



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 166

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JANUARY 28, 2020

No. 18

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
January 28, 2020.

I hereby appoint the Honorable G.K. BUTTERFIELD 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.

QUESTIONS TO THE SENATE

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

Mr. GREEN of Texas. And still I rise, Mr. Speaker, and I rise today because I have a question. I have a question for posterity. I have a question for those who reside and dwell within the Senate. I have a question, but I also have a predicate for the question.

The predicate is this: Knowing what you know, knowing that the National Security Advisor was in the room with the President, knowing that he has in-

dicated that there were concerns within him with reference to the President's dealings with other countries, heads of state, knowing that he took his consternation to the Attorney General of the United States of America, knowing that the Attorney General expressed some concerns as well, knowing what you know, that the National Security Advisor, not just another person in the room but the person who advises the President on concerns with reference to our security, knowing this, how can you possibly thwart efforts to have the National Security Advisor give testimony before the Senate in the impeachment trial?

I have another question. This question is one for eternity.

Knowing that the hands of history are writing your legacy, knowing that future generations, that your grandchildren, that the people who will look to you for leadership will read what the hands of history will record, knowing that history will afford you the opportunity to be on the right side, the right side of history, how can you possibly decide that you will conduct yourself in a trial for the ages such that history will record that you were on the wrong side of history?

My dear friends, this is bigger than you. It is bigger than all of us. This is about the country we love and government we have.

We have a great opportunity to do justice in the Senate, and the only way we can do justice is to have witnesses testify.

I said before that I believe that there would be 51 Senators who would vote to have witnesses. Today, I am absolutely confident that there will be 51 or more Senators who will move to have witnesses present themselves and give testimony. To do otherwise would allow the greatest country in the world to have history record that, when we had the opportunity to stand up for the Constitution, some of us turned our backs and looked the other way.

This is your time, Senate. This is your time, Members of the great deliberative body. I beg that you will do what you must and have witnesses present themselves so that we will have history record that we did the right and just thing.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CARSON of Indiana). Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair, not to a perceived viewing audience.

NAVIGABLE WATERS PROTECTION RULE

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, last week, I had the pleasure of joining the Environmental Protection Agency and the Army Corps of Engineers in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, for an event announcing NWPA, or the Navigable Waters Protection Rule, a rule that will replace the flawed 2015 WOTUS, Waters of the United States rule.

For decades, there has been confusion and never-ending litigation over WOTUS. During my time as chairman of the House Agriculture Committee's Conservation and Forestry Subcommittee, which included watersheds and oversees environmental policy regarding agriculture, I heard from many farmers and ranchers, landowners, and environmental advocates about just how harmful WOTUS was to their businesses and to their way of life.

WOTUS was a gross overreach and particularly dangerous for the agriculture industry, as vast new areas of farmlands would be subject to the Clean Water Act and costly new permitting mandates for the very first time, even beyond our farms and ranches. Anyone who owned any property, private property rights would be

☐ 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.

H571

regulated. Ninety-nine percent of Pennsylvania was swept under these overreaching WOTUS regulations.

In addition to taking away States' authority to manage water resources, the 2015 WOTUS rule expanded the Clean Water Act far beyond the law's historical limits of navigable waters and the long-held intent of Congress. Instead of providing much-needed clarity to the Clean Water Act, WOTUS created even more confusion.

Thankfully, the negative impact of WOTUS was brought to an end when the Trump administration repealed it this past fall.

I support the Clean Water Act, and I agree that it must be clarified. However, this must be done without undue burdens on farmers, landowners, private property owners, and commercial activities that are already effectively regulated by the States.

Times have been very tough over the past decade for many farmers in rural areas. An average farm income was nearly halved during that period. Regulatory uncertainty—notably, the former WOTUS rule—only made things more difficult.

I am confident, however, that the new Navigable Waters Protection Rule is a step in the right direction and will address many of the regulatory gray areas that WOTUS did not. This new rule clearly defines four commonsense categories of Federal waters that would be regulated, while providing clarity on what is not regulated. This includes ditches, isolated ponds, and prior converted croplands.

The Navigable Waters Protection Rule will still support strong water protections without compromising the rights of States and without unnecessary burdens to the agriculture industry.

With clearly defined State and Federal regulations, our Nation's farmers can continue to focus on what they provide all of us: food, fiber, building materials, and energy that we all rely upon.

HONORING THE GREENSBORO FOUR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleague from North Carolina, Congresswoman ALMA ADAMS, as we introduce a resolution recognizing the significance of the Greensboro Four sit-in protest which took place on February 1, 1960, 60 years ago.

The Greensboro, North Carolina, sit-in was a civil rights protest that commenced when four young African American college students staged a sit-in at the segregated lunch counter of F. W. Woolworth department store in Greensboro. They refused to leave after being denied service only because of their race.

The four young men—Ezell Blair, Jr.; David Richmond; Franklin McCain; and Joseph McNeil—were students from North Carolina A&T College, now known as North Carolina A&T State University. I might add that A&T State University is now the largest HBCU in the country.

Mr. Speaker, I would also mention that Congresswoman ALMA ADAMS is a graduate of A&T State University and served as a college professor across the street at Bennett College for more than 40 years.

The Greensboro Four students were influenced by the unanimous Supreme Court decision in *Brown v. Board of Education*, 1954, wherein the Court ruled that State laws establishing racial segregation in public schools are unconstitutional even if the segregated schools are otherwise equal.

The students were also influenced by the Supreme Court decision in *Keys v. Carolina Coach Company*, 1955, wherein, the Court broke with its historic adherence to the *Plessy v. Ferguson* separate but equal doctrine and interpreted the Interstate Commerce Act as banning the segregation of Black passengers on buses traveling across State lines. The *Keys* case originated at the bus station in Roanoke Rapids, North Carolina, located in the heart of my congressional district.

The *Keys* ruling was announced 6 days prior to Rosa Parks' refusal to move from her seat on a segregated bus in Montgomery. And without question, the Rosa Parks Montgomery bus boycott, lasting 381 days, also inspired the Greensboro Four students.

The students were also inspired to act following the 1955 brutal lynching of Emmett Till after he was accused of offending a White woman in a Mississippi grocery store.

These four college students blazed a trail that ignited a movement to challenge racial segregation in public facilities throughout the segregated South. The sit-in movement soon spread to college towns throughout the South.

The Greensboro Four sit-ins contributed greatly to the civil rights movement and served as a catalyst for the mobilization of college students in the movement, evolving into the formation of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, which was founded in Raleigh, North Carolina, in April 1960. Some of the organizers of SNCC were Congressman JOHN LEWIS, Congressman JIM CLYBURN, and Diane Nash.

Nationwide participation in this new movement included over 700,000 people, including students, clergymen, and unified citizens, both Black and White. Many of the protestors, more than 3,000, were arrested for trespassing, disorderly conduct, or disturbing the peace.

However, the Greensboro Four remained peaceful throughout the 6-month sit-in, and their actions made an immediate and lasting impact, forc-

ing Woolworth's and other establishments to change their discriminatory policies. On July 26, 1960, the Woolworth's lunch counter was finally integrated. Today, the former Woolworth's now houses the International Civil Rights Center and Museum, which features a restored version of the lunch counter where the Greensboro Four sat. Part of the original counter is on display at the Smithsonian National Museum of American History here in Washington.

On Saturday of this week, February 1, the museum will commemorate the 60th anniversary of this historic event at the Greensboro Coliseum. Past award recipients have been numerous. They include Oprah Winfrey; Jesse Jackson, Sr.; President Nelson Mandela; and many, many others.

The award recipients this year will be: President Barack Obama, the Reverend Al Sharpton, Danny Glover, Mrs. Clayola Brown, Reverend Cardes Brown, Dr. Linda Brown, and Mrs. Emma Washington.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution that Ms. ADAMS and I introduce seeks to encourage all of the States to include in their educational curriculum the history and contributions of the Greensboro Four. It is imperative that we learn the lessons from the past and reaffirm that the ethnic and racial diversity of our country enriches our Nation.

We are always stronger together. We must never forget, in all things, to demand justice and equality for all.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the Greensboro Four. I congratulate the International Museum, and I look forward to participating in the great gala they will have this weekend in Greensboro.

NAVIGABLE WATERS PROTECTION RULE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend President Trump for providing much-needed relief and regulatory clarity through the enactment of the Navigable Waters Protection Rule.

Under the Obama administration, in an era rife with government overreach and constricting regulations, our Nation's hardworking farmers were subjected to regulations—specifically, under the Waters of the United States rule—that impeded on their businesses and their livelihoods.

Instead of enacting meaningful environmental protections and returning power back to State, local, and municipal governments, WOTUS put government overreach in the express lane. Farmers were forced to hire expensive attorneys to define which bodies of water on their properties were subject to Federal regulations.

The most concerning part is that bodies of water such as small ponds,

ditches, drains, and even areas of dry land were subject to these regulations.

□ 1015

Sadly, this is just another textbook example of the types of government overreach that must be eliminated. Thanks to the Navigable Waters Protection Rule, erroneous, misguided regulations enacted by the Obama administration are finally repealed. Hardworking Americans will once again have the freedom to compete within the marketplace, spur innovation, and create lasting value.

Under this rule, regulatory certainty will be returned to farmers, landowners, and manufacturers; the laws and specific powers that the Federal Government has been given under the Constitution and the Clean Water Act will be respected; and the relationship between the Federal Government and the State regarding the managing of land and water resources will be rebalanced.

By eliminating these constructive regulations, President Trump continues to deliver on his promises to our farmers, landowners, and manufacturers.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to stand alongside the President as we support, defend, and fight for the men and women who provide food, shelter, and essential commodities that Americans rely on every day.

RECOGNIZING NATIONAL SLAVERY AND HUMAN TRAFFICKING PREVENTION MONTH

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, January has been proclaimed as National Slavery and Human Trafficking Prevention Month.

These appalling criminal acts not only tear at the fabric of our society, but they also reflect a blatant disregard for the sanctity of human life.

Though human trafficking is often a hidden crime, its effects are far-reaching. It is estimated that over 25 million people—children and adults around the world—are victims of both human trafficking and slavery. Traffickers rob victims of their freedom, split families apart, and impose sizeable threats to communities.

Let's be clear. We must remain relentless in our fight to end these abhorrent crimes. We must all work together to protect and support survivors, prosecute those responsible, and proactively foster a culture of justice and accountability for these crimes.

ACT ON PHYSICIAN SHORTAGE

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

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about the healthcare crisis that we have in America today—primarily, the physician shortage that exists throughout the entire United States. It is a crisis that we must do something about.

In the next 15 years, the United States is expected to face a shortfall of

over 4,000 primary care physicians alone. Rural and low-income communities, many of which I represent, are expected to feel the brunt of this shortage, communities such as those in California, like the San Joaquin Valley.

The San Joaquin Valley has the lowest number of physicians in the State, approximately 0.9 physicians per 1,000 people. That is less than one. The statewide average is 2.2 physicians for every 1,000 people, which is twice as many.

Last week, I introduced legislation to help tackle this crisis. The Expanding Medical Education Act of 2020 will provide over \$200 million in funding to promote medical training in areas of high need throughout the country, like the San Joaquin Valley, with a focus on diverse and medically deprived communities.

We have Governor Gavin Newsom's and our local legislators' support on this legislation. Medical institutions, such as the University of California, San Francisco, have used funding from this effort to train and develop homegrown physicians under the residency program for 45 years in the valley and throughout the State. It is very important.

We have discovered that when you train physicians locally, residents, they are more inclined to practice in that area—in our case, in the valley—and bring healthcare to our communities.

Studies consistently show that students who can find quality education near their homes and families will be more likely to stay there after graduation. It is just common sense.

Growing our own doctors is essential to confronting this medical crisis, and I will continue to fight for every dollar to ensure that our valley residents have access to the necessary healthcare that they deserve.

RECOGNIZING TOM FLORES

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I also rise today to recognize the career of Tom Flores, a trailblazer in the Latino/Hispanic communities in professional football. It is appropriate. With the Super Bowl coming up this Sunday, I can't think of a better time to do it.

A native of my hometown, Fresno, California, Tom Flores was a gifted athlete, both in high school and college, and, later, in professional football. He played for the Oakland Raiders, becoming the first Hispanic starting quarterback in professional football.

Tom's success didn't stop there. After ending his playing career, he went on to win Super Bowl XI as the assistant coach for the Raiders in 1977. Then, 4 years later, he again led the team to victory as head coach, becoming the first Hispanic coach to win a Super Bowl, both in 1980 and in 1983. He won it twice.

To this day, he is one of only two people in history to win multiple Super Bowls as a player, an assistant coach, and a head coach. Mike Ditka is the

only other coach who falls in that category.

Tom Flores is terrific. He left professional football with a record of 97 wins and 87 losses as head coach, including a playoff record of 8 wins and 3 losses, including a stint as head coach and general manager of the Seattle Seahawks.

Since retiring, Tom Flores has used his influence to bring educational opportunities to the valley, his home, a place he has never, ever forgotten, through the Tom Flores Youth Foundation effort. Over the years, he has raised nearly \$2 million to support local school districts in science, art, and athletic programs.

Sadly, Tom Flores was short of the required votes needed for induction into the Professional Football Hall of Fame, and this is not the first time he has been passed over.

This week, I am introducing a resolution calling for the recognition of his significant accomplishments in the sport and his induction into the Pro Football Hall of Fame—well deserved and overdue.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation and honor the invaluable contributions that Coach Tom Flores has made to his community, to his country, and to America's game.

We have the Super Bowl this Sunday. We will all be watching it, I am sure. I know Tom Flores will be. He deserves to be in the national Pro Football Hall of Fame at Canton, Ohio. I can't think of anyone more deserving than Coach Tom Flores.

REMEMBERING THE LIFE OF DAVID GLASS

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

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember the life of David Glass.

David was born in 1935 and grew up in Mountain View, Missouri. He joined the U.S. Army after high school and then earned a degree at Missouri State. He started a career in business, eventually making his way to Arkansas.

He was hired by the famous Sam Walton in 1976 as the chief financial officer for Walmart, a young discount retailer at the time. Nobody knew then that his hiring would transform the company.

An entrepreneur in his own right, David helped further unleash the potential of the organization. Under his leadership, Walmart grew exponentially and transformed from a rural chain into the international business we all know today.

After succeeding Sam Walton as the chief executive officer of the company, he led the building of supercenters, introduced the sale of grocery items, helped develop automated distribution centers, and increased international acquisitions and operations. He advanced the company into the future while maintaining the founding principles of his predecessor, Sam Walton.

He would never admit it, but much of the success of Walmart and the growth of our region is a reflection of the work of David Glass.

His business expertise was rivaled only by his love of baseball. He famously helped keep the Kansas City Royals franchise from leaving Kansas City in 1993. Under his ownership, the team saw two American League pennants and a World Series trophy in 2015. His passion for the sport, the team, and the city helped bring success on the field.

Whether in Arkansas or Kansas City, the contributions of David Glass will long be remembered. I had the privilege of knowing him, not only as an accomplished businessman and a novel thinker, but as a friend.

I hope you will join me in celebrating his life, in praying for his wife, Ruth, and his children, Dan, Don, Dayna, and their families during the time of his passing.

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF
FORREST WOOD

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the life and legacy of a legend in Arkansas business, the founder of Ranger Boats, the late Forrest Wood.

Forrest was born in Flippin, Arkansas, in 1932, and his life reflected everything the Natural State has to offer. As a pioneer with a love for the outdoors, Forrest spent his time raising cattle and acting as a guide on Bull Shoals Lake, the White River, the Buffalo River, and Crooked Creek.

He became known throughout the region as an elite fishing guide. He eventually leveraged his skills on the water to create a float trip business, and in 1968, he began building lake boats. That year, he built six boats. Named after the Army Rangers and the Texas Rangers, Forrest Woods' Ranger Boats quickly became a household name in America.

He soon went from producing 6 to 600, and his novel concept became the modern bass boat that we know today. Forrest's ingenuity and vision transformed the boating and fishing industry across our Nation.

No one I know has loved or served Arkansas' great outdoors more than Forrest Wood. Whether as an entrepreneur, instructor, or former chairman of the Arkansas Game and Fish Commission, he was committed to ensuring people enjoy the outdoors for generations to come.

He will forever be remembered as a legend in the fishing industry, and I believe his biggest asset was his redeeming personality. A loyal friend, mentor, and dedicated family man, his genuine smile and caring nature will be sorely missed.

Mr. Speaker, as he is laid to rest this week, I ask that we keep his wife, Nina, and the entire Wood family in our prayers.

ADDRESS DETROIT BULK
STORAGE COLLAPSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. LAWRENCE) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, on November 26, 2019, during the Thanksgiving holiday, a dock piled with aggregates collapsed into the Detroit River.

Local and State authorities were slow to communicate with each other, and misinformation quickly spread. Concerns about polluted drinking water, even radioactive contamination, caused confusion and concern in my district. Many of us learned about the collapse from a Canadian newspaper, which published an article days after the collapse.

Over 2 months later, the site continues to deteriorate. The shoreline continues to erode, and contaminated soil is still spilling into the water. More recently, a sinkhole developed at the site, discharging even more contaminants into the water.

The area's long-serving industrial history was another source of concern for public health and the environment. During the 1940s and the 1950s, the site produced uranium for the development of the atomic bomb.

Recently, the site has been leased to companies openly storing toxic chemicals and piles of aggregates along the water.

Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed in the site owner's lack of urgency to quickly fix this problem. Over 2 months later, aggregate is still spilling into the water. The owners have failed to address the erosion and, now, the emerging sinkhole.

Mr. Speaker, I join with the EPA and the Michigan Department of Environmental, Great Lakes, and Energy, or EGLE, to hold this owner accountable to the fullest extent possible.

□ 1030

The owner has missed key deadlines to submit cleanup plans and, so far, their proposals don't even come close to stopping the erosion. If it is the responsibility of the violators to clean up their mess, how do we know they will do it properly and efficiently?

I expect our State and Federal agencies to continue to take action to safeguard our public health. They are continuing to test the surrounding area for contamination and are regularly updating my office with test results.

The risks to our public health cannot be dismissed. My constituents have witnessed how government action can help or hurt our communities.

We cannot forget the Flint water crisis. We witnessed a failure of government. Just last year, the Detroit Public Schools shut off its drinking fountains after finding elevated lead and copper. In the last year, Michigan has led the Nation in active PFAS sites, drawing national attention to the efforts of these "forever chemicals" in our waters.

We cannot—and I will fight to make sure we do not—repeat the Flint water crisis. We must learn from our mistakes. This situation demands a sense of urgency to restore the public's faith in our government to protect them from being contaminated by water.

This is why I am continuing to monitor the ongoing cleanup and remediation of the collapsed site. While the latest test results showed no significant threat to the public health, I will work with the State to ensure the site's cleanup and urge the State to push for a third-party independent study. We have the right to know that the surrounding water and the environment is safe from contaminants.

I will also remain in communication to ensure the drinking water in Michigan and—also with government oversight—that we in America have safe, clean water, and we must continue the fight for affordable water.

If there is a threat to our public health, the government has a responsibility to safeguard our constituents from harm.

OUR RESPONSE TO THE
CORONAVIRUS OUTBREAK

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

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, with more than 4,500 people confirmed infected in China, and over 100 deaths, the coronavirus certainly has my attention. But as the outbreak of the coronavirus strain originating in China continues, I want to remind Kansans that U.S. health officials remain on high alert and are fully prepared for any situation.

The Centers for Disease Control currently has teams on the ground, both domestically and internationally. Domestically, the CDC is working closely with local public health departments to identify potential cases early and make sure patients get the best and most appropriate care. To control the spread of the outbreak, the CDC has preventive screening measures in major U.S. airports.

Last year, President Trump signed into law the reauthorization of the Pandemic and All-Hazards Preparedness Innovation Act. This bill has been critical for improving preparedness and response, and bolstering the emergency response workforce, as well as increasing communication and efforts in medical countermeasures.

The administration has also consistently prioritized funding to build on investments to protect the civilian population in the event of public health emergencies related to infectious disease outbreaks.

As a physician, I understand the uncertainty and fear infectious disease outbreaks can have. But first, I want to encourage Kansans to follow recommendations from your own doctor. And if you have any concern about the situation, you should call your doctor's

nurse and talk to them about the situation and your concerns.

But all that being said, I might offer these tips: First of all, make sure you have gotten your flu shot. Now, the flu shot won't protect you from a coronavirus, but it is a much bigger threat to you right now than the coronavirus is.

Children, pregnant women, and our senior citizens, who are most susceptible to viruses should avoid public places where exposure risk is high.

Thorough handwashing is a great best practice as we continue to work through the flu and cold season.

And, finally, follow the CDC and State Department's recommendations regarding travel to China.

If you are at all concerned about any symptoms you are experiencing, especially if you are having new onset of wheezing or shortness of breath, you should contact your primary care doctor.

Now, thus far, only 5 cases have been confirmed in the United States, and all cases include recent travel to China. While testing can now only be done at the CDC, we hope that a commercially-available test will soon be available in February, which will help us contain and monitor this virus.

These global outbreaks impact us here at home, and that is why we respond to infectious disease outbreaks with urgency and as a global community. Efforts by President Trump and this administration have ensured our health agencies have the funding and resources necessary to combat outbreaks and protect Kansans.

I am confident in the measures being taken by our national healthcare officials and agencies, as well as by our local health departments, our local doctors, nurses, and our local hospitals.

NEW NAVIGABLE WATERS PROTECTION REGULATIONS

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, last Friday, I was honored to join EPA Region 7 Administrator Jim Gulliford at the Kansas Commodity Classic in Manhattan, Kansas, to announce the EPA's new Navigable Waters Protection Rule. The rule provides a clear definition of Waters of the United States, otherwise known as WOTUS, delivering on President Trump's promise to cut burdensome regulations and slash bureaucratic red tape to empower farmers, ranchers, builders, small businesses, and other landowners.

Kansas farmers and ranchers are the original and best conservationists in the world, and I have heard from them about this issue since I came into office. This new rule will tremendously reduce the burden on Kansans who work in dairy, cattle, and crop operations, and allow them to implement conservation methods without Federal overreach.

The EPA's new Navigable Waters Protection Rule will continue to protect our environment without stifling economic growth and rebalance the re-

lationship between the Federal Government and States in managing our land and water resources.

The Navigable Waters Protection Rule ends decades of uncertainty over where Federal jurisdiction begins and ends. It also ensures that America's water protections, among the best in the world, remain strong, while giving our States and Tribes more flexibility in determining how best to manage their land and water resources to protect the environment and local economies.

Go Chiefs.

HONORING THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF CONSTER DAVIS

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

Mr. CLOUD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Ms. Conster Davis and to wish her a very happy 100th birthday.

Ms. Davis is a citizen of south Texas whose life has been characterized by a servant-hearted desire to help others and to work hard.

During World War II, she drove rivets into airplane wings, playing her part, along with countless other American women, in the war effort.

Today, at 100 years old, she spends her time supporting the students and staff at Galvan Elementary School in Corpus Christi, Texas, where she is affectionately known as Granny Davis.

She mentors the pre-K students and helps teachers with clerical work. She also served as a Senior Corps Foster Grandparent for 25 years, mentoring young people and pouring into them during some of the most formative years of their lives.

Ms. Davis loves caring for young people and shows it by investing much of her time and energy into the children of Corpus Christi.

It is difficult to imagine the tremendous impact Ms. Conster Davis has had in living a life of service that continues today to impact generation after generation.

On behalf of the people of the 27th Congressional District of Texas, I am proud to honor her life and service.

HONORING THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF JAKE GODBOLD

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

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of Mayor Jake Godbold, who served the city of Jacksonville from 1978 to 1987 and, sadly, passed away last week.

Mayor Godbold, or simply "Jake," as we all called him, was a man of the highest integrity whose contributions to northeast Florida are seemingly infinite.

One thing I will always remember about Jake was that when he spoke to

you, he made you feel as though you were the only person in the room. I recall fondly my first interaction with the Mayor occurred actually when I was a young patrolman on the north side of Jacksonville. And as an officer, I soon learned every time the Mayor saw a police officer or a firefighter, he would stop whatever he was doing and would take the time to speak with that officer or that firefighter.

Jake loved our policemen, our firemen, and our city, and they all loved him back. He will be dearly missed.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF ROBERT SHIRCLIFF

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of Mr. Robert Shircliff of Jacksonville.

Bob lived his Christian faith and was well-known for his giving and loving character. His extraordinary contributions and service to our country and local community are truly legendary. Deeply beloved by the people of Jacksonville, Mr. Shircliff passed away last week at the age of 91.

He served on the boards of numerous civic groups, such as the Community Foundation and led countless efforts to support institutions like St. Vincent's HealthCare, the Jacksonville Symphony, United Way, and the Cummer Art Museum, just to name a few.

Despite his success, he remained humble and grateful to those around him. He once said, "I've tried coming into the office on Saturdays and changing the world, and I can't do it. But if I come in on Monday, and I'm surrounded by really good people, anything can happen."

On behalf of the Fourth District of Florida, I want to offer my condolences to the many friends and loved ones of Mr. Shircliff. His service, generosity, and leadership has made northeast Florida a better place to live, work, and play.

And since Bob's arrival, heaven is truly a better place.

SUPPORTING CHILD NUTRITION RULEMAKING

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

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to applaud the Trump administration's recent proposed rulemaking for school meals and the Summer Food Service Program.

As a member of the Agriculture Committee, and ranking member on the Education and Labor Subcommittee with jurisdiction over the child nutrition programs, I have consistently heard from school food service administrators in my district about their frustrations with the heavyhanded Obama-era regulations.

I am glad to see the administration seeking input from those who administer these programs every day. This new rule will provide needed flexibility for food service supervisors to adapt their menus to teach students proper

nutrition habits that they will adopt during crucial periods of growth and into adulthood.

These food service professionals know the needs of their students best, and I look forward to seeing this rule finalized and our schools and communities become even stronger.

UPDATES ON AGRICULTURE AND THE TRADE WAR
WITH CHINA

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I think most people in this body know that I am a farmer by trade, and I represent a southern Kentucky district that is one of the biggest agricultural districts in America.

I am very pleased today to give an update on the accomplishments that the Trump administration and Congress has made over the past 3 years with respect to agriculture.

Anyone that keeps up with President Trump knows that he sincerely cares about the farmers in America; and he realizes that the farmers, through no fault of their own, have been on the front lines of this trade war with China.

But if you talk to any farmer, as I do on a regular basis when I am home in Kentucky, the farmers still strongly support the President and they understand why we are in this trade war. They also understand the efforts that have been made and the accomplishments that have been achieved with respect to agriculture from this administration and from this Congress over the past 3 years.

I want to touch on three areas where we focused in Congress, where I focused as a member of the Agriculture Committee, to improve our agriculture for our family farmers who are struggling, again, on the front lines of this trade war with China.

First of all, regulations. As with many other industries in America, one of the first things that President Trump looked at, and then the Republicans and the majority of this body looked at 3 years ago, was the regulations. Many industries, especially in agriculture, felt like there were burdensome regulations that were holding farmers back, holding agriculture back.

So, one by one, this administration, whether it was through the U.S. Department of Agriculture, or the EPA, has looked at every regulation to deem whether that regulation was necessary, or whether that regulation was excessive and needed to be scaled back.

□ 1045

I am very pleased to report that the biggest regulation that scared most people in agriculture was the WOTUS rule from the Obama administration. I am very pleased, last week, this administration completely eliminated the WOTUS rule with respect to navigable streams. Under the Obama regulation, every mud puddle in Kentucky would have been defined as a navigable stream, therefore, creating a situation where farmers would be breaking the

law to farm the land that they farmed for many generations.

Next is tax policy. We focused very heavily on passing the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, which helped cut taxes overall, but one thing that helped agriculture is the accelerated depreciation rule, which encouraged farmers to make a bigger investment.

And, lastly, trade. We have had huge success on the trade front over the past couple of weeks here in Washington, and I applaud the Trump administration for their efforts to not only sign the USMCA, which is the new modern NAFTA deal that puts workers on a level playing field in America with workers in Mexico and Canada, but it also enhances agriculture opportunities.

Also, the phase one trade deal that the President signed recently with China, this focuses on agriculture. It brings back those markets that we lost in agriculture because we were on the front lines of this trade war, and it also increases new markets for agriculture.

I am very pleased with the achievements that have been made in agriculture, but I realize that our farmers are struggling and we have a lot more work to do. I pledge to continue to work with the Trump administration to see that our farmers are treated fairly and that we can continue to grow our Nation's most important industry: agriculture.

HONORING THE MEMORY OF
PHILIP M. VAN HOY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BISHOP) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the memory of Philip M. Van Hoy of Charlotte, who passed away unexpectedly Saturday morning.

Phil was a preeminent attorney, a mentor to a generation of conservatives, and a dear friend of 30 years.

Phil grew up in Charlotte and graduated from Duke University and the University of North Carolina Law School, but he was a lifelong Duke fan. Upon graduation, Phil enlisted in the U.S. Army Reserve, eventually leaving as a first lieutenant.

As a lawyer, Phil served Duke Power and, in due course, founded the law firm Van Hoy, Reutlinger, Adams & Dunn, where he handled some of the most complex employment cases at every level, including the United States Supreme Court. In 2013 and 2019, Phil was named Lawyer of the Year for employment law by Best Lawyers in America.

Though Phil was a gifted lawyer, his true passion was Republican politics. Phil served as vice chairman of the Mecklenburg County Republican Party and was an alternative delegate to the RNC convention that nominated Ronald Reagan.

But most significantly, Phil was a mentor to a generation of conserv-

atives. He organized a lunch that still goes on in Charlotte, and they refer to it affectionately as the "Hun Lunch"; although, as Phil was quick to point out, Attila the Hun was no conservative. He was a collectivist.

Phil welcomed me 30 years ago to the Hun Lunch, and it continues weekly today. Its members are devastated by his loss.

I am lucky to count Phil as a cherished friend. Friends will remember, particularly, his trademark sharp wit, the ever-ready joke, and the gleam in his eye much more since his untimely passing and will remember his consistent kindness and commitment to values.

Jo and I extend our deepest condolences and prayers to Sylvia and their two sons, Travis and Marshall. May Phil Van Hoy rest in peace.

HONORING THE LIFE OF TERRY L. HUNT

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Terry L. Hunt, who passed away this weekend while on a business trip to Kenya.

Mr. Hunt was president of Lumbee Tribe Enterprises and a valued member of the Lumbee Tribe. Terry's life was dedicated to the success of the Lumbee people, and his passing represents a grave loss.

Mr. Hunt was a native of the Fairmont community in Robeson County, North Carolina. Terry graduated from Fairmont High School in 1979 and served his community as a police officer with the Fairmont Police Department.

In 1993, Terry rose to the position of chief of police and was selected by the Attorney General to help shape the national law enforcement initiative for cases of missing children.

Mr. Hunt was deeply devoted to his community, and when he retired from law enforcement in 2001, he continued his public service. Mr. Hunt represented his district on the Lumbee Tribal Council from 2011 to 2017 and was elected as economic development chairman, taking an active interest in economic affairs of the Lumbee people.

While Mr. Hunt left us far too young, it is altogether fitting that he passed while finalizing a new contract for the Tribe-owned business that he led. Mr. Hunt served his community until the very end, a community that is deeply mourning his loss.

Terry's work will go on, but no one will be able to fill his shoes. May his love and dedication for his people be an example for all of us.

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 51 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. LEE of California) at noon.

PRAYER

Reverend Jeffrey F. Kirby, Our Lady of Grace Catholic Church, Indian Land, South Carolina, offered the following prayer:

Good and gracious God, You have ordered all things according to Your laws of goodness and righteousness.

You bless all Your children with equal dignity and endow them with talents to pursue happiness. In Your kindness, You inspire and raise up leaders for Your people.

We ask You to bless this House of Representatives, made up of these leaders, and to bless their work during today's session. Grant them prudence and fortitude. May they seek Your divine wisdom and give You due homage in all their deliberations and decisions. May they always seek the common good, the public benefit, and true justice and peace for all.

We ask all these blessings from You, who are the Lord God and the giver of life, forever and ever.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

Mr. CISNEROS led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

WELCOMING REVEREND JEFFREY F. KIRBY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. NORMAN. Madam Speaker, it is my honor to recognize and nominate today's guest, Father Jeffrey Kirby, to serve as guest chaplain for the noon prayer.

Father Kirby, pastor of Our Lady of Grace Parish in South Carolina and the adjunct professor of theology at Belmont Abbey College, is a devout follower of Jesus Christ and lives his life as a light unto others.

Father Kirby received his bachelor of arts and master's degree from Franciscan University of Steubenville before receiving his doctorate in moral theology from Holy Cross University in Rome.

His selflessness led him to enlist in the National Guard during his studies, and he even served on a relief effort for Hurricane Mitch.

In 2002, he entered seminary in Rome and was ordained a Catholic priest. He has since served parishes across South Carolina, from Clemson to Walhalla to Seneca to Columbia and now Lancaster.

Governor Nikki Haley selected him in 2016 to receive the Order of the Palmetto, our State's highest civilian honor.

In His word, and one that exemplifies Father Kirby's life, the Book of Malachi 2:7 reads: "For the lips of a priest should guard knowledge, and people should seek instruction from his mouth, for he is the messenger of the Lord of hosts."

In light of his many years of ministry, it is my honor to welcome Father Kirby as the guest chaplain of the United States House of Representatives.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

CONGRATULATING 2020 CALIFORNIA DISTINGUISHED SCHOOLS

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

Mr. CISNEROS. Madam Speaker, it is with great pride that I rise today to honor and congratulate 13 elementary schools in California's 39th District for their selection as 2020 California Distinguished Schools.

The 39th District elementary schools awarded this distinction include: Aca-cia, Blandford, Buena Terra, Charles G. Emery, Golden, Hidden Trails, Killian, Laguna Road, Laurel Elementary Magnet School of Innovation and Career Exploration, Mesa Robles, Robert C. Fisler, Wedgeworth, and Ybarra Academy of Arts and Technology.

Our students' success is a testament not only to their dedication but also to the tireless efforts made by educators, administrators, staff, and parents.

Madam Speaker, I ask that you and my honorable colleagues join me in congratulating these 13 California distinguished schools for their tremendous educational achievements.

CELEBRATING SCHOOL CHOICE

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

Mr. LAMBORN. Madam Speaker, I rise during this week to celebrate school choice.

Americans lose their freedom when parents aren't allowed to decide on their own where to send their children to school. A one-size-fits-all approach doesn't encourage growth for the next generation of Americans.

In March, the Supreme Court will be hearing oral arguments for the case of Espinoza v. Montana Department of Revenue. The Court's decision could have important ramifications for public funding of private and public schools.

In my district, I am proud of the work being done by Steve and Joyce Schuck, champions of the school choice movement in Colorado. Steven Woodford is also doing great work for the homeschool communities of Colorado.

These key leaders in our community are enabling students to have educational opportunities they wouldn't otherwise have.

Colorado is making great strides in the school choice movement, and I am proud to represent both the community leaders who facilitate it and the talented students of this generation.

COMMEMORATING TODD PORTUNE AND NATHANIEL JONES

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

Mr. CHABOT. Madam Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I rise today to honor two iconic Cincinnati leaders who passed away over the weekend.

On Saturday, we lost longtime Hamilton County Commissioner and former Cincinnati City Councilman Todd Portune.

Todd was a true leader, willing to put aside political differences and work together on issues to benefit our community. He was also someone I considered not only a respected colleague but a friend.

Then, on Sunday, Cincinnati suffered another loss with the passing of Judge Nathaniel Jones.

As a civil rights leader, a Federal judge, and a person, Judge Jones was one of those rare people who was universally admired and respected. Having worked with Thurgood Marshall on Brown v. Board of Education, having helped South Africa overcome apartheid, and having served as general counsel for the NAACP, Judge Jones not only improved the lives of people in Cincinnati but across the country and, in fact, across the globe.

Madam Speaker, while Cincinnati will sorely miss Commissioner Portune and Judge Jones, their accomplishments will be felt by our community and across our Nation for generations to come.

SUPPORT PROTESTERS IN REPUBLIC OF GEORGIA

(Mr. OLSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OLSON. Madam Speaker, I have a question. What does Oscar the Grouch from Sesame Street have in common with the republic of Georgia's oligarch Bidzina Ivanishvili? What do they have in common?

Answer: They are both puppets who trash their own home.

Vladimir Putin's puppet has attacked foreign investment in Georgia and crushed basic human rights.

A company from Texas, Frontera Resources, has been drilling in Georgia for years and years and years. They have created great jobs in America and great jobs in Georgia. They have created freedom. That was until the government took over all of their operations, all of their equipment. Now, they are drilling zero wells in Georgia.

Of course, the Napoleon of Siberia, Vladimir Putin, is happy to control Georgia's oil. His puppet, oligarch Ivanishvili, is getting rich off the backs of the Georgian people.

It is time to wake up. As this photo from Getty shows, the protesters in Georgia need our support. Join me in raising our voices for freedom in Georgia.

RECOGNIZING NATIONAL SCHOOL CHOICE WEEK 2020

(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. Madam Speaker, I am grateful to be an original cosponsor of H. Res. 814 to designate January 26 to February 1 as National School Choice Week.

As the husband of a teacher, father of four, and grandfather of eight, I appreciate the importance of school choice. We must continue to support magnet, charter, traditional, public, private, and homeschools inspired by Zan Tyler across the country.

Every year, I have the opportunity to meet with students and teachers and talk to them about their unique educational experiences and why they think school choice is important. I will be visiting schools this Friday to renew this discussion.

What we have seen is too many top-down mandates from unelected Washington bureaucrats who do not know the needs of students like their parents, teachers, and local school boards do. The quality of our children's education is too important to rely on a one-size-fits-all approach.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism with the courageous leadership of President Donald Trump.

SAY NO TO THE PRO ACT

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

Mr. KELLER. Madam Speaker, as part of a productive district work period, our team met with job creators and employers who are members of the Williamsport/Lycoming Chamber of Commerce.

The topic of discussion was the so-called Protecting the Right to Organize Act, otherwise known as the PRO Act. One thing was clear from these individuals: The PRO Act is a bad bill that has too much government interference in the employee-employer relationship.

More than being bad for employers, the PRO Act is terrible for workers. Cloaked in the language of employee protection, the real result of the PRO Act is providing workers with fewer choices, fewer rights, and an inability to speak directly for themselves.

Our Nation is experiencing the greatest economy in generations with the lowest unemployment rate for all categories of Americans since I was 4 years old. Congress should not pass legislation that would slow economic growth, stifle job creation, and limit workers' free choice and privacy. Yet, that is exactly what the PRO Act would do.

If Congress really cares about jobs, the economy, and workers' rights, it should say no to the PRO Act.

EXTEND RIGHT TO LIFE TO ALL

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, last week marked the 47th anniversary of Roe v. Wade.

Our Nation's Founders enshrined in the Declaration of Independence that all humans are "endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

Since that fateful Roe v. Wade decision, we have denied the first of those basic rights, the right to life, to more than 60 million unborn children.

I rise today in opposition to this atrocity, and I rise in support of the brave individuals who flooded the National Mall this past Friday to take part in the annual March for Life.

As long as abortion exists in our country, a dark cloud will hang over us, but the March for Life makes me hopeful that this cloud will not hang over us forever. I have great hope that life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness will extend to all Americans born and those yet to be born.

EVIDENCE PERTINENT TO IMPEACHMENT TRIAL

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

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, we have gone through and are going through a serious time in our country. The Senate is engaged, as was said the

other day, in one of its most important duties and responsibilities.

This weekend, a draft of the upcoming book by President Trump's former National Security Advisor, Ambassador John Bolton, was reported on by The New York Times.

In that book, Ambassador Bolton, who was the National Security Advisor and foreign policy advisor for President Donald Trump, revealed additional evidence pertinent to the impeachment trial now underway in the Senate. There is strong and direct evidence that the President linked critical military aid to Ukraine. It is reported that so many of his advisers, including Mr. Bolton, could not understand that aid being withheld to our ally.

He reveals that the President linked that critical military aid to Ukraine to the announcement of an investigation by President Zelensky, which was intended to benefit President Trump personally and politically.

□ 1215

Ambassador Bolton's book further confirms this and reveals that he was in the room; not a whistleblower; not somebody relying on hearsay, in the room with the President, and heard him state clearly that the two were linked or, said in another way, that there was a quid pro quo, as was alleged in Article I of the Articles of Impeachment. They were linked and that congressionally-appropriated military aid to Ukraine would not be released until President Zelensky responded to the President's personal, political demands.

Whether you are a lawyer or not, you have watched trials on TV, or perhaps been a witness in a trial. A trial is to examine and weigh the evidence, all the relevant evidence. That is the definition of a fair trial, of a quest for justice trial, a trial in which the jurors are impartial and seeking truth; not a trial in which the jurors refuse to hear the evidence the prosecution wants to submit.

It is unheard of that a juror would say, no, I don't want to hear that evidence. The juror's duty is to hear the evidence and to seek the truth. And the witnesses raise their hand, swear to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth; the whole truth, a key phrase in that witness' oath.

That, of course, includes Ambassador Bolton's testimony, the whole truth; what he heard directly from the President, as well as others who have firsthand knowledge of facts relevant to the truth or falsity of the allegations; in this case, abuse of power and obstruction of justice.

And, of course, so many of those witnesses have been ordered by the President not to tell the truth, not to testify, to fight subpoenas of the Congress of the United States.

A juror cannot be impartial if he or she willfully ignores evidence upon which the case might turn.

As a Washington Post editorial stated powerfully yesterday:

If Senators fail to summon Bolton, whom they were talking about, they will turn the Senate trial into a farce.

I might use the words show trial. We are familiar with show trials. Show trials are to pretend that you are seeking justice while you exonerate, theoretically, a guilty party.

I will remind Members of the iconic Japanese monkeys, the macaques. The three of them sit and see no evil, hear no evil, speak no evil. I would characterize that as a see no evil, hear no evil, speak no truth juror. Keeping your eyes shut and ears plugged is refusing to hear, refusing to weigh the facts. See no evil, hear no evil, speak no truth.

In the old Supreme Court Chamber, if you visit that, you will see Lady Justice, a statue, with no blindfold. We hear that justice is blind. Justice cannot be blind. Justice must see the facts. It must see the equities. It must see who said what, when, where, how, and make a judgment.

A great legislator and contemporary of our Founders, Edmund Burke, once said, "The only thing necessary for the triumph of evil is for good men to do nothing."

This is a serious time in America. We will judge whether or not party is above principle; whether truth is trumped by see no evil, hear no evil, speak no truth.

Madam Speaker, I implore the good men and women of the United States Senate, do not do nothing, which Edmund Burke said was the only thing necessary for evil to triumph. Do something that will secure your place in history to be remembered for your courage, your honesty, and honoring your oath.

Allow witnesses like Ambassador Bolton to be heard. Allow a fair and impartial trial.

Madam Speaker, I believe that is what the American people are looking for. They are pretty divided on whether or not this is an impeachable offense. I get that. That is a legitimate argument to make.

But what is not legitimate is not to listen to the evidence. Senators must now do their duty to their oaths, to our Constitution, and to its authors, and to the cause of truth itself, to allow Ambassador Bolton and other witnesses to be heard.

I urge Senators to uncover their eyes, uncover their ears. The American people and history are waiting to hear truth from them. They are waiting for the Senate trial to seek the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth.

HONORING THE GREENSBORO FOUR

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

Ms. ADAMS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor and recognize those

four young men from North Carolina A&T State University who helped bend the arc of history towards justice, the Greensboro Four.

On February 1, 1960, 60 years ago this upcoming Saturday, David Richmond, Franklin McCain, Jibreel Khazan, and Joseph McNeil, took their seats at a Woolworth lunch counter in Greensboro, North Carolina, and changed American history forever. And after they were refused service, they continued to sit at that lunch counter until the store closed.

The next day, 12 more students sat at that same lunch counter; and by the next week, thousands of demonstrators began to fight against Jim Crow in North Carolina.

To honor the triumphs of these four young men, and to commemorate their efforts to make this a more just society, I am proud to introduce today, with my colleague, Representative G.K. BUTTERFIELD, a resolution recognizing the significance of the Greensboro Four sit-in.

May we all continue to live by their example as we make this a fairer and more equitable America for all that call it home.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3621, STUDENT BORROWER CREDIT IMPROVEMENT ACT, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 550, MERCHANT MARINERS OF WORLD WAR II CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL ACT OF 2019

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 811 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 811

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. 3621) to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act to remove adverse information for certain defaulted or delinquent private education loan borrowers who demonstrate a history of loan repayment, 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 amendments specified in this section and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services. 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 Financial Services now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116-47, modified by the amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, 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 in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules. 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 take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 550) to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the United States Merchant Mariners of World War II, in recognition of their dedicated and vital service during World War II, with the Senate amendment thereto, and to consider in the House, without intervention of any point of order, a motion offered by the chair of the Committee on Foreign Affairs or his designee that the House concur in the Senate amendment with each of the two amendments specified in section 4 of this resolution. The Senate amendment and the motion shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except as specified in section 3 of this resolution.

SEC. 3. (a) The question of adoption of the motion shall be divided between the two House amendments specified in section 4 of this resolution. The two portions of the divided question shall be considered in the order specified by the Chair.

(b) Each portion of the divided question shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SEC. 4. The amendments referred to in the second and third sections of this resolution are as follows:

(a) An amendment consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116-48.

(b) An amendment consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116-49.

SEC. 5. If only one portion of the divided question is adopted, that portion shall be engrossed as an amendment in the nature of a substitute to the Senate amendment to H.R. 550.

□ 1230

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL), 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. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, on Monday, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 811, providing for consideration of two measures: H.R. 3621, the Comprehensive CREDIT Act; and the Senate amendment to H.R. 550.

The rule provides for consideration of H.R. 3621 under a structured rule, with 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and the ranking member of the Committee on Financial Services. It self-executes Chairwoman WATERS' manager's amendment, which updates definitions, amends requirements for issuance of final rules, includes protections for workers affected by a Federal shutdown, and makes other technical changes. It also makes in order 14 amendments.

The rule also provides for consideration of two House amendments to the Senate amendment to H.R. 550. The rule provides for 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs for each House amendment. Finally, the rule provides for separate votes on each House amendment.

Madam Speaker, on H.R. 3621, the Comprehensive CREDIT Act of 2020, credit scores and credit reports play a critical role in determining which of our constituents across America will be able to pay for college, rent an apartment, buy a car or a house, start a business, meet major unexpected expenses, or even, increasingly, get a particular job.

Most Americans do not have the wealth to pay out of pocket for major expenditures, so credit is essential; and credit scores and credit reports have become the key screening and sorting mechanism, the key gatekeeper that makes the difference for millions of Americans between having the money to pay for college or not, being able to buy a house or rent an apartment or not, and, increasingly, qualifying as an employee for a specific position or not, because so many employers are increasingly using credit scores and credit reports as part of the qualifying process for appointing and hiring new employees.

