

every lever we have in society, everything from dealing with the opioid crisis to incentives to participate in the labor force.

Come to Phoenix, Arizona. We have a homeless shelter. There is an organization there called St. Joseph The Worker. It is a 100-year-old-plus Catholic charity. You walk in the door, and they will show you—they have a stack of job opportunities for the most disaffected of our society, people who are trying to get on their program, trying to deal with mental health demons and substance abuse demons and those things. But they are there.

There should be joy that there is such a labor shortage that our brothers and sisters in the business community are willing to take a risk on our brothers and sisters who are living in a homeless shelter. That part, we have proven, works.

How do we expand participation in the labor force? How do we also, now, incentivize the other end? If you are healthy, if you are fit, if you are sharp, if you just want to, do we actually start to say: Well, you are 72 years old. You want to work. We are going to start adding certain levels of taxes. We are going to start taking away parts of your Social Security. We are going to tax these benefits because you are out there working.

Just the opposite. We want as much of our society to stay in the labor force. And if you want to and you are older, let's redesign some of these incentives to stay in the labor force.

Our millennial males that we still have a math problem entering the labor force and the other end of the age curve—let's fix it. Those are policies. Is that Republican or Democrat? It is just rational policy to keep the economy growing.

The other one that I come to the floor constantly and speak about is the disruption of technology that is about to crash the price of healthcare. And this is one of those moments I seem to succeed in offending everyone, so maybe it is the right thing.

The ACA, ObamaCare—let's have a moment of truth and reality about it. It was substantially a finance mechanism. It was about who got subsidized, who had to pay.

Our Republican alternative, well-meaning, had a number of kickers, a number of incentives in it, but it wasn't about who got subsidized and who had to pay; it was substantially about who had to pay and who got subsidized.

This body needs to stop having the absurd conversation about the financing part of healthcare and start thinking about what we do to crash the actual delivery price.

It turns out there is a revolution of technology out there, the thing you can blow into that can actually tell you you have the flu. It can bounce off your phone, check your medical records, and then order antivirals. Except for, the problem is, that tech-

nology is illegal under the way our laws are written today.

There is a revolution coming. The other side of the spectrum is drugs like the single-shot cure for hemophilia. You saw that we think we now have the cure for sickle cell anemia. On cystic fibrosis, it looks like we think we may have the drug that stabilizes it. We know we have the drug that stabilizes ALS.

They are all going to be really expensive. These are miracles in the biologic pharmaceutical world. We need to now work on a financing mechanism for the distribution of these pharmaceuticals that cure our brothers and sisters with chronic conditions. Because, remember, 5 percent of our population with chronic conditions is the majority of our healthcare spending.

And we are about to start curing a number of them, because a few years ago the Republicans in this body, we passed the Cures Act, and it is working.

And my terror is the left is moving a bill called H.R. 3. It made it through the Ways and Means Committee, and it breaks my heart because they are about to screw up the very incentives that have created these miracles, that are about to start curing individuals with these chronic conditions.

Understand, if we could get our act together, if we could actually start to understand the technology disruption that is here, we can start to crash the price of healthcare, instead of having the absurd debate of who should get subsidized and who should have to pay.

Is that Republican or Democrat? It is just technology.

But when you work in an environment where rage is the actual commodity of exchange, how do you ever actually get to solutions?

And then the last one, which will be the most difficult one, is we have to have an honest conversation of what to do in the actual incentives, are there things we could do in the incentives of staying healthy, of how you deliver Medicare and Medicare part A and B and D, the incentives there.

Could we actually create some incentives for Social Security that, if you wanted to work longer, you get spiffs and those things?

But, if we do those five things, we can make the math work that we as a society, we as a country do not have to fall off the debt cliff. And it is the hardest thing you can imagine for a body that is completely calcified in its inability to actually do anything of value. Because it would require owning a calculator; it would require thinking; it would require some creativity; and it would require doing everything at one time to make the math work.

You can't just do one of these things, walk away, and pretend you did something. It all has a synergistic feed because the labor force participation needs the strong economy; the strong economy needs the investments for the technology; the technology disruption

needs the strong labor force to grab those who may have been rotated in the economy. It all has to work together.

