United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 164 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JULY 11, 2018 *No. 116*

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MARSHALL).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
July 11, 2018.

I hereby appoint the Honorable ROGER W. MARSHALL to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

PAUL D. RYAN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 8, 2018, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties. All time shall be equally allocated between the parties, and in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m. Each Member, other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip, shall be limited to 5 minutes.

FAMILY SEPARATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI) for 5 minutes.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, yesterday was the court-ordered deadline for the Trump administration to reunite more than 100 children under 5 years old with their families.

The administration has failed to meet this deadline, and that is shameful. Dozens of babies and toddlers remain in government custody with no idea of when they will see their parents again.

As a mom, I am outraged. This administration is failing to comply with a court-ordered deadline.

But what is this really about, babies, toddlers, and young children? Ask any pediatrician. This is harmful, and every day creates more harm to these innocent children.

This administration is saying they were forced to separate families when, in fact, it was their deliberate zero-tolerance policy, their strategy that forcibly took children out of their parents' arms, and it has always been within their power to stop this coldhearted and inhumane madness.

On Monday, I met with Latino and immigrant community leaders in Oregon to hear from them firsthand about how this administration's actions are harming families and communities. They spoke of unprecedented fear, of families torn apart, and of children afraid to go to school. They spoke about why people come to the United States in the first place: to make a better life for themselves and for their children.

Miriam Corona from Yamhill County said that there is no greater gift of love than to leave everything you know for your children's future. That is why my grandparents got on a boat in 1921 and crossed the ocean from Italy for the American Dream. It is why many people are now fleeing terrible violence in Central America and in Mexico to make a better life for themselves and their children and, oftentimes, to save their children's lives.

That is what we stand for in this country of the United States of America: a better life, a peaceful life free from violence, and a better future for the next generation. As a parent, that is what I want for my children, and as a Member of Congress, it is what I want for everyone in our community.

The Trump administration's actions contradict these fundamental values. We are better than this. I continue to demand that the administration reunite all separated children with their parents—not later, now. This is a court order, not a suggestion.

If the problem is that these agencies are understaffed, I will come over to the agency. I will go over to Health and Human Services to help. I am sure many of my colleagues will join me.

Mr. Speaker, when the families are reunited, our work is not done. We must fix our broken immigration system. It is long past time to vote on a comprehensive, humane, and compassionate immigration reform bill. That is what Oregonians want, and it is what the majority of people in this country want.

RECOGNIZING EAGLE SCOUT TOMMY FULFORD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. BOST) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Tommy Fulford of O'Fallon, Illinois, for winning the National Eagle Scout Service Project of the Year Award for the central region.

This project was a year in the making. Tommy took a dirt-filled storage room dating back to 1904 in the basement of the O'Fallon, Illinois, History Museum and created an exhibit illustrating the long history of coal mining in southern Illinois. The room was designed to give visitors the feel of being in an actual mine.

I visited the exhibit last month. Mr. Speaker, coming from mining roots myself, I can tell you Tommy's project hit very close to home.

To put things in perspective, Eagle Scouts around the country and their volunteers completed almost 8.5 million hours of service toward their Eagle projects last year. This works out to 150 hours per project. Tommy and his 18 volunteers dedicated 934 hours of service to complete his coal mining exhibit.

Tommy, I applaud you, and I appreciate your dedication and hard work. I know you have a bright future ahead of you.

SCHOOL VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, in January, I came to this well to urge support for bipartisan legislation I introduced with my Illinois colleague, Mr. SCHNEIDER. Our bill proposed a Federal grant program to improve security at our schools and protect our children.

Since then, our legislation passed the House and the Senate and was signed into law by President Trump. Because of Members' bipartisan support, I am proud to say these grants are now available to local communities.

Please urge local officials in our districts to visit cops.usdoj.gov for more information on how to apply for up to $500,000 in grants through the school violence prevention program. However, the application deadline for this fiscal year is July 30, so time is of the essence.

