought to empower and to give a voice to the people who were voiceless.

Long live Richard Barnett.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Members may have 5 days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

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 family matters.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 13 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, January 15, 2020, at 10 a.m. 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:

3539. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Science and Technology Program, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Regulations and Procedures Under the Plant Variety Protection Act [Doc. No.: AMS-ST-19-004] received January 13, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3540. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Specialty Crops Program, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Marketing Order Regulating the Handling of Apricots Grown in Designated Counties in Washington; Increased Assessment Rate [Doc. No.: AMS-SC-19-0048; SC16-922-1 FR] received January 13, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3541. A letter from the FPAC-BC, Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's Major interim rule — Agricultural Conservation Easement Program [Docket ID: NRCS-2019-0006] (RIN: 0578-AA66) received January 13, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3542. A letter from the FPAC-BC, Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's Major interim rule — Environmental Quality Incentives Program [Docket ID: NRCS-2019-0009] (RIN: 0578-AA68) received January 13, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3543. A letter from the Administrator, Livestock and Poultry Program, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's direct final rule — Beef Promotion and Research Rules and Regulations [No.: AMS-LP-19-0054] received January 13, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3544. A letter from the Director, Regulations Management Division, Rural Development Innovation Center, Rural Development, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Advanced Biofuel Payment Program (RIN: 0570-AA75) received January 13, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3545. A letter from the Alternate OSD FRLO, Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's interim final rule — Commissary Credit and Debit Card User Fee [Docket ID: DOD-2019-OS-0131] (RIN: 0790-AK92) received January 13, 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.

3546. A letter from the Counsel, Legal Division, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting the Bureau's final rule — Truth in Lending Act (Regulation Z) Adjustment to Asset-Size Exemption Threshold received January 8, 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.

3547. A letter from the Program Specialist, Chief Counsel's Office, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Regulatory Capital Rule: Capital Simplification for Qualifying Community Banking Organizations; Technical Correction [Docket ID: OCC-2018-0040] (RIN: 1557-AE59) received January 9, 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.

3548. A letter from the Acting General Counsel, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Payday Alternative Loans (RIN: 3133-AE84) received January 9, 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.

3549. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Medical Device Submissions: Amending Premarket Regulations That Require Multiple Copies and Specify Paper Copies To Be Required in Electronic Format [Docket No.: FDA-2018-N-0628] (RIN: 0910-AH48) received January 13, 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.

3550. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Regulation Requiring an Approved New Drug Application for Drugs Sterilized by Irradiation [Docket No.: FDA-2017-N-6924] (RIN: 0910-AH47) received January 13, 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.

3551. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final NUREG — Surface Deformation [NUREG-0800, Chapter 2] received January 13, 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.

3552. A letter from the Chair, National Advisory Council on Indian Education, transmitting the Council's 2018-2019 Annual Report to Congress; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

3553. A letter from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, U.S. Census Bureau, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's notice of final rulemaking — Temporary Suspension of the Population Estimates Challenge Program [Docket Number: 191211-0109] (RIN: 0607-AA57) received January 13, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

3554. A letter from the Acting Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Office of General Counsel, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final regulations — Adjustment of Civil Monetary Penalties for Inflation (RIN: 1801-AA20) received January 9, 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.

3555. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final regulations — Adjustment of Civil Monetary Penalties for Inflation (RIN: 1801-AA20) received January 9, 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.

3556. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Inflation Adjustment of Civil Monetary Penalties received January 8, 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.

3557. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Redding, CA [Docket No.: FAA-2019-0625; Airspace Docket No.: 19-AWP-2] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received January 9, 2020, 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.

3558. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of the Class E Airspace; Coudersport, PA; and Revocation of Class E Airspace; Galetton, PA [Docket No.: FAA-2019-0757; Airspace Docket No.: 19-AEA-13] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received January 9, 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.

3559. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Depart-

ment's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2016-9072; Product Identifier 2015-NM-110-AD; Amendment 39-19797; AD 2019-23-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 9, 2020, 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.

3560. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2019-0983; Product Identifier 2019-NM-171-AD; Amendment 39-21010; AD 2019-25-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 9, 2020, 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.

3561. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Embraer S.A. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2019-0499; Product Identifier 2019-NM-088-AD; Amendment 39-21015; AD 2019-25-16] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 9, 2020, 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.

3562. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2019-0603; Product Identifier 2019-NM-087-AD; Amendment 39-21013; AD 2019-25-14] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 9, 2020, 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.

3563. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Viking Air Limited (Type Certificate Previously Held by Bombardier, Inc.; Canadair Limited) Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2019-0710; Product Identifier 2019-NM-060-AD; Amendment 39-21009; AD 2019-25-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 9, 2020, 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.

