

for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Florida Air National Guard's 125th Fighter Wing on their return home after a 4-month deployment in support of Operation Spartan Shield.

During their deployment, the 125th Fighter Wing served as an essential and direct combat support component of that mission that provided intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance in southwest Asia and contributed to a successful mission. I thank these brave Air Force men and women who are willing to go abroad and risk their lives for our freedom.

We are incredibly proud of the more than 1,600 Air Force men and women who make up the 125th Fighter Wing to provide 24/7, 365 air homeland defense to combatant commanders worldwide, while simultaneously protecting the life and property of Floridians during times of crisis.

I especially want to thank their families and the northeast Florida community for supporting these brave men and women before, during, and after they are sent into harm's way.

Also, Mr. Speaker, as a 41-year law enforcement officer, I know what due process is and I know what fairness is when I see it. This impeachment process provides no due process, nor fairness.

CONGRATULATING MARILYN MIGUEL

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

Mr. VAN DREW. Madam Speaker, Marilyn Miguel is 18 years old. She graduated from Vineland High School with a 4.0 this year, and she received a full-ride scholarship to Harvard University. She also has coordinated with Harvard for their new community outreach program, Service Starts with Summer, which encourages incoming freshmen to create service projects for their various communities.

As a first-generation college student and a second-generation Mexican American, Marilyn knew the importance of implementing a college preparation course for incoming seniors at her high school. Her free program ran from August 13 to 15, and Marilyn made sure to create an accessible, comprehensive college prep course for the people of south Jersey.

Marilyn says the goal of her program was to help people discover their own potential. Nothing could be more important. Programs like these are essential for the success of young people, and I commend Marilyn for bringing it to our community in south Jersey.

I wish Marilyn the best of luck at Harvard and to have a wonderful year. You are truly a star, and south Jersey is proud of you.

DEMOCRATS ARE TRYING TO IMPEACH THE PRESIDENT FOR FOLLOWING A LAW THAT THEY VOTED FOR

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

Mr. BARR. Madam Speaker, we know the Democrats' hyperpartisan closed-door impeachment process lacks any semblance of fundamental fairness. We know from the transcript between President Trump and President Zelensky that there was no quid pro quo.

But what many people don't know is this: In 2014, this House unanimously passed the Ukraine Freedom Support Act, which tasks the executive branch to use U.S. assistance to bolster democratic institutions of Ukraine and counter corruption and improve transparency and accountability of the Ukrainian Government. Every Democrat voted for this measure.

In 2017, this House overwhelmingly passed the National Defense Authorization Act, which required the administration to certify as a condition of providing assistance that the Government of Ukraine has taken substantial actions to counter corruption and increase accountability. 145 Democrats voted for that.

In 2019, the NDAA that passed this House required that certification requirement again, and 139 Democrats voted for that.

So here is the bottom line: Given recent elections, President Trump not only had the authority to address the issue of corruption in the call with President Zelensky, he had a legal duty to speak and secure assurances from the new Ukrainian Government that those anticorruption measures would be carried forward. The Democrats are trying to impeach the President for following a law that they voted for.

□ 1245

REVIEW IMPEACHMENT PROCESS

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

Mr. MEUSER. Madam Speaker, let's review some facts surrounding this unfair, partisan impeachment process.

To begin with, a whistleblower claims to have secondhand information on the President's call with the Ukrainian President. The White House released the transcript of the call, making the whistleblower irrelevant.

The Ukrainian President, the most important witness, emphasized publicly that there was no quid pro quo and no pressure. Prior to having any of this information, or maybe they did, the Speaker announces an impeachment inquiry, and over 200 Democratic Members of the House agree, evidence be damned.

Since then, we have discovered that the chairman's staff met with the whis-

tleblower earlier than originally stated, yet stated that they didn't.

All hearings were held in secrecy, and there has been no due process.

Madam Speaker, a petty thief is provided more legal rights than the President of the United States. There is no transparency of testimony to Members of Congress or to the general public, and there has been no vote for an impeachment inquiry.

