

(e) FUNDING.—For each of fiscal years 2021 through 2024, there is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary \$40,000,000 to carry out this section.

(f) DERIVATION OF FUNDS.—Funds to carry out the activities under this section shall be derived from amounts authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary that are enacted after the date of the enactment of this section.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. CASE) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Hawaii.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CASE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the measure under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, the National Landslide Preparedness Act sponsored by my colleague, Ms. DELBENE, would establish a national landslide hazards reduction program through the United States Geological Survey to better identify landslide risks and to improve emergency preparedness for communities. This bill also directs USGS to implement a 3D elevation program to update and produce high-resolution elevation data across the country.

The House passed a version of this legislation by voice vote last year, but after further negotiation with both the majority and the minority in the Senate, we have agreed to a few changes in the language and are passing this revised bill to allow the Senate to move this compromise to the President before it adjourns.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, once again, I have no objection to this particular bill. I do have objections to the process we are going through.

The House has already passed a bill. It went to the Senate. The Senate passed a bill. It came back here. Now, we introduced a new bill to go up there with different changes in it going back to the Senate. We should have fixed it the first time. But having said that, go with it.

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

Mr. CASE. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DELBENE).

Ms. DELBENE. Madam Speaker, almost 7 years ago, on March 22, 2014, Washington experienced one of its worst natural disasters ever. In a mat-

ter of seconds, a tragic landslide near Oso killed 43 people, destroyed over 40 homes, and severely damaged public infrastructure and private property.

That day forever changed the people of Oso, Darrington, Arlington, the Stillaguamish Tribe, and the Sauk-Suiattle Tribe. But even in the aftermath of the landslide, it was incredibly inspiring to see a community come together to help each other through this tragedy. That is why I introduced this bill, the National Landslide Preparedness Act.

In 2016, I introduced the first version of this bill and have been working tirelessly to get it signed into law. This will allow significant progress to be made in landslide science and will allow communities to be better prepared for when landslides do occur.

As the Oso landslide demonstrated, simply sending aid after a tragic natural disaster is insufficient. We need to do more to fund programs and research efforts to prevent future natural disasters from becoming national tragedies.

In recent years, we have seen dramatic increases in extreme weather events, and we need to do everything in our power to make sure that communities across the country are better prepared. Given the importance of this issue, I strongly urge my colleagues to support this bill. Getting it signed into law is long overdue, and I hope the Senate will pass this bill quickly and send it to the President's desk for his signature.

Mr. CASE. Madam Speaker, I urge adoption of this measure, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. CASE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 8810, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BIG CAT PUBLIC SAFETY ACT

Mr. CASE. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1380) to amend the Lacey Act Amendments of 1981 to clarify provisions enacted by the Captive Wildlife Safety Act, to further the conservation of certain wildlife species, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1380

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Big Cat Public Safety Act”.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2 of the Lacey Act Amendments of 1981 (16 U.S.C. 3371) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (a) through (k) as subsections (b) through (l), respectively; and

(2) by inserting before subsection (b) (as so redesignated) the following:

“(a) BREED.—The term ‘breed’ means to facilitate propagation or reproduction (whether intentionally or negligently), or to fail to prevent propagation or reproduction.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) CONSOLIDATED FARM AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT ACT.—Section 349(a)(3) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1997(a)(3)) is amended by striking “section 2(a)” and inserting “section 2(b)”.

(2) LACEY ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1981.—Section 7(c) of the Lacey Act Amendments of 1981 (16 U.S.C. 3376(c)) is amended by striking “section 2(f)(2)(A)” and inserting “section 2(g)(2)(A)”.

SEC. 3. PROHIBITIONS.

Section 3 of the Lacey Act Amendments of 1981 (16 U.S.C. 3372) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking the semicolon at the end and inserting “; or”;;

(ii) in subparagraph (B)(iii), by striking “; or” and inserting a semicolon; and

(iii) by striking subparagraph (C); and

(B) in paragraph (4), by striking “(1) through (3)” and inserting “(1) through (3) or subsection (e)”;

(2) by amending subsection (e) to read as follows:

“(e) CAPTIVE WILDLIFE OFFENSE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—It is unlawful for any person to import, export, transport, sell, receive, acquire, or purchase in interstate or foreign commerce, or in a manner substantially affecting interstate or foreign commerce, or to breed or possess, any prohibited wildlife species.

