

for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I am here to represent the residents of Arizona's Second Congressional District. I work for them.

Our constituents sent us here to practice good government and to fight for their values and interests, so I am upset with the President's recent budget request.

A budget is an expression of our values, and this budget further proves how out of touch Donald Trump is with real American families.

This budget ransacks Medicaid, Medicare, and affordable healthcare. It makes it harder for Americans to have access to quality healthcare.

This budget abandons hungry families who are struggling to make ends meet. It fails farmers and rural communities. It pushes affordable college further out of reach, making it harder for students to attend college. And this budget demands billions for a wasteful, ineffective wall.

We need to have a budget that prioritizes working families and not large corporations.

We need to invest more in our education system and invest more in our young people, not less.

What the President has laid out does not accomplish the goals or values of American families, and I reject this budget.

#### RURAL COMMUNITIES ARE FORGOTTEN AND LEFT BEHIND

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

Mr. COX of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Equality Act.

Too often in our policy debates, it is our rural communities that are forgotten and left behind. And for LGBTQ people living in rural America, this is no different.

If you want to live and work and raise your family in rural America, you should be able to have that choice, but it is unfortunately the case today that rural LGBTQ families are denied opportunities in housing, employment, and healthcare access.

While in California we have comprehensive laws to protect LGBTQ people and protect them against discrimination, this is not the case everywhere.

That is why we need bills like the Equality Act.

This bill would take important steps to protect every LGBTQ family from discrimination in housing, employment, and financing.

It will help ensure that every family that chooses to live in rural America can fully participate in our society free from fear of discrimination simply because of who they are or who they love.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. CON. RES. 24, EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF CONGRESS THAT THE REPORT OF SPECIAL COUNSEL MUELLER SHOULD BE MADE AVAILABLE TO THE PUBLIC AND TO CONGRESS, AND PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM MARCH 15, 2019, THROUGH MARCH 22, 2019

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 208 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

#### H. RES. 208

*Resolved*, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 24) expressing the sense of Congress that the report of Special Counsel Mueller should be made available to the public and to Congress. All points of order against consideration of the concurrent resolution are waived. The amendments to the concurrent resolution and the preamble printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted. The concurrent resolution, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the concurrent resolution, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution and preamble, as amended, to adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

SEC. 2. On any legislative day during the period from March 15, 2019, through March 22, 2019—

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

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

SEC. 3. The Speaker may appoint Members to perform the duties of the Chair for the duration of the period addressed by section 2 of this resolution as though under clause 8(a) of rule I.

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

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from 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. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 208, providing for the consideration of H.

Con. Res. 24, a resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the report of Special Counsel Mueller should be made available to the public and to Congress.

The rule provides for consideration of the legislation under a closed rule.

The rule self-executes two amendments to simply clarify that the resolution is calling for the release of the special counsel's findings in addition to any report.

□ 1215

It provides 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the Judiciary Committee.

Finally, the rule provides standard recess procedures for the period of March 15 through March 22.

Mr. Speaker, when the Justice Department named the special counsel for the Russia investigation, acting Attorney General Rod Rosenstein said: "A special counsel is necessary in order for the American people to have full confidence in the outcome. Our Nation is grounded on the rule of law, and the public must be assured that government officials administer the law fairly."

This investigation has been about following the facts wherever they may lead, getting to the truth of Russia's involvement in the 2016 election, and ensuring government is transparent and accountable to the American public.

This does not predetermine the outcome of that investigation. It simply expresses that the report of the special counsel should be made available to Congress and to the American people.

The public, including my constituents in California—our constituents in California, Mr. Speaker—want to know what happened. Nearly 9 in 10 Americans in both parties say the investigation should produce a full public report on their findings. Not only do the American people want to know, but they deserve to know. Congress needs to preserve their ability to know.

Our election system is an integral part of what makes us the beacon of Western democracy. Any and all attempts to undermine this system is an attack on our country's values and cannot be taken lightly.

This is a serious investigation with consequences for our elections, democracy, government, and the future of this country and democracy itself. There is no one with more intimate knowledge of Russia's involvement in our election than the special counsel.

To date, this investigation has resulted in 34 people and three companies being criminally charged; nearly 200 charges filed; seven guilty pleas; one conviction following a jury trial; and the investigation, while costing \$25 million, has recovered approximately \$48 million in assets from tax evasion.

Mr. Speaker, eight Federal and congressional intelligence and national security groups believe Russia interfered

in our election, with the Central Intelligence Agency, the National Security Agency, the FBI, and the Office of the Director of National Intelligence concluding that Vladimir Putin personally “ordered an influence campaign in 2016 aimed at the U.S. Presidential election” to “undermine public faith in the democratic process.”

The last time our country had a special counsel operating under the same rules as this probe was in 1993 to investigate the Waco siege and allegations of government wrongdoing. Prosecutors posted their final report directly on the internet with hundreds of pages of exhibits and timelines. The American people must receive the same transparency when this report is released.

I encourage my friends across the aisle to support the release of this report. We have commitments to support it from three House Republican leaders, including the minority leader, the minority whip, and the Republican Conference chair. I hope all my colleagues across the aisle will join us in this vote to ensure that we are on the record that we will share one of the most important investigations of our time within these halls and with all of America.

This is happening on our watch, and it is our job to be faithful to our oath to defend and uphold democracy. As Justice Brandeis famously said, “Sunlight is said to be the best of disinfectants.”

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

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I thank my friend from California for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, when I see someone of your stature come to the chair, I think: We must be down here to debate some serious American public policy. We must be down here to change the law in ways that can only happen once in a generation when people come together to make things happen.

I don't know what they told you when you came to the chair this morning, but let me be the first to tell you that is not at all why we are here today. What we are here to say today is important, that the American people have a vested interest in confidence in our democracy. That is a value shared from the furthest side of the left to the furthest side of the right. But the resolution we have here before us today is just a restatement of current law.

