United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 165 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 25, 2019 No. 155

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
September 25, 2019.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JOYCE BEATTY to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2019, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

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

RECOGNIZING CYRUS G. WILEY

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the ninth President of Savannah State University, Mr. Cyrus G. Wiley.

At the time called the Georgia State Industrial College for Colored Youths, Mr. Wiley made tremendous strides forward for the oldest public historically Black college in the State of Georgia.

He started his term in 1921 and was the first alumnus to become president of the school. In that same year, he allowed women to attend for the first time and he transitioned the college out of its role providing high school programs and into a 4 year, degree-granting institution.

Nearly 100 years later, the school remains a vital part of the Savannah community. They have earned patents in battling Alzheimer's and ALS, built new science and technology buildings, and purchased new property for a new marine lab.

Madam Speaker, I want to thank everyone at Savannah State University, especially President Kimberly Ballard-Washington, for following in Mr. Wiley's footsteps to continue breaking barriers, their commitment to the Savannah community, and for providing a great education for the students.

WORLD PHARMACISTS' DAY 2019

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize World Pharmacists' Day 2019 being celebrated today. I am proud that we have a day like this for people all over the world to remember the important role that pharmacists play in keeping all of us and our loved ones healthy.

There are currently over 2 million practicing pharmacists around the world, but in each nation, pharmacists are combating unique problems. For some countries pharmacists are at a severe shortage.

In the United States, pharmacists have been thrown into the front lines of a critical issue: the opioid epidemic.

Currently, more than 115 people die every day from opioid addictions, and pharmacists will play an integral role in bringing this number all the way down to zero.

Madam Speaker, I encourage everyone to get to know their pharmacists and to thank them for the work that they do.

As the only pharmacist currently serving in Congress, I thank all our pharmacists around the world.

CONGRATULATING EMD PERFORMANCE MATERIALS ON THEIR 40TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 40th anniversary of EMD Performance Material's Savannah location.

I am so proud of the work this company has done over the last 40 years, providing nearly 140 jobs for citizens in the First Congressional District of Georgia.

More than just jobs alone, EMD brings a prestige to our area that comes along with its brand name.

At the Savannah location specifically, they manufacture groundbreaking liquid crystals that are largely responsible for advancing razor sharp margins in smartphones, laptops, flat-screen TVs, and more.

EMD's success is a great example of why the State of Georgia was named as the top State to do business for the sixth year in a row. And Savannah itself has a strategic location with its connection to a major seaport and interstates.

Madam Speaker, I thank EMD for their work in our area, and I congratulate them on their anniversary. I hope that we will have another 40 years of working together.

RECOGNIZING GEORGIA ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Georgia Army National Guard, whose last unit is coming home this month from Afghanistan.

Stationed at Fort Stewart in the First Congressional District of Georgia, the 177th Brigade Engineer Battalion is the only unmanned aerial vehicle unit in the entire Georgia National Guard.

Because of that expertise, they remained in Afghanistan longer than other units, and their high quality of work has not gone unnoticed.

Upon returning home, they will be working in a brand-new facility at Fort Stewart for the first time. I am proud

to have this group located in the First Congressional District of Georgia.

Madam Speaker, I thank them for their service to our country, and I welcome them home.

WE HAVE BEEN VINDICATED

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

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, and still I rise, because I love my country.

I rise today, Madam Speaker, to thank the Speaker of the House for standing up for this country, advancing the cause of justice, and taking on the challenge to protect our Nation, when it is obvious that national security is of great concern.

I rise because there were persons who made yesterday possible. There are some who say that yesterday was a tipping point, others say that things happened that were the equivalent of a straw that broke the camel's back as it relates to impeachment, but I say that yesterday was a seminal moment in time that has the potential to impact the rest of our time.

I say that yesterday was a moment of truth, and I say that there were people who made yesterday possible.

I would like to read a statement into the RECORD that will address many of the people, not all, but many of the people who made yesterday possible.

My statement reads: ''On behalf of people of goodwill, I thank the first 58 who voted to move Articles of Impeachment on November 6, 2017, the historic 66 who voted to move Articles of Impeachment on January 19, 2018, and the noble 95 who voted to move Articles of Impeachment on July 17, 2019.

For their tireless and progressive efforts, I would also like to thank By the People; Center for Popular Democracy; Citizens Impeachment Coalition; Common Cause; Courage Campaign; CREDO; CREW; D.C. Action Lab; Democracy for America; Free Speech for People; Indivisible; Lawyers for Good Government; Mainers For Accountable Leadership; March for Truth; March for Truth—Boston; MoveOn; National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, NAACP; Need to Impeach; NextGen America; Our Revolution; Popular Democracy; Progressive Democrats of America; Revolving Door Project; Social Security Works; Stand Up America; and Women's March.

With nearly 200 Members of the House of Representatives favoring impeachment inquiry, we have been vindicated. However, our approach is not one that has ended as of yesterday. We need 218 to vote for impeachment. There is more to be done.

PARKRIDGE PREGNANCY CENTER

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

Mr. ARRINGTON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the good people at Parkridge Pregnancy Medical Clinic in Lubbock, Texas.

Parkridge, a nonprofit pregnancy center, is celebrating 26 years of providing compassionate care to mothers throughout their pregnancies, and often in the most difficult of circumstances.

By providing ultrasounds, medical services, material assistance, and even ministering to mothers' deeper emotional and spiritual needs, the people at Parkridge are truly and literally saving lives.

You see, Madam Speaker, they believe, like I do, that all life is a gift from God. They believe in the words etched into our Declaration of Independence, our founding principle and fundamental belief that all of us are created equally by God and endowed by our creator with the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

But for nearly 50 years now, we have fallen short of that national ethic. Ever since the Supreme Court erred in Roe v. Wade, we have failed to protect the sacred right for the most vulnerable among us, rejecting the notion that life at every stage is equally valuable, equally precious, not only in light of the Constitution, but in the eyes of God.

Since then, over 60 million lives have been terminated through the practice of abortion in these United States. And yet even in the shadow of this darkness, we can see rays of hope shining through.

Because of places like Parkridge, I believe the tide is finally turning, and in the direction of life. All across our country, the growing momentum for a culture of life is palpable.

Last week, we learned that the abortion rate in America has dropped to its lowest level at any point since 1973 and Roe v. Wade.

We have seen States throughout the country taking bold action to defend the inherent dignity of every human life, especially those who can't speak up for themselves.

I am proud to have supported every single pro-life measure considered in this Chamber, from the Heartbeat Protection Act, to the pain-capable protections, to defunding Planned Parenthood, to the recent born-alive protection legislation.

I stand behind our President 100 percent in his efforts to reshape the courts so that judges adhere to the Constitution and to the independent and interpretive role that they are supposed to play, rather than legislating from the bench and imposing their policy preferences on the American people.

This is one of the most important and certainly lasting legacies of this President, and I am proud to say and excited to say the Senate has recently confirmed President Trump's 150th judicial nominee.

But I also recognize that in order to build a lasting culture of life, we are going to need to do more than just change laws. We are going to have to change hearts.

In the debate over abortion, the late Pennsylvania Governor Bob Casey said:

> The real question is not when life begins, but when love begins.

For 26 years now, the people of Parkridge Pregnancy Center have been coming alongside these young mothers not in judgment, but in joy, not in condemnation, but to comfort, praying with them, loving them, and ministering to them and meeting their deepest needs in their darkest hours.

Thanks to the good and godly work that they are doing, along with countless organizations like them across America, I hope, pray, and I believe that we will soon see a day in our country when every child is loved and every life, born or unborn, is celebrated, cherished, and protected.

Madam Speaker, may God bless the Parkridge family, may He bless their mission to protect life and promote love, all to the praise of God, the author of both life and love.

Go west Texas.

Madam Speaker, may I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 1¼ minutes remaining.

WE SHOULD BE MORE RESPONSIBLE IN CARRYING OUT OUR CONSTITUTIONAL DUTIES

Mr. ARRINGTON. Madam Speaker, I would like to say that I feel like it is incredibly irresponsible and premature and careless for this body, led by our Speaker and the Democratic Party, to rush to this conclusion and allege that our President has committed high crimes.

I don't believe this is under the auspices of pursuit of justice and truth. I think it is placating a certain group in the Democratic Party.

I think this is more of the bloodlust for impeaching our President, not because of high crimes, but because they hate him, they hate his personality, they hate his policies, but that is no justification.

We are better than that as a country. We should be more responsible in how we faithfully carry out our constitutional duties.

So I look forward to reading the transcript. I look forward to getting the facts.

Republican or Democrat, Madam Speaker, we ought to look at the facts and we ought to be very judicious and careful and certainly responsible when wielding our constitutional oversight, and certainly that provision of impeachment.

So that is what I am going to do on behalf of the good people of west Texas and my beloved countrymen across the United States.

□ 1015

TRIBUTE TO THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF JUANITA ABERNATHY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Alabama (Ms. SEWELL) for 5 minutes.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Madam Speaker, today, I rise to honor the remarkable life and legacy of Mrs. Juanita Abernathy, a selfless leader in the struggle for civil rights whose direction and tireless engagement was an integral part in the movement of civil rights and voting rights in America. She, sadly, passed earlier this month.

From the Montgomery bus boycott to the marches from Selma to Montgomery and onward to Washington, D.C., and beyond, Mrs. Abernathy played a key role in our Nation's proudest instance of civic engagement. She fought boldly alongside her husband, Reverend Dr. Ralph Abernathy, and her dear friends and fellow architects of the movement, Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., and Mrs. Coretta Scott King.

While many male leaders of the civil rights movement have rightfully become household names, the women of the movement, whose struggles and sacrifices were equal and whose participation was necessary, have not enjoyed the same recognition. Mrs. Juanita Abernathy was a brilliant, courageous leader in her own right, and today, we recognize her remarkable and distinct contributions.

Mrs. Abernathy was born on December 1, 1931, in Uniontown, Alabama. She was the youngest of eight children born to Alexander and Ella Gilmore Jones. In the ninth grade, she met her future husband, Reverend Dr. Ralph Abernathy, who wrote in his memoir that he was impressed by her audacious spirit and her inherent dignity. In 1952, after Mrs. Abernathy finished her B.S. in business education at Tennessee State University, she and Dr. Ralph Abernathy were married.

Mrs. and Reverend Abernathy moved to Montgomery, Alabama, where she became the secretary for the Alabama chapter of the NAACP and taught high school courses on business education while Reverend Abernathy became the pastor of the First Baptist Church on Ripley Street.

In 1955, around the family dining room table, Mrs. Abernathy wrote a business plan for the Montgomery bus boycott, a plan that later served as a blueprint for the civil rights movement. Meant to last only 1 day, the Montgomery bus boycott went on for 381 days, eventually leading to the courts desegregating public transit.

In retaliation to the success of the Montgomery bus boycott, the Abernathy home was bombed. Reverend Abernathy was in Atlanta at the time, but it was said that Mrs. Abernathy and her children only survived because the bomb landed off by 2 feet.

Over the years, Mrs. Abernathy endured terror, harassment, and unbridled hatred from white supremacists in her community and beyond. Yet, in the face of unimaginable threats, she maintained her innate dignity and bravery.

In 1961, Mrs. Abernathy and her husband moved to Atlanta, Georgia, where she worked closely with the King family to integrate Atlanta's public schools.

At this same time, understanding the link between race and economic inequality in this country, Mrs. Abernathy fought to establish a national food stamp program for low-income families and a national free meal program for public schoolchildren.

A true servant leader, Mrs. Abernathy's brilliant mind, full heart, and resilient spirit should remind all of us of what constitutes a full and wonderful life.

On a personal note, I was honored to get to know Mrs. Abernathy during her many pilgrimages to my hometown of Selma, Alabama, for the annual commemoration of Bloody Sunday and the Selma to Montgomery marches.

She was a powerful voice for change and a proud product of Alabama's Black Belt who passionately protected the legacy of her husband and their lifelong work together to advance civil rights.

Mrs. Abernathy graciously encouraged me to run for Congress and honored me with her presence in my hometown of Selma on election night when I won in November 2010. I saw in her face that night the pride she felt witnessing the election of Alabama's first Black Congresswoman. I prevailed because of her personal courage and sacrifice that paved the way for future generations of Black children like me to succeed.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in paying tribute and honor to Alabama native Mrs. Juanita Jones Abernathy on the passing of this civil rights icon and true American heroine, whose tremendous efforts helped propel our Nation toward a more perfect Union.

SPEAKER'S ACTIONS HAVE EMBARRASSED CONGRESS

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

Mr. GAETZ. Madam Speaker, the transcript has now been released of the phone conversation between President Trump and President Zelensky.

The evidence is clear, unfortunately, that the Speaker of the House of Representatives has been functionally catfished into a politically fatal impeachment proceeding based on rumors, based on faulty evidence, and based on a bloodlust for the President, politically, that does not serve our Nation well.

Let me give you the high points. There is no quid pro quo between President Trump and President Zelensky for anything, much less military aid. There is no eight times a reference to Joe Biden. I think The Wall Street Journal will have a good deal of retracting to do today. In fact, President Zelensky, himself, identifies the rooting out of corruption as the reason for his election.

Early on in the conversation between President Trump and President Zelensky, President Zelensky says: We, here in Ukraine, are trying to drain the swamp much in the way you are working to drain the swamp in the United States of America.

This wasn't a call about leverage. This wasn't a call about threats. This was a mutually appreciative and mutually laudatory call between two leaders who are trying to clean up some of the garbage in their respective countries that has polluted politics.

Now, the President does ask for a favor from President Zelensky, but the favor is on behalf of our Nation. The favor we seek is cooperation between the Zelensky government and Attorney General Bill Barr as we work to determine what activities in Ukraine may have been in any way involved in the 2016—not 2020, but 2016—efforts to interfere with the United States election.

The President even references CrowdStrike, attempting to get to the bottom of these improper actions, which, again, may have emanated from Ukraine. John Solomon with The Hill has a great deal of reporting on that very question.

Zelensky ran against corruption. Thus, it would be only appropriate that, in a conversation about that election victory, they would discuss and reference what are, obviously, mutual goals between the United States and Ukraine to have the world safer for democracy.

The President also mentions Mayor Rudy Giuliani. Let me be clear about this: Mayor Giuliani has every right to go to Ukraine to try to ascertain whether or not activities in that country were harming his client as a result of the corrupt connections that may have existed between the DNC and some elements in Ukraine.

I feel like we have been here before. House Democrats told us it was all about collusion. We had to wait for the Mueller report. Well, when the Mueller report falls flat on collusion, then it is all about obstruction of justice. Until Robert Mueller testifies and that falls flat, then it is all about abuse of power. Until the Democrats go to court and are unable to make the case in court that there has been an abuse of power. Now, lo and behold, it is all about Ukraine.

Do you know what? I saw this movie as it related to Russia. I didn't like it very much, and I doubt I am going to enjoy the cheap Ukrainian knockoff.

The Speaker has embraced these concerns. I fear that her embrace of impeachment does great damage to the House of Representatives. There may be a time where we have to solemnly exercise our impeachment powers because there is true crime or corruption, and the Speaker's actions have embarrassed the United States Congress and harm our entire country.

President Zelensky, in this call, indicates that he will conduct an investigation into corruption. It is a promise

not only that he made to President Trump but that he made to his own citizens. In that promise, President Zelensky says that any investigation will be both open and candid, open and candid investigations of corruption of election meddling. I sure would like to see that level of candidness and openness in our House of Representatives.

Certainly, my greatest hope is that the Attorney General's investigation into the corrupt origins of the efforts to smear the President of the United States will be exposed and those responsible will go to jail.

That is how we restore honor to this House. That is how we solve and heal some of the great wounds that were inflicted on this body by the Speaker yesterday. Maybe next time the radical left will wait for the facts before engaging in a reflexive, fact-free impeachment.

SUPPORT UKRAINIAN PEOPLE BY ROOTING OUT CORRUPTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, as co-chair of the House Congressional Ukrainian Caucus, I rise to provide some background on why the conversations between President Donald Trump and the newly elected President of Ukraine, President Volodymyr Zelensky, are so vitally important to liberty and our Nation's national security.

There is no more important strategic alliance for liberty and with our military than America's membership with European allies in NATO, our dependable transatlantic allies who stood at our side through so many battles for the values we share. The blood lands of Europe directly influence the very founding of our Republic, our fundamental ideals of democracy. NATO, today, stands ready every hour of every day to defend our liberty.

Ukraine, today, is the scrimmage line for liberty for its defense on the European Continent. Thus, when a U.S. President holds back military assistance to Ukraine through NATO and other instrumentalities, Congress must insist on transparency on any conversations that relate to our cooperation with the nation of Ukraine.

Please let me remind, after the collapse of communist Russia in 1991, officially known as the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Ukraine became a free nation. At least it had a chance to be. Ukraine had been occupied for all of modern history by Russia and began its jagged path forward to the free world, a path that has been tortuous and fraught with danger and setbacks.

It will be a permanent blot on American history that certain Americans, including President Trump's campaign manager, Paul Manafort, and several other Trump operatives were actually involved in supporting the corrupt pro-Russian political operatives in Ukraine and doing it to earn money, millions and millions of dollars from Kremlin allies. What an abomination to liberty.

Since Ukraine's Euromaidan Revolution of Dignity 5 years ago, the Ukrainian people have bravely demonstrated their resolute commitment to their nation's democratic future.

The latest example is the recent historic Presidential and parliamentary elections in Ukraine, which international observers lauded as free and fair. What progress.

Ukraine has managed to make critical reforms, despite the immense pressure of Russia's illegal invasion of Ukraine in which 13,000 poorly equipped Ukrainian troops and many civilians who were in the pathway lost their lives; 30,000 have been injured; and 1.5 million Ukrainians have been dispossessed of their properties and are displaced.

Tragically, Ukraine is at war and must fight a two-front war: one against Russia and one against the enemy from within, the scourge of corruption aided by Kremlin allies every minute of every day.

While Ukraine has sought to shake off the vestiges of Soviet repression, Ukraine's oligarch class has subverted this progress in order to steal and plunder from the people of that nation to advance their own sick, insatiable, and corrupt moneyed interests.

In fact, it might surprise people to hear that, in the State of Ohio, the Ukrainian oligarch who owned the television station that made the current President of Ukraine famous is the largest commercial real estate owner in Cleveland, Ohio. With a net worth of over $1.2 billion, Ihor Kolomoisky is one of the richest oligarchs in Ukraine. But he travels between Ukraine, Cyprus, Israel, and here. His own son was on the basketball team at Cleveland State University.

But this oligarch ran the show, servant of the people, who propelled President Zelensky to stardom. And so the question for history is: Will President Zelensky be his own man, or will he be beholden to oligarchs? Will he stand for liberty, and will the people of this country and this House, who are the Representatives, stand for liberty against repression?

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD material related to my remarks this morning.

[From Clevescene, June 11, 2019]

HOW UKRAINIAN OLIGARCHS SECRETLY BECAME THE LARGEST REAL ESTATE OWNERS IN DOWNTOWN CLEVELAND

(By Sam Allard)

In an explosive legal complaint filed last month in Delaware, attorneys for a major Ukrainian bank alleged that two oligarchs who founded the bank and controlled it from 2006 to 2016 laundered hundreds of millions of dollars in fraudulent corporate loans to purchase assets in the United States and unjustly enrich themselves and their associates.

Dubbed the ''Optima Schemes'' in the 104-page document, these ''brazen fraudulent schemes'' were successful, among other things, in making the oligarchs and their co-defendants the largest commercial real estate holders in Cleveland.

With money siphoned from public bonds and 20 million private Ukrainian citizens who'd opened accounts with PrivatBank, the oligarchs Igor Kolomoisky and Gennadiy Bogolyubov doled out corporate loans to shell companies that they controlled. They used PrivatBank ''as their own personal piggy bank,'' in the words of the complaint.

Those loans were then laundered in multiple digital transactions, sent through dozens of other shell companies that had been created exclusively for the purpose of laundering. These accounts were managed by co-conspirators at PrivatBank's branch in Cyprus.

The true origin of the money thus concealed, funds were then shipped to LLCs in Delaware (hence the legal filing there). Those LLCs—''One Cleveland Center, LLC,'' to take just one example—were used to acquire properties and metalworking facilities in the U.S. Kolomoisky and Bogolyubov are mineral magnates and own mining factories and metalworking plants in Ukraine.

The men on the ground in the United States, according to the complaint, were a Miami-based trio: Mordechai ''Motti'' Korf, his brother-in-law Chaim Schochet, and Uriel Laber. These three men managed the ''Optima'' companies: Optima International, Optima Ventures and Optima Acquisitions, all of which were created and ultimately controlled by Kolomoisky and Bogolyubov.

''Optima Ventures'' should be a familiar local name. It was the company, launched in 2007, used to acquire properties in the U.S. for Kolomoisky and Bogolyubov. The majority of these properties were in Cleveland.

Chaim Schochet was Optima's ''front man'' in Northeast Ohio. He told the Plain Dealer in 2012 that his local goals were twofold: ''making money for investors betting on the upside of a Midwestern city, and contributing to the betterment of a downtown that more high-profile buyers ha[d] passed by.''

But his investors' funds were ill-gotten, according to the complaint, proceeds from ''massive, systematic and fraudulent loan misappropriation and recycling schemes. (In the 2012 PD piece referenced above, Schochet was reportedly ''circumspect about discussing how [Optima Ventures] is structured or who the major investors are.'')

The loan recycling schemes were functionally identical to a ponzi scheme, except instead of paying purported profits to early investors with funds from more recent investors, the Ukrainian oligarchs and their cronies within PrivatBank paid off early fraudulent corporate loans with money from new fraudulent corporate loans.

''On paper, this appeared to be a repayment,'' the complaint explains. ''But in reality, it was a sham and fraud, as PrivatBank was repaying itself and increasing its outstanding liabilities in the process. This process was carried out over and over again, over a period of many years.''

In December 2016, the Ukrainian state was forced to nationalize PrivatBank as a result of the oligarchs' conduct. The state injected more than $5.5 billion into the bank to prevent its collapse, and ''preserve the stability of the [Ukrainian] financial system.'' In 2018, the bank reverted to private ownership.

The complaint alleges that Korf, Schochet and Laber were in on the racket, aware of the systematic corruption because they were under direct supervision from Kolomoisky and Bogolyubov (or their trusted lieutenant inside PrivatBank, Timur Novikov), and because they were enriched in the process. Korf, Schochet and Laber received ''substantial financial remuneration,'' according to the complaint, which they used to acquire

millions of dollars worth of property in Florida.

Using the laundered loan proceeds, Optima acquired the following Cleveland buildings:

One Cleveland Center: 1375 E. 9th St. Acquired for $86.3 million in May, 2008.

55 Public Square. Acquired for $34 million in July, 2008.

Huntington Building: 925 Euclid Ave. Acquired for $18.5 million in June, 2010.

AECOM/Penton Media Building: 1300 E. 9th St. Acquired for $46.5 million in August, 2010.

Crowne Plaza Building: 777 St. Clair Ave. Acquired in a joint venture with Denver-based Sage Hospitality Group.

Here's an example of exactly how the properties were acquired, via the complaint:

On April 29 and 30, 2008 . . . two Ukrainian [metal plants] owned or controlled by [Kolomoisky and Bogolyubov] drew down $2.7 million and $4.3 million in loan proceeds from PrivatBank Ukraine. The purpose of the loans was ''financing of current business activities of the entity.'' On April 30, 2008, Bocatoro Enterprises Ltd. (''Bocatoro Enterprises''), a Cypriot entity owned or controlled by [Kolomoisky and Bogolyubov] drew down $40 million in loan proceeds from PrivatBank Cyprus for ''replenishment of floating assets for payments according to contracts, including purchase of shares.''

However, the loan proceeds were not used for their stated purposes. Instead, the loan proceeds were combined with funds from other sources linked to [Kolomoisky and Bogolyubov] and laundered in forty-two transactions through fifteen Laundering Accounts, including the accounts of Defendant Kolomoisky's Divot Enterprises, Ralkon Commercial, and Pavanti Enterprises, as well as Defendant Bogolyubov's Bonique, and [K&B's] Blisont Capital and Brotstone accounts.

On information and belief, [K&B] and their co-conspirators used Pavanti Enterprises to misappropriate and transfer a combined $36.1 million into the U.S. to the Multi-State Title Agency Ltd. to fund the acquisition of One Cleveland [Center] through Optima One Cleveland Center LLC for Optima Ventures.

At its height, Optima Ventures controlled 2.8 million square feet of downtown Cleveland commercial real estate. This was a larger footprint than even Forest City Enterprises at the time.

In recent years, Optima has been selling off its Cleveland properties, most of which have fallen into disrepair and suffer from high vacancy rates.

The AECOM building, for example, which Optima acquired in $46.5 million in 2010, was sold to New-Jersey based Rugy Realty last summer for $38 million. When Optima bought AECOM (the former Penton Media Building), it was 90-percent occupied. But when Rugby purchased it last year, it had dropped to only 57-percent occupancy and was in need of significant renovations.

''We'll fully renovate the lobby so it fits the 21st century and doesn't look like the 1980s,'' Rugby principal Robert Ades said at the time of purchase. Rugby's plans also included updating the elevators, the mechanical components of which reportedly dated back to 1972.

The Huntington Building (The 925 Building) was sold to Frank Sinito's Millennia Companies last year for $40 million. A full overhaul of the building was projected to cost $300 million. The property was characterized by the PD at the time of sale as a ''gaping hole in the heart of a revitalizing downtown.''

A situation of disrepair and vacancy can also be found at 55 Public Square, the only building other than One Cleveland Center that remains in Optima's local ownership portfolio.

A sale was in the works with K&D development last year, but K&D pulled out, calling the project ''unworkable.'' Though Optima had purchased it for $34 million in 2008, it was appraised for only about $20 million last year. The Plain Dealer reported that the building was ''in dire need of a makeover'' and that ''only a smattering'' of businesses occupied the 2nd through 11th floors of the 22-story structure. The John Q Steakhouse space on the ground floor has been vacant for years.

Optima retains a management stake in what is now the downtown Westin Hotel (formerly the Crowne Plaza) and owns One Cleveland Center, which it refinanced in 2010. Optima Management Group, the management company affiliated with Optima Ventures, also works out of One Cleveland Center.

Scene spoke with a representative there by phone, who asked that questions for Chaim Schochet about the so-called ''Optima Schemes'' be submitted via email. Shochet provided the following via Optima Management Group late Tuesday afternoon:

The allegations in this lawsuit—part of an orchestrated political attack by a Ukrainian bank against investors in our thriving businesses—are false, defamatory and utterly without merit. We intend not only to contest but to disprove these reckless allegations, and to demonstrate that they are part of a smear campaign driven by a Ukrainian political agenda that we have nothing to do with. We are immensely proud of our extensive track record building a vibrant real estate portfolio in Cleveland, and we will not let a frivolous lawsuit tarnish our hard-earned reputation or distract us from our mission to continue to serve the interests of the Cleveland community.

Filed on behalf of the current PrivatBank shareholders, the Delaware complaint seeks damages which could include all of Optima's U.S. assets. Those include properties in Dallas and Louisville and metallurgical assets in addition to the Cleveland portfolio. Among the metallurgical assets that Optima Acquisitions acquired was a steelmaking plant in Warren, Ohio, called Warren Steel Holdings LLC. Warren Steel shuttered permanently in 2016 and laid off 162 workers due to ''unforeseeable business circumstances.''

Kolomoisky and Bogolyubov are now back in Ukraine after having fled from their residences in Switzerland to Israel in 2018. Both oligarchs reportedly have Ukrainian, Israeli and Cypriot citizenship.

The Daily Beast reported in April that Kolomoisky is under FBI investigation and that the U.S. Attorney's Office in the Northern District of Ohio was involved in a wide-ranging probe. Kolomoisky's lawyer said that his client ''categorically denied'' laundering any money into the United States.

Kolomoisky has reportedly returned to Ukraine, however, with the tacit protection of new president Volodymyr Zelenskiy, a comedian who played the Ukrainian President on the TV show Servant of the People (now streaming on Netflix).

That show, immensely popular in Ukraine, aired on a network owned by Kolomoisky.

□ 1030

LEGALIZE BANKS WORKING WITH CANNABIS-RELATED BUSINESSES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Oklahoma (Ms. KENDRA S. HORN) for 5 minutes.

Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma. Madam Speaker, I rise today to talk about H.R. 1595, the SAFE Banking Act. Later today, we will consider this important piece of right-sized, pragmatic legislation that tackles problems facing our communities.

H.R. 1595, the SAFE Banking Act, is a bipartisan bill that confronts a problem that has arisen from the conflict between State and Federal law and is currently endangering communities, as well as inhibiting small businesses from growing.

Currently, 33 States, including my home State of Oklahoma, have passed some form of legalized cannabis. However, due to the schedule I status in Federal law, it is illegal for banks across this country to work with cannabis and cannabis-related businesses, even in States where it has been legalized.

This prevents businesses from using banks to deposit their revenue, pay their bills, finance capital improvement projects, and makes it challenging for them to file their taxes.

This has also created a serious safety hazard for cannabis and cannabis-related businesses by forcing them to hold on to large amounts of cash on their premises and increases the likelihood of tax evasion, which has been historically prevalent among cash-only businesses.

The SAFE Banking Act resolves these issues by creating a legal pathway for banks to serve cannabis and cannabis-related businesses without fear of Federal sanctions.

Importantly, this bill defends States' rights by allowing banks in States where cannabis is legal to serve these businesses, but does not force banks to serve them and does not force it in States where it is illegal.

Last year, Oklahoma legalized medical cannabis, and, since then, Oklahoma's industry has become one of the fastest growing in the Nation. Just this past April, Oklahomans spent more than $18 million on medical cannabis, and the Oklahoma Medical Marijuana Authority has licensed 1,400 dispensaries and 2,700 commercial growers in the State.

This industry is bringing revenue to our State, creating small businesses, and helping those who suffer with physical illness to relieve their ailments. The SAFE Banking Act supports this growing Oklahoma industry, our banks, and works to keep Oklahomans that work in and around this industry safe.

Madam Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to support this pragmatic legislation that makes our community safer, protects States' rights, supports small businesses, and grows our economy.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 32 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CUELLAR) at noon.

PRAYER

Dr. J.D. Greear, The Summit Church, Raleigh-Durham, North Carolina, offered the following prayer:

Almighty Father, we ask You for Your help in guiding the affairs of this great Nation. We acknowledge that you have appointed governments for the promotion of peace, for the preservation of justice, and the protection of liberty. We recognize that the wisdom to accomplish these things comes only from You.

May You grant that this body rule in a way that directs the men, women, and children of this country towards Your goodness, and enables them to respond in thankfulness to You, knowing that each of us must give an account for our decisions and our actions to You.

May we perceive the love that You have for us, and may that translate into love for one another, especially the most vulnerable.

Finally, may we recognize that all of this comes as a gift from You, embodied in Jesus Christ, who was punished for our sin and raised to life so that we could find new life in Him.

It is in His name that I pray.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

WELCOMING DR. J.D. GREEAR

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, you have just heard from a man, J.D. Greear, that I have the distinct privilege of calling my friend.

Pastor J.D. Greear leads The Summit Church in Durham, North Carolina. Under Pastor J.D.'s leadership, The Summit Church has gone from 300 members to over 10,000, making it one of the fastest growing churches in our country.

His vision is to plant 1,000 new churches around the world by the year 2050.

He believes the deeper we dive into the extravagant love of Christ, the more our lives will be filled with unquenchable joy, reckless generosity, and audacious faith.

Pastor J.D. is the author of several life-transforming books and is the current president of the Southern Baptist Convention.

One of his most important accomplishments is his dedication to his wife, Veronica, and their four children.

It is an honor to have him here in Washington, D.C., today. He is also the mentor of my pastor, Andrew Hopper.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to his continued work as a father, as a pastor, and as a leader.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

AN IMPEACHMENT INQUIRY IS NECESSARY

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

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, with each passing day, we see an erosion of this country's ideals by a President who freely sidesteps Congress, profits off his position, obstructs justice, and places personal petty politics before national security.

The validity of these violations is not in question. They are happening before us.

The Intelligence inspector general, who was appointed by President Trump, said that the whistleblower complaint is of both urgent concern and credible, and its public release is the National Intelligence director's obligation to the American people.

An impeachment inquiry is necessary to protect the values included in our Constitution and to deliver the truth Americans deserve.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

SANDHILL RESEARCH AND EDUCATION CENTER

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, each August, I participate in a bus tour of South Carolina's Second Congressional District with my wife, Roxanne, and dedicated staff from the Washington and district offices.

This year, the tour took us to the Clemson University Sandhill Research and Education Center in Columbia. The Sandhill Research and Education Center plays a vital role in the growth of statewide agribusiness.

We were welcomed by long-time friend, Director Kathy Coleman.

During the visit, we heard updates from faculty members Cory Heaton, Adam Kantrovich, and Nathan Smith on their research in agribusiness programming, which promotes President Donald Trump's policies of farm exports.

We learned from farm manager Cody Bishop of the incubator program, which provides small plots for startup farmers to begin growing their business.

The visit was jointly hosted with the South Carolina Farm Bureau. We were welcomed by David Wilson, Gary Spires, and Charles Wingard.

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

INVESTIGATE FORMER VICE PRESIDENT JOE BIDEN AND HIS SON, HUNTER BIDEN

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

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call for an investigation into former Vice President Joe Biden and his son, Hunter Biden, for their unethical and potentially criminal actions in Ukraine.

In 2014, after being discharged from the Navy for cocaine use, Hunter Biden was named a board member of Burisma Holdings. Burisma is a natural gas company that was being investigated by the Ukrainian Government for corruption.

This strange hire for a million dollars a year was around the same period that Vice President Joe Biden was the primary American liaison to Ukraine, supposedly assisting their new government in combating corruption.

Just last year, Joe Biden bragged to the Council on Foreign Relations that he threatened the Ukrainian Government while vice president with the loss of a billion dollars unless they fired the prosecutor general leading the ethics probe into Hunter Biden, or America would cut off that foreign aid.

Talk about quid pro quo.

It is clear: Democrats would rather smear President Trump than investigate Biden's corrupt bullying of the Ukrainian Government.

AFFORDABLE HEALTH INSURANCE OPTIONS

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

Mr. BUDD. Mr. Speaker, when Congress passed the Affordable Care Act in 2010, President Obama made a famous promise: that the American people would be able to keep the plans they liked while paying less for health insurance. But, Mr. Speaker, that famous promise was false, and ObamaCare's consequences are still being felt to this day.

Over the preceding decade, premiums for individual coverage have more than doubled, patient choice has declined, and State exchanges have collapsed. This upheaval is a direct result of the law's rigid and costly regulations that predated the Trump administration.

In order to bring down costs and increase choice, today I introduced the Flexibility Through Lower Expenses Healthcare Act, or the FLEX Act.

The FLEX Act codifies into law the Trump administration's rules on short term, limited duration, and association healthcare plans. This will allow small businesses to band together to purchase affordable plans and give consumers the freedom to purchase low-cost, short-term plans if they need to.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for Congress to follow the Trump administration's lead and make these rules permanent. All citizens of our great country deserve affordable health insurance options that are free from ObamaCare's crippling regulatory regime.

TYSON UPWARD ACADEMY

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

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the launch of the 50th Upward Academy at the Tyson Foods plant in my hometown of Zeeland, Michigan.

This unique in-plant educational program offers empowering resources and courses to all workers at no cost.

By partnering with local community organizations, Upward Academy provides team members the opportunity to access important classes, such as English as a second language, general education development, and citizenship courses.

The academy also includes multiple components focused on workplace skills and professional training to develop talent, especially in rural and marginalized areas.

Through programs such as drivers' education, computer technology, and financial literacy, Upward Academy brings knowledgeable experts directly to workers so they can move beyond entry-level jobs and receive valuable qualifications so that they can perform at even higher levels.

The 50th launch of the Upward Academy will open the door for all team members to strive beyond their current situations.

Tyson Foods and Upward Academy's commitment to cultivating a modern workforce that is prepared for the 21st century helps our community grow stronger and make west Michigan a better place to live, work, and raise a family.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, September 25, 2019.

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

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on September 25, 2019, at 9:28 a.m.:

That the Senate passed with an amendment H.R. 1158.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 1590.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

CHERYL L. JOHNSON.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2203, HOMELAND SECURITY IMPROVEMENT ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3525, U.S. BORDER PATROL MEDICAL SCREENING STANDARDS ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 576, EXPRESSING SENSE OF THE HOUSE WITH RESPECT TO WHISTLEBLOWER COMPLAINT MADE TO INSPECTOR GENERAL OF INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 577 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 577

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2203) to increase transparency, accountability, and community engagement within the Department of Homeland Security, provide independent oversight of border security activities, improve training for agents and officers of U.S. Customs and Border Protection and U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Homeland Security now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116-27, modified by the amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Homeland Security; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 3525) to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to direct the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection to establish uniform processes for medical screening of individuals interdicted between ports of entry, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Homeland Security now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116-33 shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Homeland Security; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 3. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the resolution (H. Res. 576) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the whistleblower complaint of August 12, 2019, made to the Inspector General of the Intelligence Community. The resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and preamble to adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

SEC. 4. It shall be in order at any time on the legislative day of September 26, 2019, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules as though under clause 1 of rule XV. The Speaker or her designee shall consult with the Minority Leader or his designee on the designation of any matter for consideration pursuant to this section.

SEC. 5. On any legislative day during the period from September 30, 2019, through October 14, 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. 6. The Speaker may appoint Members to perform the duties of the Chair for the duration of the period addressed by section 5 of this resolution as though under clause 8 (a) of rule I.

SEC. 7. Each day during the period addressed by section 5 of this resolution shall not constitute a calendar day for purposes of section 7 of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1546).

SEC. 8. Each day during the period addressed by section 5 of this resolution shall not constitute a legislative day for purposes of clause 7 of rule XIII.

SEC. 9. Each day during the period addressed by section 5 of this resolution shall not constitute a calendar or legislative day for purposes of clause 7(c)(1) of rule XXII.

Sec. 10. Each day during the period addressed by section 5 of this resolution shall not constitute a legislative day for purposes of clause 7 of rule XV.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. LESKO), 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.

□ 1215

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. SCANLON. 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 gentlewoman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 577, providing for consideration of H.R. 2203, the Homeland Security Improvement Act; H.R. 3525, the U.S. Border Patrol Medical Screening Standards Act; and H. Res. 576, expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the whistleblower complaint of August 12, 2019, made to the Inspector General of the Intelligence Community, under closed rules.

For H.R. 2203 and H.R. 3525, the rule provides 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Homeland Security for each bill. The rule provides H. Res. 576 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

The rule also provides blanket suspension authority for the legislative day of Thursday, September 26, 2019, and standard recess instructions for the district work period from September 30 to October 14.

At the end of this debate, I will be offering an amendment to the rule to replace the text of H. Res. 576 with the text of S. Res. 325, a bipartisan resolution that passed the Senate unanimously yesterday. Both of these resolutions urge that the complaint be transmitted immediately to the Intelligence Committees, as required by law.

In our Rules Committee meeting last night, several of my Republican colleagues suggested that they would prefer that we take up the Senate-passed language. To ensure that this Congress speaks with one voice clearly and unequivocally on this urgent matter, we will be amending the rule to do just that.

Mr. Speaker, we are here today to debate the rule for three important pieces of legislative business, which I will address serially: H. Res. 576, with the text of S. Res. 325; H.R. 3525; and H.R. 2203.

By now, every Member of this body is well aware of the whistleblower complaint that was filed to the intelligence community inspector general following a call President Trump had with the President of Ukraine. These types of complaints are far from unheard of, and the law states that the complaint must be turned over to the House and Senate Intelligence Committees. However, the inspector general has testified that the Acting Director of National Intelligence blocked the complaint, after consulting with the Department of Justice, from being turned over to Congress, despite the complaint fitting the requirements for being turned over under the law.

The way this complaint was handled by the Trump administration was a stark violation of that whistleblower law, which states that the Director of National Intelligence shall provide Congress with the full whistleblower complaint. In addition to breaking the law, this corruption sends a strong and chilling message to would-be whistleblowers that their courage and sacrifice in speaking out against impropriety and corruption will not be valued if it is not politically expedient.

Yesterday, the Senate voted by unanimous consent to pass a nonbinding resolution directing the Trump administration to hand over the whistleblower report filed against President Trump, reportedly, to House and Senate Intelligence Committees. The fact that Senator MCCONNELL allowed this resolution to go to the floor should show House Republicans that there is a point where you must stop turning a blind eye to this administration's betrayal of our Constitution, our country, and our national security.

It is a sad day when Congress needs to pass a resolution to obtain documents that we have an absolute right to see, but this type of conduct is part of a pattern of obstruction by this administration that we have seen time and time again.

Allowing the Intelligence Committees to see the complaints and interview the whistleblower is essential to our national security. Furthermore, this resolution serves as a show of support and solidarity with whistleblowers. If we allow partisanship to deter whistleblowers from acting, we risk undermining a necessary check on an unrestrained administration. It is imperative that these brave Americans are protected and that their concerns are heard.

It is also worth noting that these whistleblower protections were negotiated and implemented with bipartisan support over multiple administrations.

Protecting the integrity of our national security is vitally important. I urge my Republican colleagues to follow the lead of their Senate counterparts and join us in passing this resolution so that Congress can properly meet its constitutional oversight duties.

Also subject to this rule are two homeland security measures.

First, H.R. 2203, the Homeland Security Improvement Act, is a timely and necessary bill to address our Nation's immigration and security challenges at the southern border in a responsible and humane way. This legislation will ensure accountability, transparency, and oversight in the agency responsible for monitoring and securing our Nation's borders.

Further, the bill establishes an ombudsman for border- and immigration-related concerns within the Department of Homeland Security. This additional oversight in the Department of Homeland Security will bring a much-needed level of independent accountability to DHS and ensure that the agents and employees working at our border are performing their duties to the highest possible standard.

There is no doubt that these border security jobs are demanding and intense, and the creation of an independent, neutral, and confidential process to address complaints will help both the agents and employees working at the border, as well as the individuals they process.

This bill also creates a border communities liaison, appointed by the ombudsman in conjunction with the Office for Civil Rights and Civil Liberties at DHS, to operate in each Border Patrol sector along the northern and southern borders. The liaison will be charged with fostering cooperation between ICE, CBP, and surrounding border communities, relationships that have become increasingly strained and distrustful in recent months.

In addition, the ombudsman will be required to conduct annual evaluations of all training given to ICE and CBP agents and officers.

One of the many concerns that I heard from ICE and CBP agents during my trips to the border is that they are not given adequate training and resources to properly do their jobs under current conditions. It is clear that this administration is creating chaos at the southern border by instituting policies that prioritize political fearmongering over addressing the humanitarian crisis in Central America. This is unacceptable given the complex challenges border agents face every day, and an annual assessment of their training will serve to better equip these men and women for their very difficult jobs.

Another area where DHS is lacking is utilizing advancements in technology that could improve outcomes for both border agents and migrants. This bill mandates that the ombudsman, in coordination with the CBP Commissioner, ICE Director, and ORR, develop recommendations for an electronic tracking number system to keep track of children in U.S. custody. The wholly inhumane practice of separating children from their parents is preventable, and tracking the location of a child who has been separated from his or her parents or guardians will help ensure that no child is ever again in custody alone and unaccounted for at our southern border.

Finally, this bill requires the ombudsman to submit to Congress a plan for requiring the use of body-worn cameras by U.S. Border Patrol agents and ICE officers when they are engaged in border security and immigration enforcement activities. This is a long-overdue step. Body cameras are already used by State and local police departments around the country and have served to improve justice outcomes for the individuals who come into contact with the police and provide a level of oversight that is greatly needed at the border.

Mr. Speaker, House Democrats are committed to passing legislation that will improve conditions at the border and better ensure the safety of agents and employees who work there, as well as the safety of migrants they come into contact with. Increased accountability is necessary to improving the situation at the border, a situation, I might add, that my Republican counterparts continuously say needs addressing. This bill is the chance for that added accountability.

I commend my colleague Representative ESCOBAR from El Paso for her hard work and dedication on this issue and Chairman THOMPSON and the Homeland Security Committee for their thoughtful consideration of H.R. 2203.

The second Homeland Security bill in today's rule is H.R. 3525, the U.S. Border Patrol Medical Screening Standards Act.

In December 2018, Jakelin, aged 7, and Felipe, aged 8, both passed away in the custody of the U.S. Border Patrol. Following their deaths, CBP announced new medical screening procedures for children. Despite this, four more children have since passed away in Federal custody.

Let us be clear that we are addressing an issue that has emerged with the implementation of the Trump administration's inhumane border policies. No child died in CBP custody for the entire decade preceding 2018, but we have seen six in the last 10 months.

CBP facilities must be better equipped to provide medical attention for individuals in U.S. custody, particularly children.

One critical component of addressing the new reality is an initial health screening to identify acute or pressing medical issues that need immediate or follow-up attention. H.R. 3525 builds upon legislation passed by the House in July of this year by directing DHS to research innovative approaches to address capability gaps for providing medical screening at the border and mandates the implementation of an electronic health record system.

DHS medical professionals and other medical caregivers at the border have spoken of how much they need an electronic health system for CBP. In fact, this was the genesis of the bill following Representative UNDERWOOD's visits to the border.