It appears these impeachment proceedings are not about whether the President did right or wrong or broke any laws. It is only about scoring political points while undermining the will of the electorate.

LET'S GET BACK TO WORK

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Speaker, I rise today because I would sure like for Congress to get back to work doing what the American people really need.

It has been more than a year since the USMCA, a trade agreement with Canada and Mexico, was agreed to. We still haven't voted on it here in the House, despite bipartisan support. Why? Because a new and improved trade deal with our closest neighbors looks like it might be too much of a win for the President for the Democratic leadership to allow.

Since the Democrats have been in control of the House, what do we have to show for it, other than investigation after investigation? What have we accomplished in this Chamber for the American people? Not what we should be.

Hyperpartisan language has been injected into bills that both parties would otherwise support. Good, bipartisan legislation on lowering prescription drug prices that could pass committee unanimously languished because of hyperpartisan activity, undoing the good work of our committees and hurting Americans who are paying too much for prescription drugs.

As my Democratic colleagues dive headfirst into finding any excuse to impeach this President, they are leaving the American people hung out to dry.

Let's get to work. There are countless things other than this witch hunt.

ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. GARCIA of Texas). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, at this time, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HURD), my friend.

Mr. HURD of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2420, the National Museum of the American Latino Act.

As the lead Republican on this bill, I believe it is my solemn obligation to champion the gospel of the American Latino, not only in Texas, not only in Congress, but across the globe.

When you walk down the historic National Mall, a sense of patriotism overwhelms every American spirit. We proudly celebrate our history, our ingenuity. We proudly celebrate the arts and sciences. We acknowledge our sins against our fellow man. We honor centuries' worth of heroic acts to bring peace to the world.

But for nearly 60 million Americans, there is a void when they visit The National Mall, a hole in the quilt of America's fabric. That is why we need a National Museum of the American Latino.

For it is the Latino who has joined fellow Americans in taking up arms against oppression in defense of democracy in every war since the American Revolution; it is the Latino who has contributed extensively to our Nation's history and culture; and it is the American Latino, through innovation and a thirst for knowledge, who will help propel the United States into realms never imagined by our forefathers.

Madam Speaker, I remind my colleagues present that the America we cherish in our hearts would be a shell of what she is today if it were not for the selfless contributions of the American Latino.

This week, the Natural Resources Committee has taken a critical step toward the eternal immortalization of the American Latino. This committee has recognized that the American image was painted by the broad strokes of patriotic Latinos. This committee has acknowledged the need to champion the accolades of American Latinos past, present, and future.

Madam Speaker, I hope every Member of this body will stand alongside Congressman SERRANO, Congressman CÁRDENAS, and I as we work to establish a foundation for the National Museum of the American Latino.

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, first, I want to pay tribute to a colleague, Congressman Elijah Cummings.

We had political disagreements, but in working together to help an Army sergeant who was unfairly, inappropriately prosecuted while serving and being heroic in Afghanistan, I developed a great appreciation for Elijah Cummings' desire to see justice done.

It was an honor to work with him in successfully helping Sergeant Derrick Miller. I am proud to have Sergeant Derrick Miller now working with me and those of us that have started a caucus, the Congressional Justice for Warriors Caucus.

That arose out of sincere, worthy, and quite able efforts by Elijah Cummings. I had not been on a committee with him, but it gave me an opportunity to see the heart of the man. He will be sorely missed here in Congress, and I am grateful to have had the chance to have worked with him.

Madam Speaker, I also felt it was important to pay tribute to one of our fallen soldiers. That is Master Sergeant Mark Allen.

This is Master Sergeant Mark Allen, his wife, and child.

I think this article from David Aaro is very helpful in reminding people who Master Sergeant Mark Allen was.

First of all, to become a master sergeant, with all the stripes above and below, it takes many, many, many years of devoted service.