My heartbreak as I come behind this microphone and the reason I am here is to save this country and save it from that huge monster that is our debt, because I have the world's greatest little 4-year-old girl, and I am going to find a way to fix this for my country, but also for my daughter.

I have been coming behind this microphone now with this for over a year. We have meeting after meeting after meeting after meeting on the fact that there is a path. It requires being willing to accept disruption in technology. It requires being able to actually drop some of the crazy ideology and actually use a calculator on the math on the things that actually grow the economy.

And the ideology of rage has blinded us from, I think, in many ways, doing the right thing for working men and women, for my little girl, for this country.

And I don't care if you are on the right or the left; you should be having your soul ripped out because we are now—we have been here, what, 10-plus months, and we have squandered almost every day we have been here because we know the path we have to go down, yet, in many ways, all we have done is make it worse.

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

IMPEACHMENT PROCEEDINGS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for the remainder of the hour as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, these are interesting times, and I build more respect for my friend from Arizona every time I hear him speak. I am very grateful for his presence and his efforts.

At this point I would like to address this ongoing issue, ongoing for only about 3 years, because it was immediately upon President Trump being elected President that we immediately started hearing all of the saber-rattling that we have got to impeach this guy, he is not qualified, he is crazy, he has committed crimes.

And we have been hearing for nearly 3 years: there is no question, there is lots of direct evidence, President Trump has committed crimes, a lot more than you might think; in fact, a lot more than circumstantial evidence. Oh, it is overwhelming.

We have heard from so many people for nearly 3 years—well, actually, over 3 years now—over 3 years.

Then we get down to it. The great hope was the man that I believe did more damage to the FBI than all of the FBI directors for the last 50 years, a guy named Mueller.

□ 1730

He ran off thousands and thousands of years of our best FBI experience. Apparently, he just wanted yes-people. He didn't want people who had enough experience to tell him when he was on the wrong track.

He said he had no reason to apologize when he destroyed the lives of innocent people. And yet, that is the person who was put in charge of this investigation.

What did he do? He went out and hired over a dozen people who absolutely despise Donald Trump, put them to work trying to destroy our sitting President. They harassed him and his family, business associates, people in the administration, threatened their families, threatened them.

Even after all that, after virtually 2 years, nearly 2 years of investigation by the Mueller cabal, they had nothing. They had nothing. I think Mueller would have been happy to keep investigating and using up millions and millions of taxpayer dollars, tens of millions, as he had been doing. Fortunately, his investigation came to an end.

After thousands of witnesses, they had nothing. No Russia collusion. A hoax is what it turned out to be.

When it was clear there was no Russia collusion—of course, it is not a crime to collude. It is a crime to conspire.

There was no Russian conspiracy between anybody with the Trump campaign and the Russians. But it is very clear, the Russians, what they really wanted, for people who have really dug into this, they wanted and what they always want, always have wanted, back when it was the Soviet Union, they want to divide America. They want to destroy this Republic.

Unfortunately, they found allies, willing or otherwise, here in this country, to take absolute lies that were created, were spun up, were twisted—had the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act court, the FISA court, manipulated fraud upon the FISA court, which has exposed to me, as a former judge and chief justice, that since we have seen nothing from the FISA court of outrage, as a good judge should have when they realized there has been a fraud upon the court, nothing, which tells me we either need to totally get rid of the FISA court or we need to have some dramatic changes.

We certainly need to change the FISA judges themselves because either they were unwilling and unknowing accomplices with the fraud upon the court, or they knew what was going on and he or she, or they, were proud to play a part in trying to destroy the Trump campaign and the Trump Presidency.

I think it is interesting, this call between President Trump and President Zelensky, July 25, I mean, when so many people—we find out now so many people were on the call, including at least four stenographers taking down every word.

I mean, I have been in courts for my whole adult life, and you might have a stenographer miss a word here and there. They are amazing. They hardly ever make mistakes. But if you have four stenographers sitting on a call, you are not going to have four stenographers miss anything when they consult each other and work together. That is just not going to happen.