Sometimes I think, Mr. Speaker, that we undermine faith in the democracy when we try to pretend that division exists where division does not, where we try to pretend that we are doing great things when, in fact, we are not.

This is an opportunity today to speak with a voice in Congress that says the special counsel should release the report. But let me be clear, because we sometimes do more harm than good,

that is going to be the headline: “House Votes for Special Counsel to Release Report.” That is not actually what the resolution says, and I want to guide you.

If you have a copy, Mr. Speaker, you can go back through it. It is not going to be on page 1. It is not going to be on pages 2, 3, 4, or 5. The real substance of the resolution is back on the bottom of page 5, early on page 6. It says, “to the extent permitted by law.”

As you know from your legal background, Mr. Speaker, the law does not allow the special counsel to release so many things. Grand jury testimony, for example, nowhere in the country is grand jury testimony disclosed. Those facts are gathered, but that is never disclosed. Intelligence sources and methods, that is never disclosed, nor would anybody on the other side of the aisle suggest that it should be.

That is why, in the resolution drafted by the Democratic chairman of the Judiciary Committee, it says specifically that these things need not be released because it is prohibited by law. I only make that point, Mr. Speaker, because sometimes the headlines are all we read when they come through on our Twitter feed. Sometimes we believe the headline tells the whole story.

I want to make it clear that there is unanimity in this Chamber that transparency is valuable in our Republic. But it is also true that this is a nation of laws. The reason the special counsel exists is because we are a nation of laws, and the substance of the special counsel's report is going to be governed by those laws. To the extent allowable by law, our Attorney General has already said he wants to make the entire thing available.

I don't know how you want to characterize the resolution today, Mr. Speaker, whether you want to characterize it as an insistence of the House on how the administration should behave or just a big attaboy to our new Attorney General to say: You are doing a great job, and we are behind you 100 percent in what you have already promised the American people you were going to do.

However you characterize that resolution—we heard it in the Rules Committee, as my friend from California suggested—it is coming to the floor today under a closed rule. So if anybody has any additional changes they want to make, those changes will not be permitted. This is a take-it-or-leave-it resolution from the Rules Committee today.

But as a restatement of current law, it is quite clear. Again, you have to go all the way to the back of the resolution to find those 10 lines of substance. But when you get there, you will find these are already things the Attorney General has agreed to, and all Americans should be pleased about that outcome.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, let me join with my friend from Georgia in noting how important it is that you are presiding, my good friend, with lots of history between the two of us in our political life in California and our education, I might add to the Jesuits.

I want to say to my good friend, I look at this as one of those opportunities where we may not get a headline. Unfortunately, too many of the headlines talk about how divisive it is here. Certainly, there is a lot of that.

But when I go home and do town-halls—and I do a lot of them in northern California—when this question comes up about polarization, I talk about all the times we do work together that don't get out, certainly, in the headlines, because that is not what sells advertising, apparently. I think this is one of those moments that we aspire to that, that we actually aspire that somebody picks up on this; that all of us, in these extraordinary circumstances, are being faithful to our oath; that we make sure that the things that may have happened, that apparently did happen, that the public needs confidence in us.

When we look every day, including today, at the affronts and the attacks on so many institutions in America, and this institution having had challenges, this might be one of those opportunities, at least for us, to say: We agree. We may have differences of opinion about who did what, but we have faith.

For me, I think history will say that this special counsel is one of those providential Americans. With his background, with his determination to believe in fidelity and truth, we were lucky to have this person at this point in time.

I put my faith in this institution. I put faith in the special counsel. In this instance, I hear from you, my friend from Georgia, that we are going to put our faith in this institution and one another, that we can show the American people that this is, indeed, more important than party, and it is more important than any of our individual political careers.

I did want to mention, Mr. Speaker, that this is a sense of Congress and that this is not the first time we have brought a resolution like this to the floor. In fact, just last week, we brought a resolution to the floor to send a message to the American people that Congress is united in condemning anti-Semitism and bigotry in all its forms. There are people who criticized us for bringing that and thought that it was unnecessary, but we brought that to the floor.

A majority of Republicans joined Democrats, an overwhelming majority, in voting for it. Leader MCCARTHY called it a resolution to make a statement. Whip SCALISE said, regarding the resolution, “We must all take a strong

stand against hatred and bigotry wherever we see it, and I am glad this resolution makes" sense.

We agree with our colleagues on the other side of the aisle that passing these types of resolutions can make a strong statement. Although they may seem to some as unnecessary, these statements on these kinds of important issues, I believe, are very necessary for this institution to make, particularly when they are bipartisan.

Today, we are letting Attorney General Barr and everyone else know that we are all united behind one common principle, which I believe he agreed to in his confirmation hearings, which the Member from Georgia alluded to. That complete transparency, consistent with law, is vital to the success of our democracy. The American people deserve to have access to this report.

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

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS), a senior member on the Rules Committee and a subcommittee ranking member on the Energy and Commerce Committee.

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

Mr. Speaker, today, I rise in opposition to the rule providing for consideration of H. Con. Res. 24 to release the special counsel's investigation report, a report that, I may note, has not yet been issued.

The resolution we are considering here today will not change the law; it will not increase transparency; and it will provide no new benefit to the American people. Quite simply, this resolution merely states current law. This resolution simply restates current Department of Justice protocol.

We had a Member here in this House who was also a physician and who was a member of the other party, former Congressman McDermott of Washington State. I remember one time Republicans offered a sense of Congress resolution that had something to do with taxes. The gentleman took to the floor of the House and said, if you want to do something about taxes, do something about taxes, but a sense of Congress resolution, why you might as well be sending a get-well card to the IRS.

