

in guiding the university through an era of incredible growth and change, as tens of thousands of women began attending the university, and by creating a unique culture which provided Aggie students with extensive leadership opportunities. In his role as vice president of student services, John had a deep and impactful relationship with the students of Texas A&M.

He had oversight of a number of organizations, including the Corps of Cadets, Recreational Sports, the Memorial Student Center, Student Activities, Student Affairs, Student Health Services, and Student Legal Services. During his time at Texas A&M, the number of student organizations doubled to more than 700. John also taught classes and served on many academic committees for graduate students.

□ 1215

In his 20 years at Texas A&M, John was a recipient of 15 significant awards, including the Association of College and University Student Personnel Administrators' Distinguished Service Award, The Association of Former Students' Distinguished Achievement Award for Student Relations, the Buck Weirus Spirit Award, and the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators Region III Outstanding Service to NASPA Award in 1984.

In 1985, this latter award was named in his honor as a reflection of his impact on student services all across this Nation. John's impact on the university was so meaningful, that when he retired in 1993, he was the recipient of the President's Medallion of Achievement, and he was named Vice President Emeritus of Texas A&M University.

The Student Services Building was also renamed the John J. Koldus Building, and the Texas A&M Foundation also created the John J. Koldus Quality of Student Life Endowment. Although neither he nor Mary Dell were graduates of Texas A&M, in 2006 they were bestowed by proclamation the title of "Texas Aggies."

In the beginning of this recognition, I discussed the attributes—soldier, statesman, knightly gentleman, and the core values of Texas A&M University: Excellence, integrity, leadership, loyalty, respect and selfless service. The reason I discussed these attributes and these values is this:

Dr. Koldus was a soldier, a statesman, a knightly gentleman, and he personified A&M's core values of excellence, integrity, leadership, loyalty, respect, and selfless service. More importantly, he helped share and model those attributes and values to the Texas A&M student body through his mentoring capabilities. His skills in this regard were noteworthy as he mentored thousands of Aggies who started their education at A&M as, what I would call, "diamonds in the rough."

I want to continue discussing this subject, because I was one of those per-

sons who arrived at A&M pretty rough around the edges. Early on, as an Aggie student, Dr. Koldus identified me as a person who might have some promise, and he invested his time and leadership skills into my education. His mentoring and friendship had an indelible impact on me as he tried to mold me to be a soldier, statesman, knightly gentleman, and he helped me live and adopt those significant Aggie core values.

The bottom line is that John Koldus had a huge impact on tens of thousands of Texas Aggies, and upon me. He was a great friend, and I miss him dearly.

Mr. Speaker, John Koldus' life was defined by his service to his family, to our country, and to Texas A&M University. He will be forever remembered as a husband, a father, a grandfather, a great-grandfather, a veteran, a mentor, a selfless servant, and a friend to thousands, if not tens of thousands.

My wife, Gina, and I offer deepest and heartfelt condolences to the Koldus family. We also lift up the family and friends of John Koldus in our prayers. I have requested the United States flag be flown over our Nation's Capitol to honor his life and legacy.

As I close today, I urge all Americans to continue to pray for our country during these difficult times, for our military who protects us abroad, and for our first responders who keep us safe at home.

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

RETRACTIONS OF NEW YORK TIMES' ARTICLES

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

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the privilege to be recognized to address you here on the floor of the United States House of Representatives.

And I come to this floor to talk a little bit today about what is happening to our Nation, our society, our culture, our Constitution. And these are topics that have been debated in this Chamber for a long time, but some things have happened that never happened before.

And so I would start first with: It seems to me our leader seems to be a high respecter of the credibility of the New York Times. So I put together a document here that I thought might be interesting to him, and I would go through just a few of them, the articles that have come up in the New York Times, that have had to be retracted.

Let's see: There are the articles about Russian meddling in the election that had to be retracted.

They had to apologize for ruining Wen Ho Lee's career and life.

And the New York Times admits that one of the reporters engaged in frequent acts of journalistic fraud, wide-

spread fabrication and plagiarism, and found problems in at least 36 of the 73 articles written by a single individual since he had started.

Further, the Times admits—that is the New York Times—that Judith Miller took journalistic shortcuts, and that New York Times' editors, "failed to dig into problems before they became a mess."