The system of credit scores and credit reports is deeply flawed today, and we have done nothing to reform it in 17 years. The Federal Trade Commission tells us that one in five Americans has an error on at least one of their credit reports, and 5 percent of the people have errors grave enough to result in their being denied credit or having to pay substantially more for their mortgages or their auto loans or to obtain insurance policies.

The three big CRAs, consumer reporting agencies—Equifax, TransUnion, and Experian—have files on more than 200 million American consumers, which means that there are errors in the credit reports of at least 40 million of our constituents and serious, potentially life-changing errors in the credit reports of 10 million Americans across the country.

Correcting these errors often takes considerable time and procedural effort, as well as knowledge on how to communicate with the credit reporting companies. The Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, the CFPB, determined that, in 2018, credit reports were the single most complained-about financial product in our country, and the three big CRAs were the most complained-about financial companies in America.

Many vulnerable populations like seniors, stressed and busy working-class Americans, and less financially literate young Americans describe immense frustration in trying to solve problems with credit scoring and reporting companies. Even beyond the errors and mistakes, the credit system takes advantage of the financially insecure and precarious, converting transitory lapses of poverty into a lifetime of financial stigma and hardship. It is very expensive to be poor in America.

Consumers lack the right to a free annual credit score. Many consumers who try to get a free annual credit report or to obtain their scores get tricked into purchasing high-priced credit monitoring or subscription services.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 3621, the Comprehensive CREDIT Act of 2020, comprehensively addresses these abuses and combines six bills carefully constructed by our colleagues on the Financial Services Committee to improve transparency, fairness, and accuracy in America's credit reporting system. It reforms and upgrades the process for consumers seeking to resolve errors in their credit reports, and it seeks to ensure that consumer financial information held by the CRAs will be accurate, complete, and verifiable.

This bill will:

Prohibit reporting on consumers' debt relating to medically necessary procedures and delay reporting by 1 year for other forms of medical debt;

Remove adverse credit file information relating to defaulted or delinquent private education loans for borrowers who demonstrate a history of essentially timely and faithful loan repayments for these loans;

Permit reasonable interruptions in the consecutive repayment periods for student borrowers facing unique and extenuating life events;

Prohibit most current and prospective employers from using credit reports to make employment decisions unless required by a local, State, or Federal law or government;

Shorten the time period adverse credit information stays on consumer re-

ports from 7 years to 4 years and from 10 to 7 years for bankruptcy information;

Give consumers a new right to appeal the results of disputes with the CRAs; and

Improve the oversight capabilities of the CFPB on credit reporting agencies and their scoring modules and require these agencies to better train their personnel on addressing consumer concerns.

It has been more than 15 years since we enacted comprehensive reform of the credit reporting system. The House can be proud of the significant progress this credit reform package will bring to hardworking people across America for whom credit and credit reports are the lifeline to education, housing, and, in many cases, good employment and financial stability.

Madam Speaker, on the Senate amendment to H.R. 550, the House also considers the rule on two important amendments to the Senate amendment of H.R. 550.

The first amendment, based on Representative RO KHANNA's No War with Iran Act, clarifies that Congress has not authorized military force against Iran and asserts Congress' funding power to enforce the congressional authorization requirements under the War Powers Resolution of 1973. It, thus, prohibits funds for any military force in or against Iran unless Congress declares war or enacts specific statutory authorization for the use of military force against Iran or there is a national emergency created by an attack upon the United States or our Armed Forces consistent with the provisions of the War Powers Resolution.

The second amendment, based on Representative BARBARA LEE's bill, will repeal the 2002 AUMF for the Iraq war against Saddam Hussein, which authorized the President to use the Armed Forces to the extent "he determines to be necessary and appropriate" to "defend the national security of the United States against the continuing threat posed by Iraq" and "enforce all relevant United Nations Security Council resolutions regarding Iraq."

The commanding premise of the 2002 authorization was the need to counter the threat of weapons of mass destruction putatively possessed by Saddam Hussein. But Saddam Hussein actually never had nuclear weapons or other weapons of mass destruction and was driven from office in 2003 and was killed in 2006. The current government in Iraq is a strategic partner of the United States in the struggle against nonstate terror groups like ISIS and al-Qaida and poses no threat to our national security.

The 2002 AUMF does not authorize, and has never authorized, the use of force against Iran; yet it was invoked by National Security Advisor Robert O'Brien as a primary source of the administration's authority to engage in military hostilities against Iran, including the strike against Qasem Soleimani.

This is one problem with obsolete AUMFs hanging around decades after they were approved. Presidents can treat them like a loaded gun sitting on a table which can be picked up at will and used in a completely different context for a completely different reason.

The 2002 authorization must be repealed to ensure that no President now or in the future can use it as a pretextual justification for deploying military force without congressional authorization or a formal declaration of war as called for by the Constitution of the United States.

Madam Speaker, the Framers gave Congress the power to declare war because they had just had a revolution against the kings and the monarchs who, for centuries, plunged their populations into wars of vanity, intrigue, political advantage, and distraction of the population. The Framers understood that the power over life and death, over war and peace, was far too awesome to vest in one person, much less a political actor motivated by the desire for fame, prestige, and power. By giving Congress the exclusive power to declare war and to appropriate funds for war, the Framers made certain that the momentous decision to go to war, to send our troops into battle, would belong primarily to the representatives of the people, both the people who fight and die in our wars, their parents, and their families, and the communities that they are drawn from.

Over the last month, the President initiated a dramatic escalation of tensions with Iran without the consent of Congress and without consulting Congress pursuant to the War Powers Resolution of 1973. In the case of the strike against Qasem Soleimani, Congress was never consulted by President Trump, although he apparently spoke with several people who were guests of his at Mar-a-Lago, where the decisions were apparently being made.

On January 7, Iran retaliated for the killing of General Soleimani by launching ballistic missiles against our military and coalition forces in Iraq. We now know that at least 34 troops have been diagnosed with traumatic brain injuries from these strikes, injuries the President has dismissed as headaches. We have still yet to receive any legitimate explanation for the justification for the strike in Iraq, and the administration's subsequent briefing on these actions left far more questions than answers and troubled even many Republican Senators to the point of extreme frustration.

On January 8, when administration officials briefed Members of Congress on the President's actions, both Democrats and Republicans, alike, expressed grave concerns about the briefing, with one Member highlighting the administration had given no time, place, or method justifying the attacks. The President later said there were four threats to United States Embassies, an explanation which apparently was withdrawn in the aftermath. So we still don't know.

In any event, Madam Speaker, we need to return to the Constitution of the United States and the rule of law. The grave decision to go to war is one that belongs properly with Congress.

If we can send our sons and daughters into battle and ask them to exercise the most powerful courage in the world to do that, certainly, we can exercise and summon up the moral and political courage needed just to properly exercise our constitutional powers. We have the power and we have the duty to declare war when we engage in military hostilities abroad, and that is what we are doing with these two amendments.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume and thank my friend from Maryland for yielding.

Madam Speaker, it is not lost on me that you are in the chair for this debate; and having put in the years that you have put in working on this issue, I know you couldn't be down here for your amendment later on this afternoon. I am glad that you are in the chair today.

It matters, folks who invest themselves in ideas around here; and what I love about this Chamber is that, if a man or a woman, either side of the aisle, any region of the country, commits themselves to something, commits themselves in a transparent, heartfelt way, their colleagues respond to that.

I have had the great pleasure of voting for your amendments on this topic many times over the years because what my friend from Maryland says is exactly right. When it comes to matters of war and peace, this institution has, in many ways, by the wheelbarrow load, carried its authority down to 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue and left it down there, and the American people deserve better than that. Our men and women in uniform deserve better than that. And we, as stewards of this institution, can do better than that.

Though, while I am pleased to see you in the chair, Madam Speaker, I confess I regret that it is on this bill, at this time, in this way.

For decades, you have worked to build bipartisan support; you have not tried to work alone. When you have had to, you do go it alone. When you are going to be the only voice there, you will lead because you believe, and you will follow that path. But when you can, you build bridges.

What is so frustrating to me about the rule that is before us today is we have an opportunity to come together; we have an opportunity to speak with one voice; we have an opportunity to restore exactly the kind of dialogue that my friend from Maryland suggests this House owes the American people; and we are letting it slip.

□ 1245

I will start with the easier one. That is the Financial Services Committee bill that is wrapped up in this rule.

Madam Speaker, I don't know if you recall. It was just a few weeks ago we had another Financial Services Committee bill. It was H.R. 2534. It was the Insider Trading Prohibition Act.

It seems like something we ought to all be able to get together on, but it was brought to the floor in a partisan way with absolutely no consultation on the other side. It was going to be a straight party-line vote, but to the credit of the chairwoman and ranking member of the Financial Services Committee, they continued to work together right up until the Rules Committee finished its meeting—you know that is the last stop before the bill comes to the floor—and they found a bipartisan pathway forward.

They changed directions from what was going to be a straight party-line vote on the floor of the House that goes nowhere, to a vote—let me consult my notes because I want to be right—410-13 was the result when we got together and worked in a bipartisan way. That is a bill that is going to go somewhere.

All the challenges my friend in Maryland talked about with credit reporting agencies, they are real, and the ranking member on the Financial Services Committee agrees with that. In fact, he has a substitute that has supported those ideas in a bipartisan way that he wanted to make in order to try to get us away from a partisan path.

The Rules Committee, in its wisdom, voted on a party-line vote to deny the ranking member an opportunity to bring forward the bipartisan language that he had.

So, we will go down this partisan road. Again, that is a partisan road on protecting consumers. It is a shame that has to happen. This bill is going to go nowhere. The President has promised he will veto it. The Senate is not going to take it up. We are not going to protect any consumers. We had a chance to, and we let that slip. Shame on us.

As shameful as that is in the financial services space, as you know from your decades of work in the war and peace space, the consequences of failure for war and peace are even greater.

Time and time again, oftentimes with your leadership, this House has had opportunities to revisit the Authorization for Use of Military Force that it passed in 2001 and that it passed in 2002. Generally, it is in our appropriations bill, as you well know, because the committee of jurisdiction, the authorizing committee, the Foreign Affairs Committee, that has the ability to have a full-throated debate on this issue to decide whether to repeal, whether to replace, how to structure that, has not moved legislation forward. We are in that exact same place today.

You introduced your language, Madam Speaker, in May 2019. That is the language that this rule is going to stuff into the Congressional Gold Medal bill for merchant mariners. We will talk about that here in a bit. It is

going to stuff your language that you introduced in May that has never had a markup.

Now, you led this issue when President Bush was in the White House, and we didn't get a markup. You led this issue while President Obama was in the White House, and we didn't get a markup. You are now leading this issue while President Trump is in the White House, and we still have never had a markup.

Now, don't tell me about your commitment to men and women in uniform. Do not tell me about what our Framers intended and bring language that has never had a committee markup to the House floor.

I asked these questions last night in the Rules Committee, Madam Speaker. I said: So which operations that are going on in Iraq today are going to be curtailed if we repeal the AUMF tomorrow?

I am not misremembering, Madam Speaker. So many times, when you have offered this language, you offered it for a date certain in the future. You recognized that doing something immediately would have consequences that would be very difficult for men and women in uniform to deal with, difficult for the administration, difficult for our allies. So very often you said: Let's put this down the road 6 months, 9 months, 12 months. Let's be certain that we are going to be done with it, but let's give time to transition.

I asked: This language today, what is the impact of that?

I asked: Which members of the State Department have come to testify that this is not going to put our allies in a predicament, in a precarious predicament in Iraq?

The answer was: Well, we haven't had those hearings. We don't know those answers. We believe that we know, but we have not had those folks come to testify.

Well, what about the FBI? How is this going to impact counterterrorism operations?

Well, we have not had those conversations. We have not had that in an open hearing. We have not had a chance to talk about it.

Well, what does the Pentagon have to say?

Madam Speaker, we have an opportunity to do this in a thoughtful, bipartisan way.

The leadership that the new majority is providing in the House, candidly, gives you an opportunity to do things that might not have been possible in a Republican-led House. After your decade of work on that, I think you have earned that, and it would have been a bipartisan vote.

Instead, we are here today for a partisan exercise, with no input from the minority, that the President has already recommended a veto on.

I think our men and women in uniform deserve better. I think this institution deserves better.

Madam Speaker, I don't know if you were paying attention as the Reading Clerk read. He did not go through and read all the amendments that were offered.

For the very important issue of credit agencies and how we regulate them, the majority, in its wisdom, has made 14 amendments in order. Fourteen different ideas are going to be considered for how we regulate credit reporting agencies.

For the question of war and peace—what should be the wind-down timeline, how quickly should it take effect, who should be affected, what are the impacts of that, should it be replaced, should it just be repealed—for those very complicated life-and-death questions, no committee hearing, not one amendment made in order.

The majority, in its wisdom, has provided 1 hour of debate on the floor of the House.

My friend from Maryland is very adept at quoting our Framers. His knowledge of the Constitution runs deep. Debate has never meant an hour to come down to the House floor in a take-it-or-leave-it fashion. Debate, as our Framers intended it, meant that we were going to engage in dialogue with one another, that we were going to have a conversation about how to get it right together, that we were going to do what you have done for much of your career, in terms of building coalitions. We are doing none of it today.

Madam Speaker, I have 30 minutes on the rule. We will have an hour of a take-it-or-leave-it debate.

For our men and women in uniform, as I hold the veto threat from the White House here, and we are going to produce a partisan outcome with no hope of overriding a Presidential veto, if the Senate were even to take it up, which it won't, we are going to be absolutely no closer to achieving the goal that you and I have striven for together. In fact, I believe we are going to be further away from that goal at the end of this.

I used all the ability I had as a Rules Committee member to try to keep this from going forward last night because I believe it is a missed opportunity. But on a 9-4 party-line vote, I was defeated.

Madam Speaker, the only way to get back to the partnership that our men and women in uniform deserve, the partnership that the efforts that you have brought forward over the years have received, is to defeat this rule today and have the open hearing in the Foreign Affairs Committee, to have that testimony from the experts in this field, and then to move forward, not on a party-line vote that goes nowhere in this House, but in a big, big, bipartisan vote that moves through the Senate and either receives the President's signature or overrides that veto. This isn't going to get that done.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mas-

sachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), the distinguished chairman of the House Rules Committee.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN) for yielding me the time and for his leadership on the Rules Committee.

Madam Speaker, something has been happening over the last few decades. Power meant to be held in these Halls, granted to us by the Constitution, intentionally given to us by our Founders, has ended up instead in the hands of whoever sat in the Oval Office.

It wasn't stolen by any particular President. No, Madam Speaker. We gave it away.

Congresses run by both parties surrendered it to Democratic and Republican administrations alike year after year after year.

Nowhere is this more pronounced than when it comes to matters of war and peace. Make no mistake, the Constitution is clear on this: The President may be Commander in Chief, but only Congress has the power to declare war. It is right there in Article I, Section 8.

But we abdicated that responsibility. We have been too content to stand on the sidelines and watch as wars were crafted and carried out by the White House with virtually no input from the people's House.

Our troops, the very people we represent, have received orders to deploy. Taxpayer dollars have been shoveled overseas. Policies have changed from one administration to the next. But too often, Congress remained silent, not because we were too engaged on other urgent matters, but because we feared the political risk of a vote.

Many of our colleagues, on a bipartisan basis, have tried to force debates and votes. I have joined many of my colleagues, from ADAM SMITH and BARBARA LEE and RO KHANNA to TOM COLE and Walter Jones and MATT GAETZ.

In fact, I have stood here more than two dozen times and pleaded for the chance to vote on many conflicts, like Afghanistan, Iraq, and Syria.

Too often, these simple calls for debate were ignored, but these are precisely the issues our constituents sent us here to debate, the hard ones, the ones where lives are at stake.

Now, I don't care who is President. I don't care who controls the House. When our troops are ordered to engage, they do not do so casually. And once they are deployed, it is not easy for them to withdraw. We all know this. Wars are easy to start but are very, very hard to end.

This is why how they begin is the most crucial decision. It cannot be left to one person. The Constitution enshrines that power in our hands, the people's representatives, the people's voice, and the people's House.

Today, Madam Speaker, the process of reclaiming that authority begins. This rule contains two measures.

The first is a resolution from Congresswoman LEE to repeal the 2002 Iraq

AUMF. For nearly two decades, this AUMF has been used by multiple Presidents to unilaterally engage our troops in conflicts that Congress never imagined when it was first passed.

It was used to justify the recent strike against Iranian General Soleimani.

If you think the consequences are limited, bear in mind that 34 more of our troops now suffer from traumatic brain injuries from Iran's retaliatory strike.

Pay attention to the words of Marine General Frank McKenzie, U.S. commander in the Middle East, who told our troops on Thursday that 20,000 newly deployed troops to the region could be there for "quite a while."

Repealing this AUMF isn't just about ensuring that this President cannot use it as justification for asserting military force without proper congressional authorization. This vote is about ensuring that no President can.

The second item included in this rule is legislation from Congressman KHANNA to prohibit funding for military action against Iran that is not authorized by Congress.

The situation with Iran remains volatile. If tensions should escalate again and President Trump wants to use military force, he must come to Congress first, period.

These measures passed overwhelmingly as bipartisan amendments to the House-passed NDAA bill last year. These are not new items or new ideas. Unfortunately, both were stripped out of the bill in final conference.

It is my hope that this House will again approve these measures and that the Senate will recognize the urgency of their passage.

Madam Speaker, I have heard a lot of talk about what it means to support our troops. Let me just say this: We respect their service when we give them an honest, thoughtful debate about their sacrifice, about possible deployments that impact not only them but their families and their loved ones.

Members of our military put their lives on the line for this country. The least we can do is have the guts to vote on their fate.

Let's respect our troops. Let's respect this institution. Let's finally get back to respecting the Constitution, doing our jobs, and voting on issues of war and peace.

I have to tell you, I am just sick and tired of hearing excuse after excuse, not only now, but over the last several years, from my colleagues as to why we can't have these debates, why we can't vote on these issues.

Madam Speaker, it is time now for my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying measure.

□ 1300

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to amend the

rule to provide for a motion to recommit on the Senate amendment to H.R. 550 so that minority voices can be heard on the critical issue of war.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would advise that all time has been yielded for the purpose of debate only.

Does the gentleman from Maryland yield for the purpose of this unanimous consent request?

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, no, I do not yield for that purpose. All time is yielded for the purpose of debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland does not yield; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. KEVIN HERN) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to amend the rule to provide for a motion to recommit on the Senate amendment to H.R. 550 so that minority voices can be heard on the critical issue of war.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Maryland has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. GUTHRIE) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to amend the rule to provide for a motion to recommit on the Senate amendment to H.R. 550 so that minority voices can be heard on the critical issue of war.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Maryland has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX), because I have seen the gentleman from Maryland change his mind many times over the years when he was on the wrong side of an issue to make himself right.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to amend the rule to provide for a motion to recommit on the Senate amendment to H.R. 550 so that minority voices can be heard on the critical issue of war.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Maryland has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GRIFFITH) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to amend the rule to provide for a motion to recommit on the Senate amendment to H.R. 550 so that minority voices can be heard on the critical issue of war.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman

from Maryland has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. MILLER) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mrs. MILLER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to amend the rule to provide for a motion to recommit on the Senate amendment to H.R. 550 so that minority voices can be heard on the critical issue of war.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Maryland has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. LAMBORN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to amend the rule to provide for a motion to recommit on the Senate amendment to H.R. 550 so that minority voices can be heard on the critical issue of war.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Maryland has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. JOYCE) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to amend the rule to provide for a motion to recommit on the Senate amendment to H.R. 550 so that minority voices can be heard on the critical issue of war.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Maryland has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. OLSON) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. OLSON. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to amend the rule to provide for a motion to recommit on the Senate amendment to H.R. 550 so that minority voices can be heard on the critical issue of war.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Maryland has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. CONAWAY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to amend the rule to provide for a motion to recommit on the Senate amendment to H.R. 550 so that minority voices can be heard on the critical issue of war.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Maryland has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLER) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. KELLER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to amend the rule to provide for a motion to recommit on the Senate amendment to H.R. 550 so that minority voices can be heard on the critical issue of war.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Maryland has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BABIN) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. BABIN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to amend the rule to provide for a motion to recommit on the Senate amendment to H.R. 550 so that minority voices can be heard on this critical issue of war.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Maryland has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. CHABOT. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to amend the rule to provide for a motion to recommit on the Senate amendment to H.R. 550 so that minority voices can be heard on the critical issue of war.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Maryland has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SPANO) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. SPANO. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to amend the rule to make in order the Cole-McCarthy amendment that would ensure the President can protect the United States and our ally, Israel.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would advise that all time has been yielded for the purpose of debate only.

Does the gentleman from Maryland yield for the purpose of this unanimous consent request?

Mr. RASKIN. No, I do not. I have yielded for the purpose of debate only, and I would love to have a real debate about the resolution that is before us.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland does not yield; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

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

Madam Speaker, I share with my friend from Maryland that if the gentleman is interested in a real debate, the gentleman would allow minority voices to be heard.

If the gentleman is not following this, the reason that Members are coming to the floor to make this request is because these resolutions, as they pertain to dealing with Iran, do nothing to protect our ally, our strongest friend in the Middle East, Israel, and we would like to make sure that Israel is protected.

I ask my friend if he would yield for the debate on protecting our friend, Israel, and to have an opportunity for not dozens of minority amendments, but my friends are asking unanimous consent for one single Republican amendment to the underlying bill: a right that has been guaranteed to the minority for over 100 years, but has been turned off by clever procedural tricks in this particular rule today.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to amend the rule to make in order the Cole-McCarthy amendment that would ensure the President can protect the United States and our ally, Israel.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Maryland has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. POSEY) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request, understanding that my friend from Maryland has called for a real debate.

Mr. POSEY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to amend the rule to make in order the Cole-McCarthy amendment that would ensure the President can protect the United States and our ally, Israel.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Maryland has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MEUSER).

Mr. MEUSER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to amend the rule to make in order the Cole-McCarthy amendment that would ensure the President can protect the United States and our ally, Israel.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Maryland has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. MARSHALL. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to amend the rule to make in order the Cole-McCarthy amendment that would ensure the President can protect the United States and her ally, Israel.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman

from Maryland has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. WALDEN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that we would amend this rule, which then would make in order the Cole-McCarthy amendment.

Now, that amendment would ensure the President can protect the United States and our ally, Israel. I don't think that is asking too much.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Maryland has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

The Chair would advise Members that even though a unanimous consent request is not entertained, embellishments accompanying such requests constitute debate and will become an imposition on the time of the Member who yielded for that purpose.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to amend the rule to make in order the Cole-McCarthy amendment that would ensure the President can protect the United States and our ally, Israel.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Maryland has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to amend the rule to make in order the Cole-McCarthy amendment that would ensure that the President can protect the United States and our ally, Israel.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Maryland has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to amend the rule to make in order the Cole-McCarthy amendment that will ensure the President can protect the understand and our ally, Israel.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Maryland has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to amend the rule to make in order the Cole-McCarthy amendment that would ensure the President can protect the United States and our ally, Israel.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Maryland has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. PALMER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to amend the rule to make in order the Cole-McCarthy amendment that would ensure the President can protect the United States and our ally, Israel.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Maryland has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

□ 1315

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

Madam Speaker, your rulings here today follow very clearly the Rules Committee meeting we had just across the Chamber last night that allowed for absolutely no amendment or discussion of any kind on two war resolutions that have received no markup of any kind in the committee of jurisdiction.

I know that seemed like a bothersome and worrisome procedural process to have just gone through. Madam Speaker, in those few minutes that you were ruling those unanimous consent requests out of order, we have just discussed whether or not our commitment to Israel and its safety and security will be hampered by the underlying Khanna amendment in more detail than any committee of jurisdiction has ever done. In these few minutes of Members' asking for a debate and being told no, ironically, when time was yielded for the purpose of debate only, we have discussed the issue more than in any markup in any committee of jurisdiction.

There is not one Member of this Chamber who does not think our Nation's sons and daughters in uniform deserve better. There is not one Member of this Chamber who does not think our ally Israel deserves better.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I rarely fail to be moved by my good friend from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL) with his directness, his charm, and his legislative prowess. But I have to say I fail to be moved by this last jack-in-the-box procedural maneuver of people getting up and asking for unanimous consent to do something that my friends failed to do for the last 8 years when they could have had a hearing at any point on the War Powers Act, yet they didn't do it.

Now, I believe that all of my friends who got up in the line were operating under a misapprehension because there was a hearing in the House Foreign Affairs Committee on January 14—that is about 2 weeks ago—called "From Sanctions to the Soleimani Strike to Escalation: Evaluating the Administration's Iran Policy" and all the implications in terms of Congress' war powers.

For the life of me, I can't understand why my good friend is not joining us today. I understand that it is always possible to summon up a procedural objection when the substantive task at hand is too difficult to do politically. I understand this would require people to make the President of the United States mad because, like every President before him—and this is a bipartisan issue, as Chairman MCGOVERN said—this President wants to be able to decide for himself whether or not the United States of America is going to be plunged into war.

The very simple proposition that we bring before the House that everybody in the Chamber can speak to right now, and everybody in the Chamber can vote on, is the repeal of the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002.

That was 18 years ago. We have kids who could die in a war against Iran in Iraq, or a war in Iran, based on this resolution, and they weren't even born when this Authorization of Use of Military Force was adopted by Congress.

The real question is: Are we going to have the courage to stand up for the Constitution and to stand up for our constituents and say that we will not go to war unless there is a specific statutory authorization by Congress or a declaration of war or there is an actual attack on the United States such that the President is really acting in self-defense?

Both Democratic and Republican Members of Congress were bewildered and frustrated by the presentation of this administration as to why the United States of America needed to commit that strike when they did.

There were changing stories. About every 20 minutes, we got a new story about why it was necessary. I have not heard a single word on the other side—to their credit—defending any of the justifications or rationalizations or pretexts that were offered by the administration.

So, we come back to a constitutional point that is not difficult, and that is one that came up at that Foreign Affairs Committee hearing a couple of weeks ago. It is one that we talked about in the Rules Committee last night in debate. It is one that every one of us is invited to join in right now on the floor of the House to discuss, which is the one that was made by the chairman of the Rules Committee.

I have to say a word in honor of our great chair on the Rules Committee. He has been invoking the Constitution and the exclusive power of Congress to declare war for two decades, through

Democratic Presidents, Republican Presidents, Bushes, Clintons, Obamas, and now Trump. He has been saying the same thing, which is that we should not be committing American troops to wars abroad without a vote of Congress, which was the explicit design of the Framers of the Constitution.

Go back to the Preamble of the Constitution:

We the people, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, ensure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and preserve to ourselves and our posterity the blessings of liberty do hereby ordain and establish the Constitution of the United States of America.

The very next sentence in Article I states that the legislative power is vested in a Congress of the United States, a House of Representatives and a Senate. Then, it sets forth all of our powers, including the power to declare war, the power of taxes, the power to appropriate money, the power to raise armies, the power to maintain a navy, and so on. All of that is with Congress.

You go all the way through Article I, Madam Speaker, and then you get to Article II, where the President is denominated the Commander in Chief of the Army and the Navy in times of actual conflict and insurrection, and the President's core job is to take care that the laws are faithfully executed.

That includes the Constitution itself, of course, and it includes the War Powers Resolution of 1973.

This is a very clear principle. It is a constitutional axiom we are advancing today. We had a hearing on it a couple of weeks ago, but we don't need weeks and months of hearings. Obviously, our good friends didn't think it required any hearings over the 8 years that they were in control of the House of Representatives.

It is a simple proposition, which is that the war power belongs to Congress. We have to declare war. We can't run away from it any more than our brave troops can run away from battle when they have been committed to battle.

All we are saying is that if there is going to be war against Iran, if there is going to be a war against the new government in Iraq—not Saddam Hussein, who is gone and dead—then we have to declare the war; we have to authorize the war; and we have to debate and deliberate over it as contemplated by the Founders of our country. That is our job.

We had a bipartisan vote invoking the War Powers Resolution on January 9. It ended up 224-194, but we had Democrats and Republicans invoking the War Powers Resolution with respect to the situation in Iran.

Again, I am not quite sure why our colleagues don't want to do this with us. I understand it is easier to do it when the opposing party is in the White House, but we have many Members on both sides of the aisle who have demonstrated their courage by invoking the War Powers Resolution and by

standing up for the Constitution. That is what we have to do today, and we have the perfect opportunity and legislative vehicle to do it right now.

I reserve the remainder of my time, Madam Speaker.

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

Madam Speaker, I don't question my friend from Maryland's passion at all. He says that we have the perfect vehicle to get this done today. I refer you back to the rule. That perfect vehicle is called H.R. 550, the Merchant Mariners of World War II Congressional Gold Medal Act of 2019.

You haven't heard us talk about merchant mariners or gold medals yet today because, as you know, Madam Speaker, this rule would strip out all the language in the underlying bill that deals with gold medals and merchant mariners and replace it with matters of war and peace.

I will quote the author of one of the amendments that is stuffed into the merchant mariners bill in place of the merchant mariners language, Mr. KHANNA, who said in Politico last week: "Majority Leader Hoyer has done an excellent job in figuring out a procedure for how we can get a vote on the floor on these bills without an MTR," a motion to recommit.

Madam Speaker, a motion to recommit is what you heard folks asking unanimous consent for. A motion to recommit in this case would be the only opportunity for any voices to be heard at all on this issue.

My friend from Maryland proudly talks about a single hearing that was held 2 weeks ago, but it wasn't held on this bill. There has been not one markup, not one word, discussed in committee, marked up, and reported to the floor of this House—not one.

My friend from Maryland says that we have to debate and deliberate over matters of this gravity, that that is our job.

Madam Speaker, let's do our job: debate and deliberate.

What does it tell you? That I have been voting with the Speaker on these issues for almost a decade, on issues of war and peace, and I am offended by the process that you are using to bring this to the floor the first time.

Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS).

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Again, just to recapitulate, today's rule provides for consideration of legislation to do two things: one, to limit funding for any military action in or against Iran; and, two, repeal the 2002 Authorization for Use of Military Force. I do believe it is correct to advocate for Congress to retake Article I powers, and it is correct to negotiate a new Authorization for Use of Military Force.

I was not here in 2002. I was not able to vote on that legislation. However,

we should not repeal the existing 2002 authorization without a hearing, without a markup, and without fully assessing how it will affect our troops in the region. Further, we should evaluate whether or not a new Authorization for Use of Military Force should take its place.

In fact, 2 or 3 weeks ago, Democratic leadership of this House brought H. Con. Res. 83. The House passed this earlier this month. In the findings, the majority stated: "The United States has national interests in preserving its partnership with Iraq." Yet, here we are now just a few weeks later considering a repeal of that very authority.

If it was important 3 weeks ago, how did it become unimportant today? We don't know because we haven't had a hearing.

Limiting funding for any military action in and against Iran simply broadcasts our plans or lack thereof to the enemy, potentially inciting further aggression. Weakness is provocative.

I voted for an amendment to the National Defense Authorization Act prohibiting funding for authorized military action in Iran because it was offered, considered, and voted on following regular order. But neither piece of legislation addressing war authorities before us today has been marked up or has had committee consideration.

We heard last night in the Rules Committee that there have been hearings focused on Iran and that, in fact, suffices. But, realistically, regional hearings do not allow for the serious discussion required for an Authorization for Use of Military Force and including funding for military action.

In addition, currently, the Democratic majority is using a vehicle that removes minority Republicans' ability to offer that one opportunity to amend the bill that is known as the motion to recommit. That is a long-honored tradition of both sides that there should at least be one opportunity for the minority to be heard.

So, I believe it is wrong to rush to limit war authorities, and it is irresponsible.

Do you know what, Madam Speaker? In a dangerous world, it is downright dangerous. Congress should be authorizing action through a renegotiated Authorization for Use of Military Force rather than passing a resolution prohibiting funding for military activity.

□ 1330

I remember on the floor of this House, a former colleague, Rob Simmons from Connecticut, a Republican, when there was an effort to limit funding during the most kinetic part of the Iraq war. Mr. Simmons had served in the Armed Forces during the Vietnam conflict, and he related, from one of these very podia, how, as a young soldier in Vietnam, he had heard that Congress had withdrawn the funding for what he was doing. I will never forget his words. He said: At that mo-

ment, I hated the United States Congress.

That is the effect we can have on the young men and women whom we have sent to answer the call of duty, that Congress could and should be working to provide the necessary authorities for our Commander in Chief as he directs these brave young men and women in uniform rather than broadcasting our limitations to the enemy.

Again, weakness is provocative.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, how much time do I have?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland has 5½ minutes remaining.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time to close.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, we will offer an amendment to the rule that will make in order a bipartisan resolution, an amendment to deal with fentanyl and its listing on schedule I.

Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN) for the purpose of explaining that previous question vote.

Mr. WALDEN. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague and friend on the Rules Committee for yielding me the time.

Our proposal to defeat the previous question and offer this amendment would do no underlying violence to the two bills—it has nothing to do with them—but it would save lives of all kinds of people in America.

You see, fentanyl is a synthetic, manmade opioid. It is 50 times more potent than heroin. It is 100 times more potent than morphine. It is a scheduled drug under the Controlled Substances Act. However, Madam Speaker, drug traffickers are able to make small changes to fentanyl and its chemical structure, and that creates a new variation of the substance.

Now, these so-called analogues are not on the schedule of controlled drugs. They are outside of the control of law enforcement, and they are incredibly dangerous—may I say, deadly.

For example, one of these analogues, carfentanil, is 100 times as potent as the same amount of fentanyl, 5,000 times more potent than a unit of heroin, and 10,000 times as potent as a unit of morphine.

Now, the creation of analogues outpaced the Drug Enforcement Administration's ability to schedule them, so the DEA used emergency authorities to place all of the analogues in schedule I.

The Controlled Substances Act, the CSA, provides the Attorney General with the authority to temporarily place a substance in schedule I of the CSA for 2 years if he finds that such action is necessary to avoid an imminent hazard to the public safety. In 2018, the Trump administration's DEA used this authority to place fentanyl analogues and fentanyl-like substances on that schedule I.

So here is the issue: The emergency scheduling order expires next Thursday, February 6, and Congress has yet

to extend it. The Senate passed an extension, Madam Speaker, I believe, unanimously; but, so far, Democrats in the House have not acted.

There is no excuse for this. There is no reason for this. Lives will be lost. We have seen a series of delay tactics, and that is leading to an expiration of this incredibly important authority.

With the United States Senate dealing with impeachment, there is no time for the House to generate a new product, a different bill, before this expires. So the House needs to pass the Senate extension this week so law enforcement does not lose or have a lapse on this important capability to fight fentanyl, which is deadly, which is added to heroin, which causes deaths all across America.

We are using this limited tool we have asking for a defeat of the previous question so that we can offer this should-be-unanimous amendment to get it on a vehicle so it can become law.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, I am prepared to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to put the text of our amendment to amend the rule to add S. 3201 in the RECORD immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

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

Everything we have talked about has been partisan and divisive. What you have just heard from the gentleman from Oregon is to say, in the midst of why ever it is the majority has chosen to use this rule today to move partisan priorities, to make statements instead of policy, that we have one opportunity to make policy, actual policy, policy that passed the Senate unanimously, policy that America needs, desires, that is going to expire next week, and that, if we added it today, would go straight to the President's desk for his approval.

I can't count the number of times my colleagues have said that issues deserve debate. I didn't come here to be part of a debating society. I came here to be a part of a getting-something-done group, conscientious men and women who want to do the best they can to serve their constituents.

My friend from Oregon is offering us a chance to do exactly that today, and I would ask my friends—they have seen fit to use a very strange procedure to turn a Congressional Gold Medal for merchant mariners bill into a bill on war and peace. They have seen fit to strip away an opportunity for any voices to be heard on any of those measures whatsoever.

They could, as long as they are setting precedent, go ahead and support our defeat of the previous question

today to add one more item so that we don't leave here today having just made a point, so that we can leave here today having made a difference, as my friend from Oregon is giving us the opportunity to do.

Mr. WALDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODALL. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. WALDEN. Madam Speaker, the gentleman's passionate statements are all accurate and true. It was not that long ago we came together as a Congress, the last Congress, under my leadership of the Energy and Commerce Committee, and passed nearly 60 pieces of legislation into one, the SUPPORT Act, that deals with the opioid crisis, the substance use disorder crisis in America, and one of the key points of that was dealing with this illegal fentanyl that is coming in.

If we let this authority expire, the real practical consequence is these evil actors, these chemists in their labs, will simply alter the chemical makeup, which they do all the time, create an even more deadly or powerful fentanyl that can go into heroin and other drugs and kill our citizens, and they can do that lawfully because that new substance will not be covered.

Now, we would hope the majority would move the Senate bill. But we have seen no text; we have heard no schedule. This authority expires next week on February 6, and we only have a legislative day or two left.

Madam Speaker, lives hang in the balance. This, we should adopt.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I know my friend from Maryland is prepared to close.

We had a bipartisan pathway forward on credit reporting agencies and reform, but the majority, in its wisdom, saw fit to shut those voices out; and this rule makes in order a partisan pathway forward that will go to the President's desk, if it makes it through the Senate, for a veto.

For decades, you have worked to build bipartisan support for finally re-examining an AUMF that should have been reexamined decades ago. The majority, in its wisdom, has decided to shut out all voices, Republican and Democrat, hold no markups, change language not at all, and make a partisan exercise of what should be a bipartisan issue, a resounding bipartisan issue, in this House; and my friend from Oregon is offering us an opportunity to take what has always been a bipartisan effort to protect our young people from the harms of opioids, to prevent traffickers from making chemical changes that allow them to thwart the law, and move that to the President's desk immediately.

Madam Speaker, defeat the previous question. Defeat the previous question so that we can at least do one thing that we know will make a difference today, one thing that will bring us together, one thing the Senate did unanimously and the President would put a

signature on tomorrow. Let's do that one thing: defeat the previous question.

I tell my colleagues, if they won't defeat the previous question, they are going to have to defeat the rule, because they have turned protecting consumers into a partisan exercise, protecting men and women in uniform into a partisan exercise, and all of the goodwill that men and women of this Chamber have put into building for decades becomes a little bit weaker today.

Defeat the previous question; if not, defeat the rule.

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

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I want to thank my good friend from Georgia for our robust and active exchange today.

We came to debate matters of war and peace and the reassertion of Congress' essential constitutional powers over the declaration of war and the commitment of our troops and our funds to foreign wars.

These are critical issues that our friends, when they were in charge of the Chamber, routinely ignored; but we are confronting them, and we invite them in enthusiastically to be part of this process of reasserting Congress' war powers.

But the minority's previous question is obviously unnecessary and an irrelevant distraction from the important issues that we have come to address. And I want to be clear about this: It is an unnecessary distraction because the House majority leader committed this morning to bringing up S. 3201, which extends the ban on all fentanyl-based substances. It took place this morning. Check docs.house.gov, which has the complete running explanation of what is taking place. This morning, he scheduled it for the very first item of business tomorrow.

So the bill that my friends are valiantly promising to bring to the floor if we defeat the previous question is already scheduled to be considered as the first item of business tomorrow morning under suspension of the House rules.

And I will remind my colleagues of what defeating the previous question means. It gives control of the floor to the minority. We are not going to do that because we are here to prevent unauthorized war with Iran; to repeal the obsolete and unnecessary 2002 AUMF, which addressed the situation with Saddam Hussein; and to modernize the credit reporting system, which is failing millions of Americans, our constituents.

For all of the reasons that we have discussed during this robust debate, we need to ensure that the whole House gets the chance to vote on all of these things: on the repeal of the 2002 Iraq AUMF and on reforming the credit reporting system so our people have better access to credit and we have real transparency and fairness in people's credit reports and credit scores.

I hope that all of our colleagues, both in the majority and the minority, will join us in voting “yes” on the previous question and “yes” on this rule so we can move on to serious, thoughtful, deliberate consideration of all of these critical measures that we bring before the Congress and the American people.

I also hope that all of our colleagues will join me in supporting S. 3201, the fentanyl legislation, which our colleague discussed, on suspension tomorrow.

Mr. WALDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RASKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. WALDEN. Madam Speaker, we agree on the fentanyl issue, I think.

My understanding is that the leader posted this, Madam Speaker, at 11:50 this morning, about a half an hour after we posted our previous question proposal to bring this to the floor.

We are just curious what text, when it is scheduled. We need to resolve this issue, we would agree.

□ 1345

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, reclaiming my time. I am thrilled to be able to assure the gentleman that we are taking up the exact Senate bill in its exact verbatim text.

Mr. WALDEN. Madam Speaker, I ask the gentleman when that will occur.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, this will occur tomorrow morning on the first bill at 12:15, 12:30. It is the first bill.

Madam Speaker, let me just say that I hope our friends take yes for an answer, and I hope that this will perhaps usher in their ability to support the underlying legislation here because I know that they agree with us that the Constitution gives the House of Representatives and the Senate the power to declare war. It gives Congress the power to declare war, to spend money on war. We should not allow a President of any party—Democratic, Republican, or anything else—to usurp that power and to engage in unilateral Presidential wars without our specific authorization, without our declaration, unless there is an attack on the land, the people of the United States, or our Armed Forces, as specified in the War Powers Resolution.

Madam Speaker, I urge a “yes” vote on the rule and the previous question.

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

AMENDMENT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 811

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 bill (S. 3201) to extend the temporary scheduling order for fentanyl-related substances, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill 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 Energy & Commerce; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 7. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of S. 3201.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam 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 on the resolution.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER
PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or votes objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

The House will resume proceedings on postponed questions at a later time.

GLOBAL HOPE ACT OF 2019

Mr. PHILLIPS. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5338) to authorize the Secretary of State to pursue public-private partnerships, innovative financing mechanisms, research partnerships, and coordination with international and multilateral organizations to address childhood cancer globally, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5338

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Global Hope Act of 2019”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Approximately 300,000 children aged 0 to 19 years old are diagnosed with cancer each year.

(2) The most common categories of childhood cancers include leukemia, brain cancer, lymphoma, and solid tumors, such as neuroblastoma and Wilms tumor.

(3) Most childhood cancers can be cured with generic medicines and can be cost-effective for all income levels.

(4) In the United States, the survival rate for children diagnosed with cancer is over 80 percent. In many developing countries, the mortality rate of children diagnosed with cancer is around 80 percent. In some parts of Africa, the mortality rate reaches 90 percent.

(5) In September 2018, the World Health Organization announced a new effort—the Global Initiative for Childhood Cancer—with

the aim of reaching at least a 60-percent survival rate for children with cancer by 2030, thereby saving an additional 1,000,000 lives.

SEC. 3. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress as follows:

(1) The work of the United States on infectious disease remains the core tenet of United States work on global health.

(2) As the United States and international partners continue to succeed in lowering incidences of infectious diseases, global mortality rates of non-communicable diseases will become an increasing burden that must be addressed.

(3) The United States should work to support the goals of the World Health Organization Initiative for Childhood Cancer, helping increase survival rates for children with cancer.

SEC. 4. STATEMENT OF POLICY.

The United States shall seek to—

(1) increase political commitment for childhood cancer diagnosis, treatment, and care globally;

(2) support efforts to increase the survival rate of children with cancer globally;

(3) support efforts to train medical personnel and develop the capabilities of other existing healthcare infrastructure to diagnose, treat, and care for childhood cancer;

(4) improve access to affordable and essential medicines and technologies that treat childhood cancer;

(5) elevate and prioritize efforts to reduce the mortality rate of childhood cancer in international organizations such as the United Nations;

(6) pursue research and research partnerships with international institutions to identify low-cost interventions and best practices to diagnose, treat, and care for childhood cancer in the United States and globally; and

(7) improve partnerships with international health ministries and pharmaceutical companies to facilitate efforts for broader, global clinical trials for medicines to treat or care for childhood cancer in the United States and globally.

SEC. 5. AUTHORIZATION.

The Secretary of State, in coordination with the heads of relevant Federal departments and agencies, is authorized and encouraged to—

(1) pursue public-private partnerships, other research partnerships, and innovative financing mechanisms to address childhood cancer globally; and

(2) coordinate with appropriate agencies of the United Nations and other relevant multilateral organizations to address childhood cancer globally.

SEC. 6. REPORT.

Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall submit to the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate a report that includes the following:

(1) An assessment of opportunities for United States engagement in global efforts to increase the worldwide survival rate of children with cancer.

(2) An assessment of efforts taken by the United States to support efforts to increase the worldwide survival rate of children with cancer.

(3) An assessment of existing programs funded by the United States that could be expanded to support efforts to increase the worldwide survival rate of children with cancer.

(4) An assessment of how such increased international engagement could positively affect—

(A) survival rates of individuals with childhood cancer in the United States; and

(B) reductions in the rates of infant and pediatric morbidity and mortality.

SEC. 7. COST LIMITATION.

No additional funds are authorized to be appropriated to carry out the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 8. CHILDHOOD CANCER DEFINED.

In this Act, the term “childhood cancer” means cancers formed or diagnosed in individuals under the age of 20.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PHILLIPS) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PHILLIPS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 5338.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, the measure before us is a wonderful bipartisan bill written by Ranking Member MCCAUL and supported by Chairman ENGEL.

Every year, more than 300,000 children from all around the world are diagnosed with childhood cancer, and their lives are instantly turned upside down.

Among them is my very own daughter, Pia, who was diagnosed with Hodgkin's lymphoma when she was 14 years old. While she has since been cured and is among the very lucky ones, as a father, I know all too well the horror that devastates way too many families around the world every single day.

The Global Hope Act works to leverage the resources developed in the United States to explore public-private partnerships in the fight against childhood cancer all around the globe.

It calls on the Secretary of State to coordinate these activities across the executive branch on this very important initiative and to submit a report assessing current efforts and future opportunities to end such heart-wrenching suffering.

This is a good and very commonsense bill to expand the global fight against childhood cancer. I commend the ranking member for his outstanding work on this issue, and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting it.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of my bill, the Global Hope Act. I am proud to have introduced this bill with my good friend, Chairman ELIOT ENGEL. I thank the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PHILLIPS) for his strong support and his personal story. I also thank the co-chair of the Childhood

Cancer Caucus, JACKIE SPEIER, for her tireless work with me in the caucus to help these children.

I have been a tireless advocate for these children with cancer since I first came to Congress. In 2010, I helped found the Childhood Cancer Caucus really to give a voice to patients, advocates, and the children.

This endeavor is deeply personal for me, as well. Growing up in elementary school, my best friend passed away from leukemia. Back then, it was a death sentence.

Since founding the caucus, we have been very successful. Congress passed bipartisan legislation to improve cancer treatment options, boost research opportunities, and address health issues of the nearly 500,000 long-term childhood cancer survivors.