We have advanced safety technology in banks, office buildings, and retail locations. There is no reason we shouldn't have that same technology in our schools to protect our children.

IMMIGRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, once again, I am proud to stand in the well of the Congress of the United States of America. I am not proud to stand here today for the reasons that I shall articulate.

Mr. Speaker, we live in a world where it is not enough for things to be right; they must also look right. Mr. Speaker, when the Federal Government separates children from their parents, indeed, mothers from their babies, it does not look right.

Some may argue that it is right because of various laws and legislation that might exist, but it doesn't look right for this country, the country that believes in liberty and justice for all. It doesn't look right for the United States of America to separate babies from their mothers.

Where is the moral compass?

There ought to be an inner voice within us that says there is something wrong here. We are taking a baby from the baby's mother, and we are going to put the baby in a location separate and apart from the mother. The baby needs the mother. The mother is there to nurture the baby.

How can we do this in good conscience?

We live in a world where it is not enough for things to be right; they must also look right. And this doesn't look right to the world.

I have gone to visit these children. I went to Brownsville. I saw the children. They are caring for the children, but the missing element, the most important thing that these children need, was not there: their parents.

I went to three other sites before going to Brownsville and, Mr. Speaker, I, as a Member of the Congress of the United States of America, went to a site in my congressional district, and I went to other sites. I could not see the children, and I was asked to leave the premises. I behaved in an orderly fashion. I had two forms of identification. But not only could I not see the children, I was asked to leave the property.

There is no transparency. This is the Federal Government holding children and not allowing open access to these children by Members of Congress.

It is not enough for things to be right; they must also look right. When the Members of the Congress of the United States of America cannot see the children who have been secreted in various locations around the country and separated from their parents, not only does this not look right, it isn't right.

At some point on this infinite continuum that we call time, we will all have to account for our time. At some point, when the omnipotent, the omnipresent, and omniscient are one, we will have to answer to what is happening to these children today. These children belong to all of us in the sense that they are children of our world, and we must answer and account for what is happening today.

So I stand here in the well, a proud Member of Congress and proud to be an American, but sad to know that we have not done enough to reunite these children with their parents.

Mr. Speaker, if you separate children from their parents, if you take babies from their mothers, then you must have a plan to reunite them. When you do not, you are failing not only those parents, but you are failing the future of a great country, because it gives us the appearance of not caring for people who are in harm's way who have come asking for help. It gives us the appearance of not being that Good Samaritan who not only helped the person who was in harm's way who had been beset upon by thieves, it gives us the appearance of not being that Good Samaritan who said: I am going to help you. I am going to take you to the inn. I am going to leave; I am coming back; and I will pay more if you need more.

This is the United States of America. We can do better.

LAKE OKEECHOBEE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MAST) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MAST. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question of this body. I would like every Member of this body to think about this: What would you do if one of your neighbors each and every day was taking their garbage and throwing it over your fence into your yard? What would you do if that were the case?

In the case of my community, it is not just the garbage of neighboring communities that enters its way into our community, it is toxic water pollution.

So if somebody throwing garbage over your fence would infuriate you as an individual, then I would ask you to imagine how you would feel if your neighbor was knowingly poisoning the kids in your backyard, your children?

I don't think that I know of words. I don't think I know of a four-letter word that would describe this for me. I don't know of an emoji that I could text anybody. I don't know an emotion that I could use to adequately describe the feeling of having my community poisoned, knowingly and willingly, year after year after year.

Now, the World Health Organization says that any amount greater than 10 parts per billion microcystin algae is poison for humans and that it causes everything from nausea to liver disease. That is a pretty broad spectrum.

The Florida Department of Environmental Protection just reported that the level released into our waters is more than 150 parts per billion.

Let me say that one more time.

The World Health Organization said that anything greater than 10 parts per billion is poison. The water being released into my community that plays no role in producing this toxic water is being exposed to water that is more than 150 parts per billion, 15 times what is considered harmful to human health.