They did become a tremendous mess. Remember, that was the allegation that Saddam Hussein possessed weapons of mass destruction. Well, we got into a war over that one, didn't we, over the New York Times—at least in part.

Most of us will remember in 2006, when the New York Times covered an alleged rape by Duke—or multiple rapes, I should say, by the Duke University Lacrosse team. The Times coverage was biased towards the accuser, despite the fact that it ended up being a hoax and there was little evidence supporting the accuser's case.

And those young men on the Duke Lacrosse team were run through the wringer. They were excoriated; they were pounded on by the national media, not only the New York Times, but that is one of the things that triggers it.

Then, again, there is a New York Times article that questioned John McCain's relationship with a lobbyist. And that faced widespread criticism to the article implying that McCain had a romantic relationship with a lobbyist. They had to issue a correction, that they did not intend for the article to imply a romantic relationship. Well, they did imply that. They just said they didn't "intend" that.

And so somehow, the Times thinks they should have a pass for their own definition of intent, even though time after time after time, the Times has been found to be less than credible.

The President of the United States has poured forth his ire against the New York Times, and called them the "lying New York Times," "the fake news New York Times," "the failing New York Times," and probably a number of descriptions that I haven't uncovered here, Mr. Speaker.

But in 2009, the New York Times' appraisal on Walter Cronkite had to have eight different corrections due to just factual inaccuracies. And this is a newspaper, of course, that America used to depend upon.

And then in 2015, the New York Times published an article claiming that new figures surrounding China's rate of coal usage could affect U.N. climate talks when, in fact, those figures were so outdated that the U.N. was already aware of that particular uptick. So, again, distorted information.

But what is consistent with this? What are the common denominators? And that is, their misinformation in the New York Times almost always fits their narrative.

And then in 2017, the New York Times incorrectly stated that China

was in the Trans-Pacific Partnership. Well, that starts a whole national debate of what is going on. If China is in the TPP, and we are not in the TPP, and then the debate churns along, well, how are we ever going to get back into the TPP? And we have to take China in with us, if they will let us in. China wasn't part of the TPP—just misinformation. And that was an obvious one that it would have failed even the most rudimentary of fact-checks.

I would go further, in 2017 the Times, because of a—their words—“because of an editing error,” quoted three tweets from General Michael Flynn's parody account attributing the quotes to General Flynn, further damaging General Flynn's reputation, and probably contributing to the difficulties that the proud patriot has had as he wound up his career serving our country. An editing error caused these three tweets. They weren't editing errors. They were just picking up—because the parody account fit the Times narrative, they accepted the narrative without checking on it. That is my assertion here, and I believe it is true.

Again, in 2017, the New York Times claims that Trump visited Israel during the campaign, which actually it was planned, but it was canceled for political reasons, I presume. And to be relatively astute on allowing then-President Barack Obama to be in charge of foreign policy.

In fact, I have a personal experience with that, when I thought during the campaign it would be wise for then-candidate Trump to have a meeting or two with some key players around the world. But when I raised that issue, I got the straight answer back, which was, No, we don't want to have any kind of implication that we are conducting foreign policy as a candidate for the President of the United States. That is up to the current Commander-in-Chief, and that transition after the election can take place in due course.

They were exactly correct in that and conducted themselves accordingly, but the allegations that were in the paper would indicate the opposite of that.

I have a number of other stories in here. In fact, I have only gone to the top of page 2, and there is about seven pages, maybe eight pages in here, Mr. Speaker. But I think it is clear that if anybody is going to hang their hat on something that they see printed in the New York Times, they are going to find themselves—if that narrative happens to fit the narrative that the New York Times pushes and promotes—you ought to be very suspicious of the facts and the allegations around that.

I would go through a few cases that come to mind. Also, in America where misinformation came out, it happened to fit the narrative of the left, and so the New York Times, The Washington Post, MSNBC, CNN, on and on—Huffington Post—they pick up that narrative, embellish the narrative, and they look for another way to add to

that narrative, if it is a narrative that fits their ideology and their preconceived notions of what they think of their political opposition.

We think back to the best example we have is now-Justice Brett Kavanaugh, who was put through a confirmation wringer that only had been matched, perhaps, by Justice Clarence Thomas.