Just for a little background, when I was finishing college at Texas A&M with a 4-year obligation of Active Duty coming up in the Army, I was told by an officer: Look, Louie, the best thing you can do when you get to your post is find a master sergeant that you like and feel comfortable with, and make him your confidant, because if he is a master sergeant, he has been around and has seen everything. You can trust him, and he is one of the best we have in the military.

It was very wise advice. That is the kind of guy Mark Allen was.

This article says: "Retired Army Master Sergeant Mark Allen died . . . 10 years after he was shot while looking for a missing soldier in Afghanistan back in 2009." He has died at the age of 46.

Master Sergeant "Allen was unable to walk or speak since being shot in the head by a sniper in July 2009 during his attempted search for Army Sergeant Bowe Bergdahl, who walked off his base in Afghanistan."

The article doesn't say it, but basically, Bowe Bergdahl was a deserter. He betrayed his country. Even worse than betraying his country, he betrayed his fellow soldiers who have to rely on each other in a combat theater. He simply walked away and went over to the enemy.

This heroic master sergeant, Mark Allen, dutifully went out into harm's way, looking for what they hoped was not a deserter. They hoped that something happened, that the enemy may have gotten him. They went looking. He was leading, looking for what turns out to have been a deserter.

In his service to his country, and in his service to what he was afraid was a fellow warrior who had befallen an enemy's tactics, he got shot in the head by an enemy sniper.

Master Sergeant Allen died 10 years after he was shot while looking for Bowe Bergdahl, the article says, who went missing in Afghanistan. He deserted.

"Bergdahl later pled guilty and was dishonorably discharged, reduced in rank from sergeant to private and fined \$1,000 per month over a 10-month period for deserting his post and endangering the lives of fellow soldiers, including Allen."

In other words, we can thank Bowe Bergdahl's desertion for getting this man maimed, paralyzed for 10 years, and killed.

"When Bergdahl was traded for five Taliban prisoners"—those are the en-

emies. Those are people who were killing Americans, and the Obama administration thought it wise to give five people who had killed Americans, who were enemies of America, give those back so that they could go on killing other Americans so that we could get our deserter back from our enemy.

"When Bergdahl was traded for five Taliban prisoners and brought home, Shannon Allen, Mark's wife, didn't hold back her feelings for how he changed their family forever.

"Meet my husband," she wrote on Facebook, "injuries directly brought to you by the actions of this traitor."

Our President, Donald Trump, "also expressed his disdain toward the prisoner transfer of Bergdahl, calling the decision 'a complete' and 'total disgrace to our country and our military.'

"During the trial of Bergdahl, Shannon testified that it took 90 minutes to get her husband out of bed, showered, and dressed each morning. She had to use a pulley system, which was attached to the ceiling to move him, according to Task & Purpose."

Master Sergeant Allen's "young daughter also enjoyed climbing into his wheelchair and sitting on his lap, Shannon told the outlet.

"U.S. Veterans' Network posted a tribute, calling Allen 'a true American hero.'

"Master Sergeant Mark Allen, a true American hero. Thank you for your service, brother."

"His service will be held in Loganville, Georgia."

□ 1300

May he rest in peace and may something that we do here give comfort to the family of this American hero that was betrayed by a man who the Obama administration traded five of our enemies to get back. That is a hero. If we were going to trade enemies for anybody, it would have been a guy like this.

We thank Mark Allen for his service and his incredible wife and daughter for standing by our hero for the last 10 years.

I was here in the Chamber the last couple of hours and heard the exchanges during the colloquy between STEVE SCALISE and Leader HOYER. I heard the comment that ADAM SCHIFF is fair and judicious. And I hope the Parliamentarian won't get nervous, because I am going to adeptly avoid violating the rules.

Congressman ADAM SCHIFF, back in 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, we were on the Judiciary Committee together, and we had two Federal judges who needed to be impeached. They needed to be eliminated from their official positions as Federal judges. One had committed a sexual assault, and the other had trouble understanding that bribes were not appropriate for judges.