Today, childhood cancer is largely treatable with an 80 percent, 5-year survival rate in the United States.

Unfortunately, in developing countries, the opposite is true. Children diagnosed with cancer in developing countries have an 80 percent mortality rate.

Madam Speaker, in sub-Saharan Africa, the mortality rate of children diagnosed with cancer is as high as 90 percent. This says nothing of the tens of thousands of cases that are believed to go undiagnosed every year.

I truly believe that a child's birthplace should not determine their fate from cancer. That is why I introduced the Global Hope Act.

My bill authorizes the Secretary of State to pursue public-private partnerships, increase access to treatment options, train health professionals, and, ultimately, improve care for children with cancer in developing countries. These partnerships will leverage decades of U.S. investments to strengthen health infrastructure and build the capacity of health ministries.

This legislation does not take away funds from other critical global health interventions and infectious disease efforts. Rather, these public-private partnerships will build on existing programs to improve childhood cancer survival rates.

Organizations such as Texas Children's Hospital and St. Jude, private sector partners such as Bristol-Myers Squibb and Teva, and nonprofits such as ACCESS are already starting this important work and are now seeing results in Botswana and other nations. These efforts are also supported by the World Health Organization's Global Childhood Cancer Initiative.

Launched in 2018, the WHO aims to build political support and institutional capacity to treat childhood cancer in developing countries. The initiative set a goal of saving an additional 1 million lives by 2030.

For the past two decades, the United States has been a global leader in funding health programs around the world, and I am proud to support this life-saving work.

Most recently, we passed a resolution affirming the U.S. commitment to the

Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria and secured robust funding in the fiscal year 2020 appropriations bill.

Our work to fight HIV/AIDS and eradicate other infectious diseases is far from over. But there is a critical opportunity to build on the successes of these global health programs and integrate projects aimed at improving childhood cancer care and available treatment options.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this important, life-saving measure, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER), my friend and co-chair of the Childhood Cancer Caucus.

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Minnesota for granting me the time.

To my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL), let me say that this will be the most significant piece of legislation that you can take great pride in having authored, as your career continues in this august body. I can't begin to say how grateful I am to be working with you, not just on this bill but on our Childhood Cancer Caucus and the great work that you have done.

This particular bill, the Global Hope Act, will have a profound impact on children around the world who have been diagnosed with cancer, 80 percent of whom die because of that diagnosis, while here in the United States, 80 percent of those children now live.

This is a remarkable effort that we must embrace wholeheartedly on both sides of the aisle.

The Chinese effort, the Belt and Road Initiative, where they are investing in concrete around the world, says something about their values. This shows that we, in this country, are investing in people, particularly in children around the world, to save their lives.

I join my colleague, again, in saying how important this legislation is, how enthusiastically I support it, and how, as we move forward, we can recognize that this is the kind of leadership that will bring peace around the world.

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

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Speaker, I am prepared to close, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, let me thank my dear friend, JACKIE SPEIER, for her leadership on this issue and as the co-chair of the caucus. I think we can prove that, in this toxic, partisan, difficult time in this Congress, we can work across the aisle, Republican and Democrat, but most importantly as Americans, to get good things done for not only the American people but for the world and save the children of the world.

I think Congresswoman SPEIER is correct. We passed a lot of bills together that have saved lives, but I

think this one probably is the most profound one. It is very difficult to pass a bill in the Congress, much less get it signed into law, but when you pass a bill and see it saving lives, that is perhaps the most remarkable and gratifying experience I have personally had in my eight terms in Congress.

Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman so much for her friendship.

Madam Speaker, in closing, I remember being in Texas Children's Hospital in September 2018 to hear from the President of Botswana about the project Global HOPE initiative inspired by Baylor College of Medicine and their early work against HIV/AIDS and the epidemic in Africa. Global HOPE is starting to deliver childhood cancer care in sub-Saharan Africa, as I speak.

At the event, when I met the President of Botswana, where the Global HOPE Act was recently constructed in a new pediatric facility in Botswana, which I will be visiting next month with my little, childhood cancer survivor, Sadie Keller. It is starting to train a new generation of Botswanan oncologists.

What I was most impressed by was when he told me about the legacy of PEPFAR and what we did as a Nation. He said: PEPFAR saved a generation of my people from extinction—from "extinction."

It is my hope that this bill saves a generation of children from this dreaded disease. I believe that childhood cancer can be the next successful Global HOPE initiative that will save lives.

Madam Speaker, I want to thank, particularly, Dr. Poplack, who was the chief oncologist at Texas Children's. He is the one who is responsible for this initiative. We are taking their initiative and turning it into law in the Congress. I will be there next month to commemorate International Children's Cancer Day.

Madam Speaker, I do want to reference, too, my little childhood cancer fighter and survivor, Sadie Keller. She came into my office, and there are a lot of lobbyists in this town, but the children had no voice. They had no power. That is why JACKIE and I formed the Childhood Cancer Caucus, to give them a voice.

□ 1400

When she entered my office—she is 7 years old here—in her pink dress, I knew I had met somebody very special. I canceled my calendar, my schedule for the rest of the day, and I took her on a tour of the Capitol.

Here we are looking—we had no idea they were even taking pictures—but I took her to the Rotunda in the Capitol. I remember we spun around and looked at the top of the Capitol.

Then I took her out to the Speaker's balcony, one of the most beautiful views in this Capitol building. Looking out on the horizon toward the future, seeing the ominous dark clouds, but also a ray of sunshine. The sunshine

that is coming in, the sunshine that little Sadie has brought to my life, the sunshine that we are trying to bring to all these children out there who have gone through some really tough experiences. I have met many of them, like the Congressman from Minnesota's daughter, and it is very heartbreaking to see them in the hospitals. Some survive, and some don't.

But this effort will take it to the next step, to take our fight against this dreaded disease. We have done so much to help children in the United States. The FDA's approval of CAR T, which takes your own immune system and attacks your own cancer through your own T cells, rather than injecting chemo—which is really a derivative of World War I mustard gas, which has been banned from the battlefield, which kills the cancer just before it kills you.

You can imagine the survivorship issues with these children, because they have the rest of their lives, if they survive, to deal with.

So, I want to thank all those friends of mine on the other side of the aisle for helping me move this forward. This is a momentous day for our fight against childhood cancer. It is a momentous day to take it global and take the fight globally.

I look forward to this bill's passage in the Senate and it being signed into law.

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

Mr. PHILLIPS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume for the purpose of closing.

Madam Speaker, childhood cancer is devastating; yet, many types can now be treated effectively and at relatively low cost. It is incumbent on all of us to make sure the United States' policy is working toward this end and doing what we can to stop the suffering.

The Global Hope Act is a good measure that leverages the resources developed here in the United States to explore public/private partnerships to fight childhood cancer all around the globe.

I am very grateful to Ranking Member MCCAUL for his dedication and tireless work on this cause.

I am proud to support this, and I urge all my fellow Members to do the same.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PHILLIPS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5338, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUPPORTING THE RIGHTS OF THE PEOPLE OF IRAN TO FREE EXPRESSION

Mr. PHILLIPS. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 752) supporting the rights of the people of Iran to free expression, condemning the Iranian regime for its crackdown on legitimate protests, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 752

Whereas, on November 15, 2019, popular protests against the Iranian regime began and rapidly spread to at least 100 cities throughout the country, in the most significant antigovernment protests in Iran since June 2009;

Whereas the protests began in response to an announced increase on the price of fuel and protesters have expressed numerous economic grievances, while also calling for the structural reform of the political system and condemning current and former Iranian leaders;

Whereas reports indicate that Iranian security forces have used lethal force in arresting more than 7,000 people and killed hundreds of people in connection with the protests;

Whereas reports indicate that Iranian Government authorities have, in many instances, refused to return victims' bodies to their families and that security forces have removed bodies from morgues and transferred them to unknown locations;

Whereas, on November 16, 2019, Iranian authorities began implementing a near-total shutdown of internet services, stopping nearly all means of online communications for people inside Iran, to preclude the sharing of images and videos of deadly violence being used by security forces;

Whereas section 103(b)(2)(B) of the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (22 U.S.C. 8512(b)(2)(B)) authorizes licensing services relating to personal communications over the Internet, to improve the ability of the Iranian people to speak freely;

Whereas General License D-1 authorizes the provision of key communication tools to the Iranian people with the aim of ensuring that the Iranian people can freely access the internet;

Whereas, on November 16, 2019, Iran's Interior Minister Abdolreza Rahmani Fazli said that the Iranian regime will no longer show "tolerance" and "self-control" toward the protesters;

Whereas, on November 17, 2019, Iranian Supreme Leader Ayatollah Ali Khamenei called the demonstrators "villains" galvanized by foreign enemies and domestic insurgents and ordered Iranian security services to "implement their duties" to end the protests;

Whereas, on November 18, 2019, Iran's Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps deployed to the city of Mahshahr and engaged in mass repression, reportedly killing as many as 100 people;

Whereas several laws provide authorities to designate and sanction elements of the Iranian regime involved in significant corruption or serious human rights abuses, including the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010, the Countering America's Adversaries Through Sanctions Act, and the Iran Threat Reduction and Syria Human Rights Act of 2012;

Whereas the Iranian regime was implicated in a March 2018 plot in Albania and June 2018 plot in France against Iranian opposition activists;

Whereas Iran's Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps and its Basij militia have been sanctioned by the United States for planning and carrying out serious human rights abuses against the Iranian people, including for the cruel and prolonged torture of political dissidents;

Whereas in August 2018 the United States criminally charged two persons for acting as illegal agents of the Government of Iran for having conducted surveillance on Jewish and Israeli facilities and Iranian political dissidents;

Whereas the regime has routinely violated the human rights of Iranian citizens, including by implementing ongoing, systematic, and serious restrictions of freedom of peaceful assembly and association and freedom of opinion and expression, including the continuing closures of media outlets, arrests of journalists, and the censorship of expression in online forums such as blogs and websites;

Whereas the Department of State's 2018 Human Rights Report on Iran noted "severe restrictions on free expression, the press, and the internet, including censorship, site blocking, and criminalization of libel; substantial interference with the rights of peaceful assembly and freedom of association, such as overly restrictive nongovernmental organization (NGO) laws; egregious restrictions of religious freedom; restrictions on political participation; widespread corruption at all levels of government";

Whereas, on November 18, 2019, Secretary of State Mike Pompeo stated that, "The United States is monitoring the ongoing protests in Iran closely. We condemn strongly any acts of violence committed by this regime against the Iranian people and are deeply concerned by reports of several fatalities. . . The Islamic Republic must cease violence against its own people and should immediately restore the ability of all Iranians to access a free and open Internet.";

Whereas, on November 22, 2019, the United States imposed sanctions on Iran's Minister of Information and Communications Technology for his role in shutting down internet access in Iran;

Whereas, on November 18, 2019, the Office of the German Chancellor stated that, "It is legitimate and deserving of our respect when people courageously air their economic and political grievances, as is currently happening in Iran. The Iranian government should respond to the current protests with a willingness to engage in dialogue. . . We urge the government in Tehran to respect freedom of assembly and expression.";

Whereas, on November 20, 2019, the French Foreign Ministry stated that, "France is following the demonstrations taking place in Iran with concern. It expresses its deep concern at reports that a large number of demonstrators have been killed in the last few days. It reaffirms its attachment to respect for the freedom of expression and to access to means of communication, as well as to the right to demonstrate peacefully. France calls on Iran to comply with its international human rights obligations, in particular the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.";

Whereas, on November 21, 2019, the European Union stated that, "The protests in several Iranian cities over the past days have, according to reports, led to serious loss of life and left many people injured. We convey our condolences to the families of victims and wish a speedy recovery to those injured. Socio-economic challenges should be addressed through inclusive dialogue and not through the use of violence. We expect Iran's

security forces to exercise maximum restraint in handling the protests and for protestors to demonstrate peacefully. Any violence is unacceptable. The rights to freedom of expression and assembly must be guaranteed. We also expect the Iranian authorities to ensure the free flow of information and access to the internet.";

Whereas, on November 26, 2019, Secretary of State Michael Pompeo stated, "The Iranian people are once again on the streets because of the regime's poor economic management. And instead of addressing their grievances, Tehran has responded with violence and blaming those outside of the country.";

Whereas, on December 8, 2019, the High Representative of the European Union Josep Borrell Fontelles stated that, "A growing body of evidence indicates that despite repeated calls for restraint, the Iranian security forces' disproportionate response to recent demonstrations has led to high numbers of deaths and injuries. For the European Union and its Member States, the widespread and disproportionate use of force against nonviolent protestors is unacceptable.";

Whereas, on December 8, 2019, the High Representative of the European Union Josep Borrell Fontelles stated that "A growing body of evidence indicates that despite repeated calls for restraint, the Iranian security forces' disproportionate response to recent demonstrations has led to high numbers of deaths and injuries. For the European Union and its Member States, the widespread and disproportionate use of force against nonviolent protestors is unacceptable.";

Whereas Iran is a member of the United Nations, voted for the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and is a signatory to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, among other international human rights treaties;

Whereas in violation of these and other international obligations, Iranian regime officials continue to violate the fundamental human rights of the Iranian people;

Whereas the Iranian regime has a long history of violent repression of dissent, including—

(1) in 1988, the Iranian regime carrying out the barbaric mass executions of thousands of political prisoners by hanging and firing squad for refusing to renounce their political affiliations and in some cases for possessing political reading material, including prisoners of conscience, teenagers, and pregnant women;

(2) in 1999, the Iranian regime brutally suppressing a student revolt that was one of the largest mass uprisings up until that point in the country since 1979;

(3) following voting irregularities that resulted in the 2009 election of President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, the Iranian regime brutally suppressing peaceful political dissent from wide segments of civil society during the Green Revolution in a cynical attempt to retain its undemocratic grip on power; and

(4) beginning in December 2017, and continuing for several months after protests erupted in more than 80 cities, the Iranian regime suppressing such protests with repressive force that resulted in at least 25 deaths and 4,000 arrests;

Whereas, on January 9, 2018, the House of Representatives overwhelmingly passed H. Res. 676, a resolution supporting the rights of the people of Iran to free expression and condemning the Iranian regime for its crackdown on legitimate protests;

Whereas, on December 5, 2019, the Department of State identified the Great Tehran Penitentiary (Fashafuyeh) and Qarchack Prison as entities responsible for gross violations of internationally recognized human rights in Iran and subject to the imposition

of sanctions under section 106 of the Countering America's Adversaries Through Sanctions Act (22 U.S.C. 9405);

Whereas, on January 8, 2020, the Iranian military shot down a civilian airliner Ukrainian Airlines Flight 752 in a surface-to-air missile strike, killing 176 civilians aboard;

Whereas for three days, the Iranian military denied that it shot down Ukrainian Airlines Flight 752 before admitting responsibility on January 11, 2020;

Whereas peaceful protestors amassed throughout Iran on January 11, 2020, and subsequent days, decrying the Government of Iran's downing of the Ukrainian airliner, subsequent campaign of lies and obfuscation, and continued undemocratic practices; and

Whereas in response to peaceful protests throughout early January 2020, Iranian Government forces fired live rounds and used brutal tactics against civilians in a manner well-documented by international human rights organizations, media, and scores of Iranians: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) stands with the people of Iran that are engaged in legitimate and peaceful protests against an oppressive, corrupt regime;

(2) condemns the Iranian regime's serious human rights abuses against the Iranian people, significant corruption, and destabilizing activities abroad;

(3) commends the statements of support for the protestors from the executive branch and key allies;

(4) calls on all democratic governments and institutions to clearly support the Iranian people's right to live in a free society;

(5) demands that the Iranian regime abide by its international obligations with respect to human rights and civil liberties, including freedoms of assembly, speech, and press;

(6) urges the Administration to work to convene emergency sessions of the United Nations Security Council and the United Nations Human Rights Council to condemn the ongoing human rights violations perpetrated by the Iranian regime and establish a mechanism by which the Security Council can monitor such violations;

(7) encourages the Administration to provide assistance to the Iranian people to have free and uninterrupted access to the internet, including by broadening General License D-1;

(8) calls on companies to reject requests by the regime to cut off the Iranian people from social media and other communications platforms;

(9) respects the proud history and rich culture of the Iranian nation and fully supports efforts by the people of Iran to promote the establishment of basic freedoms that build the foundation for the emergence of a freely elected, open, and democratic political system;

(10) supports the right of Iranian dissidents to assemble, without fear of persecution and violence, whether in Iran or internationally; and

(11) urges the President and the Secretary of State to work with the international community to ensure that violations of human rights are part of all formal and informal multilateral or bilateral discussions with and regarding Iran.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PHILLIPS) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PHILLIPS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H. Res. 752.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, since November, Iranian protesters have flooded the streets, demonstrating against corruption, high fuel, and high food prices. Protests flared up in recent weeks after the government of Iran took responsibility for downing a Ukrainian airliner after, of course, initially denying it.

Peaceful protesters have been met with violence and brutality from the Iranian regime. Over 1,500 people have been killed, and thousands more injured.

For decades, this has been the horrifying standard practice of the regime, heinous human rights abuses and significant corruption, even targeting Iranian dissidents abroad.

We must send a clear message now to the protesters that we stand with them. Today's resolution shows that solidarity; that we stand for the rights of the Iranian people to free expression, and we condemn the regime for its crimes.

Today, we urge the President and the Secretary of State to work with the international community to ensure that violations of human rights are part of all formal and informal, multilateral or bilateral discussions with and regarding Iran.

Sending a strong message of support is important, but the United States must do more to help the Iranian protesters. The administration should help the Iranian people access free and uninterrupted internet, including broadening General License D-1, the Treasury Department's license of personal communication devices and software that helps Iranians access the free flow of information.

The administration should also welcome, not deny, Iranian visitors to the United States, because giving Iranians an opportunity to experience our great country for themselves is the best way to counter anti-American sentiment and fear.

There is much that we can do to help the protesters, and we must start today with this resolution. I urge all my colleagues to join me in passing this great measure.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Iranian people and our condemnation of the Iranian regime's crackdown on legitimate protests.

I want to first thank Congressman DEUTCH for bringing this important legislation, introducing this resolution. And I am proud to be a cosponsor of it.

Twice in the past 3 months, the Iranian people have bravely raised their voices to protest the conduct of the despotic Iranian regime. And both times, these peaceful, popular demonstrations have been met with utter violence.

In November, protestors across Iran voiced their anger at an abrupt increase in gasoline prices. This soon broadened to voicing their anger at the regime as a whole.

The Islamic Republic of Iran responded with brutal force. Security thugs opened fire on unarmed protestors. The regime cut off the internet in an attempt to silence the voice of the people and suppress the evidence of the security forces' bloodshed.

Despite the regime's efforts, the world still knows about their cruelty. We have all seen the videos of security forces shooting innocent people on the streets. The regime killed as many as 1,500 people, by far the largest and most violent crackdown since the 1979 revolution.

Just a few weeks later, the Iranian people were once again furious with their government. This time, it was because the regime shot down a commercial airliner, killing 176 innocent people, many of whom were Iranian. Even worse, the regime did not admit to having done so for 3 days. They intentionally lied to their own people and to the world.

Once again, security forces fired on peaceful protestors.

The broad frustration with this cruel, lying regime is evident. An Iranian Olympic medalist announced she was defecting because of "hypocrisy, lies, injustice, and flattery."

Iran's State TV anchor resigned, saying, "It was very hard for me to believe the killing of my own countrymen. I apologize for lying to you on television for the last 13 years."

With this resolution, we declare that the House of Representatives stands with the people of Iran demanding accountability from their leaders.

I thank the President for loudly and clearly supporting the rights of the Iranian people. The President has urged the regime not to use violence against their own people. He has also worked to hold the Iranian regime accountable for its cruelty.

The administration has actively sought information about the perpetrators of violence through its tip line. Using those tips, the administration has sanctioned those with blood on their hands, such as the IRGC commander who oversaw a massacre in November, killing as many as 148 people. I want to thank the administration for taking concrete action to support the people of Iran.

This resolution is our opportunity in the Congress to show the same support.

It is an important step, but we can and must do more. Our next course of action should be to pass my bill that holds the Iranian officials accountable for serious human rights abuses.

So let's stand together as Americans and keep the process and pressure up on this dangerous regime.

And let me just say, I have talked to many Iranians throughout this country, and the people of Iran are watching what we say here. Our voices do matter in Iran and to the Iranian people who are in the United States.

So I want to again thank Congressman DEUTCH for bringing this important resolution that stands up for the people of Iran.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH), the author of this important resolution, and the chairman of the Subcommittee on the Middle East, North Africa, and International Terrorism.

Mr. DEUTCH. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend from Minnesota for yielding.

I appreciate the kind words of the ranking member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, and I appreciate his leadership.

Special thanks, as well, to the ranking member of the Middle East, North Africa, and International Terrorism Subcommittee, Mr. WILSON, for his leadership on these issues and his commitment to standing up for the Iranian people.

In mid-November, popular protests against the Iranian regime began and rapidly spread to at least 100 cities throughout the country, in the most significant anti-government protests in Iran since 2009.

While protesters took to the streets in response to an increase in fuel prices, they also called for structural reform of the Iranian political system. They condemned current and former leaders.

In response, Iranian authorities shut down the internet. Security forces used lethal force, killing hundreds of people, marking the highest casualty rate of any protest movement in Iran since the Islamic revolution 4 decades ago. And they arrested over 7,000 more.

Protesters returned earlier this month after Iran shot down Ukrainian Airlines Flight 752 as it took off from Tehran's International Airport, killing all 176 people on board, and then tried to cover it up.

The Iranians in the streets were frustrated by the regime's lies, frustrated by their incompetence, and chanted against the IRGC and against the Supreme Leader. As in November, Iranian authorities met these protests with unlawful, disproportionate force.

Congress has long expressed bipartisan support for the human rights of the Iranian people, including the rights to peaceably assemble and the right to protest.

Congress has also supported the rights of Iranian dissidents and authorized the licensing of communication services to improve the ability of Iranian people to speak freely.

In keeping with that tradition, H. Res. 752 expresses the support of the House of Representatives for the rights of the Iranian people to free expression and condemns the regime for its crackdown on the recent, legitimate, peaceful protests in Iran.

The resolution condemns the Iranian regime's serious human rights abuses, its significant corruption, destabilizing activities abroad, and urges the President and the Secretary of State to work with the international community to ensure that violations of human rights are part of all formal and informal multilateral or bilateral discussions regarding Iran.

I also encourage additional efforts by this House to support the people of Iran. These include initiatives proposed by my colleagues, like the one by Representative TOM MALINOWSKI, to end the ban on Iranians and other citizens of predominantly-Muslim countries from entering the United States. If we truly support the Iranian people, we need to allow them to visit so they can experience our vibrant society, so they can experience democracy, so that they can see pluralism and our great democratic traditions. I look forward to working with my colleagues to help advance these measures as well.

I thank my colleagues for their strong support of this resolution which demonstrates that Congress stands with the Iranian people and supports their right to live in a free society.

□ 1415

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON), the ranking member on the Subcommittee for the Middle East, North Africa, and International Terrorism.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, I thank the Republican leader, MIKE MCCAUL, for yielding.

I am pleased to speak in favor of H. Res. 752, which supports the rights of the Iranian people to protest without violent consequences from the Islamic Republic regime, which I coauthored with my appreciative colleague, Chairman TED DEUTCH from Florida.

Last November, thousands of people all over 100 cities of Iran demonstrated against the regime's oppressive economic and tyrannical other policies. The Islamic Republic responded viciously to these peaceful protests. The regime killed over 1,000 people and arrested thousands more. We mourn the deaths of these courageous individuals who died while advocating for their rights.

The Iranian people again voiced their anger in January when the Islamic Republic lied about shooting down a Ukrainian civilian passenger Boeing jet, killing 176 people.

How did the regime respond to the protests over the death of these innocent people? By using more violence against innocent civilians.

Today, we say to the people of Iran: We respect the importance of Persian culture to the world and your right to be heard without fear. We support your rights to ask for a better governance. We ask for accountability from your government, to ask for a government that puts your interests first and does not deceive you with blatant corruption. We will not allow you to be overlooked or forgotten, and we will stand by you while this regime brutalizes you.

President Donald Trump has taken a firm stand in support of the protestors, saying: "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."

I agree with President Donald Trump, and I am gratified to stand today in support of the free expression of the Iranian people. President Trump's sanctions deter terrorism and protect American families.

I thank my colleagues for bringing this bipartisan resolution to the floor. I look forward to seeing it pass and continuing to work together to support the rights of the Iranian people.

Iranian Americans are extraordinarily successful in America and very much appreciated in every State. In my home State of South Carolina, Iranian American doctors are vital.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. RUIZ), my friend.

Mr. RUIZ. Madam Speaker, I am proud of the growing Iranian American community in my district, California's 36th. I have spoken with members of the community, and I have watched the protests in Iran.

I am increasingly concerned and outraged at what we are witnessing from the Iranian regime. The violence, the oppression, the internet blackouts, the large-scale incarcerations—these are egregious human rights violations.

Over 7,000 Iranians have been arrested and, tragically, over 1,000 killed by Iranian security forces since November of last year.

This shameful use of violence by the state security forces, sweeping internet shutoffs, jailing of journalists and protestors, these are just the most recent examples of merciless attempts of censorship by a regime with a long, abhorrent history of oppression and violence against its own people.

We must support the protestors seeking nothing but their fundamental human rights and civil liberties such as the freedom to assemble openly, speak freely, and have an open and free press. That is why I stand with my Iranian American constituents in support of bipartisan H. Res. 752: to support the rights of the people of Iran to free ex-

pression and to say, forcefully, that we condemn the Iranian regime for its violent tactics to oppress its legitimate protestors.

To the Iranian people seeking freedom, democracy, and human rights: I stand with you. The United States Congress stands with you. The American people stand with you. We will continue supporting you as you fight for your basic rights, freedom, and democracy.

That is why I urge my colleagues to pass H. Res. 752 here today.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Madam Speaker, in 2016, President Obama sent \$1.7 billion of untraceable cash on shrink-wrapped cargo pallets to the regime in Iran. The Iranian expatriates in my district reported that immediately following this shameful spectacle, the Iranian Guard expanded dramatically and began a brutal round of repression that cost thousands of innocent Iranians their lives.

Thankfully, President Trump has reversed these destructive policies of appeasement. The renewal of sanctions against Iran is again bringing economic pressure on the regime and causing European nations to reconsider their ties with that tyranny.

Iran is one of the oldest and greatest civilizations in history, yet it has been suppressed and plundered by a clique of theocratic thugs who comprise the illegitimate Iranian Government.

This resolution is an important gesture, but it is empty and idle without action. We need to support the freedom-fighting organizations operating within Iran with the same financial resources that Obama sent to their oppressors. I challenge the House majority to do so.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, I met with a group of Iranian Americans just this last weekend, and I talked to them about their friends in Iran who are fighting this oppression. I saw the video, the internet feed that they are able to get out of country. One of the problems has been they shut down the internet. They control the internet in Iran because it was built with security in mind, first.

It is very difficult to get communications both inside and outside of Iran, but we are working on those technologies today, Madam Speaker, so that these people can communicate with the outside world. They are being held hostage themselves by the Ayatollah, who held our Embassy officials hostage in 1979. They are listening to our voices here in the Congress, and they are shooting out texts and emails, and we are finding ways to get them to communicate.

There are 80 million people in Iran, once a great empire, the Persian empire that brought us so many great things; and now, under this oppressive theocracy, the majority of these people

do not support their own oppressive, brutal killing regime.

The Islamic Republic of Iran, in my judgment, their days are limited, and it is time for the people of Iran to take back their country. And when I say this to the people of Iran, know that the American people stand with the people of Iran. Know that this House stands with the people of Iran and that this Congress and President stand with the people of Iran.

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

Mr. PHILLIPS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume for the purpose of closing.

Madam Speaker, Iranian people want the same thing that Americans want: peace, opportunity, and security. It is critical that we now support the peaceful protestors in Iran today.

Today's resolution shows that we stand in solidarity with the Iranian people in their struggle against the cruelty of their regime, and I hope all Members will join me in supporting this important measure.

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

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 752, a resolution supporting human rights and fundamental freedoms in Iran. Today, we send a vital message to the protest movement in Iran that—as they face persecution and violence—the House of Representatives stands in solidarity with them.

For decades, the Iranian regime has oppressed dissidents. From the 1988 massacre to the 2009 protests to today, people who dared to speak against the Iranian regime have been subject to torture, arrest, disappearance and worse. Iran's prisons are some of the most notorious in the world.

The protests have escalated since the Iranian regime lied to the world about their responsibility for shooting down the Ukrainian jetliner. It is unfathomable that for three days, the Iranian regime sought to hide their culpability.

The United States must do what we can to help support those who fight for human rights and freedom in Iran. This resolution outlines some important steps, including expanding internet access for Iranian dissidents by easing the restrictions on sharing software and hardware for personal communication devices.

I would also add that if the Trump administration wants to send a message of solidarity to the Iranian protest movement, they should repeal the ill-conceived Muslim ban, which has prevented Iranians from visiting and studying in America.

The American people have no quarrel with the people of Iran. America should welcome those Iranians who want to see America for themselves.

I'd like to thank Mr. DEUTCH and Mr. WILSON for spearheading this important resolution.

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 752, which reinforces our nation's support for the rights of the Iranian people to have free speech, free association and fair elections. For over 40 years the Iranian regime has engaged in terrorism and has been a declared enemy of freedom, human rights, and freedom of religion. The Iranian re-

gime, a designated state sponsor of terrorism, states its antipathy for the United States on a daily basis. The regime has engaged in atrocities in Iran and throughout the world.

Recently President Trump authorized the removal of Iranian terrorist Qassem Soleimani. The president had the legal authority to do so under the Congressionally enacted AUMF pertaining to Iraq. In the United States, expatriates from Iran applauded this as long overdue justice for a leading proponent of terror, death and destruction. This action should have been taken years ago by the Obama Administration. Instead of addressing Iran's terrorist actions, the prior administration gave aid and support to the terrorist regime. No doubt some of that aid, including billions of dollars, was used to kill innocent people. It took the courage of a real leader to be bold and do what needed to be done.

Our country supports the Iranian opposition via the Organization of Iranian American Communities. Their fight is our fight. With patience, a new day will dawn in Iran and its people will be free again.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PHILLIPS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 752, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TIBETAN POLICY AND SUPPORT ACT OF 2019

Mr. PHILLIPS. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4331) to modify and reauthorize the Tibetan Policy Act of 2002, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4331

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Tibetan Policy and Support Act of 2019”.

SEC. 2. MODIFICATIONS TO AND REAUTHORIZATION OF TIBETAN POLICY ACT OF 2002.

(a) TIBETAN NEGOTIATIONS.—Section 613 of the Tibetan Policy Act of 2002 (22 U.S.C. 6901 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by inserting “without preconditions” after “a dialogue”;

(ii) by inserting “or democratically-elected leaders of the Tibetan community” after “his representatives”;

(iii) by adding at the end before the period the following: “and should coordinate with other governments in multilateral efforts toward this goal”;

(B) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (3); and

(C) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

“(2) POLICY COMMUNICATION.—The President shall direct the Secretary of State to ensure that, in accordance with this Act, United States policy on Tibet, as coordinated by the United States Special Coordi-

nator for Tibetan Issues, is communicated to all Federal departments and agencies in contact with the Government of the People's Republic of China.”;

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking “until December 31, 2021”;

and

(ii) by inserting “and direct the Department of State to make public on its website”

after “appropriate congressional committees”;

(B) in paragraph (1), by striking “and” at the end;

(C) in paragraph (2), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”;

(D) by adding at the end the following:

“(3) the steps taken by the United States Government to promote the human rights and distinct religious, cultural, linguistic, and historical identity of the Tibetan people, including the right of the Tibetan people to select, educate, and venerate their own religious leaders in accordance with their established religious practice and system.”

(b) TIBET PROJECT PRINCIPLES.—Section 616 of such Act (22 U.S.C. 6901 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (d), by striking paragraphs (1) through (9) and inserting the following:

“(1) neither provide incentive for, nor facilitate the migration and settlement of, non-Tibetans into Tibet;

“(2) neither provide incentive for, nor facilitate the transfer of ownership of, Tibetan land or natural resources to non-Tibetans;

“(3) neither provide incentive for, nor facilitate the involuntary or coerced relocation of, Tibetan nomads from their traditional pasture lands into concentrated settlements;

“(4) be implemented in consultation with the Tibetan people and, as appropriate, after the conduct of cultural and environmental impact assessments;

“(5) foster self-sufficiency and self-reliance of Tibetans;

“(6) respect human rights and Tibetan culture and traditions;

“(7) be subject to ongoing monitoring and evaluation; and

“(8) be conducted, as much as possible, in the Tibetan language.”;

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(e) UNITED STATES ASSISTANCE.—The President shall provide funds to nongovernmental organizations to support sustainable development, cultural and historical preservation, health care, education, and environmental sustainability projects for Tibetan communities in Tibet, in accordance with the principles specified in subsection (d) and with the concurrence of the United States Special Coordinator for Tibetan Issues under section 621(d).”

(c) DIPLOMATIC REPRESENTATION RELATING TO TIBET.—Section 618 of such Act (22 U.S.C. 6901 note) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 618. DIPLOMATIC REPRESENTATION RELATING TO TIBET.

“(a) UNITED STATES CONSULATE IN LHASA, TIBET.—The Secretary should seek to establish a United States consulate in Lhasa, Tibet—

“(1) to provide consular services to United States citizens traveling in Tibet; and

“(2) to monitor political, economic, and cultural developments in Tibet.

“(b) POLICY.—The Secretary may not authorize the establishment in the United States of any additional consulate of the People's Republic of China until such time as a United States consulate in Lhasa, Tibet, is established under subsection (a).”

(d) RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION IN TIBET.—Section 620(b) of such Act (22 U.S.C. 6901 note) is amended by adding at the end before the period the following: “, including with respect

to the reincarnation system of Tibetan Buddhism”.

(e) UNITED STATES SPECIAL COORDINATOR FOR TIBETAN ISSUES.—Section 621 of such Act (22 U.S.C. 6901 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c) to read as follows:

“(c) OBJECTIVES.—The objectives of the Special Coordinator are to—

“(1) promote substantive dialogue without preconditions between the Government of the People’s Republic of China and the Dalai Lama or his representatives or democratically-elected leaders of the Tibetan community leading to a negotiated agreement on Tibet and coordinate with other governments in multilateral efforts toward this goal;

“(2) encourage the Government of the People’s Republic of China to address the aspirations of the Tibetan people with regard to their distinct historical, cultural, religious, and linguistic identity;

“(3) promote the human rights of the Tibetan people;

“(4) promote activities to preserve environment and water resources of the Tibetan plateau;

“(5) encourage sustainable development in accordance with section 616(d), cultural and historical preservation, health care, education, and environmental sustainability projects for Tibetan communities in Tibet; and

“(6) promote access to Tibet in accordance with the Reciprocal Access to Tibet Act of 2018 (Public Law 115-330).”;

(2) in subsection (d)—

(A) in paragraph (5), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) by redesignating paragraph (6) as paragraph (8); and

(C) by inserting after paragraph (5) the following:

“(6) provide concurrence with respect to all projects carried out pursuant to assistance provided under section 616(e);

“(7) seek to establish international diplomatic coalitions to—

“(A) oppose any effort by the Government of the People’s Republic of China to select, educate, and venerate Tibetan Buddhist religious leaders in a manner inconsistent with Tibetan Buddhism in which the succession or identification of Tibetan Buddhist lamas, including the Dalai Lama, should occur without interference, in a manner consistent with Tibetan Buddhists’ beliefs; and

“(B) ensure that the identification and installation of Tibetan Buddhist religious leaders, including any future Dalai Lama, is determined solely within the Tibetan Buddhist faith community, in accordance with the universally-recognized right to religious freedom; and”;

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(e) PERSONNEL.—The Secretary shall ensure that the Office of the Special Coordinator is adequately staffed at all times to assist in the management of the responsibilities of this section.”.

SEC. 3. STATEMENT OF POLICY REGARDING THE SUCCESSION OR REINCARNATION OF THE DALAI LAMA.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) Notwithstanding that Tibetan Buddhism is practiced in many countries including Bhutan, India, Mongolia, Nepal, the People’s Republic of China, the Russian Federation, and the United States, the Government of the People’s Republic of China has repeatedly insisted on its role in managing the selection of Tibet’s next spiritual leader, the Dalai Lama, through actions such as those described in the “Measures on the Management of the Reincarnation of Living Buddhas” in 2007.

(2) On March 19, 2019, Chinese Ministry of Affairs spokesperson reiterated that the “reincarnation of living Buddhas including the Dalai Lama must comply with Chinese laws and regulations and follow religious rituals and historical conventions”.

(3) The Government of the People’s Republic of China has interfered in the process of recognizing a successor or reincarnation of Tibetan Buddhist leaders, including in 1995 by arbitrarily detaining Gedhun Choekyi Nyima, a 6-year old boy who was identified as the 11th Panchen Lama, and purporting to install its own candidate as the Panchen Lama.

(4) The 14th Dalai Lama, Tenzin Gyatso, issued a statement on September 24, 2011, explaining the traditions and spiritual precepts of the selection of Dalai Lamas, setting forth his views on the considerations and process for selecting his successor, and providing a response to the Chinese government’s claims that only the Chinese government has the ultimate authority in the selection process of the Dalai Lama.

(5) The 14th Dalai Lama said in his statement that the person who reincarnates has sole legitimate authority over where and how he or she takes rebirth and how that reincarnation is to be recognized and if there is a need for a 15th Dalai Lama to be recognized, then the responsibility shall primarily rest with the officers of the Dalai Lama’s Gaden Phodrang Trust, who will be informed by the written instructions of the 14th Dalai Lama.

(6) Since 2011, the 14th Dalai Lama has reiterated publicly on numerous occasions that decisions on the successions, emanations, or reincarnations of the Dalai Lama belongs to the Tibetan Buddhist faith community alone.

(7) On June 8, 2015, the United States House of Representatives unanimously approved House Resolution 337 which calls on the United States Government to “underscore that government interference in the Tibetan reincarnation process is a violation of the internationally recognized right to religious freedom . . . and to highlight the fact that other countries besides China have long Tibetan Buddhist traditions and that matters related to reincarnations in Tibetan Buddhism are of keen interest to Tibetan Buddhist populations worldwide”.

(8) On April 25, 2018, the United States Senate unanimously approved Senate Resolution 429 which “expresses its sense that the identification and installation of Tibetan Buddhist religious leaders, including a future 15th Dalai Lama, is a matter that should be determined solely within the Tibetan Buddhist faith community, in accordance with the inalienable right to religious freedom”.

(9) The Department of State’s Report on International Religious Freedom for 2018 reported on policies and efforts of the Government of the People’s Republic of China to exert control over the selection of Tibetan Buddhist religious leaders, including reincarnate lamas, and stated that “U.S. officials underscored that decisions on the reincarnation of the Dalai Lama should be made solely by faith leaders.”.

(b) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—It is the policy of the United States that—

(1) decisions regarding the selection, education, and veneration of Tibetan Buddhist religious leaders are exclusively spiritual matters that should be made by the appropriate religious authorities within the Tibetan Buddhist tradition and in the context of the will of practitioners of Tibetan Buddhism;

(2) the wishes of the 14th Dalai Lama, including any written instructions, should play a determinative role in the selection,

education, and veneration of a future 15th Dalai Lama; and

(3) interference by the Government of the People’s Republic of China or any other government in the process of recognizing a successor or reincarnation of the 14th Dalai Lama and any future Dalai Lamas would represent a clear violation of the fundamental religious freedoms of Tibetan Buddhists and the Tibetan people.

(c) HOLDING CHINESE OFFICIALS RESPONSIBLE FOR RELIGIOUS FREEDOM ABUSES TARGETING TIBETAN BUDDHISTS.—It is the policy of the United States to consider senior officials of the Government of the People’s Republic of China who are responsible for, complicit in, or have directly or indirectly engaged in the identification or installation of a candidate chosen by China as the future 15th Dalai Lama of Tibetan Buddhism to have committed—

(1) a gross violation of internationally recognized human rights for purposes of imposing sanctions with respect to such officials under the Global Magnitsky Human Rights Accountability Act (22 U.S.C. 2656 note); and

(2) a particularly severe violation of religious freedom for purposes of applying section 212(a)(2)(G) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(2)(G)) with respect to such officials.

(d) DEPARTMENT OF STATE PROGRAMMING TO PROMOTE RELIGIOUS FREEDOM FOR TIBETAN BUDDHISTS.—Consistent with section 401 of the Frank R. Wolf International Religious Freedom Act (Public Law 114-281; 130 Stat. 1436), of the funds available to the Department of State for international religious freedom programs, the Ambassador-at-Large for International Religious Freedom should support efforts to protect and promote international religious freedom in China and for programs to protect Tibetan Buddhism in China and elsewhere.

SEC. 4. POLICY REGARDING THE ENVIRONMENT AND WATER RESOURCES ON THE TIBETAN PLATEAU.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) The Tibetan Plateau contains glaciers, rivers, grasslands, and other geographical and ecological features that are crucial for supporting vegetation growth and biodiversity, regulating water flow and supply for an estimated 1.8 billion people. Global warming threatens the glaciers in Tibet that feed the major rivers of South and East Asia, which supply freshwater to an estimated 1.8 billion people.

(2) Rising global temperatures—especially in the Tibetan Plateau where the average temperature has increased at twice the global average—will result in variable water flows in the future.

(3) The construction in Tibet of large hydroelectric power dams intended to be used in part to transmit power to Chinese provinces outside of Tibet, as well as other infrastructure projects, including the Sichuan-Tibet railroad, may also lead to the resettlement of thousands of Tibetans and transform the environment.

(4) The grasslands of Tibet play a significant role in carbon production and sequestration and Tibet’s rivers support wetlands that play a key role in water storage, water quality, and the regulation of water flow, support biodiversity, foster vegetation growth, and act as carbon sinks.

(5) Rising temperatures and intensifying evaporation, can affect the water supply, cause desertification, and destabilize infrastructure on the Tibetan Plateau and beyond.

(6) Traditional Tibetan grassland stewardship practices, which can be key to mitigating the negative effects of warming on the Tibetan Plateau, are undermined by the

resettlement of nomads from Tibetan grasslands.

(7) The People's Republic of China has approximately 20 percent of the world's population but only around 7 percent of the world's water supply, while many countries in South and Southeast Asia rely on the rivers flowing from the Himalayas of the Tibetan Plateau.

(8) The People's Republic of China has already completed water transfer programs diverting billions of cubic meters of water yearly and has plans to divert more waters from the Tibetan plateau in China.

(b) WATER RESOURCES IN TIBET AND THE TIBETAN WATERSHED.—The Secretary of State, in coordination with relevant agencies of the United States Government, should—

(1) pursue collaborative efforts with Chinese and international scientific institutions, as appropriate, to monitor the environment on the Tibetan Plateau, including glacial retreat, temperature rise, and carbon levels, in order to promote a greater understanding of the effects on permafrost, river flows, grasslands and desertification, and the monsoon cycle;

(2) engage with the Government of the People's Republic of China, the Tibetan people, and nongovernmental organizations to encourage the participation of Tibetan nomads and other Tibetan stakeholders in the development and implementation of grassland management policies, in order to utilize their indigenous experience in mitigation and stewardship of the land and to assess policies on the forced resettlement of nomads; and

(3) encourage a regional framework on water security, or use existing frameworks, such as the Lower Mekong Initiative, to facilitate cooperative agreements among all riparian nations that would promote transparency, sharing of information, pollution regulation, and arrangements on impounding and diversion of waters that originate on the Tibetan Plateau.

SEC. 5. DEMOCRACY IN THE TIBETAN EXILE COMMUNITY.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) The 14th Dalai Lama advocates the Middle Way Approach, which seeks genuine autonomy for the six million Tibetans in Tibet.

(2) The 14th Dalai Lama has overseen a process of democratization within the Tibetan polity, beginning in Tibet in the 1950s and continuing in exile from the 1960s to the present and to address the needs of the Tibetan people until such time as genuine autonomy in Tibet is realized, the 14th Dalai Lama devolved his political responsibilities to the elected representatives of the Tibetan people in exile in 2011.

(3) In 2011 and again in 2016, members of the Tibetan exile community across some 30 countries held elections to select political leaders to serve in the Central Tibetan Administration parliament and as chief executive, elections which were monitored by international observers and assessed to be free and fair.

(4) The Dalai Lama has said that the Central Tibetan Administration will cease to exist once a negotiated settlement has been achieved that allows Tibetans to freely enjoy their culture, religion and language in Tibet.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) Tibetan exile communities around the world should be commended for the adoption of a system of self-governance with democratic institutions to choose their leaders;

(2) the Dalai Lama should be commended for his decision to devolve political authority to elected leaders in accordance with democratic principles; and

(3) as consistent with section 621(d)(3) of the Tibetan Policy Act of 2002 (22 U.S.C. 6901 note), the United States Special Coordinator for Tibetan Issues should continue to maintain close contact with the religious, cultural, and political leaders of the Tibetan people.

SEC. 6. SUSTAINABILITY IN TIBETAN COMMUNITIES SEEKING TO PRESERVE THEIR CULTURE, RELIGION, AND LANGUAGE.

The Secretary of State should urge the Government of Nepal to honor the Gentleman's Agreement with the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees and to provide legal documentation to long-staying Tibetan residents in Nepal who fled a credible threat of persecution in Tibet in order to allow them to more fully participate in the economy and society of Nepal.

SEC. 7. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES SPECIAL COORDINATOR FOR TIBETAN ISSUES.—There is authorized to be appropriated \$1,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2021 through 2025 for the Office of the United States Special Coordinator for Tibetan Issues.

(b) TIBETAN SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM AND NGAWANG CHOEPHEL EXCHANGE PROGRAMS.—

(1) TIBETAN SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM.—There is authorized to be appropriated \$675,000 for each of the fiscal years 2021 through 2025 to carry out the Tibetan scholarship program established under section 103(b)(1) of the Human Rights, Refugee, and Other Foreign Relations Provisions Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-319; 22 U.S.C. 2151 note).

(2) NGAWANG CHOEPHEL EXCHANGE PROGRAMS.—There is authorized to be appropriated \$575,000 for each of the fiscal years 2021 through 2025 to carry out the “Ngwang Choepel Exchange Programs” (formerly known as “programs of educational and cultural exchange between the United States and the people of Tibet”) under section 103(a) of the Human Rights, Refugee, and Other Foreign Relations Provisions Act of 1996.