“(2) LIMITATION ON APPLICATION.—Paragraph (1) does not apply to—

“(A) an entity exhibiting animals to the public under a Class C license from the Department of Agriculture, or a Federal facility registered with the Department of Agriculture that exhibits animals, if such entity or facility holds such license or registration in good standing and if the entity or facility—

“(i) does not allow any individual to come into direct physical contact with a prohibited wildlife species, unless that individual is—

“(I) a trained professional employee or contractor of the entity or facility (or an accompanying employee receiving professional training);

“(II) a licensed veterinarian (or a veterinary student accompanying such a veterinarian); or

“(III) directly supporting conservation programs of the entity or facility, the contact is not in the course of commercial activity (which may be evidenced by advertisement or promotion of such activity or other relevant evidence), and the contact is incidental to humane husbandry conducted pursuant to a species-specific, publicly available, peer-edited population management and care plan that has been provided to the Secretary with justifications that the plan—

“(aa) reflects established conservation science principles;

“(bb) incorporates genetic and demographic analysis of a multi-institution population of animals covered by the plan; and

“(cc) promotes animal welfare by ensuring that the frequency of breeding is appropriate for the species;

“(ii) ensures that during public exhibition of a lion (*Panthera leo*), tiger (*Panthera tigris*), leopard (*Panthera pardus*), snow leopard (*Uncia uncia*), jaguar (*Panthera onca*),

cougar (*Puma concolor*), or any hybrid thereof, the animal is at least 15 feet from members of the public unless there is a permanent barrier sufficient to prevent public contact;

“(B) a State college, university, or agency, or a State-licensed veterinarian;

“(C) a wildlife sanctuary that cares for prohibited wildlife species, and—

“(i) is a corporation that is exempt from taxation under section 501(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and described in sections 501(c)(3) and 170(b)(1)(A)(vi) of such Code;

“(ii) does not commercially trade in any prohibited wildlife species, including offspring, parts, and byproducts of such animals;

“(iii) does not breed any prohibited wildlife species;

“(iv) does not allow direct contact between the public and any prohibited wildlife species; and

“(v) does not allow the transportation and display of any prohibited wildlife species off-site;

“(D) has custody of any prohibited wildlife species solely for the purpose of expeditiously transporting the prohibited wildlife species to a person described in this paragraph with respect to the species; or

“(E) an entity or individual that is in possession of any prohibited wildlife species that was born before the date of the enactment of the Big Cat Public Safety Act, and—

“(i) not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of the such Act, the entity or individual registers each individual animal of each prohibited wildlife species possessed by the entity or individual with the United States Fish and Wildlife Service;

“(ii) does not breed, acquire, or sell any prohibited wildlife species after the date of the enactment of such Act; and

“(iii) does not allow direct contact between the public and prohibited wildlife species.”.

SEC. 4. PENALTIES.

(a) CIVIL PENALTIES.—Section 4(a)(1) of the Lacey Act Amendments of 1981 (16 U.S.C. 3373(a)(1)) is amended—

(1) by inserting “(e),” after “(d),”; and
(2) by inserting “, (e),” after “subsection (d)”.

(b) CRIMINAL PENALTIES.—Section 4(d) of the Lacey Act Amendments of 1981 (16 U.S.C. 3373(d)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(A), by inserting “(e),” after “(d),”;
(2) in paragraph (1)(B), by inserting “(e),” after “(d),”;
(3) in paragraph (2), by inserting “(e),” after “(d),”; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

“(4) Any person who knowingly violates subsection (e) of section 3 shall be fined not more than \$20,000, or imprisoned for not more than five years, or both. Each violation shall be a separate offense and the offense is deemed to have been committed in the district where the violation first occurred, and in any district in which the defendant may have taken or been in possession of the prohibited wildlife species.”.

SEC. 5. FORFEITURE OF PROHIBITED WILDLIFE SPECIES.

Section 5(a)(1) of the Lacey Act Amendments of 1981 (16 U.S.C. 3374(a)(1)) is amended by inserting “bred, possessed,” before “imported, exported.”.