This bill requires DHS to make concerted process improvements, including research done in consultation with national medical professional associations that have expertise in emergency medicine, nursing, pediatric care, and other relevant medical skills.

Upon completion of this research, DHS must submit a report to Congress on its recommendations for improving medical screening, access to emergency care, and steps the Department plans to take in response.

Within 90 days of this enactment, DHS must establish an electronic health record system that can be accessed by all DHS components operating on our borders. ICE already has its own electronic health record system in place, and it is time CBP upgraded its capabilities, as well.

The deaths that have occurred on our borders are a stain on our Nation, and current medical screening processes are clearly not enough.

An inspector general report, released a few weeks ago, highlighted the challenges that ORR is having in addressing the mental health needs of those children released by CBP to ORR. Though this bill deals with CBP, many of the issues transfer from agency to agency with the children. The trauma for these children begins when they are forced to flee their birth countries and is exacerbated by the journey to the U.S., which, for many, is marked by violence, sexual abuse, hunger, and sleep deprivation.

Once they finally arrive in the U.S., they then may be separated from their parents, if that didn't happen along the original journey, causing further trauma. Medical professionals are clear that these children are going to have lifelong trauma. They need a detailed medical record of the care they receive or do not receive while in U.S. custody so that they can receive adequate follow-up care.

The IG report noted, as well, that the facilities where we house these children have not employed sufficient numbers of essential mental health clinicians. This results in higher caseloads for staff and worse outcomes for these afflicted children.

The electronic health record system required by this bill will ensure that medical information does not get lost, help track when follow-up appointments are necessary, and prevent duplication of medical services due to lost or incomplete records once children are transferred to ORR custody.

This bill is the result of Representative UNDERWOOD's leadership and engagement with the treatment of migrants at our border, and I commend her for her efforts.

□ 1230

These two Homeland Security bills provided for in this rule will modernize the Department of Homeland Security and support better outcomes for border agents, employees, and migrants who come into U.S. custody.

House Democrats understand the need to provide the Department of Homeland Security with the resources it needs to effectively do its job, and I urge my Republican colleagues to vote for this legislation to support all those who work and live by the border.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support for this rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative SCANLON for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the bills we consider today highlight how far the priorities of my colleagues across the aisle have diverged from the priorities of the American people.

We consider two bills purportedly related to border security but which do nothing to solve the humanitarian crisis at our border and, like the rest of their previous so-called solutions, make the problem even worse.

Instead of addressing the issues that impact American citizens and legal residents, the Democrats continue to cave to radical, leftwing activists, cater to illegal immigrants over U.S. citizens and legal residents, and malign the President for his attempts to secure or border.

Then, late yesterday afternoon, a mere 1 hour and 45 minutes before the Rules Committee met, my Democratic colleagues added another item to the schedule for this rule to further their witch hunt against President Trump.

The Democrats ran on kitchen table issues like healthcare, but it is becoming increasingly clear that their obsession with attacking this President and prioritizing illegal immigrants over U.S. citizens has impeded their ability to address the needs of our country.

The first bill, H.R. 2203, expands the government by creating another Federal bureaucrat, an ombudsman, to investigate complaints against Customs and Border Protection and Immigration and Customs Enforcement, our law enforcement on the border.

This is a special ombudsman just for illegal immigrants to file complaints against law enforcement, even though there are current avenues to file complaints. It requires that bureaucrat to establish even more bureaucrats in each U.S. Border Patrol sector. On top of those bureaucrats, it creates even more to sit on a border oversight panel. The icing on the cake: The legislation gives the ombudsman no real authority to resolve any issues.

This bill does nothing to address the root causes of the current humanitarian crisis on the southern border. In fact, I have introduced six bills to get to the root of the problem. None of them have been heard in the Judiciary Committee, but, instead, their bill is made up of policy provisions that cater to illegal immigrants and undermine our law enforcement at the border, thus, weakening our national security.

Put simply, my Democratic colleagues' answer to our border crisis is to create a taxpayer-funded complaint

box for illegal immigrants, and it gives no power to the ombudsman.

The second bill, H.R. 3525, throws even more taxpayer money at programs that will do nothing for the border security Americans demand. It even jeopardizes our national security by requiring the Department of Homeland Security to reprogram funding used for combating terrorist and criminal organizations and for responding to manmade and national disasters to an IT system to track illegal immigrant health records.

The bill states that this new electronic health records program has to be completed in a record 90 days. Once again, my Democratic colleagues are prioritizing illegal immigrants over U.S. citizens. Our own veterans don't even have a system like this.

In fact, we in Congress have been trying to get an electronic health record system in the VA for years, and we found that it would cost multimillions of dollars. Yet there is no funding in this bill for this electronic program, so we would have to divert money from our national security priorities.

This bill does divert money from protecting American citizens to enhancing the experience for illegal immigrants.

I have been to a border facility in Eloy, Arizona, a detention center, and I have also been to an HHS facility in Virginia that houses unaccompanied minors. I saw that both facilities were clean and the occupants were treated well. I even ate with detainees, sat at the table with them at the Eloy Detention Center, and the food was good.

Prioritizing where DHS should allocate its limited resources, my firsthand experience leads me to believe that hurricane response and thwarting terrorists are of greater concern than prioritizing illegal immigrants.

Finally, the resolution, H. Res. 576, is an inappropriate rush to judgment without gathering all of the facts.

First of all, the President released the call transcript text with the President of Ukraine today. I read it. To me, it is a big nothing burger, and, in fact, it demonstrates—I am glad the President released it because it demonstrates how the media and some of my Democratic colleagues were totally false in their allegations.

One of the accusations was that eight times the President talked about this Biden issue with the Ukrainian President. That is totally untrue.

Second, the Director of National Intelligence is testifying before the House Intelligence Committee tomorrow, on Thursday, and Chairman SCHIFF has already announced efforts to have a closed-door meeting with the whistleblower this week.

Third, these things should occur before the House rushes into this type of resolution. I understand, and we are told on the floor today by my colleagues, that Democrats intend to amend the rule to match the Senate-passed resolution on this matter, and I am glad. They are removing the disparaging language against the President and other people in his administration that was in the House version that we saw last night in the Rules Committee.

In fact, as the Speaker knows, I brought this up last night in committee, and we could have done this last night. However, I am still concerned that this resolution, as amended, is still premature.

Even if the two border bills pass the Senate—and they won't—they would not help our constituents.

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

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN), a distinguished member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the floor leader for her leadership on this.

Our colleague from Arizona chides us because we campaigned on healthcare. We campaigned on healthcare, proudly, and we are defending preexisting conditions coverage against every effort by the Republicans to destroy it by repealing the Affordable Care Act in this body. And we have defended it and we continue to defend it in court as they are trying to destroy preexisting conditions coverage in Texas right now.

We hope that they will work with us on lowering prescription drug prices. So I believe that my colleague should take up her own invitation to get to work for the American people.

We have no problem advancing the public policy interests of the American people while we defend the Constitution and the rule of law against the conduct of this President.

Now, we had a resolution last night saying, obey the law, telling the administration there is a very simple whistleblower statute which gives people the opportunity to come forward to say that there is a violation of the National Security Act in a way that flags a serious or flagrant problem, abuse, or violation of law, and then that goes to the inspector general of the Department.

It went to the inspector general, and that is an inspector general appointed by President Trump himself. And the inspector general found that the whistleblower's complaint was credible and it was urgent. It went to a serious problem.

At that point, it goes to the Director of National Intelligence, and that Director has 7 days to turn it over to the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

The 7 days came and went. This is the first time in American history when the Director of National Intelligence did not turn over such a complaint to the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

So the U.S. Senate, in a bipartisan fashion, all the Democrats and all of the Republicans, got together and said to the administration, to the Director of National Intelligence: Turn that complaint over immediately to Congress.

We had the exact same resolution last night, and our colleagues said: Well, we don't like your resolution. It is too profuse. There is too much language, as the gentlewoman said. We think that it may disparage the conduct of the President.

So what we did is we took them at their word. We purged all of that language and we made it an exact replica of the Senate resolution that they were praising last night. They loved it last night. They said: That is exactly what this should be. So we have conformed it precisely to what they are asking for, and they still oppose it.

What we need is an emphatic, unanimous, bipartisan statement that the Federal laws of the United States must be respected by this administration. The lawlessness must stop.

A whistleblower is someone acting in the highest, most noble traditions of the country. He is not a traitor, as some have implied. A whistleblower is not someone who has gone over to the other side of the country. A whistleblower is someone working for the American people.

Both parties used to understand that, not just Democrats, but Republicans used to understand that. Apparently, the Senate Republicans do understand it, and yet, now, we have a situation where we are saying: We have got a resolution, an exact replica of the Senate resolution where we are asking the administration just to comply with the law. Come forward and give us the complaint as you are required to do by law.

The statute uses the phrase, ''shall turn over to Congress.'' ''Shall,'' that means must—not may, not maybe do it. You must do it. Every other President, every other administration, every other Director of National Intelligence has understood that.

We asked our colleagues to stand by what they told us in committee last night, which was they liked the Senate version, and they urged us to use the Senate version. We are using the Senate version, and we hope that we will have an emphatic, bipartisan statement to the executive branch of government they must turn over this material according to law.

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

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to allow for immediate consideration of S. 820, the Debbie Smith Act of 2019, which reauthorizes funding to process the rape kit backlogs.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, this program was reauthorized with broad bipartisan support in both 2008 and 2014. The Senate passed the Debbie Smith Act by unanimous consent in May, over 4 months ago; yet the House has yet to take up this important bill meant to end the rape kit backlog, even though it expires in just 5 days.

As a survivor of domestic violence and co-chair of the bipartisan Congressional Caucus for Women's Issues, I am deeply disturbed by reports that some are using this program as leverage to get the Senate to pass other things that have nothing to do with DNA testing of rape kits.

□ 1245

My amendment makes the vote on the previous question simple. Vote ''no'' if you believe survivors of rape and sexual assault deserve to be one step closer to justice. Vote ''no'' so we can immediately consider the Debbie Smith Act. Vote ''no'' on the previous question if you stand with survivors of rape and sexual assault.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. ARMSTRONG), who is my good friend.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Speaker, I, like many people growing up thought murder was the worst crime you could have in this country. However, my career as a criminal defense attorney and as a legal guardian ad litem for victims of sexual assault has taught me that is not true. Violent sexual assault is the most terrible crime that can be committed, and, as opposed to other things, victims of that crime have to relive it when they are interviewed by law enforcement, they have to relive it when they are interviewed by doctors and nurses, they have to relive it when they are interviewed by prosecutors, and they oftentimes have to relive it as they navigate through the criminal justice system.

We have all heard stories about light sentences in different areas, especially when it comes under these cases. One of the main reasons for that is because of the nature of the crime and the unwillingness of victims to continue to go through this process as they move through the courtroom. I have done this in a court of law. I have helped victims navigate this.

The single biggest predicator for getting a conviction without a jury trial is DNA evidence. This puts really bad people in jail, it protects victims, it protects future victims, and, more importantly, it protects the very victims who are there from having to deal with this and navigate it.

In 5 days this expires. The FBI has said that 475,000 matches have happened through this DNA testing; of that 42 percent of those are directly related to the Debbie Smith law. This should be the only thing we are talking about in this town, because I cannot imagine that we do not have broad, bipartisan agreement, and it should be the previous question on every single bill until we get it passed.

I understand how we work, and I understand how things move around, but there is absolutely no reason this should be used as a bargaining chip for anything else. This is simple, this is commonsense, this is good law enforcement, and this protects victims of the most dangerous and despicable crime that can be committed on them.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. DEAN.)

Ms. DEAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule, and I thank our floor manager, my colleague and friend from Pennsylvania, Representative SCANLON, for so ably guiding this argument.

Mr. Speaker, as the Speaker so eloquently stated yesterday, this is a dangerous time for our democracy. Our Founding Fathers understood the importance of whistleblowers as an integral part of the fabric of our democracy and ensuring the rule of law is upheld.

The first United States whistleblower law which unanimously passed on July 30, 1778, by the Continental Congress states: ''That it is the duty of all persons in the service of the United States, as well as all other the inhabitants thereof, to give the earliest information to Congress or other proper authority of any misconduct, frauds or misdemeanors committed by any officers or persons in the service of these states, which may come to their knowledge.''

The Founding Fathers understood this simple principle—that it is the duty of all patriotic Americans to not only come forward with allegations of wrongdoing but to ensure that there is a path that these allegations be brought to Congress.

Mr. Speaker, what have we learned?

That these principles that our Founding Fathers fought so hard to enshrine in our democracy are in jeopardy. It is our responsibility, and it is our duty to restore the faith of the public in our elections and oversight of all elected officials including and especially our President.

We know that the memorandum that was released today is only a memorandum of the conversation between the President and the President of Ukraine, and it undermines the integrity of his office. The President has betrayed his oath of office and his fidelity to that oath by putting himself and his personal and political gain over national security and the rule of law.

He must provide full details of the whistleblower information to Congress. He must provide a full transcript or tape of that conversation with the Ukrainian President. The public deserves it, our election security relies upon it, and the integrity of the office demands it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. RESCHENTHALER), who is my friend.

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Mr. Speaker, before I came to Congress, I served as a magisterial district judge. I was on the front line of the criminal justice system, and I handled preliminary hearings for sexual assault and rape cases. Let me tell you, these crimes are incredibly heinous, and stories from the victims are absolutely heartbreaking.

Many of these victims went through a grueling evidence collection process in the hopes they would help catch their rapist. Unfortunately, this evidence often sits untested on shelves for months to years while sexual assault victims wait for justice and their rapists roam the streets. This is especially dangerous because those who commit sexual assault are likely to do it again. They are typically habitual offenders. So when we delay the testing of these kits, we do so at the expense and the risk of others being sexually assaulted.

So that is where the Debbie Smith Act comes in. The Debbie Smith Act provides funding for DNA testing and training to eliminate the backlog of untested DNA and rape kit evidence. Since 2004 nearly 200,000 DNA matches have been made thanks to the Debbie Smith DNA Backlog Grant Program. Again, that is over 200,000 DNA matches since 2004. But without congressional action, this legislation is set to expire on Monday.

The Senate recognized the critical need to reauthorize this bill. They passed this bill back in May and sent it to the House for consideration, but, unfortunately, my Democratic colleagues refuse to bring this bill to the floor. They would rather play politics than put criminals in jail.

This is absolutely despicable. Sexual assault victims have been through enough. We should not hold this up for funding so that Democrats can score cheap political points with their radical, far-left base.

So I ask my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to reexamine their priorities and help us get justice for these crime victims. This issue is too important for partisan games.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I would ask if the Representative from Arizona has more speakers.

Mrs. LESKO. I have three speakers at least, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CLINE), who is my good friend.

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, it is imperative that the House immediately bring the Debbie Smith Act up for consideration before the program expires later this month. As a former prosecutor in Virginia, I know all too well how critical DNA evidence is for achieving justice for victims of sexual violence.

Debbie Smith's courage to share her story with the world has changed the

lives of millions, and no person should ever have to experience her trauma firsthand. Thanks to this program, incredible progress has been made to reduce DNA backlogs, and we cannot take a step backward by allowing it to lapse. The importance of DNA evidence in criminal investigations and prosecutions is unquestionable. In my home State of Virginia, the FBI's National DNA Index contains more than 447,000 offender profiles and has aided in over 11,000 criminal investigations.

This program has been reauthorized previously with bipartisan support, and there is no excuse for it to be politicized now. S. 820 has been languishing in the Judiciary Committee for months. This failure to act enables violent criminals to remain at large and in our society.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Speaker to bring this bill to the floor and put it up for a vote so we can protect people from violent sexual predators and allow justice to be served through our legal system.

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

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from the great State of Texas (Mr. GOHMERT), who is my good friend.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I would urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this previous question because in doing so we can finally take care of a matter that should have been taken care of long before now that I understood was a bipartisan matter. Both sides of the aisle wanted to help address the tremendous backlog of DNA rape kits that needed to be analyzed. The Debbie Smith Act, as my friend from Arizona indicated, was previously passed and reauthorized, and now we need to reauthorize it again because even though there are 641,000 DNA cases that were processed, there is still so much that needs to be done.

In addition to crime scene evidence and rape kits, the Debbie Smith funds also are utilized to process offender DNA samples to ensure evidence from unsolved crimes can be matched against our database. So the funds provided by the act are incredibly critical since they will help solve crimes and get criminals off the streets.

I know from my friends across the aisle and in our hearing that was just going on that I just left in Judiciary that there is an effort to, as one Democratic witness said: Gee, we are here just to ask you to do something.

Rather than taking guns from law-abiding citizens as is being proposed, I would submit a better answer is let's get the criminals off the street. I know there is a big effort to get criminals out of prison, but how about if we get criminals back in prison for crimes they have committed that have not been adjudicated?

This needs to be addressed. It shouldn't be a political issue. If we could get a majority to vote ''no'' on the previous question, then we will get this amendment in as part of the rule. I don't know if we would have more than a couple of people who would even vote against the Debbie Smith Act. So it is all a matter of getting it to the floor.

Here we are about to enter October, and we still have not taken this commonsense step to get criminals off the street. So I hope we will do the right thing by all those victims, all those women who have been raped and are waiting for their criminal—their horrible and torturous individual—to be taken off the street. Let's vote ''no'' on the previous question, and then we can do that.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close, but I believe my colleagues have one more speaker, so I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1300

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN), my good friend.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I will address the underlying bills on this rule.

I have been at the border three times this year, and while I have been to a lot of workplaces, a lot of work environments, there is nobody I have more respect for than the professional job that the U.S. Border Patrol does of protecting this country, and they do it under the most difficult of circumstances.

Last time I was down there, they had 2,000 vacant positions. They were, in May, staffed at a level that was maybe a third of what it should have been, given the huge number of people coming across.

In addition to just apprehending people, they had to do mounds of paperwork. They had to, in essence, act as a daycare for all the young people who are sneaking in this country, but they did it without complaining, with the utmost professionalism.

I find it hard to believe, after watching these professional Border Patrol agents, that other people went down to the border and felt the problem is we have to tie their hands still more with another ombudsman, more paperwork, inviting people to file false complaints, particularly since we already have an inspector general and an Office of Civil Rights and Civil Liberties in the Department of Homeland Security. So in addition to the watchmen on the Border Patrol, we had all sorts of new people down here.

I guess I am still surprised, but maybe I shouldn't be surprised. There are some people who look at an interaction between police and a criminal and think there is something wrong with the policeman and instinctually don't like him. There are people in a corrections facility who look at the corrections officers and the prisoners and automatically think the problem in the corrections facility is the corrections officers.

That is what we have down at the border right now, which is being submitted in this bill. Rather than giving a thank-you to our Border Patrol by adding additional people, we give them a kick in the teeth by saying: There must be something wrong with you. We need more people to watch over you, make it easier to file paperwork against you, have you have to look out more than you have in the past—and such a dangerous job.

I mean, you figure some of these folks, they are out there in the middle of the night, maybe they catch a caravan of 30 or 50 people sneaking into this country, and one Border Patrol agent is supposed to bring all these people in. What sacrifice for our country.

And what do they get from this body? Do they get filling out the empty positions? They don't get that. What they get is a kick in the teeth, saying: We have something wrong with you.

Mr. Speaker, I hope we vote against the rule, and I hope we vote against the acts.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, before my closing statements, I want to put on the RECORD that the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN) had said earlier that, in Rules Committee last night, Republicans gushed over the Senate resolution, and that is actually not accurate.

What we did is, after Mr. SCHIFF made some disparaging remarks about House Republicans, if they didn't vote for the House resolution like the Senate Republicans did, that we didn't care about the issue, then I merely pointed out the differences between the Senate version and the House version, and so that is how that came about.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I will just summarize the bills before us today:

One, creates government bureaucrats with no real authority;

Two, diverts money meant to protect Americans from terrorism, gangs, and natural disasters;

Three, continues the obsession by my Democratic colleagues to bash the President and others and is a political tool.

The Democrats ran on kitchen table issues. Instead, week after week, they prioritized the demands of the radical leftwing activists over the needs of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I urge ''no'' on the previous question, ''no'' on the underlying measure, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, the whistleblower resolution we will vote on later this week is critical to the constitutional oversight responsibilities given to us by the Constitution. Congress has a right to view this whistleblower complaint, and it is important that we join our Senate colleagues in a bipartisan statement to

this administration that Congress will not abdicate its responsibilities.

Again, I urge my Republican colleagues in the House to join House Democrats and a unanimous Senate to support the final resolution affirming to this administration that we will perform our duty and to reassure whistleblowers that their courageous acts will be valued and welcomed by Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the two strong bills to protect children and families from appalling conditions and treatment at our southwest border have been sent to us by the Committee on Homeland Security and are representative of the types of constructive and measured legislation that comes from going through regular order.

These bills seek to address emergent conditions at our southern border in a way that is thoughtful and practical and, if enacted, will have a tangible impact on the day-to-day working lives of the men and women who work at the border and the migrants and children who come into U.S. custody.

Conditions at the border are unacceptable. I think both sides of the aisle should agree on that. But what we would also likely agree upon is that simply throwing money at this situation will not help. We talk about the need for meaningful solutions a lot around here, and today we present two of them.

The situation at the border is complicated and requires ongoing attention, but we cannot let conditions at the border continue to deteriorate. These two bills will provide meaningful and much-needed reforms to our border detention system and help pave the way for larger scale immigration legislation.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. SCANLON

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike section 3 of the resolution and insert the following:

SEC. 3. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the resolution (H. Res. 576) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the whistleblower complaint of August 12, 2019, made to the Inspector General of the Intelligence Community. The amendments to the resolution and the preamble specified in section 11 of this resolution shall be considered as adopted. The resolution, as amended, shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution, 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 Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 11. The amendments referred to in section 3 are as follows:

(a) Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

''That—

(1) the whistleblower complaint received on August 12, 2019, by the Inspector General of the Intelligence Community shall be transmitted immediately to the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives; and

(2) the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives should be allowed to evaluate the complaint in a deliberate and bipartisan manner consistent with applicable statutes and processes in order to safeguard classified and sensitive information.''.

(b) Strike the preamble.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I urge support for the resolution, as amended.

The material previously referred to by Mrs. LESKO is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 577

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 11. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall proceed on the consideration in the House of the bill (S. 820) to strengthen programs authorized under the Debbie Smith Act of 2004. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 12. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of S. 820.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question on the amendment and on the resolution.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on the amendment to the resolution, if ordered, and adoption of the resolution, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 227, nays 191, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 542]

YEAS—227

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

NAYS—191

Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Bishop (UT)
Bost
Brady
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Conaway
Cook
Crenshaw
Curtis
Davidson (OH)
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Estes
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxx (NC)
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gonzalez (OH)
Gooden
Gosar
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harris
Hartzler
Hern, Kevin
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Hill (AR)
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Joyce (OH)
Katko
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn

Latta
Lesko
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Marchant
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
Meadows
Meuser
Miller
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Murphy (NC)
Newhouse
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Riggleman
Roby
Rodgers (WA)
Roe, David P.
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rooney (FL)
Rose, John W.
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spano
Stauber
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Timmons
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Waltz
Watkins
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoho
Young
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—15

Abraham
Clyburn
Crawford
Cummings
Dean
Graves (LA)
Higgins (LA)
Jackson Lee
Jordan
Joyce (PA)
Kuster (NH)
Marshall
McEachin
Van Drew
Wright

□ 1337

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, because I was chairing a Committee on the assault weapons ban, I missed the following vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 542.

Mr. VAN DREW. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 542.

Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 542.

Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, September 25, 2019, I was unavoidably detained and missed rollcall vote No. 542. Had I been present for this recorded vote, I would have voted "aye."

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution, as amended.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 228, nays 191, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 543]

YEAS—228

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

NAYS—191

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

NOT VOTING—14

Abraham
Clyburn
Crawford
Cummings
Graves (LA)
Higgins (LA)
Jordan
Joyce (PA)
Krishnamoorthi
Marshall
McEachin
Meeks
Schweikert
Wright

□ 1348

So the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted nay on rollcall No. 543.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I was absent during the first series of votes on September 25 due to illness. Had I been present, I would have voted nay on rollcall No. 542, and nay on rollcall No. 543.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, because I was held up chairing a hearing on the assault weapons ban, I missed the motion on ordering the previous question to the rule, House Resolution 577, regarding the Homeland Security bill and the whistleblower bill. If I had been here, I would have voted ''yea.''

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1440

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro

tempore (Ms. DEGETTE) at 2 o'clock and 40 minutes p.m.

EXPRESSING SENSE OF THE HOUSE WITH RESPECT TO WHISTLEBLOWER COMPLAINT MADE TO INSPECTOR GENERAL OF INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY

Mr. HIMES. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 577, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 576) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the whistleblower complaint of August 12, 2019, made to the Inspector General of the Intelligence Community, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 577, the amendments to the text and preamble specified in section 11 of that resolution are adopted and the resolution, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the resolution, as amended, is as follows:

H. RES. 576

Resolved, That—

(1) the whistleblower complaint received on August 12, 2019, by the Inspector General of the Intelligence Community shall be transmitted immediately to the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives; and

(2) the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives should be allowed to evaluate the complaint in a deliberate and bipartisan manner consistent with applicable statutes and processes in order to safeguard classified and sensitive information.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The resolution, as amended, shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

The gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. HIMES) and the gentleman from California (Mr. NUNES) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the amended resolution, which demands provision to the congressional intelligence committees of a whistleblower complaint, which the Acting Director of National Intelligence has withheld. The law, however, required the Acting DNI to submit it to the committees.

This is a serious matter, Madam Speaker, for IC whistleblowing, congressional oversight, and the rule of law.

Before turning to it, let me express my deep gratitude for the actions of a courageous and anonymous individual in the intelligence community. That person wanted to report urgent, credible allegations of serious wrongdoing and did the right thing by acting in strict accordance with proper whistleblower procedures. These permit classified disclosures to be made to the intelligence committees while protecting national security.

Using that mechanism, in August, the whistleblower made a complaint to the inspector general of the intelligence community. According to the Justice Department's legal opinion regarding the complaint, which it today released to the public, the whistleblower's allegations concerned the content of a telephone call between President Trump and a foreign leader.

The inspector general determined the complaint to be urgent, meaning that the matter met important statutory criteria, and that its allegations appeared to be credible.

The inspector general, months later, would write that the complaint's allegations not only fell ''within the DNI's jurisdiction,'' but that they ''relate to one of the most important and significant responsibilities to the American people.'' That is protecting the United States from foreign interference in our elections.

In strict accordance with the statutory rules, the inspector general passed the complaint and his determination to the Acting Director of National Intelligence. The Acting Director was obligated to forward this material to the congressional intelligence committees within 7 days of receipt, but, in contravention of the law, he refused to do that.

There can be no misreading of the provision imposing that obligation. It says that the DNI ''shall'' forward the materials to the House intelligence committee and also to our colleagues at the Senate intelligence committee.

□ 1445

''Shall,'' of course, means ''shall.'' It does not mean ''can if you want to.''

Despite this unambiguous, categorical directive, the Trump administration interfered with the time-tested process for IC whistleblowing. It would need to resist that process forcefully because, as public reports have suggested, the complaint potentially concerned the same craven abuse of power by President Trump which the public learned about this morning.

I won't recite all the details of this sordid episode. But suffice it to say that documents released today plainly show the President of the United States shaking down his Ukrainian counterpart for a ''favor''—an investigation by Ukraine's authorities, with close coordination by Rudy Giuliani and Attorney General Bill Barr, into the son of former Vice President Joe Biden, the former Vice President himself being a candidate for the U.S. presidency.

So the administration got the Justice Department's Office of Legal Counsel involved, it got the White House Counsel involved, and, without invoking national security or making a claim of executive privilege, it managed to get a staggeringly flawed legal opinion from the Department of Justice.

The opinion's reasoning is specious on its face. According to the Department of Justice, the whistleblower statute did not apply to the complaint, and the complaint therefore did not have to be forwarded to the committees because the complaint's allegations do not relate to an urgent concern, meaning the funding, administration, or operation of an intelligence activity under the DNI's authority and responsibility.

In this regard, the DOJ observed that the alleged conduct was committed by the President, who is outside of and above the IC. I will point out that that is irrelevant under the statute. All that is required is that the allegation ''relate to'' an intelligence activity within the DNI's purview.

The DOJ also faulted the IC IG, the inspector general, for not citing a statute or policy that gave the DNI operational responsibility to prevent foreign interference in our elections.

Think about that for a second. Have in mind what our country went through in 2016 when Russia undertook covert as well as overt measures to warp the U.S. Presidential election and to sow discord which the Trump campaign welcomed with open arms.

With that recent history in mind, to say nothing of the rules on the books, we can easily dispose of the claim that the intelligence community, as captained by the acting DNI, has no operational role in keeping adversary governments from meddling in our democratic processes. That assertion is ignorant. It is wrong. And it bespeaks a serious misunderstanding about the DNI's authorities and the activities of the United States intelligence community.

The DOJ's cramped view would come as news to President Trump, I suspect, given the executive order he issued in September of 2018 regarding foreign interference in our elections, which requires the DNI, after every Federal election in this country, to assess whether such interference has taken place and to report his assessment to the rest of the executive branch. That sounds a lot like a serious role for the DNI to me.

I imagine the Department of Justice's view would also come as a shock to the acting DNI himself. After all, by statute the DNI is the head of the U.S. intelligence community and the principal intelligence adviser to the President and the National Security Council, among other things. As the inspector general correctly noted, one mission of the intelligence community, among its core missions, is to protect the United States against hostile intelligence activities directed against it. That would include any hostile foreign intelligence activities associated with efforts by foreign adversaries to interfere in our elections.

So I am stunned that the acting DNI would accept legal advice like this,

which strains to minimize or ignore the functions and responsibilities that the DNI carries out—or at least I hope—routinely.

I am also stunned that the ODNI would acquiesce in advice that, if permitted to stand, would do such extraordinary damage. By conferring on the DNI the discretion to opt out of what is plainly mandatory, the Department of Justice neutered a statute governing intelligence community whistleblowing; overturned years of consistent practice; and, most damaging of all, called into doubt important protections from reprisal on which this whistleblower relied and other lawful whistleblowers in the IC have relied.

I can only imagine the chilling effect that the Department of Justice's approach will have on lawful IC whistleblowing and thus on the intelligence committees' ability to conduct oversight of intelligence activities.

Madam Speaker, let me end with a note about the state of play, which is fluid, to say the least. I understand that the executive branch may make some of the whistleblower's materials available to the committee this afternoon, but the details remain sketchy, and the committee may not yet receive, in complete and unredacted form, all the information that the acting DNI is obligated to furnish by law, and that we have sought by subpoena. The committee will settle for nothing less.

However, the situation is resolved, Madam Speaker, the House has no choice but to denounce the extraordinary lengths to which the White House and Justice Department have gone to cover up and obstruct.

Madam Speaker, I strongly support the resolution, as amended. I urge my colleagues to join me, and I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 576, as amended.

This resolution, which mirrors a resolution passed by the Senate yesterday, expresses the sense of the House that the whistleblower complaint received by the intelligence community inspector general should be immediately transmitted to the congressional intelligence committees.

Madam Speaker, this complaint has given rise to fevered speculation and frenzied media reporting, much of which is based on a transcript of the President's phone call released today. It appears to be exaggerated, misleading, or outright false. It is also serving as a linchpin of a longstanding attempt by the Democrats to impeach President Trump and finally achieve their goal of overturning the results of the 2016 election. The media coverage and the Democrats' hysterical and politicized response to it is reminiscent of countless episodes during the course of the Russia collusion hoax. Thus, Republicans look forward to actually reading the material on which the Democrats, from a position of ignorance, are basing their unrestrained accusations.

I should make the House aware that it is roughly 3 o'clock in the afternoon here in Washington, D.C., and at 4 o'clock this afternoon, in fact, the DNI is going to transmit the complaint to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence spaces where all the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence members will have an opportunity to read it.

So, therefore, we have to ask ourselves: Why are we voting on a resolution that is asking for the very documents that are being sent over?

They are probably on their way right now, if they are not already here.

So, with that, I guess it gives an opportunity for the Democrats to come down and bash the President, which I know they enjoy doing, but in the meantime, we have no problem with this H. Res. 576, as amended. We appreciate the majority's accepting our amendment so that it mirrors exactly what the Senate passed last night.

Madam Speaker, in the meantime, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HIMES. Madam Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF), and I ask unanimous consent that he control that time.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Alabama (Ms. SEWELL).

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Madam Speaker, this is a sobering moment in our Nation's history, when the rule of law and constitutional duty requires Congress to move swiftly to protect our national security and the integrity of our democracy.

In my time on the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, I have been amazed and grateful for the work our intelligence community performs every day. We hold these men and women accountable to the rule of law and expect them to adhere to the principles of our Constitution.

In return, those great Americans expect their elected leaders to be held accountable to the same standard—above all, their Commander in Chief. President Trump's refusal to adhere to the whistleblower statute and his unwarranted attacks against one of these professionals flies in the face of that compact.

The statute is clear, Madam Speaker. The Director of National Intelligence shall provide the intelligence committee with all whistleblower complaints, especially those that the inspector general finds credible and of urgent concern.

It should not take this resolution or the threat of impeachment to convince the President to uphold the law he swore to obey.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H. Res. 576, honor our oaths, and do the right thing.

Mr. NUNES. Madam Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WENSTRUP), and I ask unanimous consent that he control that time.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, I appreciate this, and I am glad we are having the opportunity to bring this resolution to the floor.

At this time I am pleased that we are going to be able to get to the documents that are being requested in this resolution. I am pleased that if there is going to be a resolution that it is the one that the Senate put forward in a bipartisan fashion. This is what we asked for in the Rules Committee last night, and I am glad that it has come forward today.

The question in hand—and we have heard lots of comments, some of it rehashing old history, some of it rehashing history that was disproven by the Mueller Report—but at the same time we are questioning what the DNI's authority is in this situation, according to statute. I think it should be discussed.

In this situation where the DNI determined that this should not be sent to Congress, but also did not, in review of the complaint—because the complaint was given to DOJ for appropriate review, DOJ officials reviewed the complaint in light of legal issues identified by the IC IG in his cover letter and determined that no further action was warranted.

Tomorrow we are going to hear from the DNI in the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, which I think is appropriate.

As I pointed out last night in the Rules Committee, I don't think that the other side would be happy if we only heard from the DNI and not the IG. So it is appropriate that we do that.

He talked about the timely fashion of it. I think it is appropriate that you go through the Department of Justice and make sure you are doing everything right, and we need to hear from the DNI tomorrow.

We also have received the transcripts of the conversation between the President of Ukraine and the President of the United States. The President made supposedly, and is being accused of making, a mysterious promise to Zelensky in return for Ukraine reviving an investigation against Joe Biden and his son. In fact, there was no such promise. The President wanted allegations of corruption potentially involving an American official to be investigated.

What I see in this transcript is the President of one country speaking to a President of another country about trying to eliminate corruption within their government.

The other comment that had been made is the President offered a quid pro quo related to military aid for Ukraine. There is no quid pro quo in that conversation. There is no mention of an aid package to Ukraine at all. It is not in there at all. So while one might want to keep saying that, it is not in there.

Another myth, the President urged President Zelensky to work with Rudy Giuliani to investigate Biden's involvement in securing the firing of a Ukrainian prosecutor eight times.

Fact: The President mentioned Rudy Giuliani in that conversation only after Zelensky mentioned him first and referred to Biden in only one exchange.

I, myself, have some confusion on what the rules are within the intelligence community and involving the executive branch. A couple of years ago in an open hearing, when we were discussing with John Brennan—this was in an open hearing—the former CIA director, obviously an expert in intelligence, when I asked him about the conversation between President Obama and President Medvedev where it was caught on tape where he said:

> I'll have more flexibility after my election.

Medvedev said:

> I stand with you, and I will let President Putin know.

I asked him if that was a red flag. His answer was:

> I am not going to comment on a private conversation between two heads of state.

□ 1500

Since that time, I have wondered what the rules are within the intelligence community. Are conversations between two heads of state completely off-limits within the IC? I don't know. I have asked that question time and time again. I have asked some high-ranking officials who should know the answer to that, and I have gotten no answer.

What I have heard in the testimony here today, I heard someone say, ''favor,'' ''favor,'' in response to the potential of this President asking for a favor. I did not see that, and I don't know who made the quote. I would like some clarification on that.

Where we stand right now is kind of a recurring playbook. It is always moving the goalpost, right?

We want to see these documents.

Okay. The President has given you the documents.

Okay. We are going to see what the whistleblower had to say.

And now, what do we hear? Well, I am concerned that there may be more out there that we are not getting.

It is always moving the goalpost.

Listen, I speak in favor of this resolution. We should get to it, move on with the business of the country.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H. Res. 576.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, we are here today because, over a month ago, a courageous employee or detailee or contractor within the intelligence community brought to the inspector general a complaint that the inspector general reviewed. He had 14 days to review that complaint.

The inspector general found that complaint credible, found that complaint urgent, and found that that complaint should be provided to Congress, as the whistleblower intended.

That complaint then went to the Director of National Intelligence, who had 1 week to review it. Then the statute says that complaint shall be provided to the committee—not ''may,'' not ''might,'' not ''if the DOJ doesn't write an opinion,'' not ''if the White House doesn't like it.'' It says ''shall'' transmit to the committee.

The reason Congress wrote the statute that way is that, particularly in the intelligence community, we are reliant on whistleblowers. Through the vast majority of our hearings, there are no witnesses. They are not conducted in open session. There are not outside stakeholders who can tell us that what this agency represented or that agency said is not correct.

We are reliant on the intelligence community to self-report, and most of the time they do. When they don't, we are completely reliant on whistleblowers. If the whistleblower process doesn't work, if the subject of a complaint by a whistleblower can be held up by the subject of that complaint—that is, if the whistleblower says that the impropriety that they have evidence of was committed by X person, and X person is given the discretion to decide whether Congress ever sees that report—that system is broken. That is certainly not how Congress intended it.

Presuming that this complaint involves the conversation that we are now witness to because some readout of that conversation was made public, that whistleblower may have been trying to communicate to Congress that the President of the United States was pressuring a foreign President to manufacture dirt on his political opponent for help in his Presidential campaign and doing so at a time when the President of the United States was withholding military support that we approved on a bipartisan basis.

Now we see that readout says that, after the Ukraine President expressed the need for further arms to the United States, our President said: We are doing a lot for Ukraine. We are doing more for Ukraine than other countries. But you know something? There is not much reciprocity here. I have a favor I would like to ask. I want you to investigate my opponent, and I am going to have my Attorney General and my personal lawyer follow up with you.

This was the constant theme of the President's request to the President of Ukraine. It wasn't, what are the national security needs of Ukraine? It wasn't, what are the economic needs of Ukraine? It wasn't, what are the separatists doing in Ukraine?

It was: This is what I want from you. I have done so much for Ukraine. We have done so much for Ukraine. This is what we want of you.

The idea that a complaint with these allegations, if indeed this complaint is about this call, would be withheld from Congress and would be withheld on the basis of an opinion written by the Attorney General, someone who was mentioned in that very conversation, screams of conflict of interest, if not far worse.

When we brought this resolution up a month after this complaint was filed, and we brought it up in the Rules Committee last night, the argument was that this is premature. The argument here today is that this is postmature. I guess this is never mature. It is never mature for the Congress to insist that the Director follow the law.

Apparently, we need second opinions on whether ''shall'' really means ''shall.'' That is why we are here.

If we don't validate the whistleblower process, if we leave the whistleblower unprotected, even as the President suggests that the whistleblower has somehow betrayed his or her country, that system is broken, meaning corruption will not be exposed. The corruption here involves the suborning of our national security to our President's political needs. That is what is at stake here.

Madam Speaker, that is why I urge my colleagues to support this resolution, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WENSTRUP. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), the renowned minority whip.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WENSTRUP) for yielding.

As we are talking about this resolution, and as my colleagues from Ohio and from California earlier talked about, as we speak, the White House is actually transmitting the documents that are mentioned in the resolution.

The White House has been going overboard, doing more than has been done before, to make sure that Congress has all the information it needs about this issue.

I think what really is at question is where this all leads to, and I think we know where it all leads to. This all started with an intention by many in the majority. When they took the majority, it was that they were going to

try to work to impeach the President. Many of them talked about it. They didn't even have the gavels in their hands yet, and they were talking about impeaching the President.

The chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary said he wants to bring Articles of Impeachment to the House floor by the end of this year. Keep in mind, there is not a single Article of Impeachment that they have listed because there have been no crimes.

They thought the Mueller report was going to give them the crimes. It turned out it showed there was no collusion. Instead of wrapping it up, they move on to look for something else.

It is not the job of a prosecutor, by the way, to hope to go indict somebody and then look around to see if they find evidence. They are supposed to follow facts. If the facts lead them there, that is where they go. That is not happening here.

When you saw the Speaker of the House yesterday saying that the President committed crimes, please name one crime that has been listed.

We have seen the report now, the transcript of a conversation between President Trump and President Zelensky of Ukraine. There are a lot of niceties here, the President congratulating him on winning an election. There is not a single quid pro quo, which we were told there would be. There is not an exertion of pressure, which we were told there would be.

Now, they bring up Joe Biden. Joe Biden, himself, has said that he exerted pressure on the Ukrainians, bragged about the fact that he withheld $1 billion in aid from the Ukrainians.

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

Mr. WENSTRUP. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Louisiana an additional 1 minute.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio.

Again, when we talk about something as serious as impeachment, and obviously, that is where they have said they would go, the Speaker said she wants to get the committee working toward an impeachment inquiry.

Why? Why, Madam Speaker, haven't they brought a vote here on this House floor to start an impeachment inquiry? They are scared to death of having a vote on this House floor on impeachment. Yet, they keep moving down that train track.

It is a reckless track, when they say that they are going to bring impeachment. Even the people who have read this, not one of them has pointed out a high crime or misdemeanor that is in here.

The quid pro quo that they promised doesn't exist. These are the same people who promised that there was collusion, with the Mueller report, and there was no collusion.

Instead of moving on, they keep going down the impeachment path. People are sick and tired of the constant harassment of the President.

Go read the transcript, and you will see, again, a President congratulating another President who was elected on a platform to root out corruption, and he is working to root out corruption. We ought to cheer that.

Instead of doing this, we ought to be focused on things like USMCA, lowering drug prices, solving real problems. Let's move on.

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Speaker, with respect to my colleague, the only corruption the President seems to be concerned about is corruption that he is not involved with, and that seems to be an increasingly narrow category.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. CARSON).

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of this resolution demanding that the administration release the whistleblower complaint to Congress.

Every American ought to be extremely concerned by circumstances surrounding this urgent complaint and outraged that this President and members of his administration are hiding it.

Congress has a constitutional duty, Madam Speaker, to obtain this information by the deadline required by law. The administration is blocking our ability to gather the information necessary to respond to the public's needs. In this case, these needs are inseparable from our security, our safety, and the well-being of our Nation.

Congress is entitled to the full complaint, not only for the sake of national security, Madam Speaker, but to ensure that our ability to hold public servants accountable remains.

This isn't about partisan politics. This is about protecting our democracy and its people.

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

Mr. WENSTRUP. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SPANO).

Mr. SPANO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to express my disappointment at what the House is devoting its time to this afternoon. It is certainly not the issues that my constituents elected me to come to Washington to advocate for on their behalf.

We are not on the floor today talking about how we can improve care and services for veterans. We are not talking about how to fix the crumbling infrastructure, how to fix the broken immigration system. We are not talking about how to modernize and personally tailor healthcare. We are not on the floor talking about how we can continue to implement policies to further strengthen our booming economy.

Instead, we again find ourselves on the House floor talking about President Trump and his administration.

Sound familiar? This morning, in the interest of full transparency, the Trump administration released the complete memorandum outlining the telephone conversation between the President and the Ukrainian President, just as the President promised he would do yesterday. But before reading the transcript, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle prejudged the memo and called for impeachment.

Did the Speaker wait to see and review this information? No. Instead, she went before the American people to announce that the House would begin the formal impeachment inquiry into President Trump.

Well, I read the transcript, and I don't see the bombshell that the Democrats promised. There is no quid pro quo, no this for that. Nowhere does the President say that he will withhold military aid unless the Ukrainian investigation continues. It is simply not there.

Rushing to judgment and overpromising, if it sounds familiar, that is because it is. We waited nearly 2 years for Special Counsel Mueller to finish his report on the 2016 election. Over and over, we heard Democrats promise the report would lead to President Trump's impeachment. After a disappointing report and an even more disappointing appearance by the special counsel before Congress, they went fishing for new reasons to attack the President.

What happened to the standard of innocent until proven guilty in this country? I learned that in law school. How have we strayed so far from this fundamental principle?

The Democrats are operating under the presumptive belief that the President is guilty. They believe if they look long enough and hard enough, maybe, just maybe, they will uncover something, anything, that they can impeach him for.

This is wrong, and I will not support their efforts. I will not stand by silently while it happens. If my colleagues on the other side of the aisle truly believe that this warrants impeachment, and if they are not willing to wait 1 day to read the transcript, then why are they sending us back to our districts for the next 2 weeks?