□ 1015

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers is planning to resume its poisoning operations later this week. As a result of that, I would like to ask three things:

Number one, to the Department of Defense, who is currently conducting a systemwide review of its policies: Do not release one more drop of this poison water into my community, into Florida's Treasure Coast, into the epicenter of population for hundreds of thousands of people. Our community did not create the problem or the conditions leading to this poison, and we must not be forced to have the health of each of our citizens put at risk as a result of someone else's garbage being thrown into our yard—or, rather, by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers releasing it into our backyard.

Number two, I would ask this of our President: The situation has resulted in a state of emergency in years past, and the Governor has already declared a state of emergency for Florida and a number of counties, including for Martin and St. Lucie Counties. I call for a Federal state of emergency to be declared right now.

I also ask this. Previous administrations had this request come before them, and those administrations did nothing. I would ask this of our administration: Bring in the cavalry. Bring in every bit of water cleanup operation you can find that can be yielded by FEMA, by the Coast Guard, by Fish and Wildlife, by anybody else that can

go out there and clean this poison, these toxins out of our waterways.

Number three, to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers: Federal court cases demand that everything—all the water that goes south of Lake Okeechobee, where this toxic water stems from—not be exposed to anything greater than 10 parts per billion of phosphorous. That actually slows the rate of water flow to the south, where that water actually belongs, where God designed that water to go. Yet my community is getting toxic water with parts greater than 150 parts per billion, which is, as I said, 15 times greater than what is safe for human contact. That is not equitable. That is not right.

So I would ask that the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, who has the emergency authority granted to them under section 7–13 when there are pollution emergencies: Use that authority now to stop poisoning my community, to protect the hundreds of thousands of people on the Treasure Coast of Florida, and send that dirty, toxic water south.

STOP THE GOVERNMENT FROM SPYING ON AMERICAN CITIZENS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, millions of data sheets spit out of the printer inside a thick-walled, secure facility. Across the top are Americans' names, a list of phone numbers dialed, the time and date called, and the frequency in which they called or texted a person.

''Who is doing this?'' you might ask. A criminal organization? A private investigator? Who is intentionally stalking and gathering data on innocent American citizens without their knowledge?

Well, it is not a nefarious organization operating behind closed doors. It is not the Russians. It is the spying eyes of the United States Federal Government.

In the aftermath of 9/11, the government authorized once-secret programs by the NSA to collect information on bad actors, primarily terrorists, who wish to create mayhem. They were terrorists overseas.

As the subcommittee chairman of Terrorism, Nonproliferation, and Trade, I agree that we should go after terrorists. Our government should use techniques they have on those people who wish to destroy America and find out what those terrorists are doing.

But despite the overall intention of the law, the program has been corrupted. Not only does the NSA collect information on terrorists, which they should do, but it collects data on ordinary American citizens, including communications, emails, and text messages.

The government does not have a specific Fourth Amendment warrant to collect and search this data on Americans, but it does it anyway. The Fourth Amendment says the warrantless search and seizure is unconstitutional without a probable cause warrant. But the government ignores the Constitution.

This sensitive information is placed into a searchable database by the government, a secret database. Sometimes the government decides to go into that database that was seized without a Fourth Amendment warrant and checks to see how many times a name comes up. They take that information and do a reverse search, checking to see if the citizen's identifying information is in the database.

Remember, Mr. Speaker, this is done by our government on Americans, in secret, without a Fourth Amendment warrant.

For years, the NSA has refused to provide data on the number of Americans swept up in their secret searches. I have advocated for years that the NSA level with Americans, our government, and the Congress as to how much information they are seizing.

Several months ago, the House voted for a flawed FISA bill, the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, which, unfortunately, reauthorized the warrantless surveillance of American citizens. The only good thing to come out of this spying bill is a hard-fought provision releasing the numbers of Americans wrapped up in government spying. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, they paint a grim picture for the privacy of Fourth Amendment protections.

