

vote for a union, you should be able to get a contract for your union—making so-called independent contractors employees, and protections for workers on strike.

All of those things I just mentioned are included in the PRO Act. All those things could be possible for workers across the country.

We know that when we have had the least amount of income inequality in our country, back in the 1950s, is when we had the greatest representation of people in unions. Now that we have got one of the smallest amounts of people—about 11 percent, nationwide, in public and private employee unions—we have the greatest gap in income that we have had in this country.

There is no surprise there is a lot of pushback from not only people on the other side of the aisle, but from the United States Chamber of Commerce, which is not your local business in your chamber of commerce, but it is the big businesses in this country that don't want to take care of their workers. Instead, they want to send all the profits up to their shareholders, so very few get a lot and everyone else gets the crumbs that are left over.

Just to give you an idea of some of the actions we see by these companies: 75 percent of private-sector employers hire outside consultants to run antiunion campaigns when workers try to form a union; 63 percent force their employees to attend closed-door meetings to hear antiunion propaganda; and over half of employers threaten workers in these meetings, they threaten their jobs.

You have a one-in-five chance, if you are a union organizer, of losing your job because, right now, you can get away with it with this administration and how they enforce our labor laws.

But here is the reality. If you don't have a union in your company right now, this is what you get when you have a union:

Health insurance: 75 percent of people in a union participate in job-provided health insurance versus about 48 percent nationwide;

Pensions: 70 percent of people versus 13 percent nationwide;

Paid sick leave: 91 percent of people who are in a union have paid sick leave, and the median weekly earnings are \$207 more a week. That is \$11,000 a year more if you are a member of a union, in a similar job, than if you are not.

That is the real reason we see the attacks on working people trying to have a voice in their workplaces, and that is why we see people not trying to lift this bill.

This is so important that, in this Congress, we take this bill up in the House of Representatives and we pass this bill and we give, finally, an edge to help push a little more assistance to workers who want to have a say in the workplace than what employers have had because of this administration, because of States that have passed bad

laws, that make it harder, again, to have a say in your workplace.

This is an important piece of legislation. The Congressional Progressive Caucus has made this issue a priority. We are going to make sure there will be a vote this session in Congress. We are going to try to make the Senate take this up as well.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Chicago. His help on this and so many issues has been so very important. We are going to do everything we can to get this done this session.

Mr. GARCIA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for his remarks.

So what is the essence of the Protect the Right to Organize Act? We have heard from my colleagues today about the many ways that unions have made America strong. From the 8-hour day to building the middle class, we have a lot to thank the labor movement for. Unions are an integral part of increasing wages and addressing income inequality.

Still, special interest-funded attacks on labor laws have eroded union membership for years. For too long, greedy companies have used extreme measures to stop working people from exercising their right to join together and negotiate for their rights and their working conditions.

While the economy is working very well for the wealthy, our middle class continues to shrink. The cause is simple: policy choices, especially by Republicans in the House at this time, in the Senate, in State legislatures, and the Presidency that have stripped workers of the power to stand together.

The Protecting the Right to Organize Act is a historical proposal that restores fairness in the economy by strengthening the Federal laws to protect workers' rights to organize.

We need the PRO Act at a time when Trump wages war against the labor movement. We need the PRO Act to build an economy that works for all working families and not just the wealthy.

The lessons I learned from unions—that individual justice is only as good as collective justice—continue to inform my career in public service, and I hope every worker can have the opportunities that unions gave me.

I got a chance to work at a young age. I joined a union. It helped me pay for my college education. I did well in the community that I still live in. That is why I approach banding together for the welfare of working people.

Tonight, you have heard from people from coast to coast, all over our country, from the South and from the heartland. These are individuals who are fighting for working people to, again, level the playing field and create a real purpose of economic justice to lift everyone up in our country.

As we move forward with the PRO Act, I call upon the American public to understand that it is time for economic justice and it is time for prosperity for

all. And, with that, I ask them to call on their Representatives in the U.S. Congress to make this law a reality for all working men and women across the Nation.

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

ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I really haven't ever become friends with General Michael Flynn. He doesn't object to being called Michael Flynn, even though he earned the title of "General," even though he has not been treated fairly at all and has actually been treated unjustly.