The majority leader said this morning there are no plans to cancel the recess because it is important Members go home to their constituents and explain what we are doing. In other words, they still need to convince the American people that today's revelations, which didn't live up to their promises, should lead to President Trump's removal from office.

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

Mr. WENSTRUP. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Florida an additional 1 minute.

□ 1515

Mr. SPANO. Madam Speaker, I call on the Democrat leadership to keep us in session the first 2 weeks of October, if this is as urgent and as serious as they are telling the American people.

I will not support the political impeachment that Democrats are incessantly pursuing. I implore this House

and its leadership to put this behind us once and for all and get to work, get to work and do the important work that the American people sent us here to do.

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. QUIGLEY).

Mr. QUIGLEY. Madam Speaker, a point of clarification: Quid pro quo exists on its face in what we reviewed just today. But, for the record, criminal conduct does not have to be quid pro quo.

The President asked a foreign government to investigate his political rival and interfere in our election.

The response by my friends across the aisle has also confirmed something else I have had a suspicion about: They have an extraordinary sense of humor. They imagine that this administration would have released this whatever it is this morning relating to a transcript, the complaint, and allowed the DNI to formally testify and the complaining witness to testify just because the President thought we should know, not because there was a complaining witness.

Without the complaining witness, no one knows about this—without their courage. That emphasizes the point of how important complaining witnesses are, because, without their courage, we don't know about wrongdoing or there are further leaks, both of which put our country at risk.

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

Let me make a few comments, if I can.

This was reviewed by the criminal division of DOJ today that found no violation whatsoever.

Let me make another point, because I have heard accusations along the way that certain entities here in Congress don't care about whistleblower protections.

We do care. We care about the whistleblower process. We care about their protections. Let's be perfectly clear on that. As Republicans, and sitting on the intelligence committee, we recognize the value of this process. We are for it.

We have heard a lot of comments, yesterday especially, that were made that would imply guilty until proven innocent when we haven't even seen the whistleblower claim. We just got the transcripts of the President with the President of Ukraine today, and we don't even know the circumstances of the claim.

I don't know if anyone on the other side has had contact with the whistleblower, but I know nothing about this whistleblower except that there is a whistleblower. And I have not seen the complaint, and I look forward to seeing it.

We have been through a lot as a country. Time and time again, our country gets challenged—challenged from outside, challenged from within. We have been through a lot.

As Mr. SPANO alluded, we are about ready to go home. Yet we have got an urgent matter on our hands, we have been told; yet leadership is saying: But just go home.

Well, if this is such an urgent matter, why are we going home?

And I also will bring up the point again that tomorrow we are scheduled to hear from the DNI. Let's give that process its due, and let's know facts before we speak and before we pass judgment. That is all we are asking to do.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER).

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Speaker, I thank the chair of the committee for yielding.

Madam Speaker, this is a powder keg. This is not as my colleagues on the other side are trying to suggest it is, but they are dealing with alternative facts.

As co-chair of the Whistleblower Caucus, I can point to the fact that $54 billion has been returned to the taxpayers of this country because men and women had the courage to stand up and point out tax evasion, fraud, abuse, and waste.

Now, we have a whistleblower here who was defined as not being a whistleblower by the Attorney General, and now we are all saying he is a whistleblower. He doesn't even have the protections of a whistleblower based on the analysis by the Attorney General.

One thing is very clear here, Members: But for the fact that this whistleblower came forward, but for the fact that the inspector general found that it was both credible and urgent, and but for the fact, after the DNI did not deem it to be sent to the committee, it was the inspector general who had the courage to contact the chair of this committee to inform him that there was a whistleblower pending that brought this all to the fore.

So let's be very clear: There was a concerted effort by the administration to shut down this whistleblower, to restrict the money that was supposed to go to Ukraine on June 18—or July 18.

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

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Speaker, I am proud to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the Speaker.

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding, and I commend him for his great patriotism, for the equanimity that he brings to all that he does with great wisdom and judgment.

Madam Speaker, just over a week ago, when our Nation observed the anniversary of the adoption of our Constitution, on that very day, news broke of great allegations which were a threat to our Constitution.

On that day, the intelligence community inspector general formally notified Congress that the administration was forbidding him from turning over a whistleblower complaint that he found to be of ''urgent concern'' and ''credible.''

The administration's refusal to turn over the full complaint is a violation of the law, which is unequivocal, stating that the DNI, the Director of National Intelligence, shall provide Congress with the full complaint.

I repeat, that obligation is mandatory.

Shortly thereafter, the American people learned of a phone call from the White House calling upon a foreign power to intervene in the upcoming election. Today's release of the notes of the call by the White House confirms this behavior, which undermines the integrity of our elections, the dignity of any Presidency, and our national security.

Let us repeat the facts:

The intelligence community inspector general, who was appointed by President Trump, determined that the complaint was both of ''urgent concern and credible,'' and its disclosure ''relates to one of the most significant and important of the Director of National Intelligence's responsibilities to the American people.''

I want to talk a moment, Madam Speaker, if I may, about whistleblowers.

First, let me say what an asset the intelligence community is to the security of our country. We talk about our men and women in uniform, and we praise them. We could never thank them enough. Our intelligence community personnel are a significant part of the national security of our country.

Whistleblowers, in any part of the government, are important, but whistleblowers can be defined as an act of reporting waste, fraud, abuse, and corruption in a lawful manner to those who can correct the wrongdoing.

The intelligence community has publicly recognized the importance of whistle blowing and supports protections for whistleblowers who conform to guidelines to protect classified information.

This is a very important balance, and when laws were written—and I was there for it as a member of the committee and as ranking member and part of the Gang of Four, before I even became part of the leadership. I saw the evolution of these laws and then the improvements on them, with further protection for whistleblowers.

I was also there for the creation of the Office of the Director of National Intelligence and the relationship between the two, and it is a careful balance of protecting whistleblowers but also protecting our national security and our intelligence—our intelligence.

So, in any event, one of the bills we wrote was the Intelligence Community Whistleblower Protection Act. The law plays a vital role in our democracy. It enables our system of separation of powers to maintain the rule of law by making sure that the abuses of unlawful actions are known, first through

the inspector general of the intelligence community, and then the congressional intelligence committees, House and Senate, which can act upon it.

The statute does not permit the DNI to second-guess the inspector general's determination of any complaint he finds to be ''credible.'' At no point in the history of this law has a DNI ever refused to turn over a whistleblower's complaint that has been found by the IG as ''credible.'' Refusing to do this is a violation of the law.

Our national security depends on this framework. This vote today is about more than just any one President. This resolution is about the preservation of our American system of government.

Once we pass this resolution—and I acknowledge that we are joining the Senate, which passed it without objection yesterday, unanimously—the DNI will be faced with a choice: to honor his responsibility to help preserve our Republic or to break the law.

This resolution passed by unanimous consent—I repeat—in the Senate. Every Member, Democratic and Republican, should join us in passing this in the House.

While we await the release of the full complaint, we reiterate our call for the release of the full transcript of the call between President Trump and the Ukrainian President and reiterate our call to protect whistleblowers from retaliation.

Madam Speaker, I urge a bipartisan vote to defend our national security and to protect our democracy.

Mr. WENSTRUP. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. SWALWELL).

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Madam Speaker, the gentleman from Ohio had asked earlier: Where does it say in the President's notes—and these are notes; this is not a transcript—the word, ''favor''?

Page 3, I would direct the gentleman: ''I would like you to do us a favor,'' the President of the United States says.

And the problem with this mob-like tactic is that, when you ask someone to do a favor, you owe that person something in return. And, when that person is a foreign leader, that means, as President of the United States, one day you will have to put a foreign leader's interests ahead of America's interests.

This is only the tip of the iceberg, this note that the President has released, and that is why it is important that we hear from the whistleblower.

It is also important to note that Ukraine depends on the U.S. economically, militarily, and the credibility we afford to them when we support them. So, you don't need to be explicit with them when you tell them that you need a favor and you are withholding military funds.

In this case, the whistleblower did everything right; so now it is time for the Acting Director of National Intelligence to do the same.

Mr. WENSTRUP. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASTRO).

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Madam Speaker, I, too, look forward to reviewing the whistleblower's complaint, shortly.

I want to start by saying thank you to the whistleblower. We don't know if it is a man or a woman, the person's identity, yet, but I want to say thank you for having the courage and the bravery to come forward and reveal—at least in terms of what we have seen from the transcript—abuse of power by the President of the United States.

We must protect a whistleblower who comes forward and puts himself or herself and their career on the line. I hope that this Congress will be committed to doing that.

These are very serious charges, an abuse of power that includes coercing a foreign leader into digging up dirt against a political rival for the President's political gain, to win reelection; asking a personal lawyer, his personal lawyer, to go along with this.

It appears as though the State Department and, perhaps, the Secretary of State may also be implicated in this scandal.

Madam Speaker, I look forward to passing this resolution. I hope all will support it.

□ 1530

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

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

Mr. WELCH. Madam Speaker, this resolution really raises a question to each one of us who is a Member of Congress; and that question is: Do we believe in the separate, independent authority of the legislative branch to conduct oversight?

The contents of this resolution and the whistleblower report, to be sure, are extremely explosive and important. But the question that we have to ask, as a Congress, Republicans and Democrats, is: Are we willing to stand up for the constitutional authority of the House as a representative branch of government?

That is the constitutional question. This resolution goes to the heart of our responsibility. We must pass it in order for us to be a coequal branch of government.

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. HIMES), and I ask unanimous consent that he may control that time.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HIMES. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY).

Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, if I understand, the Republican argument is that the document doesn't contain an explicit quid pro quo.

Well, let me remind my friends, you don't need to state an explicit quid pro quo to break your oath. You don't need to state an explicit quid pro quo to break the law. You don't need to state an explicit quid pro quo when you have conducted the quid pro quo, when you have withheld the military aid.

You don't need to state an explicit quid pro quo when you have launched a cover-up by violating the law by refusing to produce the whistleblower complaint as you are required to do.

All of these actions are contained in the recent statements of the President and in the plain language of the White House document. And the idea, the idea that we can't wait a day to get the transcript ignores the fact that, for three weeks, they have ignored the law in producing the whistleblower complaint; and we would not have it ever if it weren't for the actions of the Democrats in this House.

And the talking point that this issue should hinge on the explicitness of the quid pro quo is nothing more than a smokescreen to hide the fact that the President's conduct is a violation of the law, and a violation of his oath, and more than justifies the production of the whistleblower complaint and the launching of an impeachment inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

Mr. WENSTRUP. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL).

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WENSTRUP) for yielding the time.

I listened to what my friend just came to the well to say, and it sounds as if we are not working on a nonbinding House Resolution today. It sounds as if we are working on Articles of Impeachment today. If folks want to get on to Articles of Impeachment, get on with it.

I want to associate myself with my friend from Vermont who said this is an Article I, Article II question. And I want to ask my colleagues, again, if you are ready to get going with impeachment articles, bring them, and let's have that debate on the floor.

This is a nonbinding resolution that says to our coequal branch of government, we have an oversight responsibility, and we want to see some paperwork. Now, the Senate already passed the same nonbinding resolution yesterday. We are not breaking any new ground here.

But, yes, if the Intelligence Committee wants to review documents in a closed session, they ought to have access to those documents. That is not a complicated question.

I want to ask my colleagues how we are advantaged as an institution by turning this into an us against them.

Again, when you get ready to go down the Articles of Impeachment, it is going to be an us against them. I have seen no crimes and lots of hearings. I have heard lots of promises and absolutely no there, there.

But we have an opportunity, I dare say, an obligation, to conduct ourselves in a way that, forbid the thought, should one day our Nation have to go down that path, we have the credibility to lead that discussion.

You have an hour of debate here that we can absolutely use, and the Speaker can continue to admonish Members not to engage in personalities with the President. We can absolutely conduct ourselves in that way if that is what we would like.

Or we could follow the pathway of the United States; do this in a bipartisan way to say we have got a coequal branch of government that has a right to see these documents and be done with it.

I will remind my colleagues who are raising their constitutional ire today that this institution held President Obama's Attorney General in both civil and criminal contempt, and we got no support, save 17 Members, to make that happen.

Mr. HIMES. Madam Speaker, may I inquire as to the time remaining for the majority.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Connecticut has 6½ minutes remaining.

Mr. HIMES. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. DEMINGS).

Mrs. DEMINGS. Madam Speaker, Republican President Teddy Roosevelt said that ''patriotism means to stand by the country.'' It does not mean to stand by the President at any cost.

The whistleblower is a patriot who stood up for their country. It is time for Americans of good conscience, starting with every member of this committee, to follow in that patriot's footsteps and unite behind the belief that no one is above the law.

The President has abused the powers of his office. Perhaps he is afraid of losing the next election. Perhaps it is just who he is.

When the President of Ukraine brought up a request to buy military equipment from the United States, the President said—and yes, it is quite clear—''I would like you to do us a favor.''

But even worse, press reports indicate that the whistleblower's complaint was far more extensive than any one call.

The ongoing cover-up by this White House has prevented us from immediately reviewing the report that is required by law.

Further, the administration must immediately move to ensure that the whistleblower is fully protected as required under law.

To my colleagues, history is about to be written at this moment. I ask you to think about your place in that history. Decide whether you want to defend and stand up for corruption or abuse of power or stand up for the country we all swore to protect.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

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

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

It may turn out that this resolution is unnecessary. I understand procedures are being made to provide the complaint, I hope, the full whistleblower complaint, to the Congress and, specifically, to the Intelligence Committee. If that is true, that is a good first step. It is a step, of course, that is remedying the blatant violation of law that this administration engaged in when they chose to stop the transmittal of that complaint to the Congress.

But I do want to take this opportunity to just clear up some things that were said, because these are serious matters, and it is important that the American people understand the truth.

Mr. SCALISE came before this body and ridiculed the majority, saying that we had promised a quid pro quo, a statement that is, of course, absurd on the face of it. We made no such promise. In fact, we have spent the day explaining that a quid pro quo is not necessary for the kind of extortion that is evident in the so-called transcript that we received today.

Bribery requires a quid pro quo; if you do this, I will pay you that. Extortion is simply saying you better do me a favor, or else.

So there was no promise of a quid pro quo. Neither is it necessary for this behavior to be well beyond the pale.

And I would remind my friends in the minority that we did not bring this moment upon the Congress. The inspector general came to this Congress of his own volition and, I would add, at significant personal risk, because of his concern over the actions of the administration.

It emerges today that the Acting DNI perhaps threatened to resign his position unless the Department of Justice gave a legal justification for his stance.

So we are not here because we want to be here. The Speaker of the House, as every Member of this Chamber knows, has resisted, until yesterday, even using the word impeachment because she is that focused on the sentiment of the American people and the consequences of that dramatic step.

So I do not want to hear from my friends in the minority that this has been a train that we have been barreling down.

We are not here because we are happy. We are here because there is a genuine threat to this republic and to this democracy. We were brought here by members of the administration who raised their hand and said something is not right.

So this resolution and its contents may be remedied later this afternoon; I certainly hope so. But let's be clear about what really happened and how we got here, because I suspect this is not the final word in this discussion, and the American people deserve to know the truth.

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

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

Madam Speaker, I heard something before, that no one asks for a favor that doesn't want something in return. You know, when my wife asks me for a favor, I don't ask for something in return, I have got to tell you.

And I have to say, I agree with what Mr. WELCH had to say today. I thank the gentleman for his words. We do have an oversight, but we also have a process in our country.

So I am very curious to hear tomorrow, fortunately, in an open hearing, what the DNI has to say, and how he may have interpreted the law differently, or DOJ did. And I think that the American people deserve that, and I am glad it is going to be in an open hearing.

There is a lot we can talk about. We can go back and forth on this. But I will tell you, amongst my constituents, what I hear at home is that there is a lot of hypocrisy out here.

When you talk about having oversight, or quid pro quo, and you are only willing to look at one side of it, or one event of it, or one possible event of it, I should say, only willing to look in one direction, you lose the trust of the American people. You lose the trust of the American people.

When I was a child, I watched the Watergate hearings. Do you know what I was impressed with?

You had both sides of the aisle seeking the truth, regardless of who was in power or who was in question.

We haven't seen that for 3 years. So, let's get this resolution on the floor. It is a foregone conclusion. We are all in agreement. This is something we want brought forward. Half of it already has been, and the other half is being delivered at 4:00.

That is what we were here to debate today, this resolution. You wouldn't know it was a resolution we were all in favor of. So let's have our vote and move on.

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

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise to support H. Res. 576—Expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the whistleblower complaint of August 12, 2019, made to the Inspector General of the Intelligence Community.

Allegations that the President of the United States sought to enlist a foreign government to interfere in our democratic process by investigating one of his political rivals, and may have used the withholding of Congressionally appropriated military aid, days earlier as intimidation, is a clear problem. We must have all

of the facts so that we can do what is required under law and get to the bottom of what actually took place. This is not a partisan matter. It is an American matter that must be investigated so that we can continue to protect our democracy against outside attacks.

This resolution expresses the sense of the House that the whistleblower complaint received on August 12, 2019, by the Inspector General of the Intelligence Community should be transmitted immediately to the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

Our Constitution demands respect for the rule of law. As a Member of Congress, I will continue to uphold our American principles and values. I urge passage of this resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 577, the previous question is ordered on the resolution, as amended.

The question is on the resolution.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

□ 1545

HOMELAND SECURITY IMPROVEMENT ACT

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 577, I call up the bill (H.R. 2203) to increase transparency, accountability, and community engagement within the Department of Homeland Security, provide independent oversight of border security activities, improve training for agents and officers of U.S. Customs and Border Protection and U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ESPAILLAT). Pursuant to House Resolution 577, in lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Homeland Security printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116–27, modified by the amendment printed in House Report 116–217, is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 2203

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

SECTION 1. ESTABLISHMENT OF THE OFFICE OF THE OMBUDSMAN FOR BORDER AND IMMIGRATION ENFORCEMENT RELATED CONCERNS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title VII of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 341 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''SEC. 711. OMBUDSMAN FOR BORDER AND IMMIGRATION ENFORCEMENT RELATED CONCERNS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Within the Department there shall be a position of Ombudsman for Border and Immigration Enforcement Related Concerns (in this section referred to as the 'Ombudsman'), who shall—

''(1) be independent of Department agencies and officers;

''(2) report directly to the Secretary; and

''(3) have a background in immigration law, civil rights, and law enforcement.

''(b) FUNCTIONS.—It shall be the function of the Ombudsman to—

''(1) in coordination with the Inspector General of the Department, establish an independent, neutral, accessible, confidential, and standardized process to assist individuals (including aliens (as such term is defined in section 101 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101)) in resolving complaints with respect to U.S. Customs and Border Protection, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, a subcontractor, or a cooperating entity, which process shall include a publicly accessible website through which a complainant can check on the status of such a complaint;

''(2) identify and thereafter review, examine, and make recommendations to the Secretary to address chronic issues identified by the Ombudsman in carrying out the function described in paragraph (1);

''(3) establish a Border Oversight Panel in accordance with subsection (f); and

''(4) review compliance with departmental policies and standards of care for custody of aliens by U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement and U.S. Customs and Border Protection, including any violations of applicable policy or standards of care involving force-feeding.

''(c) CONFIDENTIALITY.—The existence of a complaint, including the identity of any Department employee implicated in a complaint, shall be kept confidential by the Ombudsman and, in the absence of the written consent of an individual who submits a complaint, the Ombudsman shall keep confidential the identity of and any identifying information relating to such individual. Such confidentiality requirement may not be considered as a factor of whether or not information under this subsection may be disclosed under section 552 of title 5, United Stated Code (commonly referred to as the Freedom of Information Act).

''(d) ANNUAL REPORTING.—Not later than June 30 of each year beginning in the year after the date of the enactment of this section, the Ombudsman shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate a report that includes, for the previous year, the following:

''(1) The number and types of complaints received under this section and for each complaint—

''(A) the component or subcomponent, subcontractor, or cooperating entity identified;

''(B) the demographics of the complainant; and

''(C) a description of the resolution of the complaint or the status of the resolution process.

''(2) Any complaint pattern that could be prevented or reduced by policy training or practice changes.

''(3) A description of any pattern of violations of any applicable policy or standards.

''(4) A description of each complaint received under this section with respect to which U.S. Customs and Border Protection, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, a subcontractor, or a cooperating entity, as applicable, has taken action to resolve, and the time between receipt and resolution of each such complaint.

''(5) A description of complaints received under this section for which action has not been taken after one year, and the period during which each complaint has been open.

''(6) Recommendations the Ombudsman has made under subsection (b)(2).

''(7) Other information, as determined appropriate by the Ombudsman .

''(e) APPOINTMENT OF BORDER COMMUNITIES LIAISON.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Ombudsman, in conjunction with the Office for Civil Rights and Civil Liberties of the Department, shall appoint a Border Community Liaison (in this subsection referred to as the 'Liaison') in each U.S. Border Patrol sector on the northern and southern borders. Each Liaison shall report to the Ombudsman.

''(2) PURPOSES.—Each Liaison appointed under this subsection shall—

''(A) foster cooperation between U.S. Customs and Border Protection, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, and border communities;

''(B) consult with border communities on the development of policies, directives, and programs of U.S. Customs and Border Protection and U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement;

''(C) receive feedback from border communities on the performance of U.S. Customs and Border Protection and U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement; and

''(D) submit to the Ombudsman an annual report detailing their findings, feedback received from border communities, and recommendations to increase cooperation between U.S. Customs and Border Protection, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, and border communities.

''(f) BORDER OVERSIGHT PANEL.—

''(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Ombudsman shall establish a Border Oversight Panel (in this subsection referred to as the 'Panel').

''(2) COMPOSITION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Panel shall be composed of 30 members selected by the Ombudsman.

''(B) CHAIRPERSON.—The Ombudsman shall be the chair of the Panel.

''(C) EXPERTISE.—Members of the Panel shall have expertise in immigration, local crime indices, civil and human rights, community relations, cross-border trade and commerce, quality of life indicators, or other experience the Ombudsman determines is appropriate, and shall include individuals who reside in or near border counties.

''(3) DUTIES.—The Panel shall evaluate and make recommendations regarding the border enforcement policies, strategies, and programs of the Department operating along the northern and southern borders of the United States to—

''(A) take into consideration the impact of such policies, strategies, and programs on border communities, including protecting due process, civil and human rights of border residents and visitors, and private property rights of land owners;

''(B) uphold domestic and international legal obligations;

''(C) reduce the number of migrant deaths; and

''(D) improve the safety of agents and officers of U.S. Customs and Border Protection and U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement.

''(g) STAFFING.—The Secretary shall take appropriate action to ensure the Ombudsman's office is sufficiently staffed and resourced to carry out its duties effectively and efficiently.

''(h) TRAINING.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Ombudsman shall conduct a yearly evaluation of all training given to agents and officers of U.S. Customs and Border Protection and U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement.

''(2) CONTENTS.—Each evaluation under paragraph (1) shall include whether the training referred to in such paragraph adequately addresses the following:

''(A) Best practices in community policing, cultural awareness, and carrying out enforcement actions near sensitive locations, such as

places of worship or religious ceremony, school or education-related places or events, courthouses or other civic buildings providing services accessible to the public, hospitals, medical treatment or health care facilities, public demonstrations, and attorney's offices (including a public defender or legal aid offices).

''(B) Policies for operating in locations where there are limitations on cooperation by local law enforcement.

''(C) Interaction with vulnerable populations, including instruction on screening, identifying, and responding to vulnerable populations, such as children, victims of human trafficking, and the acutely ill.

''(D) Standards of professional and ethical conduct, including the following:

''(i) Lawful use of force, de-escalation tactics, and alternatives to the use of force.

''(ii) Complying with chain of command and lawful orders.

''(iii) Conduct and ethical behavior toward the public in a civil and professional manner.

''(iv) Civil rights and legal protections for nationals of the United States and aliens.

''(v) Non-biased questioning.

''(vi) Sensitivity towards lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer individuals.

''(vii) Permissible and impermissible social media activity.

''(viii) Sexual and other harassment and assault, including an assessment of whether adequate policies exist to resolve complaints.

''(E) Protecting the civil, constitutional, human, and privacy rights of individuals, with special emphasis on the scope of enforcement authority, including chain of evidence practices and document seizure, and use of force policies available to agents and officers.

''(F) Maintaining and updated understanding of Federal legal rulings, court decisions, and Department policies and procedures.

''(G) The scope of agents' and officers' authority to conduct immigration enforcement activities, including interviews, interrogations, stops, searches, arrests, and detentions, in addition to identifying and detecting fraudulent documents.

''(3) RECOMMENDATIONS.—Not later than 90 days after conducting each evaluation under paragraph (1), the Ombudsman shall develop, and submit to the Secretary, recommendations regarding any additional training.

''(4) FEEDBACK.—Not later than 180 days after receiving recommendations transmitted by the Ombudsman, the Secretary shall respond publicly and in writing with feedback on each of the recommendations, an action plan to implement any of such recommendations with which the Secretary concurs, and a justification for why any of such recommendations have been rejected.

''(i) ELECTRONIC TRACKING.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Ombudsman, in coordination with the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection, the Director of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, and the Office of Refugee Resettlement of the Department of Health and Human Services, shall develop recommendations for the establishment of an electronic tracking number system on a single interface, which shall be used to track the location of a child who has been separated from a parent, legal guardian, or other relative of such child, and which shall be accessible to agents and officers of U.S. Customs and Border Protection, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, and the Office of Refugee Resettlement.

''(2) TRACKING NUMBER.—The recommendations developed under this subsection shall consider how a tracking number can be assigned to a child who has been separated from a parent, legal guardian, or other relative of such child that—

''(A) is transferrable;

''(B) may be shared easily on the electronic tracking system described in this subsection by agents and officers of—

''(i) U.S. Customs and Border Protection;

''(ii) U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement; and

''(iii) the Office of Refugee Resettlement of the Department of Health and Human Services; and

''(C) is interoperable with the electronic location records of a parent, legal guardian, or other relative of such child.

''(j) BODY-WORN CAMERAS.—

''(1) REQUIREMENT.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this section, the Ombudsman, in coordination with the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection, the Director of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, and labor organizations representing agents and officers of U.S. Customs and Border Protection and U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate a plan for requiring, not later than one year after such date of enactment, the use of body-worn cameras by U.S. Border Patrol agents and U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement officers whenever such agents and officers are engaged in border security or immigration enforcement activities.

''(2) ELEMENTS.—The plan required under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

''(A) Benchmarks for implementation of the use of body-worn cameras within U.S. Customs and Border Protection and U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement.

''(B) Policies, procedures, and training modules for the use of body-worn cameras by agents and officers of U.S. Customs and Border Protection and U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, including training modules relating to the appropriate use of such cameras and adverse action for non-compliance.

''(C) Mechanisms to ensure compliance with body-worn camera policies and procedures.

''(3) CONSIDERATIONS.—The plan required under paragraph (1) shall be informed by—

''(A) existing State and local policies requiring the use of body-worn cameras; and

''(B) principles regarding body-worn cameras published by major civil and human rights organizations.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 is amended by adding after the item relating to section 710 the following new item:

''Sec. 711. Ombudsman for Border and Immigration Enforcement Related Concerns.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill, as amended, shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Homeland Security.

The gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON) and the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ROGERS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on this measure.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2203, the Homeland Security Improvement Act, as amended, seeks to enhance accountability for how the Department of Homeland Security carries out its border security and immigration enforcement activities.

For years, the complaints process at DHS has been fragmented. While the inspector general of DHS reviews allegations of unlawful activity by Department personnel, other complaints must go through Customs and Border Protection or Immigration and Customs Enforcement first.

Further, the process for filing a complaint can be complicated and confusing. Additionally, there is no central mechanism for residents of border communities to speak out about how DHS' operations affect their day-to-day lives or the environment around them.

H.R. 2203, as we are considering it today, would establish a new ombudsman to carry out an independent, neutral, and confidential process to help resolve complaints with respect to the Department's border and immigration enforcement activities. The ombudsman would also note patterns in the types of complaints received to identify any systemic issues.

The communities most directly impacted by DHS' border and immigration enforcement activities are those that are on our borders with Mexico and Canada.

Under H.R. 2203, the ombudsman would appoint border community liaisons to serve in sectors along the northern and southern borders to foster better communication and meaningful engagement with these communities.

The ombudsman is also required to stand up a border oversight panel to make recommendations on border and immigration policies and programs with attention to DHS activities that affect due process, property rights, and the safety of migrants and officers.

H.R. 2203 is also intended to ensure greater oversight of the training that frontline personnel receive. Specifically, the ombudsman would annually evaluate the CBP and ICE agents and officers training, particularly on standards for professional and ethical conduct, and make recommendations on any needed improvements.

Additionally, the bill directs the ombudsman to develop an implementation plan to require the use of body-worn cameras by Border Patrol agents and ICE officers while engaged in border security or immigration enforcement activities.

While the current administration's activities in this area warrant heightened scrutiny, several issues, such as conditions in ICE detention or insufficient consultation with property owners by U.S. Border Patrol, have persisted for years.

H.R. 2203 represents a step in the right direction to bring greater transparency and accountability to DHS. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

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

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, DC, July 18, 2019.

Hon. BENNIE G. THOMPSON,
Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is to advise you that the Committee on the Judiciary has now had an opportunity to review the provisions in H.R. 2203, the ''Homeland Security Improvement Act'' that fall with our Rule X jurisdiction. I appreciate your consulting with us on those provisions. The Judiciary Committee has no objection to your including them in the bill for consideration on the House floor, and to expedite that consideration is willing to waive sequential referral, with the understanding that we do not thereby waive any future jurisdictional claim over those provisions or their subject matters.

In the event a House-Senate conference on this or similar legislation is convened, the Judiciary Committee reserves the right to request an appropriate number of conferees to address any concerns with these or similar provisions that may arise in conference.

Please place this letter into the Congressional Record during consideration of the measure on the House floor. Thank you for the cooperative spirit in which you have worked regarding this matter and others between our committees.

Sincerely,

JERROLD NADLER,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY,
Washington, DC July 18, 2019.

Hon. JERROLD NADLER,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN NADLER: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 2203, the ''Homeland Security Improvement Act.'' The Committee on Homeland Security recognizes that the Committee on the Judiciary has a jurisdictional interest in H.R. 2203, and I appreciate your effort to allow this bill to be considered on the House floor.

I concur with you that forgoing action on the bill does not in any way prejudice the Committee on the Judiciary with respect to its jurisdictional prerogatives on this bill or similar legislation in the future, and I would support your effort to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House—Senate conference involving this legislation.

I will include our letters on H.R. 2203 in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of this bill. I look forward to working with you on this legislation and other matters of great importance to this nation.

Sincerely,

BENNIE G. THOMPSON,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
Washington, DC, September 25, 2019.

Hon. BENNIE G. THOMPSON,
Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: In order to expedite consideration of H.R. 2203, the Homeland Security Improvement Act, the Committee on Ways and Means has agreed to waive formal consideration of provisions that fall within the rule X jurisdiction of the Committee. We do so with the understanding that the authority given to the Ombudsmen in Title II of the bill, relating to the enforcement activities of U.S. Customs and Border Protection, does not include authority to enforce trade laws. The Committee also reserves the right to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this or similar legislation.

I would appreciate your response to this letter confirming this understanding and would ask that a copy of our exchange of letter on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of H.R. 2203.

Sincerely,

RICHARD E. NEAL,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY,
Washington, DC, September 25, 2019.

Hon. RICHARD NEAL,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN NEAL: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 2203, the ''Homeland Security Improvement Act.'' The Committee on Homeland Security recognizes that the Committee on Ways and Means has a jurisdictional interest in H.R. 2203, and I appreciate your effort to allow this bill to be considered on the House floor.

I concur with you that the authority given to the Ombudsman in Title II of the bill is not intended to include authority regarding trade law enforcement complaints. Should you choose to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House—Senate conference involving this legislation, I would support that effort.

I will include our letters on H.R. 2203 in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of this bill. I look forward to working with you on this legislation and other matters of great importance to this nation.

Sincerely,

BENNIE G. THOMPSON,
Chairman.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 2203.

Over this past fiscal year, law enforcement has encountered nearly a million migrants illegally crossing the southwest border.

For months, records of migrant families and unaccompanied children overwhelmed obsolete Customs and Border Protection facilities, creating an unprecedented humanitarian crisis. And for months, Democrats did nothing. They said the crisis wasn't real. Then they said the President manufactured it.

Then, after months of ignoring pictures of children and families living in overcrowded conditions, Democrats finally agreed to the President's request for emergency funding. Now, thanks to that funding and the administration's efforts to reach agreements with Mexico and some Northern Triangle countries, the crisis has finally abated.

Congress should use this opportunity to advance a bipartisan bill to address the causes of the border crisis and prevent another one from happening. Unfortunately, Democrats have chosen to squander the opportunity. Instead, they decided to move yet another partisan messaging bill that stands no chance of becoming law.

All this bill does is waste taxpayers' dollars on a duplicative new office designed to demoralize law enforcement and serve the demands of illegal immigrants. It should really be called the illegal immigrant customer service act.

The bill creates a new ombudsman at the Department of Homeland Security to collect and review complaints made by illegal immigrants against Federal law enforcement officers.

The Department already has an Office of Inspector General and an Office for Civil Rights and Liberties required by law to collect and investigate complaints against DHS personnel, as well as recommended relief for the complainant. Both offices maintain tip lines for anonymous complaints and websites to collect complaints, and both regularly report to Congress on their caseload.

It is unclear how creating another bureaucrat with a duplicative mission will improve the current process. It is clear, however, that this new bureaucrat will further demoralize the men and women of law enforcement.

The bill empowers the ombudsman to scrutinize the training and conduct of ICE and CBP officers on an ongoing basis.

The bill also includes a bogus oversight panel comprised of so-called quality of life indicators to make recommendations on how ICE and CBP officers should carry out their law enforcement mission.

Every day, the men and women of ICE and CBP put their lives in danger to keep our families and communities safe. They faithfully and skillfully carry out their duty to enforce Federal immigration law. Congress should be moving legislation to thank them, not second-guess and criticize them.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation started out as an attempt by Democrats to appease radical leftwing open border activists. The original bill was chock-full of so many absurd provisions that the Speaker was forced to pull it from floor consideration in July. The bill has been rewritten six times to get it to this point where just enough Democrats will vote for it to pass it.

But it didn't have to be such a partisan exercise. We could have worked together to move comprehensive legislation to truly prevent another crisis at our border.

Republicans are ready and willing to work with Democrats on serious proposals to reform our asylum laws to reduce the pull factors for illegal immigration, to protect vulnerable families and children from exploitation by human smugglers, to expand migrant processing and long-term housing facilities to eliminate dangerous overcrowding, and to hire additional immigration lawyers and judges to reduce the unprecedented backlog in asylum cases.

When this partisan bill fails to move in the Senate, I hope Democrats will finally choose policy over politics and will agree to work with Republicans on solutions to our border security problems.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. ESCOBAR), the sponsor of this legislation.

Ms. ESCOBAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2203, the Homeland Security Improvement Act.

I would first like to thank Speaker PELOSI and Chairman THOMPSON for their steadfast leadership and for helping get this bill to the floor. Mr. Speaker, this moment never would have been possible without Mr. THOMPSON's perseverance and hard work.

H.R. 2203 started at our southern border as a community-driven effort to boost accountability and transparency within DHS. To that end, I would like to especially thank the Border Network for Human Rights, an El Paso-based organization that works tirelessly to ensure migrants and border communities are treated with the dignity and respect that we all deserve.

Those of us who live within the 100-mile border enforcement zone have often had our civil rights impeded because some basic constitutional principles don't fully apply to us.

Since the creation of DHS in 2003, our government has spent over $300 billion, including two supplemental bills passed this year, on the agencies that carry out immigration enforcement, largely within that 100-mile zone. This enormous taxpayer investment has created a situation where the American taxpayer spends more money on immigration enforcement than on all other Federal law enforcement agencies combined.

Unfortunately, especially for those of us who live within that 100-mile enforcement zone, this spending has not included corresponding oversight or accountability measures. This bill seeks to change that with the creation of an ombudsman for border and immigration-related concerns.

The ombudsman, in conjunction with the inspector general at DHS, will be charged with establishing an independent, neutral, and confidential process to assist individuals, including personnel, with complaints against Immigration and Customs Enforcement and U.S. Customs and Border Protection.

The ombudsman is also responsible for reviewing CBP and ICE compliance with all departmental policies and standards related to the treatment of migrants in custody.

This function was a priority for me after learning about child deaths in Federal custody; after having witnessed severe overcrowding in Border Patrol facilities; after hearing in my community, in El Paso, Texas, concerns from agents over and over again about leadership not listening to them and about policies they were forced to enforce; and after interviewing ICE detainees in my hometown who were subjected to force-feeding, an inhumane practice that is tantamount to torture.

I have heard countless times from my constituents and other border residents that they need to have a voice in crafting border policies because we are the ones most impacted. H.R. 2203 will allow them this opportunity through the establishment of both a border community liaison and a border oversight panel. Both seek to foster communication and cooperation between DHS and the community by giving border residents an opportunity to provide feedback and recommendations regarding border policies.

This panel will also help improve conditions for agents and officers. For example, one responsibility of the border oversight panel is to evaluate policies to enhance their safety.

The bill also requires the ombudsman to conduct annual evaluations of all training provided and will examine whether key areas are covered, including community policing, which builds trust; enforcement near sensitive locations; interacting with vulnerable populations; and professional and ethical conduct, such as lawful use of force, LGBTQ sensitivity, and sexual harassment.

El Paso has been at the epicenter of much of the humanitarian chaos our Nation has seen, like being the testing ground for the cruel family separation policy that continues to this day. To help speed up reunifications of these families, H.R. 2203 requires the ombudsman, in conjunction with the CBP Commissioner, ICE Director, and the Office of Refugee Resettlement, to develop recommendations for the establishment of an electronic tracking number system on a single, interoperable interface.

Finally, the ombudsman is responsible for developing a plan for outlining the use of body-worn cameras by Border Patrol agents and ICE officers when engaged in border security and immigration enforcement activities, something local police forces have embraced.

The plan must be crafted in conjunction with the CBP Commissioner, the ICE Director, and relevant labor organizations that represent these officers and agents. It must also consider existing State and local body-worn camera policies.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. ESCOBAR) an additional 1 minute.

□ 1600

Ms. ESCOBAR. Mr. Speaker, it must also consider existing State and local body-worn camera policies and principles developed by major civil and human rights organizations, so that DHS can build upon best practices for each community.

This plan further ensures that safety needs are met, and trust is built.

All of these features will be invaluable tools to make sure that we address our Nation's immigration challenges in a common sense and humane way.

Today, we have the opportunity to come together and begin to make a powerful and well-funded Federal agency more accountable to the Congress and to the people that they serve. The ombudsman's role will fill much needed gaps in transparency, oversight, training, and trust.

Mr. Speaker, I am very proud of this legislation. It comes right from the communities that are impacted the most. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I find it amazing that the majority, the Democrat majority, would like to see us prioritize establishing electronic medical records for illegal immigrants when we still haven't been able to provide that for veterans in our country or our military, and we have been working on it for years.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. JOYCE), a member of the Committee on Homeland Security.

Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 2203, yet another one of the majority's messaging bills that would do nothing to address the crisis on our southern border.

At home in Pennsylvania's 13th Congressional District, nearly 2,000 miles away from the southern border, this crisis is taking a tangible toll on our communities. As illicit drugs continue to pour across the southern border and infiltrate into my district, addiction and death are occurring.

If we continue to kick the solutions down the road, we are choosing simply not to act.

Today, we could be voting to stop the human trafficking, to stop the drug trafficking, to stop the cartels and the violent criminals who permeate into our country. H.R. 2203 does not address the real problems.

Instead of passing this do-nothing bill, I ask that we return to the Homeland Security Committee and work on a bipartisan basis to secure our border, to end the asylum loopholes, and to protect this great country.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. GARCIA).

Ms. GARCIA of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 2203, a bill introduced by my dear friend from Texas, Congresswoman VERONICA ESCOBAR.

There is a humanitarian crisis at the southern border and within the American immigration system. The Homeland Security Improvement Act is a critical bill, not a do-nothing bill. It is a critical bill that addresses our Nation's immigration challenges at the border in a responsible and humane manner by ensuring accountability and oversight through the creation of an ombudsman.

Our American values, moral conscience, and Constitution require that we treat all individuals on American soil humanely and respectfully. This bill helps ensure that that happens.

Congress must continue working to finally end the humanitarian crisis at the southern border. This is a step in the right direction.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in support of H.R. 2203.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. RUTHERFORD).

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Alabama for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, we have a crisis at the border. Finally, our colleagues across the aisle have recognized that this is not a manufactured crisis.

Just this month, over 800,000 illegal aliens have now crossed our southern border in 2019. That is two times more than crossed in all of 2018.

These numbers are at historic highs in large part due to our broken immigration system that incentivizes illegal crossings, and H.R. 2203 does nothing to fix it.

This bill does nothing to stop children from being used as pawns by traffickers to cross our border. This bill does nothing to support law enforcement officers, which as a lifelong enforcement officer myself, I take particular issue with. This bill does nothing to hire more immigration judges, which are desperately needed in order to decrease the growing and historic backlog of cases that we have now seen. This bill does nothing to alleviate the pressure on our detention facilities.

In fact, this bill will make these problems worse; worse, Mr. Speaker.

Requiring the release of all migrants after 72 hours in detention will incentivize even more people to cross our southern border, because they are guaranteed to be released into the interior of our country.

This bill negates the positive steps that President Trump has taken to secure our southern border.

A bipartisan majority in the House and Senate did not support these ideas before when we passed the border supplemental in June, and they will not support them now.

Instead of giving law enforcement the resources they need to keep our communities safe, House Democrats are tiptoeing around real solutions, and are more interested in obstructing our President than solving problems for the American public.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to vote ''no'' on H.R. 2203.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman and certainly the ranking member for his position on this bill, but I rise with great enthusiasm to support H.R. 2203 by the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas, and as well to indicate to her that I had wished that the joy of doing this would be that we are passing productive legislation, but the sadness is that it is based upon the history and the evidence of what is going on at the southern border where she lives.

So I hope those who are waiting for this bill will realize that it is going to pass this House and that we are going to move this bill to the United States Senate and ask the Senate whether, in fact, they believe in the humanity of all people.

Let me share with you what this bill is about from my perspective. First of all, I take no backseat to dealing with the border patrol agents, the CBP, and any others.

In 2004, Senator Kerry and I, he in the Senate and I in the House, helped contribute to the modernizing of the border patrol, because when I went down to the border, they didn't have the tools that they needed. We gave them the night goggles, we gave them the kinds of equipment that they needed, those heavy terrain vehicles. We gave them the fast boats that they needed.

We gave them their equipment, recognizing that we had been organized just a few years as the Homeland Security Committee, and we wanted our border to be safe and secure, but at the same time, we wanted to make sure that we had comprehensive immigration reform. That was imploded when we could not pass a major bill that came to this House.

So I am curious why anyone would not want to have a bill that says it is the Homeland Security Improvement Act.

So I stand here in the name of Roger, 9 months old, who was separated from his parents by the Trump administration's heinous policies of family separation.

This bill deals with eliminating family separation.

I stand here for the mother who had had a baby, and 45 days after having that baby, she had not been to a hospital, but she was in a detention center.

I think it is fair that there be a policy for border patrol agents to wear those cameras, like any other law enforcement, to protect them and others; the limitation on the separation of families; the prohibition of exceeding 72 hours in short-term detention; the ombudsman, which is so important so that we have a fair investment.

To my friend that was on the floor dealing with human trafficking: Any day of the week, I will join him in a bill that deals with human trafficking. I held the first hearing by Homeland Security on human trafficking in the field almost 8 years ago, because Houston is a known epicenter for human trafficking.

But right now, we are dealing with the improvement of this Department, and I believe this commission is going to be important and crucial for migrant families and children that have been separated and abused by the Trump administration.

Do we want to see human beings in cages? Or do we want to have a fair system that protects the United States and the border from the intrusion of those who would do us harm?

A regular immigration system would allow these desperate families to come and be processed.

I would have wanted the Mexican program to be out. I would have wanted to have my amendment that deals with making sure that the FOIA amendment covers every detention center, private and nonprivate, that would have ensured that they had to report about what was going on inside these detention centers.

Those amendments were not allowed at this time, but we will work with the gentlewoman and work with Homeland Security to make sure that we do not have Members of Congress blocked from coming to these private detention centers that women and children are in.

But this is a good start. This gives tools to those who are in need of those particular tools.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman.

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

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to focus on this: We know in the past year, under this administration, seven-plus children have died. How many adults have also passed? It is as important to report the deaths of individuals in our own prison systems as it is to report migrant deaths. They are human beings.

It is important to be able to use and to understand the use of force. To every law enforcement officer, I say to their families, I want them to go home to their families. But to every human being who comes desperate for the hope and the blessings of America who has not come to do us harm, I want to be able to have the oversight that is in this bill, the accountability and transparency in that border area.

We all know that El Paso has been touted as the safest city in the Nation. It was not an immigrant that killed 22 people. It was not an immigrant whose violence and victimization and utilization of an automatic weapon caused the injuries to the people whom I had to visit in the hospitals of El Paso. It was not an immigrant.