That is the force with which we are exercising our congressional time today. Speaker PELOSI and the Democratic leadership have decided to use valuable legislative time to consider a resolution that changes nothing and does not serve the American people.

In the time that we have spent debating this resolution, we could have been discussing more serious matters before this body. Let's just run through a few of them.

The Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act has been brought to the floor 17 times, yet the current Democratic leadership refuses to bring up this legislation for a vote. I might remind the body that this bill is not

about abortion but saving the lives of children who are, in fact, born alive.

□ 1230

You know, I don't make it a habit of watching "60 Minutes" on television, but last Sunday night, "60 Minutes" had a news story on the dramatic advances in the treatment and perhaps—perhaps—inching towards a cure for sickle cell disease.

Sickle cell disease is a painful condition I witnessed many times as a resident at Parkland Hospital back in the 1970s.

For years, sickle cell received very little attention. Now, I am happy to say in the last Congress, under the leadership of DANNY DAVIS of Illinois, our subcommittee worked on and passed his bill dealing with sickle cell. It finally was passed by the Senate in October of last year, and it was signed into law by the President last December.

As a consequence, the push for sickle cell research has continued. The 21st Century Cures Act, which this Congress worked on at the end of the previous administration, certainly can be given some credit for that. But, I have to tell you, it was dramatic to have the Director of the NIH interviewed on "60 Minutes" talking about a cure for sickle cell.

So our work that we do here is important. It does impact the lives of real people, and I think that is just one dramatic example.

Well, another example was the first tax reform, 31 years, that was signed into law last year, and here we are a month out from tax day. We could use this time to strengthen the progress we made on the tax reform that was passed last year.

In the last Congress, we helped American people keep more of their hard-earned money. We should be working to continue that momentum, perhaps make those tax cuts permanent for the middle class.

We could be discussing the Democrats' government-run, bureaucratic, top-down healthcare plan that would strip hardworking Americans of their private health insurance and offer less coverage at more expense to American taxpayers, but we are not.

Today, we could be talking about patent abuse entities, so-called patent trolls, particularly troublesome in the eastern district of Texas, where most of those cases are litigated.

The House could be considering the Troll Act, legislation that I have introduced for three terms of Congress to limit patent assertion entities and protect Americans' intellectual property.

We could be using this time to discuss our Nation's critical need for border security to protect the American people and defend our borders.

In February of 2019, the shortest month of the year, only 28 days, more than 75,000 people that we know of crossed the border without legal status, in excess of a 100 percent increase

from the same period last year. People argue whether that is an emergency. I believe that it is, but we could be talking about that.

In a week in which more than 150 lost their lives, we could be using this time to discuss aviation safety and does Congress need to do anything further to ensure the continued safety of the American traveling public.

So time and again, we found that Members on the other side of the dais are far more interested in discrediting the President than working on policy that will help the American people, this President who, in the first 2 years and 2 months of this administration, has probably been more productive than any Presidency in the last 50 years.

And, finally, Mr. Speaker, we could be using this time to address the false and misleading comments that a member of the Judiciary Committee made about the Department of Health and Human Services.

Last month, a Member of this House grossly mischaracterized the work being done by the Department of Health and Human Services to care for unaccompanied alien children by stating that the Office of Refugee Resettlement created "an environment of systemic sexual assaults by Health and Human Services staff on unaccompanied alien children."

Mr. Speaker, that accusation is false, and it was made without that Member ever having visited an ORR facility. Those comments are a discredit to the effort by dedicated personnel of the Office of Refugee Resettlement, those employees who deal with a problem that dates back to the Obama administration when the Office of Refugee Resettlement was unprepared for the task.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BEYER). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BURGESS. If Democrats don't like the work that the Office of Refugee Resettlement is doing, you are in the majority. You have the ability to introduce legislation and pass legislation to do something different.

Instead of standing here today discussing this superfluous resolution, the Democrats could be using this time to change a law that they clearly don't like.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from the agency's Administration for Children and Families regarding this issue.

ADMINISTRATION FOR  
CHILDREN & FAMILIES,

Washington, DC, February 28, 2019.

Representative TED DEUTCH,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE DEUTCH: At the February 26th House Judiciary Committee hearing, you stated that ORR created "an environment of systemic sexual assaults by staff on unaccompanied alien children" and went on to conclude that you have seen "thousands of cases of sexual assault, if not by

HHS staff, then by staff HHS oversees.” (emphasis added). However, this is unsupported by the data you provided and none of the allegations involve HHS employees. By mischaracterizing the data during a televised hearing, you impugned the integrity of hundreds of federal civil servants who, like Commander White, work tirelessly to ensure the well-being of the nearly 50,000 unaccompanied alien children who they have been charged by federal law to protect annually. On behalf of these dedicated employees of HHS assigned to the UAC program, we request that you apologize to these career civil servants for your untoward and unfounded comments. Acknowledging that you were wrong is the moral, decent and right thing to do.

Child safety is our top priority in managing the UAC program. All but one of our care facilities are licensed by the authorizing state residential child care agency, and operate under intense state and federal oversight. Because ORR care facilities diligently track all allegations of a wide range of sexually inappropriate conduct, ranging from name calling or use of vulgar language to more serious claims, the data given to Congress by our agency reflects allegations much broader than just ‘sexual abuse’ (as defined in 34 U.S.C. §20341 and in ORR regulations at 45 C.F.R. §411.6), to also include ‘sexual harassment’ (as defined in ORR regulations at 45 C.F.R. §411.6) and ‘inappropriate sexual behavior’ (a catch-all category for sexual behaviors that do not rise to the level of sexual abuse or sexual harassment).