SEC. 6. ADMINISTRATION.

Section 7(a) of the Lacey Act Amendments of 1981 (16 U.S.C. 3376(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(3) The Secretary shall, in consultation with other relevant Federal and State agencies, promulgate any regulations necessary to implement section 3(e).”.

SEC. 7. DETERMINATION OF BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled “Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation” for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the House Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. CASE) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Hawaii.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CASE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the measure under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1380, the Big Cat Public Safety Act.

At the beginning of this hectic year, many Americans were introduced to the issue before us today and this legislation for the first time through the “Tiger King,” which in addition to a plethora of colorful real-life characters also shined a spotlight on the dark side of keeping lions, tigers, and other big cats in captivity.

The Big Cat Public Safety Act ends the ownership of big cats as pets and prohibits exhibitors from allowing public contact with big cats, including cubs.

In 2003, Congress unanimously passed the Captive Wildlife Safety Act, which amended the Lacey Act to prohibit the import, export, buying, selling, transport, receiving, or acquisition of big cats across States to the U.S. border. However, the existing law did not include prohibitions for the private possession or breeding of big cats.

Currently, State laws vary quite a bit. Some States have no restrictions; some simply require registration; and some completely prohibit ownership of big cats as pets.

The Big Cat Public Safety Act builds on the Captive Wildlife Safety Act by making it illegal to privately possess or breed lions, tigers, leopards, cheetahs, jaguars, cougars, or any hybrid. The bill is narrowly focused on privately owned animals and includes exemptions for exhibitors with U.S. Department of Agriculture class C licenses, such as zoos, State universities, and sanctuaries.

This bill, championed by my colleague, Representative MIKE QUIGLEY, along with an astounding 230 cosponsors, is a commonsense solution to address public safety and animal abuse

concerns. It enjoys wide bipartisan support, and it is time we passed it into law.

It is unknown how many big cats, including tigers, lions, jaguars, leopards, cougars, and hybrids, are currently kept in private ownership in the United States, but estimates are in the range of 5,000 to 10,000. That means an average of up to 200 big cats are in private ownership in every State in America.

I don’t know about you, Madam Speaker, but I wouldn’t feel safe with my children or grandchildren living next door to a tiger, nor does that seem humane for the animals whose ancestors roamed vast expanses of the savannahs and jungles.

As we saw in “Tiger King,” the top priority for private big cat owners is not the best interests of animals or public safety but rather greed, profit, or glory.

Since 1990, there have been around 300 dangerous incidents involving big cats in the United States—including one just today—that have resulted in human injuries, mauling, and even death. When these incidents occur, first responders are also put at risk since they are not trained or equipped to handle situations involving big cats.

Madam Speaker, I hope you can all agree with me that the private ownership of big cats opens the door for rampant animal abuse and also presents a dangerous and significant risk to public safety.

This bill is endorsed by over 27 organizations, including the Association of Zoos and Aquariums and the National Sheriffs’ Association. Of special note as well is that the Zoological Association of America, which previously opposed this measure, has withdrawn its opposition and is now neutral because its board has now banned public contact with big cats at its accredited zoos.

Please join me in voting for this legislation to stop animal abuse and bad actors like those we saw in “Tiger King.” In the midst of a roller coaster of a year, here is one thing we can do to reduce the mayhem.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. CASE. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. QUIGLEY).

Mr. QUIGLEY. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of my bill, H.R. 1380, the Big Cat Public Safety Act, and I am grateful for the bipartisan support it has received. I also want to thank my staffer, Max, who worked so hard on this measure.

The Big Cat Public Safety Act has been endorsed by the Fraternal Order of Police, the National Sheriffs’ Association, and numerous other State and local law enforcement agencies because 500-pound carnivores pose a serious and very real threat to first responders, law enforcement officers, and entire communities around the country. The photo behind me is not staged.

This bill is also endorsed by the Humane Society of the United States and countless other animal welfare organizations because lions and tigers do not belong in urban apartments or in cages in suburban backyards and because private citizens simply do not have the resources to care for dangerous animals that are meant to roam over hundreds of square miles.