There is an article today from Margot Cleveland in *The Federalist*. It talks about Michael Flynn's case, and I am learning some things.

I think the world of Sidney Powell. She is an amazing attorney. She is a friend. But there is a motion pending before Federal Judge Emmett Sullivan on a motion to compel and motion for sanctions that attorney Sidney Powell had filed.

"Powell's motion seeks to force Federal prosecutors to provide Flynn an array of documents withheld from his attorneys and to sanction government lawyers for their failure to provide relevant evidence to the defense team in a timely manner."

Now, as a former judge—and I have prosecuted, I have defended, and I have been a chief justice, but nothing is more infuriating to me, when it comes to our justice system, than prosecutors who are unjust, who lie, who misrepresent. And it looks like all of that has been occurring in Michael Flynn's case or with deference to, like Colonel Vindman, General Michael Flynn.

This article points out: "Then, mere days after the final briefing came in," to Judge Sullivan, "Federal prosecutors found themselves forced to admit that, for nearly 3 years, they had wrongly identified the authors of the handwritten notes taken by the FBI agents during their January 24, 2017, interview of then-National Security Advisor Flynn. Prosecutors had told defense counsel, and the court, that the notes written by Peter Stozk had been compiled by FBI Agent Joe Pietka, and those taken by Pietka had been written by Stozk."

"This embarrassing mea culpa surely added strength to Powell's plea for access to other withheld evidence. After all, if Federal prosecutors made such a basic blunder concerning key evidence, what other mistakes lay buried in the undisclosed evidence?"

This goes on and points out that, at a minimum, things that are being set out now "would also support the withdrawal of Flynn's guilty plea—something Powell does not appear to be considering at this time—including"—and

here is the circumstance that is just phenomenal, that, in a Federal district court we could have Justice Department attorneys who are this flagrantly abusive of the process.

So, “Flynn’s original attorneys had a conflict of interest preventing them from representing Flynn in the criminal case; Flynn did not intentionally make false statements to the FBI agents; the FBI agents entrapped Flynn; Flynn’s purported misstatements were immaterial to the investigation into supposed Russia collusion and, thus, no crime occurred; the government engaged in selective prosecution and charged Flynn solely because of his relationship to Trump; prosecutors used threats to induce Flynn’s plea; the prosecutors’ failure to timely disclose exculpatory and impeachment evidence invalidates Flynn’s plea; and that egregious prosecutorial and government misconduct mandates dismissal of all charges against Flynn.”

If you go down further, more revelations.

“The government had pushed Flynn’s previous attorneys at Covington and Burling LLP, in February 2017, to quickly file a registration statement under the Foreign Agent Registration Act, FARA, for Flynn Intel Group, FIG. Federal prosecutors later obtained indictments against Flynn’s FIG business partners for supposed Foreign Agent Registration Act violations, and still later, the prosecutors branded Flynn a co-conspirator in the FARA case. There was a clear conflict of interest, which the government failed to mention to Judge Sullivan.

“Further, since Flynn last appeared before Sullivan, the government’s FARA case against his FIG partners has imploded. Following a 6-day trial, a jury had convicted Flynn’s former business partner, Bijan Rafiekian, of acting as an unregistered agent of Turkey, conspiring to act as an unregistered agent of Turkey. . . .”

It says: “But Federal Judge Anthony Trenga stepped in and tossed the guilty verdict, concluding that no ‘rational jury could conclude that Rafiekian conspired with Alptekin or anyone else.’ Judge Trenga further held that ‘there is no evidence of discussions or suggestions, let alone any agreement express or implied, to either avoid filing under FARA or to cause the filing of a false FARA registration statement.’”

□ 2000

“That the government’s FARA case against Flynn’s business partner proved bogus should also trouble Sullivan because, according to Powell’s earlier court filings, the special counsel’s office had informed Flynn’s ‘counsel in the summer of 2017 that it was going to indict the FARA case then, had obtained authorization to target Michael Flynn, Jr.—who had a newborn—and had seized all his electronic devices.’