In 2017 alone, the NSA unconstitutionally gathered data on 7,512 U.S. persons, a search without a probable cause warrant. This is up from 5,288 in 2016.

According to a previous report by The Washington Post, 90 percent of the account holders whose communications were collected were not targets. That means the government was just fishing around in the data they had collected and searching information on Americans without a warrant.

Privacy must not be forsaken on the false altar of national security. As a former judge, I am very concerned about the loss of our Fourth Amendment right of privacy in the United States based on this unconstitutional action by the NSA.

The Fourth Amendment is sacred to this country and to the Founders who drafted it. It is up to Congress to uphold Americans' Fourth Amendment rights. We must reform an article called 702 to require that if the government wants to look at the data that was seized on Americans, they do it with a search warrant, based on the Fourth Amendment. If they don't have a search warrant based on the Fourth Amendment, then they cannot seize and go through that information.

It is a very simple concept, Mr. Speaker, and I would hope that Congress would act to stop our government from spying on American citizens in the name of national security. It is unconstitutional.

And that is just the way it is.

TWILIGHT WISH FOUNDATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize a nonprofit organization in Bucks County, Pennsylvania, that recently celebrated its 15th anniversary.

The Twilight Wish Foundation, based in Doylestown, seeks to grant the wishes of low-income senior citizens. These wishes can be big or small, ranging from meeting Philadelphia Eagles players to the purchasing of a new pair of eyeglasses.

As a society, Mr. Speaker, it is incumbent upon all of us as both public servants and citizens to support programs and support policies that protect our senior citizens. I commend the work done by the Twilight Wish Foundation, and I applaud the leadership of founder and Chairman of the Board Cass Forkin. I would also like to thank Vice President Robin Kardane; Director of Community Relations Mary Farrell; and Director of Wish Management Michelle Bowren, for all their incredible work for our community.

RECOGNIZING BOB CONSULMAGNO

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to recognize a resident of Bucks County, Pennsylvania, who recently broke his fourth world record.

Bob Consulmagno of Morrisville successfully broke the record for the most outstanding ab wheel rollouts while wearing a 40-pound weight vest. Making this feat more impressive is that Bob, a retired marine, completed this major accomplishment to raise awareness of mental illness.

Diagnosed with post-traumatic stress disorder and bipolar disorder, Bob turned to sports and physical training to battle mental illness. Using his athleticism to garner attention to those who struggle from mental illness, Bob hopes to end the stigma with which it is often associated and to promote treatment for military veterans.

I am proud to call Bob my constituent, and I am thankful for his service to our community and for turning challenging experiences into positive and educational engagements.

RECOGNIZING THE KAITLIN MURPHY FOUNDATION

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a nonprofit organization in Bucks County, Pennsylvania, that is working tirelessly to assist those struggling with drug addiction.

The Kaitlin Murphy Foundation, established to honor the life and memory of Kaitlin Murphy of Doylestown, partners with law enforcement agencies and organizations with similar missions to provide resources to those suffering from substance abuse, along with their families.

Some of these organizations include the HEART Program, which serves to rehabilitate females suffering from addiction at the Bucks County Correctional Facility; the Moyer Foundation's Camp Mariposa; and Bucks County Police Assisting in Recovery. For their work, the Kaitlin Murphy Foundation recently received a grant from Warrington Cares, the employee charity of Warrington Township.

I am proud to represent such thoughtful and generous people in our community, and I applaud the work of the Kaitlin Murphy Foundation and Warrington Cares, and I will continue to do my part here in Washington to end this public health crisis.

Lastly, I would like to extend my appreciation to Kaitlin's parents, Tim and Pat Murphy of Doylestown; Kaitlin's brother, Sean; and the organization's president, Annemarie Murphy of Warrington for all their work for our community.