As was stated, this bill is supported by the AGA and is not opposed by the Zoological Association of America, the trade association for small roadside-type zoos, because ripping newborn cubs from their mothers moments after their birth to use them as props in photos is already cruel enough, but once they are too big to be safely held, brutally killing them is just wrong.

□ 1930

Nearly 65,000 Americans have signed a Change.org petition calling for the immediate passage of this bill because the Netflix series “Tiger King” showed the world in stark relief how exploitive, dangerous, and inhumane this tiny so-called industry is.

This bill should be served by every American because right now taxpayers shoulder the cost of monitoring and regulating private owners, and when big cats are rescued from horrific conditions or simply abandoned by overwhelmed owners, they pay for the care and feeding of these cats.

Madam Speaker, I thank the many Republican Members of Congress who support this bill, which is cosponsored by more than half the House.

I urge every Member to stand with the law enforcement community and stand up for those that need our help but cannot ask for that. Please vote for this bill.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK).

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Madam Speaker, for too long, big cats have been mistreated, exploited, and abused in private roadside zoos. Private possession of big cats is a tremendous risk to humans as well. On average, a 1-year-old tiger weighs about 200 pounds and can easily harm or kill a human.

These wild animals are trained to perform for paying customers, and at the end of the day, they are wild, dangerous animals that are a serious risk to humans and themselves.

Big cats, themselves, are also at risk, as there have been countless reports of abuse, mistreatment, and exploitation at private zoos.

Madam Speaker, opponents of our legislation argue that it unfairly targets small zoos, pitting the large against the small. To be clear, this legislation has nothing to do with the zoo size and does not ban any zoo from possessing, breeding, or exhibiting big cats. Our legislation prohibits zoos from allowing the public to interact with big cats.

It does not in any way impact the typical model of zoos in which they

have an exhibit of big cats on display. As long as the zoo does not allow direct contact between people and the public and these big cats, they will not be affected by this legislation.

This practice also takes a toll on law enforcement agencies that are forced to respond to escapes and attacks when big cats have outgrown cub petting and are funneled into the hands of private citizens.

Madam Speaker, this bill is supported by both the National Sheriffs’ Association and the Fraternal Order of Police.

I thank the Humane Society, Animal Wellness Action, and the Animal Welfare Institute for their incredible advocacy on this issue, and to my predecessor who worked on this bill, Congressman Jeff Denham from the State of California, for all of his work. And, of course, I thank my partner on this legislation, Congressman MIKE QUIGLEY.

As a member of the bipartisan Congressional Animal Caucus, we are committed to ensuring that our government is doing its part to promote animal welfare, and it is crucial that we stand up for animals, both as individuals and societies.

Madam Speaker, as was pointed out, there are 230 cosponsors on this bill that collectively represent over 165 million Americans who support this legislation.

Madam Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to vote “yes” on H.R. 1380, the Big Cat Public Safety Act.

Mr. CASE. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my colleague from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman’s courtesy in permitting me to speak on this.

Madam Speaker, I am excited that this bill is finally making it to the floor. We have watched the support build while we have watched the case become ever stronger.

As has been referenced by my colleagues, across the country, there are thousands of big cats—“exotics” they are referred to—in terms of tigers and lions who are often kept by private owners in unsafe and abusive conditions. They are shown often bred by unlicensed exhibitors in basements or backyards. Not only does this cause suffering among these exhibit wild animals that are not meant to live under these conditions, but it does, as has been referenced, pose a risk to community safety.

Since 1990, there have been almost 380 dangerous incidents involving captive big cats in 46 States and the District of Columbia, leading to some traumatic injuries—and even death.

Too often, as has been referenced, it is the first responders who answer calls involving these animals, exposing police and fire to unnecessary risk. They are trained for public safety, not to deal with these huge and occasionally dangerous animals. State law is completely inadequate. It is a patchwork

on this issue. Some ban private use. Others allow it with no questions asked. This is cruel and dangerous. Today, we are voting on a bill to change that.

Madam Speaker, I appreciate my friends, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. QUIGLEY—people who have spent time advancing this issue, and finally, it is before us. It will restrict private ownership of big cats, reduce breeding, and help minimize abuse.