I had one of the best court reporters in the world, and, you know, there was a mistake now and then.

You put four people like that together, like we are taking down the President and President Zelensky's call, and they don't make mistakes.

But it had to send shivers up the spines of anybody in our intelligence community that had worked with Ukrainians, Russians, former MI-6, Italians, Australians to try to destroy President Trump. It had to send shivers up their spine. It had to get them very concerned.

Oh, my gosh. This President is going to close in on us because this new President, we understand he is honest. That is what we keep hearing, that he wants to end corruption in Ukraine.

This whole body, I think there were maybe 10 or 12 or so that didn't vote for the bill in 2014 that talks about Russia, I mean—not Russia, but Ukrainian corruption, and how we need to push them to end that corruption. So, I mean, everybody on this floor basically knows. And I think the “no” votes were based on some other reason, not on a desire not to end corruption. We all had the same goal, just concerns about different parts.

The fact is, people know. There has been a lot of corruption. It sounds like President Zelensky wants to end it. You put that with a President who doesn't mind rattling cages and trying to drain the swamp and trying to change the way we do things for the better, and of course, it offends those whether they say they are part of the deep state or not. It is the people that work here that have never been elected here but think they run this country, and those in embassies who, beyond what they are assigned to do, they think they run foreign policy. We have gotten a taste of that through these hearings and through these witnesses and through their testimony.

The star witness yesterday, Mr. Taylor, I don't impugn his military service, but I know if he had been the kind of gossipmonger in the Army or at West Point that he has turned into at the State Department, he sure wouldn't have gone very far. His next OER in the Army would have destroyed his career. In West Point, he would have gotten the lowest peer review ratings. He would not have done very well at all.

This is, apparently, a different Mr. Taylor than the one that went through West Point and served honorably and well in the Army.

But as Ambassador Sondland testified, and our friend JIM JORDAN read

yesterday, Ambassador Taylor recalls, and this is Sondland's testimony, that Tim Morrison told Ambassador Taylor that Sondland “told Mr. Morrison that I conveyed this message to Yermak on September 1, 2019, in connection with Vice President PENCE's visit to Warsaw and a meeting with President Zelensky.”

Astounding. That is where Mr. Taylor says he got his clear understanding of what had happened.

If you look at his testimony, you get a real sense of how this honorable serving military member, fine graduate of West Point, has been tainted over the years.

You look at his testimony, first of all, he says something like—he answered a question. He had never seen aid conditioned on political interests. And yet, what he probably had in his mind is he had never seen aid conditioned on something he disagreed with.

Most of our aid is conditioned on something. If it is not, we need to find it and get conditions on it.

As I have said ever since I have been here, you don't have to pay people to hate you. They will do it for free. And yet, our country continues to pay dictators that hate us.

That stuff ought to be stopped. It ought to be conditioned on making those countries less corrupt. That is what this House has tried to do on both sides of the aisle, in prior years, to end corruption in Ukraine.

But you get a sense of things when—this is his testimony, at page 11, Mr. Taylor's. Let's see. “The first summary of the July 25 Trump-Zelensky call that I heard from anybody inside the U.S. Government was during a phone call I had with Tim Morrison, Dr. Hill's recent replacement at the NSC, on July 28.”

That is what Ambassador Sondland was apparently talking about. He got that from Tim Morrison, who conveyed a message that Yermak got from Ambassador Sondland about Vice President PENCE's visit to Warsaw and meeting with President Zelensky.

He goes on, and his next statement, next paragraph: “By August, I was becoming more concerned.”

Yeah, Mr. Taylor was becoming concerned because he had heard fourth-hand the President wanted to end some corruption in Ukraine that was affecting the United States election.

I thought that is what everybody here wanted to do. That is what we have been hearing from the leftwing, or many call it the mainstream, but the leftwing, alt-left media. They have been saying, oh, how horrible.

Well, here you have a President trying to do something about it, and Mr. Taylor, the wonderful, honorably serving Army man, is now concerned because of the fourth-hand account he got about what the President did.