What do they have in common? They are both constitutionalists. They are both originalists. They are both textualists. And they are both in the process of moving America back to the Constitution, its original intent. And understanding the text of the Constitution has to mean what it was understood to mean at the time of ratification.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask you just to think about that. If the Constitution is a living and breathing document, and this definition can change on the fly, then what kind of a deal do we have at all with our Founding Fathers and with our posterity?

Can you imagine signing a contract—I have spent my life in the construction business—and can you imagine signing a contract, and during the course of that contract, the words in that contract have to mean a defined, precise, black-and-white meaning. And those words are on paper so that the deal doesn't change. That is what a contract is.

You put words on paper, you sign that document, and that says, I am committed to the language in this Constitution—or the contract—and the intent of this language in the contract, or the Constitution, and I will follow through on that, and I will complete my side of this agreement. That is a contract.

The Constitution is a written contract that lays down the foundation of our government, and it is the supreme law of the land. And it went on paper, on parchment. It went on parchment and was signed and ratified by the Thirteen Colonies so that they said, We are going to keep our part of this bargain. This is the deal.

You would have never ratified that Constitution back in the day if somebody would have said, well, it is a living, breathing document. We can redefine these words in here and ignore others and be able to just work our way around it, and we will get some activist justices that will work with us on this and give us precedent cases that undermine the original intent of the Constitution.

That is what has been going on in this modern era, probably longer than I recall, but I would say at least back to the Warren Court. And yet today, we have Justice Clarence Thomas, who is an originalist, a textualist, and he believes the Constitution has to mean what it was understood to mean at the time of ratification.

And if we don't like that, that is why we have the amendment process, Mr. Speaker. And that is the nominee Jus-

tice Brett Kavanaugh, and that is nominee Justice Neil Gorsuch. And I believe that is the case also for Justice Alito, and most of the time, I think it is also true for Chief Justice John Roberts. But if we don't have a guaranty from our Constitution, we don't have a foundation for America and our government.

And then that puts it into the hands of the willy-nilly attitudes of what might be a majority in the Supreme Court or the will of the people here on the floor of the House of Representatives, who sometimes just turn our back on the Constitution. That contract of our Constitution has to mean what it was understood to mean at the time that it was ratified.

And so why was the big fight then pushing back against Brett Kavanaugh when he was before the United States Senate to be confirmed?

And the reasons for that are the other side—the left, the radical left, that is sometimes supported by the militant left—doesn't want to live under our Constitution. They want to change it. They want to move America. They want to attack the pillars of American exceptionalism. And they have much of the news media as their allies.

So as the news media pours forth these erroneous stories and they put misinformation into the eyes and ears of the American people, while they are doing that, they are pitting the American people against the American people. And you saw that during the confirmation process of Justice Kavanaugh.

And he faced—this is just my memory, but I believe there were something like six different accusers that they accumulated over time. And these accusers, one of them was Christine Blasey Ford, who sat over there with her hair inside of her glasses and told us how bad this was.

But her testimony could not be corroborated, and that was actually the verdict that came down when Justice Kavanaugh was confirmed before the United States Senate. Neither could the testimony or the affidavits or the narratives of the others be corroborated.

And so of those five or six accusers then, none of them held up under the scrutiny, under the light of day, even though the New York Times and The Washington Post, and all these publications I have listed, and many more, came at it as if Christine Blasey Ford was the gold standard for a witness with integrity. And it is clear she was not.

□ 1230

Well, they beat up so badly on Justice Kavanaugh that, at one point, one of the Democrat Senators asked him the question: You have gone through a lot. You have been faced with all this criticism.

Essentially, I will paraphrase and summarize how I understood that, and

it is not a quote from the Senator, but it was essentially this: We have beaten you up so badly and mercilessly. We damaged your reputation so badly. We destroyed your character. You have to be personally just crushed. So, how, if you are confirmed as a Justice on the Supreme Court, can you sit in impartial judgment on ruling on the Constitution and the rule of law? Aren't you going to be tempted to retaliate because of what all you have been through?

Those are not the exact words, but that was the theme.