3564. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Fokker Services B.V. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2019-0709; Product Identifier 2019-NM-127-AD; Amendment 39-21008; AD 2019-25-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 9, 2020, 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.

3565. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc., Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2019-0993; Product Identifier 2019-NM-198-AD; Amendment 39-21017; AD 2019-25-18] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 9, 2020, 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.

3566. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Fokker Services B.V. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2019-0703; Product Identifier

2019-NM-106-AD; Amendment 39-21014; AD 2019-25-15] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 9, 2020, 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.

3567. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc., Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2019-0256; Product Identifier 2019-NM-027-AD; Amendment 39-19786; AD 2019-22-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 9, 2020, 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.

3568. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Revenue Procedure 2020-5 (I.R.B. 2020-1) received January 10, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

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. ROY (for himself, Mr. BIGGS, and Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana):

H.R. 5596. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand and improve health savings accounts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma (for herself, Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. LUCAS, and Mr. COLE):

H.R. 5597. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 305 Northwest 5th Street in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, as the "Clara Luper Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Ms. MCCOLLUM (for herself, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. PHILLIPS, and Mr. UPTON):

H.R. 5598. A bill to provide for the protection of the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness and interconnected Federal lands and waters, including Voyageurs National Park, within the Rainy River Watershed in the State of Minnesota, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. HECK (for himself, Mr. CLAY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. PERLMUTTER):

H.R. 5599. A bill to amend the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992 to require the deposit of enterprise guarantee fees in the Housing Trust Fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mrs. AXNE:

H.R. 5600. A bill to amend the Worker Adjustment and Retraining Notification Act to provide a notice requirement regarding offshoring; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. NORMAN (for himself, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. GIANFORTE, Ms. CHENEY, Mr. NEWHOUSE, and Mr. MCCLINTOCK):

H.R. 5601. A bill to protect private property rights and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of

such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SCHNEIDER (for himself, Mr. NADLER, Ms. BASS, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. CORREA, Mr. CISNEROS, Mr. COOPER, Mr. PANETTA, Ms. NORTON, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. CASE, Ms. MENG, Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma, Mr. MALINOWSKI, and Miss RICE of New York):

H.R. 5602. A bill to authorize dedicated domestic terrorism offices within the Department of Homeland Security, the Department of Justice, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation to analyze and monitor domestic terrorist activity and require the Federal Government to take steps to prevent domestic terrorism; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Homeland Security, and Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. STEUBE (for himself, Mrs. LESKO, and Mr. HAGEDORN):

H.R. 5603. A bill to provide that for purposes of determining compliance with title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 in athletics, sex shall be determined on the basis of sex assigned at birth by a physician; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. TORRES of California (for herself and Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee):

H.R. 5604. A bill to amend the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act to establish demonstration and pilot projects to facilitate education and training programs in the field of advanced manufacturing; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WALTZ (for himself, Mrs. LURIA, Mr. ZELDIN, Ms. HOULAHAN, Mr. CRENSHAW, and Ms. WILD):

H.R. 5605. A bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to carry out a grant program to increase cooperation on post-traumatic stress disorder research between the United States and Israel; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LIPINSKI (for himself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. RYAN, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. LATTA, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. LAHOOD, and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois):

H. Res. 792. A resolution supporting the contributions of Catholic schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. JEFFRIES:

H. Res. 793. A resolution electing a certain Member to a certain standing committee of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to, considered and agreed to.

By Mr. SCHRADER (for himself and Mr. YOHIO):

H. Res. 794. A resolution supporting the designation of January 2020 as "National One Health Awareness Month" to promote awareness of organizations focused on public health, animal health, and environmental health collaboration throughout the United States and to recognize the critical contributions of those organizations to the future of the United States; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself and Mr. RYAN):

H. Res. 795. A resolution supporting the commitment of the United States to lawfully protect international cultural sites; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:

H. Res. 796. A resolution congratulating the North Dakota State University Bison

football team for winning the 2019 National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I Football Championship Subdivision title; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. DINGELL (for herself, Mr. PAPPAS, Ms. NORTON, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. ROUDA, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. TLAIB, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CASTEN of Illinois, Mr. MALINOWSKI, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. COHEN, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. SOTO, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. POCAN, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. SLOTKIN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. CASE, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. NEAL, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. COOPER, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. McEACHIN, Mr. DEFazio, Ms. STEVENS, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. NADLER, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. SIREs, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Ms. WILD, Ms. WEXTON, Mrs. TRAHAN, Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, and Ms. MENG):

H. Res. 797. A resolution encouraging the Environmental Protection Agency to maintain and strengthen requirements under the Clean Water Act and reverse ongoing administrative actions to weaken this landmark law and protections for United States waters; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

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. ROY:

H.R. 5596.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution—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 any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma:

H.R. 5597.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 7 and 18.