Now, we are told: Oh, by the way, I heard about a staffer who overheard a conversation between the Ambassador and the President, and he mentioned

the interviews, had some question about the interviews, maybe how they were going.

Oh, my goodness. The investigation, wanted to know how it was going. Gee, how horrible that we had a President who wanted to know about corruption in Ukraine that was affecting the United States.

Then we get down—and I think this tells us a great deal about their star witness, until his staffer, who was eavesdropping and heard a conversation, we are told, when Mr. Taylor says, “A formal U.S. request to the Ukrainians to conduct an investigation based on violations of their own law struck me as improper.”

Well, my understanding was the President wants to know about corruption in Ukraine that may have violated American law, our laws, work with our U.S. Attorney General to try to get to the bottom of not Ukraine, per se, but Ukrainians’ effort to affect our election.

That offends these deep staters in the State Department, these people that don’t like a President that doesn’t see things exactly like they do. How dare this President come in and want to exert his foreign policy that he got elected to put in place. He doesn’t understand. We are the ones that run things.

You see it here. He says that “struck me as improper.” I am the judge, the purveyor of what is right or not in my realm.

You find that in a number of people in the State Department. We run things.

Of course, they come in and testify. “I have worked for this many Presidents, carried out their foreign policy.” Then we find out that what means. “I carry out their foreign policy as long as they do what I tell them. Or I ignore them and carry out what I know is much better.” You get that sense.

He goes on: “And I recommended to Ambassador Volker we ‘stay clear’” because I, Mr. Taylor, know much better than the elected President. I know better than the Attorney General.

□ 1745

I know better than all of these clowns who are elected or have been confirmed by the Senate. Who are they to go around what I think?

And he goes on: “To find out the legal aspects of the question, however, I gave him,” the Ambassador, “the name of a deputy assistant attorney general, whom I thought would be the proper point of contact for seeking a U.S. request for a foreign investigation.”

How dare President Trump try to go around the way I, Mr. Taylor, think that foreign affairs ought to be handled and the way corruption ought to be addressed when it affects the United States? How dare he? I am the one who knows these things, not this clown President.

I mean, it is pretty clear what was in his mind, and it needs to stop.

And I would just suggest, if we have a vote to send this matter of impeachment, actually impeach this President for violating the sense of propriety of somebody who is so deep in the state and in the intel that they don’t like somebody coming in trying to drain the swamp, if that is what they want to impeach this President over, trying to end corruption in Ukraine that affects our election, well, then, the Senate, I know some have said, “Oh, we are not going to have a vote on that,” well, I imagine they probably will, and they are going to need to have a trial.

In looking back and researching this again, you know, there are no rules of evidence for impeachment; there are no rules of procedure. The Constitution provides for it, the impeachment trial in the Senate. But as I understand it, the Senate may have even gone to the Old Senate Chamber to have a session out from under C-SPAN cameras to work out the rules of evidence and procedure, limit time, limit witnesses, how questions are asked, all that. They have to come up with that every impeachment, a new set of rules.

I would point to Article III, Section 3 for a little bit of guidance here.

Article III, Section 3 talks about treason, and President Trump is not guilty of any treason. He is not being accused of treason, except from people who are suffering from PTSD. That is President Trump stress disorder. But otherwise, there will be no charge of treason against this President, because it didn’t happen.

But it is such an important issue when you talk about removing a duly elected President for the first time in our history. And there is a rule on treason. It is in the Constitution: “No person shall be convicted of treason unless on the testimony of two witnesses to the same overt act.” That means direct evidence, no hearsay, two people who actually witnessed this despicable act.

I would submit to the Senate that removing a President properly duly elected for the first time in our history, even after there were Ukrainians and Russians trying to help the Democrats to keep him from being elected—he still won, got a huge majority of the electoral college votes. This would be every bit as serious as charging someone with treason. The Senate ought to set a rule that says: We have got to have two direct witnesses to whatever they are saying he did wrong. We are not going to take hearsay to remove a President for the first time.