Mr. Speaker, this is a worthy bill that will, in fact, provide the right direction for the Homeland Security Department. I rise to support H.R. 2203.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in support of H.R. 2203, the Homeland Security Improvement Act.

I thank my colleague, Congresswoman ESCOBAR for her leadership in drafting this important piece of legislation.

As a member of the House Committees on the Judiciary and Homeland Security, I am well aware of the many problems associated with this Administration's immigration policy.

Independent Ombudsman:

Establishes an independent Ombudsman for Border and Immigration Related Concerns within DHS.

The functions of the Ombudsman include establishing an independent, neutral, and confidential process to assist individuals with complaints against Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) and U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP).

Provides for annual reporting on the complaints filed, including the number and types of complaints received to identify trends and solve systemic problems.

Reviews compliance by CBP and ICE with all departmental policies and standards related to treatment of migrants in custody, including with respect to force-feeding.

Makes the complaint resolution process easy to follow by establishing a publicly available website.

Border Communities Liaison:

Directs the Ombudsman, in conjunction with the Office for Civil Rights and Civil Liberties at DHS, to appoint a Border Community Liaison in each Border Patrol sector along the northern and southern border to:

foster cooperation between ICE, CBP, and border communities;

consult with border communities on CBP and ICE policies, directives, and programs;

receive feedback from border communities about CBP and ICE activities in the region; and

report annually to the Ombudsman.

Border Oversight Panel:

Directs the Ombudsman to establish a Border Oversight Panel to evaluate and make recommendations regarding the border enforcement policies, strategies, and programs that directly affect border communities.

Specifically directs the Panel to pay special attention to the way DHS policies impact due process, property rights, legal obligations, and migrant and officer safety.

Training Evaluations:

Requires the Ombudsman to conduct annual evaluations of all training given to the agents and officers at CBP and ICE.

The Ombudsman must examine whether there is training in specific key areas including community policing, enforcement near sensitive locations, interacting with vulnerable populations, and professional and ethical conduct (like lawful use of force, LGBTQ sensitivity, and sexual harassment).

Mandates that the Ombudsman provide recommendations to the Secretary on additional training needs. The Secretary must respond to these recommendations publicly within 180 days with an action plan to implement such recommendations and a justification for why any of such recommendations have been rejected.

Body-Worn Cameras:

Directs the Ombudsman, in coordination with CBP Commissioner, ICE Director, and labor organizations representing agents and officers, to submit to Congress a plan for requiring the use of body-worn cameras by U.S. Border Patrol agents and ICE officers when engaged in border security and immigration enforcement activities.

Provides that the plan must consider existing state and local body-worn camera policies and principles developed by major civil and human rights organizations.

I offered an amendment to H.R. 2203, that was not included in this final bill.

This Jackson Lee Amendment, listed as No. 6 on the Rules Committee Roster, makes a good bill better by creating an affirmative obligation on the part of Customs and Border Protection to provide access to records of entities that contract with the agency to provide services related to detention or removal of persons, including children.

The Jackson Lee Amendment states simply:

''In the case of a contractor including a State licensed, vetted, and qualified contractor, and a nonprofit entity, which has a contract with U.S. Customs and Border Protection for the provision of direct or support services associated with providing care for individuals, including unaccompanied alien children, apprehended at the southern border of the United States, any record of the contractor held by U.S. Customs and Border Protection shall be considered an agency record for purposes of section 552 on title 5, United States Code.''

Since 1967, the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) has provided the public the right to request access to records from any federal agency.

It is often described as the law that keeps citizens in the know about their government.

Federal agencies are required to disclose any information requested under the FOIA unless it falls under one of nine exemptions which protect interests such as personal privacy, national security, and law enforcement.

The FOIA also requires agencies to proactively post online certain categories of information, including frequently requested records.

As Congress, the President, and the Supreme Court have all recognized, the FOIA is a vital part of our democracy.

I will continue to work with my colleagues on gaining greater transparency and oversight of CBP.

I ask my colleagues to join me in support of this bill.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. GUEST), a member of the Committee on Homeland Security.

Mr. GUEST. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Homeland Security and a former prosecutor, I rise today to express my concerns regarding H.R. 2203.

While the bill is referred to as the Homeland Security Improvement Act, the legislation does not make improvements to our homeland security, and, in fact, would have no positive impact on resolving the crisis at our southwest border or preventing any future homeland security crisis.

It is the responsibility of Congress to fix gaps in our immigration system that benefit criminals such as human traffickers and drug smugglers.

Instead of addressing these needs, this bill would create even more loopholes.

H.R. 2203 would establish a new and unnecessary position at the Department of Homeland Security that would serve as an additional barrier for law enforcement officers charged with protecting our communities. This new position would overlap with existing positions at DHS, and a panel of appointees or bureaucrats with no prior experience in law enforcement would oversee the border and immigration enforcement process.

□ 1615

Democrats must recognize the efforts, dedication, and sacrifices made each day by members of our law enforcement community to uphold the rule of law. Rather than undermining their roles and duties, we should be focusing on how we can assist these brave men and women who work to maintain our Nation's security.

I recently introduced H.R. 3990, the Operation Stonegarden Authorization Act. This bill would establish a grant program for States bordering Mexico or Canada or those with a maritime border. These grants would provide much-needed resources to help Customs and Border Protection and local law enforcement officers efficiently carry out their mission on behalf of the American people.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in promoting respect for our law enforcement community and providing a sense of gratitude for the work they do to keep us, our families, and our communities safe.

As a member of the Committee on Homeland Security, I voted against this bill when it was considered in committee. Now, I strongly encourage my colleagues to join me in voting against this partisan measure and to, instead, work across the aisle to find real solutions, bipartisan solutions, to make America a safer place to live, to worship, and to raise a family.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, first, I thank Chairman THOMPSON for yielding and for his tremendous leadership not only on issues of security but on so many issues that affect our country.

Also, I thank Congresswoman VERONICA ESCOBAR, who I call my Congresswoman because she represents the wonderful people of my hometown of El Paso, Texas.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support H.R. 2203, the Homeland Security Improvement Act.

I have visited McAllen and Brownsville, Texas, and Homestead. I have witnessed children in cages, sleeping on concrete floors. I had a chance to talk to mothers and fathers who had no idea where their children were.

I served on the conference committee on homeland security as we moved to open the government earlier this year. I have to tell you, there were so many suggestions that were made that

weren't accepted. There were good, rational, concrete suggestions.

This is a critical bill that addresses some of those concerns.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman.

Ms. LEE of California. It creates an independent ombudsman, which will establish a confidential process to assist individuals with complaints against ICE and CBP.

Once more, this bill is important for our children and would develop recommendations for the establishment of an electronic tracking system to track the location of children who have been separated from a parent, legal guardian, or other relative.

We will not stand by while the Trump administration separates children from their families, so this bill takes an important step in the right direction.

By passing this bill today, we are putting critical protocols and protections in place for migrants, making sure that their well-being and health is uplifted at every step.

We cannot allow migrants to be abused by CBP and ICE any longer. It is past time to protect migrants who are seeking a chance to start a new life in America. It is past time we recognize people fleeing violence are human beings who deserve a chance to address and be part of a just immigration system.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on this vital bill.

I thank Chairman THOMPSON and Congresswoman ESCOBAR for finally getting this bill to the floor.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I am prepared to close.

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

Mr. Speaker, this bill demonstrates just how disingenuous Democrats are about securing our borders and fixing our broken immigration system. Their Caucus is in such disarray on this issue that it took them 10 weeks and a hatchet just to find a compromise among themselves. Now, they are going to send another partisan messaging bill to the Senate, where it will promptly die.

Congratulations on the press release.

Mr. Speaker, we watched an unprecedented humanitarian crisis unfold on our Southwest border this year. It used to be that when this country faced a crisis, Democrats and Republicans came together to solve it and ensure it didn't happen again. Unfortunately, that is no longer the practice under Democratic control.

When Democrats are ready to legislate with real solutions to problems this country faces, Republicans stand ready to work with them. In the meantime, I urge all Members to oppose this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the Trump administration's cruel and inhumane approach to border and immigration enforcement has subjected DHS' frontline personnel and border communities to chaotic conditions. It has also hurt families and children.

From the Remain in Mexico policy that puts children and families in harm's way indefinitely to family separation to metering, the Trump administration has haphazardly reshaped how people who seek safety in the U.S. are treated. It is essential that there be greater transparency and accountability regarding what DHS is doing along the border. More remains to be done, but H.R. 2203 includes several first steps.

I urge my colleagues to support this measure, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 577, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of H.R. 2203 is postponed.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Byrd, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has agreed to a joint resolution of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S.J. Res. 54. Joint resolution relating to a national emergency declared by the President on February 15, 2019.

COMMUNICATION FROM CHAIR OF COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the chair of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure; which was read and, without objection, referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, DC, September 19, 2019.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,

Speaker of the House, House of Representatives, Washington, DC

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: On September 19, 2019, pursuant to section 3307 of Title 40, United States Code, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure met in open session to consider six resolutions included in the General Services Administration's Capital Investment and Leasing Programs.

I have enclosed copies of the resolutions adopted.

Sincerely,

PETER A. DEFAZIO,
Chairman.

Enclosures.

COMMITTEE RESOLUTION

LEASE—DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS, KANSAS CITY, MO

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives, that pursuant to 40 U.S.C. 3307, appropriations are authorized for a lease of up to 204,607 rentable square feet of space, including 104 official parking spaces, for the Department of Transportation and the Department of Veterans Affairs currently located at 901 Locust Street in Kansas City, MO at a proposed total annual cost of $4,982,181 for a lease term of up to 5 years, a prospectus for which is attached to and included in this resolution.

Approval of this prospectus constitutes authority to execute an interim lease for all tenants, if necessary, prior to the execution of the new lease.

Provided that, the Administrator of General Services and tenant agency(ies) agree to apply an overall utilization rate of 311 square feet or less per person, except that, if the Administrator determines that the overall utilization rate cannot be achieved, the Administrator shall provide an explanatory statement to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives prior to exercising any lease authority provided in this resolution.

Provided that, except for interim leases as described above, the Administrator may not enter into any leases that are below prospectus level for the purposes of meeting any of the requirements, or portions thereof, included in the prospectus that would result in an overall utilization rate of 311 square feet or higher per person.

Provided that, to the maximum extent practicable, the Administrator shall include in the lease contract(s) a purchase option that can be exercised at the conclusion of the firm term of the lease.

Provided further, that the General Services Administration shall not delegate to any other agency the authority granted by this resolution.

Provided further, that the Administrator shall require that the delineated area of the procurement is identical to the delineated area included in the prospectus, except that, if the Administrator determines that the delineated area of the procurement should not be identical to the delineated area included in the prospectus, the Administrator shall provide an explanatory statement to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives prior to exercising any lease authority provided in this resolution.

Provided further, not later than 30 calendar days after the date on which a request from the Chairman or Ranking Member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives is received by the Administrator of General Services, the Administrator shall provide such Member a response in writing that provides any information requested regarding the project.

Provided further, the Administrator of General Services may not enter into this lease if it does not contain a provision barring any individual holding a Federally-elected office, regardless of whether such individual took office before or after execution of this lease, to directly participate in, or benefit from or under this lease or any part thereof and that such provision provide that if this lease is found to have been made in violation of the foregoing prohibition or it is found that this prohibition has been violated during the term of the lease, the lease shall be void, except that the foregoing limitation shall not

apply if the lease is entered into with a publicly-held corporation or publicly-held entity for the general benefit of such corporation or entity.

Provided further, prior to entering into this lease or approving a novation agreement involving a change of ownership under this lease, the Administrator of General Services shall require the offeror or the parties requesting the novation, as applicable, to identify and disclose whether the owner of the leased space, including an entity involved in the financing thereof, is a foreign person or a foreign-owned entity; provided further, in such an instance, the Administrator of General Services shall notify the occupant agency(ies) in writing, and consult with such occupant agency(ies) regarding security concerns and necessary mitigation measures (if any) prior to award of the lease or approval of the novation agreement.

Provided that, to the maximum extent practicable, the Administrator of General Services shall require that the lease procurement consider the availability of public transportation consistent with agency mission requirements and that the space to be leased be renovated for all cost effective improvements, including renewable energy upgrades, water efficiency improvements, and indoor air quality optimization, that reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

PROSPECTUS – LEASE
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS
KANSAS CITY, MO

Prospectus Number: PMO-02-KC20
Congressional District: 05

Executive Summary

The General Services Administration (GSA) proposes a lease extension of up to 5 years for approximately 204,607 rentable square feet (RSF) for five components of the Department of Transportation (DOT) and for the Department of Veterans Affairs, Veterans Health Administration (VA-VHA), currently located at 901 Locust Street, Kansas City, Missouri. DOT and VA-VHA have occupied space in the building since 2009 under a lease that expires on October 14, 2019.

Extension of the current lease will enable DOT and VA-VHA to provide continued housing for personnel and meet their mission requirements while planning for the future replacement lease. The office and overall utilization will be maintained at 162 and 311 usable square feet (USF) per person, respectively.

Description

Occupant:	Departments of Transportation and Veterans Affairs
Current RSF:	204,607 (Current RSF/USF = 1.20)
Estimated/Proposed Maximum RSF:	204,607 (Proposed RSF/USF = 1.20)
Expansion/Reduction RSF:	None
Current USF/Person:	311
Estimated/Proposed USF/Person:	311
Expiration Dates of Current Lease(s):	10/14/2019
Proposed Maximum Leasing Authority:	5 years
Delineated Area:	North: I-70/I-35; East: 1-70/Campbell Street; South: 31st Street; West: Summit Street/I-35.
Number of Official Parking Spaces:	104
Scoring:	Operating
Current Total Annual Cost:	$4,238,269 (leases effective 10/15/2009)
Estimated Rental Rate[1]:	$24.35/RSF
Estimated Total Annual Cost[2]:	$4,982,181

[1] This estimate is for fiscal year 2020 and may be escalated by 2 percent per year to the effective date of the lease to account for inflation. The proposed rental rate is fully serviced, including all operating expenses, whether paid by the lessor or directly by the Government. GSA will conduct the procurement using prevailing market rental rates as a benchmark for the evaluation of competitive offers and as the basis for negotiating with offerors to ensure that lease award is made in the best interest of the Government.

[2] New leases may contain an escalation clause to provide for annual changes in real estate taxes and operating costs.

PROSPECTUS – LEASE
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND
DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS
KANSAS CITY, MO

Prospectus Number: PMO-02-KC20
Congressional District: 05

Background

In addition to VA-VHA, this location houses the administrative offices of the following five DOT operating administrations within the Kansas City, Missouri, area:

- The Federal Aviation Administration's (FAA) mission is to provide the safest, most efficient aerospace system in the world;
- The Federal Railroad Administration's mission is to enable the safe, reliable, and efficient movement of people and goods for a strong America, now and in the future;
- The National Highway Transportation Safety Administration's mission is to save lives, prevent injuries, and reduce economic costs due to road traffic crashes, through education, research, safety standards, and enforcement activity;
- The Federal Transit Administration's mission is to provide financial and technical assistance to local public transit systems, including buses, subways, light rail, commuter rail, trolleys, and ferries; and
- The Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration's mission is to protect people and the environment by advancing the safe transportation of energy and other hazardous materials that are essential to our daily lives.

VA-VHA's mission is to honor America's veterans by providing exceptional healthcare that improves their health and well-being. VA-VHA is the largest integrated healthcare system in the United States, providing care to over 9 million veterans enrolled in the VA healthcare program.

Justification

The current lease at 901 Locust Street expires on October 14, 2019, and the agencies require continued housing to carry out their missions until the long-term plan can be executed for a replacement lease. This FAA location houses the Regional Office and the functions of oversight of airport planning, development, and certification, as well as administration of regulations for airmen, air carriers, and air agencies. The remaining DOT components execute mission functions necessary to perform vital operations. The VA-VHA office is responsible for administrative operations to support the VA Heartland Network of medical centers and healthcare systems.

Continued housing is critical to these agencies meeting their mission requirements, and a 5-year lease extension will provide sufficient time to formulate and execute lease replacement plans, as well as budget for move and replication costs accordingly.

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS – LEASE
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND
DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS
KANSAS CITY, MO

Prospectus Number: PMO-02-KC20
Congressional District: 05

Resolutions of Approval

Resolutions adopted by the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works approving this prospectus will constitute approval to make appropriations to lease space in a facility that will yield the required rentable area.

Interim Leasing

GSA will execute such interim leasing actions as are necessary to ensure continued housing of the tenant agency prior to the effective date of the extension. It is in the best interest of the Government to avert the financial risk of holdover tenancy.

Certification of Need

The proposed project is the best solution to meet a validated Government need.

Submitted at Washington, DC, on September 6, 2019

Recommended: _____
Commissioner, Public Buildings Service

Approved: _____
Administrator, General Services Administration

COMMITTEE RESOLUTION

LEASE—DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY, CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION, QUEENS, NY

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives, that pursuant to 40 U.S.C. 3307, appropriations are authorized for a lease of up to 140,000 rentable square feet of space, including 208 official parking spaces, for the Department of Homeland Security—Customs and Border Protection currently located at Building 77 at the JFK Airport in Queens, NY at a proposed total annual cost of $11,060,000 for a lease term of up to 20 years, a prospectus for which is attached to and included in this resolution.

Approval of this prospectus constitutes authority to execute an interim lease for all tenants, if necessary, prior to the execution of the new lease.

Provided that, the Administrator of General Services and tenant agency(ies) agree to apply an overall utilization rate of 212 square feet or less per person, except that, if the Administrator determines that the overall utilization rate cannot be achieved, the Administrator shall provide an explanatory statement to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives prior to exercising any lease authority provided in this resolution.

Provided that, except for interim leases as described above, the Administrator may not enter into any leases that are below prospectus level for the purposes of meeting any of the requirements, or portions thereof, included in the prospectus that would result in an overall utilization rate of 212 square feet or higher per person.

Provided that, to the maximum extent practicable, the Administrator shall include in the lease contract(s) a purchase option that can be exercised at the conclusion of the firm term of the lease.

Provided further, that the General Services Administration shall not delegate to any other agency the authority granted by this resolution.

Provided further, that the Administrator shall require that the delineated area of the procurement is identical to the delineated area included in the prospectus, except that, if the Administrator determines that the delineated area of the procurement should not be identical to the delineated area included in the prospectus, the Administrator shall provide an explanatory statement to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives prior to exercising any lease authority provided in this resolution.

Provided further, not later than 30 calendar days after the date on which a request from the Chairman or Ranking Member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives is received by the Administrator of General Services, the Administrator shall provide such Member a response in writing that provides any information requested regarding the project.

Provided further, the Administrator of General Services may not enter into this lease if it does not contain a provision barring any individual holding a Federally-elected office, regardless of whether such individual took office before or after execution of this lease, to directly participate in, or benefit from or under this lease or any part thereof and that such provision provide that if this lease is found to have been made in violation of the foregoing prohibition or it is found that this prohibition has been violated during the term of the lease, the lease shall be void, except that the foregoing limitation shall not apply if the lease is entered into with a publicly-held corporation or publicly-held entity for the general benefit of such corporation or entity.

Provided further, prior to entering into this lease or approving a novation agreement involving a change of ownership under this lease, the Administrator of General Services shall require the offeror or the parties requesting the novation, as applicable, to identify and disclose whether the owner of the leased space, including an entity involved in the financing thereof, is a foreign person or a foreign-owned entity; provided further, in such an instance, the Administrator of General Services shall notify the occupant agency(ies) in writing, and consult with such occupant agency(ies) regarding security concerns and necessary mitigation measures (if any) prior to award of the lease or approval of the novation agreement.

Provided that, to the maximum extent practicable, the Administrator of General Services shall require that the lease procurement consider the availability of public transportation consistent with agency mission requirements and that the space to be leased be renovated for all cost effective improvements, including renewable energy upgrades, water efficiency improvements, and indoor air quality optimization, that reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS – LEASE
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY
CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION
QUEENS, NY

Prospectus Number: PNY-03-QU19
Congressional District: 05

Executive Summary

The General Services Administration (GSA) proposes a lease of approximately 140,000 rentable square feet (RSF) for the Department of Homeland Security, Customs and Border Protection (CBP), currently located at Building 77 at the JFK Airport in Queens, NY.

The lease will provide continued housing for CBP and will improve the office and overall space utilization from 142 to 84 and 241 to 212 usable square feet (USF) per person, respectively.

Description

Occupant:	CBP
Current Rentable Square Feet (RSF)	145,912 (Current RSF/USF = 1.15)
Estimated Maximum RSF:	140,000 (Proposed RSF/USF = 1.15)
Reduction RSF:	5,912
Current USF/Person:	241
Estimated USF/Person:	212
Expiration Dates of Current Lease(s):	06/30/2021
Proposed Maximum Leasing Authority:	20 years
Delineated Area:	North: Intersection of Lefferts Blvd. and S. Conduit Rd. heading east to Rockaway Blvd. then heading east to Brookville Blvd; West: Lefferts Blvd; East: Head of Bay; South: Jamaica Bay
Number of Official Parking Spaces:	208
Scoring:	Operating
Current Total Annual Cost:	$8,244,028 (leases effective 06/19/1992)
Estimated Rental Rate[1]:	$79.00 / RSF
Estimated Total Annual Cost[2]:	$11,060,000

[1] This estimate is for fiscal year 2021 and may be escalated by 2% percent annually to the effective date of the lease to account for inflation. The proposed rental rate is fully serviced including all operating expenses, whether paid by the lessor or directly by the Government. GSA will conduct the procurement using prevailing market rental rates as a benchmark for the evaluation of competitive offers and as the basis for negotiating with offerors to ensure that lease award is made in the best interest of the Government.

[2] New leases may contain an escalation clause to provide for annual changes in real estate taxes and operating costs.

PROSPECTUS – LEASE
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY
CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION
QUEENS, NY

Prospectus Number: PNY-03-QU19
Congressional District: 05

Background

CBP currently occupies approximately 145,912 RSF of space in Building 77 at JFK Airport in Queens, NY. CBP at JFK Airport covers the diverse operational demands of 5 international passenger terminals, 1 International Mail Facility (IMF), 24 air cargo facilities, 80 containerized freight stations, 2 general order warehouses, 14 bonded warehouses, 3 foreign trade zones, and 5 general aviation facilities. This facility functions much more like a port of entry than an office location.

The CBP operation at JFK Airport monitors half the cargo imported into the United States as well as over 10 million passengers a year. CBP's ability to effectively and safely manage this extensive operation is facilitated by close physical proximity to the airport. Transporting narcotics, currency, and inadmissible aliens and criminals to off-airport locations for processing would pose security risks, decrease effectiveness, and unnecessarily reduce the time dedicated to CBP's enforcement mission. The proposed delineated area maintains the agency's proximity to the airport.

Justification

This replacement lease will provide CBP with the opportunity to increase space utilization efficiency to accommodate additional personnel in field operations, internal affairs, and the international trade office.

The current lease expires on June 30, 2021, and CBP requires continued housing to perform its mission.

Summary of Energy Compliance

GSA will incorporate energy efficiency requirements into the Request for Lease Proposals and other documents related to the procurement of space based on the approved prospectus. GSA encourages offerors to exceed minimum requirements set forth in the procurement and to achieve an Energy Star performance rating of 75 or higher.

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS – LEASE
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY
CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION
QUEENS, NY

Prospectus Number: PNY-03-QU19
Congressional District: 05

Resolutions of Approval

Resolutions adopted by the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works approving this prospectus will constitute approval to make appropriations to lease space in a facility that will yield the required rentable area.

Interim Leasing

GSA will execute such interim leasing actions as are necessary to ensure continued housing of the tenant agency prior to the effective date of the new lease. It is in the best interest of the Government to avert the financial risk of holdover tenancy.

Certification of Need

The proposed project is the best solution to meet a validated Government need.

Submitted at Washington, DC, on April 29, 2019.

Recommended: _____
Commissioner, Public Buildings Service

Approved: _____
Administrator, General Services Administration

COMMITTEE RESOLUTION

LEASE—VETERANS HEALTH ADMINISTRATION, SOUTH HAMPTON ROADS, VA

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives, that pursuant to 40 U.S.C. 3307, appropriations are authorized for a lease of up to 215,000 rentable square feet of space, including 1,050 official parking spaces, for the Veterans Health Administration currently located at 244 Clearfield Avenue in Virginia Beach, VA at a proposed total annual cost of $9,030,000 for a lease term of up to 20 years, a prospectus for which is attached to and included in this resolution.

Approval of this prospectus constitutes authority to execute an interim lease for all tenants, if necessary, prior to the execution of the new lease.

Provided that, to the maximum extent practicable, the Administrator shall include in the lease contract(s) a purchase option that can be exercised at the conclusion of the firm term of the lease.

Provided further, that the General Services Administration shall not delegate to any other agency the authority granted by this resolution.

Provided further, that the Administrator shall require that the delineated area of the procurement is identical to the delineated area included in the prospectus, except that, if the Administrator determines that the delineated area of the procurement should not be identical to the delineated area included in the prospectus, the Administrator shall provide an explanatory statement to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives prior to exercising any lease authority provided in this resolution.

Provided further, not later than 30 calendar days after the date on which a request from the Chairman or Ranking Member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives is received by the Administrator of General Services, the Administrator shall provide such Member a response in writing that provides any information requested regarding the project.

Provided further, the Administrator of General Services may not enter into this lease if it does not contain a provision barring any individual holding a Federally-elected office, regardless of whether such individual took office before or after execution of this lease, to directly participate in, or benefit from or under this lease or any part thereof and that such provision provide that if this lease is found to have been made in violation of the foregoing prohibition or it is found that this prohibition has been violated during the term of the lease, the lease shall be void, except that the foregoing limitation shall not apply if the lease is entered into with a publicly-held corporation or publicly-held entity for the general benefit of such corporation or entity.

Provided further, prior to entering into this lease or approving a novation agreement involving a change of ownership under this lease, the Administrator of General Services shall require the offeror or the parties requesting the novation, as applicable, to identify and disclose whether the owner of the leased space, including an entity involved in the financing thereof, is a foreign person or a foreign-owned entity; provided further, in such an instance, the Administrator of General Services shall notify the occupant agency(ies) in writing, and consult with such occupant agency(ies) regarding security concerns and necessary mitigation measures (if any) prior to award of the lease or approval of the novation agreement.

Provided that, to the maximum extent practicable, the Administrator of General Services shall require that the lease procurement consider the availability of public transportation consistent with agency mission requirements and that the space to be leased be renovated for all cost effective improvements, including renewable energy upgrades, water efficiency improvements, and indoor air quality optimization, that reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

PROSPECTUS – LEASE
VETERANS HEALTH ADMINISTRATION
SOUTH HAMPTON ROADS, VA

Prospectus Number: PVA-01-HA20
Congressional District: 2, 3, 4

Executive Summary

The General Services Administration (GSA) proposes an outpatient clinic lease of approximately 215,000 rentable square feet (RSF) for the Department of Veterans Affairs, Veterans Health Administration (VHA). The lease will house a new Health Care Center and will serve as a complement to the existing Community Based Health Care Center (CBOC) currently located at 244 Clearfield Avenue in Virginia Beach, VA.

This project would allow VHA to expand its current primary care, mental health, and eye clinic services, as well as provide much needed new specialty care and advanced imaging services to veterans in a right-sized, state-of-the-art, and energy-efficient healthcare facility.

Description

Occupant:	Veterans Health Administration
Current RSF:	0
Estimated/Proposed Maximum RSF:	215,000 (Proposed RSF/Usable SF = 1.15)
Expansion/Reduction RSF:	215,000 (Expansion)
Expiration Dates of Current Lease(s):	N/A
Proposed Maximum Leasing Authority:	20 years
Delineated Area:	North: start at the intersection of Tidewater Drive (Route 168) and E Virginia Beach Blvd. (Route 58) to Virginia Beach Blvd.; East: S. Independence Blvd. (Route 225) to Holland Road, south onto Dam Neck Road, continue onto Elbow Road, continue on Indian River Road; South: at the intersection of Indian River Road and Elbow Road, head south on Elbow Road, west on Butts Station Road, west on Clearfield Ave., west on Kempsville Road (Route 190); West: north on Battlefield Blvd. N (Business 168), onto Oak Grove Connector (Chesapeake Expressway - Route 168), onto Hampton Roads Beltway (Route 64), onto Battlefield Blvd. N (Business 168), onto Campostella Road, onto E Brambleton Ave., onto Tidewater

PROSPECTUS – LEASE
VETERANS HEALTH ADMINISTRATION
SOUTH HAMPTON ROADS, VA

Prospectus Number: PVA-01-HA20
Congressional District: 2, 3, 4

Drive (Route 168).

Number of Official Parking Spaces:	1,050
Scoring:	Operating
Current Total Annual Cost:	N/A
Estimated Rental Rate[1]:	$42.00/RSF
Estimated Total Annual Cost[2]:	$9,030,000

Background

VHA's mission is to honor America's veterans by providing exceptional healthcare that improves their health and well-being. To make access to healthcare easier, VHA utilizes CBOCs across the country. These clinics provide the most common outpatient services, including health and wellness visits. VHA continues to expand the network of CBOCs to include more rural locations, bringing access to care closer to veterans' homes.

The CBOC in the South Hampton Roads area is an approximately 13,000 RSF facility located in Virginia Beach and is inadequately sized for the anticipated growth of the veteran population and service needs. The proposed lease will allow VHA to significantly expand its healthcare access in the area, providing much needed medical services to the fast growing veteran population.

Justification

The proposed lease would provide modern, efficient space for comprehensive outpatient services and address space and utilization gaps. The new lease will allow VHA to adapt to a growing veteran population and increased workload in the South Hampton Roads area.

This project is essential to ensure that veterans are able to access a full suite of services in a timely manner. The expansion of mental health services—including mental health screenings—by hiring additional mental health staff to provide behavioral therapy, family counseling, and substance abuse therapy on site would support the Department of Veterans Affairs' goal of eliminating veteran homelessness. The lease would provide

[1] This estimate is for fiscal year 2020 and may be escalated by 2 percent annually to the effective date of the lease to account for inflation. The proposed rental rate is fully serviced including all operating expenses, whether paid by the lessor or directly by the Government. GSA will conduct the procurement using prevailing market rental rates as a benchmark for the evaluation of competitive offers and as the basis for negotiating with offerors to ensure that lease award is made in the best interest of the Government.
[2] New leases may contain an escalation clause to provide for annual changes in real estate taxes and operating costs.

PROSPECTUS – LEASE
VETERANS HEALTH ADMINISTRATION
SOUTH HAMPTON ROADS, VA

Prospectus Number: PVA-01-HA20
Congressional District: 2, 3, 4

increased access to care for veterans living in the South Hampton Roads area who are currently seen in the undersized Virginia Beach CBOC or who commute in excess of 1 hour to another facility in Hampton, VA.

Summary of Energy Compliance

GSA will incorporate energy efficiency requirements into the Request for Lease Proposals and other documents related to the procurement of space based on the approved prospectus. GSA encourages offerors to exceed minimum requirements set forth in the procurement and to achieve an Energy Star performance rating of 75 or higher.

Resolutions of Approval

Resolutions adopted by the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works approving this prospectus will constitute approval to make appropriations to lease space in a facility that will yield the required rentable area.

Interim Leasing

The Government will execute such interim leasing actions as are necessary to ensure continued housing of the tenant agency prior to the effective date of the new lease. It is in the best interest of the Government to avert the financial risk of holdover tenancy.

GSA **PBS**

PROSPECTUS – LEASE
VETERANS HEALTH ADMINISTRATION
SOUTH HAMPTON ROADS, VA

Prospectus Number: PVA-01-HA20
Congressional District: 2, 3, 4

Certification of Need

The proposed project is the best solution to meet a validated Government need.

Submitted at Washington, DC, on July 31, 2019

Recommended: _____
Commissioner, Public Buildings Service

Approved: _____
Administrator, General Services Administration

COMMITTEE RESOLUTION

LEASE—U.S. DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS, FREDERICKSBURG, VA

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives, that pursuant to 40 U.S.C. 3307, appropriations are authorized for a lease of up to 364,831 net usable square feet of space, and 2,600 official parking spaces, for the Department of Veterans Affairs for a Community Based Outpatient Clinic in Fredericksburg, VA to replace and consolidate two existing leases in Fredericksburg at a proposed unserviced annual cost of $14,844,973 for a lease term of up to 20 years, a prospectus for which is attached to and included in this resolution.

Approval of this prospectus constitutes authority to execute an interim lease for all tenants, if necessary, prior to the execution of the new lease.

Provided that, to the maximum extent practicable, the Administrator shall include in the lease contract(s) a purchase option that can be exercised at the conclusion of the firm term of the lease.

Provided further, that the Administrator shall require that the delineated area of the procurement is identical to the delineated area included in the prospectus, except that, if the Administrator determines that the delineated area of the procurement should not be identical to the delineated area included in the prospectus, the Administrator shall provide an explanatory statement to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives prior to exercising any lease authority provided in this resolution.

Provided further, not later than 30 calendar days after the date on which a request from the Chairman or Ranking Member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives is received by the Administrator of General Services, the Administrator shall provide such Member a response in writing that provides any information requested regarding the project.

Provided further, the lease shall contain a provision barring any individual holding a Federally-elected office, regardless of whether such individual took office before or after execution of this lease, to directly participate in, or benefit from or under this lease or any part thereof and that such provision provide that if this lease is found to have been made in violation of the foregoing prohibition or it is found that this prohibition has been violated during the term of the lease, the lease shall be void, except that the foregoing limitation shall not apply if the lease is entered into with a publicly-held corporation or publicly-held entity for the general benefit of such corporation or entity.

Provided further, prior to entering into this lease or approving a novation agreement involving a change of ownership under this lease, the Administrator of General Services shall require the offeror or the parties requesting the novation, as applicable, to identify and disclose whether the owner of the leased space, including an entity involved in the financing thereof, is a foreign person or a foreign-owned entity; provided further, in such an instance, the Administrator of General Services shall notify the occupant agency(ies) in writing, and consult with such occupant agency(ies) regarding security concerns and necessary mitigation measures (if any) prior to award of the lease or approval of the novation agreement.

Provided that, to the maximum extent practicable, the Administrator of General Services shall require that the lease procurement consider the availability of public transportation consistent with agency mission requirements and that the space to be leased be renovated for all cost effective improvements, including renewable energy upgrades, water efficiency improvements, and indoor air quality optimization, that reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

GSA **PBS**

PROSPECTUS – LEASE
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS
FREDERICKSBURG, VA

Prospectus Number: PVA-01-VA19
Congressional District(s): 1, 7

Executive Summary

The General Services Administration (GSA) proposes a lease of approximately 364,831 net usable square feet (NUSF) for the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) outpatient clinic currently located in two leases totaling 21,551 NUSF in Fredericksburg, VA.

The lease will be delegated to VA, provide continued services for the Fredericksburg veteran community, and provide the necessary expansion services to meet current and projected service delivery gaps for healthcare in the local market.

Description

Occupant:	Veterans Affairs
Current NUSF	21,551
Estimated Maximum NUSF:	364,831
Expansion/Reduction NUSF:	343,280 (expansion)
Estimated Maximum Rentable Square Feet:	492,522
Expiration Dates of Current Lease(s):	9,975 NUSF – 10/31/2021 11,576 NUSF – 1/21/2026
Proposed Maximum Leasing Authority:	20 years
Delineated Area:	North: Courthouse Rd. from Shelton Shop Rd. (SR 648) east to Andrew Chapel Rd. (SR 629) South: Smith Station Rd./Spotsylvania Pkwy. (SR 628) from SR 208 to Hospital Blvd. to Mills Dr./US 17 to Jim Morris Rd. (SR 609) East: Jim Morris Rd. (SR 609) from US 17 N to Tidewater Trail/US-17 BUS N to VA-3E/Blue and Gray Pkwy. to Kings Hwy. to Cool Springs Rd. to Deacon Rd. to Brooke Rd. to Andrew Chapel Rd. to Courthouse Rd. (SR 630) West: Smith Station Rd. (SR 628) from SR 208 to Gordon Road to Trench Hill Lane to River Road to Fall Hill Ave. (SR 639) to I-95N to Sandford Dr. to Celebrate VA Pkwy. to Warrenton Rd. (SR 17) to Poplar Rd. to Kellogg Mill Rd. to Mountain View Rd. to Shelton

PROSPECTUS – LEASE
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS
FREDERICKSBURG, VA

Prospectus Number: PVA-01-VA19
Congressional District(s): 1, 7

	Shop Rd. to Courthouse Rd.
Number of Official Parking Spaces:	2,600
Scoring:	Operating Lease
Current Total Annual Cost:	$629,142
Current Total Unserviced Annual Cost:	$485,492
Estimated Unserviced Rental Rate[1]:	$40.69 per NUSF
Estimated Total Unserviced Annual Cost[2]:	$14,844,973

Justification

A new 364,831 NUSF lease in Fredericksburg will replace and consolidate the two existing Community Based Outpatient Clinic leases. The current space in these leased facilities is insufficient to meet the current and projected needs of the veteran community. Space limitations and an increase in workload limit veterans' access to services in a timely manner. Additionally, the existing locations have safety and security deficiencies.

The new facility will enhance VA outpatient services by closing space and utilization gaps identified in VA's Strategic Capital Investment Planning process and will provide a single location in the Fredericksburg area to serve the outpatient care needs of veterans and their families. The new lease will allow VA to provide new specialty care services and enhance and expand the existing primary care, mental health, and specialty care services it currently provides to veterans in a rightsized, state-of-the-art, healthcare facility. Further, the intent of this lease is to facilitate collaboration and sharing of services with the Department of Defense (DoD).

The proposed lease will provide veterans in the Fredericksburg area better access to high-quality, reliable healthcare. A new lease also will provide future flexibility. Based on changes in veteran demographics, workload patterns, and emergent healthcare delivery practices, a lease will allow VA to resize, replace, or exit the proposed clinic lease as necessary. With this new lease, sufficient space will be available to provide the necessary primary care, mental health, and specialty care capacity to help ensure veterans have timely access to high-quality care.

As part of the proposed comprehensive outpatient care offering, the facility will include a fully staffed Compensation and Pension department. This facility also will have a strong focus on improving mental health services, reducing veteran homelessness, providing

[1] This estimate is for fiscal year 2019 and may be escalated by 2.0 percent annually to the effective date of the lease to account for inflation. The proposed rental rate is unserviced (taxes, insurance, management and maintenance and repair reserves are included); however, the lease contract may include operating expenses paid by the lessor.
[2] New leases may contain an escalation clause to provide for annual changes in real estate taxes.

PROSPECTUS – LEASE
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS
FREDERICKSBURG, VA

Prospectus Number: PVA-01-VA19
Congressional District(s): 1, 7

women's health services, and widely using telehealth services. The newly expanded clinic in Fredericksburg will also provide training opportunities for Virginia Commonwealth University medical students/residents and other training programs. In addition, the Outpatient Clinic in Fredericksburg will include 16,733 NUSF of space for DoD. The intent is for DoD to have access to VA ancillary and diagnostic services, as well as some specialty care. Due to the rapid growth in workload and the lack of available private-sector providers to accommodate any of the excess demand in the Fredericksburg area, the new lease is necessary to provide high-quality outpatient services to veterans in a timely manner.

Summary of Energy Compliance

Energy efficiency requirements will be incorporated into the Request for Lease Proposals and other documents related to the procurement of space based on the approved prospectus. Offerors are encouraged to exceed minimum requirements set forth in the procurement and to achieve an Energy Star performance rating of 75 or higher.

Resolutions of Approval

Resolutions adopted by the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works approving this prospectus will constitute approval to make appropriations to lease space in a facility that will yield the required net usable area.

Interim Leasing

The Government will execute such interim leasing actions as are necessary to ensure continued housing prior to the effective date of the new lease. It is in the best interest of the Government to avert the financial risk of holdover tenancy.

GSA **PBS**

PROSPECTUS – LEASE
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS
FREDERICKSBURG, VA

Prospectus Number: PVA-01-VA19
Congressional District(s): 1, 7

Certification of Need

The proposed project is the best solution to meet a validated Government need.

Submitted at Washington, DC, on August 9, 2019.

Recommended: _____
Commissioner, Public Buildings Service

Approved: _____
Administrator, General Services Administration

COMMITTEE RESOLUTION

LEASE—SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION, FALLS CHURCH, VA

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives, that pursuant to 40 U.S.C. §3307, appropriations are authorized for a lease of up to 334,103 rentable square feet of space, including 24 official parking spaces, for the Social Security Administration currently located at 5107 Leesburg Pike in Falls Church, VA at a proposed total annual cost of $9,271,358 for a lease term of up to 5 years, a prospectus for which is attached to and included in this resolution.

Approval of this prospectus constitutes authority to execute an interim lease for all tenants, if necessary, prior to the execution of the new lease.

Provided that, the Administrator of General Services and tenant agency(ies) agree to apply an overall utilization rate of 261 square feet or less per person, except that, if the Administrator determines that the overall utilization rate cannot be achieved, the Administrator shall provide an explanatory statement to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives prior to exercising any lease authority provided in this resolution.

Provided that, except for interim leases as described above, the Administrator may not enter into any leases that are below prospectus level for the purposes of meeting any of the requirements, or portions thereof, included in the prospectus that would result in an overall utilization rate of 261 square feet or higher per person.

Provided that, to the maximum extent practicable, the Administrator shall include in the lease contract(s) a purchase option that can be exercised at the conclusion of the firm term of the lease.

Provided further, that the General Services Administration shall not delegate to any other agency the authority granted by this resolution.

Provided further, that the Administrator shall require that the delineated area of the procurement is identical to the delineated area included in the prospectus, except that, if the Administrator determines that the delineated area of the procurement should not be identical to the delineated area included in the prospectus, the Administrator shall provide an explanatory statement to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives prior to exercising any lease authority provided in this resolution.

Provided further, not later than 30 calendar days after the date on which a request from the Chairman or Ranking Member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives is received by the Administrator of General Services, the Administrator shall provide such Member a response in writing that provides any information requested regarding the project.

Provided further, the Administrator of General Services may not enter into this lease if it does not contain a provision barring any individual holding a Federally-elected office, regardless of whether such individual took office before or after execution of this lease, to directly participate in, or benefit from or under this lease or any part thereof and that such provision provide that if this lease is found to have been made in violation of the foregoing prohibition or it is found that this prohibition has been violated during the term of the lease, the lease shall be void, except that the foregoing limitation shall not apply if the lease is entered into with a publicly-held corporation or publicly-held entity for the general benefit of such corporation or entity.

Provided further, prior to entering into this lease or approving a novation agreement involving a change of ownership under this lease, the Administrator of General Services shall require the offeror or the parties requesting the novation, as applicable, to identify and disclose whether the owner of the leased space, including an entity involved in the financing thereof, is a foreign person or a foreign-owned entity; provided further, in such an instance, the Administrator of General Services shall notify the occupant agency(ies) in writing, and consult with such occupant agency(ies) regarding security concerns and necessary mitigation measures (if any) prior to award of the lease or approval of the novation agreement.

Provided that, to the maximum extent practicable, the Administrator of General Services shall require that the lease procurement consider the availability of public transportation consistent with agency mission requirements and that the space to be leased be renovated for all cost effective improvements, including renewable energy upgrades, water efficiency improvements, and indoor air quality optimization, that reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS – LEASE
SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION
FALLS CHURCH, VA

Prospectus Number: PVA-03-FC20
Congressional District: 8

Executive Summary

The General Services Administration (GSA) proposes the exercise of a renewal option of up to 5 years for approximately 334,103 rentable square feet (RSF) for the Social Security Administration's (SSA) Office of Hearings Operations (OHO) and Office of Analytics, Review, and Oversight (OARO), currently located at 5107 Leesburg Pike in Falls Church, VA. SSA has occupied space in the building since October 1, 2009, under a lease that expires on September 30, 2019. Additionally, employees currently housed in a lease at 4401 Ford Avenue in Alexandria, VA, that expires on June 5, 2022, will be consolidated into the existing footprint.

Renewal of the current lease located at 5107 Leesburg Pike in Falls Church will enable SSA to provide continued housing for current personnel and meet its current mission requirements. SSA will have office and overall utilization rates at 156 and 261 usable square feet (USF) per person, respectively.

Description

Occupant:	SSA
Current RSF:	355,809 (Current RSF/USF = 1.19)
Estimated/Proposed Maximum RSF:	334,103 (Proposed RSF/USF = 1.19)
Expansion/Reduction RSF:	21,706 reduction
Current USF/Person:	279 (all-in)
Estimated/Proposed USF/Person:	261 (all-in)
Expiration Dates of Current Lease(s):	09/30/2019; 6/5/2022
Proposed Maximum Leasing Authority:	5 years
Delineated Area:	Fairfax County and Fairfax City
Number of Official Parking Spaces:	24
Scoring:	Operating
Current Total Annual Cost:	$11,845,007 (lease effective 10/1/2009)
Estimated Rental Rate[1]:	$27.75 / RSF
Estimated Total Annual Cost[2]:	$9,271,358

[1] This estimate is for fiscal year fiscal year 2020 and may be escalated by 2 percent per year to the effective date of the lease to account for inflation. The proposed rental rate is fully serviced including all operating expenses, whether paid by the lessor or directly by the Government. GSA will conduct the procurement using prevailing market rental rates as a benchmark for the evaluation of competitive offers and as the basis for negotiating with offerors to ensure that lease award is made in the best interest of the Government.