By Ms. MCCOLLUM:

H.R. 5598.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution

By Mr. HECK:

H.R. 5599.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 and Clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress), Amendment 10.

By Mrs. AXNE:
H.R. 5600.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. NORMAN:
H.R. 5601.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. SCHNEIDER:
H.R. 5602.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. STEUBE:
H.R. 5603.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

To borrow money on the credit of the United States;

To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;

To establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization, and uniform Laws on the subject of Bankruptcies throughout the United States;

To coin Money, regulate the Value thereof, and of foreign Coin, and fix the Standard of Weights and Measures;

To provide for the Punishment of counterfeiting the Securities and current Coin of the United States;

To establish Post Offices and Post Roads;

To promote the Progress of Science and useful Arts, by securing for limited Times to Authors and Inventors the exclusive Right to their respective Writings and Discoveries;

To constitute Tribunals inferior to the supreme Court;

and Offenses against the Law of Nations;

To declare War, grant Letters of Marque and Reprisal, and make Rules concerning Captures on Land and Water;

To raise and support Armies, but no Appropriation of Money to that Use shall be for a longer Term than two Years;

To provide and maintain a Navy;

To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces;

To provide for calling forth the Militia to execute the Laws of the Union, suppress Insurrections and repel Invasions;

To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining, the Militia, and for governing such Part of them as may be employed in the Service of the United States, reserving to the States respectively, the Appointment of the Officers, and the Authority of training the Militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress;

To exercise exclusive Legislation in all Cases whatsoever, over such District (not exceeding ten Miles square) as may, by Cession of particular States, and the acceptance of Congress, become the Seat of the Government of the United States, and to exercise like Authority over all Places purchased by the Consent of the Legislature of the State in which the Same shall be, for the Erection of Forts, Magazines, Arsenals, dock-Yards, and other needful Buildings; And

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the

foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mrs. TORRES of California:
H.R. 5604.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3, which gives Congress the power to regulate commerce

By Mr. WALTZ:
H.R. 5605.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 30: Ms. CHENEY.
H.R. 222: Mr. ARRINGTON.
H.R. 435: Mr. LYNCH.
H.R. 619: Mr. COSTA and Mr. HASTINGS.
H.R. 649: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.
H.R. 714: Mr. JOHN W. ROSE of Tennessee.
H.R. 1043: Mr. CARTER of Texas.
H.R. 1049: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, and Ms. FUDGE.
H.R. 1080: Mr. NEGUSE.
H.R. 1140: Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 1164: Mr. COLE.
H.R. 1166: Ms. WEXTON.
H.R. 1174: Mr. SARBANES and Mrs. MCBATH.
H.R. 1266: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1345: Ms. FUDGE.
H.R. 1355: Mr. CLAY, Mr. CICILLINE, and Ms. WILSON of Florida.
H.R. 1383: Mr. SMITH of Washington.
H.R. 1570: Mr. WALTZ.
H.R. 1695: Mr. SMITH of Washington and Mr. PETERSON.
H.R. 1753: Mr. BABIN.
H.R. 1834: Ms. GABBARD.
H.R. 1931: Ms. SLOTKIN.
H.R. 2102: Ms. SPEIER.
H.R. 2199: Mr. HORSFORD.
H.R. 2256: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 2271: Mrs. AXNE.
H.R. 2416: Mrs. MILLER.
H.R. 2491: Mr. LEVIN of California.
H.R. 2571: Mr. KELLY of Mississippi.
H.R. 2599: Ms. MATSUI.
H.R. 2650: Mr. VAN DREW.
H.R. 2651: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 2653: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.
H.R. 2694: Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. ALLRED, Mr. KIND, Mr. ROSE of New York, and Ms. WEXTON.
H.R. 2711: Mr. PAPPAS.
H.R. 2850: Mr. BRINDISI, Mr. HECK, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Mr. QUIGLEY.
H.R. 2867: Ms. JAYAPAL.
H.R. 2895: Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina, Mr. GREEN of Tennessee, and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.
H.R. 2912: Mr. CISNEROS and Mr. HASTINGS.
H.R. 2990: Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. COOK, and Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 2991: Mr. DOGGETT.
H.R. 3036: Mr. KIND.
H.R. 3048: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 3218: Mr. GROTHMAN.
H.R. 3219: Mr. SHERMAN.
H.R. 3244: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.
H.R. 3364: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
H.R. 3522: Mr. BACON.
H.R. 3536: Mr. ALLRED.
H.R. 3561: Mr. PETERS and Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.