The total number of sexual conduct allegations reported to ORR decreased in FY2017 (1,069 total) but otherwise has generally remained relatively stable each year (FY2015: 1,000 total, FY2016: 1,226 total, FY2018 (through July): 1,261 total). The vast majority of the allegations reported to ORR are ‘inappropriate sexual behaviors’ involving solely UAC, and not staff or any other adults. Facilities can often resolve these allegations by, for example, counseling the minors about more appropriate behaviors.

More serious allegations rising to the level of ‘sexual abuse’ are reported to both ORR and the Department of Justice (DOJ). Of these, the vast majority involve ‘UAC-on-UAC’ allegations; the distinct minority involve adults. In FY2015, 279 allegations of sexual abuse were reported. Of these, 8.6% (24 instances) involved allegations of facility-staff-on-minor sexual abuse. These metrics fluctuated in subsequent years but remained relatively consistent. In FY2016, ORR and DOJ received 348 allegations of sexual abuse, and 16.1% (56 instances) involved facility-staff-on-minor allegations; in FY2017, ORR and DOJ received 264 allegations of sexual abuse, and 18.6% involved facility-staff-on-minor allegations (49 instances); in FY2018 (through July), ORR and DOJ received 412 allegations of sexual abuse, and 11.9% involved facility-staff-on-minor allegations (49 instances). Thus, the total number of incidents of alleged ‘sexual abuse’ involving facility-staff-on-minor misconduct across a four-year period spanning the previous administration and this administration was 178 out of approximately 182,806 children under UAC care or about 0.10% of all children placed in ORR custody during that period. None of the allegations involved ORR or other HHS federal staff. These allegations were all fully investigated and remedial action was taken where appropriate.

Your office staff requests an additional briefing from ORR program officials on these allegations. ORR will be happy to meet with you once you correct the hearing record and provide an apology to the dedicated men and women working tirelessly to protect and im-

prove the lives of unaccompanied alien children in our care.

Sincerely,

JONATHAN H. HAYES,  
Acting Director,  
Office of Refugee Resettlement.

Mr. BURGESS. So here is the bottom line: House Democrats do not like the President of the United States, and we know that.

Less than 3 months into the 116th Congress, the Democrats have shown that they will work against President Trump to the detriment of the American people.

We are here in the United States House of Representatives to serve the American people, and the legislation we are considering here today will not do that.

President Trump has urged us at the State of the Union, asked all the Members present, to reject the politics of revenge, resistance, and retribution and embrace the boundless potential of cooperation, compromise, and the common good. I also believe this is possible, and I recommend we get on with the task.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN), the distinguished chair of the Committee on House Administration.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution today.

We have a responsibility to the American people to uphold the Constitution and rule of law, and we also have an obligation, as a separate and equal branch of government, to act as a check on the executive branch.

Without access to necessary information, we can’t fulfill our constitutionally prescribed duties. We must have not only this report, but the evidence collected to support the report.

If the President has nothing to hide, then he would also support this resolution by tweet or verbal approval.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be a cosponsor of this legislation. It is very important for our country.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Antitrust, Commercial and Administrative Law.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution.

Special Counsel Mueller’s investigation has resulted in 199 criminal charges against 39 people and entities. Seven people have pleaded guilty, and five people have been sentenced to prison.

This investigation has been conducted on behalf of the American people, and they are entitled to know the results of this investigation.

This investigation was begun to safeguard our democracy, and the American people deserve to know the results of this investigation; and yet President Trump has repeatedly sought to attack and discredit the investigation, label-

ing it a witch hunt and even contemplating firing the special counsel.

The President’s pick for Attorney General, Bill Barr, has also made it clear during his confirmation hearing that he will only follow DOJ’s policies that are convenient for the President. Therefore, it is up to Congress to make sure that documents related to the special counsel’s investigation are preserved and published.

That is why I introduced the Special Counsel Transparency Act, with Congressman DOGGETT, to require the publication of the special counsel’s report.

No one person should decide what the public gets to see. The American people have a right to come to their own conclusions and to know that justice was served.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the American people. Allow them to see the results of the investigation conducted on their behalf. Bring transparency to this process. Support this resolution and signal a willingness to respect the right of the American people to see the consequences and the results of this important investigation which, again, was begun to safeguard our democracy.

This shouldn’t be a Republican or Democratic issue. Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will join us in our effort to preserve our democracy.

I thank, again, the gentleman for yielding.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to ask my friend from Rhode Island before he leaves the floor: The bill that he introduced, was that also a House resolution or was that an H.R. to insist on the revealing?

Mr. CICILLINE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODALL. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, this legislation that I introduced is an H.R. But if the point of the gentleman’s question is is that a more effective way to do it, I would welcome support on my resolution. I haven’t been as successful getting my Republican colleagues to join us.

We are hoping that this resolution is a way for him to find his way toward transparency, democracy, and spirit of bipartisanship and letting the American people know the results of the investigation.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Rhode Island introducing the bill.

And I think that is an important distinction, Mr. Speaker, and that is what you have heard, largely. You heard it in the Rules Committee; you have heard it down here on the floor, that: Listen, there are lots of things that we could be doing here, and if we wanted to pass a law that insisted that the entire report was released—those parts that are prohibited from being released under current law and those parts that are intended to be released under current law—we could do that. That is just not what we are doing.

What we are doing is saying: Hey, do you know what current law is? Follow current law. Follow current law. We, the House of Representatives, have thought about it, and in our deliberative wisdom, we are prepared to announce that we believe current law should be followed—Signed, U.S. House of Representatives.

There are those who would have you believe this is something more than that. It is not. There is nothing wrong with what we are doing today except that it is not a particularly valuable use of time.

When I opened, Mr. Speaker, you were not in the chair, but I mentioned that I think we do great damage to trust in our Republic when we seek division instead of highlighting our unity. To suggest that we are down here doing something to protect our Republic from its inevitable demise is just ridiculous. No such thing is happening here on the floor today. All that is happening on the floor today is saying that we, the duly-elected Members of the U.S. House of Representatives, believe U.S. law should be followed.