[2] New leases may contain an escalation clause to provide for annual changes in real estate taxes and operating costs.

PROSPECTUS – LEASE
SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION
FALLS CHURCH, VA

Prospectus Number: PVA-03-FC20
Congressional District: 8

Background

The mission of SSA is to deliver quality social security services to the public through the three programs it administers under the Social Security Act: the Old-Age and Survivors Insurance program, the Disability Insurance program, and the Supplemental Security Income program. SSA's OHO and OARO are two components responsible for holding hearings, issuing decisions, and reviewing appeals as part of SSA's process for determining whether a person may receive benefits.

OHO is one of the largest administrative adjudication systems in the world and directs a nationwide field organization of administrative law judges (ALJ) who conduct impartial hearings and make decisions on appealed determinations involving retirement, survivors, disability, and supplemental security income benefits.

OARO reviews ALJ decisions on appeal by claimants, or on its own motion, and processes cases appealed to Federal court. The OARO Office of Appellate Operations serves through the Appeals Council as the final level of administrative review for claimants appealing administrative law judge denials and dismissals of claims. The Office of Appellate Operations also collects and analyzes nationwide data on policy compliance of adjudicators and performance of the adjudication process.

Justification

This location houses both OHO and OARO offices. Maintaining these operations is essential to SSA's execution of functions under the Social Security Act.

The current lease at 5107 Leesburg Pike, Falls Church, VA, expires on September 30, 2019, and SSA requires continued housing to meet its mission requirements until it can carry out a long-term consolidation plan. A 5-year lease renewal will provide SSA with sufficient time to formulate the consolidation plan and budget for move costs accordingly.

Summary of Energy Compliance

GSA will incorporate energy efficiency requirements into the Request for Lease Proposals and other documents related to the procurement of space based on the approved prospectus. GSA encourages offerors to exceed minimum requirements set forth in the procurement and to achieve an Energy Star performance rating of 75 or higher.

Resolutions of Approval

Resolutions adopted by the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works approving this prospectus will constitute

PROSPECTUS – LEASE
SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION
FALLS CHURCH, VA

Prospectus Number: PVA-03-FC20
Congressional District: 8

approval to make appropriations to lease space in a facility that will yield the required rentable area.

Interim Leasing

GSA will execute such interim leasing actions as are necessary to ensure continued housing of the tenant agency prior to the effective date of the extension It is in the best interest of the Government to avert the financial risk of holdover tenancy.

Certification of Need

The proposed project is the best solution to meet a validated Government need.

Submitted at Washington, DC, on June 12, 2019

Recommended: _____
Commissioner, Public Buildings Service

Approved: _____
Administrator, General Services Administration

COMMITTEE RESOLUTION

AMENDED RESOLUTION—UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE ANNEX, SAN DIEGO, CA

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives, that pursuant to 40 U.S.C. 3307, the resolution passed by the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee dated September 24, 2009 is amended;

Provided that, the Administrator of the General Services Administration shall ensure that the San Diego, California Courthouse Complex contains no more than 8 courtrooms and 16 chambers in the Carter-Keep Courthouse Annex and no more than 16 courtrooms and 20 chambers in the Edward J. Schwartz Federal Building and U.S. Courthouse, bringing the total number of courtrooms and chambers at the San Diego Courthouse Complex to 24 courtrooms and 36 chambers.

The proviso ''Provided that, the Administrator of General Services shall ensure that the San Diego, California Courthouse Complex contains no more than 22 courtrooms;' is amended to read ''Provided, that the Administrator of General Services shall ensure that the San Diego, California Courthouse Complex contains no more than 24 courtrooms;''.

The proviso ''Provided further, that the Administrator of General Services shall not construct more than six courtrooms or 12 chambers in the San Diego, California Courthouse Annex under the authority of this resolution;'' is amended to read ''Provided further, that the Administrator of General Services shall not construct more than eight courtrooms or 16 chambers in the San Diego, California Courthouse Annex under the authority of this resolution;''.

GSA PBS

FACTSHEET
ALTERATIONS – COURT EXPANSION
SAN DIEGO COURTHOUSE COMPLEX
JAMES M. CARTER & JUDITH N. KEEP COURTHOUSE ANNEX
SAN DIEGO, CA

FY 2019 Project Summary

At its June 2017 meeting, the Judicial Conference Committee on Space and Facilities approved a project for the construction of 2 new district courtrooms (and requisite holding cells) and 4 magistrate judge chambers in the James M. Carter & Judith N. Keep Courthouse Annex (Carter-Keep Courthouse Annex) located at 333 W. Broadway in San Diego, CA. The additional courtrooms and chambers would support the space needs of authorized replacement judges for five district judges who have taken senior status and two district judges who are eligible to take senior status by the end of fiscal year 2019.

All Judicial Conference policies and business rules, including those on courtroom sharing, were considered and applied by the Judiciary in developing this project and funding for the project was included in the Judiciary's FY 2019 Budget.

Although this project is reimbursable and requires no authorization of Federal Building Funds, GSA is unable to accept Reimbursable Work Authorization for the project due to a previous House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure Resolution adopted for the Carter-Keep Courthouse Annex (formerly referred to as the San Diego Courthouse Annex) on September 24, 2009. The resolution included the following provisions:

- "...that the Administrator of General Services shall ensure that the San Diego, California Courthouse Complex contains no more than 22 courtrooms;" and,
- "...that the Administrator of General Services shall not construct more than six courtrooms or 12 chambers in the San Diego, California Courthouse Annex under the authority of this resolution;" and,

Completion of the project would result in 8 courtrooms and 16 chambers in the Carter-Keep Courthouse Annex. Along with the 16 courtrooms and 20 chambers in the Edward J. Schwartz Federal Building and U.S. Courthouse (Schwartz FB-CT), this project would bring the total number of courtrooms and chambers at the San Diego Courthouse Complex to 24 and 36, respectively[1].

Therefore, for GSA to complete the proposed Judiciary funded project, the Committee would need to remove the existing restriction on GSA.

[1] The total number of judges serving the Southern District of California in the Ninth Circuit is 38 including one Circuit Judge whose chamber is in leased space.

FACTSHEET
ALTERATIONS – COURT EXPANSION
SAN DIEGO COURTHOUSE COMPLEX
JAMES M. CARTER & JUDITH N. KEEP COURTHOUSE ANNEX
SAN DIEGO, CA

Project Budget

GSA is not requesting authorization of Federal Building Funds for this project; the following information is provided for information only:

Design	$ 958,000
Estimated Construction Cost (ECC)	9,924,000
M&I	647,000
Estimated Total Project Cost (ETPC)[2]	**$11,529,000**

Overview of the Project

The additional Courtrooms would be constructed on the 12th floor of the Carter-Keep Courthouse Annex while the Magistrate Chambers would be built out on the 7th floor. These expansions necessitate the relocation of the Clerk from the 12th floor to the 7th floor. This relocation, along with the construction of the Magistrate chambers would force the displacement of a portion of the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) from the 7th floor of the Carter-Keep Courthouse Annex into leased space in the San Diego area. IRS' remaining space requirement would continue to be housed in the Carter-Keep Courthouse Annex. Holding cells would also be constructed adjacent to the new courtrooms and would be funded by reimbursable funds from the U.S. Marshals Service (USMS).

The Judiciary would provide reimbursable funds to construct the two additional District courtrooms, four additional Magistrate chambers and the relocation of the IRS.

Schedule

	Start	End
Design	FY 2019	FY2020
Construction	FY 2020	FY 2021

San Diego Courthouse Complex

James M. Carter & Judith N. Keep Courthouse Annex

The Carter-Keep Courthouse Annex was originally called the New San Diego Courthouse Annex building but was renamed in early 2015 to the James M. Carter and Judith N. Keep Courthouse in honor of two former federal judges. The 480,941 gross square foot (gsf), sixteen story (plus 3 underground stories) building has a modern style of off-white exterior brick and window glazing. It is connected to the Schwartz FBCT by an underground tunnel. Those two buildings, the adjacent multi-story federal holding facility, which is not owned

[2] Additional funds would be provided by the AOUSC for the forced relocation of IRS to leased space including all move, data, and security costs.

FACTSHEET
ALTERATIONS – COURT EXPANSION
SAN DIEGO COURTHOUSE COMPLEX
JAMES M. CARTER & JUDITH N. KEEP COURTHOUSE ANNEX
SAN DIEGO, CA

by GSA, along with the historic Jacob Weinberger Courthouse located a block south, form a Federal campus environment in downtown San Diego. The Carter-Keep Courthouse Annex building houses the U.S. Courts, U.S. Marshals Service, IRS and GSA.

Edward J. Schwartz Federal Building and U.S. Courthouse

The 895,247 gsf Schwartz FB-CT, at 880 Front Street in downtown San Diego, was built in 1973. It consists of two adjacent structures: a 6 story federal office wing, and a 5 story court wing with underground parking and basement offices. The building's two wings share an upper basement and are connected by a bridge between the fifth and sixth floors.

Impacted Tenant Agencies

U.S. District Court, U.S. Department of Justice - Marshals Service, Pretrial Services, Federal Public Defender, Department of Treasury - Internal Revenue Service, and GSA

Major Work Items

Interior Alterations	$5,072,000
Electrical	1,943,000
Furnishing	1,094,000
HVAC	867,000
Demolition	257,000
Plumbing	239,000
Fire Protection	239,000
Elevators	213,000
Total ECC	**$9,924,000**

Justification

By the end of FY 2019, the number of active federal judges housed in the San Diego Courthouse Complex is anticipated to increase from 30 to 37. After applying Judicial Conference policies and business rules, including those on courtroom sharing, the number of courtrooms and chambers at the San Diego Courthouse Complex would need to be increased to meet those requirements.

GSA PBS

FACTSHEET
ALTERATIONS – COURT EXPANSION
SAN DIEGO COURTHOUSE COMPLEX
JAMES M. CARTER & JUDITH N. KEEP COURTHOUSE ANNEX
SAN DIEGO, CA

Space Requirements of the U.S. Courts – San Diego Court Complex

Carter-Keep Courthouse Annex	Current		Proposed	
	Courtrooms	Judges	Courtroom	Judges
District				
Active	3	3	5	5
Senior	3	3	3	6
Visiting	0	0	0	0
Magistrate	0	6	0	5
Carter-Keep Courthouse Annex Total	**6**	**12**	**8**	**16**

Schwartz FB-CT	Current		Proposed	
	Courtrooms	Judges	Courtrooms	Judges
District				
Active	5	5	8	8
Senior	5	6	2	5
Visiting	0	1	0	1
Magistrate	6	4	6	5
Circuit	0	2	0	2
Schwartz FB-CT Total*:	**16**	**18**	**16**	**21**

* Current and Proposed Total Number of Chambers is 20.

San Diego Court Complex	Current		Proposed	
	Courtroom	Judges	Courtroom	Judges
District				
Active	8	8	13	13
Senior	8	9	5	11
Visiting	0	1	0	1
Magistrate	6	10	6	10
Circuit*	0	2	0	2
San Diego Court Complex Totals**:	22	30	24	37

*There are 3 Circuit Judges currently serving the Southern District of California in the Ninth Circuit. 2 of the Circuit Judges are housed in the San Diego Court Complex, 1 is housed in leased space.

**Upon completion of the proposed project, 37 Judges will be housed in the San Diego Court Complex in 36 chambers - 1 chamber suite is and will be shared between a Senior and a Visiting Judge. With the addition of the 1 Circuit Judge currently in leased space, the total number of Judges serving the Southern District of California in the Ninth Circuit will be 38.

There was no objection.

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.

SECURE AND FAIR ENFORCEMENT BANKING ACT OF 2019

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1595) to create protections for depository institutions that provide financial services to cannabis-related legitimate businesses and service providers for such businesses, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1595

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; PURPOSE.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Secure And Fair Enforcement Banking Act of 2019'' or the ''SAFE Banking Act of 2019''.

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this Act is to increase public safety by ensuring access to financial services to cannabis-related legitimate businesses and service providers and reducing the amount of cash at such businesses.

SEC. 2. SAFE HARBOR FOR DEPOSITORY INSTITUTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—A Federal banking regulator may not—

(1) terminate or limit the deposit insurance or share insurance of a depository institution under the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1811 et seq.), the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1751 et seq.), or take any other adverse action against a depository institution under section 8 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1818) solely because the depository institution provides or has provided financial services to a cannabis-related legitimate business or service provider;

(2) prohibit, penalize, or otherwise discourage a depository institution from providing financial services to a cannabis-related legitimate business or service provider or to a State, political subdivision of a State, or Indian Tribe that exercises jurisdiction over cannabis-related legitimate businesses;

(3) recommend, incentivize, or encourage a depository institution not to offer financial services to an account holder, or to downgrade or cancel the financial services offered to an account holder solely because—

(A) the account holder is a cannabis-related legitimate business or service provider, or is an employee, owner, or operator of a cannabis-related legitimate business or service provider;

(B) the account holder later becomes an employee, owner, or operator of a cannabis-related legitimate business or service provider; or

(C) the depository institution was not aware that the account holder is an employee, owner, or operator of a cannabis-related legitimate business or service provider;

(4) take any adverse or corrective supervisory action on a loan made to—

(A) a cannabis-related legitimate business or service provider, solely because the business is a cannabis-related legitimate business or service provider;

(B) an employee, owner, or operator of a cannabis-related legitimate business or service provider, solely because the employee, owner, or operator is employed by, owns, or operates a cannabis-related legitimate business or service provider, as applicable; or

(C) an owner or operator of real estate or equipment that is leased to a cannabis-related legitimate business or service provider, solely because the owner or operator of the real estate or equipment leased the equipment or real estate to a cannabis-related legitimate business or service provider, as applicable; or

(5) prohibit or penalize a depository institution (or entity performing a financial service for or in association with a depository institution) for, or otherwise discourage a depository institution (or entity performing a financial service for or in association with a depository institution) from, engaging in a financial service for a cannabis-related legitimate business or service provider.

(b) SAFE HARBOR APPLICABLE TO DE NOVO INSTITUTIONS.—Subsection (a) shall apply to an institution applying for a depository institution charter to the same extent as such subsection applies to a depository institution.

SEC. 3. PROTECTIONS FOR ANCILLARY BUSINESSES.

For the purposes of sections 1956 and 1957 of title 18, United States Code, and all other provisions of Federal law, the proceeds from a transaction involving activities of a cannabis-related legitimate business or service provider shall not be considered proceeds from an unlawful activity solely because—

(1) the transaction involves proceeds from a cannabis-related legitimate business or service provider; or

(2) the transaction involves proceeds from—

(A) cannabis-related activities described in section 14(4)(B) conducted by a cannabis-related legitimate business; or

(B) activities described in section 14(13)(A) conducted by a service provider.

SEC. 4. PROTECTIONS UNDER FEDERAL LAW.

(a) IN GENERAL.—With respect to providing a financial service to a cannabis-related legitimate business or service provider within a State, political subdivision of a State, or Indian country that allows the cultivation, production, manufacture, sale, transportation, display, dispensing, distribution, or purchase of cannabis pursuant to a law or regulation of such State, political subdivision, or Indian Tribe that has jurisdiction over the Indian country, as applicable, a depository institution, entity performing a financial service for or in association with a depository institution, or insurer that provides a financial service to a cannabis-related legitimate business or service provider, and the officers, directors, and employees of that depository institution, entity, or insurer may not be held liable pursuant to any Federal law or regulation—

(1) solely for providing such a financial service; or

(2) for further investing any income derived from such a financial service.

(b) PROTECTIONS FOR FEDERAL RESERVE BANKS AND FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS.—With respect to providing a service to a depository institution that provides a financial service to a cannabis-related legitimate business or service provider (where such financial service is provided within a State, political subdivision of a State, or Indian country that allows the cultivation, production, manufacture, sale, transportation, display, dispensing, distribution, or purchase of cannabis pursuant to a law or regulation of such State, political subdivision, or Indian Tribe that has jurisdiction over the Indian country, as applicable), a Federal reserve bank or Federal Home Loan Bank, and the officers, directors, and employees of the Federal reserve bank or Federal Home Loan Bank, may not be held liable pursuant to any Federal law or regulation—

(1) solely for providing such a service; or

(2) for further investing any income derived from such a service.

(c) PROTECTIONS FOR INSURERS.—With respect to engaging in the business of insurance within a State, political subdivision of a State, or Indian country that allows the cultivation, production, manufacture, sale, transportation, display, dispensing, distribution, or purchase of cannabis pursuant to a law or regulation of such State, political subdivision, or Indian Tribe that has jurisdiction over the Indian country, as applicable, an insurer that engages in the business of insurance with a cannabis-related legitimate business or service provider or who otherwise engages with a person in a transaction permissible under State law related to cannabis, and the officers, directors, and employees of that insurer may not be held liable pursuant to any Federal law or regulation—

(1) solely for engaging in the business of insurance; or

(2) for further investing any income derived from the business of insurance.

(d) FORFEITURE.—

(1) DEPOSITORY INSTITUTIONS.—A depository institution that has a legal interest in the collateral for a loan or another financial service provided to an owner, employee, or operator of a cannabis-related legitimate business or service provider, or to an owner or operator of real estate or equipment that is leased or sold to a cannabis-related legitimate business or service provider, shall not be subject to criminal, civil, or administrative forfeiture of that legal interest pursuant to any Federal law for providing such loan or other financial service.

(2) FEDERAL RESERVE BANKS AND FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS.—A Federal reserve bank or Federal Home Loan Bank that has a legal interest in the collateral for a loan or another financial service provided to a depository institution that provides a financial service to a cannabis-related legitimate business or service provider, or to an owner or operator of real estate or equipment that is leased or sold to a cannabis-related legitimate business or service provider, shall not be subject to criminal, civil, or administrative forfeiture of that legal interest pursuant to any Federal law for providing such loan or other financial service.

SEC. 5. RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.

(a) NO REQUIREMENT TO PROVIDE FINANCIAL SERVICES.—Nothing in this Act shall require a depository institution, entity performing a financial service for or in association with a depository institution, or insurer to provide financial services to a cannabis-related legitimate business, service provider, or any other business.

(b) GENERAL EXAMINATION, SUPERVISORY, AND ENFORCEMENT AUTHORITY.—Nothing in this Act may be construed in any way as limiting or otherwise restricting the general examination, supervisory, and enforcement authority of the Federal banking regulators, provided that the basis for any supervisory or enforcement action is not the provision of financial services to a cannabis-related legitimate business or service provider.

SEC. 6. REQUIREMENTS FOR FILING SUSPICIOUS ACTIVITY REPORTS.

Section 5318(g) of title 31, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(5) REQUIREMENTS FOR CANNABIS-RELATED LEGITIMATE BUSINESSES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—With respect to a financial institution or any director, officer, employee, or agent of a financial institution that reports a suspicious transaction pursuant to this subsection, if the reason for the report relates to a cannabis-related legitimate business or service provider, the report shall comply with appropriate guidance issued by the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network. The Secretary shall ensure that the guidance is consistent with the purpose and intent of the SAFE Banking Act of 2019 and does not significantly inhibit the provision of financial services to a cannabis-related legitimate business or service provider in a State, political subdivision of a State, or Indian country that has allowed the cultivation, production, manufacture, transportation, display, dispensing, distribution, sale, or purchase of cannabis pursuant to law or regulation of such State, political subdivision, or Indian Tribe that has jurisdiction over the Indian country.

''(B) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this paragraph:

''(i) CANNABIS.—The term 'cannabis' has the meaning given the term 'marihuana' in section 102 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 802).

''(ii) CANNABIS-RELATED LEGITIMATE BUSINESS.—The term 'cannabis-related legitimate business' has the meaning given that term in section 14 of the SAFE Banking Act of 2019.

''(iii) INDIAN COUNTRY.—The term 'Indian country' has the meaning given that term in section 1151 of title 18.

''(iv) INDIAN TRIBE.—The term 'Indian Tribe' has the meaning given that term in section 102 of the Federally Recognized Indian Tribe List Act of 1994 (25 U.S.C. 479a).

''(v) FINANCIAL SERVICE.—The term 'financial service' has the meaning given that term in section 14 of the SAFE Banking Act of 2019.

''(vi) SERVICE PROVIDER.—The term 'service provider' has the meaning given that term in section 14 of the SAFE Banking Act of 2019.

''(vii) STATE.—The term 'State' means each of the several States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and any territory or possession of the United States.''.

SEC. 7. GUIDANCE AND EXAMINATION PROCEDURES.

Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Financial Institutions Examination Council shall develop uniform guidance and examination procedures for depository institutions that provide financial services to cannabis-related legitimate businesses and service providers.

SEC. 8. ANNUAL DIVERSITY AND INCLUSION REPORT.

The Federal banking regulators shall issue an annual report to Congress containing—

(1) information and data on the availability of access to financial services for minority-owned and women-owned cannabis-related legitimate businesses; and

(2) any regulatory or legislative recommendations for expanding access to financial services for minority-owned and women-owned cannabis-related legitimate businesses.

SEC. 9. GAO STUDY ON DIVERSITY AND INCLUSION.

(a) STUDY.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall carry out a study on the barriers to marketplace entry, including in the licensing process, and the access to financial services for potential and existing minority-owned and women-owned cannabis-related legitimate businesses.

(b) REPORT.—The Comptroller General shall issue a report to the Congress—

(1) containing all findings and determinations made in carrying out the study required under subsection (a); and

(2) containing any regulatory or legislative recommendations for removing barriers to marketplace entry, including in the licensing process, and expanding access to financial services for potential and existing minority-owned and women-owned cannabis-related legitimate businesses.

SEC. 10. GAO STUDY ON EFFECTIVENESS OF CERTAIN REPORTS ON FINDING CERTAIN PERSONS.

Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall carry out a study on the effectiveness of reports on suspicious transactions filed pursuant to section 5318(g) of title 31, United States Code, at finding individuals or organizations suspected or known to be engaged with transnational criminal organizations and whether any such engagement exists in a State, political subdivision, or Indian Tribe that has jurisdiction over Indian country that allows the cultivation, production, manufacture, sale, transportation, display, dispensing, distribution, or purchase of cannabis. The study shall examine reports on suspicious transactions as follows:

(1) During the period of 2014 until the date of the enactment of this Act, reports relating to marijuana-related businesses.

(2) During the 1-year period after date of the enactment of this Act, reports relating to cannabis-related legitimate businesses.

SEC. 11. BANKING SERVICES FOR HEMP BUSINESSES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) the Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018 (Public Law 115–334) legalized hemp by removing it from the definition of ''marihuana'' under the Controlled Substances Act;

(2) despite the legalization of hemp, some hemp businesses (including producers, manufacturers, and retailers) continue to have difficulty gaining access to banking products and services; and

(3) businesses involved in the sale of hemp-derived cannabidiol (''CBD'') products are particularly affected, due to confusion about their legal status.

(b) FEDERAL BANKING REGULATOR HEMP BANKING GUIDANCE.—Not later than the end of the 90-day period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, the Federal banking regulators shall jointly issue guidance to financial institutions—

(1) confirming the legality of hemp, hemp-derived CBD products, and other hemp-derived cannabinoid products, and the legality of engaging in financial services with businesses selling hemp, hemp-derived CBD products, and other hemp-derived cannabinoid products, after the enactment of the Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018; and

(2) to provide recommended best practices for financial institutions to follow when providing financial services and merchant processing services to businesses involved in the sale of hemp, hemp-derived CBD products, and other hemp-derived cannabinoid products.

(c) FINANCIAL INSTITUTION DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''financial institution'' means any person providing financial services.

SEC. 12. APPLICATION OF SAFE HARBORS TO HEMP AND CBD PRODUCTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided under subsection (b), the provisions of this Act (other than sections 6 and 10) shall apply to hemp (including hemp-derived cannabidiol and other hemp-derived cannabinoid products) in the same manner as such provisions apply to cannabis.

(b) RULE OF APPLICATION.—In applying the provisions of this Act described under subsection (a) to hemp, the definition of ''cannabis-related legitimate business'' shall be treated as excluding any requirement to engage in activity pursuant to the law of a State or political subdivision thereof.

(c) HEMP DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''hemp'' has the meaning given that term under section 297A of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1639o).

SEC. 13. REQUIREMENTS FOR DEPOSIT ACCOUNT TERMINATION REQUESTS AND ORDERS.

(a) TERMINATION REQUESTS OR ORDERS MUST BE VALID.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—An appropriate Federal banking agency may not formally or informally request or order a depository institution to terminate a specific customer account or group of customer accounts or to otherwise restrict or discourage a depository institution from entering into or maintaining a banking relationship with a specific customer or group of customers unless—

(A) the agency has a valid reason for such request or order; and

(B) such reason is not based solely on reputation risk.

(2) TREATMENT OF NATIONAL SECURITY THREATS.—If an appropriate Federal banking agency believes a specific customer or group of customers is, or is acting as a conduit for, an entity which—

(A) poses a threat to national security;

(B) is involved in terrorist financing;

(C) is an agency of the Government of Iran, North Korea, Syria, or any country listed from time to time on the State Sponsors of Terrorism list;

(D) is located in, or is subject to the jurisdiction of, any country specified in subparagraph (C); or

(E) does business with any entity described in subparagraph (C) or (D), unless the appropriate Federal banking agency determines that the customer or group of customers has used due diligence to avoid doing business with any entity described in subparagraph (C) or (D),

such belief shall satisfy the requirement under paragraph (1).

(b) NOTICE REQUIREMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If an appropriate Federal banking agency formally or informally requests or orders a depository institution to terminate a specific customer account or a group of customer accounts, the agency shall—

(A) provide such request or order to the institution in writing; and

(B) accompany such request or order with a written justification for why such termination is needed, including any specific laws or regulations the agency believes are being violated by the customer or group of customers, if any.

(2) JUSTIFICATION REQUIREMENT.—A justification described under paragraph (1)(B) may not be based solely on the reputation risk to the depository institution.

(c) CUSTOMER NOTICE.—

(1) NOTICE REQUIRED.—Except as provided under paragraph (2) or as otherwise prohibited from being disclosed by law, if an appropriate Federal banking agency orders a depository institution to terminate a specific customer account or a group of customer accounts, the depository institution shall inform the specific customer or group of customers of the justification for the customer's account termination described under subsection (b).

(2) NOTICE PROHIBITED.—

(A) NOTICE PROHIBITED IN CASES OF NATIONAL SECURITY.—If an appropriate Federal banking agency requests or orders a depository institution to terminate a specific customer account or a group of customer accounts based on a belief that the customer or customers pose a threat to national security, or are otherwise described under subsection (a)(2), neither the depository institution nor the appropriate Federal banking agency may inform the customer or customers of the justification for the customer's account termination.

(B) NOTICE PROHIBITED IN OTHER CASES.—If an appropriate Federal banking agency determines that the notice required under paragraph (1) may interfere with an authorized criminal investigation, neither the depository institution nor the appropriate Federal banking agency may inform the specific customer or group of customers of the justification for the customer's account termination.

(d) REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—Each appropriate Federal banking agency shall issue an annual report to the Congress stating—

(1) the aggregate number of specific customer accounts that the agency requested or ordered a depository institution to terminate during the previous year; and

(2) the legal authority on which the agency relied in making such requests and orders and the frequency on which the agency relied on each such authority.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section:

(1) APPROPRIATE FEDERAL BANKING AGENCY.—The term ''appropriate Federal banking agency'' means—

(A) the appropriate Federal banking agency, as defined under section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1813); and

(B) the National Credit Union Administration, in the case of an insured credit union.

(2) DEPOSITORY INSTITUTION.—The term ''depository institution'' means—

(A) a depository institution, as defined under section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1813); and

(B) an insured credit union.

SEC. 14. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) BUSINESS OF INSURANCE.—The term ''business of insurance'' has the meaning given such term in section 1002 of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (12 U.S.C. 5481).

(2) CANNABIS.—The term ''cannabis'' has the meaning given the term ''marihuana'' in section 102 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 802).

(3) CANNABIS PRODUCT.—The term ''cannabis product'' means any article which contains cannabis, including an article which is a concentrate, an edible, a tincture, a cannabis-infused product, or a topical.

(4) CANNABIS-RELATED LEGITIMATE BUSINESS.—The term ''cannabis-related legitimate business'' means a manufacturer, producer, or any person or company that—

(A) engages in any activity described in subparagraph (B) pursuant to a law established by a State or a political subdivision of a State, as determined by such State or political subdivision; and

(B) participates in any business or organized activity that involves handling cannabis or cannabis products, including cultivating, producing, manufacturing, selling, transporting, displaying, dispensing, distributing, or purchasing cannabis or cannabis products.

(5) DEPOSITORY INSTITUTION.—The term ''depository institution'' means—

(A) a depository institution as defined in section 3(c) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1813(c));

(B) a Federal credit union as defined in section 101 of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1752); or

(C) a State credit union as defined in section 101 of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1752).

(6) FEDERAL BANKING REGULATOR.—The term ''Federal banking regulator'' means each of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Federal Housing Finance Agency, the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network, the Office of Foreign Asset Control, the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, the National Credit Union Administration, the Department of the Treasury, or any Federal agency or department that regulates banking or financial services, as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury.

(7) FINANCIAL SERVICE.—The term ''financial service''—

(A) means a financial product or service, as defined in section 1002 of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (12 U.S.C. 5481);

(B) includes the business of insurance;

(C) includes, whether performed directly or indirectly, the authorizing, processing, clearing, settling, billing, transferring for deposit, transmitting, delivering, instructing to be delivered, reconciling, collecting, or otherwise effectuating or facilitating of payments or funds, where such payments or funds are made or transferred by any means, including by the use of credit cards, debit cards, other payment cards, or other access devices, accounts, original or substitute checks, or electronic funds transfers;

(D) includes acting as a money transmitting business which directly or indirectly makes use of a depository institution in connection with effectuating or facilitating a payment for a cannabis-related legitimate business or service provider in compliance with section 5330 of title 31, United States Code, and any applicable State law; and

(E) includes acting as an armored car service for processing and depositing with a depository institution or a Federal reserve bank with respect to any monetary instruments (as defined under section 1956(c)(5) of title 18, United States Code.

(8) INDIAN COUNTRY.—The term ''Indian country'' has the meaning given that term in section 1151 of title 18.

(9) INDIAN TRIBE.—The term ''Indian Tribe'' has the meaning given that term in section 102 of the Federally Recognized Indian Tribe List Act of 1994 (25 U.S.C. 479a).

(10) INSURER.—The term ''insurer'' has the meaning given that term under section 313(r) of title 31, United States Code.

(11) MANUFACTURER.—The term ''manufacturer'' means a person who manufactures, compounds, converts, processes, prepares, or packages cannabis or cannabis products.

(12) PRODUCER.—The term ''producer'' means a person who plants, cultivates, harvests, or in any way facilitates the natural growth of cannabis.

(13) SERVICE PROVIDER.—The term ''service provider''—

(A) means a business, organization, or other person that—

(i) sells goods or services to a cannabis-related legitimate business; or

(ii) provides any business services, including the sale or lease of real or any other property, legal or other licensed services, or any other ancillary service, relating to cannabis; and

(B) does not include a business, organization, or other person that participates in any business or organized activity that involves handling cannabis or cannabis products, including cultivating, producing, manufacturing, selling, transporting, displaying, dispensing, distributing, or purchasing cannabis or cannabis products.

(14) STATE.—The term ''State'' means each of the several States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and any territory or possession of the United States.

SEC. 15. DISCRETIONARY SURPLUS FUNDS.

Section 7(a)(3)(A) of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 289(a)(3)(A)) is amended by striking ''$6,825,000,000'' and inserting ''$6,821,000,000''.

SEC. 16. DETERMINATION OF BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled ''Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation'' for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the House Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous materials on H.R. 1595.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am proud we are here today to pass this bill about public safety, accountability, and respecting States' rights. Forty-seven States, four U.S. territories, and the District of Columbia have spoken and legalized some form of recreational or medical marijuana, including cannabidiol. 318.2 million people live in those 47 States. That is 97.7 percent of the population.

However, because marijuana remains illegal under Federal law, businesses in these States are forced to deal in cash. These businesses, their employees, and ancillary businesses cannot access the banking system.

The fact is, the people in States and localities across the country are voting to approve some level of marijuana use, and we need these marijuana businesses and employees to have access to checking accounts, lines of credit, payroll accounts, and more.

This will improve transparency and accountability and help law enforcement root out illegal transactions to prevent tax evasion, money laundering, and other white-collar crime.

Most importantly, Mr. Speaker, this will also reduce the risk of violent crime in our communities. These businesses and their employees become targets for murder, robbery, assault, and more by dealing in all cash, and this

puts the employees and store owners at risk. Congressman HECK will speak directly to this point.

The SAFE Banking Act will create a safe harbor for financial institutions and their employees who choose to do business with a marijuana company.

Section 3 of the bill is particularly important to not only marijuana businesses but everyone who might do business with a marijuana-related company. This section would protect ancillary businesses like real estate owners, accountants, electricians, and vendors by clarifying that the proceeds from legitimate cannabis businesses are not illegal under Federal laws. This proceeds section is the key provision, allowing all cannabis-related businesses and their service providers to access the banking system without fear of reprisal.

We have worked with our Republican colleagues on a few changes to improve the bill since it was marked up in March.

As Mr. BARR will discuss, the bill now includes protections for financial institutions to provide financial services to hemp and CBD businesses since we have learned the provisions from the farm bill last year did not provide sufficient clarity for banks and credit unions to provide these services.

At Mr. STIVERS' urging, we expanded the protections in the bill for various insurance products, such as workers compensation.

Additionally, we have added language from Mr. LUETKEMEYER's Financial Institution Customer Protection Act, which passed the House 395–2 last Congress. This language would prohibit bank regulators from directing a bank to close an account for reputational reasons.

In summary, if someone wants to oppose the legalization of marijuana, that is their prerogative. But American voters have spoken and continue to speak. The fact is that you can't put the genie back in the bottle. Prohibition is over.

Our bill is focused solely on taking cash off the streets and making our communities safer. Only Congress can take these steps to provide this certainty for businesses, employees, and financial institutions across the country.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative HECK for his partnership through the years on this bill. I also thank Representative STIVERS and Representative DAVIDSON for their support and cosponsorship of the SAFE Banking Act. Subcommittee Chairman GREG MEEKS and Representative KATIE PORTER have been very helpful in the process.

Finally, I thank Chairwoman MAXINE WATERS for shepherding this bill through the Financial Services Committee and making this a priority.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in voting ''yes,'' and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1630

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1595.

Before I go into the contents of my argument against this legislation, I want to start by commending the bill's sponsor, Mr. PERLMUTTER from Colorado, for his tireless advocacy, his reasonableness in his approach, and his willingness, even in the midst of the toughest negotiations around the subject matter, to keep his cool, to think through the import of the bill, and to seek compromise where he could.

It is quite a legislative endeavor that he has taken upon for himself, for this institution, for his State, and for States around the country. He has been a fantastic advocate.

And I would say that, standing in opposition to this bill, it is not because of his lack of good will. It is not for lack of his willingness to engage, but for a fundamental disagreement in the approach. We have been able to have real discussions around this that I think would make the American people more proud or more confident in this institution and our body politic, more broadly speaking.

I also want to thank my friend and colleague on the committee, Mr. STIVERS from Ohio, for his work on the issue. Together, they have conducted themselves with wonderful integrity and respect for their colleagues and their colleagues' views and ideas, especially on an issue like this where it can create an enormous amount of controversy.

Twenty-one States have legalized medicinal marijuana, and 10 States have legalized the recreational use of the drug. However, cannabis remains completely illegal in 19 States. Federal law defines this as a drug that has ''a high potential for abuse; no currently accepted medical use in treatment in the United States; and a lack of accepted safety for use of the drug . . . under medical supervision.'' That is the current Federal law.

This bill does not change the fact that cannabis remains a prohibited schedule I substance under the Controlled Substances Act.

To that end, if we seek to give financial institutions certainty, we should deal with the listing of cannabis as a schedule I substance, not debating a partial solution for financial institutions to what is a much larger problem and a larger societal issue that we must wrestle with.

Should States be allowed to continue to violate Federal law? Does Federal law need to be changed when it comes to the scheduling of cannabis?

We have an FDA that regulates cigarettes and e-cigarettes, which, as we know, there is the recent announcement that they will seek a ban on flavored e-cigarettes. But the FDA has no regulatory authority to regulate cannabis.

The bill we are considering today is one of the biggest changes to U.S. drug policy in my lifetime, yet it was done with little debate. While our committee has jurisdiction over financial institutions—in the nature of our debate, it is usually about the nature of regulation for the capital markets and for banks—we heard little from the committees of jurisdiction over the Controlled Substances Act or the Criminal Code. In fact, the Financial Services Committee is the only one that has held a hearing on the issue of cannabis this Congress.

Now, I would say that is due to the leadership of Mr. PERLMUTTER and his tireless advocacy for this, but we only had one panel of witnesses. I voiced my concerns in our jurisdiction to Chairwoman WATERS and to Congressman PERLMUTTER about my concerns for this.

In March of this year, I wrote Chairwoman WATERS to express my belief that we need to have a better comprehension of the nature of this substance and address the supervisory and regulatory issues that would result from enactment of H.R. 1595. I include in the RECORD a copy of that letter.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES,
Washington, DC, March 21, 2019.

The Hon. MAXINE WATERS,
Chairwoman, Committee on Financial Services, Washington, DC.

The Hon. GREGORY W. MEEKS,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Consumer Protection and Financial Institutions, Washington DC.

DEAR CHAIRWOMAN WATERS AND CHAIRMAN MEEKS: We write today to seek your agreement to delay consideration of H.R. 1595, the SAFE Act, currently scheduled to be marked up on March 26, 2019, until the Committee has a better understanding of the full range of consequences that enacting such legislation may trigger. As you know, marijuana is a schedule I controlled substance as defined in 21 U.S.C. 802. The impact that many state laws, which have legalized marijuana, have on the federal laws governing the manufacturing, use, and sale of marijuana, including proceeds, raise many questions and concerns. Any change to these statutes, or those that impact them, has the potential to divide the Congress and the country. We must ensure that Congress has done its due diligence, including conducting thorough oversight and review, before moving such legislation.

The hearing at the Committee on Financial Services on February 13, 2019, made clear that we need to better comprehend and address the supervisory and regulatory issues that would result from enactment of H.R. 1595. Many outstanding questions remain, which include but are not limited to the following:

1. What changes to our banking laws are necessary to implement the SAFE Banking Act or other legislation creating a safe harbor for cannabis-related businesses?

2. How would individual agencies enforce Bank Secrecy Act (BSA) requirements following enactment of the SAFE Banking Act? What changes would be required of BSA requirements?

3. How would individual agencies enforce anti-money laundering (AML) regulations following enactment of the SAFE Banking Act? Would AML reforms be necessary?

4. How would individual agencies enforce Know Your Customer (KYC) rules following enactment of the SAFE Banking Act? What changes would be required of KYC rules?

5. How would individual agencies enforce Suspicious Activity Report (SAR) filing requirements and guidelines following passage

of the SAFE Banking Act? What changes would be required of SAR filing requirements and guidelines to ensure illicit financial activities were not being financed?

6. How would individual agencies enforce Currency Transaction Report (CTR) filing requirements and guidelines following enactment of the SAFE Banking Act? What changes would be required of CTR filing requirements and guidelines?

7. In what ways are agencies working with state counterparts, including state banking and securities supervisors, under the existing regime? How would those cooperative relationships change with enactment of H.R. 1595?

8. Would H.R. 1595 require conforming changes to any of the statues, rules, and requirements previously listed to ensure there are no unintended consequences, such as cartels and other bad actors gaining access to our financial system?

9. Would the safe harbor require any changes to the rules or processes governing federal deposit insurance systems?

10. What are the implications of H.R. 1595 on nonbank financial firms, including insurers and investment companies?

11. What are the implications of H.R 1595 on third parties, including payment processors?

12. What are the implications of H.R. 1595 on individual and institutional investors of cannabis-related businesses?

13. What are the implications of RR.1595 on federal, state, and local law enforcement, including the Department of Justice and the Drug Enforcement Agency?

14. How are proceeds from state licensed growers and distributers taxed under federal law? Relatedly, what conforming changes to our tax code are necessary?

15. What are the implications of H.R. 1595 on other products and services offered by financial institutions, including but not limited to mortgage products, deposit advance products or general commercial lending?

As Members of Congress, and the Committee of primary jurisdiction, we owe it to our constituents and to the public to fully understand the implications of any legislation before supporting or opposing it. We urge you to hold H.R. 1595 and any related legislation until we have a full understanding of the consequences of this bill.

Sincerely,

PATRICK MCHENRY,
Ranking Member.
BLAINE LUETKEMEYER,
Ranking Member.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, in that letter, I listed a number of questions that have yet to be answered, including:

What steps will Federal financial regulators have to take to harmonize standards and protect against illicit activity, including institutions' obligations with respect to the Bank Secrecy Act, anti-money laundering requirements, suspicious activity reports, and currency transaction reports?

What are the implications of this bill on nonbank financial firms, including investment companies?

I know there have been additions, since we have come to the floor, to include insurance companies, and I think that is a positive step. But these are some of the basic questions that still need to be resolved.

It is also important that we understand whether this legislation could lead to bad actors, like drug cartels, that could more easily access our banking system in the United States. These concerns have been echoed by several former Directors of the Office of National Drug Control Policy and former Administrators of the Drug Enforcement Administration.

In a July letter from this year, former law enforcement officials serving from 1981 to 2014 have voiced concerns that the SAFE Banking Act could be exploited to provide easier, more cost-effective ways for nefarious groups to launder money. I include in the RECORD a copy of that letter.

Hon. MIKE CRAPO,
Chairman, U.S. Senate Committee on Banking, Housing, & Urban Affairs, Washington, DC.
Hon. SHERROD BROWN,
Ranking Member, U.S. Senate Committee on Banking, Housing, & Urban Affairs, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN CRAPO AND RANKING MEMBER BROWN: We write as former Directors of the Office of National Drug Control Policy and former Administrators of the Drug Enforcement Administration to warn about the unintended consequences of the SAFE Banking Act to legalize the banking of federally illegal proceeds from the sale of marijuana.

Some Members of your Committee may be familiar with the Black Market Peso Exchange that has been in operation for several decades. This scheme has enabled international drug cartels to launder billions of U.S. dollars through international monetary exchanges and has ensnared many banks and mainstream U.S. companies.

The lesson that the Black Market Peso Exchange teaches us is that cartels will go to enormous lengths and use sophisticated and complex methods to move cash into banks-since laundering money is the life-blood of criminal organizations. It is therefore a virtual certainty that cartels will seek to exploit the SAFE Banking act if it provides them with an easier and more cost-effective means to launder their money.

Because cash made from the sale of marijuana looks the same regardless of what it was used to pay for, it will be extremely difficult for banks to know whether large bundles of cash presented for deposit were made from the sale of marijuana rather than from the sale of heroin, fentanyl, or methamphetamine.

In short, the SAFE Banking Act could inadvertently allow cartels to bring into banks duffel bags of cash made from the sale of those illicit drugs that are killing tens of thousands of Americans every year.

Consider the current landscape of offering banking services to cash-intensive marijuana businesses. Even if customers are offered the opportunity to pay in credit, many customers will choose to pay cash to avoid being tracked within, the state seed-to-sale tracking system.

While banks know how much cash to expect from other cash-intensive businesses like dry cleaners or convenience stores, it will be very difficult to figure out when a marijuana dispensary is participating in a money laundering scheme. The scale of the marijuana industry is already such that there are huge opportunities for these dispensaries to be the destination for cartel cash. Indeed, we have already seen many cases of cartels using the cover of legalization to operate illicit marijuana grows and black market activity. Two recent examples within the past year involved organized efforts to expel Mexican drug cartels growing marijuana in Northern California—including a request to use the California National Guard, and the May 2019 bust of the largest international drug trafficking organization in Colorado law enforcement history, with over 80,000 plants in over 250 locations and 4.5 tons of finished marijuana products.

We urge the Senate Banking Committee to reject the SAFE Banking Act and other legislation that would give these cartels more cover and more access to the U.S. financial system.

Sincerely,

Mr. R. Gil Kerlikowske, Former Director, May 7, 2009 to March 6, 2014, Office of National Drug Control Policy; Mr. John P. Walters, Former Director, December 7, 2001 to January 20, 2009, Office of National Drug Control Policy; General Barry R. McCaffrey, USA (Ret.), Former Director, February 29, 1996 to January 20, 2001, Office of National Drug Control Policy; Mr. Lee P. Brown, Former Director, July 19, 1993 to January 1996, Office of National Drug Control Policy; Mr. Robert Martinez, Former Director, March 28, 1991 to January 20, 1993, Office of National Drug Control Policy; Mr. William J. Bennett, Former Director, March 13, 1989 to December 13, 1990, Office of National Drug Control Policy; Ms. Michele M. Leonhart, Former Administrator, November 10, 2007 to May 14, 2015, Drug Enforcement Administration; Ms. Karen P. Tandy, Former Administrator, July 31, 2003 to November 9, 2007, Drug Enforcement Administration; Mr. John C. Lawn, Former Administrator, July 26, 1985 and March 23, 1990, Drug Enforcement Administration; Mr. Peter B. Bensinger, Former Administrator, February 23, 1976 to July 10, 1981, Drug Enforcement Administration.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, drug cartels are a significant problem in cannabis-legal States like California, Washington, and Colorado. As reported in a May article by NBC News, the cartels have found that it is easier to grow and process marijuana in legal States like Colorado and ship it throughout the United States than it is to bring it from Mexico or Cuba.