Now, think of this. If somebody is put forward before the public in a nomination process or some other type of scrutiny and they are so mercilessly pounded by the leftist media—and, in some cases, collaboration from Republican leadership—that their reputation is so badly damaged, the question comes up: Well, can Justice Kavanaugh do his job now that we have eviscerated him through this confirmation process?

Oh, I think he can do his job all right, and I think he can do it clearly and with a cool hand and a cool head and an analytical mind. And I think Justice Kavanaugh is doing and will continue to do this: bring America back to the Constitution, bring America back to the original intent, bring America back to the text of the language that is in the Constitution.

And, if Americans don't like the results of those decisions, we have a method to amend the Constitution rather than simply distort it by judicial activism. And that is about the best way to get revenge on people who put our Constitution under threat by the tactics that they are using in the confirmation process.

Well, that process that they were trying to deny the confirmation of Justice Kavanaugh failed, and he is confirmed, and he is serving with dignity and honor. And he should be allowed to do that for life if he chooses.

But they mounted another effort at him a week or so ago, and it turned out to be another false story. The New York Times, in particular, didn't bother to write into the story that the woman who allegedly had experienced some type of harassment, and maybe even physical harassment—and I say "allegedly"; allegedly, in case The New York Times missed it the first time I said it—that she didn't have any recollection of the incident whatsoever. They knew that, and it is reported that the reporters who wrote the story had that line in their story and that it was taken out by the editors.

So, think of that. The editors at The New York Times are redacting language, but disappearing language, so that the meaning of the story is different and it can be as pejorative as possible against a seated Justice on the United States Supreme Court. That is appalling.

And is it willful? Well, that question hangs out there: Is it willful?

I will say this. There is a Supreme Court precedent case out there from

about 1964 called The New York Times—excuse me. It is Sullivan v. The New York Times Company.

That was a case where, in Alabama, during the civil rights disruptions of the sixties, there was a story that had multiple falsehoods in it that was designed to be pejorative against the law enforcement and the people in Alabama near the Selma area.

And I am not actually sure that was Selma, but it was in Alabama.

In any case, the story that came out in The New York Times was inaccurate on step after step. They argued that they locked the cafeteria shut so that they could starve the students out. Or they reported that. They reported that students were refusing to register and, essentially, leaving college. Neither one of those things were true.

They argued that they circled the building with law enforcement officers essentially arm in arm. That wasn't true. There were about four other falsehoods. They had to be manufactured because what would they be based on, things like that.

Yet, when they went before the Supreme Court in the middle of the 1960s, Sullivan v. The New York Times Company, the Supreme Court came down with a decision, which is, well, The Times is protected because they are a print publication, and we have to allow them their First Amendment right—freedom of the press—even if it is false, even if it is blatantly false, even if it is obviously false. It just has to be willfully and maliciously false in order for them to be liable.

That case needs to come back before the United States Supreme Court and be reconsidered. And I am told that there are one or more Justices on that bench who would welcome such a case to make it to the Supreme Court, and I think I have named those two most likely to welcome that case here already.

So I am frustrated by this. I am glad that this case, this second round, Kavanaugh 2.0 in malicious media meddling, is pretty much now in the rear-view mirror now that the truth has been applied to the story a little bit better.

But this country is not off of this hook by any means. We have a long, long ways to go before we can get down to what is true. And I think Congress is going to have to act at some point. I don't think it is going to happen in this Congress. There has to be a majority change in this Congress. But we are going to have to act.

And the stories that have been served up to the American people—I brought up the Kavanaugh story as the first one. Then you can move along a little bit, and I will take you to—let's see. Let's do Covington Catholic.

The Covington Catholics were here during the March for Life. That would be around January 22. A lot of young men, and, also, at least one of them was wearing a MAGA hat, a "Make America Great" cap, a red one.

They were down by the Lincoln Memorial, and there was a story that there was a Native American who was beating a drum in the face of this young man, and the young man just stood there and maintained his posture, his composure, his expression.

And that just seemed to be what all the media would pile on, that they had been disrespecting a Native American who was beating a drum in his face, and that clip of the close-up seemed to be enough just to reinforce a lot of critics that the young man from Covington Catholic somehow carried an attitude that should be punished.