I would suggest that if the Senate would do that, they won’t even have to worry about setting time deadlines, witness deadlines. Just put that requirement on, and it will be a very short trial because there are no direct witnesses of any allegation that would rise to the level of what is being accused here.

MILITARY PERSONNEL HAVE BEEN TREATED UNFAIRLY

Mr. GOHMERT. Now I want to turn quickly to the issue of some of our

United States military personnel who have been unfairly treated, people who saw it as their patriotic duty to sign up and serve this country, risk their lives and limbs and their life as a family member to serve this country.

Greater love hath no one, Jesus told us, that they would be willing to lay down their lives for their friends, and that is what these people do.

My group, my 4 years on Active Duty, we were never sent to combat, but we have, currently, a Secretary of the Department of Defense who is trying to stop efforts and came out and publicly—basically threatened the President, don’t you dare try to right what you think are wrongs in people who I would tell you have been railroaded by a broken military justice system.

The reason Congress created the UCMJ, where military members don’t even get all the rights that we give to terrorists, to foreign terrorists illegally in our country—we don’t give our military as many rights as they have.

The reason we had to shortcut, or Congress did, back when the UCMJ was passed was because both sides of the aisle understood that, when you are in a combat theater, you don’t have time to go back and have a thorough investigation, gather up all the forensic evidence and then come back and have a nice jury trial in America. You have got to deal with it quickly and then get back on the battlefield.

And yet what we have seen over and over, when the military chooses for political expedience or political correctness purposes or when they want to satisfy a terrible leader like Maliki was in Iraq who created all kinds of trouble for that country, we would send a Vice President over to stand by him and say we are going to get these guys, or tell Karzai, a corrupt family in Afghanistan, oh, yes, we are going to prosecute our guys who, turned out, killed people who created IEDs that killed Americans, people who were Taliban trying to kill Americans, and yet we have hung some of our own people out to dry.

So we have a letter, a bunch of us do. It should go out in the morning, I guess, to the Defense Secretary, and, you know, I put the words in there myself that I think, if he doesn’t realize that there needs to be some corrections within military justice so we don’t keep sending innocent people defending our country, defending their brothers and sisters on the battlefield, if we don’t stop sending them to prison and bring them back to America for a trial, don’t allow the defendant to bring witnesses back from the combat theater, oh, no, but the CID and our officials will make deals with Taliban or with people in Iraq who want to destroy our country and us, if they will come over and say terrible things about our military member, we will put them in prison, and we will give them visas.

And that happened with Sergeant Derrick Miller. We got a whole bunch of people.

Clint Lorance, hoping that the President will act. Apparently got slowed down by the Defense Secretary jumping in.

John Hatley, a first sergeant, two bronze stars, He should have gotten a silver star, but that was apparently pulled as a recommendation.

Michael Behenna, Corey Claggett, we have got a whole bunch of folks, and we have a Congressional Justice for Warriors Caucus here that is working on this.

And we have got a guy who recognized a Taliban member from the day before when he had his AK-47 and grabbed him in the middle of our U.S. Army camp in Afghanistan and starts questioning him, and he starts lying through the interpreter: Oh, I was here to fix electrical. Oh, no, I was here to fix plumbing.

And that sergeant pulled his gun and demanded answers. The guy grabs for the gun and, in the struggle, the Taliban member was shot. That sergeant was brought back to America. The translator, who they told separate stories—I mean, they told separate stories, but it was the same story told separately.

Yet, after the CID got through promising or somebody promising this guy that had been trying to get a visa into America and turned down every time: If you will come to America and testify that the Taliban member never grabbed his gun, then we will give you and your family visas; you will probably be able to get citizenship.

Oh, okay, then that is my story now, he never tried to grab the gun.

And you threaten another witness who was there, he is going to prison if you don't turn around and change what you have said from the very beginning without any influence from Sergeant Miller, and you put the guy in prison for premeditated murder?

You don't have the weapon? Oh, no, you don't let him have the weapon. You don't have it examined so that it can show that the fingerprints of the Taliban member were on that gun, he did try to grab it. And he is sentenced for premeditated murder for the rest of his life.