As has been referenced and needs to be emphasized, this is narrowly focused on privately owned animals with appropriate exemptions for zoos and universities and sanctuaries. It can improve the lives of big cats and protect communities when things go wrong. These cats were never meant to be in captivity. Unlicensed ownership and breeding is bad for the animals. It is bad for the community. It doesn’t advance conservation or education.

Madam Speaker, I hope that we will both vote today overwhelmingly to end the exotic trade on big cats and focus our efforts on real, meaningful conservation efforts at home and abroad. I think we were all just horrified by what we saw with the television series, “Tiger King.” Sadly, one would think that that would be enough to motivate the action.

Having worked on this issue over the years, I had some opportunity to be familiar with some of the players. This is something that I hope now is finally going to end, and it can today with our vote.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, with apologies, lions and tigers and bears, oh my. I have to say that before somebody else does it. But we also have to realize, as we are going through the kleinigkeiten of this day’s efforts, that this is one of those kleinigkeiten coming again here. We should also realize that Oz was not reality, it was a movie, and that reality TV is not that of which should be the basis of public policy.

This bill, contrary to what I have been hearing so far, is not about protecting the public from big cats. It is about hurting small, family-run zoos across the country. It is a power play of some kind, which is one of the reasons why the Zoological Association of America expressed their grave concerns with this bill in a very pointed letter addressed to the committee chairman, that this represents an unwarranted Federal intrusion into the rights and responsibilities of wildlife exhibitors and will have significant negative impacts on federally licensed zoological facilities.

Madam Speaker, the issue is that, under current law, anyone who has one of these exhibitions must obtain a class E exhibitor license, and that is given by the United States Department of Agriculture under the Animal Welfare Act. So a licensee under the Animal Welfare Act has to abide by all the

rules that govern housing and keeping and care of the animals and are subject to unannounced inspections under the direction of the Department of Agriculture. And it is doing its job. It is doing its job effectively and efficiently.

Madam Speaker, this bill ignores all of that under the guise of animal welfare, denying responsible Federal license facilities and predicated these class E exemptions on animal rights ideology, not necessarily the policy of what has been taken during the past.

What happens now is that this particular bill has, special interest groups having drafted it, now amends the Lacey Act—not the Animal Welfare Act, but the Lacey Act—and now has the Department of the Interior being the ones who are responsible for what is going on here.

So what is illegal now under the Lacey Act changes would be legal under the Animal Welfare Act, which is still going to be on the books. If nothing else, we should actually ask those people who are responsible for this bill just to come clean and try and make sure that they write the bill so there is consistency so you don't have conflicting acts, because you have conflicting policy with this.

And this bill also provides some huge loopholes for big, well-funded zoos and will crush those small but well-regulated private facilities. That is not the way we should be running that particular policy.

Madam Speaker, the smaller facilities are well-regulated. It is done by the Department of Agriculture. There are specific rules and guidelines. The laws are specific and they are there.

What this bill will do is put conflicting guidelines, which means, pass this bill, if you wish, but—well, very little chance of it actually going all the way, but even if you want to pass this bill, you are going to have to come back and fix the two because you have, now, two bills that are still on the books that are in conflict. So at least do it the right way.

This bill was pushed by special interest groups. It is poor policy that is not backed by science but is backed by radical ideology, and it does not fit the reality of what is taking place. The Department of Agriculture is doing their functions properly and effectively and efficiently, and we should not pass this bill.

Madam Speaker, with all the significant things we could be doing in a lame-duck session, with all the stuff we can do with the pandemic, with both Republicans and Democrats in both the House and the Senate agreeing on so many things, so much low-hanging fruit, we could easily pass something that would have a major impact, something that would be real, or actually put the NDAA on here and do something that is real, or actually come to an agreement on a CR, at least, if not the resolutions of all our appropriations. That would be big. That would be sufficient. That would be worthy of

us actually coming back here to the floor today.

But instead, we are coming here closer to 8 o'clock at night dealing with the small stuff, the insignificant stuff that is not going to go further throughout the process, which I guess is one of the reasons I think we should be happy. At least we know this will be the last time that this will be discussed here in the Capitol building at any time.

Madam Speaker, as a Congress, we can do much better. We ought to do much better. We ought not to spend our time coming up here dealing with the kleinigkeiten.