EQUALITY FOR PUERTO RICO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Puerto Rico (Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN) for 5 minutes.

Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico. Mr. Speaker, on June 27, I was joined by more than 40 Members of this House in introducing H.R. 6246, the Puerto Rico Admission Act of 2018. That number has since grown to almost 50 Members. This is truly a bipartisan bill that sets forth a transition process that will result in the formal admission of Puerto Rico as a State of the Union, on an equal footing and in true permanent union with the rest of the States.

H.R. 6246 would constitute Congress' long overdue response to the citizens of Puerto Rico who, twice in the past 6 years, have overwhelmingly voted by 97 percent and 61 percent margins expressing their political will to join their fellow Americans as equal in our Union.

After 120 years under the U.S. flag and 101 years as American citizens, Puerto Ricans remain disenfranchised and trapped in a second-class status that denied us the same rights and responsibilities as our fellow citizens in the States.

Puerto Ricans do not enjoy a democratic form of government at the national level because we can't vote for the President and the Vice President of the United States. We don't have a voting representation here in this Congress that every day passes laws that affect us and affect our future. That lack of a democratic form of government at the local level is due to Congress passing PROMESA in 2016, severely limiting the powers of the duly-elected government of the island.

This lack of full participation in the Federal Government that enacts the laws and the rules that Puerto Ricans live under, combined with the absolute power of the U.S. Congress under our Article IV, section 3, clause 2 of the Constitution to treat us equally under those laws has proven to be a fundamental limitation on the fulfillment of our potential as a people.

The combination of these inequities, which were unmasked and further exacerbated by last year's historic hurricanes, has led to incoherent and arbitrary Federal policies that have limited the island's opportunities to maximize our full economic potential.

I am certain that not even one of my stateside colleagues in this Congress would accept a territorial status like Puerto Rico's for their own constituents. It is my hope that all of them will recognize and respect that the people of Puerto Rico are no longer willing to accept it either.

I also trust that my colleagues will credit Puerto Rico for aspiring to have the first-class citizenship and equality they have been denied for over a century, with the same rights and responsibilities as their fellow citizens in the States.

My constituents might not have a vote in the government that makes their national laws, but they have a voice. They made that voice heard loud and clear not just once, but twice.

□ 1030

Every Member who supports H.R. 6246 will send a clear message that he or she is standing up for a powerful principle: that the people of Puerto Rico are American citizens who have, in war and peace, made countless contributions and greatly enriched the life of this Nation for generations.

More than 250,000 Puerto Ricans have served in our military forces and bravely fought in every conflict since the Great War, side by side with the citizens of other States, defending our democratic values all over the world. Yet, they are denied the right to vote for their Commander in Chief.

A disproportionately large number of them have made the ultimate sacrifice in battle. When they do, their caskets are flown back to this country, draped in an American flag that contains just 50 stars, but none of those represent them and represent Puerto Rico.

Furthermore, those who are fortunate to return to the island and join the ranks of the more than 100,000 veterans living on the island encounter a system that discriminates against them and treats them as second-class citizens.

Furthermore, because of these long-standing inequities, in the last 10 years alone, more than 400,000 Puerto Ricans have relocated to the States in the search for equality.

That is the equality we are looking for in this bill, a truly bipartisan bill that will let Puerto Rico become the 51st State of the Nation.

I urge my colleagues to join me in this bill and acknowledge the situation in Puerto Rico and let us become first-class U.S. citizens.

FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE REVIEW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, the Securities and Exchange Act of 1934 requires most SEC registrants to file a form 10Q quarterly report with the SEC. The form 10Q includes condensed financial information and other data prepared by a company and reviewed by independent auditors.

Although technology has evolved rapidly over the years, the form 10Q used today was adopted in 1950. My legislation, H.R. 5970, the Modernizing Disclosures for Investors Act, requires the Securities and Exchange Commission, the SEC, to report to Congress the costs and benefits of form 10Q and recommendations for decreasing costs while increasing transparency and efficiency of quarterly financial reporting.