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

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, in response to my friend from Georgia, I want to agree—and maybe we disagree a little bit.

I do think this is important. I think it is the unusual circumstance, and a lot of things that we have no direct control over have brought us to this circumstance.

Social media and the use of social media in our elections is relatively new, coming from the Bay area where so much of the genesis happened.

So I think it is important, and I do think there is lacking—and hyperbole is something that sometimes doesn't happen in this Chamber, but I think it is not a hyperbole to say that the U.S. House of Representatives, hopefully, unanimously says that the law should be followed to its letter.

So I think we agree, and I don't want to look for a way to disagree.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

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

Mr. Speaker, I don't know what is in the Mueller report and neither do you. The American people don't know what is in the Mueller report, but they want to know. And I want to know, as you do, and why not?

Mr. Speaker, 81 percent of the American people polled say they want to know, and that includes 79 percent of the Republicans. That is good news.

Because what we do know, without knowing the details of the Mueller report, is that really bad stuff happened in the last election. Some of it was in a campaign, and some of it was in a foreign country that is our severe adversary; and I speak, of course, of Vladimir Putin's Russia.

But the bad stuff: a former campaign foreign policy adviser indicted and con-

victed, Mr. Papadopoulos; a former campaign manager on his way to jail, Mr. Manafort; a former campaign aide and Manafort's long-time junior business partner indicted; a former foreign policy national security adviser pleaded guilty, Mr. Flynn.

This is the high level of a campaign where crimes are not just being discussed; there have been convictions and guilty pleas. What is behind all of that? We need to know.

And, incidentally, Mr. Speaker, the American people are footing the bill for this—about \$25 million, as far as we can tell. They have got a right to know.

But, in addition to whatever happened in the campaign, really bad stuff happened in Russia. We know from our own intelligence agencies that Russia made a concerted effort and a determined effort and a well-financed effort to interfere in our election.

□ 1245

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, outside interference goes to the heart of our democracy. The most important challenge for our country is that we, the citizens of this country, make the decision on who is our President, who are our Senators, and who are our Representatives.

We have to get to the bottom of what Russia did and how they did it so that we can take steps to make certain that that does not happen in the future. It is the American people who decide who is their leader.

Release the Mueller report.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am looking for something to disagree with my friend from Vermont about. I don't disagree with him about anything at all. I thought that was a very thoughtful presentation.

The only thing I would point out is the reason that he doesn't know what is in the Mueller report and the American people don't know what is in the Mueller report, is because as of today, there is no Mueller report. That is the only reason we don't know what is in it. It hasn't been released yet.

I don't mean released to the public. I mean, Mueller hasn't written it and handed it to the Attorney General yet, and so we don't know. When that happens, let me tell you what the Attorney General has said, Mr. Speaker. The Attorney General has committed to being transparent with Congress and the public consistent with the rules and the law. I don't think we would ask anything different of him.

The Attorney General has committed to providing as much information as he can consistent with current regulations. I don't think we would ask anything different of him than that, and,

certainly, this resolution does not ask anything different of him other than that.

He says that his objective and goal is to get as much information as he can to the public. That is exactly what this resolution asks for; exactly what he has already committed to. And he says, "I feel like I'm in a position in life where I can do the right thing and not really care about the consequences. I can be truly independent."

Well, that doesn't just mean truly independent from pressure put on him from the White House. It also means truly independent from statements of opinion sent to him by the U.S. House. He is going to do the right thing, as allowed by the law and resolutions. If he doesn't, this House can act and try to push a different outcome.

Just understand that that is not what this resolution does today. It is simply a statement of fact. To my friend from California, there are those Members of Congress that sometimes they speak and you just want to get out your sharp stick, Mr. Speaker, and poke them a little bit harder. They don't calm you down. They rile you up. My friend from California is one of those folks whose thoughtful words always recenter me and remind me what we have together.

He is right about the hyperbole, and I don't want to mischaracterize this resolution. It does do one thing that is not available in current law today, and that is, that it makes the official position of the United States House known. I have always presumed that the Attorney General would follow the law. This resolution says we expect the Attorney General to follow the law.

It is not that it does nothing. It is just that it does something so very little, perhaps our time would be better spent elsewhere, but I support the underlying premise.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend for pointing out that I am not a poker, that I might actually be trying to be thoughtful. Maybe it is because I was once registered as a Republican. I don't regularly admit that sometimes, at least not in my district.

But I do think this conversation is important on multiple levels, and I appreciate the fact that the gentleman is here to present his side of the aisle's position.

I think there is a danger here for us to resume to our corners, and this is an instance where I really think it is important—and, hopefully, it is newsworthy—to the media and to the general public that we are coming to this moment. Although it is a resolution, I still think it is significant without indulging in hyperbole.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER), my friend and a distinguished member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California,

and I thank the gentleman from Georgia. I have not heard you two be so agreeable. Disagreeable is what usually you are, but so agreeable, and the reason there is agreement here is, we all want to see what is in this report.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the rule and the underlying resolution, and I would like to remind everybody about what the Mueller investigation is about. Russia interfered in the 2016 U.S. Presidential election with, in my opinion, the goal of helping Donald Trump be elected.

This is a fact confirmed by the U.S. intelligence community, as well as by the House and Senate Intelligence Committees. This should concern every American, Republican, Democrat, or Independent.

In response to this unprecedented attack on our elections, Robert Mueller was appointed to serve as special counsel for the Justice Department to follow the facts wherever they may lead, whether they implicate people or exonerate people. We need to know precisely what happened, understand who was involved, how it was accomplished, and, ultimately, hold those responsible for this attack on our election accountable under our laws. This investigation will also ensure we better protect our elections in the future.