Congressman SCHIFF was put in charge, basically, of a temporary committee to deal with the impeachment of those two judges, and during those

efforts, it was quite bipartisan. Republicans had just gone into the minority for the first time in many years. We were in the minority, and Democrats were in the majority.

I found ADAM SCHIFF very easy to work with. I found that when he gave his word on something, it could be trusted. I found that he was a person who was a pleasure to work together with.

I have had trouble melding those experiences with what I am seeing in the effort to eliminate a duly elected President from his position.

I heard our majority leader say he is fair. So I would ask a hypothetical question, not pointed directly at an individual, but just hypothetically: Is it fair if someone lies for 2 years saying they have overwhelming evidence that a President is guilty of being a traitor to his country and that there is no question, the evidence is just overwhelming and it is not just circumstantial, and it turns out there was never such evidence?

Hypothetically speaking, I would think that such a person's fairness would come into issue.

Hypothetically, is it fair to conspire and collude with gossipmongers loyal to President Obama, people like Clapper and Brennan who use potentially third-, fourth-, fifth-, sixthhand hearsay, to try to convict a President in public opinion while remaining anonymous?

By the way, I heard reference to a whistleblower who had no direct information—he is a gossipmonger—that there was fear for his safety. As an old history major who has never stopped studying history, I think we can take a look at history.

If you look at this President's time as President, and even before being President, people who have spoken out against President Trump or candidate Trump or businessman Trump, they seem to still be around and talking.

I read about an Italian individual who may have colluded with the Democratic National Committee or the Hillary Clinton campaign in helping try to set up candidate Trump so that our intelligence, with the cooperation, potentially, of Britain, maybe Australia, corruption in Ukraine, corruption in Russia, trying to set President Trump up. He was concerned for his life in Italy and was asking security.

That is what brought the question to my mind: Well, gee, who is he afraid of? The people who have things to say—even complete lies—about President Trump are still alive and well and kicking and lying, and they are out there just spreading more gossip and lies. They seem to be plenty healthy.

So the question arises: Who the heck are they—people like the person who was involved in the conspiracy to bring down Donald Trump, who is he afraid of? It shouldn't be Donald Trump, because the people against him are still out there.

Could it be that fear of safety could be from those whom such a witness

could identify as conspiring to bring down Donald Trump?

There are plenty of people who are no longer alive who had been potential witnesses against others in the Democratic Party, but it doesn't seem that there are potential witnesses against Donald Trump who are dead.

So who would this gossip-mongering, so-called whistleblower—he is not a whistleblower. He is a gossipmonger. He didn't have any direct evidence. He just wanted to create a problem for President Trump.

People with whom he colluded knew that President Trump, if they said: Oh, he conspired in this phone conversation. He threatened Ukraine's President. He did a quid pro quo in that conversation, it is very clear—we even had a chairman represent from the chairman's position that a number of times in that conversation that President Trump made clear that he was threatening the Ukrainian President to either get dirt on Vice President Biden or else you are not going to get help.

Well, we know Joe Biden did that. He is on video. The President doesn't want to talk about that, at least not the mainstream.

Anyway, they knew that President Trump could not afford to release a transcript of the conversation, so they knew whatever they were going to say about what was in the conversation, that would be the mantra. But it turns out President Trump did release the transcript of the conversation, so it kind of messed up the strategy there.

They were already talking about the President doing a cover-up because that was the strategy: Look, first, we will have this gossipmonger call him a whistleblower. We will change the rules by other Obama loyalists still in the intelligence arena in our government. We will change the rules because it has always been a rule, and a good one, you couldn't be a whistleblower unless you had direct evidence. So they had to change the rule.

The inspector general, the new one—not the one who was there previously; he was a very honorable person—the new one, not so honorable. And that is why he dishonestly changed the rule for whistleblowers so that you could be a whistleblower and not have any direct information at all. And he backdated that so that it would go back to the time that this gossipmonger was actually coordinating and colluding with the majority staff on the Intelligence Committee.