I include in the RECORD a copy of this article, as well.

[From nbcnews.com, May 29, 2018]

FOREIGN CARTELS EMBRACE HOME-GROWN MARIJUANA IN POT-LEGAL STATES

FOREIGN GANGS ARE FINDING THAT BLACK-MARKET MARIJUANA IS PROFITABLE EVEN IN STATES THAT HAVE LEGALIZED CANNABIS

(By Dennis Romero, Gabe Gutierrez, Andrew Blankstein and Robert Powell)

LOS ANGELES.—Attorney General Jeff Sessions called it ''one of the largest residential forfeiture actions in American History.''

In early April, local and federal authorities descended upon 74 marijuana grow houses in the Sacramento area they say were underwritten by Chinese organized crime. They filed court paperwork to seize the properties, worth millions of dollars.

Federal officials allege that legal recreational marijuana states like California, Colorado and Washington, where enforcement of growing regulations is hit-or-miss, have been providing cover for transnational criminal organizations willing to invest big money to buy or rent property to achieve even bigger returns.

Chinese, Cuban and Mexican drug rings have purchased or rented hundreds of homes and use human trafficking to bring inexperienced growers to the United States to tend them, federal and local officials say.

The suspects are targeting states that have already legalized marijuana ''in an attempt

to shroud their operations in our legal environment here and then take the marijuana outside of the state,'' said Mike Hartman, executive director of the Colorado Department of Revenue, which regulates and licenses the cannabis industry. Authorities say they've seen an increase in these ''home grows'' since the launch of recreational pot sales in Colorado.

While California and Washington have mainly seen organized criminals from China buying homes and converting them into grow houses, Colorado has largely been grappling with Cuban and Mexican-led cartels, said Sheriff Bill Elder of the El Paso County Sheriff's Office in Colorado.

''They have found that it's easier to grow and process marijuana in Colorado, ship it throughout the United States, than it is to bring it from Mexico or Cuba,'' Elder said.

In El Paso County, NBC News witnessed firsthand the damage a commercial-scale cannabis grow can do to a home otherwise built for an average American family. Growers pose as legitimate renters, and by the time authorities disrupt their operation, homes have been gutted and trashed.

''We've fallen through floors,'' U.S. Drug Enforcement Agency Special Agent Randy Ladd said. ''The electrical damage, they draw so much current that you'll see, in some places, the wires are fused inside of the electrical box. And—a lot of people—they don't wanna pay the high electric bills. So what they do is they take jackhammers and pickaxes and they cut through the foundation of the house, so that they could steal the power.''

One of the biggest busts so far came last June, when the Colorado attorney general's office announced that ''a massive illegal interstate marijuana distribution and cultivation network stretching from Colorado to Texas'' had been dismantled. It was allegedly Chinese-connected, Ladd said.

Authorities said the network was responsible for securities fraud, millions of dollars of laundered cash, 2,600 ''illegally cultivated'' marijuana plants and 4,000 pounds of harvested cannabis, according to the Colorado attorney general's statement.

The operation took place in 18 warehouses and storage units and 33 homes, mostly in the Denver area, authorities said. ''These seizures are believed to only scratch the surface,'' the office said.

Ladd alleged that some Chinese crews cover immigrants' costs of traveling to America in exchange for work in the grow houses. ''It's like indentured servitude,'' he said. ''It is a form of human trafficking.''

The workers often fly from China to Belgium, and from Belgium to Mexico, before making asylum claims at the border and then disappearing by the time they're scheduled to tell their stories in court, Ladd said. Often when grow houses are raided, immigration fugitives are discovered, he said.

The grow homes are usually purchased by shell property management companies, Ladd said. ''These growers can hide in plain sight,'' he said.

The Sacramento-area raids, which also struck Calaveras, Placer, San Joaquin, El Dorado, Yuba and Amador counties, shed some light on how many of the foreign rings operate.

Northern California-based DEA Special Agent Casey Rettig said suspects send cash to the United States in $9,999 increments, just below the mandated reporting threshold, and receive funds from China that fly under that nation's $50,000 foreign spending limit. They then purchase homes with the help of cash lenders instead of traditional mortgage firms.

Last fall, a scenario fitting that pattern unfolded in Grays Harbor County, Washington, southwest of Seattle, as a drug task force busted an alleged cultivation ring funded by organized crime in China.

More than 40 suspects were arrested and $80 million worth of cannabis was seized, the Grays Harbor County Sheriff's Office said. ''The majority of these homes were purchased with cash, and information was developed that these purchases were conducted by Chinese nationals involved in organized crime,'' according to a statement from the Sheriff's Office.

And just this month, search warrants were served at 19 locations in the Puget Sound area of Washington state, a federal official who did not want her name used said. The ring was allegedly run by three Chinese nationals who produced thousands of pounds of cannabis destined for greater New York, the U.S. attorney's office in Seattle alleges.

The suspects, who face drug conspiracy charges, purchased homes with the help of multiple wire transfers from China that included dollar figures—$2,000 to $5,900—they believed would fly under the radar, according to a federal complaint.

Ultimately it was the houses' exorbitant electricity use—up to 38,477 kilowatt hours in one day versus the American average of just 30—that made them targets of a federal investigation, according to the filing.

Even a single grow house can contain a large marijuana operation. In April, police in Pomona, California, an exurb in Los Angeles County, announced they discovered a 23-room grow house allegedly run by Chinese nationals. Fifty-five-hundred marijuana products, including 2,900 plants and nearly 21 pounds of cannabis, were seized, police said.

''The grow operation used advanced systems of lighting, air conditioning, fans, exhaust blowers and air-filtering systems to control the climate inside the buildings and the odor of marijuana,'' according to a Pomona police statement.

Pomona police spokeswoman Aly Mejia said a gun and $6,900 in cash were also found.

The DEA's Rettig, speaking from her base in San Francisco, said the Chinese operations are ''illegal under state law.'' In California, marijuana growers, producers and retailers need state and local licenses. Cities can opt out and ban such businesses altogether.

Rettig said even with the Golden State's sky-high housing market—the median price of a home is $535,100, according listings site Zillow—overseas criminals know that ''marijuana can fetch three times as much out of state.''

''There's a great profit motive in it,'' the DEA's Ladd said. ''In Colorado, marijuana legalization has magnified the black market. The standard price per pound here is $2,000, but they can get $3,500 to $4,500 by shipping it back East. The profits are great there.''

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, beyond the regulatory issues, Congress has yet to examine these potential societal harms and implications for human health.

In a January article regarding research on the health effects of marijuana, author Malcolm Gladwell wrote: ''Before any drug gets permitted to go on the market, basic questions have to be answered about its safety and efficacy. We don't know relatively basic questions about marijuana.''

I include this piece from The New Yorker in the RECORD.

[From the New Yorker, jAN. 7, 2019]

IS MARIJUANA AS SAFE AS WE THINK?(BY MALCOLM GLADWELL)

A few years ago, the National Academy of Medicine convened a panel of sixteen leading medical experts to analyze the scientific literature on cannabis. The report they prepared, which came out in January of 2017, runs to four hundred and sixty-eight pages. It contains no bombshells or surprises, which perhaps explains why it went largely unnoticed. It simply stated, over and over again, that a drug North Americans have become enthusiastic about remains a mystery.

For example, smoking pot is widely supposed to diminish the nausea associated with chemotherapy. But, the panel pointed out, ''there are no good-quality randomized trials investigating this option.''We have evidence for marijuana as a treatment for pain, but ''very little is known about the efficacy, dose, routes of administration, or side effects of commonly used and commercially available cannabis products in the United States.'' The caveats continue. Is it good for epilepsy? ''Insufficient evidence.''Tourette's syndrome? Limited evidence. A.L.S., Huntington's, and Parkinson's? Insufficient evidence. Irritable-bowel syndrome? Insufficient evidence. Dementia and glaucoma? Probably not. Anxiety? Maybe. Depression? Probably not.

Then come Chapters 5 through 13, the heart of the report, which concern marijuana's potential risks. The haze of uncertainty continues. Does the use of cannabis increase the likelihood of fatal car accidents? Yes. By how much? Unclear. Does it affect motivation and cognition? Hard to say, but probably. Does it affect employment prospects? Probably. Will it impair academic achievement? Limited evidence. This goes on for pages.

We need proper studies, the panel concluded, on the health effects of cannabis on children and teen-agers and pregnant women and breast-feeding mothers and ''older populations'' and ''heavy cannabis users''; in other words, on everyone except the college student who smokes a joint once a month. The panel also called for investigation into ''the pharmacokinetic and pharmacodynamic properties of cannabis, modes of delivery, different concentrations, in various populations, including the dose-response relationships of cannabis and THC or other cannabinoids.''

Figuring out the ''dose-response relationship'' of a new compound is something a pharmaceutical company does from the start of trials in human subjects, as it prepares a new drug application for the E.D.A. Too little of a powerful drug means that it won't work. Too much means that it might do more harm than good. The amount of active ingredient in a pill and the metabolic path that the ingredient takes after it enters your body—these are things that drugmakers will have painstakingly mapped out before the product comes on the market, with a tractor-trailer full of supporting documentation.

With marijuana, apparently, we're still waiting for this information. It's hard to study a substance that until very recently has been almost universally illegal. And the few studies we do have were done mostly in the nineteen-eighties and nineties, when cannabis was not nearly as potent as it is now. Because of recent developments in plant breeding and growing techniques, the typical concentration ofTHC, the psychoactive ingredient in marijuana, has gone from the low single digits to more than twenty per cent—from a swig of near-beer to a tequila shot.

Are users smoking less, to compensate for the drug's new potency? Or simply getting more stoned, more quickly? Is high-potency cannabis more of a problem for younger users or for older ones? For some drugs, the dose-response curve is linear: twice the dose creates twice the effect. For other drugs, it's nonlinear: twice the dose can increase the effect tenfold, or hardly at all. Which is true

for cannabis? It also matters, of course, how cannabis is consumed. It can be smoked, vaped, eaten, or applied to the skin. How are absorption patterns affected?

Last May, not long before Canada legalized the recreational use of marijuana, Beau Kilmer, a drug-policy expert with the RAND Corporation, testified before the Canadian Parliament. He warned that the fastest-growing segment of the legal market in Washington State was extracts for inhalation, and that the mean THC concentration for those products was more than sixty-five per cent. ''We know little about the health consequences-risks and benefits-of many of the cannabis products likely to be sold in nonmedical markets,'' he said. Nor did we know how higher-potency products would affect THC consumption.

When it comes to cannabis, the best-case scenario is that we will muddle through, learning more about its true effects as we go along and adapting as needed-the way, say, the once extraordinarily lethal innovation of the automobile has been gradually tamed in the course of its history. For those curious about the worst-case scenario, Alex Berenson has written a short manifesto, ''Tell Your Children: The Truth About Marijuana, Mental Illness, and Violence.''

Berenson begins his book with an account of a conversation he had with his wife, a psychiatrist who specializes in treating mentally ill criminals. They were discussing one of the many grim cases that cross her desk—''the usual horror story, somebody who'd cut up his grandmother or set fire to his apartment.'' Then his wife said something like ''Of course, he was high, been smoking pot his whole life.''

Of course? I said.

Yeah, they all smoke.

Well . . . other things too, right?

Berenson used to be an investigative reporter for the Times, where he covered, among other things, health care and the pharmaceutical industry. Then he left the paper to write a popular series of thrillers. At the time of his conversation with his wife, he had the typical layman's view of cannabis, which is that it is largely benign. His wife's remark alarmed him, and he set out to educate himself. Berenson is constrained by the same problem the National Academy of Medicine faced—that, when it comes to marijuana, we really don't know very much. But he has a reporter's tenacity, a novelist's imagination, and an outsider's knack for asking intemperate questions. The result is disturbing.

The first of Berenson's questions concerns what has long been the most worrisome point about cannabis: its association with mental illness. Many people with serious psychiatric illness smoke lots of pot. The marijuana lobby typically responds to this fact by saying that pot-smoking is a response to mental illness, not the cause of it—that people with psychiatric issues use marijuana to self-medicate. That is only partly true. In some cases, heavy cannabis use does seem to cause mental illness. As the National Academy panel declared, in one of its few unequivocal conclusions, ''Cannabis use is likely to increase the risk of developing schizophrenia and other psychoses; the higher the use, the greater the risk.''

Berenson thinks that we are far too sanguine about this link. He wonders how large the risk is, and what might be behind it. In one of the most fascinating sections of ''Tell Your Children,'' he sits down with Erik Messamore, a psychiatrist who specializes in neuropharmacology and in the treatment of schizophrenia. Messamore reports that, following the recent rise in marijuana use in the U.S. (it has almost doubled in the past two decades, not necessarily as the result of legal reforms), he has begun to see a new kind of patient: older, and not from the marginalized communities that his patients usually come from. These are otherwise stable middle-class professionals. Berenson writes, ''A surprising number of them seemed to have used only cannabis and no other drugs before their breaks. The disease they'd developed looked like schizophrenia, but it had developed later-and their prognosis seemed to be worse. Their delusions and paranoia hardly responded to antipsychotics.''

Messamore theorizes that THC may interfere with the brain's anti-inflammatory mechanisms, resulting in damage to nerve cells and blood vessels. Is this the reason, Berenson wonders, for the rising incidence of schizophrenia in the developed world, where cannabis use has also increased? In the northern parts of Finland, incidence of the disease has nearly doubled since 1993. In Denmark, cases have risen twenty-five per cent since 2000. In the United States, hospital emergency rooms have seen a fifty per-cent increase in schizophrenia admissions since 2006. If you include cases where schizophrenia was a secondary diagnosis, annual admissions in the past decade have increased from 1.26 million to 2.1 million.

Berenson's second question derives from the first. The delusions and paranoia that often accompany psychoses can sometimes trigger violent behavior. If cannabis is implicated in a rise in psychoses, should we expect the increased use of marijuana to be accompanied by a rise in violent crime, as Berenson's wife suggested? Once again, there is no definitive answer, so Berenson has collected bits and pieces of evidence. For example, in a 2013 paper in the *Journal of Interpersonal Violence,* researchers looked at the results of a survey of more than twelve thousand American high-school students. The authors assumed that alcohol use among students would be a predictor of violent behavior, and that marijuana use would predict the opposite. In fact, those who used only marijuana were three times more likely to be physically aggressive than abstainers were; those who used only alcohol were 2.7 times more likely to be aggressive.

Observational studies like these don't establish causation. But they invite the sort of research that could.

Berenson looks, too, at the early results from the state of Washington, which, in 2014, became the first U.S. jurisdiction to legalize recreational marijuana. Between 2013 and 2017, the state's aggravated-assault rate rose seventeen per cent, which was nearly twice the increase seen nationwide, and the murder rate rose forty-four per cent, which was more than twice the increase nationwide. We don't know that an increase in cannabis use was responsible for that surge in violence. Berenson, though, finds it strange that, at a time when Washington may have exposed its population to higher levels of what is widely assumed to be a calming substance, its citizens began turning on one another with increased aggression.

His third question is whether cannabis serves as a gateway drug. There are two possibilities. The first is that marijuana activates certain behavioral and neurological pathways that ease the onset of more serious addictions. The second possibility is that marijuana offers a safer alternative to other drugs: that if you start smoking pot to deal with chronic pain you never graduate to opioids.

Which is it? This is a very hard question to answer. We're only a decade or so into the widespread recreational use of high-potency marijuana. Maybe cannabis opens the door to other drugs, but only after prolonged use. Or maybe the low-potency marijuana of years past wasn't a gateway, but today's high-potency marijuana is. Methodologically, Berenson points out, the issue is complicated by the fact that the first wave of marijuana legalization took place on the West Coast, while the first serious wave of opioid addiction took place in the middle of the country. So, if all you do is eyeball the numbers, it looks as if opioid overdoses are lowest in cannabis states and highest in non-cannabis states.

Not surprisingly, the data we have are messy. Berenson, in his role as devil's advocate, emphasizes the research that sees cannabis as opening the door to opioid use. For example, two studies of identical twins—in the Netherlands and in Australia—show that, in cases where one twin used cannabis before the age of seventeen and the other didn't, the cannabis user was several times more likely to develop an addiction to opioids. Berenson also enlists a statistician at N.Y.U. to help him sort through state-level overdose data, and what he finds is not encouraging: ''States where more people used cannabis tended to have more overdoses.''

The National Academy panel is more judicious. Its conclusion is that we simply don't know enough, because there haven't been any ''systematic'' studies. But the panel's uncertainty is scarcely more reassuring than Berenson's alarmism. Seventy-two thousand Americans died in 2017 of drug overdoses. Should you embark on a procannabis crusade without knowing whether it will add to or subtract from that number?

Drug policy is always clearest at the fringes. Illegal opioids are at one end. They are dangerous. Manufacturers and distributors belong in prison, and users belong in drug-treatment programs. The cannabis industry would have us believe that its product, like coffee, belongs at the other end of the continuum. ''Flow Kana partners with independent multi-generational farmers who cultivate under full sun, sustainably, and in small batches,'' the promotional literature for one California cannabis brand reads. ''Using only organic methods, these stewards of the land have spent their lives balancing a unique and harmonious relationship between the farm, the genetics and the terroir.'' But cannabis is not coffee. It's somewhere in the middle. The experience of most users is relatively benign and predictable; the experience of a few, at the margins, is not. Products or behaviors that have that kind of muddled risk profile are confusing, because it is very difficult for those in the benign middle to appreciate the experiences of those at the statistical tails. Low-frequency risks also take longer and are far harder to quantify, and the lesson of ''Tell Your Children'' and the National Academy report is that we aren't yet in a position to do so. For the moment, cannabis probably belongs in the category of substances that society permits but simultaneously discourages. Cigarettes are heavily taxed, and smoking is prohibited in most workplaces and public spaces. Alcohol can't be sold without a license and is kept out of the hands of children. Prescription drugs have rules about dosages, labels that describe their risks, and policies that govern their availability. The advice that seasoned potheads sometimes give new users—''start low and go slow''—is probably good advice for society as a whole, at least until we better understand what we are dealing with.

Late last year, the commissioner of the Food and Drug Administration, Scott Gottlieb, announced a federal crackdown on e-cigarettes. He had seen the data on soaring use among teen-agers, and, he said, ''it shocked my conscience.'' He announced that the F.D.A. would ban many kinds of flavored e-cigarettes, which are especially popular

with teens, and would restrict the retail outlets where e-cigarettes were available.

In the dozen years since e-cigarettes were introduced into the marketplace, they have attracted an enormous amount of attention. There are scores of studies and papers on the subject in the medical and legal literature, grappling with the questions raised by the new technology. Vaping is clearly popular among kids. Is it a gateway to traditional tobacco use? Some public-health experts worry that we're grooming a younger generation for a lifetime of dangerous addiction. Yet other people see e-cigarettes as a much safer alternative for adult smokers looking to satisfy their nicotine addiction. That's the British perspective. Last year, a Parliamentary committee recommended cutting taxes on e-cigarettes and allowing vaping in areas where it had previously been banned. Since e-cigarettes are as much as ninety-five per cent less harmful than regular cigarettes, the committee argued, why not promote them? Gottlieb said that he was splitting the difference between the two positions—giving adults ''opportunities to transition to non-combustible products,'' while upholding the F.D.A.'s ''solemn mandate to make nicotine products less accessible and less appealing to children.'' He was immediately criticized.''Somehow, we have completely lost all sense of public-health perspective,'' Michael Siegel, a public-health researcher at Boston University, wrote after the F.D.A. announcement:

Every argument that the F.D.A. is making in justifying a ban on the sale of electronic cigarettes in convenience stores and gas stations applies even more strongly for real tobacco cigarettes: you know, the ones that kill hundreds of thousands of Americans each year. Something is terribly wrong with our sense of perspective when we take the e-cigarettes off the shelf but allow the old-fashioned ones to remain.

Among members of the public-health community, it is impossible to spend five minutes on the e-cigarette question without getting into an argument. And this is nicotine they are arguing about, a drug that has been exhaustively studied by generations of scientists. We don't worry that e-cigarettes increase the number of fatal car accidents, diminish motivation and cognition, or impair academic achievement. The drugs through the gateway that we worry about with e-cigarettes are Marlboros, not opioids. There are no enormous scientific question marks over nicotine's dosing and bio-availability. Yet we still proceed cautiously and carefully with nicotine, because it is a powerful drug, and when powerful drugs are consumed by lots of people in new and untested ways we have an obligation to try to figure out what will happen.

A week after Gottlieb announced his crackdown on e-cigarettes, on the ground that they are too enticing to children, Siegel visited the first recreational-marijuana facility in Massachusetts. Here is what he found on the menu, each offering laced with large amounts of a drug, THC, that no one knows much about:

Strawberry-flavored chewy bites
Large, citrus gummy bears
Delectable Belgian dark chocolate bars
Assorted fruit-flavored chews
Assorted fruit-flavored cubes
Raspberry flavored confection
Raspberry flavored lozenges
Chewy, cocoa caramel bite-sized treats
Raspberry & watermelon flavored lozenges
Chocolate-chip brownies. He concludes, ''This is public health in 2018?''

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Colorado's willingness to work with several of my colleagues on this side of the aisle. I want to commend him and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STIVERS), once again, for their commitment to this effort.

This version of the legislation before us right now is dramatically improved and includes a number of Republican priorities, such as language on Operation Choke Point, and a solution that will help industrial hemp farmers across the country, but most especially in Kentucky.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, there are many questions left to be answered. We do not fully understand the sweeping implications of this legislation. We do not yet know what the resulting regulatory regime will look like, nor do we have any assurance that it will not expose the current financial system to illicit activity. In particular, as it is currently drafted, H.R. 1595 offers insufficient safeguards against drug cartels accessing the banking system.

What this legislation does is provide a half answer to a much larger problem than just banking. We owe it to our constituents and to the public to have a serious debate on the underlying issue, and that is the issue of whether or not cannabis should be considered a schedule I substance under the Controlled Substances Act. I know Mr. PERLMUTTER and I share that same sentiment that we should have that larger debate.

In the meantime, Congress is working in a bipartisan way to come up with at least a measure of a solution, but I am hopeful that we can get the medical research necessary and the FDA processes necessary for us to have that larger debate as well. I would welcome that debate, as I know the American people would as well.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I say thank you to my friend for the kind words about working across the aisle. This has been a partnership in many respects, lots of interchange.

I would also say to my friend, the Financial Services Committee has certain jurisdiction. We couldn't take up all of the different things that the gentleman has suggested, Mr. Speaker, but we were able to take up this marijuana bill. It is the first time this Congress has done it, certainly in my terms here, and the reason we did that was because the chairwoman was a driving force to get this matter in front of the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS), chairwoman of the full committee.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1595, the SAFE Banking Act, sponsored by Representatives ED PERLMUTTER, DENNY HECK, STEVE STIVERS, and WARREN DAVIDSON. Let me say to all of these individuals who have worked so long and so hard on this legislation, I am proud of the work that they have done; I am proud of the cooperation that they have demonstrated; and I am proud to be on this floor with them today.

This bipartisan bill addresses a pressing public safety issue for businesses that legally grow, market, or sell cannabis in States that have legalized its use and that are currently forced to operate with cash only. Forty-seven States, three territories, and D.C. have legalized some form of marijuana, and it is time for Congress to act.

Cannabis-related businesses are locked out of the banking system and cannot maintain checking accounts, process payroll obligations, or pay taxes. The Financial Services Committee heard testimony in February that these cash-only businesses and their employees have become targets for violent criminals.

The SAFE Banking Act addresses this serious problem by providing a safe harbor to financial institutions that choose to serve State-regulated cannabis businesses. The bill would also help others, like plumbers or electricians who provide services to cannabis businesses, who face similar challenges with access to banking services. With the passage of this bill, all of these businesses will gain access to traditional financial services that most businesses take for granted.

H.R. 1595 also promotes diversity and inclusion, with several reporting provisions to help Congress monitor that minority-owned and women-owned cannabis businesses get access to credit they need and have a fair chance to compete.

As I have said before and I say here on the floor today, this bill is but one important piece of what should be a comprehensive series of cannabis reform bills.

I have long fought for criminal justice reform and deeply understand the need to fully address the historical racial and social inequities related to the criminalization of marijuana.

I support legislation like Representatives LEE's Marijuana Justice Act and Chairman NADLER's MORE Act that would de-schedule marijuana federally and provide assistance, such as job training and reentry services, for those who have been harmed by the war on drugs.

Let me be clear. It is long overdue for Congress to address the unjust criminalization of marijuana use. So I eagerly look forward to the Judiciary Committee sending the legislation to the House floor soon.

I thank Representatives PERLMUTTER and HECK for their longstanding leadership on this issue for the past 6 years.

I urge all Members to vote ''yes'' on the bill and, when we get the legislation from the Judiciary Committee, to do all of those things that I have spoken about here, what is considered justice for those who have been harmed by some of the laws that cause people to

be incarcerated. We eagerly look forward to that legislation. We urge the Judiciary Committee to send it to the floor so that we can support it.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA), the ranking member of the Investor Protection, Entrepreneurship, and Capital Markets Subcommittee.

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the ranking member allowing me this time.

Let's set aside the moral and societal aspects of cannabis and the debate and acknowledge that we have a problem. We do have a problem. We have States that have decided to violate Federal law; and within those States, we have banking institutions and businesses that are operating within the confines of the State, however, that are still in violation of the Federal law.

Now, here is what we do agree on: We need to have a goal of predictability for these financial institutions and for these businesses. However, I don't believe that this bill will ultimately do that because the Federal Government still views this as a schedule I substance.

I had an amendment in committee, as the author of the bill well knows, that would have forced alignment with all of the various regulators. I think at the time, my recollection is, we counted 13 different Federal regulators that touch these institutions in one way or another.

The answer to that was, well, in the bill, we have a requirement that they are going to agree with each other within 180 days.

Well, this is not going to come as a surprise to those watching on C–SPAN. We can't collectively tie our shoes here in Washington in 180 days, much less get through something that complicated.

My amendment said that this would go into effect only when and if all of the regulators could agree to the language of how to deal with it. I still think that is the right way to go.

□ 1645

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

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Michigan an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. HUIZENGA. There is a big difference we know between industrial hemp and recreational cannabis. The only way for us to really get at this issue and provide predictability to the companies, to the financial institutions, and to our citizens is to have the full debate about whether marijuana and cannabis should be a schedule I substance or not. It is time for this full debate to happen, and I look forward to it.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, to my friend from Michigan, I guess I have more confidence in the Federal employees that they can get something done in the next 180 days.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HECK) who has been working on this subject with me for the last 6 years.

Mr. HECK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Colorado for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1595, the SAFE Banking Act.

Before I do that, I want to acknowledge the leadership of this man for a very long period of time. The only reason we are standing here tonight about to vote on this is because of the tireless and brilliant leadership by the gentleman from Colorado. I thank him for it. It has been an incredible journey over a long period of time. I thank the chair of the committee as well for her strong and clear leadership on this. Lastly, I would like to thank the two gentlemen from Ohio, Mr. STIVERS and Mr. DAVIDSON, who are not just allies, they are friends and have done excellent work in this regard.

This is a public safety bill pure and simple. If you want your neighborhoods to be safer, Mr. Speaker, vote ''yes.'' If you want your communities to be safer, vote ''yes.'' If you want the employees at the dispensaries throughout the 47 States who have some form of legalized cannabis, vote ''yes.''

This is a public safety bill, and it is not hypothetical. It is real. Exhibit A, Travis Mason. June 18 of 2016, Travis Mason got up and went to work. He was full of optimism about life. He was a marine veteran. He served this country honorably. He was looking forward to his future, because he just had been informed that he was approved to take the Denver Police Department test. He was confident he would pass it. He had been studying for it.

So he kissed his lovely wife, Samantha, good-bye. They were both marine veterans, both just 24 with three small children. He kissed Aidyn and Daisy—they were twins—and little baby Julian good-bye and went to work where he served as a security guard in a dispensary in suburban Denver.

Because that was an all-cash settlement, because the Federal law did not allow for that business to be banked, to be within the guardrails of the financial system, an evil person walked in that night and shot Travis dead and left Samantha a 24-year-old widow with three small children. This was so unnecessary. If we pass this legislation that does not have to happen. This is not hypothetical.

You can be agnostic on the underlying policy of whether or not cannabis should be legal for either adult recreational use or to treat seizures for juvenile epileptics, but you cannot be agnostic on the need to improve safety in this area.

If you believe that the first two provisions, especially, of the Cole memorandum, which sets forth: Keep marijuana out of the hands of children and keep cash out of the hands of the cartels, if you support that, you must vote ''yes'' on this bill so that we can track this and so that we can monitor this.

If we do nothing, bad things will again happen. If we pass this law, if we pass the SAFE Banking Act, the public safety measure, then we can avoid another widow, Samantha, and another murdered clerk at a dispensary. We can make our neighborhood safer, and we can make our communities safer. Please join us in voting ''yes'' on H.R. 1595.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from North Carolina has 9 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Colorado has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Germantown, Tennessee (Mr. KUSTOFF).

Mr. KUSTOFFF of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the ranking member for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 1595, the SAFE Banking Act. I do want to say, I appreciate the debate that we have had in our Financial Services Committee, but I think that we need to have the same debate in the Judiciary Committee.

We all know that over the last several years, States across the country have passed various laws to legalize marijuana for both recreational and medical purposes. That flawed approach has created a patchwork of State laws and regulations that have allowed for the spread of marijuana use across the U.S.

Proponents of this bill claim that it will provide consistent guidelines for marijuana companies to do business across our national finance system. However, my concern is that the legalization will only provide safe harbor while legitimizing and encouraging more widespread use of this currently illegal drug.

The reality today is that we are voting to nationally legalize marijuana throughout our banking system rather than taking the correct approach, which I believe is to take a vote to legalize what is currently an illegal substance.

I would ask my colleagues who support this bill to think long and hard about what you are actually voting on today, because the consequences will be far-reaching beyond the intent of this bill.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), who is a co-chair of the Congressional Cannabis Caucus and a sponsor of the Marijuana Justice Act which we hope to see marked up and brought to the floor.

Ms. LEE of California. First of all, Madam Speaker, let me thank Congressman PERLMUTTER for yielding and also for his tireless leadership. This has taken a heck of a long time. The gentleman has stayed with it. He has been persistent, and I stand here and salute his efforts.

I also want to thank Chairwoman WATERS for moving this bill out of the Financial Services Committee and for

her support for our Marijuana Justice Act. I want to thank Congressman HECK for his clarity as to why this bill is necessary and for his support. And then, of course, my partner and friend, who has been on this issue so many years as co-chair of the bipartisan Congressional Cannabis Caucus in which I also serve as co-chair, Congressman EARL BLUMENAUER. I salute and thank everyone for getting us to this point.

The SAFE Banking Act would explicitly permit banks and other financial institutions to work directly with State legal cannabis businesses—legal cannabis businesses—instead of relying on cash transactions. This bill is not only timely but extremely necessary. Right now the cannabis industry needs access to safe and effective banking immediately.

Now, let me be clear. Federal law severely limits access to loans and capital for the cannabis business, especially, mind you, for those who have cannabis-related arrests and convictions on their record. That means that less than one-fifth of the cannabis industry is owned or operated by people of color, even though African Americans have been shown to use cannabis at the same rate as White Americans, yet are incarcerated at about 80 percent more in terms of incarceration rates. This is just plain wrong. So this bill is a great first start to addressing all of these issues.

I am telling you, Madam Speaker, communities of color should equally benefit from all of the laws that have been passed at the State level. They should have the opportunity to generate generational wealth for their families, too.

That is why, in addition to this bill, the House must bring forward legislation like my Marijuana Justice Act and the MORE Act, which addresses criminal justice reform, restorative justice, and fully reinvests in communities of color impacted by the failed and racist war on drugs.

Madam Speaker, I want to thank Mr. PERLMUTTER, again, for his leadership and for working with us to get this to the floor.

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Columbus, Ohio (Mr. STIVERS), who is the ranking member of the National Security, International Development and Monetary Policy Subcommittee of the Financial Services Committee. He is a great advocate for the bill.

Mr. STIVERS. Madam Speaker, I would like to thank the ranking member for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1595, the SAFE Banking Act. The bill provides a limited safe harbor for banks and credit unions to open and maintain accounts for marijuana-related businesses and other nonmarijuana-related businesses.

I personally oppose recreational marijuana. But for me, this bill has nothing to do with the larger debate about marijuana and whether it is a good or bad thing. Instead, I am narrowly focused on the public safety aspects of this bill. The inconsistencies between State and Federal law have created a situation where a growing number of State-regulated businesses are operating on a cash-only basis. As a result, they sit on large pools of cash that make them a magnet for violent robberies.

The transactions of cash-only businesses are not subjected to rigorous anti-money laundering or know your customer requirements that would be required for bank account holders. This makes it difficult for regulators and law enforcement to trace transactions or to freeze money.

The SAFE Banking Act will make our communities safer by getting cash off the streets and into regulated financial institutions, so we can root out fraud and other illegal activity. The bill also extends the safe harbor to any proceeds indirectly received from these businesses such as a hardware store down the street or the landlord of these businesses.

Importantly, the SAFE Banking Act does not change the legal status of marijuana. Additionally, H.R. 1595 also includes provisions that would prevent financial regulators from denying or discouraging access to the banking system for other legal businesses as happened in 2014 through 2016. This protection is a major protection for other legal businesses.

I want to thank Mr. PERLMUTTER and Mr. HECK for their incredible advocacy on this. I want to thank Chairwoman WATERS and Ranking Member MCHENRY for their honest and hard-working efforts, even when they disagree. And I want to thank Senator CORY GARDNER who has championed this bill in the Senate.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on H.R. 1595.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD a list of supporters for the SAFE Banking Act from a broad coalition, including the National Association of Attorneys General, including 38 State attorneys general, 20 State Governors, and 18 State banking supervisors, the United Food and Commercial Workers, the Credit Union National Association, the Independent Community Bankers Association, the American Bankers Association, the Mid-size Bank Coalition of America, the National Bankers Association, Law Enforcement Action Partnership, the Minority Cannabis Business Association, the Mayors Coalition for Marijuana Reform, eight insurance trade associations, the International Council of Shopping Centers, the National Cannabis Industry Association, the National Cannabis Roundtable, the Cannabis Trade Federation, the California Cannabis Industry, the Florida Agriculture Commissioner, the Safe and Responsible Banking Alliance, the Electronic Transaction Association, the Real Estate Roundtable, the National Association of Realtors, Brinks, Inc., the National Armored Car Association, the American Financial Services Association, and ScottsMiracle-Gro.

H.R. 1595, the SAFE Banking Act, is supported by a wide range of national organizations and state officials, including:

National Association of Attorneys General (NAAG), United Food and Commercial Workers (UFCW), Credit Union National Association (CUNA), Independent Community Bankers Association (ICBA), America Bankers Association (ABA), Mid-size Bank Coalition of America (MBCA), National Bankers Association (NBA), 50 State Banking Associations, Electronic Transaction Association (ETA), Third Party Payment Processors Association (TPPPA), Law Enforcement Action Partnership (LEAP), The Real Estate Roundtable (RER), National Association of REALTORS, Safe and Responsible Banking Alliance (SARBA), American Land Title Association (ALTA).

American Property Casualty Insurance Association (APCIA), The Council of Insurance Agents and Brokers (CIAB), Reinsurance Association of America (RAA), Independent Insurance Agents and Brokers of America (Big ''I''), Wholesale Specialty Insurance Association (WSIA), National Association of Professional Insurance Agents (PIA), National Association of Mutual Insurance Companies (NAMIC), Rural County Representatives of California (RCRC), Brinks, Inc., International Council of Shopping Centers (ICSC), National Association of Professional Employer Associations (NAPEA), National Cannabis Industry Association (NCIA), Minority Cannabis Business Association (MCBA), National Cannabis Roundtable (NCR), Cannabis Trade Federation (CTF), ScottsMiracle-Gro, National Armored Car Association (NACA).

Additionally, the Mayors Coalition to Push for Marijuana Reform, 38 State Attorneys General, 20 Governors, 18 State Banking Supervisors, and the Florida Agriculture Commissioner have endorsed the legislation.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), who has been the quarterback of a lot of this cannabis legislation.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy, the leadership, and you have heard from a number of the champions in this House fighting for a more rational policy regarding cannabis.

We are in this fix today because Congress has refused to provide the partnership and the leadership that the States demand. The States aren't waiting for us. As you have heard, 47 States have taken steps to legalize some form of State legal cannabis.

One of the most insidious aspects of our being out of sync is what we have seen in terms of access to banking services. Congressman HECK elaborated I think very emotionally and effectively about the dangers that this presents. We have an opportunity to fix that problem.

This is an $11 billion industry and growing, and it is growing because the people and the States have demanded it. We need to step up and solve one of the biggest problems, and that is simply they don't have access to banking services. I have worked on this issue for decades. I have never met a human being who feels that there is any good

purpose served by forcing them to pay their bills with duffle bags full of $20 bills—not one person. It is an invitation to theft, it is an invitation to money laundering already, it is an invitation to tax evasion, and it stifles the opportunities of this business.

I strongly urge our colleagues to vote for this as the next step. This is an important foundational, but it is not the last step. We have important legislation that is keyed up and ready to go. This approval today will provide momentum that we need for further reform that we all want and will make America safer and stronger.

□ 1700

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR), chair of the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations of the Committee on Financial Services.

Mr. BARR. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1595, the SAFE Banking Act, and I thank the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER), my friend, for working with me in a bipartisan way to include two amendments that will allow legal hemp farmers and businesses in my district to access financial services.

Kentuckians have a deep interest in the production, cultivation, and sale of industrial hemp, and we have historic connections to this, too. Many Americans may not know, but my predecessor in the central Kentucky seat in Congress, Speaker of the House Henry Clay, was once a hemp farmer. Now, thanks to the farm bill, the hemp industry in the Commonwealth is booming once again.

Much of the resurgence of the industry occurred under the Industrial Hemp Research Pilot Program, established by the 2014 farm bill. Since the program's enactment in 2014, the number of approved acres in Kentucky increased from 922 to over 50,000. In 2018, sales of hemp products were three-and-a-half more times than the previous year.

The 2018 farm bill took it a step further and fully legalized industrial hemp, ending 80 years of prohibition of the plant. Hemp is now completely exempt from the Controlled Substances Act. Despite these positive steps forward, hemp businesses still have trouble accessing financial services like bank accounts, loans, and payment processing.

This bill will provide additional clarity for banks, insurance companies, and card processors that they can, in fact, do business with legally operating hemp businesses. It would also direct our Federal financial regulators to issue joint guidance to financial institutions on how to serve hemp and CBD businesses without legal risk.

There is amazing potential for hemp and hemp-derived products. One hemp farmer in my district has an exclusive deal with Patagonia to provide hemp for farming. Toyota, which has the largest manufacturing facility in my district, is exploring the use of hemp for car interiors. Hemp farmers in my district are cultivating hemp to produce products ranging from nutraceuticals, dietary supplements, pharmaceuticals, cosmetics, apparel, footwear, fashion, and even industrial products and construction materials.

But for hemp producers and businesses to fully scale up and take advantage of the descheduling under the farm bill, they need access to financial services.

Again, I thank the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER), my friend, for working with me in a bipartisan way, and I urge support for H.R. 1595.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, may I inquire how much time each side has remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. DEGETTE). The gentleman from Colorado has 4 minutes remaining. The gentleman from North Carolina has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS), the chair of the Subcommittee on Consumer Protections and Financial Institutions.

Mr. MEEKS. Madam Speaker, there has been a rapid and dramatic shift in the legal treatment of cannabis, led by voters at the local and State levels.

Nearly every American now lives in a State where cannabis has been decriminalized to some extent and legal business activities permitted to varying degrees, including in my home State of New York. But Federal drug laws and bank regulations have not evolved to reflect this new reality. We need clear, harmonized laws, which the SAFE Banking Act provides.

Without passage of this bill, the legal cannabis industry is forced to operate mostly in cash, depriving law enforcement of important financial data and creating avoidable security risks for companies and their employees.

With the passage of this bill, entrepreneurs, employees, and financial institutions operating legally within the bounds of State and local laws will no longer bear the burden of a punitive Tax Code, high compliance hurdles, the lack of all basic financial services, and significant security risks.

I am proud of the work Mr. PERLMUTTER has done on this bill, and I compliment him.

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DAVIDSON), a great member of the Committee on Financial Services.

Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the SAFE Banking Act.

This is a banking bill. It defends civil liberties with a simple concept: If it is legal in your State, you should be able to bank it. No Federal regulator should be able to block an American's lawful access to the financial system.

In Ohio, legal, State-regulated businesses are being forced into using cash or intermediaries. This bill will help get cash off our streets and into the regulated financial system.

I am also pleased the bill includes Mr. LUETKEMEYER's legislation to stop the closing of accounts on the basis of political biases or motivations.

For far too long, financial institutions have said: You are not going to bank those people, are you?

It is time to defend civil liberties and pass this important bill.

Madam Speaker, I urge bipartisan, broad support of its passage.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 45 seconds to the gentleman from California (Mr. CORREA).

Mr. CORREA. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of this commonsense legislation, the SAFE Banking Act.

When I was a State senator in California, I was visited by Dr. Moynihan, who came to visit my office to ask that I do some legislation to help his daughter. In her short lifetime, she had been tormented by epileptic seizures. The only drug that worked for her without severe side effects was cannabis.

It breaks my heart to know that these legit businesses can pay their taxes with cash, yet customers like Dr. Moynihan can't use a credit card. He also has to pay with cash to get legitimate products. It doesn't make sense.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to please support commonsense legislation. Please vote ''aye'' on this legislation.

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Speaker, may I inquire how much time I have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from North Carolina has 3 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Colorado has 2¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GAETZ).

Mr. GAETZ. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY) for yielding, and it is on behalf of those cannabis patients in Fort Walton Beach and across the Sunshine State that I rise in support of the SAFE Banking Act.

I am proud to have been a part of drafting Florida's medical marijuana laws, and it is ludicrous that the Congress of the United States would stand between people operating under the color of State law and their ability to access the financial system.

It is good for no one to have billions of dollars rolling around outside of the accountabilities, efficiencies, and safeguards that the American financial system provides.

A vast majority of States have legalized some form of cannabis, and if a business is legal in that State, it should have the same financial protections as any other business.

I am a proud original cosponsor of the SAFE Banking Act, and I thank my colleagues for their tireless work on this issue. I know the bill is not perfect. I expect the bill to get better in the Senate, but hopefully, this will build some commonsense momentum for real cannabis reform.

Let's get this drug off the schedule I list and do right for the great people in the country.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 45 seconds to the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Ms. PLASKETT).

Ms. PLASKETT. Madam Speaker, today, because federally regulated banks and other financial institutions may face prosecution if they offer their services to businesses selling legal cannabis products across 47 States, D.C., and four U.S. territories, many legal businesses are forced to operate in a cash-only business, making them targets for theft and creating opportunities for tax evasion and money laundering.

It is simply unfair to deprive legal, State-approved businesses of financial services any longer. Social equity will go further by allowing businesses to come out of the shadows.

As chair of the House Committee on Agriculture's Subcommittee on Biotechnology, Horticulture, and Research, I am pleased that this legislation was made inclusive of hemp as it moved through the process. I have heard from a number of legal hemp businesses that have experienced similar issues.

Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER), my colleague, for the inclusion of the territories.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 45 seconds to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY).

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I strongly support this bill and congratulate the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HECK) for their hard work.

We have to pass this bill because it is a public safety issue. Banks can't serve marijuana businesses, an $11 billion business, because it is still illegal at the Federal level, which means that legal marijuana businesses around the country operate in all cash.

This is a huge public safety issue because storing huge piles of cash in warehouses is a magnet for criminal activity. But it also means that companies that just provide services to marijuana businesses, like electric or water utilities, are also getting cut off from the banking system. Undermining people's access to basic utilities creates yet another public safety problem.

Madam Speaker, I urge support for this bill.

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Speaker, may I inquire how much time I have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from North Carolina has 2 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Colorado has 45 seconds remaining.

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

Madam Speaker, let me begin as I did with my opening statement. I commend the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER) for how he has managed this bill and brought it to the floor.

What we have here on the House floor, and we are debating now, is a much broader bill and, therefore, will have a much broader vote than what we had in committee, however limited we were in committee jurisdiction.

Madam Speaker, I know if the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER) were on the Appropriations Committee, he would have worked for medical research funding. I know that if he were on the Energy and Commerce Committee, he would have worked for an FDA process on cannabis. And if he were on the Committee on the Judiciary, he would have worked to deschedule the drug.

However, we find ourselves on the Financial Services Committee, and this is not a normal conversation that we have on the committee. But this is addressing a key issue that many States are facing, and many financial institutions, credit unions, and banks are facing, which is how to bank people with a lot of cash, with a product that is legal at the State level but defined at the Federal level as an illicit substance that is harmful for human consumption.