Now, we have had 2 convictions of Mr. Manafort, 7 guilty pleas, 34 people and 3 companies indicted as part of the Mueller investigation. Six of the people indicted were part of President Trump's inner circle with the campaign and business. So it is important for us to understand precisely what is in the report.

I appreciate the fact that the Rules Committee unanimously supported this particular rule and the underlying resolution, and I say to my friend from Georgia, you are right. The law is what it is and that it says the report should be withheld until fully written and prepared. And then if Mr. BARR does what he says he was going to do, it will be made available to all of us.

We are emphasizing that point because Americans should know precisely what happened and where this investigation has led. I thank my friend from California for bringing this rule.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I tell my friend, I do not have any speakers remaining at this point, so I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Let me thank the gentleman from California and congratulate him on his new distinguished post on the Rules Committee. My good friend who I have seen quite frequently over the years at the Rules Committee and I have known of his consistent concern with the rule of law and truly appreciate his comments today as it relates to the rule of law.

I would like my comments to be strictly on that question and really the

American people of whom each and every one of us come here to represent.

I don't want to recount in detail, but I do want to make mention that we know that the Intelligence Committee in January 2017 concluded—and that is the intelligence community concluded—in a report that Russian President Putin ordered and influenced the campaign of 2016 on the Presidential election. We all know recently there were attempts to influence the 2018 election.

We won't dwell on that. We won't dwell on the fact that there are discussions and review in the special counsel's work dealing with collusion or the questions dealing with the campaign of the present President and Russia.

I believe that the real point of this is to answer the questions of the American people. If we say that the purpose of appointing the special counsel to oversee the investigation is to ensure that the American public would have full confidence in the integrity of the investigation, regardless of what it says, I am here to say, regardless of what the Mueller report will say—and we know that there will be comments made by the general public, leaders of Congress, and that is their right as Americans—we want to reinforce the fact that the DOJ regulations themselves say that investigation results should be made fully extended to the American public in the public interest, and that the results of that report should be made available to the American people.

Obviously, being concerned about persons that are mentioned with no relevance whatsoever, as a lawyer, I would want to make sure such protections occur. But it is true that Special Counsel Mueller previously served in the Department of Justice as a prosecutor, and director of the FBI in the Republican and Democrat administrations where he built a reputation of competence, fairness, and nonpartisanship.

With that in mind, we thank him for the work he has done that has shown a number of guilty pleas and other responses.

But the main point is the American people need to know that their government adheres to the rule of law, and the integrity of the Constitution. All we are asking today is to reflect in a sense of Congress that you, the American people, that my colleagues in this House and the Senate should have the right to see the full report.

I ask for support of the underlying bill, and I ask us to do it in a bipartisan way.

Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the Committee on Judiciary, which has oversight of the Department of Justice, and as a senior member of the Committee on Homeland Security, which has oversight over our election security infrastructure, I rise in strong support of H. Con. Res. 24.

Mr. Speaker, I take no glee in standing here.

In fact, there are many parts of the last 22 months, since the day that Deputy Attorney

General Rod Rosenstein appointed former FBI Director Robert Mueller to be Special Counsel, where I have been concerned for the state of our democracy.

And I know, from my travels back to the 18th Congressional District of Texas, around our Nation, and to nations involved, that many Americans are concerned about our democracy.

Since well before the 2016 election, Americans have been concerned about how Russia was manipulating our election and the extent to which that crime was aided and abetted by associates of the Trump Campaign.

American intelligence officials have been keenly aware of this threat to the democracy posed by Russia's active measures campaign to sabotage the election and secure the American presidency for its preferred candidate, the current occupant of the Oval Office.

Shortly after the President took office, James Comey, the former director of the FBI testified to the House Intelligence Committee in a public congressional hearing that there was an active FBI investigation into Russia's interference and the extent to which Russia and was aided and abetted by agents of the Trump Campaign.

Shortly after the hearing, the President fired James Comey as FBI Director and went on broadcast television and cited the looming Russia investigation as his reason for doing so.

The next day in the Oval Office, the President of the United States met with the Russian Ambassador and other officials from the Kremlin and told them that he had gotten rid of "nut job" Comey and had gotten the Russian investigation off his back.

Mere days later, the Deputy Attorney General, Rod Rosenstein appointed legendary FBI Director and Department of Justice prosecutor Robert Mueller as Special Counsel to investigate whether Russia interfered in our election and whether that effort was aided and abetted by members of the Trump Campaign.

Since that time, the investigation has secured numerous indictments, convictions or guilty pleas from the: President's campaign manager, his deputy campaign manager, his campaign's foreign policy advisor, his former personal attorney, his longtime confidante, and many others, including Russian agents.

The president has attempted to dismiss these crimes and other charges brought—like obstruction of justice, perjury, making false statements, etc.—as "process crimes," when in actuality they are crimes designed to safeguard the integrity of the criminal justice system and the rule of law.

But these are merely the headlines, when we look closer at just what we have learned from the Russia investigation, we have a roadmap on how to manipulate the electoral process in the world's oldest democracy.

We know that the Russians manipulated our social media systems.

They did this by turning our social media platforms like Twitter and Facebook, into rowdy and unwieldy debates that turned Americans against one another.

They did this by creating fake online social media accounts and populated them on social media platforms.

After infiltrating the social media accounts of real Americans, these fake accounts sought to sow discord in these online communities by purposely exacerbating divisions within our



Nation and creating new ones—all with the intent of pitting Americans against one another.

While they were distorting the social media landscape, they were also selectively disseminating emails stolen from the Democratic National Committee and the campaign of Hillary Clinton with the purpose of timing the dissemination to maximize political damage on Secretary Clinton's campaign.