So they excoriated him through every media that I can think of, and that young man and the school went through days and days and days of a lot of public criticism, grief that was poured forth upon them.

And I can say with experience that, if you don't have experience with public grief being poured on you, it hurts a lot more the 1st time than it does the 2nd, 5th, 10th, 20th, 50th, or 100th time.

You do build scar tissue to this, but you can't imagine that a young man from Covington Catholic has scar tissue built up at all. Who could imagine that this would be the case?

So, they took that heat and that beating—the whole school, but he in particular—for over a week until there was a video that emerged that panned back and showed that really went on. There was no antagonism from the Covington Catholics.

There were bad words being hurled back and forth, but I don't think anybody picked up any bad words coming from those young people from Covington Catholic. Yet they got the blame for all of this when they were standing there innocently and probably stunned at the environment they were in.

I can't imagine they came out of their home State and went into the middle of that, I would say, semi-demonstration environment when they were being intimidated by groups shouting back and forth at them and a drum being beaten in their face.

You would be amazed. I recall my first experience with these things in this town. It was March 18 of 2003 when there was an antiwar demonstration that took place. I thought: I need to see this.

So I went over there near the Washington Monument where they were ginning up, the antiwar demonstrators. They had two great, big speakers up on a stage that were about the size of refrigerators, microphones, and they were ginning up the crowd.

As I walked around through that crowd—I went incognito, by the way, too, Mr. Speaker. I put on my old, vintage Washington Redskins sweatshirt and a cap so I could just, hopefully, blend into the crowd.

I saw every variety of anti-Americanism that I had ever seen. A lot of it was profane. They ginned them up, and then they marched off over to the west,

around the west side of the White House, and then came back down through Pennsylvania Avenue.

I sat there, in the middle there, what I call the grassy knoll, and watched them go by for an hour and three-quarters, a human river of discontent and anger and anti-Americanism.

I saw a young lady, maybe 16 or 17 years old, run over and spit in the face of an officer who was standing there.

I saw two marines standing on the side of the street. They were holding their American flag up, and a young man from the demonstrating crowd ran over there, grabbed a hold of that flag. They held their flag, but he ripped the top half of the flag off, and he danced around the street tearing it up in strips and wearing it around his neck and others' necks as if it were some kind of a trophy to tear up the American flag and then demonstrate.

I saw a photographer there who had a camera and who was going to clean the lens on his camera. He reached in his jacket pocket and pulled out a crumpled American flag, a small, silk flag, and used it to clean that lens. You could tell by the habits of the way he handled it that that is just what he did; he kept the American flag for a rag to clean the lens on his camera while he took pictures of anti-Americanism, hatred of America, and every kind of countercultural thing that you can think of.

That is what we are faced with, the kind of people in that demonstration, the kind of people who were down here at the Lincoln Memorial who were trying to intimidate the Covington Catholics.

So, you know how that one ended, Mr. Speaker. I will say another one.

Now, remember, this one also fit the narrative. Justice Kavanaugh, the stories against him, they picked the ones that fit the narrative and drove them.

Their narrative on Covington Catholics was these must be conservative pro-lifers—and they are—so we have got to find a way to actually expose something that is in their heart, which is, by the way, faith and love. They didn't expose that. That was the Covington Catholics.

Jussie Smollett alleged that he was the subject of, at least, a lynch threat and that they had, what, poured bleach on him and whatnot. That went on for awhile. That story was all ginned up because these were supposedly racists who were going to lynch Jussie Smollett in Chicago.

But I saw the video of the two men who went into the convenience store to buy those items that he had put on top of him, that little bit of a kind of a scrawny rope that didn't look to me that it was a rope you would use for that. But that and the other items that were there, all of it was on video, purchased at the convenience store.

It was reported, at least—now I don't know if it is true—that they were paid something like \$3,500 to do their part in this.

And Jussie managed to wear that rope all the way back to his apartment before he was interviewed by the police.

Yet, still, the story went through and through, and now the Federal Government needs to get involved in it. I believe they are doing a full investigation of what looks like, let's say, a less than enthusiastic local prosecutor there in Chicago.

But that is another story that fit the narrative. Surely, there are people out there who are racist who would go out and get rope and bleach and whatever and wait in the middle of a 20-below-zero night to waylay Jussie Smollett at a place like that.