(c) HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE AND SUPPORT TO TIBETAN REFUGEES IN SOUTH ASIA.—Amounts authorized to be appropriated to carry out chapter 9 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and the Migration and Refugee Assistance Act of 1962 for each of the fiscal years 2021 through 2025 are authorized to be made available for humanitarian assistance, including food, medicine, clothing, and medical and vocational training, for Tibetan refugees in South Asia who have fled facing a credible threat of persecution in the People's Republic of China.

(d) TIBETAN AUTONOMOUS REGION AND TIBETAN COMMUNITIES IN CHINA.—There is authorized to be appropriated \$8,000,000 for each year of the fiscal years 2021 through 2025 under chapter 4 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2346 et seq.) to support activities which preserve cultural traditions and promote sustainable development, education, and environmental conservation in Tibetan communities in the Tibet Autonomous Region and in other Tibetan communities in China.

(e) ASSISTANCE FOR TIBETANS IN INDIA AND NEPAL.—There is authorized to be appropriated \$6,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2021 through 2025 under part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151 et seq.) for programs to promote and preserve Tibetan culture and language development, and the resilience of Tibetan communities in India and Nepal, and to assist in the education and development of the next generation of Tibetan leaders from such communities.

(f) TIBETAN GOVERNANCE.—There is authorized to be appropriated \$3,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2021 through 2025 for programs to strengthen the capacity of Tibetan

institutions and strengthen democracy, governance, information and international outreach, and research.

(g) VOICE OF AMERICA AND RADIO FREE ASIA.—

(1) VOICE OF AMERICA.—There is authorized to be appropriated \$3,344,000 for each of the fiscal years 2021 through 2025 to Voice of America for broadcasts described in paragraph (3).

(2) RADIO FREE ASIA.—There is authorized to be appropriated \$4,060,000 for each of the fiscal years 2021 through 2025 to Radio Free Asia for broadcasts described in paragraph (3).

(3) BROADCASTS DESCRIBED.—Broadcasts described in this paragraph are broadcasts to provide uncensored news and information in the Tibetan language to Tibetans, including Tibetans in Tibet.

SEC. 8. DETERMINATION OF BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled “Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation” for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the House Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PHILLIPS) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PHILLIPS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 4331.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, I thank Chairman MCGOVERN, along with Mr. SMITH, Mr. SUOZZI, and Mr. MEADOWS, for authoring this very important bill to update U.S. policies that support the preservation of Tibetan culture and faith as well as the environment of the Tibetan Plateau, which is vital not just to the Tibetan people, but also to the Himalayan ecosystem.

I also thank Speaker PELOSI, who has been a tireless champion of the Tibetan people for many years. She has a long history of shining a spotlight on human rights abuses in China and has ensured that this Chamber does its part to defend our values.

The Tibetan Policy and Support Act of 2019 updates existing legislation from 2002 to make sure our policies keep pace with the challenges facing Tibet today. This legislation comes at a very critical time for the Tibetan people as they seek to preserve their cultural and religious identity.

The Chinese Government has repeatedly asserted that it has a role to play in the selection of the next Dalai

Lama. This is analogous to the Government of Italy announcing that it can ignore Catholic tradition and unilaterally decide who the next Pope should be. Such disregard for the Tibetan faith is an undue violation of international religious freedoms.

This bill sends a very clear message to Chinese officials that, if they interfere in the selection process for a future Dalai Lama or other Tibetan Buddhist leader, they can be sanctioned by the United States for violating human rights.

The Tibetan Policy and Support Act also reauthorizes programs to preserve Tibetan culture and environment.

The Tibetan Plateau is home to 10 major Asian river systems feeding 10 different Asian states, and these resources are being threatened by large-scale hydroelectric projects. These rivers are of immense importance to the livelihood of not only Tibetan communities, but also the nearly 2 billion people in South and East Asia.

I urge all Members to join me in supporting this very good measure to continue underscoring our support for the Tibetan people.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, DC, January 10, 2020.

Hon. ELIOT L. ENGEL,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN ENGEL: This is to advise you that the Committee on the Judiciary has now had an opportunity to review the provisions in H.R. 4331, the "Tibetan Policy and Support Act of 2019" that fall within our Rule X jurisdiction. I appreciate your consulting with us on those provisions. The Judiciary Committee has no objection to your including them in the bill for consideration on the House floor, and to expedite that consideration is willing to forgo action on H.R. 4331, with the understanding that we do not thereby waive any future jurisdictional claim over those provisions or their subject matters.

In the event a House-Senate conference on this or similar legislation is convened, the Judiciary Committee reserves the right to request an appropriate number of conferees to address any concerns with these or similar provisions that may arise in conference.

Please place this letter into the Congressional Record during consideration of the measure on the House floor. Thank you for the cooperative spirit in which you have worked regarding this matter and others between our committees.

Sincerely,

JERROLD NADLER,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, January 24, 2020.

Hon. JERROLD NADLER,
Chairman, Committee on Judiciary,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN NADLER: I am writing to you concerning H.R. 4331, the Tibetan Policy and Support Act of 2019. I appreciate your willingness to work cooperatively on this legislation.

I acknowledge that provisions of the bill fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Judiciary under House Rule X, and that

your Committee will forgo action on H.R. 4331 to expedite floor consideration. I further acknowledge that the inaction of your Committee with respect to the bill does not waive any future jurisdictional claim over the matters contained in the bill that fall within your jurisdiction. I will also support the appointment of Committee on Judiciary conferees during any House-Senate conference convened on this legislation.

Lastly, I will ensure that our exchange of letters is included in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the bill. Thank you again for your cooperation regarding the legislation. I look forward to continuing to work with you as the measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

ELIOT L. ENGEL,
Chairman.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 4331, the Tibetan Policy and Support Act.

The Chinese Communist Party's, or CCP's, crusade against faith is the greatest threat to religious freedom in the world today. This bill reminds us that the religious persecution didn't begin under Chairman Xi. The CCP has always hated and feared religion.

Since China invaded Tibet in 1950, the CCP has tried to dismantle Tibetan Buddhism. In 1995, Chinese authorities kidnapped the second highest Tibetan faith leader and replaced him with a fraud.

The Chinese Communist Party wants to ensure Tibetan leaders are chosen according to their political agenda, not according to Tibetan Buddhist religious practices.

This bill states that the United States will not accept the CCP's destruction of Tibetan Buddhism, we will not accept fraudulent religious leaders appointed by Beijing, and we will not accept the CCP's control of deeply spiritual beliefs.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this important measure, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), the author of this important bill and the chairman of the Rules Committee.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his advocacy on behalf of this issue.

And the ranking member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, I am delighted to be here with him, and I want to thank him for his work on this.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4331, the Tibetan Policy and Support Act. I am proud to have introduced this legislation with Congressman CHRIS SMITH of New Jersey and with Senators RUBIO and CARDIN in the Senate.

I thank Chairman ENGEL and Ranking Member MCCAUL for their strong support of this bill and, more importantly, for their tireless leadership in support of the human rights of the Tibetan people.

□ 1430

Madam Speaker, our bill updates and strengthens the Tibetan Policy Act of 2002 to address the challenges facing the Tibetan people. Perhaps as importantly, it reaffirms America's commitment to the idea that human rights matter, that we care about those who are oppressed, that we stand with those who are struggling for freedom, and that we have a moral obligation to do something when we see something that is not right.

It should be clear that we support a positive and productive U.S.-China relationship, but it is essential that the human rights of all the people of China are respected by their government.

Unfortunately, the human rights situation in Tibet has gotten much worse. The Chinese Government has refused to enter into genuine dialogue with Tibetan leaders. Restrictions on access to Tibet, both for Tibetans and foreigners, have been tightened. International journalists have stated that the isolation of Tibet is as bad as North Korea, allowing human rights abuses and environmental degradation to be concealed from the outside world.

Last year, the Congress passed the Reciprocal Access to Tibet Act to demand that American journalists, diplomats, and tourists be given the same freedom to travel to Tibet that Chinese officials have to travel freely in America. I hope to see a report from the State Department, which was due in December, describing the steps that the administration has taken to implement this policy over the last year.

In addition, the Chinese Government has used advanced technology to intensify security and surveillance.

It has ratcheted up its so-called anti-crime and vice campaign targeting Tibetans.

Religious freedom continues to be severely curtailed, including through mandatory political education for religious leaders and arrests of Tibetans who display a photo of the Dalai Lama.

The Panchen Lama turned 30 years old this year, but he and his family remain incommunicado since being kidnapped by Chinese authorities in 1995, making him the world's longest-serving prisoner of conscience.

Finally, Chinese officials have intervened to select Tibetan Buddhist leaders and threatened to choose the successor to the 14th Dalai Lama. These actions are in clear violation of China's international obligations to protect religious freedom.

It is essential that U.S. policy toward Tibet be updated and strengthened. The bill we are considering today would establish as U.S. policy that the succession or reincarnation of Tibetan Buddhist leaders, including a future 15th Dalai Lama, is an exclusively religious matter that should be decided solely by the Tibetan Buddhist community.

Send a clear message that Chinese officials who interfere in the succession or reincarnation process will be subject

to targeted financial, economic, and visa-related sanctions, including those contained in the Global Magnitsky Act.

Strengthen the role of the State Department Special Coordinator for Tibetan Issues by including a mandate to work multilaterally to promote a genuine dialogue.

Mandate that no new Chinese consulates should be established in the United States until a U.S. consulate is established in Tibet's historical capital of Lhasa.

Direct the State Department to begin collaborative, multinational efforts to protect the environment and water resources of the Tibetan Plateau.

Support democratic governance in the Tibetan exile community.

The Dalai Lama should be commended for his decision to devolve political authority to elected leaders.

The Tibetan exile community is also to be commended for adopting a system of self-governance with democratic institutions to choose their own leaders, including holding multiple free and fair elections to select its parliament and chief executive.

The adoption of democracy within the Tibetan exile community ensures that the Central Tibetan Administration in Dharamsala, India, legitimately represents and reflects the aspirations of the Tibetan people around the world.

Standing together, the American people will remain steadfast partners of the Tibetan people. For 60 years, His Holiness the Dalai Lama and so many Tibetans have remained separated from their land and their home, while the people in Tibet endure some of the harshest human rights abuses in the world.

I am proud that today the House of Representatives is taking this important step to strengthen U.S. policy in support of the Tibetan people.

Madam Speaker, I thank my colleagues for their support, and I urge all of my colleagues to support this important legislation.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Speaker, let me first commend the Congressman from Massachusetts and his great work on this issue. He has been a really strong fighter for democracy and freedom-loving peoples around the world, whether it be the Hong Kong Democracy Act or the Tibetan people and their persecution in China. I thank Chairman MCGOVERN so much, from the bottom of my heart.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOHO), the Republican leader of the Asia, the Pacific, and Nonproliferation Subcommittee.

Mr. YOHO. Madam Speaker, I thank Chairman MCCAUL and Mr. PHILLIPS for their leadership on this. Also, Mr. MCGOVERN has been a strong leader on this, and I appreciate it.

This is the way Congress should work. We come together on a common goal; we get things passed; and it makes a significant difference.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4331, the Tibetan Policy and Support Act of 2019.

Madam Speaker, I thank Representative MCGOVERN for his work on this important and timely legislation, which would reauthorize the Tibetan Policy Act of 2002 and reaffirm our commitment to the Tibetan people.

Since the 1950 invasion of the Chinese PLA forces, Tibet has been a land of occupation and oppression. For too long, the Chinese Government has utilized campaigns of aggression and intimidation in trying to silence and bully its neighbor and territories.

In that regard, the people of Tibet have not been spared. The number of displaced Tibetans number in the hundreds of thousands, with 110,000 taking refuge just in India alone.

I join my colleagues in Congress in reiterating our support for Tibet, the Tibetan people, and the protection of their distinct cultural identity.

I also believe that as one of Tibet's strongest partners, the U.S. Congress should hear from Tibet's political and spiritual leaders, which is why I introduced legislation last year to invite the Dalai Lama to address a Joint Meeting of Congress via teleconference to discuss the peaceful solutions to international conflicts.

Madam Speaker, this legislation has wide bipartisan support in the House. To the people of Tibet, know that we support your fight against adversity and for religious freedom.

This legislation makes it clear that the U.S. Congress will not sit on the sidelines and watch as a spectator but, rather, advocate strongly for increased protections for the Tibetan people.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank him and my colleague on the other side of the aisle for this resolution.

Madam Speaker, I had the honor and the privilege of visiting the Dalai Lama, and I welcome this opportunity to speak of his work and the danger he and his people face.

H.R. 4331 is a bipartisan and bicameral bill to update and strengthen the Tibetan Policy Act of 2002 in light of new human rights, religious, and environmental challenges the Tibetan people face today.

In the 18 years since the original Tibetan Policy Act became law, human rights in Tibet has grown worse. The Chinese Government has refused any discussions with Tibetan leaders and has threatened to select Tibetan Buddhist leaders, in clear violation of international religious freedom and Tibetan Buddhist practices.

The new Tibet Policy and Support Act before us today writes into law U.S. policy that the succession or reincarnation of Buddhist leaders is a religious matter to be determined by the Tibetan Buddhist community alone.

Among other provisions, interference in the process of recognizing a successor or reincarnation of the Dalai Lama would result in targeted financial, economic, and visa-related sanctions.

When the Dalai Lama visited the Nation's capital in 2011, I introduced a resolution welcoming Tibet's spiritual leader and recognizing his lifelong commitment to world peace and human rights.

The Dalai Lama welcomed me into his home in 2008 as part of a congressional delegation led by Speaker NANCY PELOSI.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. HOULAHAN). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the additional time.

Tibetan children, monks, and exiles lined the streets to greet our delegation in 2008.

Our congressional visit heightened attention to continuing cultural genocide and brutality in Tibet. Our delegation had a meeting and lunch with the Nobel Prize-winning Dalai Lama and his government in exile.

The Dalai Lama and his people have nothing to fight with except their own nonviolent determination and the willingness of free people everywhere to raise their voices.

The Tibet Policy and Support Act before us today is important to convey and reinforce the understanding that the United States will never cease working to assure complete freedom for the Dalai Lama and his people.

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

Mr. PHILLIPS. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SUOZZI), my friend.

Mr. SUOZZI. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4331, the bipartisan Tibetan Policy and Support Act of 2019.

By voting for this legislation, we are standing with the Tibetans and their religious and cultural way of life that the Chinese Government is seeking to eliminate.

Since President Nixon went to China in 1971, most Americans have believed that with increased exposure to our economic system and to our system of democracy, the Chinese Government would become more like us. That simply hasn't happened.

Whether it is the Hong Kong students, Uighur Muslims, Christians, or Tibetan Buddhists, China does not support our way of life. It does not support religious liberty.

Freedom of religion is a fundamental freedom. We must raise our voices loud and clear for all that are harassed, imprisoned, tortured, persecuted, or killed seeking to live out their faith. An attack on religious freedom anywhere is an attack on religious freedom everywhere.

Chinese officials in Tibet continue to severely restrict religious freedom, speech, movement, and assembly. They continue to restrict access to the unique cultural environment of Tibet.

In July 2018, authorities displaced over 200 under-18-year-old monks from at least two monasteries in Tibet and forced them to attend government-run schools.

In October 2018, Chinese Communist Party officials opened a new political education camp to train Tibetans in Chinese Communist Party ideology, particularly grassroots party-building and antiseparatism.

International journalists have said that the isolation of Tibet is worse than that of North Korea, allowing the Chinese Government to conceal human rights abuses.

The aspirations of the Tibetan people for dignity and freedom are viewed by the Chinese Government as a direct threat to their existence as an authoritarian state.

Reeducation and surveillance methods pioneered in Tibet are being used to target the Uighurs in Xinjiang, where the Chinese Government has created a surveillance state unlike anything the world has ever seen.

The Chinese Communist Party's repugnant campaign to destroy the cultural and religious identities of Tibetans and Uighurs requires more than just words of condemnation. We must stand up to any country that restricts individual liberty and religious freedom.

This legislation would urge the administration to place economic or visa sanctions against Chinese officials who interfere with the process of recognizing the next Dalai Lama.

Chairman MCGOVERN and I hosted a townhall in Queens, New York, this past summer with the largest Tibetan diaspora community, and we learned of their inability to visit their families in Tibet.

This legislation will also direct the Department of State to establish a United States consulate in Lhasa, Tibet, to enable U.S. citizens better access to Tibet.

I am proud to be part of a legislative body that continues to advocate for Tibetans, for Uighurs, and for human rights and the rule of law in China.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 2 minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. SUOZZI. To quote the Dalai Lama: "Tragedy should be utilized as a source of strength. No matter what sort of difficulties, how painful experience is, if we lose hope, that's our real disaster."

The United States' strength is in our values, and our policies should not be separated from them. We must not lose hope.

□ 1445

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

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

The United States has a longstanding record of bipartisan support for the Tibetan people. Religious tolerance is an American principle, an American value, and one that we must express around the entire world.

I am pleased that we are moving forward with a measure today that updates United States policy so that we are not just continuing, but we are strengthening this support.

I hope all Members will join me today in supporting this important measure that shows our commitment to preserving Tibet's unique culture, lands, language, and religion.

I am also proud of the bipartisan work that this Chamber has passed on China human rights. This is the third bill this Chamber has passed in recent months, the Hong Kong Human Rights and Democracy Act, and now this bill on Tibet.

I urge support for this bill and passage in the Senate of each of these terribly important measures.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Again, I want to thank Chairman MCGOVERN for strengthening U.S. support for Tibet at this critical moment.

As the Tibetan community prepares for the Dalai Lama's succession, we must rein in the Communist Party's attempts to destroy the autonomy of Tibetan Buddhism.

I also want to thank the gentleman from Minnesota, and Speaker PELOSI for her strong support for human rights and religious liberties. The gentleman stood on the floor when we debated the Hong Kong Human Rights and Democracy Act. That is what we do as Americans: We defend freedom and we defend democracy. This Nation was formed upon the idea of religious freedom and religious liberty.

Under the Communist Party of China's rule, religion really doesn't exist. In fact, it almost prohibits religious freedom. It persecutes religious freedom. It kills religious freedom.

The Dalai Lama himself was exiled to India where he is today. The Communist Party of China is brutally murdering and oppressing the Tibetan people; oppressing religious freedom and liberty, oppressing the Uighurs where they sit in camps, as I speak, with no voice, and, yes, they suppress the Christian community as well.

So, again, I want to thank my friends on the other side of the aisle, and I thank Speaker PELOSI so much for supporting this legislation as we stood together to support Hong Kong and the people of Hong Kong.

We spoke earlier today about supporting the people of Iran against theocracy and oppression, and we support the Tibetan people in their effort to exercise their religious freedom and liberty.

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

Mr. PHILLIPS. Madam Speaker, I thank Ranking Member MCCAUL for his important words.

Madam Speaker, I am honored to yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), our distinguished Speaker of the House.

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for bringing this legislation to the floor.

I am pleased to follow the distinguished ranking member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Mr. MCCAUL. One of the joys of my service in Congress is to work in a bipartisan way on issues that relate to respecting human rights and religious freedom throughout the world.

I thank Mr. MCCAUL for his leadership and Chairman ELIOT ENGEL for his leadership in facilitating this all through the committee. I thank Mr. PHILLIPS for giving us access to the floor today.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the Tibetan Policy and Support Act of 2019, a strong, bipartisan and urgently needed legislation to strengthen America's commitment to the Tibetan people and their right to safeguard their distinct identity.

I salute Chairman JIM MCGOVERN, the chair of the Congressional-Executive Commission on China and chair of the Tom Lantos Human Rights Commission. I thank Mr. MCGOVERN for being a leading voice in Congress and in the country for human rights.

I thank Congressman CHRIS SMITH—the gentleman and I go back decades. He is the ranking member of the Congressional-Executive Commission on China, and also the co-chair of the Tom Lantos Human Rights Commission. I have worked with the gentleman for three decades to hold China accountable for its oppression, as well as for promoting human rights throughout the world. I thank Mr. SMITH for his leadership.

I also want to acknowledge Senator MARCO RUBIO for his leadership in the United States Senate. As we discussed, he has been on some of the issues we have talked about, supporting the people of Hong Kong, the Uighurs, and now this important legislation. I thank Senator MARCO RUBIO for his leadership and courage in facilitating some of this legislation through the Senate.

For many of us, the fight to protect human rights in China has been a long-term commitment, as I acknowledged with Mr. SMITH, as well as Frank Wolf, our former Member who worked with CHRIS SMITH so closely.

In 1987 when I first came to Congress, I heard Tom Lantos—we mentioned the Tom Lantos Human Rights Commission—he invited me to meet His Holiness the Dalai Lama to be in a small meeting with him. I heard His Holiness first describe his "Middle Way Approach" for Tibet. It was an approach about autonomy, not about independence.

So, when the Chinese say that it is about independence, that is not what it ever has been about as far as His Holiness' presentation on Capitol Hill or to the world.

Among other priorities, the Dalai Lama proposed that Tibet be allowed to be a zone of peace; that the Tibetan people's human rights be respected; and Tibet's natural environment be safeguarded.

He said: "The Tibetan people must once again be free to develop culturally, intellectually, economically and spiritually and to exercise basic democratic freedoms."

I just wanted to acknowledge that because he talks about Tibet's natural environment.

His Holiness was the first Nobel Laureate, the first winner of the Nobel Peace Prize to have presented in the testimonial his protection for the environment. It has been there for a long time. For many of us, the fight, again, has been a long time.

Twenty years after that meeting, in 2007, and in 2008, as Speaker of the House, I had the privilege of visiting Dharamshala. Our delegation was blessed to be received by His Holiness the Dalai Lama, and we had the opportunity to see the aspirations of the Tibetan people firsthand, especially in the eyes of the Tibetan schoolchildren we met.

It was a bipartisan delegation. We spoke to big crowds waving American flags. It was a beautiful thing. But it is important to note the children, the beautiful Tibetan children. In order for their children to be raised in the tradition of the Tibetan language, culture, and religion, parents had to send them from Tibet to India because, sadly, Tibetan aspirations of observing their culture are under threat because of brutal repression in Beijing. That was in 2008.

Then in 2015, along with Chairman MCGOVERN, the gentleman and I led the first congressional delegation in decades to enter Tibet. In Jokhang Temple, Potala Palace, and Sera Monastery, we again witnessed the deep faith of the Tibetan people and the beauty of their culture.

We also saw the Potemkin Village-like posturing of the Chinese regime. For example, they said: We are going to invite you to a family's home so you can see how Tibetan families thrive in their own culture, language, and religion.

So we go to the home—and you probably have never seen this in anybody's home—but they had a gigantic picture of President Xi in the living room. And then they talked about their grandchildren and that the daughter had taken them to school, and that is why they weren't there.

So, when the daughter then came back from so-called taking them to school, we said: Well, how are the children?

And she said: Children? What children?

They had these fake visits to homes to show us how they were respecting Tibetan culture.

And then years later in 2017, I led another bipartisan delegation, this time to Nepal in India, where we were blessed to be received by His Holiness the Dalai Lama again. We saw once more the beautiful children again waving American flags, but no closer to an autonomous Tibet.

Today, we are here to pass the Tibetan Policy and Support Act. In 2002, Congress passed the Tibetan Policy Act to support the aspirations of the Tibetan people to safeguard their distinct identity, as His Holiness had suggested.

But in the years since, China has cruelly accelerated its outrageous aggression against the Tibetan people. As the CECC, the Congressional-Executive Commission on China concluded in its most recent report, Beijing is increasing Sinicization efforts and restricting the religious freedom of Tibetan Buddhists, including with mandatory political education for religious leaders, large-scale evictions from Buddhist monasteries, and by replacing images of the His Holiness the Dalai Lama with past and current party leaders.

The report also concludes that Beijing is expanding a massive surveillance regime to intimidate Tibetans and prevent them from practicing their culture or observing their religion. We could see the cameras every place we went, especially near the monasteries.

Pursuing massive infrastructure projects—I have seen that over the years. And we fought some of this in the World Bank then with Chris Cox and others here then on the Republican side of the aisle, working together—pursuing massive infrastructure projects that violate the social, economic, and cultural rights of Tibetans, forcing scores of families from their homes and even detaining monks for peaceful protest.

And tightening access to Tibet for international visitors. International journalists have stated that the isolation of Tibet is worse than North Korea, allowing the Chinese Government to conceal human rights abuses and environmentally damaging large-scale projects.

Today, the House is taking action to update and strengthen the Tibetan Policy Act to address these growing threats.

We are supporting the Tibetan people's right to religious freedom and genuine autonomy by formally establishing a U.S. policy that the Tibetan Buddhist community has exclusive right to choose its religious leaders, including a future 15th Dalai Lama.

Imagine that the Chinese Government should think that they should be choosing the next Dalai Lama of the Tibetan Buddhists.

We are sending Beijing a clear signal that they will be held accountable for interfering in Tibet's religious and cultural affairs, making it clear that Chinese officials who meddle in the proc-

ess of recognizing the new Dalai Lama will be subject to targeted sanctions, including those in the Global Magnitsky Act.

We are protecting Tibet's environmental and cultural rights, working with international governments and the business community to ensure the self-sufficiency of the Tibetan people and protect the environment and water resources of the Tibetan Plateau. This is really very important to the sustainability of our planet.

This legislation also deploys America's diplomatic weight to encourage a genuine dialogue between Tibetan leaders and Beijing. It is unacceptable that the Chinese Government still refuses to enter into a dialogue with Tibetan leaders.

□ 1500

Congress will—and must—continue to take action to hold China accountable for its many abuses which sadly target so many, including the Uighur community—which Mr. MCCAUL and Mr. RUBIO in a bipartisan way had acted upon—which faces horrific human rights abuses, including forced sterilizations and the mass incarceration of millions. This is happening as we speak. Millions of people are subjected to this in China.

And, as we know, the current party chairman of the Uighur Autonomous Region, Secretary Chen, previously served as the top party official of the Tibetan Autonomous Region. So oppressive was he, they rewarded him by sending him to the Uighur Autonomous Region. That is so sad.

We also see human rights abuses, as we know, in Hong Kong, where millions are fighting for the democratic freedoms they were promised and, on the mainland, where journalists, human rights lawyers, Christians, and democracy advocates languish in jail cells.

Today, in the face of rising oppression in China, Congress has an urgent responsibility to act. Sikyong Dr. Lobsang Sangay, the President of the Central Tibetan Administration, has said that, "The very survival of Tibetan culture and identity is in peril." Madam Speaker, if we don't speak out for human rights in China because of commercial interests, then we lose all moral authority to speak out for human rights anywhere in the world.

As I have said on this floor to those who take the repressive Chinese Government's side, we ask: What does it profit a man to have gained the whole world and suffers the loss of his soul?

Madam Speaker, I urge a strong vote for this legislation and support the Tibetan people as they seek to defend their culture and their identity and to pursue a future of freedom of religion and dignity.

I thank, again, the members of the Foreign Affairs Committee for giving us the opportunity to talk about Tibet on the floor of the House today.

Repression in Tibet by the Chinese Government is a challenge to the conscience of the world. Let's take this step to address that challenge.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PHILLIPS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4331, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

KEEPING GIRLS IN SCHOOL ACT

Mr. PHILLIPS. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2153) to support empowerment, economic security, and educational opportunities for adolescent girls around the world, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2153

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the “Keeping Girls in School Act”.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

- Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
- Sec. 2. Appropriate congressional committees defined.
- Sec. 3. Findings.
- Sec. 4. Sense of Congress.
- Sec. 5. Secondary education for adolescent girls.
- Sec. 6. Global strategy requirement.
- Sec. 7. Transparency and reporting to Congress.

SEC. 2. APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.

In this Act, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

- (1) the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives; and
- (2) the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.

SEC. 3. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

- (1) Adolescence is a critical period in a girl’s life, when significant physical, emotional, and social changes shape her future.
- (2) Adolescent girls are particularly vulnerable to HIV/AIDS, child, early and forced marriage, and other forms of violence which are detrimental to their futures, as evidenced by the following statistics:

(A) Each year, 380,000 adolescent girls and young women become newly infected with HIV, more than 1,000 every day, and comprise the fastest-growing demographic for new infections in sub-Saharan Africa.

(B) Each year, 12,000,000 adolescent girls around the world are married before their 18th birthday, and more than 650,000,000 women alive today were married as children.

(C) Child marriages often interrupt schooling, limit opportunities, and impact the physical, psychological and social well-being

of such girls. If there is no reduction in child marriage, the global number of women married as children is projected to increase by 150,000,000 by 2030.

(D) One-quarter to one-half of girls in developing countries become mothers before the age of 18, and girls under 15 are five times more likely to die during childbirth than women in their 20s.

(3) Approximately 130,000,000 girls around the world are not in school, and millions more are failing to acquire basic reading, writing, and numeracy skills.

(4) Girls between the ages of 10 and 19 are three times more likely than boys to be kept out of school, particularly in countries affected by conflict.

(5) Due to discriminatory gender norms and expectations, disparities in access to safe and quality education manifest early in a girl’s life and continue to become more pronounced throughout adolescence.

(6) Girls living with disabilities are less likely to start school and transition to secondary school than boys living with disabilities and other children, and just 1 percent of women with disabilities are literate globally.

(7) While two-thirds of all countries have achieved gender parity in primary education, only 40 percent have achieved gender parity in secondary education.

(8) Adolescent girls who remain in school are more likely to live longer, marry later, have healthier children, and, as adults, earn an income to support their families, thereby contributing to the economic advancement of communities and nations.

(9) Since July 2015, more than 100 public-private partnerships have been formed between the United States Government and external partners to support innovative and community-led solutions in targeted countries, including Malawi and Tanzania, to ensure adolescent girls receive a quality education.

(10) The United States Global Strategy to Empower Adolescent Girls, published in March 2016, has brought together the Department of State, the United States Agency for International Development, the Peace Corps, and the Millennium Challenge Corporation, as well as other agencies and programs such as the President’s Emergency Fund for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR), to address the range of challenges preventing adolescent girls from attaining an inclusive and equitable quality education leading to relevant learning outcomes.

(11) According to the United States Global Strategy to Empower Adolescent Girls, which is the first foreign policy document in the world solely dedicated to the rights and empowerment of girls globally, “[w]hile the Millennium Development Goals improved outcomes for girls in primary education, they also highlighted the need for a targeted focus on adolescents and young adults, particularly regarding the transition to and completion of secondary school”.

(12) PEPFAR, through its DREAMS (Determined, Resilient, Empowered, AIDS-free, Mentored, and Safe) Initiative, has worked to address a number of the specific barriers to education that adolescent girls face.

SEC. 4. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) every child, regardless of place of birth, deserves an equal opportunity to access quality education;

(2) the United States has been a global leader in efforts to expand and improve educational opportunities for those who have been traditionally disenfranchised, particularly women and girls;

(3) gains with respect to girls’ secondary education and empowerment have been proven to correlate strongly with progress in

gender equality and women’s rights, as well as economic and social progress, and achieving gender equality should be a priority goal of United States foreign policy;

(4) achieving gender parity in both access to and quality of educational opportunity contributes significantly to economic growth and development, thereby lowering the risk for violence and instability; and

(5) education is a lifesaving humanitarian intervention that protects the lives, futures, and well-being of girls.

SEC. 5. SECONDARY EDUCATION FOR ADOLESCENT GIRLS.

(a) AUTHORITY.—The Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development may enter into acquisition, assistance, or results-based financing agreements, including agreements combining more than one such feature, for activities addressing the barriers described in subsection (b) that adolescent girls face in accessing a quality secondary education. Such activities shall—

(1) set outcome-based targets to demonstrate qualitative gains;

(2) use existing United States Government strategies and frameworks relevant to international basic education and gender equality, including evidence-based interventions, to—

(A) integrate new technologies and approaches, including to establish or continue public-private partnerships or to pilot the use of development impact bonds (the results of which are verified by an independent evaluation);

(B) to the greatest extent possible, apply quasi-experimental and scientific, research-based approaches;

(C) promote inclusive, equitable and sustainable educational achievement; and

(D) support a responsible transition to education systems that are sustainably financed by domestic governments; and

(3) ensure that schools provide safe and quality educational opportunities and create empowering environments, so that girls can enroll in and regularly attend school, successfully transition from primary to secondary school, and eventually graduate having achieved learning outcomes and positioned to make healthy transitions into adulthood.

(b) SPECIFIC BARRIERS.—The barriers described in this subsection include—

(1) harmful societal and cultural norms;

(2) lack of safety at school or traveling to school, including harassment and other forms of physical, sexual, or psychological violence;

(3) child, early, and forced marriage;

(4) female genital mutilation;

(5) distance from a secondary school;

(6) cost of secondary schooling, including fees, clothing, and supplies;

(7) inadequate sanitation facilities and products available at secondary schools;

(8) prioritization of boys’ secondary education;

(9) poor nutrition;

(10) early pregnancy and motherhood;

(11) HIV infection;

(12) disability;

(13) discrimination based on religious or ethnic identity; and

(14) heavy workload due to household tasks.

(c) COORDINATION AND OVERSIGHT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The United States Agency for International Development Senior Coordinator for International Basic Education Assistance, in coordination with the United States Agency for International Development Senior Coordinator for Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment and the Ambassador-at-Large for Global Women’s Issues

at the Department of State, shall be responsible for the oversight and coordination of all activities of the United States Government carried out under this section.

(2) **DEVELOPMENT OF AGREEMENTS.**—In the development of results-based financing agreements described in subsection (a), the Senior Coordinators shall consult with the United States Agency for International Development Innovation, Technology, and Research Hub or any successor center that is responsible for developing innovative tools and approaches to accelerate development impact.

(3) **COORDINATION WITH OTHER STRATEGIES.**—Activities carried out under this section shall also be carried out in coordination with—

(A) the United States Global Strategy to Empower Adolescent Girls described in section 6; and

(B) the United States Government Strategy on International Basic Education, including its objective to expand access to quality basic education for all, particularly marginalized and vulnerable populations.

(d) **ACCEPTANCE OF SOLICITATIONS FOR AWARDS.**—The Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development shall seek to accept solicitations for one or more awards, pursuant to the authority in subsection (a), to conduct activities under this section beginning not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(e) **MONITORING AND EVALUATION.**—The Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development shall seek to ensure that activities carried out under this section—

(1) employ rigorous monitoring and evaluation methodologies, including ex-post evaluation, to ensure that such activities demonstrably close the gap in gender parity for secondary education and improve the quality of education offered to adolescent girls;

(2) disaggregate all data collected and reported by age, gender, marital and motherhood status, disability, and urbanity, to the extent practicable and appropriate;

(3) adhere to the Policy Guidance on Promoting Gender Equality of the Department of State and the Gender Equality and Female Empowerment Policy of the United States Agency for International Development; and

(4) use, to the extent possible, indicators and methodologies identified by the Interagency Working Group for the Strategy on International Basic Education.

SEC. 6. GLOBAL STRATEGY REQUIREMENT.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 5 years thereafter for not less than 10 years, the Ambassador-at-Large for Global Women's Issues at the Department of State, in consultation with the Senior Coordinator for Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment and the Senior Coordinator for International Basic Education Assistance at the United States Agency for International Development, shall—

(1) review and update a United States global strategy to empower adolescent girls;

(2) provide a meaningful opportunity for public review and consultation on the strategy; and

(3) submit the strategy to the appropriate congressional committees.

(b) **INITIAL STRATEGY.**—For the purposes of this section, the “United States Global Strategy to Empower Adolescent Girls”, published in March 2016, shall be deemed to fulfill the initial requirement under subsection (a).

(c) **CONSULTATION REQUIRED.**—In reviewing and updating the strategy under subsection

(a), the Ambassador-at-Large for Global Women's Issues, the Senior Coordinator for Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment, and the Senior Coordinator for International Basic Education Assistance shall, as appropriate, consult with—

(1) the heads of relevant Federal departments and agencies their designees, as well as experts on adolescent girls, gender equality, and empowerment issues throughout the Federal Government;

(2) the appropriate congressional committees;

(3) representatives of United States civil society and multilateral organizations with demonstrated experience and expertise in empowering adolescent girls or promoting gender equality, including local civil society organizations and beneficiaries where possible; and

(4) local organizations and beneficiaries in countries receiving assistance pursuant to the strategy, including youth and adolescent girls' organizations.

SEC. 7. TRANSPARENCY AND REPORTING TO CONGRESS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and biennially thereafter for 10 years until each activity initiated pursuant to the authorities under this Act has concluded, the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, in coordination with the Secretary of State, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report describing—

(1) the activities initiated under the authorities provided in this Act; and

(2) the manner and extent to which such activities are monitored and evaluated, in accordance with section 5(e).

(b) **AVAILABILITY.**—The report required by subsection (a) shall be made available on a text-based, searchable, and publicly available website of the United States Agency for International Development.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PHILLIPS) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PHILLIPS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2153.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the Keeping Girls in School Act, and I want to thank my dear friend and colleague, Representative LOIS FRANKEL, for her hard work on this bill.

Access to education should not depend on whether a child is a boy or a girl. Yet around the world, 130 million girls are kept out of school. Fifteen million girls of primary school age will never enter a classroom.

Think of what that means for their futures and for their ability to lead prosperous lives.

We know what a difference just a few years of school makes. On average,

when a girl in the developing world receives 7 years of education, she marries 4 years later and has fewer children. Better educated women tend to be healthier and live longer, and women with secondary school education earn almost twice as much as those with no education at all.

When women and girls have access to education, they lift up their entire communities. In societies that make strides in education equality, we see better health outcomes, improved economic well-being, and greater security for everyone. That is why getting more girls in classrooms should be a foreign policy priority of the United States of America. It is the right thing to do. It also helps drive stability and prosperity in the long run.

But today, too many still face barriers like harassment, early marriage, disabilities, and lack of access to hygiene. These barriers conspire against girls succeeding, particularly adolescent girls.

This bill highlights those barriers to keeping girls in school all around the world and requires USAID to support activities addressing them throughout their existing work and into the future.

I am very proud to support H.R. 2153, and I am grateful to Members on both sides of the aisle for helping push it forward.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Keeping Girls in School Act.

I want to thank Representative FRANKEL and Representative BROOKS for their leadership on this legislation.

The United States has been a global leader in funding programs to support women and girls from around the world. We recognize the importance of empowering women to succeed, and that starts with receiving an education.

This legislation codifies the existing U.S. strategy to empower adolescent girls, which coordinates efforts between the Department of State, USAID, the Millennium Challenge Corporation, the Peace Corps, and PEPFAR to ensure that our development assistance programs are addressing barriers to girls' attendance in schools. It also supports efforts to ensure girls receive a quality secondary education and have the support necessary to stay in school.

We know that when women and girls are educated and supported, they are more likely to invest in their families and in their communities.

Last year, I was honored to travel to Cote d'Ivoire to launch the Women's Global Development and Prosperity Initiative alongside Ivanka Trump and a Senate delegation. W-GDP seeks to reach 50 million women in the developing world by 2025 through efforts to empower and enable women to be entrepreneurs and productive members of the workforce.

I was also proud to be a cosponsor of the Women's Entrepreneurship and Economic Empowerment Act which was signed into law last year. We must continue our bipartisan efforts to ensure United States' support for women and girls around the world is strong.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the Keeping Girls in School Act, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Madam Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. FRANKEL), who is the author of this important bill and my dear friend.

Ms. FRANKEL. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend from Minnesota for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I want to start by thanking my very good friend, SUSAN BROOKS. Over the past 7 years together we have been involved in many efforts to advance women and girls. It is an honor to work with the gentlewoman.

I thank my other colleagues for the support to bring this bill to the floor. It is a bipartisan, bicameral bill. It is sponsored by Senators MURKOWSKI and SHAHEEN in the Senate. It is called the Keeping Girls in School Act.

Madam Speaker, I am going to start with a question:

Why should Americans even care that there are 130 million girls around the world who are kept out of school?

That a young girl in a Malawi village is too frightened to walk miles to a secondary school for fear of sexual assault?

Or that a 12-year-old girl in Mozambique is forced to marry and denied schooling?

Or that hundreds of girls are kidnapped from school by Boko Haram terrorists who believe women should be cooks or sex slaves?

Or care about the 14-year-old in Pakistan, Malala Yousafzai, shot in the head by the Taliban because she wanted girls to be educated?

So why should Americans care that there are 130 million girls around the world who are kept out of school?

Madam Speaker, there are 130 million reasons to care. According to the Malala Fund, the international nonprofit organization that fights for girl's education, cofounded by Malala, girls' education strengthens economies and creates jobs. Millions of girls being educated means there are more working women with the potential to add up to trillions of dollars in global growth.

When girls are educated, communities are more stable and can recover faster from conflict. Extremism grows alongside inequality. When a country gives all its children secondary education they cut their risk of war in half.

Educated girls are healthier citizens who raise healthier families. They are less likely to marry young or to contract HIV, and they are more likely to have healthy, educated children. Each additional year of school a girl completes cuts both infant mortality and child marriage rates.

Madam Speaker, when the Keeping Girls in School Act is put into full force, it will mean that countries where girls are educated will be more peaceful, making violent conflicts less likely and countries more prosperous, allowing them to be more self-reliant and participate in international trade. This means a safer and more economically vibrant world.

The Keeping Girls in School Act recognizes the progress made in closing the gender gap for primary education in developing countries like Vietnam, Tunisia, and Nepal, and recognizes that we must do more to advance our young girls around the world.

This legislation focuses on the unique obstacles keeping adolescent girls from accessing quality education at the secondary level. It will give USAID innovative tools and new funding mechanisms to address and reduce barriers that keep girls out of school—barriers like female genital mutilation, sexual violence, HIV infection, family obligations, and lack of safety.

This legislation would also codify and require updates to the U.S. Global Strategy to Empower Adolescent Girls, bringing together civil society organizations, the private sector, and governments around the world to prepare girls to become the leaders of tomorrow.

I am going to end today, Madam Speaker, by paraphrasing a poem about a young girl's plea to her father in Kenya. It goes something like this:

Father says to her: You are grown up, and I am going to marry you off.

I say: I don't want a husband.

Our fathers say: A daughter is good because we marry her off and we get a crate of beer.

Our mothers say: A daughter is good; the bridegroom will surely buy us presents.

And I, the daughter, say: Mother, father, give me an education because a husband without an education is nothing.

Father, look at other communities that have educated their daughters and reap good fruit.

Father says: I will take my beloved sons to school and my beloved daughters will look after the cattle.

I say: O, father, let the daughter go to school.

Educating a girl is educating a nation.

Misery will surely be a thing of the past.

And goodness will spread like a good aroma. Let's surely then educate the daughter.

Madam Speaker, when our daughters are educated, the world will change for the better.

I urge support of this very good bill, the Keeping Girls in School Act.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. BROOKS), who is the lead Republican cosponsor of this bill.

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 2153, the Keeping Girls in School Act.

I want to thank my very good friend from Florida, Representative FRANKEL, for championing this incredibly important legislation, and also my colleague, Representative MCCAUL of Texas, for

helping ensure that this was through the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

I am the mother of a daughter, and from birth I let her know that she could be anything she wanted to be. If she wanted to be a lawyer, a doctor, a nurse, a teacher, or an engineer, she could do whatever she wanted.

We all know too well that many girls around the world are not so lucky. As my good friend, Representative FRANKEL, just talked about, Malala of Pakistan was shot at the age of 15 returning from school. I am very proud that the Children's Museum of Indianapolis in my home of Indianapolis will be inducting her into the Power of Children Exhibit, because she has fought for the human rights of girls and children being able to go to school.

She was shot returning from school, and the Malala Fund is now focusing on her activism and trying to make sure that girls have the right to go to school.

As we have learned, 130 million girls don't have the opportunity to go to school, and it is impossible for them to consider their big dreams and goals. So this bill is about breaking down these barriers that women and girls face in attending and staying in school.

□ 1515

We know that the evidence has already shown, if we can keep girls in secondary education, it can boost economies of low- and middle-income nations by as much as \$92 billion, annually. It can cut childhood deaths by 50 percent, annually. It can reduce violent conflict in countries, and it can reduce child marriage by 66 percent, annually.

Studies show that girls between the ages of 10 and 19 are three times more likely than boys to be kept out of school, particularly in these countries where there is so much conflict. Yet, if we keep girls in school past fourth grade—and we are trying to get them through high school—we know that their wages will rise, their countries will be better, their communities will be better.

With our foreign investments, why wouldn't we want to take all of the incredible aid that we provide and make sure that there are strategies in place to make sure that girls get education?

This bill outlines that inexhaustible list of 14 barriers that keep girls from entering and remaining in secondary school. So let's bring together the State Department, USAID, Peace Corps, Millennium Challenge, and PEPFAR to address those challenges.

We know that young girls like Malala, who is leading the way, is a child who is so powerful in her voice because of what she went through. We know that, when girls succeed, nations and our world will succeed.

Madam Speaker, thank you, and I urge passage.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. HOULAHAN),

my friend and colleague on the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Ms. HOULAHAN. Madam Speaker, when I rise for women and girls around the world, I do so with the awareness that the barriers that we face do not exist in a vacuum, that a woman's right to education, to bodily autonomy, and to self-determination are all connected. To combat these barriers, we must enact comprehensive legislation that relies on years of data, studies, and advocacy efforts to establish a truly equal world across gender lines.

According to UN Women, every additional year of primary school increases girls' eventual wages by 10 to 20 percent. It also encourages them to marry later, to have fewer children, and leaves them less vulnerable to violence.

In our effort to achieve gender parity, it is crucial that we work with international partners and global organizations that are making great progress on this issue. Initiatives like the U.N. Joint Program to End Child Marriage are looking at this issue holistically, with the understanding that social protection, health, education, and social and behavioral change must all be addressed in order to spark sustainable changes for women and girls around the world. That is why I co-sponsored the Keeping Girls in School Act, which would empower girls by increasing their educational opportunities and economic security.

Girls and women deserve to be educated, to be economically independent, and to be the deciders of their own fate, and that is what we believe in the United States, and that is what we need to fight for in all corners of this world. I encourage all of my colleagues on both sides of this aisle to join me and to take a stand for women and girls across the globe.

The first step on the path to a more peaceful world starts with the empowerment of women and girls. A vote for the Keeping Girls in School Act is a vote for equality, for empowerment, and for a safer and more prosperous world for us all.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Speaker, yesterday in this Chamber we honored the life of a dear friend of mine, a colleague I came into the Congress with in 2005, Michael Fitzpatrick, and it was quite an honor to know him and to call him my friend. With that, I want to yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK), his brother and a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Madam Speaker, I want to thank my friend and my colleague, Mr. MCCAUL, for yielding and for his kind words and for his friendship.

Madam Speaker, first, I want to thank the entire committee, including yourself, Madam Speaker, Representative FRANKEL, and Representative BROOKS, for all of your and their work on this very, very important issue.

As a co-chair of the bipartisan International Basic Education Caucus, I want to join with all of our colleagues today to voice our strong support for H.R. 2153, the Keeping Girls in School Act, a bill that many of us helped introduce.

