

Whereas then-Ranking Member SCHIFF falsely claimed in a March 2017 interview to have “more than circumstantial evidence” of collusion with Russia;

Whereas then-Ranking Member SCHIFF negotiated with Russian comedians whom he believed to be Ukrainian officials to obtain materials to damage the President of the United States politically;

Whereas, according to a New York Times article on October 2, 2019, Chairman SCHIFF’s committee staff met with the whistleblower prior to the filing of his complaint, and staff members communicated the content of the complaint to Chairman SCHIFF;

Whereas Chairman SCHIFF concealed his dealings with the whistleblower from the rest of the Intelligence Committee, and when asked directly in a television interview whether he had any contact with the whistleblower, he lied to the American people and said, “We have not spoken directly with the whistleblower.”;

Whereas members of the Intelligence Committee have lost faith in his objectivity and capabilities as chairman, with every Republican member on the committee having signed a letter calling for his immediate resignation as chairman; and

Whereas Chairman SCHIFF has hindered the ability of the Intelligence Committee to fulfill its oversight responsibilities of the intelligence community, an indispensable pillar of our national security: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That—

One, the House of Representatives censures and condemns Representative ADAM SCHIFF for conduct that misleads the American people in a way that is not befitting an elected Member of the House of Representatives;

Two, Representative ADAM SCHIFF will forthwith present himself in the well of the House for the pronouncement of censure; and

Three, Representative ADAM SCHIFF will be censured with the public reading of this resolution by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CUELLAR). Under rule IX, a resolution offered from the floor by a Member other than the majority leader or the minority leader as a question of the privileges of the House has immediate precedence only at a time designated by the Chair within 2 legislative days after the resolution is properly noticed.

Pending that designation, the form of the resolution noticed by the gentleman from Arizona will appear in the RECORD at this point.

The Chair will not at this point determine whether the resolution constitutes a question of privilege. That determination will be made at the time designated for consideration of the resolution.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1815, SEC DISCLOSURE EFFECTIVENESS TESTING ACT, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3624, OUTSOURCING ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 2019

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 629 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 629

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1815) to require the Securities and Exchange Commission, when developing rules and regulations about disclosures to retail investors, to conduct investor testing, including a survey and interviews of retail investors, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and amendments specified in this section and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Financial Services now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116-34, modified by the amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as the original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the five-minute rule and shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules. Each such further amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such further amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill, as amended, to the House with such further amendments as may have been adopted. 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 one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. At any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3624) to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to require the disclosure of the total number of domestic and foreign employees of certain public com-

panies, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Financial Services now printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part C of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

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

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 629, providing for consideration of H.R. 1815, the SEC Disclosure Effectiveness Testing Act. The rule provides for consideration of the legislation under a structured rule. It provides 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member on the Committee on Financial Services. It self-executes a manager’s amendment that makes technical changes. It also makes in order four amendments, two Democratic and two Republican.

The rule also provides for consideration of H.R. 3624, the Outsourcing Accountability Act, under a structured rule. It provides 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member on the Committee on Financial Services. Finally, it makes in order two Republican amendments to H.R. 3624.

Mr. Speaker, the bills before us this week are consumer protection bills. Together, these bills make an effort to give everyday Americans access to clear, digestible information that will help them make informed investment decisions.

Mr. Speaker, inequality in this country is at a historic level. The experience right now is on par with the Great Depression and the gilded age. Without adjustments like the ones proposed in these bills, it can only get worse.

The most visible indicator of wealth inequality in America today may be the Forbes magazine list of the Nation's 400 richest Americans. In 2018, the three men at the top of this list—Amazon founder Jeff Bezos, Microsoft founder Bill Gates, and investor Warren Buffett—held combined fortunes worth more than the total wealth of the poorest half of Americans. Three men had more wealth than 160 million Americans.

□ 1245

In 1989, the bottom 90 percent of the U.S. population held 33 percent of all wealth. By 2016, the bottom 90 percent of the population held only 23 percent of wealth. The wealth share of the top 1 percent increased from about 30 percent to approximately 40 percent over the same period of time. The tax bill just passed by the House last session doubles down on this troubling trend.