While Congress is taking this half-measure, it doesn't resolve the issue. It does not resolve the issue of medical research or understanding the brain science and how cannabis affects the adolescent brain. There are enormous questions there. There are enormous questions about the Federal Criminal Code. But these are things that we should be debating rather than this half-measure on banking.

While this is an important step on the question of the overall legalization of this drug, it still doesn't resolve the issue fully.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues for a ''no'' vote, but I expect this vote will pass on the suspension calendar today. I thank my colleague for his handling of this important issue and the wise nature of how he has approached the amendment process to address many different equities across the country. I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY). As I said at the top of this debate, this bill is about public safety, accountability, and respecting States' rights.

Our bill is narrowly tailored to get cash off the streets and improve public safety in communities across the country.

I thank my cosponsors. They have heard from me. They have been working with me for years, and I really appreciate that. Especially, I thank the staff of the Committee on Financial Services, the staff of my cosponsors, and my own staff for the work they have done to put this bill and coalition together.

There are many marijuana issues that remain, but this one gets the cash off the streets. This is about public safety.

Madam Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on the SAFE Banking Act, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1595, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 321, nays 103, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 544]

YEAS—321

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Amash
Amodei
Armstrong
Axne
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bost
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brindisi
Brooks (AL)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crenshaw
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Cunningham
Curtis
Davids (KS)
Davidson (OH)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Davis, Rodney
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Emmer
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Estes
Evans
Ferguson
Finkenauer
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fletcher
Flores
Foster
Frankel
Fudge
Gabbard
Gaetz
Gallego
Garamendi
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Gibbs
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez (OH)
Gonzalez (TX)
Gooden
Gottheimer
Graves (GA)
Green (TN)
Green, Al (TX)
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Haaland
Hagedorn
Harder (CA)
Hastings
Hayes
Heck
Hern, Kevin
Herrera Beutler
Higgins (NY)
Hill (AR)
Hill (CA)
Himes
Hollingsworth
Horn, Kendra S.
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Hunter
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (TX)
Joyce (OH)
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Keller
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Massie
Mast

Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCarthy
McClintock
McCollum
McGovern
McKinley
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Meuser
Miller
Mitchell
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newhouse
Norcross
Norman
Nunes
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Olson
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Riggleman
Rodgers (WA)
Roe, David P.
Rogers (AL)
Rooney (FL)
Rose (NY)
Rouda
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill
Simpson
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Soto
Spanberger
Spano
Speier
Stanton
Stauber
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stevens
Stivers
Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Timmons
Tipton
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres Small (NM)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Upton
Van Drew
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Waltz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watkins
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Wilson (FL)
Womack
Yarmuth
Yoho
Young
Zeldin

NAYS—103

Aderholt
Allen
Arrington
Babin
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Brady
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Conaway
Cook
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duncan
Dunn
Fortenberry
Foxx (NC)
Fulcher
Gallagher
Gianforte
Gohmert
Gosar
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Guest
Guthrie
Harris
Hartzler
Hice (GA)
Holding
Hudson
Huizenga
Hurd (TX)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (PA)
Kelly (MS)
King (IA)
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
Lesko
Lucas
Marchant
McCaul
McHenry
Meadows
Moolenaar
Mullin
Murphy (NC)
Palazzo
Palmer
Pence
Posey
Ratcliffe
Roby
Rogers (KY)
Rose, John W.
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Scalise
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sewell (AL)
Shimkus
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Stewart
Thornberry
Turner
Wagner
Walberg
Walker
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Woodall

NOT VOTING—9

Abraham
Clyburn
Crawford
Cummings
Higgins (LA)
Marshall
McEachin
Torres (CA)
Wright

□ 1742

Messrs. SENSENBRENNER, BUCHANAN, and Ms. SEWELL of Alabama changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. EMMER, NADLER, Mrs. LURIA, Messrs. HUNTER, WOMACK, LONG, Ms. STEFANIK, Messrs. RESCHENTHALER and TIMMONS changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOMELAND SECURITY IMPROVEMENT ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2203) to increase transparency, accountability, and community engagement within the Department of Homeland Security, provide independent oversight of border security activities, improve training for agents and officers of U.S. Customs and Border Protection and U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, and for other purposes, will now resume.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

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

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I am in its present form.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Green of Tennessee moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 2203, to the Committee on Homeland Security with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Add, at the end of section 711 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (as proposed to be added by section 1 of the bill), the following:

''(k) PROTECTIONS FOR VICTIMS OF CRIME IN SANCTUARY CITIES.—

''(1) RECEIPT OF COMPLAINTS.—The Ombudsman shall use the process established under subsection (b) to receive complaints—

''(A) from victims of crimes committed by aliens unlawfully present in the United States when such crimes occur in sanctuary jurisdictions; and

''(B) regarding the impact of illegal immigration on communities located in sanctuary jurisdictions from individuals within such jurisdictions.

''(2) INCLUSION IN REPORTS.—The Ombudsman shall include in the report submitted under subsection (d) the following:

''(A) The names of each sanctuary jurisdiction from which a complaint under paragraph (1) was received.

''(B) Information regarding whether a detainer request was issued by U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement for an alien related to a complaint and whether such detainer was acted upon by the relevant sanctuary jurisdiction.

''(C) Any complaint pattern that could be prevented or reduced by policy or practice changes by sanctuary jurisdictions.

''(D) Other information or recommendations, as determined appropriate by the Ombudsman.

''(3) DEFINITION.—The term 'sanctuary jurisdiction' means a State or local government that has in effect on the effective date of this section a law, regulation, or policy that prohibits or in any way restricts a Federal, State, or local government entity, official, or other personnel from complying with the immigration laws (as defined in section 101(a)(17) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(17))), or from assisting or cooperating with Federal law enforcement entities, officials, or other personnel regarding the enforcement of such laws.''.

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee (during the reading). Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, over 180 jurisdictions in the United States, including our most populated cities and States have passed laws prohibiting local law enforcement from cooperating with Federal immigration officials.

In these sanctuary jurisdictions, local law enforcement is barred from complying with lawful detainers from Immigration and Customs Enforcement. An ICE detainer is a notice to another law enforcement agency that ICE intends to assume custody of an illegal alien. It includes information on their criminal history.

The Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals found that ICE administrative warrants, which, unlike criminal warrants, are not issued by a judge, are, in fact, sufficient to detain in a county jail someone whom ICE might deport, even if they have been granted bail or their charges have been dropped.

Madam Speaker, there are many accounts of innocent men and women and children murdered, raped, or assaulted by criminal aliens released by sanctuary cities that refuse to comply with the ICE detainer.

In March 2018, ICE lodged a detainer on Martin Gallo-Gallardo, a Mexican national, in the country illegally after locating him in an Oregon county jail. Jail officials did not honor the immigration detainer and released the convicted criminal. Seven months later, he was arrested again, this time for killing his wife.

In February 2019, police in San Jose, California, arrested Carlos Carranza, a Salvadorian national who had entered the country illegally, in the brutal slaying of a 59-year-old woman that he just noticed on the street. Carranza had an extensive criminal record, having been arrested half a dozen times for assault, battery, and burglary. ICE lodged seven detainers with local California authorities, yet, every single time, local authorities released him without notifying ICE, and now a mother of two is dead.

Sadly, I could go on and on with these horrible true stories. The facts

are undeniable: sanctuary cities constitute a threat to public safety. Meanwhile, as this body fails to act, the number of victims continues to grow.

We are a nation of laws, and we must uphold our laws and not reward State and local officials who deliberately and flagrantly disregard the laws of this body.

When I was a State senator in Tennessee, we addressed the problem. I authored a bill and added teeth to our sanctuary city laws, anti-sanctuary city laws, so any city that would choose to ignore the law would lose their State economic funding.

It is time for Congress to act. Despite all of our disagreements, all this bill does is allow the victims to be heard, that is it. It requires the ombudsman created by this bill to collect their stories and the data on these victims.

Under this amendment, any victim of a crime committed by an illegal immigrant in a sanctuary jurisdiction can safely and securely file a report with the ombudsman. This allows victims and their families an opportunity to be heard by policymakers in Congress and by the Department of Homeland Security.

Why would we not let the victims be heard?

The ombudsman will analyze reporting patterns, make recommendations on how we decrease these incidents. This amendment would at least provide an outlet for the growing number of victims and their families to ensure that their stories are told. Hopefully, we will act tonight on behalf of the victims.

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

Ms. ESCOBAR. Madam Speaker, I claim the time in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. ESCOBAR. Madam Speaker, there is no one here who better understands what is happening on the southern border than those of us who actually live on the U.S.-Mexico border. There is no one here for whom border security is more important than those of us fortunate enough to live on the southern border.

Since the creation of the Department of Homeland Security in 2003, American taxpayers have spent over $300 billion on the agencies that carry out immigration enforcement; and the rights of those of us who live within 100 miles of the border, and that is the southern border as well as the northern border, our rights have been eroded.

What Congress has not done is create the corresponding transparency, accountability, and oversight needed over these investments. H.R. 2203 will do that.

The Republican motion only seeks to divide us. Quite simply, this is a poison pill amendment that has no relevance to what we are trying to do here with this bill.

Some of my colleagues seem obsessed with dehumanizing immigrants, casting them as criminals to be feared and even hated.

Let me remind Members that the recent massacre in El Paso, Texas, was not carried out by an immigrant, but by a killer, a U.S. citizen who drove 600 miles across the State of Texas to slaughter Mexicans and immigrants. And he did this in one of the safest cities in America. Immigrant communities and border communities remain among the safest cities in America.

Enough.

And my Republican colleague completely misses the point of the ombudsman, the office of the ombudsman. An ombudsman is supposed to be focused on oversight related to the inner workings of the Department, not on external policy issues. This amendment is a side show that detracts from that mission.

Accountability, oversight, and transparency should not be controversial. And much of what is in this commonsense bill is precisely what we have seen embraced by law enforcement, local law enforcement in our communities. Why would we not want to have a well-funded and powerful Federal law enforcement agency adhere to those same values?

Instead of pursuing symbols of division, we ask our Republican colleagues to support fundamental accountability and oversight over the hundreds of billions of dollars we have given to DHS and support transparency for a powerful agency.

History will not judge us kindly for the way that this administration has treated migrants, agents, and border communities like mine. It will judge us in this Chamber even more harshly if we continue to call for more symbols of division.

Let us commit to responding in a way that honors our sacred credo of our country, ''E pluribus unum''—out of many, we are one.

Let us commit to responding in a way that honors our mother of exiles, the Statue of Liberty, and our heritage as a nation of immigrants. That is who we are. It is who we always will be.

Let's work together and make sure that our response is one filled with common sense and compassion.

I urge a ''no'' vote on this motion and a ''yes'' on the underlying bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 5-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage of the bill, if ordered, and adoption of House Resolution 576.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 207, noes 216, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 545]

AYES—207

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

NOES—216

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Amash
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Davids (KS)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean

DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Haaland
Hastings
Hayes
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Hill (CA)
Himes
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luján
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McBath
McCollum
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rose (NY)
Rouda
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sires
Smith (WA)
Soto
Speier
Stanton
Stevens
Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small (NM)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—10

Abraham
Clyburn
Crawford
Cummings
Grothman
Higgins (LA)
Huizenga
Marshall
McEachin
Wright

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1800

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. GROTHMAN. Madam Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 545.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 230, nays 194, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 546]

YEAS—230

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

NAYS—194

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

NOT VOTING—9

Abraham
Clyburn
Crawford
Cummings
Higgins (LA)
Huizenga
Marshall
McEachin
Wright

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1807

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HUIZENGA. Madam Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 545 and "nay" on rollcall No. 546.

RAISING A QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MCCARTHY. Madam Speaker, I rise to a question of the privileges of the House, and I send to the desk a privileged resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas at a press conference on September 24, 2019, Speaker of the House Nancy Pelosi stated: "Therefore today, I'm announcing the House of Representatives is moving forward with an official impeachment inquiry."

Whereas House Practice states that: "Under the modern practice, an impeachment is normally instituted by the House by

the adoption of a resolution calling for a committee investigation of charges against the officer in question.''

Whereas in the past 25 years, the House of Representatives has moved forward with impeachment against a federal officer three times, each initiated by an impeachment inquiry resolution approved by the full House, not by a unilateral decree of the Speaker.

Whereas on May 12, 2009, the House approved H. Res. 424, authorizing and directing the Committee on the Judiciary to inquire whether the House should impeach Samuel B. Kent, a judge of the United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas.

Whereas on January 13, 2009, the House approved H. Res. 15, authorizing and directing the Committee on the Judiciary to inquire whether the House should impeach G. Thomas Porteous, a judge of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Louisiana.

Whereas on October 8, 1998, the House approved H. Res. 581, authorizing and directing the Committee on the Judiciary to investigate whether sufficient grounds exist for the impeachment of William Jefferson Clinton, President of the United States.

Whereas the Committee Report to accompany H. Res. 581 stated: ''Because the issue of impeachment is of such overwhelming importance, the Committee decided that it must receive authorization from the full House before proceeding on any further course of action.''

Whereas that report further stated: ''Because impeachment is delegated solely to the House of Representatives by the Constitution, the full House of Representatives should be involved in critical decision making regarding various stages of impeachment.''

Whereas the Speaker's extraordinary decision to move forward with an impeachment inquiry without any debate or vote on such a resolution by the full House undermines the voting privileges afforded to each Member and the constituents they represent.

Whereas this unprecedented and politically motivated decision by Speaker Pelosi represents an abuse of power and brings discredit to the House of Representatives: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved: That the House of Representatives disapproves of the actions of the Speaker of the House, Mrs. Pelosi of California, to initiate an impeachment inquiry against the duly elected President of the United States, Donald J. Trump.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The resolution presents a question of the privileges of the House.

MOTION TO TABLE

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I have a motion at the desk.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Hoyer moves that the resolution be laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to table.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MCCARTHY. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 5-minute vote on the motion to table will be followed by a 5-minute vote on agreeing to H. Res. 576.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 232, noes 193, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 547]

AYES—232

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

NOES—193

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

NOT VOTING—8

Abraham
Clyburn
Crawford
Cummings
Higgins (LA)
Marshall
McEachin
Wright

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1818

Mr. CASTRO of Texas changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the motion to table was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPRESSING SENSE OF THE HOUSE WITH RESPECT TO WHISTLEBLOWER COMPLAINT MADE TO INSPECTOR GENERAL OF INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on agreeing to the resolution (H. Res. 576) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the whistleblower complaint of August 12, 2019, made to the Inspector General of the Intelligence Community, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 421, nays 0, answered ''present'' 2, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 548]

YEAS—421

Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Allred
Amash
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Axne
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Bergman
Beyer
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NC)
Bishop (UT)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bost
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady
Brindisi
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Cline
Cloud
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crenshaw
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Cunningham
Curtis
Davids (KS)
Davidson (OH)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Davis, Rodney
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Estes
Evans
Ferguson
Finkenauer
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fletcher
Flores
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx (NC)
Frankel
Fudge
Fulcher
Gabbard
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gallego
Garamendi
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Gianforte
Gibbs
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez (OH)
Gonzalez (TX)
Gooden
Gosar
Gottheimer
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Green, Al (TX)
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Haaland
Hagedorn
Harder (CA)
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings
Hayes
Heck
Hern, Kevin
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (NY)
Hill (AR)
Hill (CA)
Himes
Holding
Hollingsworth
Horn, Kendra S.
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson (TX)
Jordan
Joyce (PA)
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Keller
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamb
Lamborn
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Lesko
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Mast
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McNerney
Meadows
Meeks
Meng
Meuser
Miller
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (NC)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newhouse
Norcross
Norman
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Olson
Omar
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Posey
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Riggleman
Roby
Rodgers (WA)
Roe, David P.
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rooney (FL)
Rose (NY)
Rose, John W.
Rouda
Rouzer
Roy
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Rutherford
Ryan
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scalise
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill
Shimkus
Simpson
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Soto
Spanberger
Spano
Speier
Stanton
Stauber
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stevens
Stewart
Stivers
Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Timmons
Tipton
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small (NM)
Trahan
Trone
Turner
Underwood
Upton
Van Drew
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Waltz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watkins
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Wexton
Wild
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoho
Young
Zeldin

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—2

Gohmert
Massie

NOT VOTING—10

Abraham
Clyburn
Crawford
Cummings
Higgins (LA)
Joyce (OH)
Marshall
McEachin
Nunes
Wright

□ 1824

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. LEE of Nevada) laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Small Business:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, September 25, 2019.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: I am writing to submit my resignation from the Committee on Small Business to allow an incoming Member of Congress to have the opportunity to sit on the Committee. I am honored to have served on the Committee, and I am thankful for Chairwoman Velazquez and Ranking Member Chabot's leadership.

Sincerely,

TRENT KELLY,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Homeland Security:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, September 25, 2019.

The Honorable NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER PELOSI:I write to respectfully tender my resignation as a member of the Committee on Homeland Security.

It was my great honor and privilege to serve on the Homeland Security committee since I was first elected to Congress, and I will continue prioritizing national security issues through my work as Ranking Member at the House Judiciary Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism and Homeland Security as well as the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

During my tenure in Congress, I attained additional committee assignments, which made me one of just a handful of members to serve on four committees. I relinquished this seat on the Homeland Security Committee to make room for the new Republican House members elected in the recent special elections through committee assignments that best serve the Republican conference overall.

Sincerely,

JOHN RATCLIFFE,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

□ 1830

GUN VIOLENCE IS A NATIONAL HEALTH AND NATIONAL SECURITY CRISIS

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

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, while we mourn those lost in these all-too-frequent mass shootings, it is important to remember, while some cities suffer these tragedies occasionally, others suffer them daily.

Every year, dozens of my neighbors are victims of shootings across my city. We need to stop looking at guns as simply a Second Amendment issue and address them as a national health and security crisis.

Our people are dying, and we have the power to stop it.

We have already taken similar actions in other industries when lives are threatened or lost. Automobiles are a safety risk, so we pushed for seatbelts and airbags. Smoking is a health risk, so we banned advertisement and vending machines to protect our children.

That is why I am proud to support stricter background checks before a gun purchase and a ban on high-capacity magazines, which should only be available to trained American soldiers.

But we must do more.

Like me, many Members return to districts where gun violence is all too common and where it is rare to find a family that has not lost a member to this national menace.

HUMAN TRAFFICKING IS ALIVE AND WELL

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

Mr. YOHO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to call attention to the issue of human trafficking, which is still alive and well today.

The United States has been ranked among the top three nations of origin for victims of human trafficking in 2018, according to a recent report by the State Department, and is the number one consumer of sex trafficking worldwide.

This is absolutely unacceptable, and as a Member of Congress, we must use all means necessary to rid our Nation of human trafficking and keep people safe from this kind of abuse.

That is why, this week, I will be introducing two bills to help combat this. They are the Prevent Trafficking in Our Schools Act, and the COMBAT Act of 2019.

The Prevent Trafficking in Our School Act instructs the Secretary of Homeland Security and Secretary of Education to develop a pilot program to train school officials and teachers to identify signs of trafficking in our schools and educate these same officials on the prevalence in our community.

The COMBAT Act addresses the fact that the U.S. does not have an official count for domestic human trafficking by requiring a report to Congress on the prevalence of human trafficking happening within the United States.

I ask for support on these bills.

IMPORTANT ISSUES OF THE DAY

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, today the transcript was released of the conversation between the President of the United States and the President of Ukraine.

As a person who believes in the Constitution and the rule of law, it is crucial that we proceed with the work that is necessary, and so I rise to add my enthusiastic support for H. Res. 576 that just passed, expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the whistleblower complaint, in order to protect the whistleblower and to have the complaint sent to the United States Congress, which, I believe, it is on its way, and, if not, we must have it as quickly as possible.

Let me also say that today we had a very important hearing in the Judiciary Committee regarding the ban on assault weapons. It has been 53 days since El Paso, 52 days since Dayton, and 25 days since Odessa.

It seems that the leadership of the NRA finds my statements attractive, and so they have taken to the airways with their cousin, FOX News, to talk about the opinion that I had regarding the AR–15 that, to me, ''it was as heavy as 10 boxes.''

As a person who believes in the First Amendment, I have a right to say that. To all of the members of the NRA: I believe in your beliefs and your right to believe them, but you are being led by an unfortunate group of leaders who simply want to attack and have no solutions.

I will take the hit from the NRA to save lives. I am not afraid of the NRA.

PFAS REMEDIATION

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Madam Speaker, I rise today to discuss a very important matter and one that is bipartisan in nature.

I thank my friend and colleague from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) for helping us organize and bring awareness to an issue that affects communities across the United States.

As co-chair of the Congressional PFAS Task Force, I am pleased that PFAS remediation efforts are receiving the attention so desperately needed.

In Bucks and Montgomery Counties, we have seen firsthand the negative impacts PFAS contamination has had on our community. Further action must be taken on a Federal level.

Earlier this year, the House and the Senate passed their NDAA bills that both included important provisions to address PFAS contamination. These provisions will help to clean up contaminated sites, stop PFAS from polluting our drinking water in the future, and protect our servicemembers and our first responders.

In order to protect veterans and families in our communities from PFAS, in the final NDAA, we must have the best PFAS provisions from the House and Senate NDAA bills.

Madam Speaker, I call, tonight, for all NDAA conferees to ensure resources for PFAS remediation efforts are included in the final package. This issue cannot wait any longer. Congress must act now.

MARIJUANA INDUSTRY NEEDS HELP FROM BANKERS

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

Mr. HORSFORD. Madam Speaker, I rise today in overwhelming support of the SAFE Banking Act of 2019.

Almost 3 years ago, Nevada voters went to the polls and voted to legalize recreational marijuana, making Nevada one of five States to legalize marijuana in the 2016 election.

After its legalization, local business owners invested in Nevada's legal cannabis market, creating jobs and opportunity. The Nevada marijuana market quickly exceeded expectations, growing rapidly to become a burgeoning industry.

Within 10 months, Nevada also exceeded the initial 1-year projection of tax revenue, bringing in more than $55 million in taxes for our schools, money that would have otherwise flooded the illicit drug market. Today, Nevada raises more revenue from cannabis excise taxes than alcohol excise taxes.

Interestingly enough, the marijuana industry did this without incurring vast detriments to society, creating an addiction crisis, or serving as a gateway drug, as marijuana opponents have long argued.

CONGRATULATING ERIN WILLMAN FOR CREATING OPPORTUNITIES FOR DISABLED ADULTS

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Erin Willman of Warren, Pennsylvania. Just 22 years old, Erin is running her own business, White Cane Coffee.

Erin founded her company with an important goal in mind: to provide people with disabilities with self-sustaining jobs.

Erin is blind and on the autism spectrum. She believes that providing a welcoming environment centered around a good cup of coffee is a natural way to promote inclusivity.

White Cane Coffee offers eight different roast varieties, and each bag includes braille-friendly labels.

Despite being capable and wanting to work, almost 90 percent of adults with autism are either unemployed or underemployed. For many, jobs are extremely difficult to find; and for others, work environments are not supportive or are even hostile to those who are disabled. Erin is helping to bridge this gap by empowering autistic adults in her community.

I am proud of the work that Erin is doing every day to create opportunities for autistic adults in Warren County.

CANNABIS COMPANIES NEED FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS TO HELP THEM START AND GROW

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

Ms. PINGREE. Madam Speaker, I rise to support H.R. 1595, the SAFE Banking Act, which passed this House this afternoon.

Maine voters have legalized marijuana. Like every other business, cannabis companies in Maine and other legalization States need financial institutions to help them start and grow.

Maine credit unions and banks want to help. They were early advocates of the SAFE Banking Act. They recognize that a safe harbor is necessary so that lenders can assist this emerging industry sector, to the benefit of consumers, lenders, and law enforcement.

Just yesterday, a banker from southern Maine contacted me out of regret. The bank had to close a long-time customer's account when they found out he was a delivery driver for a legal marijuana producer. Due to potential Federal liability, the bank lost a customer. The citizen lost his trusted financial institution.

Does he have to keep his earnings under a mattress?

This makes no sense. The SAFE Banking Act will fix this problem by allowing lenders to legally serve marijuana businesses. It promotes security by ensuring transactions are done through regulated institutions, not with bags of cash.

AAKASH PATEL NAMED BUSINESSMAN OF THE YEAR BY THE INDO-U.S. CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

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

Mr. SPANO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate one of Tampa Bay's most impactful business leaders, Aakash Patel.

Aakash was recently honored as Businessman of the Year by the Indo-U.S. Chamber of Commerce, a group that provides Asian American professionals and entrepreneurs a platform to share and collaborate.

Aakash currently serves as the chairman of the Early Learning Coalition of Hillsborough County, a 501(c)(3) that provides quality childhood care and after-school programs to many of the children in my district.

At the age of 27, Aakash founded a local consulting firm, with an expertise in public relations, targeted networking, and social media. Under his leadership, his small group of millennials, over the last 9 years, has actively resourced over 150 companies.

His love and passion for our community is also seen in his role as the youngest board member of the Greater Tampa Chamber of Commerce and with his selection as an honorary commander at MacDill Air Force Base.

Please join me in congratulating one of Tampa's most well-established rising stars in the business community, Aakash Patel.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S.J. RES. 54, TERMINATION OF NATIONAL EMERGENCY DECLARED BY THE PRESIDENT ON FEBRUARY 15, 2019

Mr. MORELLE, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 116–218) on the resolution (H. Res. 591) providing for consideration of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 54) relating to a national emergency declared by the President on February 15, 2019, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

DISPLAY ON NATIONAL MALL BY THE HISTORICAL VEHICLE ASSOCIATION

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Speaker, I want to point out a unique opportunity for viewing. The U.S. Park Service, their division of the Historic Vehicle Association, places on display in The National Mall, several times a year, unique vehicles with unique histories.

Right now, in a glass case just a couple of blocks from here in The National Mall is the 1966 Volkswagen van that belonged to Esau and Janie Jenkins from South Carolina, who were longtime revered civil rights leaders back in the day, transporting people to rallies and to get them out to vote and for voter registration, education, all sorts of things in the civil rights movement, starting back in the 1940s until they obtained this van and used it for many years.

It was brought out from a field where it had been deteriorating over many years. It was brought back to life in this display for everyone to see in this glass case. It will be here for the rest of the week.

I encourage people to go down and check that out and see what the Historic Vehicle Association is doing.

□ 1845

GOOD ECONOMIC NEWS

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

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Madam Speaker, this is going to be one of those evenings where I am going to try to actually go through sort of complex numbers, but a lot of it is incredibly optimistic.

I am going to do two things tonight:

Part of this is just some frustration on numbers that I keep seeing out there that aren't being discussed here in this body that are incredibly optimistic in the economy.

And the second thing is: I want to talk about, remember last week the theme was global warming, climate change, the environment, and I had my issue of The Economist on what is called the climate issue?

I want to talk about some really amazing technologies that I can't believe weren't discussed last week that are actually about to create stunning breakthroughs.

So, let's first actually talk through this. I have this intense frustration that my brothers and sisters on the left, and even a number of us on the right, don't talk enough or at all about the amazing good things happening to the American worker, to people out there who had a pretty rough previous decade.

The math is the math. So the premise I want to give right now is economic growth is moral because it uplifts, it makes work valuable, it improves your future, your retirement, and your ability to take care of your kids. Economic growth is moral.

The reason I have this particular board up—and we try to do this every week—is what are some of the greatest threats to our society?

I actually believe it is the stunning size of our unfunded liabilities. Once again—and I say this almost every week when I am behind this microphone—the next 30 years, if you take Social Security and Medicare and remove it from the 30-year window, this country, the Federal Government, the CBO projection, $23 trillion in the bank, if we pull Social Security and Medicare into that number, then we are $103 trillion in debt—negative.

That is not Republican or Democrat math, it is just demographics. There are 74 million of us who are baby boomers. We are moving into our earned benefits, and the honest truth is, the resources that were required to meet these earned benefits were never set aside.

So how do we keep our commitments?

We are actually proposing over and over and over that it is a combination. There is no magic bullet. It is a combination. Madam Speaker, you have got to grow the economy like crazy. So tax policy that grows and expands, trade policy that grows and expands, immigration policy that grows and expands, regulatory policy that grows and expands, and incentives to be in the labor force that grow and expand the economy.

The adoption of disruptive technology to change the price of healthcare is absolutely necessary. We need incentives for Americans who are older and who feel they are healthy and still want to work, to stay in the labor force. We go over these details over and over and over again.

There is a way to make the math survivable without some of the lunacy of functionally almost buying constituencies with outlandish promises, just managing the reality of our demographics and our current promises. Once again, every 5 years, just the

growth in Social Security, Medicare, and healthcare entitlements—just the growth—will equal the Defense Department. That means every 10 years two Defense Departments is just the growth.

CBO projects that in the next 10 years, 91 percent of the growth will be in spending on Social Security, Medicare, and healthcare entitlements. Much of that is calculated with actually a new much, much lower medical inflation. It is demographics. It is population shifts moving into those benefits.

You would think, Madam Speaker, if those who come behind these microphones actually loved and cared for their brothers and sisters, they would actually try something new, and that would be invest in a calculator, tell the truth about the math, come together, and make it work. We believe there is a way to make it work.

Part of the reason I am behind the microphone tonight is I want to talk about some of the amazing things that are happening, proving the first part of that discussion, that you can change the economic cycle. I have been on the Joint Economic Committee now for years. And these freaky smart professors, demographers, and economists would come and sit in front of us and say: David, it looks like your future is a 1.8, maybe a 1.9 GDP growth. We are going to have a labor force that is going to fall somewhere into the mid-50s as people retire, because remember 10,300 Americans turn 65 every single day.

That was our future, Madam Speaker, and you couldn't make this math work at all.

So how many times did you hear the term a fiscal cliff is coming?

Then this crazy thing has happened the last couple of years where we changed our tax law and we updated our regulatory environment. We are still negotiating, trying to update our trade environment. But just those couple of levers changed the economic life for so many Americans. Yet this place is so incredibly sour, I don't know why there is not joy.

I want to walk through some of these numbers. Look, these are just some of the headlines. Associated Press said that U.S. household income finally matches 1990 peak, while poverty rate hits its lowest since 2001. That is what they call inflation-adjusted dollars. We had a lost decade. We had a couple of lost decades. We are back.

For the first time, most new working-age hires in the U.S. are people of color. It turns out, when we would sit in the Joint Economic Committee a couple years ago, we would hear that those who didn't have graduate degrees, those who didn't finish high school and who didn't have these particular skill sets were going to be consigned to the permanent underclasses.

Besides just the common cruelty of accepting that, the darkness of accepting that, it turns out it wasn't true.

Why isn't there joy?

This is an editorial from The Wall Street Journal from the editorial board on the 20th, and there are some numbers in here we have been tracking. They did a fine job sort of lumping it together. But we all saw it here on this floor in some of those 1-minute comments a couple weeks ago, a number of our brothers and sisters on the left were just outraged that in 2018, Medicaid rolls declined.

Do you know why they declined?

It turns out they declined because workers' earnings increased by 3.4 percent while the poverty rate decreased by another half a percent. So now the poverty rate is at 11.8. It is still unacceptably high. It is also the lowest since 2001, and some of the fastest reduction of poverty in U.S. history was just last year.

If you say you care about those who don't have many of the same opportunities or haven't had them in life, Madam Speaker, shouldn't there be just a little recognition there is something pretty amazing happening out there in the economy for these folks who were being written off as being part of the permanent underclass? Yet they have the fastest growing wages in those lower quartiles.

I am sorry. I know I get behind this microphone and often sound like an accountant on steroids. I struggle with a way to make this sort of a powerful story, a powerful narrative. So many of our brothers and sisters around here get behind this microphone and are great at telling stories. But understanding this math—I don't care if you are Democrat or Republican, Madam Speaker, you should be joyful that something is working out there, and you would think policy-wise we would have a discussion of how we keep it going.

Some more from this editorial: Full-Time, year-round workers increased by 2.3 million in 2018. Employment gains were the biggest among minorities, female-led households. The share of workers in female-led households who worked full-time year-round increased by 4.2 percent, and among Hispanics 3.6 percent.

It is the next paragraph that caught my eye when I was reading this on the airplane, and I can't believe it wasn't headlined around this country, because we all talk about how we care about those who have had a really rough decade, those who have been poor, and those who are fighting and struggling to feed their families and move up.

As a result, real median earnings—and let's stop for a moment. When you hear the words ''real median earnings,'' Madam Speaker, what does that mean?

It is something we call inflation-adjusted dollars. So, if we tell you your income went up 2 percent, but last year inflation was 1 percent, you only went up 1 percent. So when you hear the term real dollars or constant dollars or adjusted dollars, it means we have made up for inflation, so your purchasing power is held constant.

As a result, real median earnings for female households with no spouse present jumped 7.6 last year.

How many speeches have been given on this floor over the last decade about that population and the crushing burden of poverty?

More happened last year than had happened in the previous few years in moving that population out of poverty.

I am sure our brothers and sisters on the left when they hear the actual math will be joyful because they care about these folks, right?

The poverty rate among female households declined 2.7 percent for African Americans—Blacks—4 percent for Hispanics, and 7.1 percent for their children. Those are amazing numbers.

It is part of my point that I keep trying to make over and over. Economic growth is moral.

But what was more important, because the irony of this editorial, the real cure for inequality, it turns out that the share of households making less than $35,000 in inflation-adjusted dollars has fallen 1.2 percent, because they were making more. But when you actually look at the amount where the income growth was, it wasn't at the upper quartiles of income. It looks like the growth in income with what they say in the lower quartiles. Meaning, as this editorial—and we still don't have the math yet, but we are tracking it, we are probably not going to have it for another year when we look back at 2019—but preliminarily, 2019 may be the year, the first year in modern times, where income inequality actually shrinks.

It is not because the wealthy didn't get wealthier. It is because those in the lower income finally were receiving pay raises, because they are finally working in a world where there are more jobs than there is available labor, so their labor is more valuable.

Isn't that exciting?

Shouldn't we all get together, Republicans and Democrats, and figure out how to do more of this?

□ 1900

The editorial touches on this, but I want to give an explanation. As 10,300 Americans retire every day, those are often individuals who are near the peak of their earning cycle, their lifetime earnings.

The economists for years and years had said they expected to see certain mean income fall because high-skilled workers, because of their time in the workforce, they were retiring and their salary was going to come out. Younger workers weren't being paid as much. It turns out, some of our youngest workers have had some of the biggest pops in income.

Mean incomes increased in households between the ages of 15 to 24 and 25 to 34 by 9.1 percent and 5 percent, respectively. It turns out our young workers had some of the most aggressive, positive pay raises in all of society.

How much have we heard that on our media? How about our financial press? How much here on the floor? How much from those who care about social policies?

Look, the reality of it is that something pretty amazing is happening out there in our economy. When you saw the August unemployment numbers of how many Americans who were not even looking came back into the labor force, because, back to our previous point, labor force participation, a growing economy, is moral. It is something that I hope everyone here, no matter what your ideology, is joyful about. That economic expansion, we are starting to see it in the early data from CBO, and soon, hopefully, the Social Security actuaries. The dates of running out of money in our earned entitlement programs are getting pushed off because of the amount of payroll taxes that are coming in.

As you look at these numbers, try to absorb how stunning. Earnings for single female households in just 2018—we are not talking multiple years—just 2018 of 7.6 percent. If I had shown up here a couple of years ago and said that is what 2018 was going to produce, you would have laughed me out of the place, but it happened.

Poverty rates for female households are down 2.7 percent; for Hispanic, down 4 percent. The 2.7 is African American.

Hasn't this also been the goal around here? We were going to find policies that created a level, egalitarian sort of equity in participating in the American Dream, the economic expansion. It is happening.

I am sure when my brothers and sisters on the left see these numbers, they will soon be coming to these microphones overjoyed, joyful, excited that the policies from the Republicans over the last couple of years have brought economic numbers that a lot of those really smart professors, economists, and demographers who sat in front of us over the last decade said were impossible.

We need to rethink. If you claim you care, maybe we should engage in policies that really do work. Just as the Wall Street editorial makes very, very clear, we have seen distribution not lift people out of poverty. In many ways, the math has kept them in poverty. But the economic expansion, the economic miracle from the last couple of years, is working. Maybe we should consider doing more of it. So, look, that is just an intense frustration I have.

I want to start with this slide, sort of as the thought experiment. I am someone who cares a lot about the environment, but I also care about telling the truth about the math. Virtue signaling does not make the environment healthier and cleaner. It may get you reelected. It may get you some nice comments on Twitter or a blog. It doesn't make the environment better. So every once in a while I will bring this slide up.

D.C. is one of the communities that has banned straws. Bless them. How many U.S. straws end up in the ocean? Oh, pretty much none.

Madam Speaker, 90 percent of the ocean plastic—and I am someone, before I got this job—look, I am blessed to represent one of the greatest districts you can imagine, lots of smart people, lots of people who care. Lots of people have chosen to move their lives, their existence, their prosperity, and work hard in the Phoenix-Scottsdale area. But when you are in the desert, you used to love to go to the ocean and go scuba diving. So plastic in the ocean was always one those things you talked about, you cared about.

Madam Speaker, 90 percent of the plastic in the ocean comes from 10 rivers, eight of them in Asia, two of them in Africa. If you cared about plastic in the ocean, you would do something that is simple and logical: Go to the 10 rivers that are 90 percent of the plastic in the ocean and do something.

A number of us on the Republican side are trying to find ways to adjust parts of our foreign policy, our environmental aid, some of our engineering skills, and those things to these locations of these 10 rivers that are 90 percent of the plastic in the ocean. It is absolutely fascinating the reaction I have had from some of our brothers and sisters who just stare at me because—well, that pretty much ends the virtue signaling of: We are going to get rid of straws, even though 90 percent of the problem is these 10 rivers, eight in Asia, two in Africa.

If you claim you care, learn the actual facts, because virtue signaling does not make this world cleaner.

Let's talk about this last week and optimism. Amazing article, a company called TerraPower, and apparently, Bill Gates is a substantial investor in it. It is a new, dramatically more efficient type of nuclear power. There were some numbers in the article that I thought were important for the continuation of the thought experiment.

About 20 percent of America's electric power comes from nuclear. Seventeen percent comes from renewables. Nuclear still is more than renewables. About 63 percent is from fossil fuels.

Here is the problem with that: If you take a look, the column over here on my right—if you are watching this, your left—are different nuclear power generation that has been shut down or is being shut down. This goes back to 2016. That was some of the newest data I could find. The other side is photovoltaic.

Do you notice something? The two lines are almost identical. If you are someone that is giddy—and look, I am from Arizona. We love our photovoltaic, but we also have the largest nuclear power plant, which is run by Arizona Public Service, in the country at amazing uptime. They do an amazing job running that facility. But this is nuclear power coming offline. That is photovoltaic going online.

You will notice there is no net positive. If you are someone that cares about CO_2, greenhouse gas going into the atmosphere, unless you are stabilizing nuclear power, instead of taking it offline, you didn't get anywhere. But we reward virtue signaling around here and not actual math.

Let's talk some more about the good news and some of the technology breakthroughs that are happening around us. This one is one of my favorites because something the Committee on Ways and Means did last year—and we did it bipartisan, demonstrating you can do these things—is we updated what we call the carbon sequestration tax credit.

This is a facility that is up and running—what is it?—outside the Houston area, in Texas. I hope I don't butcher the technology, but it is a natural gas-fired power plant with no smokestack. They figured out how to take the natural gas, explode it, slam it through the turbines, spin the turbines, produce electricity, and on the other end, capture all the CO_2. Then they sell it, recycle it. Now we are learning they can take that CO_2, and through a process—I think you have to put it to like 150 bars of pressure and those things—it turns out it becomes an incredibly clean-burning fuel because it is really pure carbon.

This facility, I think—if I remember the article—they are trying now to find funding to go up to around 300 megawatts. But they have proven you can burn a hydrocarbon, produce baseload electrical power, and not have a smokestack.

The technology is up and running today and, apparently, a few miles away, there is another plant that is doing the same experiment with coal and no smokestack.

This is a big deal, but there are many of us who also think of the greenhouse gas issue as global. When you have countries like China and its Belt and Road Initiative, it is bringing on 32, 33 coal-fired power plants with functionally almost no greenhouse gas mitigation, carbon capture. They are not using the newest technology.

What happens to a world where someone like myself says that we need the economic growth, that we don't have the economic growth, that we can never keep our economic promises that we have made to our seniors? Retirement security is crucial to economic expansion, but we want a clean environment.

The lunacy of some of the proposals, I beg of them, please, come by our office. We have binders of the disruptive technology that is coming out. This is one that I think we have to be joyful about.

How many of you have ever heard the discussion of negative carbon emissions? We have discussed this concept for 100 years. You can pull CO_2 out of the air.

It turns out this facility is up and running in its pilot project. Bill Gates

is also a funder of this. It is in Canada. I wish it was in Arizona. They are claiming right now that their facility can pull carbon out of the air for about $100 to $150 a ton, capture that carbon, package it, and make a clean-burning fuel out of it.

If the rest of the world continues to go the way it is going, the concept that we now have the technology to yank carbon out of the air, and if it is really heading toward $100 a ton, it is at the threshold where it is economical because, it turns out, the dollar values—some of the sequestration tax credits we do, but also the ability to convert it back into a fuel, it is almost in the money.

This is exciting. How many did you hear talk about this technology over the last 10 days? It is here.

My beloved university, Arizona State University, the biggest university in the United States, has an entire center devoted to this concept of technology that is a negative carbon sink. Functionally, it pulls carbon right out of the air. Their technology is passive, where the other one is active.

The professor working on this—I have met with him—freaky smart. He has a joyful view that basically says let's let the technology compete. Whoever does it the best will win.

This one is more a distributive model of this passive collection where you can put it in lots of locations. Part of it is the cover for your bus stop, but it is also pulling carbon out of the air.

The technology is here, so the Malthusians of this place—and if you don't know what that means, please go look it up—somehow think we need to go back and live in the dark ages, basically, or that man has demonstrated over and over technology is a disruption.

Look, when I was growing up, I remember having a teacher read us the Population Bomb, scaring me to death that by the late 1970s, we were all going to be starving. How many of our kids out there today hear the propaganda on some of the reactionaries, the folklore about what is happening out there, that they are going to be in a planet that is burning up in their late teenage years?

The issues are real, but so are the technology solutions. It turns out solutions often aren't as elegant as a great speech with lots of virtue signaling.

I am very proud of the things that are happening out there.

A final bit of this thought experiment is, years ago, we were blessed—we had a Ph.D. of physics. I think he is now—well, he is at one of those special agencies that does really complex stuff right now. But he did a math experiment for us. Methane, in our formula, was considered 84 times more greenhouse-causing in its first year than carbon. So, okay, you get 84-to-1.

□ 1915

He came to me with this math experiment saying, if you could build a substantial pipeline or multiple pipelines in west Texas and a couple other large hydrocarbon-producing areas and it was designed to capture methane and take that methane and pull it in in enough density to actually convert it to a fuel, and then he had that and a couple other things, you hit the Paris accord numbers.

Isn't that exciting? How many of our brothers and sisters here are already saying we need to be building a bunch more pipelines to go collect that methane so we can capture it, compress it, make sure it doesn't go into the air—except pipelines are, functionally, part of the religious process here and need to be opposed.

If anyone is watching, listening, go look this up: photosynthesis, 40 percent. I actually believe this may be the single most disruptive bit of technology in our lifetimes.

It looks like the inherent problem of plants. You remember all of your high school biology class where we were told plant cells have had, for millions of years, a small flaw. Sometimes they really, really want that carbon molecule so they can make a sugar out of it and, instead, they grab an oxygen molecule.

Apparently, through synthetic biology, they figured out how to rearrange that plant cell so it always grabs the carbon. It grows the sugar, and the plants grow 40 percent more efficient.

Think about that. What would happen if that technology was part of our commodity crops, our fresh produce, the things we eat. The world would feed itself for another 250 years. It would mean 40 percent less land, 40 percent less water, 40 percent less fertilizer.

It turns out, world agriculture produces 2.2 times the greenhouse gases of every car on Earth. Do you know, if you had this type of technology as the crops for around the world, it would be equal to removing every car off the face of the Earth?

And, yes, it is a GMO, because the fix was done through a type of synthetic biology.

But it would equal removing every car off the face of the Earth.

These are joyful thought experiments, but the technology is real, and it is here. We have to figure out, as a body, how we adopt these things that it proves we can grow as a society, we can grow economically as a world.

My soon-to-be 4-year-old little girl can have an amazing future. We don't have to be terrified about the debt cliff that is going to crush us because we grew. And we can have the amazing clean environment and deal with the issues of greenhouse gases.

Are we ready to pull our heads out and actually do that crazy thing of reading and math and understand the technology disruption is in front of us?

Madam Speaker, are we ready to adopt, embrace the technology disruption that allows us to grow, prosper, and meet so many of our goals?

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

NATIONAL SECURITY CONCERNS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, it is with grave concern for our country, our longstanding Western security alliances, and liberty itself that I rise today.

I have the distinct privilege of serving on the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense and co-chair the Congressional Ukraine Caucus.