H.R. 3582: Ms. HAALAND.
H.R. 3587: Mr. WILLIAMS.
H.R. 3598: Mr. BOST.
H.R. 3645: Ms. HAALAND.
H.R. 3797: Mr. SMUCKER.
H.R. 3852: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 3862: Ms. PORTER.
H.R. 3969: Ms. GABBARD.
H.R. 4022: Mr. TONKO.
H.R. 4049: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
H.R. 4069: Mr. WOMACK.
H.R. 4090: Mr. NORMAN.
H.R. 4141: Mr. MCKINLEY.
H.R. 4148: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 4194: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. PETERSON, and Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas.
H.R. 4216: Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 4256: Mr. NORMAN.
H.R. 4280: Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. SANCHEZ, and Mr. COOPER.
H.R. 4301: Ms. SHALALA.
H.R. 4305: Ms. DELAURO, Ms. WATERS, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. EMMER, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. CARDENAS, and Mrs. DEMINGS.
H.R. 4326: Mr. WEBER of Texas.
H.R. 4346: Ms. BARRAGAN.
H.R. 4350: Mr. BILIRAKIS.
H.R. 4393: Ms. SPEIER.
H.R. 4681: Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. PAPPAS, and Mr. PETERSON.
H.R. 4697: Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. STEVENS, and Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 4708: Mr. CORREA, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. STEVENS, Mr. WELCH, Mr. CARDENAS, and Mr. PANETTA.
H.R. 4709: Mr. CORREA, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. STEVENS, Mr. WELCH, Mr. CARDENAS, and Mr. PANETTA.
H.R. 4738: Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. SMUCKER, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, and Mr. KELLER.
H.R. 4801: Mr. BALDERSON, Mrs. AXNE, Mrs. HAYES, and Mr. NADLER.
H.R. 4805: Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico.
H.R. 4817: Mr. GUTHRIE and Mr. MITCHELL.
H.R. 4926: Mr. STAUBER.
H.R. 4960: Mr. NORMAN.
H.R. 4990: Ms. SLOTKIN and Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.
H.R. 4995: Ms. FINKENAUER.
H.R. 5036: Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, and Mr. SARBANES.
H.R. 5052: Mr. HASTINGS.
H.R. 5104: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 5141: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 5200: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 5209: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.
H.R. 5230: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.
H.R. 5231: Ms. DEAN.
H.R. 5234: Mr. GROTHMAN.
H.R. 5297: Mr. KELLY of Mississippi.
H.R. 5299: Mr. HARDER of California, Mr. VELA, Mr. SUOZZI, and Mr. GOLDEN.
H.R. 5376: Mr. MCADAMS.
H.R. 5395: Mr. COOK.
H.R. 5435: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. SOTO, Mr. COHEN, and Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.
H.R. 5447: Mr. TIPTON.
H.R. 5450: Ms. JAYAPAL.
H.R. 5453: Ms. MATSUI and Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 5483: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
H.R. 5491: Ms. KAPTUR.
H.R. 5540: Mr. NADLER and Mr. CISNEROS.
H.R. 5552: Mr. MORELLE, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. HORSFORD, Ms. TITUS, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 5557: Ms. CHENEY.
H.R. 5575: Ms. PORTER and Mr. KENNEDY.
H.R. 5577: Mrs. LESKO.
H.R. 5588: Mr. TIPTON.
H.J. Res. 38: Ms. FINKENAUER.
H.J. Res. 66: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.J. Res. 76: Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma, and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.

H. Res. 50: Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. ARRINGTON, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. BURCHETT, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. WEBER of Texas, and Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma.

H. Res. 60: Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL.

H. Res. 71: Mr. MALINOWSKI.

H. Res. 114: Ms. SCANLON, Mr. HURD of Texas, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. CORREA, and Mr. WITTMAN.

H. Res. 301: Mr. PANETTA.

H. Res. 399: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H. Res. 641: Ms. JAYAPAL.

H. Res. 745: Mr. MOOLENAAR, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mrs. DINGELL.

H. Res. 780: Mr. CLOUD, Mr. ROUZER, and Mr. SMITH of Missouri.

H. Res. 782: Mr. WEBER of Texas.

H. Res. 785: Mr. KILDEE, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Ms. SLOTKIN, Mr. REED, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. BALDERSON, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. VAN DREW, Mr. KATKO, and Mr. JOYCE of Ohio.

H. Res. 791: Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. STEIL, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. GOODEN, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee, Mr. HURD of Texas, Mr. BUDD, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. HAGEDORN, Mr. FLORES, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. LATTA, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. PENCE, Mr. BACON, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. GUTHRIE,

Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. BALDERSON, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. STEWART, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. HICE of Georgia, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. KELLER, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mr. JOHN W. ROSE of Tennessee, Mr. MEUSER, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. RIGGLEMAN, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. KINZINGER, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania, Mr. ARRINGTON, Mr. SPANO, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. HILL of Arkansas, Mr. BOST, Mr. SCALISE, Ms. CHENEY, Mr. DUNN, and Mr. FITZPATRICK.