Based on the statements from the Trump Campaign, we also know that it was actively trying to suppress the votes of groups traditionally aligned with the Democratic party, including women, African Americans and young voters.

We now know, due to information uncovered during the pendency of the Special Counsel's investigation, Russians affiliated with the highest ranks of the Kremlin were at Trump Tower during the middle of the 2016 election.

We know that then-candidate Trump asked Russia, "Russia, if you're releasing, I hope you will find Hillary's stolen emails."

In May 2017, Special Counsel Mueller was appointed with the task of getting to the bottom of this.

The American people deserve answers to know how their last presidential election was a crime scene so that we may learn to ensure that the next one is also not a crime scene.

And, the American people have every reason to have confidence in the report produced by the Special Counsel.

The Special Counsel is a decorated American hero and public servant. He has served as the FBI director for presidents of both parties.

He has served as a line prosecutor, a United States Attorney and a leader within the Justice Department.

Despite protestations by the President, this is not a witch hunt—it has yielded the public indictments of 34 individuals and 3 companies, 7 guilty pleas, and 1 conviction.

The American people are watching.

The most recent public opinion poll shows that a super majority of Americans—a full 68 percent—wants the Mueller Report made public.

The Mueller Report is one unparalleled way in which Americans can learn this information with confidence.

And, finally, we must tackle a serious issue that is being discussed among elected officials and the Justice Department.

Over the past two years, we have been told that it is Justice Department regulations that a sitting President cannot be indicted. I will note that this principle has not been tested in court.

That regulation was implemented during the Watergate investigation, under the theory that the President cannot be subjected to criminal process.

But, assuming *arguendo* that this regulation is correct, and the President cannot be subjected to criminal process and therefore cannot and should not be indicted, it is a logical fallacy to say that because he cannot be indicted by virtue of his office, and because it is Justice Department regulation not to reveal information about unindicted parties and individuals, the Justice Department cannot reveal any information of potential wrongdoing by the President and not reveal any information to the body that possesses the constitutional responsibility for holding this president accountable.

For these reasons, I rise in strong support of H. Con. Res. 24, and urge my colleagues to support it and urge passage so the American people can learn how the 2016 election became a crime scene.

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

Mr. Speaker, I hope folks pay attention to some of those things that have brought folks together today, and I hope folks pay attention to some of those things that haven't brought us together today.

We have talked about whether there has been overstatement and hyperbole, whether it comes from that end of Pennsylvania Avenue or this end of Pennsylvania Avenue. None of us are advantaged by that. It breeds more distrust in the American public, and breeds more distrust in this institution.

We have talked about who is to blame within the administration. Of course, there is news today of Paul Manafort's sentence, not for anything related to the election, but for things related to his private business practices. There will be efforts to conflate those two investigations. Those are two different investigations, and I think the American people are disadvantaged if they are led to believe that those sentences are related to the election of the President of the United States.

But what you have heard is a lot of unanimity, as you would expect, that we are a Nation of laws and the rule of law should be followed, and transparency should be our touchstone, and the American People, the boss of each and every one of us, whether we work on that end of Pennsylvania Avenue or this end of Pennsylvania Avenue, have a right to know what their tax dollars have paid for and what their government is up to.

I find that very encouraging that we have that sense of agreement here today, Mr. Speaker. What is noticeably absent in this resolution is the dramatic overreach that I think has characterized most of the work we have done so far in 2019. Things that could have been partnership issues have been pushed further and further out to the edge of the political continuum that they became partisan issues.

This resolution does not make those mistakes of the past, and to my friend from California's point, these things are done incrementally. Trust is built incrementally; relationships grow incrementally; and success happens incrementally.

It is my great hope, Mr. Speaker, that those things that unite us, transparency, rule of law, trust in and of the American people will begin today to flourish in ways, perhaps, those common themes have not thus far. And both parties play a role in that disappointing outcome. But success has to begin on one day, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps success begins today.

I serve on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee. There is no

such thing as a Republican road or a Democratic bridge. There is no such thing as sitting in traffic on a Democratic highway or missing your child's soccer game because of malfunctions on a Republican road. We are all in this together.

□ 1300

I do not plan to offer a previous question today, Mr. Speaker, because this isn't one of those issues that dramatically divides us. My friend suggested in the Rules Committee we passed this out in, I think, our first voice vote of the year out of the Rules Committee, and I intend to do exactly that today.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my friend from California for yielding the time and leading the debate today, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, again, it is a pleasure to see you up there. And to my friend from Georgia, in his long, illustrious public career, I want to thank him for his comity here today.

I can't help but think so many Americans now and people who are filled with adrenaline and hyperbole talk about what a difficult time this is, and I wouldn't underestimate the challenges ahead of us; but, arguably, a more difficult time, I was thinking of Mr. Lincoln's comments about appealing to the better angels of our nature, and perhaps this is a turning point.

Certainly we will be tested, and we will fail on occasion, but to my friend, for whatever time both of us have left here, I would like to personally say to the degree we can find things that are of interest to your district and my district, they are of interest to the United States, and I would love to work with the gentleman to find those things.

Lastly, I just can't help but comment on my observation about providential Americans in history. I was reading about Mr. Mueller and his comments when he was FBI Director in the context of his amazing life and career as a combat veteran, a Bronze Star winner in the Marine Corps in Vietnam. I think of my own father who was a devoted Marine Corps combat veteran who is buried in Arlington. My dad and all marines, although I was not one, liked to always recite "Semper Fidelis."

The special counsel, in his comments when he was FBI Director, assures me that the work he does in ways that I find profound, talked about fidelity as he talked to his agents, that the fidelity to this Constitution, to this country, and to the truth will find us true to the path that we want to take and to success as we look for the better angels of our nature.