As the Congresswoman from a district with a strong Ukrainian heritage and tens of thousands of citizens who understand what liberty demands, I hold a unique perspective and, dare say, deep knowledge to speak on the events of the past several days to provide some additional context on why the conversation between President Donald Trump and the newly elected President of Ukraine, Volodymyr Zelensky, is so distressing to our national security.

The American public has looked on in horror as America's President, President Trump, has willfully neglected his oath of office and sacred duty to defend the best interests of our Nation in favor of his own and, in effect, promote the interests of Russian dictator Vladimir Putin.

This week, we learned of yet another instance in which our President has put national security at risk in favor of advancing his own personal, partisan, political objectives.

According to a highly redacted White House memo released this morning, new Ukrainian President Volodymyr Zelensky was quoted as saying he was ''ready to buy more U.S. antitank missiles to defend his nation against Russia's invasion.''

And President Trump, without skipping a beat, responded: ''I would like you to do us a favor, though.''

A favor to receive the funds that this Congress passed and appropriated? A favor to disburse the funds already slated for Ukraine until President Trump held them back to ask a favor?

That is illegal. It is unconstitutional. And it is dead wrong.

This exchange is not only a clear violation of the law; it is an unprecedented abuse of power that undermines our national security, violates our Constitution, and compromises the struggle for liberty on the continent of Europe that includes America's most trusted allies through instrumentalities like NATO.

Article I of the Constitution clearly states that all legislative power shall be vested in the Congress of the United States and that Congress holds the awesome power of the purse.

On July 18, President Trump purposefully directed his administration to

withhold nearly $400 million in defense assistance for Ukraine from the State and Defense Departments' budgets.

These funds were voted by Members of the House and Senate. And, frankly, at one point this year, we did not know that the President was holding the funds back. When we learned that he was, I joined my fellow Ukraine Caucus co-chair, Congressman MIKE QUIGLEY of Chicago, in issuing a statement demanding that the money we had voted for be released.

Members of Congress wrote the President letters and sent them to the White House and were told by the administration that, well, you know, it was ''an interagency delay'' that caused the funds not to be released to a nation at war with Russia.

Russia invaded Ukraine, not the reverse. And the scrimmage line for liberty on the continent of Europe now is at the Russian-Ukrainian border, and our President delayed the release of those funds.

The President sought to make the release of national security funds passed and appropriated by this Congress contingent on asking a new foreign leader for a favor—a favor—prior to release of those funds.

Congress must compel the release of the full conversation that occurred between President Trump and the new President of Ukraine, Volodymyr Zelensky, as well as the full whistleblower complaint as was originally submitted to the Office of Inspector General.

We do not have the full release. I will say more about that in a moment.

The document we were provided today was not a complete transcript of the conversation that our President had with President Zelensky. We only got about 11 minutes of a conversation that lasted upwards of 30 minutes. Congress must demand the full transcript and hold the executive branch officials in contempt if they refuse to give us the full documents.

Like so many Americans, I am disgusted by President Trump's repeated betrayal of American interests in favor of Vladimir Putin's.

This President's efforts to coerce Ukrainian President Zelensky, an allied leader, into helping him win reelection by urging congressionally supported military aid as leverage is not only a dramatic betrayal of the President's constitutional duty; it is also the latest example of Trump doing Putin's bidding.

I am certain that our President's relationship with Vladimir Putin didn't start with his veiled support for Putin's election meddling or inviting the Russians to hack the Democratic National Committee or even lobbying, most recently, for Russia to be readmitted to the G7, our most trusted allies, when Russia has invaded Ukraine, for heaven's sake.

Who benefits when Ukraine loses military assistance? It is an easy question. Russia, the country that is waging a bloody war in Ukraine for over 5 years.

Who is to say Putin wasn't listening in when Trump blackmailed Zelensky?

Madam Speaker, no Member of Congress has traveled to Ukraine as many times as I, beginning long before I was in Congress and long before the Berlin wall fell. I can say with confidence that Ukraine, today, is the scrimmage line for liberty's defense on the continent of Europe. And that is why President Trump's decision to withhold this money is so troubling.

There is no more important strategic military alliance for liberty than America's membership with European nations in NATO, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Every minute of every day, NATO stands united to defend against dictatorships and protect our liberties.

Russia has always hated this organization and will do anything to disrupt the Western alliance, and she is hard and fast at work doing that as we stand here this evening.

We know the battlefields of Europe directly influenced the founding of our own Republic and our fundamental ideals of democracy. NATO stands ready, as we stand here tonight, to defend our liberty. In return, we keep our word—our word—for our NATO allies, a promise that should never be contingent on a single President's political objectives back home.

After the collapse of communist Russia in 1991, Ukraine became a free nation. Ukraine had been occupied for all of its modern history but began its jagged path forward to the free world, a path that has been torturous and fraught with danger and setbacks and, yes, bloody murder.

To this day, there exists an insidious network of corrupt Ukrainian and Russian oligarchs whose tentacles reach far across Ukraine and the rest of the world, seeking to undermine the Western alliance while protecting the selfish, corrupt financial looting that continues to this day in that part of the world and, frankly, even reaching our shores.

It will be a permanent blot on American history that certain Americans, including President Trump's campaign manager and several other Trump operatives, were actually involved in supporting these oligarchs and the undemocratic forces that are trying to undermine the Government of Ukraine every time they try to right themselves. And these oligarchs steal and plunder billions of dollars with their Kremlin allies.

Despite these setbacks, since Ukraine's Euromaidan Revolution of Dignity 5 years ago, Ukrainian people have bravely demonstrated their resolute commitment to their nation's democratic future.

The latest example is their historic Presidential and parliamentary elections, which international observers lauded as free and fair.

Meanwhile, Russia's devastating invasion of Ukraine has resulted in more than 13,000 Ukrainian deaths, including civilians who have been targeted by Russian missiles, 30,000 injured, and more than 2 million displaced internally.

It is sad that Ukraine must fight a war on two fronts: a hot war against Russia, for which she is completely underarmed, and one against the enemy from within, the scourge of corruption, both perpetuated by Russian influence.

In fact, when Boris Nemtsov, a brave Russian, was prepared to lead a demonstration for Ukrainian independence, he was killed on the steps near the Kremlin—how about that?—in Moscow.

□ 1930

That is how Russia plays.

Ukraine's new President, Volodymyr Zelensky, and his party in the Rada won a significant majority because he promised, finally, to root out this corruption.

While the ink is fresh on the Zelensky Presidency, we have high hopes for him and his ability to live up to the expectations of his people. It would be tragic if President Trump compromised him with his recent missteps.

In order to make good on his promise to root out corruption, President Zelensky must make clear his independence from every oligarch. A prime example is his benefactor, the infamous Ukrainian oligarch Ihor Kolomoisky. Kolomoisky serves as an example of corrupt influence on Ukraine's fragile political system.

With a net worth of over $1.2 billion—and I am sure that is a lowball number—Kolomoisky is one of the richest and most corrupt oligarchs in Ukraine. He also owns the television channel that ran the show ''Servant of the People'' that propelled Zelensky to stardom and popular acclaim.

The question for history will be: Will Ukraine's new President be able to rise to the highest aspirations of those who voted for him? Or will he be mired in corruption at home and by entrapment by foreign leaders like President Trump?

Kolomoisky, like other oligarchs, did not become rich due to their acumen. Rather, they used lies, intimidation, cheating, stealing, money laundering, and killing—yes, killing. These are their stock in trade.

Kolomoisky used his company, PrivatBank, as a personal piggy bank by issuing endless loans to himself and, frankly, laundering billions of dollars—billions of dollars—including in this country, mainly in real estate.

In one instance, Kolomoisky hired hundreds of thugs—think about this—with iron rods, rubber bullet pistols, chainsaws, and baseball bats to raid a plant in order to take it over. He didn't buy it. He stole it—surely, a macabre definition of a hostile takeover.

Due to Kolomoisky's corruption and looting of the PrivatBank, the bank had lost $5.5 billion, putting Ukraine's

economy at risk. That is why the head of Ukraine's National Bank, Valeria Gontareva, nationalized it. This was a critical step urged by the United States, the European Union, the International Monetary Fund, and the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

Now, Ms. Gontareva's life is under threat. She was hit by a car in London, leaving her hospitalized. Her son's car was burned. Her house in Kiev was burned down, her apartment raided by police.

Fear, crime, murder, and destruction are the paths of repressive regimes. Freedom-lovers simply do not accept that way of life for ourselves or for the future of Ukraine.

For these reasons, I have invited Valeria to come to Capitol Hill to share her courageous story in the face of such brutal intimidation.

Corrupt oligarchs, with their ill-gotten gains, launder money to the West, where they know our laws will keep their ill-gotten money safe. How ironic it is that the Kremlin mouthpieces mock our values of openness and our strong tradition of rule of law while Putin's cronies safely store and invest their dirty money here.

I can tell you that, in our country, recent reports have noted that Kolomoisky and his business partner, Gennadiy Bogolyubov, have funneled vast funds through various Delaware-based shell companies into properties and businesses around our Nation, even in my district of Cleveland, Ohio, where Kolomoisky has become downtown Cleveland's largest commercial real estate owner. How about that?

It is not just in my State. It is in Florida. It is across this country. This is what is going on with the kind of corruption that spreads across our world, and it is why we have to pay attention to what is happening in Ukraine because, next to Ukraine, behind the Iron Curtain of Russian leadership, they have a plan to disrupt the West, certainly using every tool they have to disrupt the NATO alliance, but even here in our country, trying to disrupt our way of life.

The newly reconstituted PrivatBank, which was taken over by the nation of Ukraine, has brought forth a case on behalf of its shareholders in Delaware against Kolomoisky. According to court documents—and get this—Kolomoisky laundered $470 billion through a Cyprus-based shell company between 2006 and 2016, potentially the largest money laundering case in history.

It is now reported that the FBI is currently investigating these international financial crimes. I fully support their investigation to get to the bottom of these corrupt dealings across the world but, certainly, in the region that I live.

The United States and our allies must send a message that such malign behavior will not be tolerated. We cannot be complicit in empowering foreign money laundering and the enrichment of corrupt oligarchs. We cannot encourage the kind of complicity that the President inferred in his remarks to President Zelensky in his recent conversation.

The United States and our allies can take steps to combat the illicit flows of money that empower the oligarch economy of money laundering, blackmail, murder, and extortion. Congress must enact beneficial ownership transparency legislation to prevent malign actors from easily opening shell companies here. We must continue to support investigative journalism, not just in Ukraine, but here in order to maintain our own liberty and remain the bastion of liberty for the free world.

President Zelensky and the newly elected Rada must now make good on their campaign promises to serve the people of Ukraine, not the oligarchs. Ukraine's new President must fully support the work of anticorruption that has been promoted by even many Members of our own Congress, including Representative BRIAN FITZPATRICK from Pennsylvania, who has worked so hard to establish that effort even prior to his service here in the Congress.

Critical organizations to perform the tasks include the National Anti-Corruption Bureau of Ukraine, the National Agency on Corruption Prevention, as well as the Anti-Corruption Court. The judicial system must be given true independence to root out corruption free from any kind of outside political influence.

Madam Speaker, the Ukrainian people have our full support in their efforts to shake off the rapacious grip of corrupt oligarchs supported by Russia.

Democracy shines in the sunlight, and we want that sunlight to shine here. Any conversation between our President and the new President of Ukraine that can reveal any attempt to threaten security of our longstanding allied relationships and continue to threaten liberty demands the undivided attention of this Congress.

I reiterate my call for transparency, accountability, and strong, unencumbered congressional investigations.

If President Trump and his administration fail to comply with legitimate congressional inquiries, then there is no other option than for this House to stand with our American allies and move forward with impeachment.

We appreciate those who work late into the evening this night to make sure that these words get placed in the RECORD.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD the following material:

KAPTUR PRESS RELEASE ON WHISTLEBLOWER COMPLAINT, SEPTEMBER 20, 2019

WASHINGTON.—Today, Co-Chair of the Congressional Ukraine Caucus Representatives Marcy Kaptur (D–OH), released the following statement after reports of a whistleblower complaint filed by a member of the Intelligence Community, which is being withheld from Congress in violation of federal law, is said to involve Ukraine:

''Today. press reports indicate that a U.S. intelligence officers whistleblower complaint regarding President Trump's possible breach of national security may involve the nation of Ukraine.'' said Rep. Kaptur. As co-chair of the bipartisan Congressional Ukraine Caucus. I fully support the efforts by Chairman Adam Schiff and the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence to seek a detailed accounting of the complaint and transcript of the incident(s), and call upon the Speaker and Minority Leader to take all courses of action for appropriate Congressional oversight to obtain the relevant documents and necessary testimony to establish confirmation of fact and circumstance.''

''Following Ukraine's historic elections and continued democratic struggles, the Ukrainian people deserve our full support. We must know to what extent the President and his lawyer, Rudy Giuliani. are using the weight of U.S. foreign policy, including holding critical security assistance, to advance their own narrow personal interests.''

''The American people deserve a government free of malign foreign influence. The American people deserve to know the full truth.''

KAPTUR/QUIGLEY PRESS RELEASE TO CONDEMN PRESIDENT TRUMP'S ATTEMPT TO SLOW ROLL CRITICAL ASSISTANCE TO UKRAINE, AUGUST 30, 2019

WASHINGTON.—Today, Co-Chairs of the Congressional Ukraine Caucus Representatives Marcy Kaptur (D–OH) and Mike Quigley (D–IL) released the following statement condemning President Trump's attempts to slow-roll $250 million in congressionally appropriated military aid for Ukraine, known as the Ukraine Security Assistance Initiative.

''President Trump's decision to slow-walk this congressionally appropriated military funding for Ukraine is disturbing and demonstrates once again his affinity for Russia and Russian President Vladimir Putin.'' the representatives said in a joint statement. ''This funding is vital to preserving democracy in Ukraine and Eastern Europe and must not be delayed or hindered in any way.''

''With Russia's unprovoked, unwarranted and murderous invasion of Ukraine and with over 10,000 innocent Ukrainians now having been killed, the President of the United States should not be a defender of Russian interests. President Trump has repeatedly berated our closest allies in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. lifted sanctions on Russian oligarchs. and advocated for Russia being allowed back in the G7.''

''The President of the United States should be a champion for liberty, not a pawn for dictators. This funding cannot be delayed.''

MEMORANDUM OF TELEPHONE CONVERSATION

Subject: Telephone Conversation with President Zelenskyy of Ukraine.

Participants: President Zelenskyy of Ukraine. Notetakers: The White House Situation Room.

Date, time and place: July 25, 2019, 9:03–9:33 a.m. EDT Residence.

The President: Congratulations on a great victory. We all watched from the United States and you did a terrific job. The way you came from behind, somebody who wasn't given much of a chance, and you ended up winning easily. It's a fantastic achievement. Congratulations.

President Zelenskyy: You are absolutely right Mr. President. We did win big and we worked hard for this. We worked a lot but I would like to confess to you that I had an opportunity to learn from you. We used quite a few of your skills and knowledge and were able to use it as an example for our elections

and yes it is true that these were unique elections. We were in a unique situation that we were able to achieve a unique success. I'm able to tell you the following; the first time, you called me to congratulate me when I won my presidential election, and the second time you are now calling me when my party won the parliamentary election. I think I should run more often so you can call me more often and we can talk over the phone more often.

The President: [laughter] That's a very good idea. I think your country is very happy about that.

President Zelenskyy: Well yes, to tell you the truth, we are trying to work hard because we wanted to drain the swamp here in our country. We brought in many many new people. Not the old politicians, not the typical politicians, because we want to have a new format and a new type of government. You are a great teacher for us and in that.

The President: Well it's very nice of you to say that. I will say that we do a lot for Ukraine. We spend a lot of effort and a lot of time. Much more than the European countries are doing and they should be helping you more than they are. Germany does almost nothing for you. All they do is talk and I think it's something that you should really ask them about. When I was speaking to Angela Merkel she talks Ukraine, but she doesn't do anything. A lot of the European countries are the same way so I think it's something you want to look at but the United States has been very very good to Ukraine. I wouldn't say that it's reciprocal necessarily because things are happening that are not good but the United States has been very very good to Ukraine.

President Zelenskyy: Yes you are absolutely right. Not only 100%, but actually 1000% and I can tell you the following; I did talk to Angela Merkel and I did meet with her. I also met and talked with Macron and I told them that they are not doing quite as much as they need to be doing on the issues with the sanctions. They are not enforcing the sanctions. They are not working as much as they should work for Ukraine. It turns out that even though logically, the European Union should be our biggest partner but technically the United States is a much bigger partner than the European Union and I'm very grateful to you for that because the United States is doing quite a lot for Ukraine. Much more than the European Union especially when we are talking about sanctions against the Russian Federation. I would also like to thank you for your great support in the area of defense. We are ready to continue to cooperate for the next steps specifically we are almost ready to buy more Javelins from the United States for defense purposes.

The President: I would like you to do us a favor though because our country has been through a lot and Ukraine knows a lot about it. I would like you to find out what happened with this whole situation with Ukraine, they say Crowdstrike . . . I guess you have one of your wealthy people. . . The server, they say Ukraine has it. There are a lot of things that went on, the whole situation. I think you're surrounding yourself with some of the same people. I would like to have the Attorney General call you or your people and I would like you to get to the bottom of it. As you saw yesterday, that whole nonsense ended with a very poor performance by a man named Robert Mueller, an incompetent performance, but they say a lot of it started with Ukraine. Whatever you can do, it's very important that you do it if that's possible.

President Zelenskyy: Yes it is very important for me and everything that you just mentioned earlier. For me as a President, it is very important and we are open for any future cooperation. We are ready to open a new page on cooperation in relations between the United States and Ukraine. For that purpose, I just recalled our ambassador from United States and he will be replaced by a very competent and very experienced ambassador who will work hard on making sure that our two nations are getting closer. I would also like and hope to see him having your trust and your confidence and have personal relations with you so we can cooperate even more so. I will personally tell you that one of my assistants spoke with Mr. Giuliani just recently and we are hoping very much that Mr. Giuliani will be able to travel to Ukraine and we will meet once he comes to Ukraine. I just wanted to assure you once again that you have nobody but friends around us. I will make sure that I surround myself with the best and most experienced people. I also wanted to tell you that we are friends. We are great friends and you Mr. President have friends in our country so we can continue our strategic partnership. I also plan to surround myself with great people and in addition to that investigation, I guarantee as the President of Ukraine that all the investigations will be done openly and candidly. That I can assure you.

The President: Good because I heard you had a prosecutor who was very good and he was shut down and that's really unfair. A lot of people are talking about that, the way they shut your very good prosecutor down and you had some very bad people involved. Mr. Giuliani is a highly respected man. He was the mayor of New York City, a great mayor, and I would like him to call you. I will ask him to call you along with the Attorney General. Rudy very much knows what's happening and he is a very capable guy. If you could speak to him that would be great. The former ambassador from the United States, the woman, was bad news and the people she was dealing with in the Ukraine were bad news so I just want to let you know that. The other thing, There's a lot of talk about Biden's son, that Biden stopped the prosecution and a lot of people want to find out about that so whatever you can do with the Attorney General would be great. Biden went around bragging that he stopped the prosecution so if you can look into it . . . It sounds horrible to me.

President Zelenskyy: I wanted to tell you about the prosecutor. First of all I understand and I'm knowledgeable about the situation. Since we have won the absolute majority in our Parliament, the next prosecutor general will be 100% my person, my candidate, who will be approved by the parliament and will start as a new prosecutor in September. He or she will look into the situation, specifically to the company that you mentioned in this issue. The issue of the investigation of the case is actually the issue of making sure to restore the honesty so we will take care of that and will work on the investigation of the case. On top of that, I would kindly ask you if you have any additional information that you can provide to us, it would be very helpful for the investigation to make sure that we administer justice in our country with regard to the Ambassador to the United States from Ukraine as far as I recall her name was Ivanovich. It was great that you were the first one who told me that she was a bad ambassador because I agree with you 100%. Her attitude towards me was far from the best as she admired the previous President and she was on his side. She would not accept me as a new President well enough.

The President: Well, she's going to go through some things. I will have Mr. Giuliani give you a call and I am also going to have Attorney General Barr call and we will get to the bottom of it. I'm sure you will figure it out. I heard the prosecutor was treated very badly and he was a very fair prosecutor so good luck with everything. Your economy is going to get better and better I predict. You have a lot of assets. It's a great country. I have many Ukrainian friends, they're incredible people.

President Zelenskyy: I would like to tell you that I also have quite a few Ukrainian friends that live in the United States. Actually last time I traveled to the United States, I stayed in New York near Central Park and I stayed at the Trump Tower. I will talk to them and I hope to see them again in the future. I also wanted to thank you for your invitation to visit the United States, specifically Washington DC. On the other hand, I also want to ensure you that we will be very serious about the case and will work on the investigation. As to the economy, there is much potential for our two countries and one of the issues that is very important for Ukraine is energy independence. I believe we can be very successful and cooperating on energy independence with United States. We are already working on cooperation. We are buying American oil but I am very hopeful for a future meeting. We will have more time and more opportunities to discuss these opportunities and get to know each other better. I would like to thank you very much for your support

The President: Good. Well, thank you very much and I appreciate that. I will tell Rudy and Attorney General Barr to call. Thank you. Whenever you would like to come to the White House, feel free to call. Give us a date and we'll work that out. I look forward to seeing you.

President Zelenskyy: Thank you very much. I would be very happy to come and would be happy to meet with you personally and get to know you better. I am looking forward to our meeting and I also would like to invite you to visit Ukraine and come to the city of Kyiv which is a beautiful city. We have a beautiful country which would welcome you. On the other hand, I believe that on September 1 we will be in Poland and we can meet in Poland hopefully. After that, it might be a very good idea for you to travel to Ukraine. We can either take my plane and go to Ukraine or we can take your plane, which is probably much better than mine.

The President: Okay, we can work that out. I look forward to seeing you in Washington and maybe in Poland because I think we are going to be there at that time.

President Zelenskyy: Thank you very much Mr. President.

The President: Congratulations on a fantastic job you've none. The whole world was watching. I'm not sure it was so much of an upset but congratulations.

President Zelenskyy: Thank you Mr. President bye-bye.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Cheryl L. Johnson, Clerk of the House, reported that on September 25, 2019, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill:

H.R. 1058. To amend the Public Health Service Act to enhance activities of the National Institutes of Health with respect to

research on autism spectrum disorder and enhance programs relating to autism, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 38 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, September 26, 2019, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

BUDGETARY EFFECTS OF PAYGO LEGISLATION

Pursuant to the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (PAYGO), Mr. YARMUTH hereby submits, prior to the vote on passage, for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that H.R. 1595, the SAFE Banking Act of 2019, as amended, would have no significant effect on the deficit, and therefore, the budgetary effects of such bill are estimated as zero.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

2269. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Steven M. Shepro, United States Air Force, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 1370(c)(1); Public Law 96-513, Sec. 112 (as amended by Public Law 104-106, Sec. 502(b)); (110 Stat. 293); to the Committee on Armed Services.

2270. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Vice Admiral Clinton F. Faison III, United States Navy, and his advancement to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 1370(c)(1); Public Law 96-513, Sec. 112 (as amended by Public Law 104-106, Sec. 502(b)); (110 Stat. 293); to the Committee on Armed Services.

2271. A letter from the Director, Naval Reactors, transmitting the Executive Summary of the Naval Nuclear Propulsion Program's latest reports on environmental monitoring and radioactive waste disposal, radiation exposure, and occupational safety and health; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2272. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final regulations — Student Assistance General Provisions and Federal Family Education Loan Program [Docket ID: ED-2018-OPE-0027] (RIN: 1840-AD26) received September 17, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

2273. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's final rule — Adjustment of Controls for Lower Performing Radar and Continued Temporary Modification of Category XI of the United States Munitions List [Public Notice: 10779] (RIN: 1400-AE88) received September 3, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2274. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's Freedom of Information Act 2018 Litigation and Compliance Report, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(a)(4)(F)(ii)(II); Public Law 89-554, Sec. 5(ii)(II) (as added by Public Law 110-175, Sec. 5); (121 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

2275. A letter from the Director, Office Congressional Affairs, Federal Election Commission, transmitting the Commission's report stating that it did not complete or initiate competitive sourcing for conversion of an agency activity to contractors for the prior fiscal year, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 501 note; Public Law 108-199, Sec. 647(b); (118 Stat. 361); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

2276. A letter from the Secretary of the Board of Governors, U.S. Postal Service, transmitting the Service's report on postal officers and employees who received total compensation in calendar year 2018, pursuant to 39 U.S.C. 3686(c); Public Law 109-435, Sec. 506; (120 Stat. 3236); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

2277. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act Annual Report to Congress, 2018, pursuant to 52 U.S.C. 20307(b); Public Law 99-410, Sec. 105(b) (as amended by Public Law 111-84, Sec. 587(2)); (123 Stat. 2333); to the Committee on House Administration.

2278. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Northern Rockfish in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 180713633-9174-02] (RIN: 0648-XG974) received September 10, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2279. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Catcher Vessels Using Trawl Gear in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 180713633-9174-02] (RIN: 0648-XG936) received September 10, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2280. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in Statistical Area 610 in the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 180831813-9170-02] (RIN: 0648-XG935) received September 10, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2281. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Economic Exclusive Zone Off Alaska; Deep-Water Species Fishery by Vessels Using Trawl Gear in the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 180831813-9170-02] (RIN: 0648-XG894) received September 10, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2282. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in Statistical Area 620 in the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 180831813-9170-02] (RIN: 0648-XG911) received September 10, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2283. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in Statistical Area 610 in the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 180831813-9170-02] (RIN: 0648-XG916) received September 10, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2284. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Catcher Vessels Using Trawl Gear in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 170817779-8161-02] (RIN: 0648-XG901) received September 10, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2285. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Hook-and-Line Catcher/Processors in the Western Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 180831813-9170-02] (RIN: 0648-XG716) received September 10, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2286. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Sablefish Managed Under the Individual Fishing Quota Program [Docket No.: 180713633-9174-02 and 180831813-9170-02] (RIN: 0648-XG81) received September 10, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2287. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Reallocation of Pollock in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands [Docket No.: 180713633-9174-02] (RIN: 0648-XG847) received September 10, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2288. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting the PRO IP Act FY 2018 report, pursuant to 34 U.S.C. 30106(a); Public Law 110-403, Sec. 404(a); (122 Stat. 4274); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2289. A letter from the Solicitor General, Department of Justice, transmitting a determination in Tiwari v. Shanahan, No. 17-cv-242 (W.D. Wash.), pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 530D(a)(1); Public Law 107-273, Sec. 202(a); (116 Stat. 1771); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2290. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting notification that during Fiscal Year 2017 and 2018 no payments were made from the

Victims Compensation Fund, pursuant to 18 U.S.C. 3525(b); Public Law 98-473, Sec. 1208; (98 Stat. 2162); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2291. A letter from the Solicitor General, Department of Justice, transmitting a determination of the United States Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit concerning United States v. Solis, 915 F.3d 1172 (8th Cir. 2019), pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 530D(a)(1); Public Law 107-273, Sec. 202(a); (116 Stat. 1771); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2292. A letter from the Solicitor General, Department of Justice, transmitting a determination of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania concerning Miller v. Barr, No.2:17-cv-2627 (E.D. Pa., filed Feb. 22, 2019), pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 530D(a)(1); Public Law 107-273, Sec. 202(a); (116 Stat. 1771); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2293. A letter from the Solicitor General, Department of Justice, transmitting a decision of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan of United States v. Jumana Nagarwala et al., No. 17-cr-20274 (E.D. Mich. Nov. 20, 2018), pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 530D(a)(1); Public Law 107-273, Sec. 202(a); (116 Stat. 1771); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2294. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's reports titled, ''Law Enforcement Mental Health and Wellness Act: Report to Congress'' and ''Law Enforcement Mental Health and Wellness Programs: Eleven Case Studies'', pursuant to 34 U.S.C. 10101 note; Public Law 115-113, Sec. 2(a); (131 Stat. 2276) and 34 U.S.C. 10101 note; Public Law 115-113, Sec. 2(b); (131 Stat. 2276); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2295. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting the report on the Administration of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended, for the six months ending June 30, 2018, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 621; June 8, 1938, ch. 327, Sec. 11 (as amended by Public Law 104-65, Sec. 19); (109 Stat. 704); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2296. A letter from the Secretary, Judicial Conference of the United States, transmitting for consideration of a proposed bill titled, ''Criminal Judicial Administration Act of 2019''; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2297. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting a consideration for a legislative proposal that would add a jurisdictional element tied to the Commerce Clause to the statute criminalizing female genital mutilation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2298. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Los Angeles Fleet Week, San Pedro, California [Docket Number: USCG-2019-0590] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 10, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2299. A letter from the Chief, Regulatory Development, Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Hours of Service of Drivers-Restart provisions [Docket No.: FMCSA-2004-19608] (RIN: 2126-AC30) September 13, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2300. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — IFR Altitudes; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31273; Amdt. No.: 548] received September 12, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2301. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of the Class D Airspace; New Iberia, LA [Docket No.: FAA-2019-0344; Airspace Docket No.: 19-ASW-7] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received September 12, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2302. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2019-0023; Product Identifier 2018-NM-145-AD; Amendment 39-19700; AD 2019-15-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 12, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2303. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc., Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2019-0327; Product Identifier 2019-NM-021-AD; Amendment 39-19727; AD 2019-17-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 12, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2304. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2019-0672; Product Identifier 2019-NM-100-AD; Amendment 39-19724; AD 2019-17-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 12, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2305. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; International Aero Engines AG Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2019-0268; Product Identifier 2019-NE-08-AD; Amendment 39-19728; AD 2019-18-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 12, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2306. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2019-0403; Product Identifier 2019-NM-012-AD; Amendment 39-19723; AD 2019-17-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 12, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2307. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Civil works, Department of the Army, Department of Defense, transmitting the Chickamauga Lock Replacement, Hamilton County, TN, Post Authorization Change Report of July 2018; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2308. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting a report required by Secs. 107 and 502 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1862(c); Public Law 95-511, Sec. 502(c) (as added by Public Law 109-177, Sec. 106(h)(3)); (120 Stat. 200) and 18 U.S.C. 3511 note; Public Law 109-177, Sec. 118(c)(1) (as amended by Public Law 114-23, Sec. 602(c)); (129 Stat. 294); jointly to the Committees on the Judiciary and Intelligence (Permanent Select).

2309. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting a draft of a bill to authorize funds for major medical facility projects and leases for FY 2020 and medical facility leases originally requested in FY 2019; jointly to the Committees on Veterans' Affairs and Armed Services.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MORELLE: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 591. Resolution providing for consideration of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 54) relating to a national emergency declared by the President on February 15, 2019 (Rept. 116–218). Referred to the House Calendar.

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. BUDD (for himself and Mr. HARRIS):

H.R. 4484. A bill to require short-term limited duration insurance issuers to renew or continue in force such insurance coverage at the option of the enrollees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PENCE (for himself and Mr. MEADOWS):

H.R. 4485. A bill to establish a public buildings public-private partnership pilot program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. MCNERNEY (for himself, Mr. LUJÁN, and Ms. CLARKE of New York):

H.R. 4486. A bill to require the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Communications and Information to establish a State Digital Equity Capacity Grant Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KIND (for himself, Mr. LONG, and Mr. SCHRADER):

H.R. 4487. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to define the term natural cheese; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

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

H.R. 4488. A bill to develop and implement national standards for the use of solitary confinement in correctional facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. JOHNSON of Texas (for herself, Mr. FORTENBERRY, and Ms. BASS):

H.R. 4489. A bill to prohibit unfair and deceptive advertising of rates for hotel rooms and other places of short-term lodging; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 4490. A bill to require the Inspector General, Department of Justice, to submit a report to the Congress on the number of firearm transaction denials issued by the National Instant Criminal Background Check System that are referred to the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives for investigation, the number of prosecutions resulting from such investigations, and the number of firearms recovered by the Bureau in cases in which such a denial was issued after the firearm was transferred; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MALINOWSKI (for himself and Mr. CLEAVER):

H.R. 4491. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to require shareholder authorization before a public company may make certain political expenditures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. MOORE (for herself, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. ESTES, and Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia):

H.R. 4492. A bill to protect the investment choices of investors in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 4493. A bill to provide a short-term disability insurance program for Federal employees for disabilities that are not work-related, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. PETERSON (for himself, Mr. STAUBER, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. KIND, Mr. MOOLENAAR, and Mr. HUIZENGA):

H.R. 4494. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to reissue a final rule relating to listing of the gray wolf in the Western Great Lakes under the Endangered Species Act of 1973, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. RUIZ (for himself, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. AGUILAR, and Mr. COOK):

H.R. 4495. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services, acting through the Director of the Indian Health Service, to acquire private land to facilitate access to the Desert Sage Youth Wellness Center in Hemet, California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia (for himself, Mr. DUNN, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. YOHO, Mr. YOUNG, Mrs. ROBY, and Mr. HARDER of California):

H.R. 4496. A bill to extend indemnity for wildfires and hurricanes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. SHALALA (for herself, Ms. PRESSLEY, Ms. TLAIB, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. MOORE, and Ms. HAALAND):

H.R. 4497. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to make improvements to the Federal Student Aid Office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SIRES (for himself, Mr. YOHO, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. PASCRELL):

H.R. 4498. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to encourage Canadian tourism to the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. BONAMICI (for herself, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. KILMER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. ROUDA, Mr. KEATING, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. SHALALA, Mr. LEVIN of California, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. CASE, Mr. TAKANO, Mrs. HAYES, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. SCHRIER, Mr. CASTEN of Illinois, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. BEYER, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. PORTER, Mr. NEGUSE, Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Mr. MORELLE):

H. Res. 589. A resolution expressing the need for immediate climate action in response to the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change Special Report on the Ocean and Cryosphere in a Changing Climate; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, Natural Resources, and Science, Space, and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MCCARTHY:

H. Res. 590. A resolution raising a question of the privileges of the House.

By Mr. BERA (for himself, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. KATKO, and Ms. SCHRIER):

H. Res. 592. A resolution recognizing the anniversary of the eradication of smallpox and the importance of vaccination in the United States and worldwide; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CURTIS (for himself, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. TIPTON, and Mr. STIVERS):

H. Res. 593. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the whistleblower complaint received on August 12, 2019, by the Inspector General of the Intelligence Community should be transmitted immediately to the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select).

By Mr. GRIJALVA (for himself, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Ms. HAALAND, Ms. NORTON, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. RUSH, Ms. WILD, Mr. POCAN, and Mr. HUFFMAN):

H. Res. 594. A resolution expressing profound concern about threats to human rights, the rule of law, democracy, and the environment in Brazil; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI (for himself, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. BERA, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. PALLONE, and Mrs. LAWRENCE):

H. Res. 595. A resolution commemorating the 150th anniversary of the birth of Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. BUDD:

H.R. 4484.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. PENCE:

H.R. 4485.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically Clause 1 (relating to providing for the general welfare of the United States) and Clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress) and clause 17 (relating to authority over the district as the seat of government), and Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States).

By Mr. MCNERNEY:

H.R. 4486.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States grants Congress the authority to enact this bill.

By Mr. KIND:

H.R. 4487.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. RICHMOND:

H.R. 4488.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is introduced pursuant to the powers granted to Congress under the General Welfare Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 1), the Commerce Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 3), and the Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 18).

Further, this statement of constitutional authority is made for the sole purpose of compliance with clause 7 of Rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives and shall have no bearing on judicial review of the accompanying bill.

By Ms. JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 4489.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 4490.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: To regulate commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes; and

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United

States or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. MALINOWSKI:

H.R. 4491.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Ms. MOORE:

H.R. 4492.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 4493.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H.R. 4494.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. RUIZ:

H.R. 4495.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution, to provide for the general welfare and make all laws necessary and proper to carry out the powers of Congress.

By Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia:

H.R. 4496.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. SHALALA:

H.R. 4497.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts, and Excises, to pay the Debts, and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. SIRES:

H.R. 4498.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to clause 3(d) (1) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee finds the authority for this legislation in article I, section 8 of the Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 3: Mr. ENGEL, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. FRANKEL, Mr. EVANS, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. NORCROSS, Ms. MOORE, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 88: Mr. PETERSON.

H.R. 94: Mr. KENNEDY and Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 132: Mr. VARGAS.

H.R. 333: Mr. LYNCH.

H.R. 444: Ms. STEFANIK and Mr. PAPPAS.

H.R. 510: Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio, Ms. SCHRIER, and Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.

H.R. 535: Ms. SÁNCHEZ.

H.R. 548: Mr. GOSAR.

H.R. 553: Mr. ROY.

H.R. 587: Mr. DEUTCH.

H.R. 647: Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. STAUBER, and Mr. RESCHENTHALER.

H.R. 808: Mr. LAWSON of Florida.

H.R. 836: Mr. LIPINSKI and Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas.

H.R. 884: Mr. PETERSON.

H.R. 912: Mr. SIRES, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 925: Mr. LARSEN of Washington and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 955: Mr. TRONE.

H.R. 959: Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 960: Mr. KIM, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. NORMAN.

H.R. 1024: Mr. PALAZZO.

H.R. 1034: Mr. LONG.

H.R. 1043: Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. ZELDIN, and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 1098: Mr. KELLER.

H.R. 1139: Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ.

H.R. 1154: Mr. CRIST and Mr. CASE.

H.R. 1173: Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 1175: Mr. CORREA.

H.R. 1185: Mr. PAPPAS.

H.R. 1194: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.

H.R. 1210: Mr. BACON.

H.R. 1329: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.

H.R. 1345: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.

H.R. 1349: Mr. PANETTA and Mr. BALDERSON.

H.R. 1350: Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma.

H.R. 1374: Mrs. HARTZLER and Mr. CARTER of Georgia.

H.R. 1375: Mr. GROTHMAN.

H.R. 1379: Mrs. BUSTOS.

H.R. 1434: Mrs. WAGNER and Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.

H.R. 1530: Mr. BUDD.

H.R. 1556: Mr. POSEY.

H.R. 1557: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 1661: Mr. MASSIE and Mr. AMODEI.

H.R. 1683: Mr. SPANO.

H.R. 1695: Mr. NEWHOUSE.

H.R. 1709: Ms. UNDERWOOD.

H.R. 1715: Ms. DELBENE.

H.R. 1747: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 1749: Mrs. HARTZLER.

H.R. 1753: Mr. WALTZ.

H.R. 1754: Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio, Mr. POSEY, and Mrs. LAWRENCE.

H.R. 1766: Mr. LAMB, Mr. CHABOT, and Mr. COOK.

H.R. 1767: Mr. TRONE.

H.R. 1869: Mr. SIRES, Mr. WALTZ, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mrs. RODGERS of Washington, Mr. PAPPAS, Ms. MOORE, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. VEASEY, and Mr. KELLER.

H.R. 1954: Mr. GROTHMAN.

H.R. 1968: Mrs. RADEWAGEN.

H.R. 1975: Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico.

H.R. 1981: Ms. MENG.

H.R. 1996: Mr. CHABOT.

H.R. 2000: Mr. HORSFORD.

H.R. 2089: Mr. BRINDISI.

H.R. 2148: Mr. CASTEN of Illinois.

H.R. 2214: Ms. JOHNSON of Texas and Mr. COX of California.

H.R. 2215: Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 2225: Mr. LAWSON of Florida.

H.R. 2236: Mr. CARTER of Georgia.

H.R. 2256: Mr. HIMES and Mr. TED LIEU of California.

H.R. 2321: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.

H.R. 2382: Mr. NEWHOUSE and Mr. EMMER.

H.R. 2398: Mrs. AXNE and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 2420: Mr. MORELLE, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. KEATING, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Ms. SHERRILL, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. HOULAHAN, and Mr. SCHNEIDER.

H.R. 2423: Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. WALDEN, Mrs. LESKO, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. SUOZZI, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. BURCHETT, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Miss RICE of New York, Mrs. AXNE, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. TONKO, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. NADLER, Ms. FRANKEL, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. JOHN W. ROSE of Tennessee, Ms. WILD, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. BRINDISI, Mrs. BEATTY, and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 2426: Mr. BABIN, Mr. GOODEN, Ms. CRAIG, and Ms. HILL of California.

H.R. 2435: Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 2460: Mr. STEUBE.

H.R. 2482: Mr. LOWENTHAL and Mr. LAWSON of Florida.

H.R. 2487: Mr. RUTHERFORD.

H.R. 2496: Ms. JAYAPAL.

H.R. 2571: Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma.

H.R. 2599: Mr. TED LIEU of California.

H.R. 2681: Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma.

H.R. 2711: Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. NADLER, Mr. ESPAILLAT, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H.R. 2739: Ms. STEFANIK.

H.R. 2771: Mr. KELLER.

H.R. 2846: Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. CUELLAR, and Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 2895: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 2903: Mr. BARR and Mr. DUNN.

H.R. 2982: Mr. PHILLIPS.

H.R. 2993: Mrs. LAWRENCE.

H.R. 3001: Mr. NEGUSE.

H.R. 3115: Mr. YOUNG, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico, Mr. SARBANES, and Mrs. FLETCHER.

H.R. 3157: Mr. LEVIN of California.

H.R. 3165: Mrs. RODGERS of Washington.

H.R. 3182: Mr. GIANFORTE, Ms. FOXX of North Carolina, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Mr. BACON.

H.R. 3218: Mr. BAIRD.

H.R. 3222: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 3272: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H.R. 3280: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.

H.R. 3289: Mr. MARCHANT and Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 3396: Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 3451: Mr. FOSTER.

H.R. 3452: Mr. CICILLINE and Mr. MORELLE.

H.R. 3463: Mr. CONNOLLY and Ms. JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 3473: Mr. KEATING.

H.R. 3495: Mr. SPANO, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. CRAIG, Mr. KILMER, Mrs. MILLER, and Mr. HOLDING.

H.R. 3555: Ms. DELBENE.

H.R. 3570: Ms. LOFGREN and Mrs. AXNE.

H.R. 3636: Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma.

H.R. 3637: Ms. NORTON and Mr. TED LIEU of California.

H.R. 3654: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.

H.R. 3655: Mr. FERGUSON.

H.R. 3662: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 3665: Mr. BUCSHON.

H.R. 3749: Mrs. HARTZLER.

H.R. 3764: Mr. TRONE, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. LAMB, and Ms. JAYAPAL.

H.R. 3798: Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 3799: Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 3814: Mr. SCALISE.

H.R. 3819: Mr. KEATING.

H.R. 3833: Mr. LAMB.

H.R. 3851: Mr. CUNNINGHAM and Mrs. LEE of Nevada.

H.R. 3930: Mr. CARTER of Georgia.

H.R. 3932: Mr. ROUZER, Ms. TITUS, Mrs. MCBATH, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Ms. WILD, Ms. NORTON, Ms. STEFANIK, and Mr. PAPPAS.

H.R. 3948: Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ.

H.R. 3951: Mr. MEEKS.

H.R. 3956: Mr. COLE and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.

H.R. 3968: Mr. YOHO, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. DUNN, Mr. POSEY, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, and Mr. ROUZER.

H.R. 3972: Mr. CARTER of Georgia.

H.R. 3975: Mr. GIANFORTE.

H.R. 4078: Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 4107: Ms. JAYAPAL.

H.R. 4165: Mr. VELA.

H.R. 4175: Mr. CRIST.
H.R. 4193: Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. CRAIG, Mr. COOPER, Mr. WALTZ, Mr. ENGEL, and Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.
H.R. 4236: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.
H.R. 4270: Mr. ENGEL.
H.R. 4272: Mr. CASE.
H.R. 4295: Mr. NORCROSS.
H.R. 4300: Mr. CLEAVER and Mr. SHERMAN.
H.R. 4301: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.
H.R. 4307: Mr. ROUDA and Mr. BERA.
H.R. 4339: Ms. JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 4346: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 4355: Ms. SLOTKIN.
H.R. 4370: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 4387: Mr. EVANS.
H.R. 4390: Ms. HAALAND.
H.R. 4404: Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 4405: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. EVANS, and Ms. HOULAHAN.
H.R. 4416: Ms. CLARKE of New York.
H.R. 4428: Ms. HILL of California, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. SOTO.
H.R. 4429: Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER.
H.R. 4435: Ms. JAYAPAL.
H.R. 4446: Mr. MAST and Mr. GAETZ.
H.R. 4460: Mr. PAPPAS.
H.J. Res. 38: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H. Con. Res. 27: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
H. Con. Res. 58: Mr. BUCSHON.
H. Res. 49: Mr. WITTMAN.
H. Res. 189: Mr. KIM, Ms. UNDERWOOD, Mr. HARDER of California, and Mr. NEWHOUSE.
H. Res. 234: Ms. ESHOO.
H. Res. 323: Mr. BRINDISI.
H. Res. 384: Mr. WITTMAN.
H. Res. 517: Mr. KINZINGER, Mr. HARDER of California, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. ROUDA, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. POCAN, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Mr. GOODEN.
H. Res. 543: Mr. ENGEL.
H. Res. 552: Mr. SHERMAN.
H. Res. 560: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. TLAIB, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. HASTINGS, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. LEWIS, and Ms. MOORE.
H. Res. 565: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. COSTA, Mr. KEATING, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. MITCHELL.
H. Res. 576: Ms. SPEIER and Ms. NORTON.
H. Res. 578: Mr. GROTHMAN.
H. Res. 580: Mr. ROSE of New York.
H. Res. 587: Mr. CROW and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.