Well, we got that turned around. We got it paroled, and thank God we did. He is one of the finest people I have ever known, Sergeant Derrick Miller here, working for me now, and he is working for our caucus.

We have a system that is broken, and we need to fix it. And if our Secretary of Defense doesn't recognize that, he needs to go, and we need to take the money that we have allowed them to use to drag people back to America, away from the combat field, away from juries that have combat experience, we need to put them on trial in a civil Federal court and let them have all the rights and privileges they should have as American citizens.

If you are not going to do it in the combat theater the proper way with the proper investigation, let's bring

them back. Use your money from defense. Use that not in courts-martial but here in the United States in a civil court, and that will solve the problem.

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

RECOGNIZING SALEM MEDICAL CENTER

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

Mr. VAN DREW. Mr. Speaker, today I want to acknowledge the Salem Medical Center, as they recently celebrated 100 years of service to the south Jersey community.

The medical center has been a staple of the area since its creation and has evolved over time to meet the changing needs of Salem County.

Salem Medical Center offers cutting-edge hospital services and a wide array of outpatient programs to ensure the people of south Jersey have access to the healthcare they need. The center has also been expanding in recent years, thus providing patients with more advanced technology and higher quality care.

I want to thank the Salem Medical Center for their reliable service to south Jersey for the past 100 years and hope they continue to flourish in Salem County for 100 more. Their nurses, their doctors, their technicians, all of their employees are our heroes. May God bless them.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. VAN DREW. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 58 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, November 15, 2019, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

2942. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a letter reporting a violation of the Antideficiency Act by the Department of Agriculture, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1517(b); Public Law 110-161, Sec. 1517(b); (121 Stat. 2285); to the Committee on Appropriations.

2943. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a letter reporting a violation of the Antideficiency Act by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1517(b); Public Law 110-161, Sec. 1517(b); (121 Stat. 2285); to the Committee on Appropriations.

2944. A letter from the General Counsel, Government Accountability Office, transmitting the Fiscal Year 2018 Antideficiency Act Reports Compilation, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1351; Public Law 97-258; (96 Stat. 926) and 31 U.S.C. 1517(b); Public Law 110-161, Sec. 1517(b); (121 Stat. 2285); to the Committee on Appropriations.

2945. A letter from the Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insur-

ance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Resolution Plans Required (RIN: 3064-AE93) received November 7, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2946. A letter from the Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Changes to Applicability Thresholds for Regulatory Capital and Liquidity Requirements (RIN: 3064-AE96) received November 7, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2947. A letter from the Auditor, Office of the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting a final report: ANC 8C Misappropriated Funds, pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 455(d); (87 Stat. 803); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

2948. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's Semiannual Report to Congress from the Office of the Inspector General; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

2949. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting The Department's determination on a petition filed on behalf of workers at the Y-12 Plant in Oak Ridge, Tennessee, to be added to the Special Exposure Cohort, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 7384q(c)(2); Public Law 106-398, Sec. 1 (as amended by Public Law 108-375, Sec. 3166(b)(1)); (118 Stat. 2188); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2950. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's determination on a petition filed on behalf of workers at the West Valley Demonstration Project in West Valley, New York, to be added to the Special Exposure Cohort, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 7384q(c)(2); Public Law 106-398, Sec. 1 (as amended by Public Law 108-375, Sec. 3166(b)(1)); (118 Stat. 2188); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2951. A letter from the Deputy Chief, Regulatory Coordination Division, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Registration Fee Requirement for Petitioners Seeking To File H-1B Petitions on Behalf of Cap Subject Aliens [CIS No.: 2652-19; DHS Docket No.: USCIS-2019-0006] (RIN: 1615-AC36) received November 8, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2952. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Saab AB, Saab Aeronautics (Formerly Known as Saab AB, Saab Aerosystems) Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2019-0520; Product Identifier 2019-NM-046-AD; Amendment 39-19770; AD 2019-21-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received November 7, 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.

2953. 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-2019-0724; Product Identifier 2019-NM-134-AD; Amendment 39-19773; AD 2019-21-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received November 7, 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.

2954. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of