“The threat was clear: Plead guilty and cooperate or we will prosecute your son. And given Judge Trenga’s conclusion in the Rafiekian case that there was no evidence of a FARA crime, there is an added postscript: We will prosecute your son on bogus charges.”

Unbelievable. It also should be quite scary to someone situated as Michael Flynn, General Flynn, that the Federal Government, the DOJ—especially when they use unscrupulous and unethical means—they can convict anybody, even when there is no evidence whatsoever as Judge Trenga found, there was no evidence whatsoever.

I don’t know these people, but I know the Federal judge said there was no evidence whatsoever. And, yet, the jury came back—I am sure the judge was just thinking: I will let the jury find there is no evidence because there is none.

And when they came back and convicted, wow, the judge is going: I have got to throw this out. This is totally bogus.

“The threat also wasn’t a one off: After Powell took over representation of Flynn, federal prosecutors attempted to force Flynn to testify at Rafiekian’s trial that Flynn had knowingly made false statements in the FARA filings—something Flynn denies. When Flynn refused to lie, federal prosecutors abruptly added Michael Flynn, Jr. to the witness list for the Rafiekian trial, but then never called him to testify.”

Total intimidation. Total effort to intimidate. Very unethical.

“The government, according to Powell, also had an FBI agent contact Flynn, Jr. directly, even though the younger Flynn was represented by counsel.” Also quite unethical.

Boy, the unethical conduct in this Department of Justice hasn’t gone away. It hasn’t stopped with Strzok and Page, being gone—Bruce Ohr, all of these others that appeared to conspire to defeat a Presidential candidate, and then to try the coup to take him out.

“The government, according to Powell, also had an FBI agent contact Flynn, Jr. directly.

“These maneuvers corroborate the prosecutors earlier use of Flynn, Jr. as a pawn to pressure his father to plead guilty.”

I mean, this stuff is just amazing. And if they can do this to someone who spent over 30 years dedicated to the defense of his country, all kinds of decorations for heroism, and powerful friends in Washington, they can do this to him, it is difficult to think about the terrible situation of someone without money, without friends.

If these people can be this unscrupulous to people with some power, it just bodes very poorly for this little experiment in self-government when the judicial branch, or I am sorry, the executive branch’s prosecutorial wing is this abusive. Absolutely incredible. A bit frightening, actually.

So I would like to also touch on some of the testimony that has gone on in yesterday’s hearing, the part where we had Jennifer Williams and Lieutenant Colonel Vindman.

He said, I think, that he has been in over 20 years. Didn’t make Colonel. And I have known people, you know, my 4 years in the Army, we saw those folks. They were so self-righteous on the one hand, maybe they didn’t get a promotion they thought they deserved. Maybe it was because they did something like Vindman did and was trashing the United States to Russians when he was overheard by a superior that reprimanded him for it.

Sometimes it is just because there is a mean superior that doesn’t want somebody promoted. But for whatever reason, he didn’t become a full Colonel. Here he is, harping after he had been called Lieutenant Colonel over and over by my friend, DEVIN NUNES, he interrupts and demands—and I notice he didn’t always call people Congressman. That didn’t bother me, but it is just quite interesting that he has such a double standard for himself and for others.

But when you look at the testimony, especially page 2, it is interesting—and actually, this is from our friend ADAM SCHIFF, Congressman ADAM SCHIFF—“Colonel Vindman, we have seen”—and I guess it should have been Lieutenant Colonel Vindman—“we have seen far more scurrilous attacks on your character, and watched as certain personalities on Fox have questioned your loyalty. I note that you have shed blood for America, and we owe you an immense debt of gratitude.” So that is the case, we owe him a debt of gratitude for defending our country.

I do love history and I point out down the hall when we are in the rotunda to groups, we have got General Gates standing there accepting surrender from the British, and he was not the real hero of the Battle of Saratoga, and that was the biggest victory since December 24, 1776, probably.

And it was a big one, but it wasn’t Gates. I read another book on the Revolution just months ago, and this book was saying Gates never got out of his tent, whether it was cowardice or whatever, he never would get out of his tent. But there was this great, brave, courageous, young major that just knew they could defeat the British there at Saratoga if they get on going and attack them. Gates wouldn’t give the order, so this major rallied folks, and they went down and they attacked the British, and they defeated them.