In 2019, a person in the bottom 10 percent gets a \$50 tax cut, and a person in the top 1 percent gets a \$34,000 tax cut. At the same time, millions of poor and middle-class people are expected to see their taxes either stay the same or actually increase in the long run.

Before us today, the Outsourcing Accountability Act makes one simple but meaningful change to existing reporting requirements. It would add a requirement for publicly traded companies to annually report foreign and domestic employment statistics to the SEC: Are your employees working in the United States or are they working overseas?

By publicly reporting this data that already is collected, companies are providing important information to their investors, consumers, and American workers, with no additional burden on their business.

As Heather Slavkin Corzo of the AFL-CIO said recently: "What gets measured gets paid attention to by a company"—and, I would add, their investors.

As a former union member and a current member of the House Committee on Education and Labor, I think we in Congress should do everything we can

to incentivize companies to invest in American workers and not to offshore their work.

This administration has done everything in its power, in my view, to give corporations even more power at the expense of their employees—and these effects are being felt in households across this country.

Mr. Speaker, the other bill before us is the SEC Disclosure Effectiveness Testing Act. All we are asking for in this bill is to make sure that the data we are collecting for consumers is easy to understand so it can be used in the way it was intended.

Field testing allows average investors to pilot a form that the SEC is planning to use and be a focus group on whether it is user friendly and the results are understandable.

A recent form that was field-tested revealed that everyday Americans were "deeply confused" about the information the form was supposed to be communicating. In this specific instance, we are talking about how a company discloses any conflicts of interest it may have in providing investment advice.

Close to 7 million people in my home State of California and 55 million people nationwide, most of them low and middle income, don't have access to retirement benefits at work. We are talking about people who work for small businesses, whose companies just cannot afford the expense of financial products on the market.

In stark contrast, the financial sector takes around 25 percent of all corporate profits in the United States, represents 7 percent of the U.S. economy, and creates a mere 4 percent of jobs.

Mr. Speaker, this bill makes it easier for people who are trying to build a secure retirement for themselves and their families to understand the investment advice they are receiving and whether it is in their best interest. We have an obligation to our workers who sacrifice and provide so much for our country to give them something in return.

These two bills, taken together, help put consumers in the driver's seat. One requires information already collected by companies to be shared, and the other makes sure that consumers understand the information they are being given.

The only people who should be opposed to these bills are big businesses who may be afraid of what the public will learn about their practices.

The goal should be to give every American worker a secure retirement and protect consumers. Why wouldn't we want to take every step to get there?

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

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. DESAULNIER), my friend, for yielding me the time today.

Ordinarily, Mr. Speaker, what folks decide they are going to highlight on the House floor are all of our disagreements. In fact, the 1 minutes today highlighted that.

My friend from California and I were talking before debate began—and I certainly include you in this partnership, Mr. Speaker. You lock a couple of us in the room together, we can solve about 90 percent of what ails this country. But the media wins—often distracts—from what is going on, and that is my frustration today, Mr. Speaker.

I don't really have any objection with the rule as it sits before us. We heard testimony last night from the ranking member of the Committee on Financial Services.

To paraphrase his words, he said these bills were so flawed that he didn't even offer any amendments in committee to try to make them better because there was no hope for these bills, no hope in two senses, Mr. Speaker: no hope for these bills in that they were so poorly drafted and poorly directed that they would not benefit the American people in the ways that they were intended; and no hope for these bills in that the Senate will never take them up and the President will never put his signature on them because they are so flawed.

I can't take responsibility for what the Committee on Financial Services did, Mr. Speaker, because I don't sit on that committee. I can take responsibility for what the Rules Committee did last night, Mr. Speaker.

I will tell you that it is the first time I have had the privilege of coming to the House floor and speaking on a rule where Republicans got as many amendments as Democrats did. It is a big day. I feel a partnership breaking out. I say to the gentleman from California (Mr. DESAULNIER), if we can keep this going, we might really be able to make a difference.

