

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 com-

plaint 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, includ-

ing 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 our 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 dispar-

aging 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 backlog.

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 predictor 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 heart-breaking.

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	Brindisi	Cisneros	Brooks (AL)	Cloud	Graves (MO)
Aguilar	Brown (MD)	Clark (MA)	Brooks (IN)	Cole	Green (TN)
Allred	Brownley (CA)	Clarke (NY)	Buchanan	Collins (GA)	Griffith
Axne	Bustos	Clay	Buck	Collins (NY)	Grothman
Barragán	Butterfield	Cleaver	Bucshon	Comer	Guest
Bass	Carbajal	Cohen	Budd	Conaway	Guthrie
Beatty	Cárdenas	Connolly	Burchett	Cook	Hagedorn
Bera	Carson (IN)	Cooper	Burgess	Crenshaw	Harris
Beyer	Cartwright	Correa	Byrne	Curtis	Hartzler
Bishop (GA)	Case	Costa	Calvert	Davidson (OH)	Hern, Kevin
Blumenauer	Casten (IL)	Courtney	Carter (GA)	Davis, Rodney	Herrera Beutler
Blunt Rochester	Castor (FL)	Cox (CA)	Carter (TX)	DesJarlais	Hice (GA)
Bonamici	Castro (TX)	Craig	Chabot	Diaz-Balart	Hill (AR)
Boyle, Brendan	Chu, Judy	Crist	Cheney	Duncan	Holding
F.	Cicilline	Crow	Cline	Dunn	Hollingsworth
				Emmer	Hudson
				Estes	Huizenga
				Ferguson	Hunter
				Fitzpatrick	Hurd (TX)
				Fleischmann	Johnson (LA)
				Flores	Johnson (OH)
				Fortenberry	Johnson (SD)
				Fox (NC)	Joyce (OH)
				Fulcher	Katko
				Gaetz	Keller
				Gallagher	Kelly (MS)
				Gianforte	Kelly (PA)
				Gibbs	King (IA)
				Gohmert	King (NY)
				Gonzalez (OH)	Kinzinger
				Gooden	Kustoff (TN)
				Gosar	LaHood
				Granger	LaMalfa
				Graves (GA)	Lamborn

Cuellar	Kirkpatrick	Raskin
Cunningham	Krishnamoorthi	Rice (NY)
Davids (KS)	Lamb	Richmond
Davis (CA)	Langevin	Rose (NY)
Davis, Danny K.	Larsen (WA)	Rouda
DeFazio	Larson (CT)	Royal-Allard
DeGette	Lawrence	Ruiz
DeLauro	Lawson (FL)	Ruppersberger
DelBene	Lee (CA)	Rush
Delgado	Lee (NV)	Ryan
Demings	Levin (CA)	Sánchez
DeSaulnier	Levin (MI)	Sarbanes
Deutch	Lewis	Scanlon
Dingell	Lieu, Ted	Schakowsky
Doggett	Lipinski	Schiff
Doyle, Michael F.	Loebssack	Schneider
Engel	Lofgren	Schrader
Escarobar	Lowenthal	Schrier
Eshoo	Lowey	Scott (VA)
Espallat	Lujan	Scott, David
Evans	Luria	Serrano
Finkenauer	Lynch	Sewell (AL)
Fletcher	Malinowski	Shalala
Foster	Maloney	Sherman
Frankel	Maloney B.	Sherrill
Fudge	Maloney, Sean	Sires
Gabbard	Matsui	Slotkin
Gallego	McAdams	Smith (WA)
Garamendi	McBath	Soto
García (IL)	McCollum	Spanberger
Garcia (TX)	McGovern	Speier
Golden	McNerney	Stanton
Gomez	Meeks	Stevens
Gonzalez (TX)	Meng	Suozzi
Gottheimer	Moore	Swalwell (CA)
Green, Al (TX)	Morelle	Takano
Grijalva	Moulton	Thompson (CA)
Haaland	Mucarsel-Powell	Thompson (MS)
Harder (CA)	Murphy (FL)	Titus
Hastings	Nadler	Tlaib
Hayes	Napolitano	Tonko
Heck	Neal	Torres (CA)
Higgins (NY)	Neguse	Torres Small (NM)
Hill (CA)	Norcross	Trohaan
Himes	O'Halleran	Trone
Horn, Kendra S.	Ocasio-Cortez	Vargas
Horsford	Omar	Underwood
Houlahan	Pallone	Veasey
Hoyer	Panetta	Vela
Huffman	Pappas	Velazquez
Jayapal	Pascrall	Visclosky
Jeffries	Payne	Wasserman
Johnson (GA)	Perlmutter	Schultz
Johnson (TX)	Peters	Waterson
Kaptur	Peterson	Watson Coleman
Keating	Phillips	Welch
Kelly (IL)	Pingree	Wexton
Kennedy	Pocan	Wild
Khanna	Porter	Wilson (FL)
Kildee	Pressley	Yarmuth
Kilmer	Price (NC)	
Kim	Quigley	

NAYS—191

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