So the real hero of Saratoga wasn’t General Gates. It was this major, a tough, strapping guy. He took them on, and he was wounded. And he carried a limp with him probably the rest of his life. He was wounded. He was hurt severely. But we owe that guy a debt of gratitude for his defense of his country.

Of course, later on, he got upset that he had been slighted and didn’t get a promotion like Gates’ immediate subordinates, and then that caused him to

fall prey to the British talking him into helping them because they would pay him, and they would appreciate him a whole lot more than Washington and others. And, of course, then he ended up setting up Washington to be kidnapped by the British.

But I am amazed how many people don't know that we owe a great debt of gratitude to Major Benedict Arnold, because without him, there is no victory at the Battle of Saratoga, and that was a huge victory, so very important to our becoming an independent country.

So anyway, it is just interesting when you think about history and people who demand to be given respect, and if they are not, they get rather snippy.

And I don't know that I have ever met Lieutenant Colonel Vindman, but to find out that he was trashing the United States to Russians, and it was just intriguing to go through his testimony.

For example, he said this about the investigation into the 2016 elections, Bidens, Burisma.

"I stated to Ambassador Sondland that this was inappropriate and it had nothing to do with national security. Dr. Hill also asserted his comments weren't proper. Following the meeting, Dr. Hill and I agreed to report the incident to the NSC's lead counsel."

So it is interesting. Further, he was asked by Mr. Goldman: "On September 10, the Intelligence Committee requested the whistleblower complaint from the Department of National Intelligence."

He wasn't aware of that. But it is just, wow, so September 10, they obviously knew all about the so-called whistleblower complaint.

But when you get over here to part of the questioning by Congressman NUNES: "Did you ask or encourage any individual to share the substance of the July 25th phone call or any matter associated with the call with any member of the press?"

"I did not."

And he goes on like that. And then he said:

"Lieutenant Colonel Vindman, did you discuss the July 25th phone call with anyone outside the White House on July 25th or the 26th, and if so, with whom?"

And he said: "Yes, I did. My core function is to coordinate U.S. Government policy, interagency policy, and I spoke to two individuals with regards to providing some sort of readout of the call."

NUNES says: "Two individuals that were not in the White House?"

Vindman: "Not in the White House." And that is Lieutenant Colonel Vindman. "Not in the White House, cleared U.S. Government officials with appropriate need to know."

"And what agencies were these officials with?"

Lieutenant Colonel Vindman said: "Department of State, Deputy Assist-

ant Secretary George Kent, who is responsible for the portfolio, Eastern Europe including Ukraine, and an individual from the office of—an individual in the intelligence community."

And that is where NUNES says: "As you know, the intelligence community has 17 different agencies. What agency was this individual from?"

And that is when Chairman SCHIFF said: "If I could interject. We don't want to use these proceedings"—and then cross talk—"we need to protect the whistleblower."

And what is really interesting, of course, is when he calls out Congressman NUNES. "It's Lieutenant Colonel Vindman, please." So I want to make sure that I don't slight him.

He says—and he is under oath—"I don't know who the whistleblower is. That is correct."

And yet, he gets down to there is two people. He identifies one, and Chairman SCHIFF interrupts and doesn't want him to out the other person, because that would be outing the whistleblower.

And, yet, Chairman SCHIFF and Lieutenant Colonel Vindman say they don't know who the whistleblower is, but it must be that one that he has been told not to answer because that would give away the whistleblower's identity.

And yet, they say, we don't know who the whistleblower is, but we are down to one person, but we don't know who it is. Even though if he gives the name, it will out the whistleblower. It is just really amazing when you look at this stuff.

And it is actually rather tragic. There was a question Mr. Castor says: "And are you aware, and George Kent testified a little bit about this last week, that under the Obama administration, the U.S. Government encouraged Ukraine to investigate whether Zlochevsky used his government position to grant himself or Burisma exploration licenses. Are you aware of that?"

And Lieutenant Colonel Vindman said: "I would defer to George Kent. He's a fount of knowledge on Ukraine, much deeper knowledge than I have. If he attested to that, then I'd take his word for it."