It has been a frustration of ours, as you well know, Mr. Speaker, that, when you are in a majority-driven institution like this one, being in the majority has privileges; and a privilege is that you get to draft the legislation and then you get to draft the rule to bring the legislation to the floor, and you can jam anything through this institution if you want to.

Generally, our best work isn't the work we jam through the institution. Generally, our best work is the work that we spend, not hours, not days, but weeks and months crafting together in partnership. Most of that work doesn't happen here on the House floor. That work happens in committees. It actually happens, oftentimes, behind closed doors, where earnest members can talk about what their constituents need.

We can pass this rule this afternoon, and I will offer, later on, an amendment, if we defeat the previous question. I think it will make the rule better.

But I do believe we have a missed opportunity, Mr. Speaker. There is a lot of work that needs to be done.

I have one of my bosses in town today, Mr. Speaker. Colonel Dennis Brown is a county commissioner in Forsyth County.

I was telling him the story that one of my former bosses said: If you ever wanted a real job, he was going to run for county commissioner, because when you are county commissioner, everything you do impacts somebody's life. And nobody shows up at the county commission and says, "I have a problem, and if you are a Republican, I would like for you to fix it, but if you are a Democrat, it doesn't matter to me," or vice versa. Folks show up and say, "I have a problem. I need you all to work together to fix it."

We have real problems here, Mr. Speaker. We all know, as we heard during the 1-minute time this morning, that drug pricing is a challenge in this country, and there are lot of different solutions. There are some more liberal solutions; there are some more conservative solutions; and there are some middle-of-the-road solutions that bring people together. I wish we had those on the floor this week.

We all know that we have immigration challenges in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that about 27 percent of my bosses are first-generation Americans back home, folks who so believed in America that they traded away their entire family's life back in their home country to come and try to make a new life here in America. I love that we have those stories to tell.

But we all know the immigration system is broken. Men and women who are trying desperately to get here the right way can't; men and women who are coming here the wrong way can. We all know that there are opportunities to do better there. We should have those provisions on the floor.

We all know that Social Security is underfunded, and in just a few short years men and women who are dependent on that program are going to run into that shortfall.

We can't do those hard things in unified government, Mr. Speaker. When Republicans win back the House next year and win the Presidency back and continue control of the Senate, that is going to be the wrong time to do fundamental reforms to Medicare and Social Security and Medicaid. It is going to be the wrong time to do the big things that need to be done to get our fiscal house in order.

The right time is in divided government, where we have an opportunity to put everybody's fingerprints on a solution, not that yanks the pendulum left or right, but that moves the country deliberately in a direction that we can all agree on.

But, sadly, that is not why we are here today, Mr. Speaker.

I listened to the Reading Clerk read the bill, as is always done, read the rule, and I think back to some of those days where the Reading Clerk is reading the appropriations bills or actually

going through meaningful legislation line by line, opening it up so that every Member, no matter whom he or she represents, has an opportunity to come and offer amendments and make the bill better.

The ranking member's testimony is the bills are so flawed, the committee didn't even bother considering amendments to make them better. I am pleased that the Rules Committee is going to offer an opportunity to make them a little bit better with the amendments that are made in order today, Mr. Speaker.

But it is my great hope that we will be able to move past these messaging bills. Consumer protection isn't just a political message. Consumer protection is a shared goal, from the coast of California to the coast of Georgia. It is something that unites us in this institution, not divides us.

I regret that the apparent legislative agenda for the week is going to be to consider bills that get approved or defeated on straight party-line votes. We can do better.

In this current political environment, the American people may not expect better, but I know that my bosses do, and I will continue to press for that.

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

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to make a comment to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL), my friend, as we do this.

I, first of all, express my respect and affection for him in the short time I have gotten to serve with him, and I agree with almost everything he said in his statement, with a possible exception of his prediction on the next election.

But other than that, I, too, yearn to be part of this institution, this marvelous institution that solves problems as a premium, where you take a liberal perspective and a conservative perspective, where both respect one another and understand that, by listening to both, we actually get a product that is more reflective of the whole.