It happened to be about the only location where there were not surveillance cameras. Carefully thought out? Only partly.

But that fit the narrative. That was published. It was The New York Times, too, but it was many others, Mr. Speaker.

Who am I forgetting now? There are a number of others. I happen to be one. So, I am waiting for a report to come down that would lay out what is going on in this Congress.

But I revere this Constitution. I carry one in my jacket pocket every day. When I say the Pledge, my hand is inside my jacket because my hand is on that Constitution, which is as close to my heart as I can get it. I believe in it, and I believe our job is to restore this Constitution back to its original meaning and intent.

The pillars of American exceptionalism are identified, most all of them, in the Bill of Rights itself. The central pillar of American exceptionalism is the rule of law. There are a number of things around that rule of law that we need to remember: innocent until proven guilty, a right to face your accusers, you get to face a jury of your peers. All of that is there.

We have other pillars of American exceptionalism. Freedom of speech is a pillar. Freedom of religion. Freedom of the press. Freedom of assembly—peaceable assembly, I might add. All of those are pillars that this shining city that Ronald Reagan described to be on the hill, I say, is supported and held up and built upon those pillars of American exceptionalism.

And I mentioned the rule of law, the central pillar, without which the rest of this collapses. Without freedom of the press, the rest of this collapses because corruption has, then, a free rein.

But when the media gets corrupt and the government gets corrupt, as we saw in the fall of 2016 and on into the beginnings of the Trump administration, when the major branches, major divisions, departments within our government are weaponized against a candidate for the Presidency, a President-elect Donald Trump and then an inaugurated President Donald Trump, when those branches of government are weaponized against him, that is weaponization against we, the people,

against our Constitution, and it undermines our freedom.

□ 1245

And when the abuse of those constitutional rights empowers media outlets to turn their targets, unjustly and dishonestly, against a duly-elected President of the United States, or a duly-elected Member of the United States Congress, that—meaning me, in case you are wondering, Mr. Speaker—threatens our republic. And this republic will eventually collapse if we continue down this path.

We must preserve those rights that are in our Constitution, including innocent until proven guilty; the right to face your accusers; a jury of your peers; due process. That has to all be there.

The President hasn't had due process. I haven't had due process. But I have added up a few things. There are currently four Members of this Congress, Mr. Speaker, that don't have committee assignments; four.

One of them resigned from the Republican Party and from his committee assignments; so that takes it down to three.

Two of them are indicted for Federal charges. That takes it down to one.

Then, the one in this Congress—being me, Mr. Speaker—and we look back through history all the way back to 1900, and we find one other Member of Congress that didn't have committee assignments since 1900. That happened to be James Traficant in about 2001. He happened to be one that was removed from his committee assignments shortly after he voted for Dennis Hastert, a Member of the opposite party, and went against many of the platform positions of the Democratic party. They decided he wasn't a Democrat any longer and removed him from his committees.

But in 120 years, there has only been one, other than those that I mentioned; that is James Traficant. And he was, later on, indicted and convicted on nine or ten Federal charges of fraud, corruption, taking bribes and racketeering, and those kinds of things. He was found guilty of all of them and served some time in prison.

So these are very serious charges when you are convicted of Federal felonies and removed from your committees. I don't think it is right to remove someone from a committee when they are charged because if they are indicted, they are innocent until proven guilty. So why would you punish somebody if they are innocent until proven guilty?

That defies a foundational principle of our government.

But, nonetheless, the charges, at least, are serious Federal felony charges for two seated Members today. Charges were certainly serious for James Traficant, who spent time in prison.

Why does STEVE KING not have committees? Because of a misquote in the

New York Times for the simple purpose of an allegation of politically incorrect speech.

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

RESIGNATION FROM THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation from the House of Representatives:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, September 19, 2019.

Speaker NANCY PELOSI,
The Capitol,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAME SPEAKER: I write to inform you that I will resign from the office of U.S. Representative, effective 6:00 PM EST, Monday, September 23, 2019. For the past eight years, it has been the honor of my life to represent the place that I care about and the people I love in Congress.

Sincerely,

SEAN P. DUFFY,
Representative to Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, September 19, 2019.