Well, isn't it interesting that Mr. Kent knew that the Obama administration was trying to get to the bottom of corruption about Burisma, and, yet, he freaks out, not Kent, but Lieutenant Colonel Vindman, freaks out over Burisma being brought up, that that is some kind of crime for an impeachable offense, basically, for President Trump to bring up the corruption and including Burisma.

But isn't that interesting? He didn't bring up there is a problem with the Obama administration bringing it up, just President Trump.

□ 2015

But Ranking Member NUNES also brings up that, I asked Ms. Williams about this, about, if she had ever

accessed, without authorization, colleagues' computers. She answered no. And he goes on through some of that.

But you get down here and then it is turned over to JIM JORDAN. Congressman JORDAN said, "Mr. Morrison said this: 'I had concerns about Lieutenant Colonel Vindman's judgment. Among the discussions I had with Dr. Hill—that is Fiona Hill—in the transition with our team, its strength, its weaknesses, and Fiona and others had raised concern about Alex's—he should have said Lieutenant Colonel Vindman's—judgment'. When Mr. Morrison was asked by Mr. Castor, 'Did anyone ever bring concerns to you that they believe Colonel Vindman may have leaked something,' Mr. Morrison replied, 'yes.'"

They thought he was a leaker well before this all happened.

So your boss had concerns about your judgment—your favored boss, Dr. Hill—had concerns about your judgment, your colleagues had concerns about your judgment, and your colleagues felt that there were times when you leaked information. Any idea where they might have gotten those impressions, Colonel Vindman?

He calls him "Colonel." He gave him a promotion.

But Vindman says "yes." And then he raised an OER that was somewhat glowing, but actually the answer should have been "no," if he was being truthful, because he later says, "I can't say why Mr. Morrison questioned my judgment."

But Congressman JORDAN goes on: "Colonel, it's interesting, we deposed a lot of people in the bunker, in the basement of the Capitol, over the last several weeks, but of all those depositions, only three of the individuals we deposed were actually on the now-some-what-famous July 25 phone call between President Trump and President Zelensky. There was you, the individual sitting beside you, Ms. Williams, and then there, of course, was your boss, Mr. Morrison. . . ."

"When we asked Ms. Williams who she spoke to after the call, about the call, she was willing to answer our questions, and Chairman SCHIFF allowed her to answer the questions. When we asked Mr. Morrison who he spoke to after the call, about the call, he was willing to answer our question and Chairman SCHIFF allowed him to answer our question. But when we asked you, you first told us three individuals at the NSC, your brother and two lawyers. And then you said there was a group of other people you communicated with, but you would only give us one individual in that group, Secretary Kent. And the chairman would only allow you to give us that name. When we asked you who else you communicated with, you would not tell us. So what I want to know first, how many other people are in that group of people you communicated with outside the four individuals I just named?"

"Mr. JORDAN, on a call readout"—this is Lieutenant Colonel Vindman—

“on a call readout, certainly after the first call, there were probably a half a dozen or more people that I read out. Those are people with the proper clearance and the need to know. In this case, because of the sensitivity of the call, Mr. Eisenberg told me not to speak to anybody else. I only read out, outside of the NSC, two individuals.”

So very interesting there. And it is interesting, too, that, you know, the fact is if Lieutenant Colonel Vindman, say hypothetically he leaked—as he had been suspected of in other case or cases—say he leaked in this case to people that didn’t have proper clearance, he probably would try to assert: I was named as a whistleblower, and once I had that status, you can’t prosecute me. And then there would be a motion to dismiss, this kind of thing.

And ultimately, the courts would say: Wait a minute. The whistleblower statute does not protect the whistleblower, because to protect a whistleblower, the person being complained about has to be within the department or agency from the person complaining. The President is not in the Intel agencies or department, and so it just wouldn’t work. And, of course, previously you had to have direct knowledge.

And I would submit, if you look, treason is something the President can be impeached for, but under the Constitution, that requires two people with direct knowledge as direct witnesses, not hearsay—can’t be hearsay—direct witnesses to a crime. They have to testify. If you don’t have two, you can’t prove treason under the Constitution. It is out.