Having been someone who served at the city level, the county level—county commissioner—at the State level, and now in Congress, it is discouraging to be here and not be as engaged as I hoped to in problem-solving and respecting differences of opinion.

So we will get through this. The Speaker likes to quote Lincoln: With public sentiment, anything is possible; without it, nothing is possible.

I believe he continued on to say: No statute has real force.

So that is good for us to remember, that we have to go back to our townhalls, as we all do, and sometimes some of the most difficult parts of those townhalls is telling friends that you disagree with them, that there is another side of the story.

So, with that, I thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL), my good

friend, for his reflections and his hopes for this institution, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

If the gentleman from California is going to start quoting Lincoln, I am going to have to bring out some Franklin.

I remember in the summer of 1787, as folks were taking a break, it had been hard and they were worried they weren't going to be able to reach a conclusion on language for our Constitution, Franklin admonished the members there: Don't go home and find folks who agree with you, who are going to tell you how right you are; go and find folks who disagree with you and listen closely to what it is they are saying and what their concerns are that we may come back together and bridge a divide.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question today, I am going to offer an amendment to the rule, and that amendment is going to try to do exactly what I believe Members in this institution want, and that is to get back to some of the real problem-solving that goes on.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, the amendment is going to prioritize the work that we all know America wants us to do. I went through some of those items earlier: work for the chronically ill, for our seniors; folks struggling with prescription medications; folks who were concerned about congestion; folks—go right on down the list of all the priorities that we all hear from our constituents on a regular basis.

If we defeat the previous question, it will amend the rule to allow an opportunity to move forward on these priority issues. I don't mean priority from a Republican perspective; I don't mean priority from a Democrat perspective. I mean priority from an American perspective.

I serve on the House Select Committee on the Modernization of Congress here, Mr. Speaker. In fact, we just had a hearing upstairs in the Rules Committee, and it is a different dynamic.

Mr. DESAULNIER and I serve on a committee of 13 people. There are no time limits on discussion in our committee. That committee has a majoritarian tilt—nine members in the majority, four in the minority—so you know where the vote is going to go. But because it is a small committee, because it allows for open debate, it creates a relationship among the members that isn't possible, say, for the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, on which I sit, that has more than 70 members on it.

□ 1300

I have a chance to listen every day to the opinions and the concerns of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, as well as on my side of the aisle.

What we concluded, as we were working on scheduling issues in the Modernization Committee—because we have so many young families here, folks who are trying to balance their obligations as a mother or a father with their obligations as a Member of Congress, and we all know how taxing that can be.

And one of our witnesses, who has vast experience trying to work on House schedules, cautioned us against believing that you could wave a scheduling wand and suddenly create a more productive institution, that productivity comes from those relationships, productivity comes from that sincere effort to do better.

We are here on financial services today. I cannot tell you that, in my time on Capitol Hill, the Committee on Financial Services is the committee I would pick out as the single most collegial committee on Capitol Hill.

I think back to some of the discussions that have happened over the years there. It is a committee that takes on difficult issues and often divides along partisan lines.

We have two Members from Georgia on the Financial Services Committee, Mr. Speaker: a gentleman from the metro Atlanta area (Mr. SCOTT) and a gentleman from farther west in Georgia (Mr. LOUDERMILK). One is a Republican. One is a Democrat.

And, odds are, when we get into the real issues that are really going to make a difference for families across the district, they vote the same way.

Whenever I go and try to get into the meat of a financial services issue, I can go to what my friends, Mr. SCOTT and Mr. LOUDERMILK, are saying. Again, opposite sides of the political spectrum, but a shared goal of trying to serve the men and women of Georgia as best they can.

I confess, I don't have high hopes we are going to defeat the previous question and amend the rule and get back to focusing on what I would think are those common goals that we share. But I have been surprised before. And I have been surprised in ways that disappoint me, and I have been surprised in ways that make me proud.