Governor TONY EVERS,
Secretary of State DOUG LA FOLLETTE,
Wisconsin State Capitol, Office of the Governor,
Madison, WI.

DEAR GOVERNOR EVERS AND SECRETARY OF STATE LA FOLLETTE: I write to inform you that I will resign from the office of U.S. Representative, effective 6:00 PM EST, Monday, September 23, 2019. For the past eight years, it has been the honor of my life to represent the place that I care about and the people I love in Congress.

Sincerely,

SEAN P. DUFFY,
Representative to Congress.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. JACKSON LEE (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of participation in commemorative ceremonies at the 50th anniversary of women matriculating to my alma mater, Yale University.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The Speaker announced her signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 163.—An act to prevent catastrophic failure or shutdown of remote diesel power engines due to emission control devices, and for other purposes.

S. 1689.—An act to permit States to transfer certain funds from the clean water revolving fund of a State to the drinking water revolving fund of the State in certain circumstances, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 48 minutes

p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Tuesday, September 24, 2019, at noon for morning-hour debate.

OATH FOR ACCESS TO CLASSIFIED INFORMATION

Under clause 13 of rule XXIII, the following Members executed the oath for access to classified information:

Dan Bishop.
Gregory F. Murphy.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2213. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Manpower and Reserve Affairs, Department of the Army, Department of Defense, transmitting notification to Congress of the anticipated use of Selected Reserve units that will be ordered to active duty, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 12304b(d); Public Law 112-81, Sec. 516(a)(1); (125 Stat. 1396); to the Committee on Armed Services.

2214. A letter from the Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the 2018 Annual Report of the Securities Investor Protection Corporation, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 78ggg; to the Committee on Financial Services.

2215. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting Transmittal No. 19-0I, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(5)(C) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2216. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting Transmittal No. 19-44, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2217. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting Transmittal No. 19-41, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2218. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting Transmittal No. 19-28, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2219. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting Transmittal No. 19-42, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2220. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting Transmittal No. 19-22, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2221. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting Transmittal No. 19-21, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2222. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's FY 2018 No FEAR Act report, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 2301 note; Public Law 107-174, 203(a) (as amended by Public Law 109-435, Sec. 604(f)); (120 Stat. 3242); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

2223. A letter from the Chief Justice, Supreme Court of the United States, transmitting amendments to the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure that have been adopted by the Supreme Court of the United States, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 2075; Public Law 88-623, Sec. 1 (as amended by Public Law 103-394, Sec. 104(f)); (108 Stat. 4110) (H. Doc. No. 116-65); to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

2224. A letter from the Chief Justice, Supreme Court of the United States, transmitting amendments to the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases in the United States District Courts, and the Rules Governing Section 2255 Proceedings for the United States District Courts, pursuant to 2072 U.S.C. 28 (H. Doc. No. 116-66); to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

2225. A letter from the Chief Justice, Supreme Court of the United States, transmitting amendment to the Federal Rules of Evidence that has been adopted, pursuant to 2072 U.S.C. 28 (H. Doc. No. 116-67); to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

2226. A letter from the Chief Justice, Supreme Court of the United States, transmitting amendments to the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure, pursuant to 2072 U.S.C. 28 (H. Doc. No. 116-68); to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

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. FITZPATRICK (for himself, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Ms. STEFANIK, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 4429. A bill to ensure that a fair percentage of Federal cancer research funds are dedicated to pediatric cancer research; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. TRAHAN:

H.R. 4430. A bill to direct the Secretary of Education to assign a unique numeric identifier to institutions of higher education to facilitate data collection and reporting, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. AMASH:

H.R. 4431. A bill to limit the authority of personnel of the Department of Homeland Security to prohibit a citizen or permanent resident of the United States from boarding as a passenger on an aircraft or cruise ship based on inclusion of the individual in a watchlist, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. RICHMOND (for himself and Mr. KATKO):

H.R. 4432. A bill to require the Department of Homeland Security to prepare a terrorism threat assessment relating to unmanned aircraft systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. MCKINLEY (for himself, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, and Mrs. MILLER):

H.R. 4433. A bill to amend title 40, United States Code, to establish an Appalachian regional energy hub initiative, and for other