And I would submit, the Senate would do well—if this is sent down there—to require the same thing of whatever bogus charge ends up coming their way, because that is all we have seen so far, but require two people with direct evidence. A bunch of people have been convicted of treason. No President has ever been removed. So if we are going to remove a President, it ought to require two direct witnesses as well. And so it ought to be a short trial.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today and November 21.

Mr. COOPER (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today and November 21 on account of birth of first grandchild.

Mr. LEWIS (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o’clock and 20 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the

House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, November 21, 2019, at 9 a.m.

BUDGETARY EFFECTS OF PAYGO LEGISLATION

Pursuant to the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (PAYGO), Mr. YARMUTH hereby submits, prior to the vote on passage, for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that H.R. 255, the Big Bear Land Exchange Act, as amended, would have no significant effect on the deficit, and therefore, the budgetary effects of such bill are estimated as zero.

Pursuant to the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (PAYGO), Mr. YARMUTH hereby submits, prior to the vote on passage, for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that H.R. 737, the Shark Fin sales Elimination Act of 2019, as amended, would have no significant effect on the deficit, and therefore, the budgetary effects of such bill are estimated as zero.

Pursuant to the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (PAYGO), Mr. YARMUTH hereby submits, prior to the vote on passage, for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that H.R. 1446, the Multinational Species Conservation Funds Semipostal Stamp Reauthorization Act of 2019, as amended, would have no significant effect on the deficit, and therefore, the budgetary effects of such bill are estimated as zero.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

3033. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule — Significant New Use Rules on Certain Chemical Substances (18-1) [EPA-HQ-OPPT-2018-0627; FRL-10001-30] (RIN: 2070-AB27) received November 18, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3034. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule — Air Plan Approval; Ohio; Second Limited Maintenance Plans for 1997 Ozone NAAQS [EPA-R05-OAR-2019-0216; FRL-10002-25-Region 5] received November 18, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3035. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule — Approval and Promulgation of State Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants; West Virginia; Control of Emissions from Existing Municipal Solid Waste Landfills [EPA-R03-OAR-2019-0187; FRL-9999-80-Region 3] received November 18, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3036. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule — Significant New Use Rules

on Certain Chemical Substances (17-3); Technical Correction [EPA-HQ-OPPT-2017-0464; FRL-10001-43] (RIN: 2070-AB27) received November 18, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3037. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule — Air Quality Designation: FL; Redesignation of the Duval County Ozone Unclassifiable Area [EPA-R04-OAR-2019-0374; FRL-10002-48-Region 4] received November 18, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3038. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule — Air Plan Approval; Arizona; Maricopa County Air Quality Department [EPA-R09-OAR-2019-0497; FRL-10002-13-Region 9] received November 18, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3039. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule — Air Plan Approval; GA; Miscellaneous Revisions [EPA-R04-OAR-2018-0711; FRL-10002-46-Region 4] received November 18, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3040. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule — Air Plan Approval; Illinois; Emissions Reduction Market System Sunset [EPA-R05-OAR-2019-0032; FRL-10002-26-Region 5] received November 18, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3041. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a notification of a deployment of additional U.S. Armed Forces personnel to Saudi Arabia, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1543(c); Public Law 93-148, Sec. 4(c); (87 Stat. 555) (H. Doc. No. 116—82); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

3042. A letter from the Officer for Civil Rights and Civil Liberties, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department’s Office for Civil Rights and Civil Liberties Fiscal Year 2018 Semiannual Report, Third and Fourth Quarters, pursuant to 6 U.S.C. 345(b); Public Law 107-296, Sec. 705; (116 Stat. 2219); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

3043. A letter from the Board Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Administration’s Office of Inspector General Semiannual Report to Congress covering the period of April 1, 2019, through September 30, 2019; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

3044. A letter from the Board Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Administration’s Performance and Accountability Report for FY 2019, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3515(a)(1); Public Law 101-576, Sec. 303(a)(1) (as amended by Public Law 107-289, Sec. 2(a)); (116 Stat. 2049); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

3045. A letter from the Board Chairman, Audit Committee Chairman, Farm Credit System Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation’s report to the President addressing the requirements of the Federal Managers’ Financial Integrity Act and the Inspector General Act of 1978; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

3046. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, National