Today, as was echoed earlier, many girls worldwide are not in school, and this bill will work to close the gender gap between boys and girls and work to keep girls in school through the high school level, when girls are at the highest risk of dropping out.

This is a commitment of the U.S. to support programs, policies, and resources to help vulnerable girls stay in school. This bill will provide results-based aid grants, lower the cost of secondary education, and make sure that schools are safe for all of our children.

We must work to ensure that girls in every country are able to stay in school so that we can empower them in order to reduce poverty and create safer, healthier communities. The Keeping Girls in School Act will help reduce barriers girls around the world face when trying to remain in school and help them access more opportunities.

Madam Speaker, the top line summary of H.R. 2153 states this bill is "to support empowerment, economic security, and educational opportunities for adolescent girls around the world." However, this bill will do much more than that. This bill provides opportunity. This bill provides hope. This bill will give some of our most vulnerable a chance to succeed.

As Madam Speaker said earlier, we need to be a voice for the voiceless. And, Madam Speaker, I want to thank you for doing just that, yourself and Representative BROOKS, because these 130 million girls, they need a voice, and we are going to be that voice for them here today.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WALTZ), a distinguished member of the United States military who served our country so well overseas in some very dangerous places.

Mr. WALTZ. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of this important legislation.

Every child deserves access to a quality education—every child—and, unfortunately, that is not always the case for girls around the world. Adolescent girls, in particular, are most at risk of dropping out of school.

Worldwide, there are about 61 million girls between the ages of 6 and 14 who are not in school, and that is unacceptable. It is just unacceptable.

Madam Speaker, as a Green Beret who has operated all over the world, I have seen this up close and personal. I have seen this firsthand. I can tell you this from my experiences: I know firsthand that, where women thrive in business, where women thrive in civil society, in politics, and in government, extremism doesn't. That is it. Where women thrive in all of those places, the extremists do not.

So this isn't just an economic issue, although that is a very important one, or a humanitarian issue. This is a national security issue—for the United States of America, for the Western world, for the entire world.

For me, in one of my combat tours in Afghanistan, an Afghan elder I knew, whom I developed a relationship with throughout this tour, in every meeting kept talking about his secret weapon, his secret weapon. This was how we were going to defeat the Taliban and defeat the extremists, with this secret weapon.

I finally demanded to see this secret weapon. It wasn't a missile. It wasn't a weapon, per se, at all. It was his teenage daughters. That was his secret weapon. What he was doing was he was sneaking them out of Afghanistan and over to India to be trained as a lawyer and a doctor.

He pointed to them and said: Commander MIKE, this is how we are going to defeat the extremists. This is how we are going to win.

So I echo my colleagues who have mentioned the hero Malala Yousafzai. My favorite quote from her is: "Extremists have shown what frightens them most: a girl with a book."

So as a father of a young woman who is here with me today on the floor, about to turn 16, this is personal for me. This legislation is especially important to me. And every girl around the world, like her, deserves the chance to attend school and access a proper education. This legislation is a critical step in increasing these opportunities for young women, globally.

I want to commend my colleague and fellow Floridian, Madam Speaker, Representative FRANKEL, for her leadership on this issue. I also want to thank Ivanka Trump for her leadership.

Girls' education and women's empowerment should not be a partisan issue at all. It is an American issue. It is one of leadership, and it is one of human rights, of basic human rights.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

We have heard some really powerful testimony about the rights and the role of women throughout the world, and I think back to my own time as a counterterrorism Federal prosecutor, to chairman of the Homeland Security Committee, and now my role on the Foreign Affairs Committee. Where women are oppressed, democracy and freedom is oppressed. Where extremism exists, the rights of women are denied.

I also want to thank you, Madam Speaker, Ms. FRANKEL, for your leadership in bringing this bill to the floor.

It is a national security issue. I really view it that way because, where women are empowered, we don't have extremism.

Chairman ENGEL and I will be at the Canadian Embassy this night talking about the Global Fragility Act and the ONE Campaign and Bono's efforts to

stabilize the world, stabilize this whole region from extremism. What we found, whether it was Boko Haram taking 270 Catholic grade school girls hostage, to the Taliban raining down on educated women or women trying to get an education, to the story of Ms. Yousafzai, to killing women in the streets, it is absolutely unacceptable.

I am proud today that we stand as Americans and not as partisans standing for the rights of young women. I have four daughters myself, and they live in freedom, and they know education is important. But women around the world deserve this right. Regardless of where you are born, women and girls around the world deserve this right.

We have seen it from Afghanistan, to the Sahel, to Pakistan and, really, all over the world. I think the number, 130 million. I love the quote that the biggest threat to extremism is a girl with a book. That is what we are going to change.

Madam Speaker, thank you for your boldness and your courage and leadership in bringing this to the floor, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume for the purpose of closing.

Madam Speaker, I want to thank you, Congresswoman FRANKEL, for your hard work on this measure. You have been a tireless advocate for women and girls here at home and all around the world.

I also want to thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WALTZ), my colleague, who had brought his daughter here to the floor moments ago in a heartwarming gesture. I, too, am a father of two extraordinary daughters, Daniela and Pia. They have received the blessings of education and know how lucky they are. They, like me and like so many of us here in the U.S. House of Representatives, know how important it is to extend that same blessing to every girl around the world. That is why this is one of those areas in which American leadership is vitally important.

The benefits of supporting education for women and girls are as clear as can be. But more than that, helping more people live up to their potential and to pursue their dreams is a great reflection of our values, the values that should be at the very center of American foreign policy. Girls' education must be made a strategic development priority.

This is a good measure, which I am pleased to support, and I urge all of my colleagues to do the same.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. FRANKEL). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PHILLIPS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2153, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the

rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3621, STUDENT BORROWER CREDIT IMPROVEMENT ACT, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF THE SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 550, MERCHANT MARINERS OF WORLD WAR II CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL ACT OF 2019

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 811) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3621) to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act to remove adverse information for certain defaulted or delinquent private education loan borrowers who demonstrate a history of loan repayment, and for other purposes, and providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 550) to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the United States Merchant Mariners of World War II, in recognition of their dedicated and vital service during World War II, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on:

Adoption of House Resolution 811, if ordered; and

The motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 4331.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 227, nays 184, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 25]
YEAS—227

Adams	Clay	Espallat
Aguilar	Cleaver	Evans
Allred	Clyburn	Finkenauer
Axne	Cohen	Fletcher
Barragán	Cooper	Foster
Bass	Correa	Frankel
Beatty	Costa	Fudge
Bera	Courtney	Gallego
Beyer	Cox (CA)	Garamendi
Bishop (GA)	Craig	García (IL)
Blumenauer	Crist	García (TX)
Blunt Rochester	Crow	Golden
Bonamici	Cuellar	Gomez
Boyle, Brendan	Cunningham	Gonzalez (TX)
F.	Dauids (KS)	Gottheimer
Brindisi	Davis (CA)	Green, Al (TX)
Brown (MD)	Davis, Danny K.	Grijalva
Brownley (CA)	Dean	Haaland
Bustos	DeFazio	Harder (CA)
Butterfield	DeGette	Hastings
Carbajal	DeLauro	Hayes
Cárdenas	DeBene	Higgins (NY)
Carson (IN)	Delgado	Himes
Cartwright	Demings	Horn, Kendra S.
Case	DeSaunier	Horsford
Casten (IL)	Deutch	Houlahan
Castor (FL)	Dingell	Hoyer
Castro (TX)	Doggett	Huffman
Chu, Judy	Doyle, Michael	Jackson Lee
Cicilline	F.	Jayapal
Cisneros	Engel	Jeffries
Clark (MA)	Escobar	Johnson (GA)
Clarke (NY)	Eshoo	Johnson (TX)

Kaptur	Morelle	Scott (VA)
Keating	Moulton	Scott, David
Kelly (IL)	Mucarsel-Powell	Serrano
Kennedy	Murphy (FL)	Sewell (AL)
Khanna	Nadler	Shalala
Kildee	Napolitano	Sherman
Kilmer	Neal	Sherrill
Kim	Neguse	Sires
Kind	Norcross	Slotkin
Krishnamoorthi	O'Halleran	Smith (WA)
Kuster (NH)	Ocasio-Cortez	Soto
Lamb	Omar	Spanberger
Langevin	Pallone	Speier
Larsen (WA)	Panetta	Stanton
Larson (CT)	Pappas	Stevens
Lawrence	Pascrell	Suozi
Lawson (FL)	Payne	Swalwell (CA)
Lee (CA)	Perlmutter	Takano
Lee (NV)	Peters	Thompson (CA)
Levin (CA)	Peterson	Thompson (MS)
Levin (MI)	Phillips	Titus
Lewis	Pingree	Tlaib
Lieu, Ted	Pocan	Tonko
Lipinski	Porter	Torres (CA)
Loeb sack	Pressley	Torres Small
Lofgren	Price (NC)	(NM)
Lowenthal	Quigley	Trahan
Lowe	Raskin	Trone
Luján	Rice (NY)	Underwood
Luria	Richmond	Vargas
Lynch	Rose (NY)	Veasey
Malinowski	Rouda	Vela
Maloney,	Roybal-Allard	Velázquez
Carolyn B.	Ruiz	Visclosky
Maloney, Sean	Ruppersberger	Wasserman
Matsui	Rush	Schultz
McAdams	Ryan	Waters
McBath	Sánchez	Watson Coleman
McCollum	Sarbanes	Welch
McEachin	Scanlon	Wexton
McGovern	Schakowsky	Wild
McNerney	Schiff	Wilson (FL)
Meeks	Schneider	Yarmuth
Meng	Schrader	
Moore	Schrier	

NAYS—184

Abraham	Fortenberry	Marchant
Aderholt	Foxx (NC)	Marshall
Allen	Fulcher	Massie
Amash	Gaetz	Mast
Amodei	Gallagher	McCarthy
Arrington	Gianforte	McCaul
Babin	Gibbs	McClintock
Bacon	Gohmert	McHenry
Baird	Gonzalez (OH)	McKinley
Balderson	Gooden	Meadows
Banks	Gosar	Meuser
Barr	Graves (GA)	Miller
Bergman	Graves (LA)	Mitchell
Biggs	Graves (MO)	Moolenaar
Billirakis	Green (TN)	Mooney (WV)
Bishop (NC)	Griffith	Murphy (NC)
Bishop (UT)	Grothman	Newhouse
Bost	Guest	Norman
Brady	Guthrie	Nunes
Brooks (AL)	Hagedorn	Olson
Brooks (IN)	Harris	Palazzo
Buchanan	Hartzler	Palmer
Buck	Hern, Kevin	Pence
Bucshon	Herrera Beutler	Perry
Budd	Hice (GA)	Posey
Burchett	Hill (AR)	Ratcliffe
Burgess	Holding	Reed
Calvert	Hollingsworth	Reschenthaler
Carter (GA)	Hudson	Rice (SC)
Carter (TX)	Huizenga	Riggleman
Chabot	Hurd (TX)	Roby
Cheney	Johnson (LA)	Rodgers (WA)
Cline	Johnson (OH)	Roe, David P.
Cloud	Johnson (SD)	Rogers (KY)
Cole	Jordan	Rose, John W.
Comer	Joyce (OH)	Rouzer
Conaway	Joyce (PA)	Roy
Cook	Katko	Rutherford
Crawford	Keller	Scallise
Crenshaw	Kelly (PA)	Schweikert
Curtis	King (IA)	Scott, Austin
Davidson (OH)	King (NY)	Sensenbrenner
Davis, Rodney	Kustoff (TN)	Shimkus
DesJarlais	LaHood	Simpson
Diaz-Balart	LaMalfa	Smith (MO)
Duncan	Lamborn	Smith (NE)
Dunn	Latta	Smith (NJ)
Emmer	Lesko	Smucker
Ferguson	Long	Spano
Fitzpatrick	Loudermilk	Stauber
Fleischmann	Lucas	Stefanik
Flores	Luetkemeyer	Steube

Stewart
Taylor
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Timmons
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Wagner
Walberg

NOT VOTING—18

Armstrong
Byrne
Collins (GA)
Connolly
Estes
Gabbard

□ 1601

Messrs. KHANNA and PETERS changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. LEE of California). The question is on the resolution.

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

Mr. WOODALL. Madam 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 223, nays 189, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 26]

YEAS—223

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Axne
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brindisi
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Cunningham
Davids (KS)
Davis (CA)

Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Españillat
Evans
Finkenauer
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel
Fudge
Gallego
Garamendi
García (IL)
García (TX)
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Haaland
Harder (CA)
Hastings
Hayes
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Horn, Kendra S.
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Kaptur

Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Wright
Yoho
Young
Zeldin

Mullin
Rogers (AL)
Rooney (FL)
Steil
Stivers
Van Drew

Norcross
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rose (NY)
Rouda
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Bishop (UT)
Bost
Brady
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Kim
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Cole
Comer
Conaway
Cook
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
Davidson (OH)
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxx (NC)
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Golden
Gonzalez (OH)

Byrne
Collins (GA)
Estes
Gabbard
Granger
Heck

Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Sanchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stanton
Stevens
Suozi

NAYS—189

Gooden
Gosar
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harris
Hartzler
Hern, Kevin
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Hill (AR)
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hurd (TX)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Burgess
Katko
Keller
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamb
Lamborn
Latta
Lesko
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luria
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Waltz
Watkins
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Wright
Yoho
Young
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—17

Higgins (LA)
Kelly (MS)
Kinzinger
Kirkpatrick
Mullin
Rogers (AL)

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
Weston
Wild
Wilson (FL)

Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Riggleman
Roby
Rodgers (WA)
Roe, David P.
Rogers (KY)
Rose, John W.
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sherrill
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spano
Staubert
Stefanik
Steube
Stewart
Taylor
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Timmons
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Waltz
Watkins
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Wright
Yoho
Young
Zeldin

□ 1610

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.

TIBETAN POLICY AND SUPPORT ACT OF 2019

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4331) to modify and reauthorize the Tibetan Policy Act of 2002, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PHILLIPS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 392, nays 22, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 27]

YEAS—392

Abraham	Cleaver	Fudge
Adams	Cline	Fulcher
Aderholt	Clyburn	Gallagher
Aguilar	Cohen	Gallego
Allen	Cole	Garamendi
Allred	Comer	García (IL)
Amodei	Conaway	García (TX)
Armstrong	Connolly	Gianforte
Arrington	Cook	Gibbs
Axne	Cooper	Golden
Bacon	Correa	Gomez
Baird	Costa	Gonzalez (OH)
Balderson	Courtney	Gonzalez (TX)
Banks	Cox (CA)	Gottheimer
Barr	Craig	Graves (GA)
Barragán	Crawford	Graves (LA)
Bass	Crenshaw	Graves (MO)
Beatty	Crist	Green (TN)
Bera	Crow	Green, Al (TX)
Bergman	Cuellar	Griffith
Beyer	Cunningham	Grijalva
Bilirakis	Curtis	Grothman
Bishop (GA)	Davids (KS)	Guest
Bishop (UT)	Davis (CA)	Guthrie
Blumenauer	Davis, Danny K.	Haaland
Blunt Rochester	Davis, Rodney	Hagedorn
Bonamici	Dean	Harder (CA)
Boyle, Brendan F.	DeFazio	Hartzler
Brady	DeGette	Hastings
Brindisi	DeLauro	Hayes
Brown (MD)	DelBene	Hern, Kevin
Brownley (CA)	Delgado	Herrera Beutler
Bustos	Demings	Higgins (NY)
Butterfield	DeSaulnier	Hill (AR)
Carbajal	DesJarlais	Himes
Cárdenas	Deutch	Holding
Carson (IN)	Diaz-Balart	Hollingsworth
Cartwright	Dingell	Horn, Kendra S.
Case	Doggett	Horsford
Casten (IL)	Doyle, Michael F.	Houlahan
Castor (FL)	Duncan	Hoyer
Castro (TX)	Dunn	Hudson
Chu, Judy	Emmer	Huffman
Cicilline	Engel	Huizenga
Cisneros	Escobar	Hurd (TX)
Clark (MA)	Eshoo	Jackson Lee
Clarke (NY)	Españillat	Jayapal
Clay	Evans	Jeffries
Cleaver	Ferguson	Johnson (GA)
Clyburn	Finkenauer	Johnson (LA)
Cohen	Fletcher	Johnson (OH)
Connolly	Flores	Johnson (SD)
Cooper	Fortenberry	Johnson (TX)
Correa	Foster	Jordan
Costa	Foxx (NC)	Joyce (OH)
Courtney	Frankel	Joyce (PA)
Cox (CA)		Kaptur
Craig		Katko
Crist		Keating
Crow		
Cuellar		
Cunningham		
Davids (KS)		
Davis (CA)		

Keller	Murphy (FL)	Shimkus
Kelly (IL)	Murphy (NC)	Simpson
Kelly (PA)	Nadler	Sires
Kennedy	Napolitano	Slotkin
Khanna	Neal	Smith (MO)
Kildee	Neguse	Smith (NE)
Kilmer	Newhouse	Smith (NJ)
Kim	Norcross	Smith (WA)
Kind	Nunes	Smucker
King (IA)	O'Halleran	Soto
King (NY)	Ocasio-Cortez	Spanberger
Krishnamoorthi	Olson	Spano
Kuster (NH)	Omar	Speier
Kustoff (TN)	Palazzo	Stanton
LaHood	Pallone	Staubert
LaMalfa	Palmer	Stefanik
Lamb	Panetta	Stevens
Lamborn	Pappas	Stewart
Langevin	Pascrell	Suozi
Larsen (WA)	Payne	Swalwell (CA)
Larson (CT)	Pelosi	Takano
Latta	Pence	Taylor
Lawrence	Perlmutter	Thompson (CA)
Lawson (FL)	Perry	Thompson (MS)
Lee (CA)	Peters	Thompson (PA)
Lee (NV)	Peterson	Thornberry
Lesko	Phillips	Timmons
Levin (CA)	Pingree	Tipton
Levin (MI)	Pocan	Titus
Lewis	Porter	Tlaib
Lieu, Ted	Posey	Tonko
Lipinski	Pressley	Torres (CA)
Loeback	Price (NC)	Torres Small
Lofgren	Quigley	(NM)
Long	Raskin	Trahan
Loudermilk	Ratcliffe	Trone
Lowenthal	Reed	Turner
Lowe	Reschenthaler	Underwood
Lucas	Rice (NY)	Upton
Luetkemeyer	Richmond	Vargas
Lujan	Riggleman	Veasey
Luria	Roby	Vela
Lynch	Rodgers (WA)	Velázquez
Malinowski	Roe, David P.	Visclosky
Maloney,	Rogers (KY)	Wagner
Carolyn B.	Rose (NY)	Walberg
Maloney, Sean	Rose, John W.	Walden
Marchant	Rouda	Walker
Marshall	Rouzer	Walorski
Mast	Roybal-Allard	Waltz
Matsui	Ruiz	Wasserman
McAdams	Ruppersberger	Schultz
McBath	Rush	Waters
McCarthy	Rutherford	Watkins
McCauley	Ryan	Watson Coleman
McClintock	Sánchez	Webster (FL)
McCollum	Sarbanes	Welch
McEachin	Scalise	Wenstrup
McGovern	Scanlon	Westerman
McHenry	Schakowsky	Wexton
McKinley	Schiff	Wild
McNerney	Schneider	Williams
Meadows	Schrader	Wilson (FL)
Meeks	Schrier	Wilson (SC)
Meng	Schweikert	Wittman
Meuser	Scott (VA)	Womack
Miller	Scott, Austin	Woodall
Mitchell	Scott, David	Wright
Moolenaar	Sensenbrenner	Yarmuth
Mooney (WV)	Serrano	Yoho
Moore	Sewell (AL)	Young
Morelle	Shalala	Zeldin
Moulton	Sherman	
Mucarsel-Powell	Sherrill	

NAYS—22

Amash	Cloud	Massie
Babin	Davidson (OH)	Norman
Biggs	Gaetz	Rice (SC)
Bishop (NC)	Gohmert	Roy
Brooks (AL)	Gooden	Steube
Buck	Gosar	Weber (TX)
Budd	Harris	
Burgess	Hice (GA)	

NOT VOTING—16

Byrne	Higgins (LA)	Rooney (FL)
Collins (GA)	Kelly (MS)	Steil
Estes	Kinzinger	Stivers
Gabbard	Kirkpatrick	Van Drew
Granger	Mullin	
Heck	Rogers (AL)	

□ 1619

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Madam Speaker, I was absent today due to a medical emergency. Had I been present, I would have voted: "yea" on rollcall No. 25, "yea" on rollcall No. 26 and "yea" on rollcall No. 27.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ESTES. Madam Speaker, I was not present for Roll Call vote No. 25 on Ordering the Previous Question, as Amended, Providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3621) Student Borrower Credit Improvement Act, and providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 550) Merchant Mariners of World War II Congressional Gold Medal Act. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

Madam Speaker, I was not present for Roll Call vote No. 26 on Agreeing to the Resolution, as Amended, Providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3621) Student Borrower Credit Improvement Act, and providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 550) Merchant Mariners of World War II Congressional Gold Medal Act. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

Madam Speaker, I was not present for Roll Call vote No. 27 on Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass, as Amended. Tibetan Policy and Support Act. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

PROVIDING FOR A JOINT SESSION OF CONGRESS TO RECEIVE A MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I send to the desk a privileged concurrent resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON RES. 86

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Tuesday, February 4, 2020, at 9 p.m., for the purpose of receiving such communication as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOMENT OF SILENCE HONORING VICTIMS OF THE KOBE BRYANT HELICOPTER CRASH

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

Mr. ROUDA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in solidarity with the California delegation to speak about the terrible loss our community has endured and to honor the lives of those who perished on Sunday.

We are all heartbroken by the loss of life, as this week our neighbors lost parents, children, friends, coaches, and

heroes in a horrific accident: Alyssa, Keri, and John Altobelli; Gianna and Kobe Bryant; Payton and Sarah Chester; Christina Mauser; and Ara Zobayan.

They were all connected by a love of the game, a steadfast belief in sports being bigger than a score, more than just an hour or two on the court.

The parents we lost knew all too well that the early morning wake-ups, sweaty car rides, and late nights in a gym were worth the lessons they instilled in their children: teamwork, dedication, and faith.

Our community lost kids who were overflowing with promise; kids who were great competitors and even better friends; kids you could count on, on and off the court; kids who pushed themselves to be more and who were the best daughters that any parent could ask for.

All of us wish they could play another game.

Orange County is grieving, but we will find solace and purpose in the example they left behind and the belief in something bigger than ourselves.

I ask that in Orange County and across our Nation, we think of the lives lost, in neighborhood basketball courts, school gyms, NBA arenas, and wherever the game is played.

May God bless their families, and may our community come together to offer them this support in this trying time.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS), my distinguished colleague.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I stand today on behalf of all Californians; certainly, the entire city of Los Angeles; and millions of fans worldwide who are mourning the sudden and tragic loss of one of the greatest athletes we have ever known: Kobe Bryant.

Celebrated as a king in Los Angeles, Kobe's death is deeply painful for our city and his millions of fans everywhere.

For decades, he dazzled generations of fans and aspiring athletes, leaving a legacy as a prolific athlete, devoted husband, loving father, and philanthropist that will never be forgotten.

This tragic event is made worse by the death of his 13-year-old daughter, Gianna Bryant, a beautiful young lady who was so full of life and potential.

Our hearts go out to his wife, Vanessa; surviving daughters, Bianka, Natalia, and Capri; relatives; teammates; and friends.

On behalf of the California delegation, we lift up the names of Kobe Bryant; his beloved daughter, Gianna; and all the victims of this horrible tragedy in prayer and reverence. We send our deepest condolences to their loved ones, now and forever.

Mr. ROUDA. Mr. Speaker, I ask that all Members and guests in the gallery rise for a moment of silence.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER
AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 5598

Mr. STEWART. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove myself as a cosponsor of H.R. 5598.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. AXNE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

□ 1630

HONORING THE LIFE OF
GRANDMASTER KEVIN THOMPSON

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

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor a true warrior from my district, Grandmaster Kevin Thompson. Grandmaster Thompson was a son of Newark and a world-famous martial artist.

He was a lightweight fighter at 155 pounds who defeated many heavy-weight challengers.

In his time, he won more than 100 trophies at world championships in three disciplines: weapons, forms, and fighting.

Today, he is in the Black Belt Hall of Fame alongside noted martial artists Bruce Lee and Chuck Norris. Through his skill, he earned the rank of grandmaster, a rare honor for his achievements and contributions to the sport.

Grandmaster Kevin Thompson's bravery and courage helped him battle Lou Gehrig's disease until his passing on January 8, but that will not dim the bright legacy he left in the world of martial arts and in our Newark community.

RECOGNIZING HARLEY WHEELER
ON HIS RUGBY ACHIEVEMENTS

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

Mr. BURCHETT. Madam Speaker, I rise to recognize Harley Wheeler, an outstanding rugby player from Knoxville, Tennessee. His granddad, Roy, and his grandmother—he recently lost—Alice, were dear friends of mine.

Harley played rugby since he was 14 and is now one of the top players in the United States. Harley began his rugby career with the South Doyle Rugby Club while a student at South-Doyle High School. In 2015, he enrolled at Life University to compete on its rugby team at the collegiate level.

Harley's 4 years on the Life University rugby team were incredibly successful. The team advanced to the Division 1A College Rugby National Championship match every year he was on the team, and won the championship in 2016, 2018, and 2019.

After graduating with a degree in business, Harley was selected to represent the United States on the inter-

national stage at the 2019 Pan American Games in Lima, Peru. Team USA finished third at the games, defeating Brazil 24-19. Harley scored 10 points during the bronze medal match.

As we approach the 2020 Summer Olympics, I wish Harley the best of luck as he competes for a spot on the national rugby team. I hope to see him representing Knoxville and the United States in Japan.

PREVENT DOMESTIC EXTREMISM

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

Mr. MALINOWSKI. Madam Speaker, last week in my New Jersey district I hosted a briefing with over 80 faith leaders: Jewish, Christian, Muslim, Hindu, and Sikh. We didn't discuss how to build a better world. We just talked about how to protect their houses of worship from violence.

Whether a synagogue in Pittsburgh, a mosque in New Zealand, a shopping mall in Texas, or a Jewish deli in New Jersey, people are being targeted for who they are, for what they believe.

Last year, Congress did something to help. We restored funding to the Department of Homeland Security to prevent domestic extremism—including violent acts of anti-Semitism—which the Trump administration cut in 2017. This has allowed DHS to substantially increase the number of staff working with State and local governments to stop these attacks.

This year, there is more to be done, from stepping up investigations and prosecutions of domestic terrorists, to designating transnational neo-Nazi groups as terrorist organizations, to confronting social media companies over algorithms that amplify hate.

Let's make this a priority in 2020 until no one need be afraid anymore.

NATIONAL SLAVERY AND HUMAN
TRAFFICKING PREVENTION
MONTH

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

Mr. SPANO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize National Slavery and Human Trafficking Prevention Month.

Globally, there are over 40 million victims of human trafficking at any given time, 75 percent of them women and girls, and 25 percent are children. While 81 percent are trapped in forced labor, millions more are in forced sexual exploitation and forced marriages.

Not only is human trafficking at epidemic levels overseas, but it is also experiencing rampant growth in our own backyard.

Statistics rank the State of Florida as the third highest trafficking destination in the U.S. Human trafficking traps millions of the most vulnerable

members of society into modern-day slavery and generates annual profits of \$150 billion.

Events like the February Super Bowl in Miami are major targets. It is imperative that we give law enforcement the tools needed to identify and prevent human trafficking.

We also need to pass legislation that deters and punishes the perpetrators and allows the victims to heal and re-acclimate.

This rapidly growing issue demands our attention. Let's work together, no matter which side of the aisle we sit on, to end this evil for good.

RECOGNIZING JAMIE DURRENCE

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. Jamie Durrence who has been selected to serve as the 2020 chair of the Georgia Restaurant Association Board of Directors.

I can't think of someone more deserving of this responsibility. In his more than 20 years managing restaurants in Savannah, he has rejuvenated Savannah's restaurant scene with four restaurants that serve fresh ingredients, unique menus, quality service, and overall exceptional dining experiences.

Much of Mr. Durrence's penchant for the restaurant industry stems from his youth when he was raised on a working farm just outside of Savannah.

As chairman of the Georgia Restaurant Association Board of Directors, Mr. Durrence will be tasked as the chief spokesperson for the industry and will be an integral part of the statewide events.

I know that the Georgia restaurant industry is in good hands with Mr. Durrence.

Congratulations, Mr. Durrence. Keep up the good work.

HONORING BRETT MILAM FOR
DONATING HIS KIDNEY

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

Mr. WENSTRUP. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Clermont County resident Brett Milam for selflessly donating his kidney to a stranger in need.

He recently shared his decision with our community in The Clermont Sun in Ohio where he works, describing his recent kidney donation and journey.

Brett was inspired by an article written by a man who had made the same choice to donate a kidney for no other reason than to commit an act of kindness.

As Brett tells it, after months of research, contemplation, and discussion with other organ donors, he decided to help a stranger, giving them an early Christmas present: a healthy kidney.

I applaud Brett for making this donation to save a complete stranger's life, and I am particularly moved by the selflessness and kindness that Brett made with this action.

Brett's choice to donate his kidney demonstrates the most compassionate side of humanity.

Today, I recognize Brett Milam for his extremely selfless act of kindness.

Thank you, Brett, and God bless.

COMMENDING EPA ADMINISTRATOR ANDREW WHEELER

(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 wish to commend EPA Administrator Andrew Wheeler for his recent clearing up of the definition of waters of the United States, known as WOTUS, indeed, causing a lot of woe for people in my district and the Western U.S., especially.

Under the 2015 definition, it seemed every puddle, every ditch, every possible water source was going to be brought under the fist of the U.S. Government. With much dismay, many farmers, ranchers, people building, and people doing simple things were unable to understand what they were supposed to do. Indeed, it was a long arm of government overreach.

What we have heard since then: "Oh, the sky is falling. This is going to roll back protections."

These aren't protections. These are things that are way beyond the scope of what government should be doing.

It limited the scope of rivers and large streams and our oceans. So with all of "the sky is falling" you are hearing, no, it isn't anything like that. Indeed, it is putting it back into more equitable space.

What this rule does is, indeed, end the confusion and ends the Federal overreach and helps us get back to business and still protect the environment.

STATE OF THE ECONOMY

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include any extraneous materials on the subject of this Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I come to the floor this afternoon with a number of my Democratic colleagues to

speak about the subject of paramount concern for most Americans: the economy. Healthcare, the economy, and their jobs are what folks are focused on when they wake up in the morning.

The Joint Economic Committee now headed on our side of the aisle by DON BEYER from Virginia, released two reports today that all Americans should look at carefully. One of them focuses on the failure of the 2017 Trump tax cuts which Chairman NEAL will be focusing on shortly.

Republicans claim that the tax cuts would pay for themselves and not add a penny to deficits and debt. That is a theory that we have heard time and time again from Republicans to support their tax cuts for the wealthiest in our country. Both experience and evidence tell us that their tax cuts always end up driving our deficits up, hurting the middle class, and placing the burden on future generations.

I hope Americans will read that report and draw the same conclusions that so many economists have made about the dangerous tax scam.

The second report which we will be focusing on this evening concerns the economy more broadly. It asks a question that many Americans may be asking this year: Is the Trump economy doing as well as the President claimed it would?

And: Can the President take credit for economic growth that began long before he took office?

I want to thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER) for his efforts as vice chair of the Joint Economic Committee, as well as the former vice chair, CAROLYN MALONEY, who now heads up the Oversight and Reform Committee.

I will be yielding to Mr. BEYER soon to speak more about the content of the committee's report. He will be followed by Mr. NEAL who is the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, and a senior member of this body. He is probably one of the most knowledgeable people, not only about taxes, but about the economy in general.

But first I want to speak a little bit about this President's record on the economy.

President Trump sought office on a raft of economic promises. He promised to create 25 million new jobs in 10 years.

He promised 6 percent growth in our domestic product.

He promised to eliminate the \$19 trillion national debt.

He promised to get wages up for American workers with \$4,000 raises as a result of the tax cuts.

And the President promised to make healthcare much less expensive and much better.

□ 1645

Let's see how he is doing.

On the first measure, job growth, job growth has slowed under President Trump. Let me repeat that. Job growth has slowed under President Trump

compared to the level of the economic expansion that began under his predecessor.

This chart—and it will probably be hard to see for many viewers—shows that job growth was highest here in the years before President Trump took office and then lower, following.

Now, what does that mean?

Let me give you the big figure, Madam Speaker, because the specifics of the chart will be difficult for people to see on the floor and in the gallery.

What it means is that, on average—and this is an important fact to remember—under President Obama, there were 227,000 jobs created per month over the last 35 months of his term.

Now we have had 35 months of the Trump term. What has he done to realize that promise of 25 million jobs?

Madam Speaker, 36,000 less jobs per month have been created under Donald Trump than under Barack Obama in the same timeframe.

Now, that is important because the President, of course, claims that this is the best economy we have ever seen. As I said, that is 36,000 fewer jobs per month, and 1.26 million fewer jobs over President Trump's term from the trend he inherited.

Madam Speaker, I am going to show you a chart on how the economy that President Obama had put in place with the help of the Congress was going straight up.

At this pace, President Trump's 4-year term will not achieve the same level of job creation as the previous 4-year term of President Obama. In fact, he would fall—listen to this figure—2.5 million jobs short.

So, when we hear the President at a rally claiming this great economic boom, remember, 2.5 million less jobs created.

President Trump also loves to cite the low unemployment rate, which, in December 2019, stood at 3.5 percent. That is, indeed, a low number. It is a good number in the sense that it shows that so many of our people are working. But underlying those facts are so many of our people are working one, two, and three jobs so they can support themselves and their family.

Now, when he took office, the rate was 4.7 percent. It is 3.5 percent now and 4.7 percent when he took office. Compare that to the decline in the unemployment rate during the same period in President Obama's second term.

At his second inauguration, the rate was 7.9 percent. He left office with 4.7 percent. That is 3.2 percent less. He left the office with a 4.7 percent unemployment rate, continuing a strong decline.

Under President Obama, a decline of 5.3 percentage points from when he took office; under President Trump, a decline of 1.2 percentage points.

Madam Speaker, let me give you that figure again. Under President Obama, he inherited from George Bush a declining employment. It spiked at 10 percent, and under President Obama,

that came down to 4.7 percent. That is where you get the 5.3 percent reduction. Actually, he halved the unemployment rate if you figure it that way.

Under President Trump, however, he inherited a downward trend—in other words, less unemployment as opposed to more unemployment from Bush to Obama—and he has failed to keep the pace that President Obama established.

This was the decline in the unemployment rate under Barack Obama. This is what has happened: steeper decline under Obama, got to a low number, and it has been reduced by 1.2 percent as opposed to the 4.7 percent that Obama reduced it to.

While President Trump boasted that his administration would see a 6 percent GDP—that is growth in the domestic product of our country, our entire production—that would have been good; 6 percent would have been phenomenal. It was also not attained.

Over the first 11 quarters of his term, that figure was 2.6 percent, dropping to 2.1 percent in the third quarter of last year. The Federal Reserve estimates that 2020 will see it fall even lower as any short-term stimulus from his tax cut disappears. Mr. NEAL is going to talk about the tax cut and what was promised and what was delivered.

Madam Speaker, I would simply point out to you that what you see is, essentially, a level 2.5 percent average growth under President Obama and under President Trump, notwithstanding the extraordinary trillion-dollar tax cut that was infused in the economy. Again, Mr. NEAL will speak more to that.

It is clear the Trump tax cut did little to boost GDP as he claimed it would, and, of course, he claimed many more jobs.

On deficits and the debt, President Trump's promise would seem laughable if the reality weren't so dangerous.

Instead of reversing deficits and eliminating the debt, he has overseen an increase fueled by his 2017 tax cut that gave \$2 trillion in new, unpaid-for tax cuts primarily to the wealthiest in our country.

Last week, to the surprise of no one who understands the history of Republican tax cuts, President Trump suggested he might seek cuts to Medicare and Social Security to offset the deficits created by his tax cuts. I will leave it to Chairman YARMUTH to go into greater detail about the Trump deficits.

We have all seen this President's campaign on reducing America's trade deficit, but it has increased on his watch. In fact, according to the Joint Economic Committee's report, as many as 450,000 jobs were lost in 2019 alone as a result of this President's trade wars.

The President loves to stand at the podium at his rallies and shout slogans about how his is the best economy ever and how he inherited a mess from President Obama. Those statements, sadly, as so many of his have been

shown to be, are not accurate. That is a polite way to say it. The facts tell the opposite story.

Over the course of the Obama Presidency, 10.8 million jobs were created as the unemployment rate fell from, as I said, 10 percent to 4.7 percent. In the last 11 quarters of President Obama's term, real GDP growth was averaging 2.6 percent—a remarkable turnaround from the 8.4 percent deficit, decline, that he inherited, a decrease in the last quarter before he took office.

Now, annual median income, Madam Speaker, you will note, under President Obama, the red line starts declining 2008, 2009. The deepest recession that we have experienced in our lifetimes, which started in December of '07, you will see real household income declined significantly.

But you will see, when the recovery program that President Obama and Democrats put in place in our country, the American Recovery Act, you saw employment going up, average income going up, and you see it going up to \$63,179.

The tax cut, you will see a real spike here. This is under President Obama, and then you see the tax cut, this line here, and then you see a flattening out. While it has increased, it has been a much slower increase. So, when he says it is the best economy, the folks here who were experiencing this kind of increase would beg to differ.

Compare that to the first 2 years of Trump's Presidency with an increase in annual median household income of \$1,400. This indicated, under President Obama, an increase of \$4,800 in median income, three times as much—as a matter of fact, more than three times. In fact, incomes at every level have grown faster under Democrats than under Republicans since 1968.

So this is not just picking a particular year to make a point. This is 68 years, average. The blue, Democrats, increase in every quintile. That means those at the bottom increase substantially and, yes, those at the top increase.

This is not, as some Republicans charge us with, class warfare. Everybody did better, on average, with Democratic Presidents in the 20 years during that period of time that we had the Presidency and the 30 years that the Republicans had the Presidency. Those are the averages, and you can see, in every quintile, everybody in America did better under the Democrats' economic programs.

President Trump's economy is just the latest chapter in a long story in which, time and time again, Democratic leadership has seen our economy out of a recession and danger as President Obama did when he inherited, as I said, the deepest recession anybody less than 95 years of age in our country has experienced.

This is a contrast that House Democrats will be highlighting this year when Americans will again entrust the President and Congress with crafting

economic policies. That means jobs for them. That means some money to invest in their children, in their families, in their mortgages, in buying a car, a refrigerator, or a new stove or fixing their heat when it goes out.

What President Trump doesn't seem to understand, however, is that a thriving economy is more than growing the stock market.

Let me say this as an aside. I don't have a slide here now, but the average growth in the stock market under Democrats from 1948 until 2008—I am not sure exactly when we ended the study—was more in every Democratic administration.

It is about real economic security for American workers and their families; it is about whether America is still a place where everyone has a fair shot, where everyone has access to opportunities, and where everyone can get ahead. That is what that chart shows, and that is over a significant period of time.

By that measure, the President's record has been dismal.

Now, healthcare, what I started with, is one of the greatest concerns. Jobs and healthcare were our issues in the last election. We added 63 Members to the Democratic side of the aisle, which is why we are in the majority, because people knew that we were the party that was focused on healthcare and on jobs and had delivered.

This chart shows the uninsured rate. It was going down over the last 3 years, but because of the assault on the Affordable Care Act and the uncertainty that was created, as you will see, 2014, 2013, 2016 the President is elected, it comes down and flattens out. Why? Because they are not supporting healthcare. We need to get it back up so there are less and less uninsured.

Mr. NEAL represents the State of Massachusetts where 100 percent of children are covered and 97 percent of adults. That is what the Affordable Care Act was based upon, the Massachusetts plan, when Governor Romney was the Republican Governor in Massachusetts.

As a result of the policies of this President, the number of Americans without health insurance rose to 8.5 percent in 2018. That was the first increase in a decade.

□ 1700

Not having health insurance is bad for your health and bad for your psyche and bad for your family.

His efforts, meaning President Trump, alongside congressional Republicans to repeal, undermine, and sabotage the Affordable Care Act have brought uncertainty to health insurance markets and made it harder for working families to get affordable coverage for the care they need.

We are working very hard on that. We are trying to bring prescription drug costs down. We are trying to fix the problem of surprise billing. We want to make sure that Americans have affordable, quality healthcare.

On wages, we see another lost opportunity. For 3 years, President Trump and the Republican-led Senate have refused to support legislation to raise the minimum wage, which has not been raised in over a decade, which the House finally passed a bill last year, under the Democratic majority, which tries to lift that minimum wage so people can live and support themselves when they are working 40 hours a week. No American working 40 hours a week ought not to be able to afford to support themselves and to help support a family.

According to the monthly jobs report for December, hourly wage growth slipped to its lowest rate in 18 months. When you listen to the President talk at these rallies about this economy, remember that figure and check it. Go to Google or go to some reference point. Check it.

According to the monthly jobs report for December, last month, hourly wage growth slipped to its lowest rate in 18 months. That is a far cry from the \$4,000 annual salary increase President Trump promised would trickle down from his tax cuts for the wealthiest in America.

American workers deserve better. America deserves better. American exporters deserve better. American farmers and small business owners deserve better than this uncertain Trump economy. All Americans deserve better.

That is why the Democratic-led House voted last year to raise wages, ensure equal pay for equal work, and give Federal employees a long-overdue cost of living adjustment.

That is why we voted to lower prescription drug prices, a bill that sits in the Senate, untended by Senator MCCONNELL.

That is why we voted to make it easier for more workers to save for secure retirement, thanks to Chairman NEAL and the Ways and Means Committee.

That is why we voted to protect multi-employer pension funds, so that hundreds of thousands of people would not be left out in the cold after contributing to and being promised a pension in their old age.

Now, as we look to 2020, House Democrats will continue to make economic opportunity our focus. I look forward to bringing more legislation to the floor this year to ensure that we do not squander the gains of our recovery under President Obama. We will keep looking for ways to help America get ahead.

I hope all of my colleagues will look at the facts that I put forward and see what the Obama economy did and that the last 3 years have been a continuation of the Obama economy. Just look at the line. It is almost a straight line up.

I appreciate that a number of my Democratic colleagues are here this evening to add to this conversation. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER), my friend, former Lieutenant Government, former Amba-

sador, and the vice chair of the Joint Economic Committee.

Mr. BEYER. Madam Speaker, I want to thank Majority Leader HOYER for his exemplary leadership and thank the distinguished chair of the Ways and Means Committee, RICHARD NEAL, for his friendship and his wise counsel.

Madam Speaker, you be the judge.

Two weeks ago, the World Economic Forum held its annual conference in Davos, and the central theme of the meeting this year was climate change, the most critical issue we face.

President Trump spoke at the conference, but instead of focusing on climate change, he made what amounts to a campaign speech, claiming that he has worked a miracle with the U.S. economy. The fundamental basis of his argument is wildly wrong. He claimed that the economy he inherited from Barack Obama was "in dismal shape." On the basis of this fundamental re-writing of history, he claimed credit for the strong U.S. economy.

The economy is booming, he proposed, not because Barack Obama helped dig us out from the worst recession since the Great Depression or because of the hard work and ingenuity of the American worker, but because of Donald Trump's magical touch, the same magical touch he had with his Atlantic City casinos which went bankrupt, and Trump Shuttle and Trump University and Trump Mortgage and Trump Steaks and the Trump board game and Trump Vodka.

That is quite a record.

I am a businessman. With my brother, my sister, my dad, we spent 46 years now building a highly successful company. And I know it is not easy, but I also know that when a businessman has a string of spectacular failures, you wouldn't hire him to be CEO of your company, let alone President of the United States.

But here we are. Serendipitously, with much luck, I became vice chair of the Joint Economic Committee recently, and I couldn't be more thrilled by the confidence of my Democratic leadership and the opportunity to serve.

The Joint Economic Committee studies and advises Members of Congress about the economy. We are like the economic think tank for the economy to delve into the issues and, when necessary, to set the record straight.

So, when the President stands up at Davos and claims that he is an economic miracle worker, supposedly saving the economy from what he claims is the disaster he inherited, the Joint Economic Committee has to step up to the plate. I was more than pleased when Majority Leader HOYER asked me to help lead this hour of discussion. So, today, we will talk about the supposedly dismal economy.

Was it a wreck, as the President imagines it? Far from it.

Has he worked miracles with the economy? No way. The data shows that this is not true.

Did his tax cuts supercharge the economic growth? Very weak evidence.

And did his tax cuts pay for themselves? Again, no way.

Has the President's trade war helped American businesses and consumers? We will argue it has done much more harm than good.

And The Washington Post Fact Checker found that, during his Presidency, Donald Trump has made more than 1,500 lies or misleading statements about the economy, and he brazenly repeats them even when corrected.

I suspect, next week, in this very Chamber, when he gives the State of the Union Address, we will hear many of those same misleading claims again.

Madam Speaker, when you hear him make a claim about almost anything, you can pretty much know, more often than not, that it is not true.

So, in his Davos speech at the World Economic Forum, when he said that the economy he inherited from Barack Obama was dismal, he also said: "We have the greatest economy we've ever had in the history of our country."

This claim and many others did not make it by the fact checkers at the Associated Press. This isn't unusual. He is often caught red-handed, in flagrante delicto, making easily debunked claims on a wide range of topics. And since the beginning of his administration, his record of falsehoods is astonishing.

The Washington Post Fact Checker says Trump has made over 16,000 false or misleading claims in his first 3 years of office. When you hear this President say almost anything about the economy, it is likely to be more wrong than right.

For example, he did not create a strong economy; he inherited it. This is made absolutely clear in a rigorous, carefully sourced new report by the Democratic staff on the Joint Economic Committee. This is what the report shows: that the economy Donald Trump inherited from Barack Obama was strong and getting stronger.

Madam Speaker, you can see this on the chart right here. Unemployment was below 5 percent, GDP growth was 2 percent in the fourth quarter of 2016, and 227,000 jobs were being created every month.

President Obama led the economy a very long way back from the economic records that he inherited from his predecessor. Here is how bad it was.

At the worst of the Great Recession, unemployment had reached 10 percent, but by the time President Obama left office, unemployment had already been cut more than in half, down to 4.7 percent.

When he took office, the economy was hemorrhaging 700,000 jobs per month. By the time he left, the economy had already added jobs for 76 straight months, the longest in American history.

Inflation was low. Wages and incomes were rising. It was a remarkable turnaround. It was not, as the President said at Davos, dismal.

The President called the current economy a miracle due to his golden touch, but, no, he inherited this from the previous economy.

So let's thank the President, but not this President. Let's thank my old boss, President Obama.