I will just say to my colleagues: If you are thinking about busting out of the box a little bit, if you are thinking about should we do things the same way we have always done them or should we try something new, if you are thinking about it is working great the way it has been going or thinking maybe we can improve on it a little bit, just consider the Woodall amendment to the rule today.

Let's defeat the previous question; let's amend the rule; and then let's see if, perhaps, we can break out a new day of productivity, not based on Republicans and Democrats, but based on

Americans who are facing real problems back home and the real solutions that we are very honored to be able to work to provide.

Mr. Speaker, with that, I say to my friend from California, I don't have any speakers here. I want to encourage my friends to defeat that previous question. In the absence of defeating the previous question, Mr. Speaker, I would ask folks to defeat the rule, give us a chance to go back up to the Rules Committee room with these 13 members and try to craft something even better than what we have here today.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend as well. It is always a pleasure to hear the gentleman's words of wisdom.

I am reminded of a story that you will hear if the docent has the time at Monticello, when somebody asked Jefferson when he first opened: Mr. Jefferson, why do you have a bust of Mr. Hamilton opposite you? You don't agree on anything with Hamilton.

Jefferson said: That is the point. That is why it is there.

So, I appreciate the comments. I look forward to further conversations up in that room.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I would like to thank my colleagues—Congresswoman AXNE, Congressman CASTEN, and Chairwoman WATERS—for their leadership on these commonsense bills to protect American consumers and workers, and I urge a “yes” vote on the rule and the previous question.

The material previously referred to by Mr. WOODALL is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 629

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 3. Upon adoption of this resolution, the Committees on the Judiciary, Ways and Means, Financial Services, Oversight and Reform, and Foreign Affairs and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence shall suspend pursuing matters referred to by the Speaker in her announcement of September 24, 2019, until such time as bipartisan legislation to lower prescription drug prices and limit patients' out of pocket costs is signed into law.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or votes objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

The House will resume proceedings on postponed questions at a later time.

OPPOSING THE DECISION TO END CERTAIN UNITED STATES EFFORTS TO PREVENT TURKISH MILITARY OPERATIONS AGAINST SYRIAN KURDISH FORCES IN NORTHEAST SYRIA

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 77) opposing the decision to end certain United States efforts to prevent Turkish military operations against Syrian Kurdish forces in Northeast Syria.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 77

Whereas thousands of Syrian fighters, including Syrian Kurds, fought courageously with the United States against the brutality of ISIS throughout Syria, liberating nearly one-third of Syrian territory from ISIS' so-called “caliphate.”;

Whereas, on October 6, 2019, the White House announced “Turkey will soon be moving forward with its long-planned operation into Northern Syria” while the “United States Armed Forces will not support or be involved in the operation, and United States forces . . . will no longer be in the immediate area.”;

Whereas, on October 6, 2019, the White House announced “Turkey will now be responsible for all ISIS fighters in the area captured over the past two years . . .”;

Whereas an October 10, 2019, White House statement said, “This morning, Turkey, a NATO member, invaded Syria. The United States does not endorse this attack and has made it clear to Turkey that this operation is a bad idea.”;

Whereas Turkey has historically threatened, forcibly displaced, and killed Syrian Kurds, including during military operations in the Afrin District;

Whereas, on August 1, 2019, Special Envoy James Jeffrey stated in reference to the Syrian Kurds and Syrian Democratic Forces (SDF), “We are committed to defeating ISIS in northeast Syria. The SDF . . . is our partner there. We are committed to those who have fought with us not being attacked and not being harmed by anyone. The President made that clear publicly. That includes our concerns about the Turks.”;

Whereas in January 2019, Director of National Intelligence Dan Coats stated in Congressional testimony that “The conflicts in Iraq and Syria have generated a large pool of skilled and battle-hardened fighters who remain dispersed throughout the region . . . and the group has returned to its guerilla-warfare roots while continuing to plot attacks and direct its supporters worldwide. ISIS is intent on resurging.”;

Whereas, during the counter-ISIS campaign in Syria, the SDF captured thousands of ISIS fighters, including foreign terrorist fighters from around the world who pose threats to our allies in the region;