Specifically, my bill requires the SEC to look at emerging growth companies that are particularly susceptible to the burdens and complexities associated with current reporting requirements. In recent years, annual and quarterly reporting requirements have grown in size and complexity, making it more difficult for investors to determine relevant information, often leaving them overwhelmed and unable to make sound investment decisions.

Furthermore, some companies believe that current reporting requirements have become a barrier to registering as publicly traded companies, as noted by a 2011 report by the IPO Task Force. The report, which was prompted by the JOBS Act of 2012, found that 92 percent of public company leaders said that the administrative burden of public reporting was a significant challenge to completing an IPO and becoming a public company.

Finally, I would like to note that my legislation is timely. At a recent SEC oversight hearing, Chairman Clayton highlighted in his testimony that: ''We should regularly review whether we have disclosure requirements that are outdated, duplicative, or can otherwise be improved.''

In addition, just last week, the SEC finalized a rule expanding the definition of smaller reporting companies, which will allow them to be eligible for scaled disclosures.

Before I conclude, I want to take a minute to thank Congressman GOTTHEIMER for his willingness to work across the aisle and to get this bill to the finish line. With the passage of H.R. 5970 just last evening, we have provided yet another example of how Congress can work together in a bipartisan manner.

IMPROVING CHOICES IN HEALTHCARE COVERAGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUDD) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BUDD. Mr. Speaker, the cost of health insurance is on the minds of many Americans this summer, and it should be.

Nearly half a million people in North Carolina buy their health insurance on the ObamaCare marketplace. The average price for these plans continues to go up each and every year.

This wouldn't be as much of an issue if there were many options to choose from, but, unfortunately, there are not. Blue Cross, the only insurer that is still in all 100 counties in our State, announced that they were raising rates by an average of nearly 19 percent going into 2017. Then they raised them again this year by over 14 percent. I expect them to do the same next year, the year after that, and in coming years after that.

It is clear to me that the individual mandate didn't actually lower the cost of health insurance, and bailing out big insurance companies certainly didn't help either.

Mr. Speaker, as you know very well, we need an off-ramp from ObamaCare. We need a solution that allows for more competition, because competition drives down prices and allows people to purchase health insurance without going bankrupt.

While we continue to work toward getting a full repeal and replace on the President's desk, I believe we should also pass a simple bill right now that would provide millions of Americans a way to buy more affordable health insurance

Short-term, limited-duration medical plans are designed to provide coverage for a limited time when someone is between health insurance policies—individuals who are between jobs, for example—but these plans are also exempt from having to abide by ObamaCare's regulatory regime.

The Obama administration was concerned with these plans becoming attractive alternatives to ObamaCare. So before they left office in 2016, they issued a regulation that defined these short-term policies as those that are less than 3 months long.

I believe strengthening these types of plans would be a huge step in the right direction. That is why, last month, I introduced a simple bill called the Improving Choices in Health Care Coverage Act.

This bill would do two simple things. It would allow people to stay on these less expensive, short-term medical plans for as long as 364 days, and it would allow them to renew these plans for multiple years.

According to the American Action Forum, which looked at different findings from the Congressional Budget Office, the Urban Institute, and the Commonwealth Fund, there seems to be a consensus that these plans would be attractive to consumers because of their low premiums, and, thus, enrollment would likely be into the millions.

I hear from constituents every time I go back home that their monthly premiums are way too high. Mr. Speaker, this bill is one way we can relieve some of their financial stress. With looming announcements by big insurance companies that they are again going to be increasing premiums, the time to act is now.

RUSSIA'S MILITARY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I voted for the first Gulf war many years ago because our leaders at that time said Saddam Hussein was the greatest threat since Hitler and told us all about Hussein's powerful, elite troops.

I then saw these same elite troops surrender to CNN camera crews and empty tanks. I realized then, and many times since, that the threats had been and continue to be greatly exaggerated. For this and many other reasons, I voted against the second Gulf war in 2002.