The President often cherry-picks a strong month of job growth and implies that it is representative, but let's look at things in the long term, which is how economists actually measure these things.

In the first 35 months of the Trump administration, his economy added 191,000 jobs per month. In the last 35 months of Barack Obama, his economy added 227,000 jobs per month. That is a 36,000 job-per-month difference over a comparable 35 months each. Donald Trump wants you to forget that, but let's not let him get away with it.

The job market is strong. Unemployment is 3.5 percent. But, again, he didn't create low unemployment; he inherited it, and you can see that in the long-term trends. It was at 4.7 percent; now it is down to 3.5.

But his signature policy impact, the \$1.9 trillion in tax cuts, didn't go into effect until 2018. So unemployment had already dropped to 4.1—that is the Obama effect, the 4.1. So the last six-tenths of a percent cost us \$1.9 trillion, and it might be much higher than that.

Madam Speaker, was the cost worth it? Is the President an economic genius? You be the judge.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I thank Congressman BEYER, and I appreciate his leadership on the Joint Economic Committee.

I am now pleased to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL), one of the senior Members of the House of Representatives, the dean of the Massachusetts delegation and the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, who, as I said earlier, is as knowledgeable about tax policy and its consequences as anybody in this House.

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, this is an opportunity to call attention to some of the suggestions that have been made by this President and this White House as to the economic growth that he claims credit for.

On the day that Barack Obama became President, America was losing 800,000 jobs a month. When Barack Obama left the White House, there were 14.3 million new jobs that had been created. That is a real turnabout. This notion that there was this dismal economy that President Trump inherited is simply not true.

So let's even go back to the end of the Clinton years, which, despite what President Trump says, the greatest economic growth spurt in American history took place during Bill Clinton's Presidency—plus four balanced budgets. So, when Bill Clinton said goodbye to the country, we were staring at a \$15 trillion projected surplus over the next 10 years.

Let's do the math. A \$1.3 trillion tax cut in 2001, a \$1 trillion tax cut in 2003,

and, borrowing, \$2.3 trillion tax cuts in 2017.

So let's take a look at this with some precision for a moment. That means, when you add the borrowing cost, meaning principal and interest, to what actually was embraced by two Republican Presidents, that means we have cut taxes, over about a 15-year period, by \$5 trillion, added a trillion dollars to the debt this year, and now a national debt of \$20 trillion, all based upon the theological notion—that is what it is, theology—that tax cuts pay for themselves.

You cannot find a mainstream economist in America who will say that tax cuts pay for themselves.

When we look back at what was done with the tax bill in December of 2017, it goes like this:

A major piece of legislation was written in 51 days, without one hearing, without one professional witness, without one economic forecast, but again, this fundamental belief that, as the President said in a meeting at the White House with some of us, he didn't see why we couldn't have "6 percent growth."

He completely suggested that Obama's economic growth spurt would be far surpassed by his, yet that has not happened. We have had, during the Clinton years, 2.3 to 5 percent quarters of economic growth, averaging, in the end, the highest of any President in the last century—really remarkable.

And then this suggestion, even though mainstream economists kept saying, no, the economy, even with the sugar high of the tax cut, will settle back down to less than 2 percent, so we are at 1.8 percent with \$20 trillion worth of debt.

□ 1715

The Obama years, even climbing out of the recession, averaged north of 2.3 to 2.4 percent of economic growth, given the worst recession, as the majority leader said, since the Great Depression.

The argument was that we were going to have this unparalleled economic growth because of the Republican tax bill. That has not happened.

The issues have settled back, and it has flat-lined, but here are a couple of things that I want to mention here that I think really bear noting.

Productivity, which is probably the most important part of raising quality-of-life measures for the American people, a growth spurt of productivity, that has really not happened.

Here is another key element of economic discernment: worker participation rates. If you really want to know what is happening, that is what you focus on.

The postwar norm is about 66 percent, meaning two-thirds of the American people got up and went to work every day. Where are we now? At about 63.8 percent.

The tax cut did not issue one response to one of the most fundamental

challenges facing the American people, the American family, and the American economy. Madam Speaker, 2 million people have left the workforce because of opioid addiction. Two million people have left the workforce because of addiction.

We wondered why Social Security disability climbed during those years. It was because of opioid addiction.

Back to that issue about labor participation rates and productivity, there has been no change. Poverty rates remain stubborn.

Here is something we should all be concerned about: There are still 40 million Americans who receive food stamps. If you give those people a choice between good jobs and food stamps, they will always take the good jobs, always take the good jobs.

The number of people who are working in this gig economy with uncertain hours, no benefits, two jobs, three jobs, where they would all like to have one that gave them some decent benefits and a good retirement, those are the challenges we face.

Think about this number—again, numbers are stubborn—40 percent of the American workforce every day gets up, goes to work, and is not in a qualified retirement plan. Their retirement is going to be Social Security.

All of these numbers that we have depicted here portray a very different story about the President's suggestions when compared to the reality of where we find ourselves. The uncertainty every day, largely based upon some of the bombast, the unpredictability of where we head, all are part of the challenge that we face.

But this idea that this economic growth period has all been because of President Trump, it is simply not true. He inherited a very good economy from Barack Obama.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments, and I hope the American people really focus on this. So much has been said by both sides that the American people really need to look at this themselves and figure out when did they do well, when did their families do well, who was watching out for their healthcare, who wanted to make sure that we bring up the income of those at the lowest levels of incomes in our country, and make a decision on their behalf as to who they want to support and who they believe.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH), chairman of the Budget Committee in the House of Representatives.

Mr. YARMUTH. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Earlier today, the Congressional Budget Office released its updated budget and economic outlook for the next decade. This report once again confirms that, despite the economic expansion he inherited, the fiscal outlook has worsened since President Trump took office.

Under President Trump, deficits have risen to heights not usually seen outside of recessions and major world

wars. They have increased every year, an unusual trend given that deficits tend to fall as unemployment rises.

In fact, the deficit in 2019 was the highest since 2012, when we were recovering from the Great Recession and the unemployment was 8 percent, more than double today's rate.

As a result of these deficits, the national debt has climbed higher and faster than CBO projected at the end of the Obama administration. Perhaps we shouldn't be surprised. After all, this is the same President who proclaimed just last week, "Who the hell cares about the budget?" The record is clear that he doesn't.

On their face, these fiscal facts might not be so concerning if one forgets about the multitude of deficits we face in the real economy: crumbling infrastructure, skyrocketing healthcare costs, widening student achievement gaps, warming climate, lower life expectancy.

In light of these and other problems, it is difficult to escape the conclusion that we should be making bolder investments in American families and our Nation's future. But President Trump didn't use our fiscal space to repair the roads and bridges that support our economy, to reduce drug prices for working families, or to bolster our environmental resilience in the face of the defining threat of a generation. No, President Trump and Republicans in Congress ran up our tab with a \$1.9 trillion tax cut—if you add interest, \$2.3 trillion—that showered benefits on corporations and the wealthy.

Madam Speaker, that \$1.9 trillion had little meaningful impact on the economy, other than increasing our already shameful income inequality. Madam Speaker, that \$1.9 trillion could have been, but was not, put toward making childcare more affordable, college education more accessible, and retirement security more achievable for American families.

Making this situation far worse, President Trump is once again suggesting that he will offset the deficits that his signature policy exploded by cutting Social Security and Medicare, taking money right out of the pockets of America's seniors and forcing them to foot his bill.

Our economy and budget face difficult times ahead. An aging population and rising healthcare costs mean economic growth is projected to be slower and deficits are expected to be larger going forward.

Addressing this issue over the next several decades will require a balanced approach that includes a fair tax system.

President Trump has taken us precisely in the wrong direction by adding trillions to the debt for a tax giveaway for the rich that yielded little in return for everyone else. He is squandering the chance to lay the groundwork for a more productive and equitable economy.

Despite these challenges, we still have the opportunity to make respon-

sible investments in the American people, our infrastructure, and the environment, investments that reflect our values, promote a stronger economic and fiscal outlook, and move our Nation forward.

As chairman of the Budget Committee, I have stressed that we need to think seriously about severe and persistent deficits in the real economy, not just deficits in the budget. That doesn't mean that we can spend tax dollars without thought or discretion, but it does require that we use our Nation's resources, including our deficits, more wisely than this administration has. It means prioritizing policies that improve the living standards of current and future generations that support those most in need and help mitigate the challenges American families are facing today and the challenges they may face tomorrow.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments, and I thank him for his leadership on the Budget Committee.

I might say, as a result of his work, last year, 2019, we completed the appropriations process. Unlike the previous year, when our Republican colleagues were in charge and the government was shut down when the new Congress took office, we kept the government open. There was no drama. On January 3, everybody was working and being served by their government.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE), whose father was such a good friend of mine and who does such an excellent job. His dad would be proud of him here in Congress.

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, I thank our majority leader for those kind words. I also thank Joint Economic Committee Vice Chairman BEYER, Budget Committee Chairman YARMUTH, and Ways and Means Committee Chairman NEAL for organizing this Special Order hour.

It is important to discuss the state of our economy because it is a case of true contrast. Trump's economic decisions have created two very distinct Americas.

There is the one America for the affluent where incomes are rising and taxes are dropping. There is the other America, the one reserved for minorities and low-income Americans, the one for middle Americans, the one that is losing manufacturing jobs to automation and cheap, foreign labor, the one that forces people to turn to minimum wage jobs as careers.

President Obama worked to unite these two Americas. Trump has worked very hard to divide them, once again.

As President, Trump is known for two major business moves. First, he passed his 2017 Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, but his law did not give the vast majority of Americans tax cuts. It actually cut their tax deductions. He did not improve their ability to get new jobs. He made it more difficult.

He has taken away benefits that low- and middle-income American families

took for granted. He took away their ability to deduct moving expenses when they had to find a better job and support their families. He took away their ability to deduct alimony, which could lead to more deadbeat dads. He even forced average Americans to declare more of their income, costing them more money in taxes. And while you cannot deduct your moving expenses, millionaires can deduct the entire cost of a private plane.

Then, Trump chose to impose tariffs on Chinese goods. Economic advisers said the move would hurt our country before Trump did it, and they were right. A Federal Reserve study published last December said that tariffs have caused Americans to lose critical manufacturing jobs and raised the costs of goods for consumers.

Manufacturing jobs have helped millions of Americans get out of poverty, and that opportunity wanes today. They have allowed older generations to pay the college tuitions of younger generations. They have been critical for minorities to grab a piece of the American Dream.

President Trump likes to point to his work around minorities participating in the job sector, but where I come from in north New Jersey, we do not see it. Where I come from in my district, we do not see it.

It is a situation of two Americas, once again, one for the haves and the other for the have-nots. The majority of the people under this President have not.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments; for his leadership on the minimum wage, to try to lift people up at the bottom of the wage scale; and also for his leadership on healthcare, to ensure that they have access to affordable, quality healthcare.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. HOULAHAN), a Representative from the Philadelphia suburbs who served so well in the military of our country and then became a very successful businesswoman. I know she knows a lot about how to run a business and how to run an economy.

Ms. HOULAHAN. Madam Speaker, I thank the majority leader for bringing us together this evening to talk about the economy.

January was Jobs Month for me in my district and my team. I spent time home in my community in Pennsylvania and here in Washington focused on three things: one, making sure that our economy is working for everyone and that Pennsylvanians can afford to live where they work and pay their bills while receiving fair pay; two, supporting our small businesses, which are the backbone of our economy; and three, ensuring our workforce is adapting to new technologies and to the future of their work.

□ 1730

Earlier this month, we got the jobs report from December, and there was a

lot to be optimistic about. Unemployment rates remain low, and we added more than 300,000 nonfarm jobs.

The administration also likes to point to the record-high stock market as an indication of the impact of its economic policies. To be sure, there are good signs, and this steady economic improvement began well before the President and his administration took office and, thankfully, it continues.

With this in mind, I would like to share, though, what I saw and heard during Jobs Month in my community.

My community is in the enviable position of having a very low unemployment rate. I hear more from employers who are struggling to fill empty positions than from long-term unemployed people who are looking for work.

But that doesn't tell the whole story. The rosy jobs report from January doesn't tell the story of people who work in my community, or who would like to, but can't afford to even live there.

Last week, I was in Phoenixville, Pennsylvania, meeting with affordable housing advocates and proponents for more mass transit options near those affordable housing options. During that visit, I learned that in our area, about a quarter of the people are renters.

Working an average wage for renters, a 9-5 job is not nearly enough for a modest, two-bedroom home in my community. People are working extra hours, holding down two jobs or more to be able to afford to live where they work; or they are living elsewhere, where the cost of living is lower, and they are commuting ridiculous amounts of time, using inadequate road and rail infrastructure to get to their work. And they are losing precious time with their families in the process.

A booming stock market is good for some, but it doesn't change the daily math and daily experience of so many people in my community.

The House has passed legislation to raise the minimum wage and to help workers save for retirement, and we need to see action in the Senate to ensure that our economy is working for all Americans, not just for those who have enough money to invest in the stock market.

Earlier this month, many in my community also celebrated progress on the U.S.-Mexico-Canada Agreement, a trade deal that was important for many small businesses in my community, including our agricultural producers. I was very proud to support that agreement.

But this administration's trade policies have also harmed my community. The trade war in China has hurt small businesses as well as larger manufacturers whose business models are built around global trade in my community.

Although we now have a "Phase 1" deal with China, businesses in my community are eager for a real and lasting agreement that doesn't harm the American businesses in an effort to punish China.

Madam Speaker, I also want to highlight just one other aspect of the January jobs report that stuck out to me. Just like here in Congress, women are entering the workforce at historic rates. Like so many women, and men, frankly, I have faced the real struggles of how to balance both raising a family and excelling at work. Our policies need to be adopted to support and encourage our changing workforce.

We have shown that we can work on a bipartisan basis to enact paid parental leave, as an example, for Federal workers, setting the example for other employers.

We need to examine how we provide for childcare for working parents. We need how to examine how to ensure that pregnant workers have protections if they need an accommodation in the job during their pregnancy. And we need to ensure that we are paying equal pay for equal work. All of these policies can help move our economy forward, and all deserve the attention of our Senate and our counterparts in the White House.

Over the last few weeks, I have learned a lot by visiting manufacturing facilities in my community, like OmegaFlex in Exton, Pennsylvania, or laying tile at the Chester County Intermediate Unit, or working alongside the IBEW workers training newly-separated veterans for work.

I have come away deeply optimistic about where we are headed, but also armed with motivation to move forward with the bold policies that we need to make sure our economy is working for everyone, for all of us, to support our small businesses, and to prepare our workforce for the future ahead. There certainly is work to be done.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her comments, and I know that she is working her district very, very hard, and listening to people, which is what we need to do.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. ADAMS), who is the leader of the group that I am very enthusiastic about that is helping our historically Black colleges and universities. I thank her for her leadership on that and so many other educational issues and economic issues for our families.

Ms. ADAMS. Madam Speaker, I thank the majority leader for yielding, and for his leadership, and for organizing this Special Order Hour.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in setting the record straight when it comes to the Trump economy.

The Trump economy was on sad display in Charlotte, North Carolina, on Monday, when 1,300 of my constituents stood in line for a chance at 185 affordable housing units in West Charlotte.

Instead of investing in shelter, affordable housing, and community health, the Trump economic policy is about consolidating wealth. The Trump

economy is one that works for the American billionaire, but not for the union boilermaker. It is an economy that works for executives with golden parachutes, but not for educators teaching elementary school students parachute games.

It doesn't have to be this way. In 2016, when Donald Trump was elected, he inherited a robust economy, thanks to President Obama and his administration. It was President Obama who turned our economy around and helped pull us out of the Great Recession. Seventy-five consecutive months of private sector job growth? Thanks, President Obama.

However, since then, Trump's "Billionaires First" policies have hurt our neighbors and our families. Some of these harmful policies: The U.S. withdrawal from the Paris climate agreement; the ongoing trade war with China, and threats to place tariffs on goods imported from our allies; this administration's cruel efforts to dismantle and weaken the Affordable Care Act; Trump's heartless immigration policies that have led to fearmongering and separation of families at the border.

Trump economic policy is not about helping others. Instead, the cruelty is the point. In fact, the only compassionate thing about his economic policy is that it looks out for billionaires, and not just millionaires like himself.

But Scripture tells us that, "Whoever loves money never has enough; whoever loves wealth is never satisfied with their income." The dividends we seek as public servants are not from increased wealth, but from a more perfect commonwealth.

Luckily, the American people are standing up to push back against this economy. And whether it is a small business owner who gives the homeless a place to park their cars at night, or the community advocates helping their displaced neighbors find new homes, the Queen City knows that service is the rent we pay for living on this Earth.

The American people are working for the people, and so is the people's House. It is time for the Trump administration to do the same.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her comments.

I am now pleased to yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), one of the senior Members of the House of Representatives, the chair of the Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee that deals with so many of these issues that have been discussed over the last hour.

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Speaker, I thank the majority leader for the opportunity to speak on this Special Order.

Americans are struggling under President Trump. They are desperately waiting for their incomes to rise and

their costs to slow. Yet, the President has failed to fully deliver on his promises to them. That is according to the Joint Economic Committee's excellent new report.

In fact, according to this report, growth in median annual household income was three times greater during the last 2 years of the Obama administration than the first 2 years of the Trump administration.

And mostly, job growth has slowed. According to the report, in the first 35 months of President Trump's term, there were 36,000 fewer nonfarm jobs created per month than the final 35 months of President Obama's term.

This is despite the Republicans' 2017 tax law. It will cost \$1.9 trillion, but 83 percent of its benefits go to the top 1 percent. Working people, middle-class families cannot afford more of the President's giveaways to the wealthy and the well-connected.

The single biggest economic challenge of our time is that people's pay is not keeping rise with skyrocketing costs, healthcare, childcare, housing. They struggle, including in my State of Connecticut.

The United Way put out a report, it is Asset Limited, Income Constrained, Employed, the ALICE report. And what essentially it says is that people who are working one or two jobs just can't make a standard of living. They are above the poverty line, but they can't make it.

Out of the 20 most common jobs or occupations, registered nurses, cashiers, laborers, et cetera, only one pays enough to reasonably support a household; that is operations managers.

Under this President, many Americans are suffering something akin to a personal economic crisis. To claim otherwise is to ignore the reality of their circumstances.

We see their suffering. That is why the House has passed the Paycheck Fairness Act for equal pay, lower drug costs to reduce prescription drug costs, raise the wage by raising the minimum wage to \$15 by 2025.

We need to work hard to make opportunity real for people. We urge the President to join us because, as this new report from the Joint Economic Committee indicates, Americans need a break, not more broken promises.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her comments.

Madam Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. STEVENS).

Ms. STEVENS. Madam Speaker, I rise to discuss the impact of our economy on our American workers and on our American manufacturers.

The headlines are real. We are in a technical manufacturing recession, as measured by productivity and output.

As we know, and as it has been stated many times tonight, the Tax Cut and Jobs Act of 2017 was a permanent tax giveaway for the wealthiest corporations, not our suppliers, not our workers, but the wealthiest among us, at the expense of everyday Americans.

We have the benefit of hindsight to point out what many experts at the time cautioned; that this would ultimately not lead to significant job gains or raise workers' wages.

\$1.5 trillion added to our deficit. The levels are alarming. The facts are out today.

Madam Speaker, it is clear. We must do better. We must continue to work for the people.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Madam Speaker, in 2009, President Obama came into office during the Great Recession. He inherited a dreadful economy but worked hard for policies that would stimulate growth and help the average American. Thankfully, his policies worked and America is on the upswing.

However, we now have a President who wants to take credit where credit is not due. President Trump is reaping the benefits of Obama's economic policies, while harming the people who were still left behind. Recovering from a recession and lifting up all Americans takes more than eight years, and this President has not taken the torch.

Instead of building on Obama's success, Trump has kicked the Americans who are still down.

When farmers in the 2nd Congressional District of Georgia and all across the nation were suffering from major crop losses from natural disasters, President Trump decided to start a trade war with China. Trade wars do not often have victors, but they always have losers.

American farmers, workers, and consumers were the losers.

Our farmers lost business, our workers lost wages, and our consumers paid higher prices—all to cover the costs of the tariffs—not China and not President Trump, the architect of this bad plan.

When running for office, then-candidate Trump said he would use his knowledge of tax cuts for the rich to help the people who this economy still isn't working for. When he was elected, one of the first things he did was give a \$1 trillion tax cut to the super rich—also known as himself and his friends.

Trickle down economics did not work then and they do not work now. Giving money to the wealthy does not translate to higher wages for workers. It means more money for the already super wealthy.

The Trump tax cut has also ballooned an already too high national deficit. When you take a pay cut, you cannot pay your bills, so your debt grows. But it's not the wealthy who will feel the pain from an exploding deficit that will slow our economic growth. It is everyday Americans who will feel the effects—lower wages lead to a lower standard of living. The Peterson Foundation estimates that if the national debt continues rising as is, the average income for a family of four will drop by \$16,000 over the next three decades.

\$16,000 is not much for those at the top. But it is devastating for those in the middle and working class. Food stamps, unemploy-

ment benefits, Medicare, and Social Security could all face cuts because of tax cuts for the wealthy.

We should be trying to make the nation a better place for our children and grandchildren. Instead we have a leader who wants to leave them with our debt. Instead we have a leader who wants to ride on President Obama's coattails and lure us into a false sense of security, so he and his rich friends can have even more—when so many in America have less!

America is supposed to be a land of opportunity, where anyone can succeed with enough hard work. Trade wars, tax cuts for the rich while cutting food stamps for the poor are not the way to make America great. Instead of building on our success and lending a helping hand to those in need, this President has only sought to help himself.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I thank Majority Leader Hoyer Chairmen Neal of Ways and Means and Chairman Yarmuth of the Budget Committee and Vice-Chairman Beyer of the Joint Economic Committee for holding this very important and timely Special Order to review and assess the state of the national economy two years after the Republican-controlled Congress enacted the Trump-GOP TaxScam.

The verdict is now in and it leads to the inescapable conclusion that the Trump TaxScam has not accelerated the economy, rather it is a significant drag on the booming economy President Barack Obama bequeathed to his successor, the current occupant of the office.

Specifically, two points cannot be stressed enough.

First, President Trump did not create the strong economy; he inherited it.

Second, we paid an extremely high price—\$1.9 trillion—for tax cuts that have done so little for the economy.

Madam Speaker, most of President Trump's claims about the economy are false or highly misleading.

There is no such thing as a "Trump bump"—key economic indicators are the same or worse.

The President's signature economic policy—the \$1.9 trillion tax cut—has failed to deliver the promised economic boost and his second major economic policy—the trade war—is a self-inflicted wound, hurting farmers, consumers, businesses and the economy.

Madam Speaker, those of us who were there remember well that the morning of January 20, 2009, which was one of the coldest days on record in Washington, DC.

But it was nothing compared to the chill wind blowing through the American economy and body politic because at that time the nation was facing economic challenges unseen since the Great Depression: Americans were losing their jobs at a frightening rate of 800,000 per month; the national unemployment rate had risen to 7.8 percent and would continue to climb until reaching its peak of 10.0 percent in October 2009.

For African Americans, the numbers were much grimmer, a jobless rate of 13.5 percent in January 2009 which would grow to 16.5 percent by the end of the year.

And on top of this, tens of thousands of American families each month were losing their health insurance and their homes to foreclosure.

And the average price of gas exceeded \$4 per gallon.

It was against this backdrop that the new President of the United States, Barack Obama, rose to take the oath of office.

After being sworn in as the nation's 44th President, President Obama reassured an anxious but hopeful nation, saying:

"Today I say to you that the challenges we face are real. They are serious and they are many. They will not be met easily or in a short span of time. But know this America: They will be met."

Because of the actions President Obama took, not to further the interests of himself but of the American people, these challenges were more than met and overcome and for that Barack Obama's presidency is regarded by historians as a consequential presidency that changed America for the better.

Madam Speaker, before Trump took office in January 2017, the economy had recovered from the Great Recession and overall economic indicators were already strong and were trending stronger.

Unemployment had been cut by more than half during the Obama administration, from a peak of 10 percent to 4.7 percent.

The economy had experienced 76 consecutive months of job growth, the longest sustained period of growth in American history.

GDP growth was strong, average of 2.6 percent annually in the last 11 quarters of the Obama Administration and median household income growth was strong and trending upward, increasing \$4,800 during in last two years of the Obama administration.

Even Greg Mankiw, chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers under President George W. Bush, had to admit that "the economy was in fine shape at the end of the Obama administration, despite what the current President falsely asserts.

Madam Speaker, I will include in the RECORD an op-ed published on February 17, 2016 in the Washington Examiner, entitled "Seven Years of Change You Can See and Feel."

President Obama actually had a plan to tackle the economic woes that were affecting the American people.

Working with the Democratic-controlled Congress, the President signed into law the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, which created 3.7 million jobs and saved the jobs of millions of teachers, firefighters, police officers, and social service providers.

The Recovery Act also cut taxes for working families, extended unemployment insurance, and expanded the Earned Income and Child tax credits, which disproportionately benefit African American families.

The Recovery Act ended the Great Recession, transformed the economy from one hemorrhaging jobs to one that has created over 16 million new jobs over a record 71 consecutive months.

The national unemployment rate has dipped under 5 percent for the first time since President Clinton left office, the deficit has been cut by 71 percent, and the Dow Jones stock market index topped 18,000 in 2015, an increase of 177 percent over where it stood the day President Obama took office.

And, as an added benefit, the average price of gasoline has been reduced from more than \$4.11 per gallon to \$1.80, the lowest price since before the tragedy of September 11.

In short, Madam Speaker, President Obama bequeathed a booming and vibrant economy to his successor, who promptly took actions to undermine it and explode the national debt.

Madam Speaker, the GOP TaxScam was the wrong policy at the wrong time because it showered benefits on the top 1 percent and large multinational corporations while doing little for everyday working Americans and Main Street small business owners.

GOP TaxScam also raises the nation's debt by \$1.9 trillion at a time when the economy was already strong, and when we are facing major long-term budgetary challenges driven by our aging population.

And rather than devoting resources to wise investments in our workers and small businesses, the GOP TaxScam further burdens working families, endangers Americans' retirement security, and worsens our budgetary outlook.

Our long-term economic growth trajectory is unchanged and there is no sign of an investment boom.

Real wage growth for workers remains modest and factories and jobs are more likely to go overseas.

The federal deficit is soaring as corporate tax receipts plummet and the tax code is riddled with even more special-interest tax breaks and loopholes.

THE GOP TAXSCAM LED TO A RECORD-SETTING \$1 TRILLION IN STOCK BUYBACKS

The GOP TaxScam delivered huge benefits to rich investors and CEOs through record-setting stock buybacks in 2018 while average workers struggle to pay for rising health care and living costs.

Stock buybacks do nothing to improve business operations or help workers.

THE GOP TAXSCAM SHOWERS BENEFITS ON THE WEALTHY AND LARGE CORPORATIONS WHILE DOING LITTLE FOR WORKERS AND MAIN STREET SMALL BUSINESSES

The GOP tax cut is heavily tilted toward the wealthy and corporations and exacerbates the stagnation of wages for the vast majority of workers and worsens income and wealth inequality.

The GOP tax law does nothing to help small businesses gain access to capital and grow their receipts.

Only 5 percent of small businesses pay taxes at the corporate level and most of the pass-through tax cuts go to the largest 2.6 percent of businesses.

THE GOP TAX LAW ENCOURAGES COMPANIES TO SEND FACTORIES AND JOBS OVERSEAS

Under the GOP tax law, income generated by American companies abroad face tax rates that are half the new top corporate rate of 21 percent.

Some companies may be able to avoid tax altogether on tangible investments made offshore.

This further incentivizes companies to move tangible assets, such as factories and machinery, overseas.

Rather than protecting workers and their families, the GOP tax law tilts the playing field against American workers.

THE GOP TAX LAW INCREASES DEFICITS BY \$1.9 TRILLION WHEN WE ARE FACING MAJOR BUDGETARY CHALLENGES DRIVEN BY OUR AGING POPULATION

Even after accounting for any economic growth effects, the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) estimates the GOP taxscam increases deficits by \$1.9 trillion over the ten

years 2018 to 2028—hardly the "pay for itself" message we heard from the Administration and Republicans in Congress.

Our friends across the aisle promised the GOP TaxScam would significantly boost economic growth, spurred an investment boom, drove unemployment down to the lowest level since the 1960s, created jobs for millions of workers, and helped middle-class families keep more of their paychecks.

All of these claims have collapsed in the crucible of actual experience.

THE GOP TAXSCAM DID NOT SIGNIFICANTLY BOOSTS THE ECONOMY

In the seven quarters before and after passage of the Trump TaxScam, GDP growth is unchanged from the Obama economy, averaging 2.5 percent.

By 2023, the tax law's positive effect on economic growth will fade away entirely.

The GOP TaxScam Does Not Spur Business Investment

There is no evidence of an investment boom, which Republicans promised would be the key to unleashing unprecedented economic growth and wage gains.

Nonresidential business investment grew by less than 1 percent in the third quarter of last year, while business' orders for durable goods (another measure of investment) fell in December for the fourth time in five months.

Instead of encouraging investment, the tax cut triggered a record level of stock buybacks.

GOP TAXSCAM NOT CAUSE OF LOWEST UNEMPLOYMENT SINCE 1968

President Trump is coasting on an economic expansion—now the second-longest on record—that began under President Obama.

The law has not changed the unemployment trend.

The unemployment rate has fallen steadily since the end of the Great Recession.

THE GOP TAXSCAM HAS NOT CREATED JOBS FOR MILLIONS OF WORKERS

More jobs were created in President Obama's last two years in office than President Trump's first two years, a monthly average of 227,000 for Obama contrasted to an average of 191,000 for Trump.

Monthly non-farm job growth has slowed in the first 35 months of the Trump administration compared to the last 35 months of the Obama administration—36,000 fewer jobs per month under Trump.

The tax law also encourages companies to send factories and jobs overseas rather than protecting jobs at home.

THE GOP TAXSCAM IS NOT HELPING MIDDLE-CLASS FAMILIES KEEP MORE OF THEIR PAYCHECKS

There has been very little increase in private sector compensation or wages since the tax law passed.

Real wage growth continues to be disappointingly modest, and real bonuses increased by just 2 cents per hour between December 2017 and September 2018.

The law ignores the stagnation of working-class wages and worsens income and wealth inequality.

In fact, only 35 percent of the tax law's benefits in 2018 will go to the bottom 80 percent of households making less than approximately \$150,000 per year.

EVEN THOUGH FEDERAL REVENUES HAVE RISEN, THE GOP TAXSCAM HAS CREATED A MAJOR REVENUE DEFICIENCY PROBLEM

Corporate tax receipts dropped an astounding 31 percent drop in 2018, with total receipts

as a share of GDP falling to the lowest levels since the end of the Great Recession despite healthy economic growth and a tight labor market.

Revenue last year was 16.4 percent of the economy, almost two percentage points below the 50-year average of 18.3 percent in years in which unemployment fell below 5 percent.

By contrast, spending as a share of GDP last year fell right at the historical average.

Predictably, the President and our Republican friends seeks to evade blame and responsibility for the fiscal mess and exploding debt they have created.

Instead of redressing the harm caused by the Trump TaxScam, Republicans resort again to their past practice of blaming the deficit on the entitlement programs such as Social Security, Medicare, SNAP, and veterans benefits and seek to slash these programs to the barebones.

For example the President sought to cut non-defense discretionary (NDD) programs by \$1.4 trillion, including cuts to Medicare and Medicaid, reduce funding for SNAP by \$220 billion or 22 percent, and deny infrastructure funding for, cash-strapped state and local governments; and pile more hardships on struggling Americans with \$327 billion in cuts to direct spending programs that safeguard basic living standards they need to get by.

The President is obsessed with dismantling and destabilizing health care for millions of Americans by making yet another attempt to “repeal and replace” the Affordable Care Act passed under the extraordinary leadership of President Barack Obama which provided health security to more than 20 million Americans.

Madam Speaker, we now entering Act III of the immorality play we predicted the President would write.

Act I was the cutting of taxes for the rich; Act II was the inevitable exploding of the deficit we predicted would result and our Republican friends denied would ever happen.

And now we have Act III, in which Republicans claim to have newly rediscovered their horror over the deficits created by their fiscal irresponsibility and insist that the mess they created but be cleaned up by slashing investments in the programs relied upon by the 90–95 percent of Americans who were made worse off by the GOP TaxScam.

The President should be embarrassed and ashamed of his economic stewardship and thankful every day to President Obama for tackling and solving the major economic challenges facing Americans.

HONORING THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF OFFICER KATIE THYNE

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I rise today on a solemn occasion. I have the honor of representing Newport News, Virginia, and last week, the Newport News community lost Police Officer Katie Thyne, who was tragically killed in the line of duty.

Officer Thyne was only 24 years old and was the mother of a 2-year-old daughter. The Newport News community has lost someone who dedicated her life to public service.

In addition to serving with the Newport News Police Department, Officer Thyne was a Navy veteran, and she also spent time volunteering as a basketball coach at the local Boys and Girls Club.

Only 11 Newport News police officers have died in the line of duty in the last 100 years, and the last loss of an officer in the line of duty occurred over 25 years ago. Officer Thyne was the first woman.

I want to send my deepest condolences to the friends and family of Officer Thyne, as well as members of the Newport News Police Department who are dealing with this tragic loss of a colleague.

CONGRESSIONAL WESTERN CAUCUS

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Madam Speaker, before I begin, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the topic of my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Madam Speaker, I rise this afternoon to lead a Special Order alongside my colleagues from the Congressional Western Caucus to discuss important efforts to modernize one of our Nation’s bedrock conservation laws that has sorely grown outdated and ineffective.

The Endangered Species Act was signed into law 47 years ago to protect and revitalize species of endangered or threatened animals and wildlife, truly, a worthy goal.

Unfortunately, the ESA has earned a recovery rate of only about 3 percent, a staggering failure to protect the very species that it was intended to aid.

□ 1745

And while it has failed to safeguard those species, the law has been used as a political spearhead for frivolous litigation that threatens private property rights, public land use decisions, local communities, and American jobs.

Fortunately, there are ongoing efforts in the people’s House here and within the White House to update and modernize the Endangered Species Act to better protect species, all while treating States, property owners, and local stakeholders as partners rather than obstacles to species conservation.

The Western Caucus recently unveiled a package of 18 bills introduced by members across the rural West and beyond to strengthen the ESA. These bills reflect our intention to bring this

arcane law into the 21st century, aiming to create a more comprehensive and streamlined approach to support species recovery while ensuring our communities are not burdened by overregulation and misleading data.

This package includes my legislation, the Weigh Habitats Offsetting Locational Effects Act, to ensure all conservation measures are considered when Federal decisions that impact ESA-listed species are being made.

By establishing a process that considers the totality of conservation efforts, we can incentivize private investment in species recovery, streamline Federal decisionmaking, and promote the comprehensive efforts of States, local communities, and Tribes.

We should not tie our hands when it comes to species recovery. Using the best available science, considering all ongoing conservation measures, streamlining the process for listing decisions, and empowering State and local efforts creates a comprehensive approach to advance species recovery and fulfills the true intent of the Endangered Species Act.

Madam Speaker, with this package of bills, you will hear more from many of my colleagues in the Western Caucus. We are taking a very important step toward truly strengthening the ESA.

The Trump administration has also unveiled improvements to the implementation of ESA regulations developed to increase transparency and effectiveness of the law.

Secretary of the Interior David Bernhardt has rightly focused on updating the administration of ESA to target the areas where resources will do the most good, which, of course, are the direct, on-the-ground conservation measures.

Much like legislation in the Western Caucus package that I and my colleagues have championed, the updates direct listing decisions to be based solely on the best science available as well as commercial information. Only when sound science, not politics, determine conservation measures can we truly begin to turn the tide to achieve successes under the ESA.

The revisions also establish greater certainty for timely decisionmaking by Federal agencies and applicants, therefore providing streamlined actions and coordination for conservation efforts.

With partners like President Trump, Interior Secretary Bernhardt, and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Director, Aurelia Skipwith, I believe we truly can reverse the abysmal track record currently set under the Endangered Species Act.

Unfortunately, we are seeing efforts right here in the people’s House to completely undermine and halt these important steps being taken by the administration. Our conversation this afternoon is quite timely, I believe, because tomorrow the lead Democrat in the House Natural Resources Committee is marking up legislation to thwart the administration’s rule to

bring more transparency and modernization into the ESA.

Why anyone would be proud of the status quo in which only 3 percent of the species that have been listed under this law have recovered truly does baffle me. That 3 percent is quite the meager report card, so it is disappointing to see so many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle advocate for the status quo. I would hope they join me and my colleagues who are working to strengthen this law in order to provide real results, not simply evoking political talking points aimed at appeasing litigious environmental groups.

Madam Speaker, like far too many regulations that come from our Nation's Capitol, relying on top-down decisions from bureaucrats only serves to limit economic prosperity. These decisions have not only negatively impacted local communities, they have done close to nothing to recover and protect threatened animals and wildlife.

I am looking forward to partnering with many of my colleagues from the Western Caucus this afternoon to describe our efforts here in the people's House to finally modernize the Endangered Species Act, something that is far overdue for our wildlife, for our environment, and for all of our communities.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. GIANFORTE), my colleague and good friend, who is a true leader for conservation.

Mr. GIANFORTE. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend from Washington for yielding. He has been a leader in our efforts to reform the Endangered Species Act and to return management of wolves back to the States.

I also thank the chairman of the Western Caucus, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR). Congressman GOSAR has been instrumental in putting together this package of 17 bills to modernize the Endangered Species Act.

I wish we were here tonight to celebrate the successful recovery of the grizzly bear in the greater Yellowstone ecosystem and elsewhere. The great news is the grizzly has recovered. Unfortunately, constant litigation has prevented the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service from delisting the bear and returning management to the States.

I brought Secretary Bernhardt of the Department of the Interior to meet with families, ranchers, and local leaders in Choteau, Montana, just last fall. Parents told us how they put bars on their windows because the grizzly bears were looking in their children's bedrooms. One mom told me of a grizzly bear that chased her into her home when the bear heard the sound of her child crying.

At the point bears view children as a food source, we need to make changes. We have to put human safety ahead of the recovered grizzly bear.

Misuse and abuse of the Endangered Species Act are also shutting down responsible forest management. Every

forest service project in Montana seemingly ends up in court. The result: We are unable to manage our forests, improve wildlife habitat, and reduce the severity of wildfires.

We must put commonsense guardrails on the Endangered Species Act. We must restore it to its original purpose of recovering species, not serving as a tool for frivolous lawsuits from extreme special interest groups that work to shut down critical projects in our State.

To address these abuses of the ESA, I introduced the Less Imprecision in Species Treatment Act, or the LIST Act. The LIST Act helps modernize the ESA. The LIST Act empowers the Fish and Wildlife Service to promptly act on sound, established science to delist species that have recovered—and that should be our goal.

The bill allows the Fish and Wildlife Service to reverse listings that were made due to bad data, and the bill prohibits abuses of the listing process. It will ban those who intentionally submit false information from submitting listing petitions for 10 years.

These are commonsense reforms. I am proud to sponsor the LIST Act and support the rest of the package to better protect species, increase collaboration, and improve forest health.

These pieces of legislation focus efforts on recovering species native to the U.S. They ensure that data used to make listing decisions is publicly available on the internet, and they promote voluntary wildlife conservation agreements and candidate conservation agreements with assurances.

We can and must modernize the Endangered Species Act to work better, and the Western Caucus has offered a path forward.

Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Washington State for his leadership on this.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Madam Speaker, I thank Mr. GIANFORTE; his legislation, the LIST Act, is exactly the kind of update we need. It is a straightforward, science-based tool that equips Fish and Wildlife with exactly the kind of ability to make decisions based on facts regarding listing decisions. I thank the gentleman for his leadership. He is a great spokesman for the State of Montana, and I appreciate his help here this evening.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SMITH), my good friend.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Madam Speaker, I thank Mr. NEWHOUSE for yielding and for organizing this Special Order. I thank him for presenting to this body this piece of legislation with all the reforms of the Endangered Species Act. It is something that is extremely important.

Coming from the State of Missouri, we have folks who come from all over the country to hike our trails and to float our rivers. We are also home to the first Ozark National Scenic Riverway designated by a national

State park in southern Missouri. So we have many people who come to southeast and south central Missouri to look at our nature, to see the native plants and the native species, which several of them are designated within the Endangered Species Act.

Mr. NEWHOUSE made a comment earlier about only 3 percent of the species come out of the Endangered Species Act, that they come back. By any other measure, that would be a complete failure, and that is why we need these reforms. That is why we need these revisions.

Nowhere is the pain of the Endangered Species Act regulations, no greater place are those burdens felt than in local communities, and that is why we have the legislation, the EMPOWERS Act. And it mandates—not mandates the communities, it mandates the Federal Government to make sure that they get local input from communities in any kind of designation for an Endangered Species Act.

It is common sense. It is an easy approach. It is something that I think we can all get behind since they know their area better.

When you talk about the Endangered Species Act, this is something that is very personal to me, and it is personal to the people that I represent in southern Missouri.

Just a few years ago, we had a young lady, 13 or 14 years old, who was floating with her family on the White River, and a very unfortunate event happened where she got caught up underneath a broken dam and she lost her life. That family outing turned into a day that they will never forget, a day that I won't forget.

The big issue here is that dam shouldn't have been there, or it should have been rebuilt or replaced. You see, the dam was broken in a flood several years earlier but was never replaced and couldn't be torn out, even with the local community wanting to tear out the dam, the reason being because of an endangered species, one called the Ozark hellbender. It is a salamander. It was found in the White River near the dam, so that could be a resting place for this endangered species.

Because of that, a young lady will never graduate high school. She will never go to college. She will never walk down the aisle.

That is unacceptable. We are fortunate now that dam no longer exists, but it shouldn't have taken the loss of a life for Federal bureaucrats to get their act together to get that dam removed.

So this is one example that is extremely personal to the people I represent and it is extremely personal to me why we need these reforms in the Endangered Species Act.

□ 1800

Government should not stand in the way of safety. An endangered species should not have more importance than a human life.

I am looking forward to these reforms. These reforms bring sanity back to the Endangered Species Act through commonsense reforms, Missouri commonsense reforms, reforms such as transparency of the rulemaking process.

It helps put a stop to nuisance lawsuits from extreme environmental groups, using the best science available and, critically, bringing local communities into the decision-making process through my bill, the EMPOWERS Act.

We all agree commonsense review is needed, but what we don't need is redundant and unnecessary paperwork that only serves to keep Washington bureaucrats employed.

Madam Speaker, I thank Mr. NEWHOUSE for having me here tonight. He is doing the Lord's work, and I appreciate the honor of being here with him.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Madam Speaker, I thank Mr. SMITH, and I appreciate him for sharing some really personal impacts of a law that—can anyone think of another law that has been in place for 47 years without any kind of improvements or changes? It doesn't happen very often.

When we see impacts like that, that impact people's lives—they truly do—not only species that we are trying to protect but the people who are trying to live in concert with those species, it is something that really speaks, I think, to a lot of us. So I thank the gentleman very much for his bill.

The EMPOWER Act, I think, will give a lot of much-needed change and improvement to this process so that States and local communities can have a say. We should have more positive results from the ESA and move forward from that abysmal 3 percent success rate that we should not be proud of.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TIPTON), my good friend.

Mr. TIPTON. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague from Washington for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to be able to highlight the importance of modernizing the Endangered Species Act.

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service states that it implements the Endangered Species Act by working with others to conserve the ecosystems upon which the Endangered Species Act and threatened species depend upon and by developing and maintaining conservation programs for these species to improve their status to the point that the protection of the ESA is no longer necessary.

I wholeheartedly agree with that mission, and we should do everything possible to be able to grant the Fish and Wildlife Service the ability to be able to better protect at-risk or endangered species. I believe this can be done by utilizing local and State officials in a greater capacity.

Much of that legwork doesn't have to be done at the Federal level and can in-

stead be taken over by landowners who are out on the ground every day, working their land for farming, ranching, and for other purposes. They know the challenges that the threatened and endangered species face. They are in a unique position to be able to provide input on the best conservation strategies.

That is why, with this concept in mind, I have introduced the LOCAL Act, to be able to incorporate that hands-on local experience, to make sure that we are achieving what the ultimate goal is: to actually rehabilitate the species, to be able to take it off the endangered species list, and to be able to protect others from being added.

In the past 46 years of the law's existence, there is one glaring statistic that points to reforms being necessary. Since the ESA was first signed into law, there have been over 1,660 species listed. Of those, only 54 species have fully recovered, or an underwhelming 3 percent.

These numbers speak volumes that a one-size-fits-all mentality does not always result in the way that it is intended to. Not only that, but the red tape, timeframe, and expense to be able to recover a species is astronomical.

It is important to note that the goal of the ESA is to be able to keep species off the list in the first place, not keep them on for undetermined lengths of time.

Madam Speaker, I am glad to join my colleagues in the Congressional Western Caucus to be able to highlight the necessity of ESA reform.

In Colorado, we are proud to be able to have an abundance of wildlife, wildlife that resides on our public lands and, in many cases, in our own backyards. As residents of the State, we self-promote taking extra caution in our lands so that they may be preserved for future generations to enjoy.

After almost 50 years of lackluster results of recovering endangered species, I believe it is time that we rethink our strategy and place more trust in the local stewards of the land, not just bureaucrats in Washington.

If the goal is truly to recover species and to be able to protect species, let's make sure that we have programs in place that are going to achieve those results that we can all embrace.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Madam Speaker, I thank Mr. TIPTON for his comments. I have to say that he just hit the nail right on the head.

The ESA should encourage and incentivize voluntary conservation efforts. Species recovery, habitat recovery agreements, along with private property conservation grants and habitat conservation loan programs for State and local governments, will save money and resources while boosting conservation.

The more we can do this locally, the more we can direct these measures, the more impact they will have on accomplishing what we want from this conserving of species.

Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for this commonsense approach, this collaborative approach that he has taken, and for showing leadership on all of these crucial issues that are important to us in the West and all over the country, to the whole Nation.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR), the leader of the Congressional Western Caucus, someone who has shown a true sense of commitment to make the ESA something that it should be, something that is successful that we can all be proud of.

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE), my friend, for yielding.

I would like to first look at the Special Order and give a big "thank you" to Mr. NEWHOUSE for his passion for solving these issues affecting the Western States.

Madam Speaker, I have been honored to be the chairman of the Congressional Western Caucus for the past 3 years. In that time, the caucus has been the leading voice in the charge to modernize the decades-old Endangered Species Act.

It is clear that the ESA simply isn't working the way it should. Statistics show that only 3 percent of species listed under the act have been delisted.

Madam Speaker, if only 3 percent of the patients admitted to a hospital walked out healthy, that hospital would be shut down immediately. This rate of ineptitude is not sustainable.