Mr. Speaker, this is a simple vote but an important vote. We need to get to the bottom of what happened and put faith in the special counsel's findings and put faith in the American public and the people that they can devise their own truth when we give them this investigation's report.

Mr. Speaker, you either believe the public and Congress should see the report or you don't. Fortunately, it looks like we are agreed that they should. We owe it to our constituents, the American people, and future generations to do the right thing always, but today, I think, in particular, to support the release of this report.

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

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

The previous question was ordered.

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

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

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. 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.

#### ACKNOWLEDGING LACK OF TRANSPARENCY IN FINANCIAL TRANSACTIONS POSES A THREAT TO NATIONAL SECURITY

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 206) acknowledging that the lack of sunlight and transparency in financial transactions and corporate formation poses a threat to our national security and our economy's security and supporting efforts to close related loopholes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

##### H. RES. 206

Whereas money laundering and other financial crimes are serious threats to our national and economic security;

Whereas the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime has reported "The estimated amount of money laundered globally in one year is 2 - 5% of global GDP, or \$800 billion - \$2 trillion in current US dollars";

Whereas the scale, efficiency, and complexity of the U.S. financial system make it a prime target for those who seek to conceal, launder, and move the proceeds of illicit activity;

Whereas money launderers, terrorist financiers, corrupt individuals and organizations, and their facilitators have proven to adapt quickly in order to avoid detection;

Whereas given the global nature of money laundering and terrorist financing, and the

increasing interrelatedness within the financial system, a secure national and multilateral framework is essential to the integrity of the U.S. financial system;

Whereas extensive collaboration among financial regulators, the Department of the Treasury, law enforcement, and the private sector is required to curtail the illicit flow of money throughout the United States;

Whereas despite how extensive and effective these efforts are in the United States, there is still substantial room for improvement;

Whereas financial compliance, reporting, investigation, and collaboration, as well as courageous whistleblowers and investigative reporting have had significant impact in shining sunlight on the people and institutions behind dark money and markets;

Whereas in 2016, the Financial Action Task Force (FATF), the international standards setting body, evaluated the United States' anti-money laundering/combating the financing of terrorism measures and determined the United States has significant gaps in its framework;

Whereas in 2016, the FATF found that in the United States, "Minimal measures are imposed on designated non-financial businesses and professions (DNFBPs), other than casinos and dealers in precious metals and stones";

Whereas in 2016, the FATF recommended, "The U.S. should conduct a vulnerability analysis of the minimally covered DNFBP sectors to address the higher risks to which these sectors are exposed, and consider what measures could be introduced to address them";

Whereas dealers in arts and antiquities are not, by definition, covered "financial institutions" required to comply with the Bank Secrecy Act;

Whereas Federal authorities have cautioned that art collectors and dealers to be particularly careful trading Near Eastern antiquities, warning that artifacts plundered by terrorist organizations such as the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant are entering the marketplace;

Whereas, according to the Antiquities Coalition, "because the United States is the largest destination for archaeological and ethnological objects from around the world, the discovery of recently looted and trafficked artifacts in our country not only makes Americans and our institutions accessories to crimes, but also threatens our relations with other countries";

Whereas the real-estate industry, both commercial and residential, is exempt from having to develop and implement a four-pillar anti-money laundering program pursuant to the Bank Secrecy Act;

Whereas it was asserted in a 2018 Conference Report by the Terrorism, Transnational Crime and Corruption Center at the Schar School of Policy and Government of George Mason University, money laundering in real estate (MLRE) has damaging effects on local economies by negatively impacting property prices and displacing residents;

Whereas in 2017, in response to evidence about significant money laundering through real estate in the United States, the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network (FinCEN) issued Geographic Targeting Orders (GTOs) requiring limited beneficial ownership disclosure in certain transactions involving high-end luxury real estate and "found that about 30 percent of the transactions covered by the GTOs involve a beneficial owner or purchaser representative that is also the subject of a previous suspicious activity report";

Whereas the influx of illicit money, including from Russian oligarchs, has flowed large-

ly unimpeded into the United States through these anonymous shell companies and into U.S. investments, including luxury high-end real estate;

Whereas the United States has not fulfilled the recommended steps to address the money-laundering loopholes that the FATF has identified with DNFBP sectors;

Whereas high-profile enforcement actions against some of the largest and most sophisticated financial institutions raise troubling questions about the effectiveness of U.S. domestic anti-money laundering and counter-terrorism financing regulatory, compliance, and enforcement efforts;

Whereas there are financial institutions and individuals employed therein which continue to engage in egregious violations of the Bank Secrecy Act and enter into deferred prosecution agreements and non-prosecution agreements rather than facing convictions and sentences corresponding to the severity of their violations;

Whereas effective anti-money laundering programs must emphasize sound corporate governance, including business-line accountability and clear lines of legal responsibility for individuals; and

Whereas anti-money laundering examinations in recent years at times failed to recognize the cumulative effect of the violations they cited, instead narrowly focusing their attention on individual banking units, thus permitting national banks to avoid and delay correcting problems, which allowed massive problems to occur before serious enforcement actions were taken: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives—

(1) acknowledges that the lack of sunlight and transparency in financial transactions poses a threat to our national security and our economy's security;

(2) supports efforts to close loopholes that allow corruption, terrorism, and money laundering to infiltrate our country's financial system;

(3) encourages transparency to detect, deter, and interdict individuals, entities, and networks engaged in money laundering and other financial crimes;

(4) urges financial institutions to comply with the Bank Secrecy Act and anti-money laundering laws and regulations; and

(5) affirms that financial institutions and individuals should be held accountable for money laundering and terror financing crimes and violations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

##### GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on this legislation and to insert extraneous material thereon.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 206, a resolution I have introduced to inform the Congress and the American people about the persistent