We still don't know if the Intelligence Committee staff helped prepare this so-called whistleblowing complaint.

So when we hear the so-called whistleblower, the gossipmonger is concerned for his safety, well, it sure couldn't be from President Trump, because none of his enemies have been harmed.

So who is he afraid of? Is he afraid of the people that he colluded with to try to bring down President Trump? He has no basis being afraid of Trump.

As a former judge, sometimes you have to sign protective orders. If somebody came in with the facts that we know so far about this gossipmonger, my question would be: Who is he afraid of? He shouldn't be afraid of President Trump in this situation. So who is he afraid of? And that is a really good question, I think.

So we have this Star Chamber proceeding attempting to remove a properly elected President.

We never had proceedings like this trying to take out a President—never. Since the Judiciary Committee was formed, any time there was any effort toward impeachment, it went through the Judiciary Committee, which I am a part of.

Apparently, the powers that be have not been pleased with the Democratic performance in the Judiciary Committee, so somebody figured out we are better off politically—no matter the damage it may do to our country, we are better off politically having a Star Chamber proceeding where we are the only ones who go out and leak what we want to be out. That way all of the exculpatory evidence, evidence that shows the President didn't do anything wrong, that doesn't get to come out, because, if it does, then we will demand prosecution. So we will be the only ones that leak information.

And we can legally make things available to the press, so we will only make those things available that are taken out of context that help us accomplish our goal of trying to make President Trump look bad.

I heard the Speaker on television say that she was tasking six committees with investigating President Trump, and one of those, the Judiciary Committee, I am on.

□ 1315

Sometimes we have things that are so important to keep secret that they are handled only by the Intelligence Committee only in a SCIF, so it is secured. But even then, as a member of the Judiciary Committee, many times I have gone to the SCIF to review classified information.

I remember on one occasion back when the Democrats were in the majority previously, I think it was the first closed session we ever had here at Congress, because it was desired to discuss something that was classified, and I came down here, was speaking right here, and I was stopped by the majority leader.

And he said: Wait a minute. We are authorized to have this classified discussion, but the gentleman from Texas is getting into areas that are above the classified area. He is authorized to have information that everybody here is not allowed to have. So I was not allowed to continue talking on that subject.

The point being, as a member of the Judiciary Committee, we get into things that are of a more secret nature, classified information, that a majority

of our body here is authorized to know and discuss and learn about.

So it has been quite surprising to be locked out of hearings. And we know that they are not so sensitive that only the Intelligence Committee could hear them, because they lumped in two other committees, Foreign Affairs and Oversight and Reform, so it is not about just keeping it confined to the Intelligence Committee.

But I specifically heard the Speaker say that six committees would be investigating, and I am on one of those, and, yet, I go into the SCIF, into the hallway outside of the secure area, and I am not allowed to go in.

I wanted to know who gave the order, and the Democratic staff said: Well, you know, that is the order.

Who gave the order?

Well, our boss told us.

So an unelected staffer tells two other staffers that you are to prevent a duly elected Member of Congress from doing their job.

I wanted to know who gave that order. Is it in writing somewhere? Who gave that order? Who is it that is undermining the election of over half of the Members of Congress to prevent them from being able to do their job? Who gave that order?

They couldn't say. They send out more staff; not a Member of Congress. It seemed a little cowardly to me. Nobody would come out. I was there with friends like ANDY HARRIS, ANDY BIGGS, and others. I went ahead and went through the first door—there is another door there—and they went apologetic.

I am authorized to hear classified information. I am authorized to hear the classified information that they were supposedly listening to. But the truth is, it is not classified. There is no reason for it to be classified.

This is all a political show. That is why there is no written order. That is why there has been no vote in here to proceed with impeachment, and it is just wrong.

I don't remember who said it, but there was some historian that noted there are many different—not many, but there are a number of different phases of a civil war, and only the last phase involves guns.