Back in September, I was proud to organize and chair a forum of Members of Congress and more than 30 stakeholders from across the country to hear firsthand testimonials about how the ESA is broken and to hear suggestions for modifications and reform to make it work better. These testimonies hit home, exposing the fact that the Endangered Species Act is in disrepair and in desperate need of reform.

There have been several very positive developments in modernizing ESA in the last year alone. The administration, with the full support of the Congressional Western Caucus, proposed three new rules for the ESA.

This new rulemaking is the first substantial amending of the act since the 1980s. These new rules make the ESA more transparent and efficient, and they act more in line with Congress' intent.

In addition, I am excited about the Congressional Western Caucus' Endangered Species Act reform package for the 116th Congress, which currently comprises 17 separate pieces of legislation. This package includes six bills that were included in a similar package in the 115th Congress and three other bills from Western Caucus members offered in the 115th Congress. It seeks to codify the three regulations recently finalized by the Trump administration. It also includes six new bills. These bills protect private property rights, encourage voluntary conservation, improve forest health in order to

preserve and protect species and local communities, increase multiple-use activities, and protect critical infrastructure.

The sponsoring Members of these bills come from nearly every geographic corner of the United States. These Members are taking constituent-driven initiatives and working to make them law.

The need for a package like this is obvious. For example, forests are burning across the West on a yearly basis, in part because of ludicrous ESA restrictions.

Similarly, I am sure everyone in this Chamber is familiar with some of my Democratic colleagues' sentiments that if we do not pass the Green New Deal, the world will end in 12 years. What they do not talk about is that there is no way that their already unrealistic renewable energy goals can be met without large-scale buildup of new power lines and other energy transmission infrastructure. Under current environmental regulations, including the ESA, building pieces of that very infrastructure could take at least 12 years, so I guess we are all doomed anyway.

As I mentioned earlier, great steps have been taken by the Trump administration to bring the ESA into the 21st century. My Democratic colleagues, however, Madam Speaker, cannot help themselves and are preparing to fight these commonsense proposals instead of helping and getting onboard.

Tomorrow, the Natural Resources Committee will mark the bill that will undo these landmark reforms to the ESA. This is, once again, a purely political act by this House, and it has no chance of going anywhere.

Instead, I call on my Democratic colleagues to work with us to build on the new regulations from the Trump administration to get the ESA working again and better protect species.

Once again, Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague, Mr. NEWHOUSE, for allowing me to speak during this important Special Order today and for his leadership in highlighting the need to reform the Endangered Species Act.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Madam Speaker, I thank Mr. GOSAR for being here tonight. He truly has been a leader in this effort to modernize the ESA. I thank him for his commitment to that.

Legislation like he is proposing is going to be a huge step in improving the situation that we have in this country. So, I thank the gentleman for being here, again, very much.

If I could just say, I think it will improve the predictability for endangered species listings and critical habitat designations, but it will also level the playing field by applying the same standards for listing as we do for delisting a species.

If a species is recovered, we should celebrate that. It should be a happy day, something that is a good thing. That is our goal. Then we can remove it from the endangered list so that re-

sources can then be directed toward species that still need to be protected and brought back. It just makes sense.

I think the best example that comes to mind is the gray wolf. We should be celebrating that. They are back, and they are back strong. The science is clear about that. They are recovered, and it should be removed from the list so that we can better come to the aid of other endangered species.

Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for being here tonight.

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for hosting this Special Order.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA), my good friend and fellow farmer.

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Speaker, I thank Mr. NEWHOUSE for his leadership on this and for providing this time for us here this evening to be able to talk about this issue in a very real and constructive way.

The ESA passed in 1973, I think with a pretty strong bipartisan effort, signed by President Nixon. It was very well intentioned at the time, as were some of the other protection measures that were put in place for air and water.

As we saw the other day here with the changing of the WOTUS rule, the waters of the United States rule, over time, regulations can get out of control. They can be used for politics. They can be used for controlling people, for NIMBYism, and for no-growth and all that. I think that is really what these have expanded into.

Our job is to provide oversight. Our job is to provide course corrections, to make sure the ship is on the course it was intended 40-plus years ago.

The package of reforms that are being talked about by my colleagues and the bills that are being offered aren't here to gut the Endangered Species Act or to eliminate species. It is to bring back that course correction that we are looking for.

Though it was signed 40 years ago, it is our job to constantly monitor it and make sure it is working.

We talked earlier about that 3 percent of species that were listed that have recovered. Now, 3 percent doesn't give you a very good batting average, I think, in any league, so that would be considered a failure.

It is not because of a lack of effort or lack of spending. Certainly, in my own State of California, where species have been listed, we have issues with fish, with delta smelt, with salmon, and yet trillions of gallons of water are expended flushing the delta each year to find a lower result. Only two smelt have been caught in their check traps in the last five quarters, I think. That doesn't show success, but it shows a lot of damage to the people who need that water for other purposes as well.

□ 1815

So, let's find and focus on things that are going to be helpful to the species to

be recovered and doesn't have to damage people and their livelihoods along the way.

Reform is necessary to refocus the efforts of the Federal Government to help them recover more timely. One of the longtime listed in California, the valley elderberry longhorn beetle, was listed for approximately 40 years. And, yet, in 2012, the Fish and Wildlife Service was saying: Okay, we think it is time to pull that from the list. Let's do the work involved to remove it from the list because they had seen some success in that time period.

An important part that we don't talk about enough is what is known as critical habitat. Critical habitat is any host plant or other vehicle for a possible endangered species that might take residence there.

So the bush itself, the elderberry bush, any one of those, basically cannot be touched because it might be a potential habitat for a traveling elderberry beetle, although maybe none of them have ever been tracked in that particular area. Yet, every single bush—it is a battle. It is a fight.

Now, why are we fighting over the bushes? It is because many of these grow in floodplain areas, on levees that need to be maintained, rebuilt, and upgraded. We have a lot of potential for flooding in northern California.

Indeed, it wasn't so much potential as several times we have had bad floods result. And I would mention in the Yuba City-Marysville area, two very big floods in 1986 and 1997 that happened from crumbling levees.

Why don't they maintain the levees?

Because they can't. It is getting the permits and getting through the process and then being able to afford it by the time you have done that with all the requirements that are put on to maintain this habitat.

To maintain these elderberry bushes, in this case, makes it cost prohibitive for these local levee districts to be able to do their job.

So, what happens?

Nothing happens.

And so, in 1986 there was a giant flood, hundreds, thousands of homes in 1986. In 1997, it happened again. If the lesson wasn't learned, 11 years later in 1997, it happened again in the Yuba City-Marysville area. And at this point, three lives were lost in addition to all of that other damage. Three lives were lost needlessly because we couldn't learn the lessons and get the permits done to get the levee work done.

Why does that have to be?

Because of roadblocks, because of endless lawsuits and slow-moving bureaucracies that won't issue the permits and help with the funding that needs to get done.

So, finally, after all that was litigated, the government had to pay approximately \$400 million in damages for the losses of life and property in these floods.

It is pretty disgusting. But still, every single bush is litigated as a potential for critical habitat, even

though there may not ever be one of the species you are talking about, in this case the valley elderberry longhorn beetle, that might potentially use it.

So what happened with the delisting in 2012?

Well, they finally gave up because of litigation and about how they do the sampling of the beetle; how they do the sampling of the habitat of the beetle.

They said, Well, we can't tell if it is the valley elderberry longhorn beetle or the California elderberry longhorn beetle that might be making these boreholes in the plants and in the ground there.

So they just gave up and said, We are not going to delist it anymore.

That is similar to the situation my colleagues were talking about with the gray wolf. You can find plenty of gray wolves all over the upper Midwest and those other States. Yet, the standard seems to be in the Endangered Species Act, you have to find two or four remaining pairs in every single county, otherwise it is still listed as endangered in California or anywhere else.

The rules have gone too far. We need caps on the attorney's fees that make it not such an incentive for environmental groups to use this as a way to get paid as well as the way to stop progress, stop things that people need.

So I hope this package of bills at least can be a light and example of a direction we are trying to take back to reasonableness and how the Endangered Species Act is interpreted and used; not abused, not used as a weapon, weaponized against what we need for flood control to save peoples' lives or water storage.

If we are going to play the climate-change game, then we need to be able to have more of these tools available to us to store water.

It would certainly help if we had more input from our local stakeholders on this who actually know how to get a project done.

Finally, the Marysville-Yuba City area I was talking about, using local districts and local efforts, they did some amazing work after a lot of roadblocks were overcome.

So finally, the last bit—which is up to the Army Corps of Engineers—is going to be completed in that area of rebuilding the levees and putting the slurry wall in that is going to make them much less likely to erode and blow out. In 2020, the last piece is going to be done, if the Army Corps stays on their own unique schedule.

This is many years after those two floods. So I commend the great work that has been done up to this point, but how many needless years of risk in these flood zones have to happen because we can't get out of our own way because of a permit or because of somebody's interpretation of a critical habitat for a creature that doesn't even show up to these critical habitat areas?

I am tired of fighting the fight against people who don't seem to care

how it affects the people who they govern.

And so this is, I hope, a true effort that everybody can see to reform this act into something that actually works for people, works for the species, and gets a little better batting average than 3 percent recovery rate, which is pathetic, especially for the trillions of gallons of water we lose to the delta each year, the risk we have for people in flood zones, the high cost, the loss of potential, and the anguish that all of that brings.

Madam Speaker, I am glad we had this time to be able to share this with the public that is watching and our colleagues who are hopefully listening that we can reform the act and still have it pursue the goals of making the endangered species, that we talk about and care about, come off those lists because they are thriving once again.

We have seen some successful examples. The bald eagles, which I can see outside the window of my home in my rice field there, that is pretty tremendous. But we have got to get our batting average up, especially when you look at what it is costing society in lost potential and, unfortunately, sometimes in lost lives.

Madam Speaker, I appreciate Mr. NEWHOUSE yielding me the time, and I appreciate his efforts on this.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Madam Speaker, I thank Mr. LAMALFA and have to say that he has been a true leader in the Congressional Western Caucus and in the House of Representatives. It is awesome to be able to have someone contribute as much as the gentleman does that has the experience and the knowledge of how these laws impact real people.

Madam Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. OLSON), my friend who actually serves on the important, powerful Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Mr. OLSON. Madam Speaker, I want to thank my friend, Mr. NEWHOUSE, for yielding. He is from my birth State of Washington, Fort Lewis, the old Madigan Army Medical Center in 1962. That was a long, long time ago.

I thank the gentleman for coming to see the Petra Nova project in my district, the only viable carbon capture project in the whole world.

I thank the gentleman on behalf of the Congressional Western Caucus for taking the time to see real solutions to real problems.

My bride is a girl from Los Angeles, California—Hollywood. This is a big time back home for my Nancy: the Screen Actors Guild, the SAG Awards, which happened last weekend, and before that, the Golden Globes. The granddaddy of them all, the Oscars, is coming up this weekend.

If the success of the ESA was a movie, it would get a 0.0 Rotten Tomatoes score.

It would be a horror story that surpasses Hannibal Lecter, Freddy Krueger, and Jason. It would be a story

of how misused ESA is a threat to our national security, global freedom, and guarantees more greenhouse gases plaguing our world.

This story will be set in west Texas and southeast New Mexico. It stars an unremarkable creature named the dunes sagebrush lizard with best supporting actor played by a radical, antigrowth environmental activist.

The lizard lives on top of the Permian Basin, the most powerful force America has had for peace and clean air in the past two decades. That happened because of reemergence of American oil and gas as the number one producer in the entire world. That is because of the hydraulic fracturing revolution that has swept our Nation and the world.

The Permian Basin is leading the hydraulic fracturing revolution. Experts expect it to produce, by itself, 8 million barrels of oil per day in the next 4 years. That is up from its high, a mere 2 million barrels per day just 10 years ago.

That means, one, American shale play will be a bigger producer of oil and gas than every country in the world. That means bigger than Saudi Arabia, bigger than Russia, bigger than OPEC.

Two countries that emit the most greenhouse gases, they are China and India. Their only natural power source is coal. Right now, as I speak, megatons of American liquefied natural gas coming from the Permian Basin, the Bakken shale play in South Dakota, and Marcellus shale play here out East are going to China and India. Their air will be cleaner because of American energy.

It is a win-win for the jobs here in America, exporting technology to our friends for cleaner air and cleaner air in the global context.

You would think the environmental groups would love this, but, sadly, you would be wrong. For 10 years, people who have never been to the Permian Basin and can't spell Odessa if I spot them O-D-E-S-S, are pushing actively to have the dunes sagebrush lizard listed as an endangered species.

In 2012, they pushed President Barack Obama hard to have that listing. President Obama said, No, it is unnecessary. The locals are taking care of the issue by themselves. President Obama was right. The species is still with us today. But that hasn't stopped these liberals from using the Endangered Species Act to support OPEC and Russian energy.

They filed another lawsuit this past summer that is going through the courts. They know by doing that, they hinder growth because people are afraid to invest in the place that may have a pop-up endangered species that is not actually endangered.

These groups follow someone from Hollywood who is not a real person. His name is Forrest Gump. His motto is: "Stupid is as stupid does."

Enough of the stupidity. The ESA must focus on species, not political

dreams: My bill, the Listing Reform Act, H.R. 5585, addresses this exact problem.

I close by saying something we all know: “Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall set you free.”

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments. I did have the privilege of visiting the gentleman’s district and seeing firsthand the Parish Generating Station, a state-of-the-art carbon capture and sequestration facility. It was amazing and truly helped me understand the potential of the technology that we now have at our disposal.

It is that kind of thing that will allow our Nation to truly lead in the American energy renaissance.

□ 1830

Unfortunately, all too often, some of the complications from the bureaucracy get in the way, and things like the ESA can prevent us from reaching our full potential.

I thank the gentleman for his leadership and ensuring that the economic effects are something too that we need to take into account. I appreciate the gentleman’s contributions here this evening.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from the Fifth Congressional District of the great State of Arizona (Mr. BIGGS).

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE). I appreciate his leadership and work on these very important issues.

I am grateful to have a few minutes to speak and to address some of these issues that confront us as a nation and confront us in the Western part of this country, particularly in Arizona.

Land management and species management are critically important issues everywhere in this country, especially so in the West. Nationwide, the Federal Government owns one out of every three acres. But when you go to the West, Madam Speaker, it is one out of every two acres. In fact, in my State of Arizona, only about 20 percent of the total land area is in private hands. Federal holdings actually exceed the size of the State of Virginia.

Of course, Federal control over land means that bureaucrats in Washington, D.C., rather than knowledgeable State and local officials get to set the rules, and that certainly is the case when it comes to the Endangered Species Act.

ESA listings, in theory, are meant to give short-term support for species recovery. They are not supposed to turn into permanent classifications. However, as we have been hearing a litany of stories in this Special Order tonight—and as everyone who participates in this country knows—the reality is far different. In fact, less than 2 percent of species have been removed from the ESA list.

Another significant problem is that current Fish and Wildlife Service policies make it far easier to list a new

species than to examine the current list for potential removal.

Excessive ESA listings place enormously costly requirements on private landowners and even State and local government agencies.

For this reason, I introduced the LIST Act in the last Congress to greatly speed up the rate in which recovered species may be taken off the ESA list once the Secretary of the Interior receives objective data that the species in question has recovered. I am pleased to see that my good friend from Montana, Representative GREG GIANFORTE, is championing the LIST Act this year. It is a great piece of legislation.

Meanwhile, I am aiming to reform the ESA from an entirely different perspective with a new bill I introduced last week that I am calling the American Sovereignty and Species Protection Act.

I would bet that most Americans would be surprised to learn that the ESA currently allows the U.S. Government to buy foreign land—that is right, non-U.S. land, land in foreign nations—to protect endangered species in other countries. While this may be a well-intentioned policy, it is tragically naive. Remember that just because a Department of the Interior official purchases foreign land with the hope that it will be used to protect an endangered species, it does not mean that a foreign government will see things in the same way. Because the U.S. does not have sovereignty over the internal affairs of other nations, and exerts especially little influence over the developing nations in which so many endangered species live, I would much rather see taxpayer dollars used to advance domestic priorities.

The American Sovereignty and Species Protection Act, the LIST Act, and all the other ESA modernization efforts we have been talking about today in this packet of bills will help us to scale back bureaucratic overreach and still ensure that critically endangered species are protected. Both aims are achievable.

As the Western Caucus’ chief regulatory officer, I will work with great leaders like those who have spoken and like our host today, DAN NEWHOUSE from Washington, to ensure that our goals are met.

Madam Speaker, I thank Mr. NEWHOUSE for his leadership and for yielding.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman helping us here this evening as we get down to the final few minutes of our hour.

While the thought behind foreign land acquisition in the ESA may have been well-intentioned, we need accountability, and we need to be able to determine whether results are being achieved.

The point the gentleman made about investing in our efforts domestically makes a lot of sense where we can focus on a results-driven approach using science and not emotion. So I

thank my friend very much for that thought.

In trying to accommodate schedules, if I may, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN) for a few thoughts that he has on this. He is a member of the Western Caucus. We are happy to adopt South Carolina as a Western State.

Mr. NORMAN. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend for his leadership on this issue and for what he has done over a long period of time to help this all-important issue.

Let me just echo what has already been said. I am a real estate developer. I have felt the effects of the bureaucratic overreach of the Endangered Species Act. I have seen where a heelsplitter snail can slow up projects for as many as 4 to 5 years.

I have been watching from a distance, and now, finally, we have decided to take action. I rise in support of the long-overdue efforts to modernize the Endangered Species Act and specifically my bill that would help continue protections for species while, more importantly, protecting the rights of individual property owners. My bill, the Property Rights Protection Act, would do just that.

Everyone agrees that it is important to protect these species that are threatened or endangered, but far too often, it comes at the expense of the constitutional rights of landowners.

This vital piece of legislation would ensure that we achieve both goals. We protect species, but we also protect our rights as property owners.

If the Federal Government deems land to be critical habitat because a species is endangered, then they ought to compensate the landowners, plain and simple. I believe that there needs to be a more equitable way to treat property owners who far too often find themselves in this type of situation. This legislation will be an excellent step in that direction.

Many landowners cannot afford the litigation costs that so many of these groups put before the landowners to get the rights that they deserve.

I really hope that all of my colleagues can come together to support this important piece of legislation to protect our rights and species and, more importantly, come together to update an antiquated law that is the Endangered Species Act that has been in need of modernization for far too long.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Madam Speaker, I appreciate Mr. NORMAN’s thoughts. We should be doing everything in our power to incentivize landowners to be active participants in conservation efforts for threatened and endangered species.

Without oversight over whether current restrictions set by the Federal Government would actually help these species, and with very little recourse available for the property owner, this legislation takes a very important step forward to ensure there is a collaborative approach.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the good gentleman from the First Congressional District of the great State of Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, I appreciate my friend from Washington, who is a great Member of Congress and who knows exactly some of the damage that the Endangered Species Act has done. We certainly have experienced that in Texas.

We did, in the House, modernize the Endangered Species Act in my first term, 2005 and 2006, and it was quite an education to me because I thought the Endangered Species Act was all about trying to save endangered species. But I got an education. I found out that was not what the Endangered Species Act was about because if it was just about saving endangered species, we would have saved a lot more than 1, 2, and 3 percent of the endangered species.

One of the things that we did in that bill that I thought was common sense because I know there are landowners—I hear about these situations—and that is what they rely on to feed their families. There is a doctrine that is not an official doctrine known as shoot, shovel, and shut up. Somebody sees an endangered species, and they are scared if somebody sees it, then the use of their land will be taken away, and they will no longer be able to provide for their family.

Even though I believe that it is a taking anticipated under the Bill of Rights, which requires remuneration, that is not what the courts have found. But in that modernized bill back in my first term, we said: Look, if you are going to tell a landowner he can't use his land, or she can't use her land, then you ought to pay them because you have taken away the use.

I was shocked to find that there were people on the other side of the aisle who said: No, no, no. We don't want that in there.

But that will save species; people will be more willing to volunteer that they found an endangered species.

The answer was: Well, they shouldn't even have that land anyway.

I appreciate the efforts of the gentleman from Washington. Hopefully, we can work together because we do indeed care about endangered species, and modernization will allow us to save a whole lot more than 1, 2, or 3 percent.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Madam Speaker, I thank Mr. GOHMERT. The gentleman knows full well from his time serving on the House Natural Resources Committee just how ineffective the current ESA is performing. I thank the gentleman for his leadership and for spearheading the SAVES Act, as he described, to enhance our conservation measures for endangered species.

Madam Speaker, you just heard from a variety of members from the Congressional Western Caucus who represent not only rural districts in the West but also communities across the Nation, from Montana to Missouri,

from South Carolina to California. Their message was clear: We must modernize the ESA. Doing so will be good for the species. It will be good for communities. It will be good for taxpayers. And it will be good for our economy.

A few Members were unable to join us tonight. I want to list some of the bills that they are sponsoring: Congresswoman CHENEY's Increasing Access and Multiple Use Act, Congressman WESTERMAN's PETITION Act, Congressman MIKE JOHNSON's Critical Habitat Improvement Act, Congressman YOUNG's LAMP Act, Congressman STEWART's Critical Infrastructure Act, Congressman CALVERT's FISH Act, Congressman MCCLINTOCK's Endangered Species Transparency and Reasonableness Act, and Congressman BUCK's Threatened Species Protection Improvement Act.

All of these bills are critical for a comprehensive update to ensure the ESA accomplishes what it was designed to do: recover threatened and endangered animals and wildlife.

This package is supported by dozens of organizations, including the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Counties, the Family Farm Alliance, the National Endangered Species Act Reform Coalition, the American General Contractors Association, the Independent Petroleum Association of America, the National Association of Home Builders, the Western Energy Alliance, the United Snowmobile Association, the National Mining Association, American Agri-Women, and the National Cotton Council, amongst many, many, many others.

As we continue to push for reforms to the ESA in the people's House and work with the administration and the White House to support the Department of the Interior's updated implementation regulations, I hope that my colleagues will join us in recognizing that we can do so much better to recover our Nation's magnificent flora and fauna.

The Western Caucus will remain at the forefront of this effort. A 3 percent success rate is failing our wildlife across this beautiful country. We must do better.

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

WHY IMPOUNDMENT CONTROL ACT MATTERS

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YARMUTH. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. YARMUTH. Madam Speaker, a week from today, we will hear about the state of our Union from an impeached President who has repeatedly shown a complete disregard for the principles on which that union was founded.

President Trump has brazenly trampled the constitutional boundaries of executive power, damaging the foundation of our democracy. He shamelessly betrayed his oath of office by putting his own corrupt agenda before our national security.

His withholding of aid to Ukraine has dominated the news, but the administration's willingness to pervert our laws for President Trump's ego, personal vendettas, and political gains goes much deeper.

Earlier this month, the nonpartisan U.S. Government Accountability Office, or GAO, issued a legal opinion stating that Trump's Office of Management and Budget, OMB, violated Federal law, specifically the Impoundment Control Act of 1974, by withholding foreign aid.

Madam Speaker, I will include that opinion in the RECORD.

□ 1845

As chairman of the Budget Committee, which has jurisdiction over this law, it is my responsibility to provide the full story to the American people and to Members of Congress so that we can all fully understand what is happening to our government.

To start with, this violation of Federal law was not an innocent mistake. Withholding Ukrainian aid was an intentional and brazen abuse of power. This quid pro quo is the most egregious example that we know of, but the Budget Committee has been concerned by OMB's questionable behavior and apparent violations of the Impoundment Control Act for some time.

A deeper look clearly reveals how methodically the President and his administration have been circumventing our laws to advance their authoritarian view of executive power. To understand their scheme, we must understand the law they tried to secretly dodge and ultimately broke, the Impoundment Control Act.

The U.S. Constitution grants Congress the power to appropriate our tax dollars, while the President's administration carries out these spending decisions. It is a simple but incredibly important check on executive power.

In 1974, Congress passed the Impoundment Control Act, the ICA, in response to another law-breaking President, President Nixon. By refusing to spend congressionally appropriated funds for programs he opposed, such as funding for clean drinking water, Nixon's administration was impounding funds.

An impoundment means any action or inaction that prevents Federal funds

from being obligated or spent, either temporarily or permanently.

By passing the ICA, Congress reasserted its constitutionally appropriated power of the purse by establishing procedures to block the President and other government officials from substituting their own funding decisions for those of Congress.

It created two pathways the executive branch can use to reduce, delay, or eliminate congressionally appropriated funding: They can propose to cancel funding, which is known as a rescission, or delay funding, which is a deferral, but both must meet strict requirements.

For example, if the President wants to eliminate funding for a specific program, he must first secure congressional approval to cancel that funding. The ICA requires that the President send a special message to Congress identifying the amount of, the reasons for, and the effects of a proposed rescission.

After submitting this special message, the President can withhold those funds for up to 45 legislative session days while Congress considers the request. But if Congress does not pass a law to cancel those funds within that 45-day period, those funds must be released. So even with this process, the President cannot cancel funding without Congress' explicit approval.

Also, the President cannot use the rescissions process to run out the fiscal year clock, in other words, to withhold funds for so long that they can no longer be used. We will come back to rescission, so keep this in mind.

Now, the ICA defines a deferral as withholding, delaying, or effectively preventing congressionally approved funds from being obligated or spent, either through executive action or inaction. But here is the catch. There are only three narrow circumstances in which the President can propose a deferral: to provide for contingencies, to achieve budgetary savings through approved operational efficiency, and as specifically provided by law.

Notice that policy reasons is not one of the three.

As with rescissions, the ICA requires that the President send a special message to Congress identifying how much they want to defer, why, and for how long. However, a proposed deferral may not extend beyond the end of the fiscal year. Only once Congress receives this special message can the President withhold those funds.

Again, the President cannot withhold funds for so long that they can no longer be used.

I hope that didn't make anyone's eyes glaze over, but the details of the Impoundment Control Act are at the heart of this administration's lack of respect for our Nation's separation of powers and rule of law.

Today, nearly 46 years after the ICA became law, Congress confronts a President and an administration eager to blow past the boundaries of execu-

tive budgetary power and co-opt Congress' power of the purse for the President's personal gain.

This brings us to 2018 and one the first red flags. My committee's concerns about ICA violations under the Trump administration actually started in 2018, when I was serving as the committee's ranking member.

Multiple reports warned that the Trump administration was considering a late-in-the-year rescissions package that would have effectively started that 45-day clock close to the end of the fiscal year. As you recall, the ICA requires congressional approval before funds can be canceled. By withholding funds through their expiration date, President Trump and OMB aimed to game the system and create a backdoor rescission. The White House had to abandon this scheme in the face of bipartisan condemnation.

To send a clear message to the White House and to put an end to any future attempts at backdoor rescissions, then-Chairman WOMACK and I, in October of 2018, requested GAO's legal opinion on whether an ill-timed rescission package from the White House would violate the ICA.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD the letter that then-Chairman WOMACK and I sent to the GAO.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,

Washington, DC 20515, October 31, 2018.

Hon. GENE L. DODARO,
Comptroller General, U.S. Government Accountability Office, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. DODARO: We are requesting clarification in the form of a legal opinion on the issue of proposed rescissions of funds submitted close to their expiration date. It is important that Congress remain at the center of the decision of whether to withhold funds. To that end Congress should have adequate time to receive, consider, and act on any rescission message sent by the President.

Under the Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (ICA), the President may submit a special message proposing the rescission of budget authority and may withhold funds from obligation for a period of 45 calendar days of continuous session following transmission of the special message. Public Law No. 93-344, as amended, 1012; 2 U.S.C. §683. If Congress does not pass a rescission bill within the 45-day period, the ICA requires that the funds be released for obligation. Specifically, section 1012(b) states: "Any amount of budget authority proposed to be rescinded or that is to be reserved as set forth in such special message shall be made available for obligation unless, within the prescribed 45-day period, the Congress has completed action on a rescission bill rescinding all or part of the amount proposed to be rescinded or that is to be reserved."

As you know, the rescission process has been used this year for the first time since the Clinton Administration. Naturally, some questions have arisen. One question of particular importance to Congress concerns whether the executive can use the rescission process to withhold funds from obligation for the duration of the 45-day period, even if the funds expire before the end of that period.

GAO has never issued an opinion on the legality of withholding funds in this circumstance. We now request GAO's legal opinion regarding whether the ICA allows

funds to be withheld from obligation in this situation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

STEVE WOMACK,
Chairman,
JOHN YARMUTH,
Ranking Member.

Mr. YARMUTH. In December 2018, GAO issued a decision, which I will include in the RECORD, concluding that, while the ICA does, under limited circumstances, allow the President to withhold money for up to 45 congressional session days, the President cannot freeze the money for so long that it can no longer be used.

GAO confirmed Congress' constitutional role, saying: "A withholding of this nature would be an aversion both to the constitutional process for enacting Federal law and to Congress' constitutional power of the purse, for the President would preclude the obligation of budget authority Congress has already enacted and did not rescind."

Mr. WOMACK and I both welcomed this opinion from GAO, calling it an important confirmation of Congress' constitutional authority over funding decisions.

While GAO was deliberating, OMB submitted their views, as is customary. A letter from OMB's general counsel seems to assert the belief that the President can do whatever he wants, that he doesn't have to respect our separation of powers or the will of Congress to cancel funds he doesn't want to spend, that he is above the law.

As GAO stated in their opinion: "The President has no unilateral authority to withhold funds from obligation."

"The President cannot rely on the authority in the ICA to withhold amounts from obligation, while simultaneously disregarding the ICA's limitations."

This deliberate disregard for our laws undermines our democracy. The executive branch is not a monarchy, but this attitude is a pernicious problem with this administration.

Less than a year later, in August of 2019, a document, a letter apportionment from OMB, was leaked. An apportionment is a legally binding budget document used by OMB to set the rate at which an agency spends its funds over the course of a fiscal year.

For example, we wouldn't want an agency to come to Congress in March saying that it has already spent its entire annual operating budget and must cease operations unless Congress provides more money. To prevent this, OMB apportions agencies money. However, this leaked letter from August 3, 2019, raised multiple red flags.

First, this letter apportionment, sent to officials at the State Department and the U.S. Agency for International Development, put an abrupt freeze on billions in foreign aid less than 60 days before the end of the fiscal year.

OMB put a legally binding hold on 15 key accounts that covered a spectrum of assistance, international control,

peacekeeping operations, global health programs, foreign military financing programs, and more.

Similar to 2018, reports were circulating that President Trump planned a late-in-the-year rescissions package, despite GAO's decision just 9 months earlier rebuking the tactic as an end run around Congress.

On August 19, Senate Budget Committee Ranking Member SANDERS and I wrote a letter to President Trump's Acting Chief of Staff and OMB Director Mick Mulvaney urging him to follow the law and to respect Congress' constitutional authority.

Second red flag, this apportionment was signed by Michael Duffey, an administration political appointee. Since OMB's inception, career officials with knowledge and expertise of the apportionment process and impoundment law, not political appointees, have signed these highly technical budget documents. This means that OMB took the unprecedented step of stripping career officials of their normal role in the apportionment process and, instead, gave this responsibility to someone who had been appointed by the President. This was, to say the least, suspicious.

Third red flag, under current law, apportionments are not public documents. OMB sent no special message to Congress to flag this hold on foreign aid, as the law requires; they kept Congress in the dark. If the document had not been leaked, Congress might not have ever discovered this suspicious funding freeze.

What else were they hiding?

While this leaked August 3 letter apportionment is what first alerted Congress to the President's willingness to break the law, at that time we could not have guessed how nefarious it really was. A few weeks later, the Budget Committee would uncover a pattern of abuse of the apportionment process, our separation of powers, and current law.

As part of our investigation, my committee asked OMB for documents and answers detailing their involvement in the withholding of foreign aid. After review of the materials provided to us, it was clear that this was an intentional and willful abuse of power.

To lay this out as plainly as I can, I will outline what happened chronologically.

It all starts on May 23, 2019, when the Pentagon sent a letter to Congress certifying that the Government of Ukraine had met Congress' anticorruption requirements and was, therefore, eligible to receive the critical security assistance it needed. Most importantly, the Pentagon notified lawmakers of its plans to spend the money.

Keep in mind that this is critical funding Ukraine needs to protect itself from Russia, our shared adversary.

The first sign of trouble came almost a month later, on June 19, 2019. In response to our request for answers, OMB

asserts that this is when they first reach out to the Department of Defense to ask about the Ukraine Security Assistance Initiative, or USAI, funds.

Mark Sandy, an Afghanistan veteran and top career OMB official who is responsible for managing the flow of Pentagon funds, testified that OMB officials were told the President wanted the Ukraine aid paused, but he didn't understand why.

So, while reaching out to the Pentagon to learn more about the aid package, he also repeatedly pressed Mr. Duffey about why President Trump imposed the hold. But Mr. Sandy didn't get a clear answer. He testified that Mr. Duffey "didn't provide an explicit response on the reason. He simply said, 'We need to let the hold take place'—and I'm paraphrasing here—and then revisit this issue with the President.'"

Just about a week later, on June 27, Mick Mulvaney was flying on Air Force One with President Trump when he fired off a quick email to an aide back in Washington. The email said: "I'm just trying to tie up some loose ends. Did we ever find out about the money for Ukraine and whether we can hold it back?"

The aide, Robert Blair, replied that, while they could carry out the President's request, the move to withhold aid passed in a bipartisan spending deal would not go over well with Congress. "Expect Congress to become unhinged," he wrote back.

I don't know about unhinged, but Congress was not going to let this abuse of executive overreach go unanswered.

These early conversations are critical to our timeline because they show that this administration's abuse of our laws and plans to blackmail a foreign nation into helping President Trump cheat our elections was premeditated.

President Trump, Mulvaney, and Duffey abused OMB's authority to withhold Ukraine security assistance at the same time President Trump directed his personal lawyer, Rudy Giuliani, and his associates to solicit foreign interference in our elections.

In July, they set their plans in motion. During an interagency meeting on July 18, an OMB staffer relayed President Trump's order to freeze all Ukraine assistance to the State Department and the Pentagon. This stunned and infuriated our own top Ukrainian diplomats, who understood the necessity of strong American support for Ukraine in their fight against Russia. Later that day, the House Foreign Affairs Committee was warned about the hold by administration sources, urging them to investigate.

But the bottom line was that there was no legal way for President Trump to withhold aid to Ukraine without Congress' approval. Since it was a politically motivated hold, it would not even qualify for a deferral under the ICA. If the President was going to hold this aid hostage, he had to find a way to go behind Congress' back and se-

cretly impound hundreds of millions of taxpayer dollars.

Mr. Sandy testified that, on July 19, Mr. Duffey proposed using the apportionment process to implement the hold, that is, to use a legally binding budget document to withhold security assistance to Ukraine.

Mr. Sandy also testified that, while approving apportionment schedules for agencies is routine, attaching a footnote to block spending was so unusual he did not recall another event like it in his 12 years of service at OMB.

□ 1900

There is a reason for that. It could be considered a violation of the Impoundment Control Act.

As you will recall, the ICA prohibits the President and his administration from withholding aid unless it is done under the authorities of the Impoundment Control Act, which require notification to Congress, which OMB did not want to do.

A week later, on July 25, President Trump had his now-infamous call with Ukrainian President Zelensky, where he asked a foreign government to dig up dirt on a political rival. Just 90 minutes after the President hung up the phone, Mr. Duffey emailed the Pentagon, putting a hold on the Ukraine aid.

In his email, which was only obtained under the Freedom of Information Act, Mr. Duffey shared OMB's plan to "formalize the pause with an apportionment footnote" that would come later that day. In another red flag, Mr. Duffey asked Pentagon officials to keep this "hold" decision as secret as possible.

According to documents obtained by the House Budget Committee, at 6:44 p.m. Eastern time, just hours after the "perfect call," Mr. Sandy signed an apportionment that officially imposed what OMB claimed at the time to be a "brief pause" in USAI funds.

OMB inserted a footnote into the apportionment that froze all remaining USAI funding until August 5. The footnote states that the funds are being held "to allow for an interagency process to determine the best use of such funds," but also that "DOD may continue its planning and casework for the initiative during this period."

Why would OMB allow the Pentagon to continue working on current plans and casework if they were claiming they needed to freeze the funds to review those same plans and casework? Because this hold was never about a policy review. This hold was this administration's attempt to get around Congress and secretly undermine the law, to freeze foreign aid so that they could use it to pressure Ukraine into helping President Trump cheat to win reelection in 2020.

It is the same hold that Mulvaney referenced in his June email to Mr. Blair while flying on Air Force One with the President, and it is the same hold that would ultimately lead to grounds for impeachment.

The July 25 apportionment would be the last one Mr. Sandy would sign. The White House needed to make sure the aid remained frozen while they kept up their pressure campaign on President Zelensky. But OMB career officials were becoming uneasy about the freeze and the illegality of using apportionments to create secret impoundments.

In an unprecedented move, Mr. Sandy was stripped of his authority to oversee the management of Ukraine aid, and the apportionment authority was transferred to President Trump's political appointee, Mr. Duffey.

Remember that leaked letter apportionment that raised red flags? When that apportionment leaked in early August, Congress still didn't know about the plot to withhold the Pentagon's \$250 million in Ukraine aid. So here we have 15 State and USAID foreign aid accounts on hold, one of which includes \$26.5 million in Foreign Military Financing funds for—you guessed it—Ukraine. On top of that, this apportionment is the first one with Mr. Duffey's signature.

August was a busy time for Mr. Duffey. Someone who had never before signed apportionment documents started signing all the apportionment documents in both the National Security Division and the International Affairs Division instead of career officials. On August 6, Mr. Duffey signed the first extension of what was supposed to be the brief withholding of the Pentagon's USAI funds, using another footnote to freeze the funds until August 12.

Separately, on August 9, our documents show Mr. Duffey signed another apportionment affecting the State Department and USAID foreign funds included in the leaked apportionment. This time, OMB said the agencies are only allowed to spend 2 percent of the funds each day, and it withholds the rest from the agencies. That is not a programmatic, funds management, or even a policy decision.

The State Department doesn't send a couple thousand dollars to support international peacekeeping missions one day and then a couple thousand dollars to support international narcotics control the next. That is not how it works.

Limiting agencies to such a minuscule amount effectively prevented these funds from being spent at all, while at the same time, the apportionment continued to withhold the majority of remaining funds. It was another backdoor attempt to freeze funding and possibly rescind it completely by running out the clock.

On August 19, Senator SANDERS and I sent our letter to OMB and the White House, calling on the administration to stop impounding funds, to respect GAO's legal opinion from the previous December, stating that a late-in-the-year rescission request that prevents congressional action and withholds funds until they can no longer be used would violate the ICA.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD the letter Senator SANDERS and I sent to Director Mulvaney.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, August 19 2019.

Hon. MICK MULVANEY,
Director, Office of Management and Budget,
Washington, DC.

DEAR DIRECTOR MULVANEY: We write to express our profound concern regarding the Administration's reported plan to submit a rescission request to the Congress just a few weeks before the end of the fiscal year.

Under the Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (ICA), the President may submit a special message proposing the rescission of budget authority and may withhold funds from obligation for a period of 45 calendar days of continuous session following transmission of the special message. In keeping with Congress's constitutional power of the purse, however, such funding must be released absent approval by Congress within the 45-day period. Specifically, section 1012(b) of the ICA states:

Any amount of budget authority proposed to be rescinded or that is to be reserved as set forth in such special message shall be made available for obligation unless, within the prescribed 45-day period, the Congress has completed action on a rescission bill rescinding all or part of the amount proposed to be rescinded or that is to be reserved.

Submitting a rescissions request and withholding funds from obligation this late in the fiscal year could result in funding being withheld through its expiration date. In December 2018, at the request of the House Budget Committee, the U.S. Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a legal opinion that addressed this circumstance. GAO found that "the ICA does not permit the withholding of funds through their date of expiration." Further, GAO determined that absent Congressional action to rescind the funds,

amounts proposed for rescission must be made available for prudent obligation before the amounts expire, even where the 45-day period for congressional consideration provided in the ICA approaches or spans the date on which funds would expire: the requirement to make amounts available for obligation in this situation prevails over the privilege to temporarily withhold the amounts.

The authority provided by the ICA to the Executive Branch to withhold funds temporarily is necessarily limited. The GAO opinion states:

It would be an abuse of this limited authority and an interference with Congress's constitutional prerogatives if a President were to time the withholding of expiring budget authority to effectively alter the time period that the budget authority is available for obligation from the time period established by Congress in duly enacted appropriations legislation.

As the chairman and ranking member of the respective House and Senate committees with jurisdiction over the Impoundment Control Act, we affirm our strong agreement with the legal analysis and conclusions reached by GAO. We strongly urge the Administration to refrain from sending a rescission message to the Congress; however, in the event the Administration submits such a message, it must take measures to ensure that the affected funds will be prudently obligated in the event the Congress does not approve the rescission, as required by law. To withhold these funds until they can no longer be prudently obligated or until they expire, in the absence of Congressional approval of the rescission, would violate the

ICA and flout an important constitutional check. We trust that you will comply with the law and respect the constitutional role of the Congress to remain at the center of funding decisions.

Thank you for your attention to these concerns.

Sincerely,

JOHN YARMUTH,
Chairman, House Committee on the Budget.

BERNARD SANDERS,
Ranking Member, Senate Committee on the Budget.

Mr. YARMUTH. At this time, we did not understand that the President and OMB actually had learned from their 2018 attempts to circumvent Congress. But they learned the wrong lesson. Now, they were just trying to bypass Congress completely.

By the second week of August, Mr. Duffey was issuing holds on USAI funds every couple of days to block the Pentagon from sending aid. OMB was doing what it could to keep the President's hold on Ukraine aid active, but on August 28, a senior administration official told Politico about the hold on USAI funds. The President's scheme was unraveling.

On August 29, our documents show Mr. Duffey signed another letter apportionment releasing 25 percent of the remaining State Department and USAID funds each Sunday in September. With this latest trick, it was clear these agencies were not going to be able to spend all the funds Congress appropriated before they expired on September 30. And in fact, they didn't, which was apparently OMB's intention all along.

Meanwhile, Mr. Duffey was still signing apportionments to freeze USAI funds until September 12. During this time, DOD warned that OMB's ongoing hold on Ukraine assistance would prevent them from using all the funds Congress appropriated before they expired on September 30. And, of course, DOD was right.

On September 18, Chairwoman LOWEY and I wrote to OMB, expressing deep concerns about OMB's escalating abuses of its apportionment authority and its blatant attempts to undermine Congress' power of the purse. Basically, we told them to stop their pretty obvious attempts to evade, invalidate, and violate congressional appropriations laws and the ICA.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD that letter of September 18.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,
Washington, DC, September 18, 2019.

Hon. MICK MULVANEY,
Acting Chief of Staff, The White House,
Washington, DC.

Hon. RUSSELL VOUGHT,
Acting Director, Office of Management and Budget, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. MULVANEY AND MR. VOUGHT: We write to express our deep concerns about the Office of Management and Budget's (OMB's) increasingly dubious and politicized applications of budget law, as well as the role they have played in impeding other agencies' ability to use their enacted appropriations.

OMB's actions have already damaged important government programs, diminished our country's security and standing abroad, and if continued, threaten to permanently undermine fundamental checks and balances in our constitutional republic.

Specifically, during the last year, OMB has demonstrated a growing willingness to abuse its Presidentially-delegated apportionment authorities and impermissibly disrupt the balance of powers between the branches. The agency's apportionment authorities may not be used as a form of executive control or influence over agency functions. Rather, they may only be exercised in the manner and for the purposes prescribed in the Antideficiency Act (ADA) and in compliance with other appropriations and budget laws, including title X of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (Impoundment Control Act). None of those laws give the Executive Branch the unilateral power to invalidate duly enacted statutes through the apportionment process.

Nevertheless, OMB continues to abuse those authorities, and the apportionment process, to flout the Constitution's assignment of the power of the purse to Congress. OMB's inexplicable and unprecedented apportionment actions have withheld critical funding provided for the Department of State and United States Agency for International Development (USAID) in a manner inconsistent with long-standing policies and procedures. Those OMB actions are deleteriously impacting the prudent obligation of foreign assistance intended to support U.S. interests, and are hindering the efficient and effective management of U.S. funds and programs. Indeed, those actions seem to be specifically designed to obstruct the agencies' ability to use their appropriations for their Congressionally-approved purposes in the final weeks before they expire. We have serious legal concerns that those actions will result in *de facto* impoundments, and we are deeply troubled that this may be OMB's unstated goal.

The apportionment actions at issue also undermine important programs and policies that Congress funded, to among other things:

Fulfill U.S. treaty obligations and support the nation's international allies and partners;

Counter Russian aggression and Chinese influence across the globe;

Respond to humanitarian crises all over the world, including in Venezuela, Syria, and Burma;

Counter violent extremism in the Sahel, Yemen, and elsewhere; and

Enable important initiatives such as the Indo-Pacific Strategy and Power Africa.

Withholding funds through the apportionment process until they can no longer be prudently obligated is a back-door rescission without Congressional approval. A year ago, OMB retreated from its plan to illegally impound State Department and USAID appropriations through a cynically-timed rescissions proposal—a misguided scheme that OMB threatened again this year, even after clear warning from the Government Accountability Office (GAO) that such attempts were in violation of the Impoundment Control Act. We are concerned that OMB's intransigence on these issues has led it to try to accomplish through the apportionment process what it had hoped to accomplish with a rescissions proposal.

OMB has continued to push this unlawful agenda and perniciously broadened its sights to target funding provided by the Congress to the Department of Defense to counter Russian aggression. In particular, OMB withheld funding provided for the Ukraine Security Assistance Initiative, a vital form of Congressionally-directed assistance that

helps Ukraine defend its sovereign territory. As with the State and USAID funding, this funding also expires at the end of this month, and recent estimates indicate that at least tens of millions—and potentially over one hundred million—in funds will expire as a result of OMB's attempts to stifle the Department of Defense's access to this lawfully provided funding. This apparent impoundment has interrupted the Defense Department's work on security programs that have been in place with a partner nation for years.

OMB also took the unusual and perhaps unprecedented step of delegating the authority to execute these apportionments to a political appointee, in lieu of career civil servants who have historically been the designated officials responsible for overseeing and executing these technical budget documents. More than that, the apportionment actions taken by this political appointee have no justifiable policy, program, or funds management rationale.

We are deeply troubled by this pattern of OMB interference with agencies' use of appropriations for authorized purposes. All the funding for the programs and policies mentioned above was negotiated in good faith between, and subsequently approved by, bipartisan majorities in the Congress, and was signed into law by President Trump. Moreover, we are deeply concerned that OMB has intended that these actions take place without Congressional oversight or transparency to the public, given that OMB has been unwilling to provide apportionments even pursuant to written requests by our committees.