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

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

I appreciate, again, the comments from the ranking member, but I think he is out of step with the majority in this House, given the bipartisan nature of this particular legislation.

A couple of quick points to answer some of his objections.

First of all, as I mentioned earlier, the Zoological Association of America has withdrawn its opposition to this bill. The Zoological Association of America, contrary to the statement, is not opposed to this bill.

Second, he talks about the guidelines by the USDA being sufficient. They are obviously not sufficient when the status quo across this country still has such a tremendous and deleterious impact on animal welfare, as well as presents a continued risk for public safety. As was noted in some of the comments earlier, in fact, we have a patchwork of regulation across this country; whereas, it is time for us to have one uniform standard across this country that would apply everywhere.

He complains that this bill is a matter of special interest. I would submit, if the special interests are those special interests that are concerned about the welfare of animals and are concerned about public safety, then those are good special interests to be aligned with.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. CASE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1380, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3 of House Resolution 965, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3884, MARIJUANA OPPORTUNITY REINVESTMENT AND EXPUNGEMENT ACT OF 2019

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 1244) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3884) to decriminalize and deschedule cannabis, to provide for reinvestment in certain persons adversely impacted by the War on Drugs, to provide for expungement of certain cannabis offenses, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 225, nays 160, not voting 45, as follows:

[Roll No. 230] YEAS—225		
Adams	Escobar	Lofgren
Aguilar	Eshoo	Lowenthal
Allred	Espallat	Lowey
Axne	Evans	Lujan
Barragán	Finkenauer	Luria
Bass	Fletcher	Malinowski
Beatty	Foster	Maloney
Bera	Frankel	Carolyn B. Maloney, Sean
Beyer	Fudge	Maloney
Bishop (GA)	Gabbard	Matsui
Blumenauer	Gallego	McAdams
Blunt Rochester	Garamendi	McBath
Bonamici	García (IL)	McCollum
Boyle, Brendan	García (TX)	McEachin
F.	Golden	McGovern
Brindisi	Gomez	McNerney
Brown (MD)	Gonzalez (TX)	Meng
Brownley (CA)	Gottheimer	Mfume
Bustos	Green, Al (TX)	Moore
Butterfield	Grijalva	Morelle
Carbajal	Haaland	Moulton
Cárdenas	Hall	Mucarsel-Powell
Carson (IN)	Harder (CA)	Murphy (FL)
Cartwright	Hastings	Nadler
Casten (IL)	Hayes	Napolitano
Castor (FL)	Heck	Neal
Castro (TX)	Higgins (NY)	Neguse
Chu, Judy	Himes	Norcross
Cicilline	Horn, Kendra S.	O'Halleran
Cisneros	Horsford	Ocasio-Cortez
Clark (MA)	Houlahan	Omar
Clarke (NY)	Hoyer	Pallone
Clay	Huffman	Panetta
Cleaver	Jackson Lee	Pappas
Clyburn	Jayapal	Pascrill
Cohen	Jeffries	Payne
Connolly	Johnson (GA)	Perlmutter
Cooper	Johnson (TX)	Peters
Correa	Kaptur	Peterson
Costa	Keating	Phillips
Courtney	Kelly (IL)	Pingree
Cox (CA)	Kennedy	Pocan
Craig	Khanna	Porter
Crist	Kildee	Pressley
Crow	Kilmers	Price (NC)
Cuellar	Kim	Quigley
Cunningham	Kind	Raskin
Davids (KS)	Kirkpatrick	Rice (NY)
Davis (CA)	Krishnamoorthi	Rose (NY)
Davis, Danny K.	Kuster (NH)	Rouda
Dean	Lamb	Royal-Allard
DeGette	Langevin	Ruiz
DeLauro	Larsen (WA)	Ruppersberger
DelBene	Larson (CT)	Rush
Delgado	Lawrence	Ryan
Demings	Lawson (FL)	Sánchez
DeSaulnier	Lee (CA)	Sarbanes
Deutch	Lee (NV)	Scanlon
Dingell	Levin (CA)	Schakowsky
Doggett	Levin (MI)	Schiff
Doyle, Michael	Lieu, Ted	Schneider
F.	Lipinski	Schrader
Engel	Loebssack	Schrer