But this sure feels like this coup attempt is setting this country up for civil war. I won't participate in a civil war, but our job here, our oath here is to protect and defend the Constitution of the United States.

I took that oath as a prosecutor. I took that oath in the United States Army—Active Duty for 4 years, inactive Reserve for 2 more years. I took that oath as a judge, as a felony judge. I took that oath as a chief justice, and I take that oath every 2 years, right here.

And that is what a lot of us are trying to do. But what is going on around here is not fair. It is not just. It is against the House rules. The House rules are very clear: If there was not a

specific rule in “Jefferson’s Manual and Rules of the House of Representatives,” as adopted every 2 years, then the precedence is what is the rule in that case.

And the precedence on impeachment, it goes through the Judiciary Committee, and it doesn't happen anything like what is happening now. It is true. The majority could come in here and have a vote and amend the rules so they could defy all precedent on impeachment. But for some reason, they prefer to break the rules rather than simply come in and do what they can as majority. They can change the rule any time they get ready. They have got enough votes to do that.

They won't do that. For some reason, they prefer to break the rules. This is not good. Kids across America see what is going on.

They are not taught history like they once were. Why? Because since we have the Department of Education and it mandates the Federal test—oh, yeah, you can come up with your own test, but here is what has to be on there. And if a child fails that, then you don't get any of your money back for that child's year in school. So everybody is scared. Many schools drop history, drop civics.

That is why a survey in recent years indicated college students could name The Three Stooges in greater numbers than they could name the three branches of government.

So they don't know as much as they used to about what goes on here. But when they see that if you are in the majority, you can break the rules any time you want, if you dislike some other elected official—like a President—and just try to eliminate him from office, then it is okay.

In other words, the new Constitution for America, apparently, based on what we are seeing going on here on Capitol Hill, is that if you are in the majority, then the ends justify the means.

Since I have been here, there were times we were in the majority when there were Republicans—thank God they were in a small number—but they thought the ends justified the means. It didn't for them, and it doesn't for anybody else.

This little experiment in self-government, we know won't last forever. Anybody that studied history at all knows, no country, no government lasts forever. And we are on borrowed time right now, because we are setting records every day as the Nation that has functioned the longest under one founding document, our Constitution. The Romans didn't make it that long as a republic. We are setting records every day.

We know it won't last forever, but my commitment is to do everything I can to perpetuate our freedom, and what was given to us, as the greatest country in the history of the world, more opportunity, more individual assets than any country, even more than Solomon's Israel. We are an anomaly.

And we have broken the record on how long we can exist with the freedoms we have.

It is time we come together and stop playing political games so that years from now, future generations will not be rising up and cursing our names. We need to come together and abide by the rules and the Constitution so that we have a shot some day of our children rising up and calling us blessed.

That ought to be our goal. I yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 24 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, October 21, 2019, at noon for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

2665. A letter from the Deputy Bureau Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — The Uniendo a Puerto Rico Fund and the Connect USVI Fund [WC Docket No.: 18-143]; Connect America Fund [WC Docket No.: 10-90]; ETC Annual Reports and Certifications [WC Docket No.: 14-58] received October 10, 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.

2666. A letter from the Chief, Pricing Policy Division, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Updating the Intercarrier Compensation Regime to Eliminate Access Arbitrage [WC Docket No.: 18-155] received October 10, 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.

2667. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's report detailing the progress and the status of compliance with privatization requirements, pursuant to Public Law 105-33, Sec. 11201(c)(2)(B); (111 Stat. 734); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2668. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting a signed agreement between the United States of America and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland on Access to Electronic Data for the Purpose of Countering Serious Crime; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2669. A letter from the Acting Administrator, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a report advising that the cost of response and recovery efforts for FEMA-3416-EM in the State of Louisiana has exceeded the limit for a single emergency declaration, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 5193(b)(3); Public Law 93-288, Sec. 503(b)(3) (as amended by Public Law 100-707, Sec. 107(a)); (102 Stat. 4707); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2670. A letter from the Acting Administrator, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a report advising that