We assure you that our committees will remain focused on OMB's use of apportionments and that we will respond forcefully to Executive Branch actions that seek to override the Congress' most fundamental constitutional power. We are actively pursuing a range of options to ensure that OMB is held accountable for any improper apportionment actions and to ensure that the Congress remains at the center of funding decisions. In the meantime, we urge you in the strongest possible terms to return OMB to its function of administering enacted laws, to immediately release for use all remaining expiring funds, and to cease further attempts to evade and invalidate the laws passed by the Congress. We sincerely hope you can be successful in restoring the trust that OMB has historically held as a valuable institution and good steward of federal funding.

JOHN A. YARMUTH,
Chairman, House Committee on the Budget.

NITA M. LOWEY,
Chairwoman, House Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. YARMUTH. But then, Madam Speaker, the whistleblower report was made public. The report outlined how President Trump instructed his administration and OMB officials to put a hold on almost \$400 million in Ukraine security assistance ahead of his July 25 phone call with President Zelensky. The President abused his power and betrayed the oath he took before the American people to defend our national security and honor our Constitution.

As the plan unraveled, the picture became clear. The administration was abusing the apportionment process to secretly and illegally impound funding provided by Congress to protect our national security, to use this leverage against a foreign nation to help the

President cheat our elections, and they couldn't hide it any longer.

On September 24, Speaker PELOSI announced a formal impeachment inquiry into the shady dealings of the Trump administration.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter of September 27 that Chairwoman LOWEY and I sent to OMB, seeking answers and documents related to the withholding of the Ukraine aid, State and USAID funds, and abuse of the apportionment process.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, September 27, 2019.

Hon. MICK MULVANEY,
Acting Chief of Staff, The White House, Washington, DC.

Hon. RUSSELL VOUGHT,
Acting Director, Office of Management and Budget, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. MULVANEY AND MR. VOUGHT:

The Committees on the Budget and Appropriations are the primary committees charged with overseeing and writing federal budget and appropriation laws. Consistent with our authority, we are continuing our efforts in the 116th Congress to pursue productive improvements and reforms to the laws and authorities governing federal financial management to ensure that the Congress remains at the center of funding decisions. Specifically, our committees are considering legislative proposals related to the apportionment process and the withholding of funds, including in the context of the Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (ICA) and the annual appropriations acts.

As we stated in our September 18th letter, we have serious concerns that recent apportionment actions by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) to withhold military aid for Ukraine and other foreign assistance constitute unlawful impoundments in violation of the ICA and are an abuse of the authority provided to the President to apportion appropriations. In the short time since we sent that letter, additional reports have emerged detailing the circumstances surrounding the withholding of funding for Ukraine and OMB's involvement in that withholding.

According to those reports, at least a week prior to a July 25th phone call between President Trump and Ukrainian President Zelenskyy, President Trump told Mr. Mulvaney to withhold almost \$400 million in military aid and foreign assistance for Ukraine, and "[o]fficials at the Office of Management and Budget relayed Trump's order to the State Department and the Pentagon during an interagency meeting in mid-July." The reporting also indicates that "[t]here was concern within the administration that if they did not spend the money [appropriated for Ukraine], they would run afoul of the law" and that, eventually, Mr. Vought released the money.

On Tuesday, September 24, 2019, at the United Nations General Assembly, the President confirmed the withholding and added his reasoning, stating:

As far as withholding funds, those funds were paid. They were fully paid. But my complaint has always been—and I'd withhold again, and I'll continue to withhold until such time as Europe and other nations contribute to Ukraine. Because they're not doing it.

The recently declassified complaint submitted to the Office of the Inspector General of the Intelligence Community (ICIG) on Monday, August 12, 2019 provided similar confirmation of OMB's withholding of appropriated funding for Ukraine. The complaint, which appeared credible according to a letter from the ICIG, stated among other things:

On 18 July, an Office of Management and Budget (OMB) official informed Departments and Agencies that the President “earlier that month” had issued instructions to suspend all U.S. security assistance to Ukraine. Neither OMB nor the NSC staff knew why this instruction had been issued. During interagency meetings on 23 July and 26 July, OMB officials again stated explicitly that the instruction to suspend this assistance had come directly from the President, but they still were unaware of a policy rationale. As of early August, I heard from U.S. officials that some Ukrainian officials were aware that U.S. aid might be in jeopardy, but I do not know how or when they learned of it.

As reports continue to emerge, we have deepening concerns that OMB continues to demonstrate a pattern of impeding agencies’ ability to use their enacted appropriations; that recent apportionment actions taken by OMB to withhold military aid and foreign assistance funding administered by the Department of Defense, Department of State, and U.S. Agency for International Development constitute unlawful impoundments; and that OMB took the unusual and seemingly unprecedented step of delegating the authority to execute these apportionments to a political appointee, in lieu of career civil servants who have historically been the designated officials responsible for overseeing and executing these technical budget documents. These actions have collectively undermined the longstanding application and predictability of federal funds management processes and require closer examination by our committees to inform appropriate legislative responses and reforms.

Therefore, to support our committees’ efforts, we request that OMB produce written responses to the committees, no later than Tuesday, October 1, 2019, to the following questions:

(1) a. When did OMB first instruct agencies to withhold assistance for Ukraine, including amounts appropriated in section 9013 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2019 for the Ukraine Security Assistance Initiative and any applicable amounts provided in other appropriation acts for the Foreign Military Financing Program?

b. In which Treasury Appropriation Fund Symbol(s) (TAFS or account) were amounts withheld?

c. When was the first apportionment action executed for (each of) the relevant account(s) to withhold those funds?

d. Were the withheld funds made available for immediate use by the agencies during fiscal year 2019, and if so, when?

(2) a. When did OMB first instruct agencies to withhold funding in the accounts referenced in the letter apportionment effective as of 11:59 p.m. Eastern Daylight Time on Saturday, August 3, 2019 (“August 3, 2019 Letter Apportionment”)?

b. When were the first apportionment actions executed to withhold those funds?

c. Were the withheld funds made available for immediate use by the agencies during fiscal year 2019, and if so, when?

No later than Tuesday, October 1, 2019, we also request that OMB produce the following documentation to the committees:

(3) All apportionments or reapportionments for fiscal year 2019 that were executed in the last quarter of fiscal year 2019, including documentation of the approval date of each such apportionment action and any footnotes, for any applicable TAFS used for assistance for Ukraine or the Ukraine Security Assistance Initiative appropriation, including the Department of Defense, Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide account, 97-0100/2019 and account(s) for any applicable amounts provided in other appro-

priation acts for the Foreign Military Financing Program.

(4) All apportionments and reapportionments for fiscal year 2019 that were executed in the last quarter of fiscal year 2019, including documentation of the approval date of each such apportionment action and any footnotes, for each TAFS referenced in the August 3, 2019 Letter Apportionment and any applicable child accounts.

Finally, we request that OMB produce documentation to the committees, no later than Friday, October 11, 2019, on the following:

(5) Documentation sufficient to show the obligational status of the relevant assistance funding to Ukraine by account, including all amounts appropriated in section 9013 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2019 and any applicable amounts provided in other appropriation acts for the Foreign Military Financing Program, as of June 30, 2019 and as of September 30, 2019, including the specific amounts that were (a) unobligated, (b) obligated but not expended, and (c) obligated and expended.

(6) Documentation sufficient to show:

a. when OMB first instructed agencies to withhold assistance for Ukraine, including amounts appropriated in section 9013 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2019 and any applicable amounts provided in other appropriation acts for the Foreign Military Financing Program;

b. the amount of funding that was withheld from obligation, and in which account(s);

c. when the first apportionment action was executed to withhold those funds;

d. the period over which the funds were withheld;

e. whether the funds were, subsequent to those withholdings, made available for immediate use by the agencies during fiscal year 2019, and if so, when;

f. the factual, legal, and policy bases upon which these actions were taken; and

g. whether requests were made by the affected agencies to reapportion the funding at issue, or to alter the conditions of the apportionments in effect, and if so, whether those requests were granted.

(7) Documentation sufficient to show:

a. whether there was an “interagency process” related to the withholding or use of amounts appropriated in section 9013 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2019, and the basis for initiating such interagency process, including its stated purposes and goals;

b. what entities or agencies were involved in such interagency process;

c. when that process began; and

d. the conclusions reached through that process and when they were reached, including the outcomes of any interagency meetings that occurred on July 23, 2019 and July 26, 2019 related to the disposition of the funding.

(8) Documentation sufficient to show the obligational status of all amounts apportioned as unavailable in the August 3, 2019 Letter Apportionment. This documentation should show the status of those funds as of June 30, 2019 and as of September 30, 2019, and should show, at a minimum, the specific amounts by account that were (a) unobligated, (b) obligated but not expended, and (c) obligated and expended.

(9) Documentation sufficient to show:

a. when OMB first instructed agencies to withhold funding in the accounts referenced in the August 3, 2019 Letter Apportionment;

b. how much funding was withheld from obligation in each account, and over what period the amounts were withheld;

c. when the first apportionment actions were executed to withhold those funds;

d. whether the funds were, subsequent to those withholdings, made available for im-

mediate use by the agencies during fiscal year 2019, and if so, when;

e. the factual, legal, and policy bases upon which these actions were taken; and

f. whether requests were made by the affected agencies to reapportion the funding at issue, or to alter the conditions of the apportionments in effect, if any, and whether those requests were granted.

(10) Documentation sufficient to show the timeline and basis for the delegation of apportionment authority to the Associate Director for National Security Programs, any related delegation actions, and any other delegations of the apportionment authority to a political appointee during fiscal year 2019.

(11) All apportionments and reapportionments for fiscal year 2019 that were executed in the first three quarters of fiscal year 2019, including documentation of the approval date of each such apportionment action and any footnotes, for any applicable TAFS used for assistance for Ukraine or the Ukraine Security Assistance Initiative appropriation, including the Department of Defense, Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide account, 97-0100/2019 and account(s) for any applicable amounts provided in appropriation acts for the Foreign Military Financing Program.

(12) All apportionments and reapportionments for fiscal year 2019 that were executed in the first three quarters of fiscal year 2019, including documentation of the approval date of each such apportionment action and any footnotes, for each TAFS referenced in the August 3, 2019 Letter Apportionment and any applicable child accounts.

Thank you for your prompt attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

JOHN A. YARMUTH,
Chairman, House Committee on the Budget.

NITA M. LOWEY,
Chairwoman, House Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. YARMUTH, Madam Speaker, while we received a partial production of documents from OMB, they left out large batches of requested materials.

Meanwhile, the House committees involved in the impeachment inquiry were getting completely stonewalled by the administration. If they did nothing wrong, why wouldn’t they turn over documents or allow officials to testify? If the President could clear his name, don’t you think he would have done it by now?

Instead, the President and his Chief of Staff, Mick Mulvaney, have gone on national television and confessed to the very thing Congress caught them doing. Mulvaney’s response? “Get over it,” and, “We do it all the time.”

In December 2019, the House Budget Committee released a report, which I intend to put in the RECORD, outlining three main takeaways from the documents produced by OMB.

Number one, the timeline of actions taken by OMB, as seen in the provided apportionments, shows suspicious activity and document a pattern of abuse of the apportionment process, OMB’s authority, and current law.

Number two, OMB took the seemingly unprecedented step of stripping career officials of their normal role in

the apportionment process and instead vested a political appointee with that authority.

And, three, OMB's actions hindered agencies' ability to prudently obligate funds by the end of the fiscal year, bypassing Congress and creating backdoor rescissions in violation of the ICA.

Weeks after our report was published, the House of Representatives impeached Donald J. Trump for abuse of power and obstruction of justice.

On January 16, 2020, GAO issued a legal opinion, stating that the actions taken by OMB to withhold foreign aid to Ukraine violated the ICA. The non-partisan watchdog even went so far to say: "OMB's assertions have no basis in law."

GAO found the White House's action to withhold security assistance funding constituted an illegal deferral of funding in violation of the ICA. The ICA permits deferrals only for very limited purposes and requires advanced congressional notification. But this was not just a notification violation. GAO determined that this deferral was prohibited under the ICA, period.

As GAO emphasized: "The ICA does not permit deferrals for policy reasons. . . . OMB's justification for the withholding falls squarely within the scope of an impermissible policy deferral."

So even if the President had notified Congress in advance of the deferral, it still would have been illegal.

The White House has taken a disturbing sense of pride in its obstruction of Congress so it is no surprise that they failed to fully cooperate with GAO as well. In its decision, GAO called out the Trump administration, stating: "We consider a reluctance to provide a fulsome response to have constitutional significance."

The House Budget Committee repeatedly warned the Trump administration about the ICA. The Department of Defense warned them. The State Department warned them. Even people in the Executive Office of the President called out this flagrant abuse of Federal law. But the President ignored the warnings.

Instead, he used the powers of his office to subvert our laws, solicit foreign interference to help him cheat in his next election, and then try to cover it all up.

While the House has taken action to show that no one, including the President, is above the law, OMB is still scheming. President Trump's administration continues to abuse its authority and infringe on Congress' power of the purse—for example, holding up disaster relief to Puerto Rico. I would wager it is because the President couldn't handle some criticism from one of their mayors. We shall see.

Last March, my colleagues and I wrote a letter to OMB, which I intend to put in the RECORD, calling out this administration for declaring bogus national emergencies to steal funds Congress appropriated for crucial military construction and counternarcotic ini-

tiatives to use for the President's border wall, another decision motivated by the President's political campaign and not taxpayer interests. There is more, I am sure, that we just don't know about yet, but we will find out.

In the face of this administration's clear and present threat to our democracy, we must defend Congress' constitutional authority, protect our separation of powers, and strengthen the ICA to prevent such unilateral actions.

In March, I will introduce legislation that will protect Congress' power of the purse. It will promote transparency of the executive branch to limit abuse and ensure no President can hide lawbreaking from the American people again. It will add teeth to budget law by creating significant deterrents, including administrative discipline, to create more accountability for executive branch officials so they won't break the law, and it will ensure Congress remains front and center in determining whether emergency declarations made by the President and the related shifts in funding are justified.

Look, this is a lot of information, and I am normally not one to give long statements, but in the face of such horrendous attacks on our democracy, I wanted it all on the RECORD.

I am also submitting every letter I referenced into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as well. As chairman of the House Budget Committee, I felt it was my responsibility.

It is my hope that these facts help expose this administration's systemic lawbreaking because if they get away with this and Congress does not fight back, it will not stop. We all know that.

He could attack specific communities by withholding funds that support their healthcare. He could retaliate against Senators for their votes by freezing Federal investments in their States. He could punish States that he views as unsupportive of his election by withholding the infrastructure funds.

If we don't stop him, President Trump will use our taxpayer dollars to punish political adversaries. That creates a destructive precedent for other Presidents who follow.

I implore our Republican colleagues to join us in this effort to uphold the oath we all swore and to make it unequivocally clear that, in the United States of America, no one is above the law.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

REVIEWING INHERITED IMMIGRATION CRISIS

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

Mr. GROTHMAN. Madam Speaker, it appears we are at least in the final 2 weeks of this impeachment journey, and, therefore, it is time to begin to look at the issues that have been ignored or kept out of the newspaper for the last few months, which I think is quite frankly one of the reasons why we have had this impeachment.

I am going to address what progress has been made on these issues, largely President Trump making the progress himself without any help from Congress, and then address what we should do in the next few months prior to the next election.

I think the biggest crisis for the country that President Trump inherited was the immigration crisis, and President Trump has had several successes here on his own.

□ 1915

He has reduced the number of people placed in the United States from in May, close to 100,000 people by the Border Patrol, certainly, over 90,000 by the Border Patrol and probably another 10 to 12,000 people sneaking in the country without being processed at that time, to a position where, last month, the Border Patrol probably placed under 2,000 people in the United States.

First of all, it is important to review what President Trump has done. He has begun what we would call a migrant protection protocol, in which Mexico is holding asylum seekers on their side of the border. They have agreed to hold anybody who is Spanish-speaking, and recently, in an unpublicized success, has begun a program holding Brazilians who are trying to get in this country as well.

They also have an asylum cooperative agreement in which Guatemala is holding asylum seekers who are coming from other Central American countries without moving into the United States.

I will point out something that should be obvious. If you are looking for asylum, in other words, to get away from danger in your home country, you shouldn't necessarily have to come to the United States. If you are an asylum seeker in Honduras or El Salvador, for example, and you are coming north, and you are in danger in your home country, it would be enough to stop in Guatemala. You do not have to come here.

In addition, we have begun an interior reparation initiative for people from Mexico trying to come here. Normally, in order to try to come here, you have to deal with the Mexican drug cartels. By the United States or Mexico repatriating people in Central Mexico, first of all, they are in many cases, in a more prosperous part of Mexico and, secondly, are not being dealt with by the drug cartels. And finally, you are a little bit further away from the border, which is something we should do in the first place.

The next thing President Trump has done is he has completed 110 miles of

the border wall. We anticipate 630 of the 2,000 miles being done by the end of the year. It is very difficult to get through this wall and, actually, when you talk to the Border Patrol, they don't even like to refer to it as a wall. They like to refer to it as a wall system. But it is going to be over 30 feet high and six to 7 feet underground, making it very difficult to get through.

Recently, the Border Patrol apprehended people who were kind of stuck going up the wall and they got up the wall to the point at which they weren't able to get down.

But in any event, when you combine all these activities of the Trump administration, with very little help from Congress, as well as restricting entry of people who are probably going to become a public charge, we have reduced the number of people being placed in this country from 90,000 to 2,000.

So, what should Congress do?

What President Trump has done so far is successful but precarious. First of all, President Trump is not going to be President forever, and secondly, a lot of what President Trump has done is going to be subject to possible review by a bad judge.

Congress should immediately take up the following few actions, which I think any average American would consider okay, or consider mild.

First of all, we have to change the credible fear standard. Not everybody who comes here saying they are in danger at home is in danger at home. Congress ought to revisit that and pass something in the near future, hopefully soon. With President Trump no longer having to worry about the impeachment, he can use his position to drive that sort of bill through Congress.

Secondly, we still have problems with the Flores settlement and that we are restricting holding families to only 20 days pending adjudication. There is no reason—I have been down at the border to see how well we are treating people who are held down there. There is no reason why we should have to release people after only 20 days if we have a court hearing coming up.

Thirdly, we should change the current law with regard to unaccompanied minors. There are people who claim they don't like to see families separated, but back in May, we had, I think it was 8 or 9,000 minors coming into this country unaccompanied by adults.

Now, under current law in the United States, we can turn these minors back if they came from Canada or Mexico. We can't turn around minors or send them back if they come from other countries.

There are people around here who purport to want to keep families together. If a 15- or 16-year-old child comes here from Guatemala, because children are the future of any country, the Central American or South American families want their children back; and we should go back to the days in which it is legal to send back minors from other countries.

The next thing we should do is, President Trump has had success in the courts with preventing people from coming here who are going to become a public charge. Obviously, as we look to let people in our country—and I am going to digress here for one second.

There are people who say President Trump is anti-immigrant. The number of immigrants, the number of people who were sworn in legally in this country in 2018 was 761,000 people. That was more than any of the final 3 years under President Obama.

I am going to repeat that if anybody back there says President Trump is anti-immigrant. More people were let in in 2018, were legally sworn in as American citizens under President Trump than any one of President Obama's final 3 years.

But it is important, despite President Trump's victory in court, that Congress step up to the plate and make it statutory that, as we pick which new whatever, 750,000 new people get to become American citizens, we are not picking people who are going to become a public charge.

It is already a huge drain on the American people's budget to take care of people who are in desperate straits who were born Americans in the first place. It is just horrific that people want to let people in to become a public charge from other countries, particularly at a time that we are running trillion dollar deficits; not to mention, I think you are going to eventually have a problem with the fiber of America in the future if we let all people in.

The next thing that President Trump has done, I haven't mentioned, is he has, without a lot of fanfare, restricted tourist visas for people who are soon going to have children.

I have been at the border. Until you have been down there you don't realize the degree to which women frequently are coming to this country so that their children become citizens. The United States is one of only, I believe, two out of 40 western countries in the world in which you can become a citizen just by being born here. People are taking advantage of that. Again, it is an example of us not picking the immigrants we allow in here.

It is people being able to, first of all, have their children become citizens, and then because we want family reunification, the women who have the child are soon going to be allowed to be here without being appropriately vetted.

In any event, this is something that Congress ought to take up as soon as this impeachment is over.

Extend the time you can stay under the Flores settlement; adjust the credible standard for people who claim they are in danger back home; change the rules with regard to unaccompanied minors so we can reunite those children with their families. It is ridiculous that that bill is being held up.

Do something about the sanctuary cities which, right now, are a magnet,

and they scream to people in other countries that we are not supposed to take our immigration laws seriously.

Do something about the birthright citizenship in which we are one of the few countries around the world which says that if you come here, you automatically become a citizen.

But what other things should Congress be tackling over the next seven or 8 months before we break for elections?

Given the fact that we are broke; and given our concern that we do want to encourage marriage, where necessary; given that we want to encourage people to work and that we have a shortage of labor in this country, we have to look at our current safety net.

Now, right now, the economy is good, and the number of people on Foodshare—which is a good indication of the number of people who are taking advantage of our safety net—has dropped in the last couple of years due to the booming economy. There were still 34,000 people on Foodshare in 2018, average.

In 2003, another time in which the economy was largely booming, there were 21,000 people. What has happened over the last 16 years that we have had over a 50 percent increase in the people on Foodshare?

The economy is booming. Obviously, what is going on is, Foodshare, together with many other similar programs, have changed the work ethic of Americans. What can we do to address the ease with which people become involved in these programs?

And I am not saying we have to do anything to the people who absolutely need these programs. But I can think of no reason why we would have over a 50 percent increase in a 15-year period if we weren't quietly or slowly changing the work ethic of Americans.

There are three things that Congress should deal with, and that, hopefully, President Trump will champion. First of all, when I talk to people in my district, they are aware that there is a labor shortage, particularly in the factories, and other places as well. And it is frustrating how few people can pass the drug test. If you cannot get a job because you can't pass a drug test, you shouldn't get public benefits. So drug testing should be done.

The next thing that should be done, when I talk to people, particularly people who work in our grocery stores or our convenience stores, they are frustrated that we, right now, have IDs on Foodshare without any photos on them. And again, the people who are working these jobs suspect, highly suspect, that these programs are being taken advantage of. Congress should insist that we have photo IDs on Foodshare.

And, finally, there should be work requirements or an effort that people are trying to find work. This would be a measure of the sincerity of people as to whether it is possible—as to whether or not they are really trying their best to get off of public benefits.

I am going to mention three other quick things that I hope are taken care of, that I don't think any serious American should have a concern with.

I was very frustrated with the recent omnibus bills, recent appropriation bills that dealt with a lot of the parts of the Tax Code. One more time Congress did not have the guts to take up what I consider an exemption for the very wealthy, and that is the carried interest exemption.

I know President Trump has asked Congress to look at this. Right now, highfliers who are venture capitalists, hedge fund managers—hedge fund managers in particular—are getting capital gains treatment on what should be ordinary income. I can think of no reason, other than Congressmen like very wealthy people, why, if you are a hedge fund manager making millions a year, you are paying tax at capital gains rates rather than ordinary income rates.

Congress should have the guts to stand up to some of our wealthiest citizens and tax them at the rates that the average working man pays. I hope Congress will finally take this up and do what I know President Trump wants, and tax the carried interest of the wealthiest hedge fund managers as the average working man in this country.

The next thing I would like to do that should be automatic is, when insulin was invented, the inventor wanted it cheap and available to everybody. Unfortunately, right now, it can be wildly expensive, and it is much more expensive in this country than in other countries.

What we should do is we should treat insulin, not as a drug, but as a biosimilar, and see what we can do about rushing it to market so that the drug companies cannot make excessive amounts of money off of an invention that was designed—the inventor wanted it to be freely available to everybody.

The number of Americans with diabetes is excessively high, and the idea

that, under current law, we allow makers of insulin, which I don't really consider a pharmaceutical, but makers of insulin to charge an excessive amount, when it was invented years ago, is ridiculous. It will take this body standing up to the drug companies, but it is something this Congress does not do enough.

I realize there was a bill passed designed to deal with drug prices in this House. That bill, we all know, was politically unrealistic, and it probably would have resulted in a drastic reduction in innovation on generally new pharmaceuticals.

But a separate bill should be passed on insulin and, hopefully, that is something Congress can do.

The final thing Congress could do to help the average person is, in the future, do something to restrict the amount of student loan debt.

When I talk to people, they feel—and I believe this, because it was true when I went to school—there are people taking out more debt than they absolutely need.

□ 1930

I suppose this is true everywhere in our country; people probably have too much credit card debt, more than they need, and they are not disciplined, but it is particularly true of 18- or 19- or 20-year-olds.

There was a time in this country where, if universities wanted to, they could say: No, you don't need \$7,000 in debt this year; you need \$4,000 in new loans.

They are not able to do that anymore. We ought to give that ability back to universities, and we ought to begin to sanction universities if too many people are leaving that institution and are not able to pay back their loans.

I do blame the universities for part of this, and it is going to take some political will to stand up to these university administrators, but they are the ones who are leading some of these people

down the path with the nice brochure and the nice song and dance about how it is going to be so wonderful if you graduate from this university. Some people, of course, drop out of the university.

But either way, far too many people are not paying off the loans. They are having to spend way too long. They can't buy a house. They aren't forming a family.

Quite frankly, it is a publicized scandal, but it is still underpublicized the degree to which some of the best Americans who are doing what they are told are saddled with vast amounts of debt and not the income to pay it off; or, if they have the income to pay them off, it is taking all their income and they can't buy a house and they can't have kids.

I hope Congress does something serious there other than just say we should put hundreds of billions of dollars into paying off the loans.

In any event, these are things that I think Congress could take up. I think we could salvage this session. I know President Trump did all he could on immigration without the help of Congress.

I feel that the impeachment thing was designed to keep people's eyes off the ball on the issues that we should be addressing. There are some suggestions of what to do. I hope the American people insist they be done. I hope President Trump champions them.

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

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 32 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, January 29, 2020, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

BUDGETARY EFFECTS OF PAYGO LEGISLATION

Pursuant to the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (PAYGO), Mr. YARMUTH hereby submits, prior to the vote on passage, for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that H.R. 4331, the Tibetan Policy and Support Act of 2019, as amended, would have no significant effect on the deficit, and therefore, the budgetary effects of such bill are estimated as zero.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3652. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final interpretive rule — User Fees for Agricultural Quarantine and Inspection Services [Docket No.: APHIS-2013-0021] (RIN: 0579-AD77) received January 17, 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.

3653. A letter from the Senior Counsel, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting the Bureau's policy statement — Statement of Policy Regarding Prohibition of Abusive Acts or Practices received January 27, 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.

3654. A letter from the Senior Legislative Officer, OCIA, Wage and Hour Division, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule — Joint Employer Status Under the Fair Labor Standards Act (RIN: 1235-AA26) received January 23, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

3655. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Kentucky: Cross-State Air Pollution Rule [EPA-R04-OAR-2019-0155; FRL-10004-69-Region 4] received January 27, 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.

3656. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; AL and SC: Infrastructure Requirements for the 2015

8-hour Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standard [EPA-R04-OAR-2019-0014; FRL-10004-68-Region 4] received January 27, 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.

3657. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Massachusetts; Transport State Implementation Plan for the 2015 Ozone Standard [EPA-R01-OAR-2008-0108; FRL-10004-34-Region 1] received January 27, 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.

3658. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Missouri; Restriction of Emissions from Batch-type Charcoal Kilns [EPA-R07-OAR-2019-0662; FRL-10004-63-Region 7] received January 27, 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.

3659. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Delegation of New Source Performance Standards and National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for the States of Arizona and Nevada [EPA-R09-OAR-2019-0632; FRL-10004-33-Region 9] received January 27, 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.

3660. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Oklahoma: Incorporation by Reference of Approved State Hazardous Waste Management Program [EPA-R06-RCRA-2019-0343; FRL-10001-54-Region 6] received January 27, 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.

3661. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants; Petroleum Refinery Sector [EPA-HQ-OAR-2010-0682; FRL-10004-55-OAR] (RIN: 2016-AT18) received January 27, 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.

3662. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to the Petition Provisions of the Title V Permitting Program [EPA-HQ-OAR-2016-0194; FRL-10004-56-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AS61) received January 27, 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.

3663. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final action — Withdrawal of Finding of Substantial Inadequacy of Implementation Plan and of Call for Texas State Implementation Plan Revision — Affirmative Defense Provisions [EPA-R06-OAR-2018-0770; FRL-10004-01-Region 6] received January 27, 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.

3664. A letter from the Deputy Chief, Auctions Division, Office of Economics and Analytics and Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's public notice — Auction of FM

Broadcast Construction Permits Scheduled for April 28, 2020; Notice and Filing Requirements, Minimum Opening Bids, Upfront Payments, and Other Procedures for Auction 106 (AU Docket No.: 19-290) received January 27, 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.

3665. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Supplemental Guidance Regarding the Chromium-Coated Zirconium Alloy Fuel Cladding Accident Tolerant Fuel Concept [ATF-ISG-2020-01] received January 22, 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.

3666. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Policy, NMFS, Office of Protected Resources, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Taking and Importing Marine Mammals; Taking Marine Mammals Incidental to the U.S. Navy Training and Testing Activities in the Atlantic Fleet Training and Testing Study Area [Docket No.: 191211-0106] (RIN: 0648-BI85) received January 27, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3667. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone for Fireworks Display; Spa Creek, Annapolis, MD [Docket Number: USCG-2019-0846] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 22, 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.

3668. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Notice on Relief for Reporting Required Minimum Distributions for IRAs for 2020 [Notice 2020-6] received January 28, 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.

3669. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Student Loan Debt Forgiveness (Rev. Proc. 2020-11) received January 21, 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.

3670. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final regulations and removal of temporary regulations — Transfers of Certain Property by U.S. Persons to Partnerships with Related Foreign Partners [TD 9891] (RIN: 1545-BM95) received January 21, 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. LUCAS (for himself, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. BABIN, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio, Mr. WALTZ, Mr. OLSON, Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina, Mr. BALDERSON, Mr. POSEY, and Mr. ROONEY of Florida):

H.R. 5685. A bill to invest in basic scientific research and support technology innovation

for the economic and national security of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, Small Business, Natural Resources, and Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. HARTZLER (for herself and Ms. SCHRIER):

H.R. 5686. A bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to require that only a school food authority that had a negative balance in the nonprofit school food service account on June 30th of the year preceding the previous school year shall be required to establish a price for paid lunches; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. LOWEY:

H.R. 5687. A bill making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations, and in addition to the Committees on the Budget, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. AXNE (for herself and Mr. BALDERSON):

H.R. 5688. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for grants to enable States to carry out activities to reduce administrative costs and burdens in health care; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. BROWNLEY of California:

H.R. 5689. A bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to conduct a national survey of veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CONNOLLY (for himself, Mr. NORTON, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. WEXTON, Ms. MOORE, Mr. POCAN, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. HOYER, and Mr. BEYER):

H.R. 5690. A bill to increase the rates of pay under the statutory pay systems and for prevailing rate employees by 3.5 percent, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Ms. CRAIG (for herself, Mr. GUEST, Mr. STAUBER, and Mr. PHILLIPS):

H.R. 5691. A bill to require the Secretary to conduct a study and issue a report on the affordability of insulin; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GOHMERT:

H.R. 5692. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to issue regulations to modify the gross combination weight rating of a vehicle covered under Group B, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. KIND (for himself and Mrs. WALORSKI):

H.R. 5693. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to expand Medicare Rural Health Clinic Services and Federally Qualified Health Center Services to include physical therapy services; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MCCLINTOCK (for himself, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. STAUBER, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. STEWART, Mr. PERRY,

Ms. CHENEY, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. GOHMERT, and Mr. ARMSTRONG):

H.R. 5694. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to require publication on the internet of the basis for determinations that species are endangered species or threatened species, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. McEACHIN (for himself, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. CARBAJAL, and Mr. BUCHANAN):

H.R. 5695. A bill to require operators of offshore oil and gas facilities to report failures of critical systems to the Secretary of Interior, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. PAPPAS (for himself, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. HUFFMAN):

H.R. 5696. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to carry out an active transportation investment program to make grants to eligible applicants to build safe and connected options for bicycles and walkers within and between communities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. TAKANO:

H.R. 5697. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to furnish emergent mental health care to certain individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TIMMONS:

H.R. 5698. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Treasury to instruct the United States Executive Directors at the international financial institutions on United States policy regarding international financial institution assistance with respect to advanced wireless technologies; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. HOYER:

H. Con. Res. 86. Concurrent resolution providing for a joint session of Congress to receive a message from the President; considered and agreed to. considered and agreed to.

By Mrs. TRAHAN (for herself, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. ROSE of New York, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. BARR, Mr. BRINDISI, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. POCAN, Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. TRONE, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mrs. AXNE, Mr. WELCH, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. KELLER, Mr. HORSFORD, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. RIGGLEMAN, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. CISNEROS, Mr. GRIFFITH, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. UNDERWOOD, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. KATKO, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. COMER, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. TURNER, Mr. BUDD, Ms. FINKENAUER, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. BANKS, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. CLINE, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. BURCHETT, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Ms. SLOTKIN, Mrs. MILLER, Mr. GIANFORTE, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. KEATING, Mr. WITTMAN, Mrs. BUSTOS, and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio):

H. Res. 815. A resolution supporting Minor League Baseball, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Ms. ADAMS (for herself and Mr. BUTTERFIELD):

H. Res. 816. A resolution recognizing the significance of the Greensboro Four sit-in; to

the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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. FITZPATRICK (for himself and Mrs. MURPHY of Florida):

H. Res. 817. A resolution raising awareness and encouraging the prevention of stalking by expressing support for the designation of January 2020 as "National Stalking Awareness Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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. LUCAS:

H.R. 5685.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Constitution, Article I, Section 8, Clause 18:

"The Congress shall have Power . . . To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, of in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Mrs. HARTZLER:

H.R. 5686.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I: Section 8: Clause 3 The United States Congress shall have power "To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes."

By Mrs. LOWEY:

H.R. 5687.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The principal constitutional authority for this legislation is clause 7 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution of the United States (the appropriation power), which states:

"No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law . . ."

In addition, clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution (the spending power) provides:

"The Congress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States . . ."

Together, these specific constitutional provisions establish the congressional power of the purse, granting Congress the authority to appropriate funds, to determine their purpose, amount, and period of availability, and to set forth terms and conditions governing their use.

By Mrs. AXNE:

H.R. 5688.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. BROWNLEY of California:

H.R. 5689.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. CONNOLLY:

H.R. 5690.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 18

By Ms. CRAIG:

H.R. 5691.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

i. Article 1 Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GOHMERT:

H.R. 5692.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3—Congress has the authority to regulate interstate commerce

By Mr. KIND:

H.R. 5693.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. McCLINTOCK:

H.R. 5694.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the United States Constitution, "The Property Clause," which confers on Congress the power to make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the property belonging to the United States.

By Mr. McEACHIN:

H.R. 5695.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. PAPPAS:

H.R. 5696.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 7 and Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. TAKANO:

H.R. 5697.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, authorized by Congress' power to "provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States."

By Mr. TIMMONS:

H.R. 5698.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

- H.R. 30: Mr. ARMSTRONG.
- H.R. 451: Mr. LAMB.
- H.R. 490: Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.
- H.R. 587: Ms. CHENEY and Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania.
- H.R. 839: Mr. CUELLAR.
- H.R. 856: Mr. GOODEN.
- H.R. 864: Mr. MEEKS.
- H.R. 906: Mr. NORMAN, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. HARDER of California, Mrs. LURIA, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. RUPERSBERGER, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. COLE, Mr. RUTHERFORD, and Mr. SPANO.
- H.R. 924: Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. SCHRIER, Ms. MOORE, Ms. GABBARD, Ms. TITUS, and Mrs. BUSTOS.
- H.R. 929: Mr. PETERS, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. CORREA, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida,

- Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. PANETTA, and Mr. KHANNA.
- H.R. 991: Mr. ESPAILLAT.
- H.R. 1043: Mr. LUJÁN.
- H.R. 1049: Ms. DELAURO, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, and Ms. SPANBERGER.
- H.R. 1135: Mr. BARR.
- H.R. 1140: Ms. SLOTKIN.
- H.R. 1154: Mrs. FLETCHER.
- H.R. 1179: Ms. WEXTON.
- H.R. 1236: Mr. PAYNE.
- H.R. 1244: Mr. QUIGLEY.
- H.R. 1266: Mr. VARGAS.
- H.R. 1370: Mrs. ROBY.
- H.R. 1380: Mr. POSEY.
- H.R. 1400: Mr. PETERS.
- H.R. 1434: Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. STEIL, and Mr. CLOUD.
- H.R. 1494: Ms. UNDERWOOD.
- H.R. 1692: Mr. CLEAVER and Ms. PORTER.
- H.R. 1749: Mr. CRENSHAW.
- H.R. 1784: Mr. NEGUSE.
- H.R. 1824: Ms. SLOTKIN.
- H.R. 1868: Mr. TRONE.
- H.R. 1897: Mr. MORELLE.
- H.R. 2117: Mr. GALLAGHER and Mr. REED.
- H.R. 2148: Ms. WEXTON.
- H.R. 2149: Mrs. WAGNER.
- H.R. 2153: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
- H.R. 2164: Mr. COHEN.
- H.R. 2199: Ms. BASS and Mr. SWALWELL of California.
- H.R. 2201: Mr. DESJARLAIS.
- H.R. 2208: Mr. SCHNEIDER.
- H.R. 2215: Ms. BASS and Mrs. TORRES of California.
- H.R. 2250: Mr. THOMPSON of California and Ms. BASS.
- H.R. 2339: Mrs. MCBATH.
- H.R. 2344: Ms. CRAIG.
- H.R. 2431: Mr. TRONE.
- H.R. 2456: Ms. GABBARD, Mr. HECK, and Mr. HARDER of California.
- H.R. 2529: Mr. COOPER.
- H.R. 2561: Mr. QUIGLEY.
- H.R. 2564: Mr. KILMER.
- H.R. 2569: Mr. CLEAVER.
- H.R. 2571: Mr. RUTHERFORD.
- H.R. 2599: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.
- H.R. 2606: Mr. KEATING and Ms. DELBENE.
- H.R. 2607: Mr. COLE.
- H.R. 2633: Ms. GABBARD and Ms. NORTON.
- H.R. 2662: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
- H.R. 2694: Ms. SLOTKIN, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma, Mr. PANETTA, and Ms. PORTER.
- H.R. 2708: Mr. CLEAVER.
- H.R. 2732: Mr. SHERMAN and Mr. PETERSON.
- H.R. 2742: Mr. CURTIS.
- H.R. 2748: Mr. GRIJALVA.
- H.R. 2771: Mr. BRINDISI.
- H.R. 2777: Mr. DEUTCH.
- H.R. 2795: Mr. NEGUSE.
- H.R. 2813: Ms. NORTON.
- H.R. 2818: Ms. MOORE.
- H.R. 2850: Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. GABBARD, Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, and Mr. PETERS.
- H.R. 2902: Mr. MORELLE.
- H.R. 2970: Mr. O'HALLERAN.
- H.R. 2986: Mr. COLE and Mr. FORTENBERRY.
- H.R. 3062: Mr. WILLIAMS.
- H.R. 3138: Mrs. LEE of Nevada.
- H.R. 3208: Mr. PAPPAS.
- H.R. 3219: Mr. KENNEDY.
- H.R. 3250: Mr. PAPPAS.
- H.R. 3378: Mr. MOULTON.
- H.R. 3399: Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana.
- H.R. 3414: Mr. CUELLAR, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, and Mr. VISCLOSKEY.
- H.R. 3446: Mrs. RODGERS of Washington.
- H.R. 3463: Mr. PETERSON.
- H.R. 3509: Mr. DESAULNIER.
- H.R. 3522: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
- H.R. 3582: Ms. PORTER.
- H.R. 3632: Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma.
- H.R. 3637: Mr. DESAULNIER.
- H.R. 3668: Mrs. TORRES of California.
- H.R. 3828: Mr. COLE.
- H.R. 3911: Mr. WELCH.
- H.R. 3936: Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina.
- H.R. 3969: Mr. LAMB.
- H.R. 3979: Mr. MCADAMS.
- H.R. 4078: Mr. DEUTCH and Ms. BARRAGÁN.
- H.R. 4092: Mr. CURTIS and Ms. LEE of California.
- H.R. 4097: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana and Mr. FITZPATRICK.
- H.R. 4118: Mr. QUIGLEY.
- H.R. 4141: Mr. BUTTERFIELD.
- H.R. 4144: Ms. NORTON.
- H.R. 4194: Mr. O'HALLERAN.
- H.R. 4236: Ms. UNDERWOOD.
- H.R. 4308: Mr. KENNEDY.
- H.R. 4326: Mr. WALKER, Mr. CRENSHAW, and Mr. TIPTON.
- H.R. 4350: Mrs. WALORSKI and Mr. BUCHANAN.
- H.R. 4361: Mr. COHEN, Mr. HURD of Texas, and Mr. VEASEY.
- H.R. 4388: Ms. UNDERWOOD, Mr. COLE, and Mr. HARDER of California.
- H.R. 4393: Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. HARDER of California, and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
- H.R. 4429: Mr. SOTO.
- H.R. 4457: Mr. TRONE.
- H.R. 4674: Ms. WEXTON.
- H.R. 4691: Mr. KENNEDY.
- H.R. 4738: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
- H.R. 4800: Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee and Mr. DUNCAN.
- H.R. 4817: Mr. STIVERS.
- H.R. 4845: Mr. KATKO.
- H.R. 4864: Ms. STEVENS and Mr. BOST.
- H.R. 4907: Ms. HOULAHAN and Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.
- H.R. 4945: Mr. CROW.
- H.R. 4968: Mr. PETERS.
- H.R. 5002: Mr. RESCHENTHALER, Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma, Mr. WOMACK, Mrs. RODGERS of Washington, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. OLSON, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. BABIN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. SMUCKER, and Mr. CUELLAR.
- H.R. 5041: Mrs. AXNE.
- H.R. 5046: Mr. OLSON and Mr. LAHOOD.
- H.R. 5051: Mr. GALLAGHER and Mr. YOHO.
- H.R. 5085: Mr. WATKINS.
- H.R. 5104: Mrs. DINGELL.
- H.R. 5105: Mr. LYNCH.
- H.R. 5106: Mr. LYNCH.
- H.R. 5109: Mr. LYNCH.
- H.R. 5110: Mr. LYNCH.
- H.R. 5111: Mr. LYNCH.
- H.R. 5112: Mr. LYNCH.
- H.R. 5125: Mr. GOHMERT.
- H.R. 5138: Mrs. HAYES.
- H.R. 5153: Mrs. TORRES of California.
- H.R. 5170: Ms. PORTER and Mr. CICILLINE.
- H.R. 5173: Mr. BUDD, Mr. HAGEDORN, and Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma.
- H.R. 5191: Ms. TITUS and Mr. HASTINGS.
- H.R. 5199: Mr. HURD of Texas.
- H.R. 5207: Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
- H.R. 5212: Mr. STEUBE.
- H.R. 5224: Mr. NORMAN.
- H.R. 5231: Mr. DESAULNIER.
- H.R. 5233: Mr. BRINDISI.
- H.R. 5255: Mr. HARDER of California.
- H.R. 5267: Mr. DESAULNIER.
- H.R. 5297: Mr. COOPER, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma, and Mr. COMER.
- H.R. 5306: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
- H.R. 5309: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. CAS-TOR of Florida, and Ms. WILD.
- H.R. 5312: Ms. SLOTKIN.
- H.R. 5338: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. DEUTCH, and Mr. COHEN.
- H.R. 5350: Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. WELCH, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. RYAN, Ms. WEXTON, and Mr. SERRANO.
- H.R. 5383: Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, and Mr. GREEN of Texas.
- H.R. 5405: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.
- H.R. 5414: Mr. CORREA.
- H.R. 5434: Mr. HARDER of California.
- H.R. 5469: Ms. PRESSLEY and Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.
- H.R. 5516: Mr. GALLAGHER.
- H.R. 5543: Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. HECK, and Mr. HARDER of California.
- H.R. 5544: Mr. FITZPATRICK and Mr. NEGUSE.
- H.R. 5546: Mr. COLE.
- H.R. 5549: Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. MCKINLEY, and Mr. VEASEY.
- H.R. 5552: Mr. KATKO, Mr. PAPPAS, and Ms. BARRAGÁN.
- H.R. 5565: Mr. KILDEE.
- H.R. 5570: Mr. BRINDISI and Mr. HARDER of California.
- H.R. 5579: Mr. ARMSTRONG.
- H.R. 5580: Mr. ARMSTRONG.
- H.R. 5585: Mr. ARMSTRONG.
- H.R. 5588: Mr. ARMSTRONG.
- H.R. 5589: Mr. PAPPAS.
- H.R. 5591: Mr. NORMAN and Mr. ARMSTRONG.
- H.R. 5592: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
- H.R. 5596: Mr. GIBBS and Mr. LAMBORN.
- H.R. 5598: Ms. SLOTKIN, Mr. CASE, Mr. KIND, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.
- H.R. 5601: Mr. ARMSTRONG.
- H.R. 5602: Mr. BRINDISI.
- H.R. 5630: Mr. SWALWELL of California and Mrs. BUSTOS.
- H.R. 5638: Mr. ARMSTRONG.
- H.R. 5661: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.
- H.R. 5664: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
- H.R. 5684: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.
- H.J. Res. 40: Mr. DUNCAN.
- H. Con. Res. 26: Mr. PAPPAS.
- H. Con. Res. 68: Ms. SLOTKIN.
- H. Con. Res. 84: Ms. DAVIS of Kansas.
- H. Res. 230: Mr. DESAULNIER.
- H. Res. 255: Mr. MCHENRY and Mr. TIPTON.
- H. Res. 310: Mr. STIVERS.
- H. Res. 374: Mr. WOODALL, Mr. CLINE, Mr. BURCHETT, and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
- H. Res. 616: Mr. HARDER of California.
- H. Res. 734: Mr. GALLAGHER.
- H. Res. 742: Mr. CASE.
- H. Res. 752: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.
- H. Res. 787: Mr. TRONE, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. POCAN.
- H. Res. 792: Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, and Mr. RUTHERFORD.
- H. Res. 808: Mr. STANTON.
- H. Res. 813: Ms. SLOTKIN, Mr. POCAN, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. ROUDA, and Mr. MAST.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MRS. LOWEY

H.R. 5687, making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes, does not contain any congressional earmark, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM
PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 5598: Mr. STEWART.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

82. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Spencer County, KY Fiscal Court, relative to a Resolution in Support of Industrial Hemp Amending 7 U.S.C. section 5940

Allowing 1% THC Content; which was referred jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and the Judiciary.