Most of these threats are more about money and power than they are about real danger to the U.S. They also seem to be because many of our leaders seem to be a little too eager to go to war and want to be new Winston Churchills and prove how tough they are, how patriotic, and how they are great leaders. Mr. Speaker, it is certainly not patriotic at all to send young Americans to fight very unnecessary wars.

With these thoughts as background, I would like to read part of conservative syndicated columnist Eric Margolis' most recent column.

First, let me say that President Trump is correct in saying that NATO countries should not continue to expect the U.S. to pay for their defense needs.

Mr. Margolis' column, in part, is as follows:

Germany is reported to have less than 20 operational tanks. Canada's armed forces appear to be smaller than the New York City Police Department.

But the Europeans ask, ''Defense against whom?'' The Soviet Union was a huge threat back in the Cold War when the mighty Red army had 55,000 tanks pointed west. Today, Russia's land and naval power has evaporated. Russia has perhaps 5,500 main battle tanks in active service and a similar number in storage, a far cry from its armored juggernaut of the Cold War.

More important, Russia's military budget for 2018 was only $61 billion, actually down 17 percent from last year. Russia is facing hard economic times. Russia has slipped to fourth place in military spending after the U.S., China, and Saudi Arabia.

The U.S. and its wealthy allies account for two-thirds of world military spending. In fact, the U.S.' total military budget, including for nuclear weapons and foreign wars, is about $1 trillion, 50 percent of total U.S. Government discretionary spending.

In addition, Russia must defend a vast territory from the Baltic to the Pacific. The U.S. is fortunate in having Mexico and Canada as neighbors. Russia has North Korea, China, India, the Middle East, and NATO to watch.

As with its naval forces, Russia's armies are too far apart to lend one another mutual support. Two vulnerable rail lines are Russia's main land link between European Russia and its Pacific Far East.

Trump's extra supplemental military budget boost this year of $54 billion is almost as large as Russia's entire 2018 military budget. As for Trump's claim that Europe is not paying its fair share of NATO expenses, note that Britain and France combined together spend more on their military forces than Russia.

In Europe, it is hard to find many people who still consider Russia a serious threat, except for some dipsy Danes, right-wing Swedes, and assorted Russophobic East Europeans. The main fear of Russia seems concentrated in the minds of American neoconservatives, media, and victims of the bizarre anti-Russian hysteria that has gripped the U.S.

Mr. Speaker, that is from the Margolis column, and I hope that Members in this Congress will keep those words in mind.

PRO-GROWTH POLICIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. FERGUSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because I want to talk about our pro-growth policies that are working for the American people.

Throughout this year, I have met with small-business owners, college students, seniors, and folks all across my district to hear how the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act has impacted them. Time and again—time and again—I hear the same story: People have more money in their pockets. Their businesses are doing well. Their utility bills are lower. Their small businesses are expanding. Their economic outlook is better than it used to be. And we are headed in the right direction.

Employers are now investing not only in their businesses but, more importantly, in their people. These benefits are not just limited to my district in Georgia. Our economy is booming across this great Nation, and Americans across this country are reaping the benefits of comprehensive tax reform.

Thanks to our pro-growth policies, we are finally seeing true economic recovery, and America is on a path to being the best place in the world to do business once again.

Our work isn't done. We still have work to do. And we will continue to fight for the American worker and American business while we make this the greatest place in the world to do business. I look forward to continuing to work with my colleagues to do just that.

It is mind-boggling to me, when you look around this great Nation and you see the success, that we actually have Members of this body who want to take that success away from this country and want to take money out of the American people's pockets and bring it right back here to Washington, D.C. That is a thought process that I think is wrong, and I don't understand it.

We need to keep fighting for the American family, the American worker, the American business, so that this country continues to be the best place in the world to do business. Tax reform is an example of how we get that done.

RECOGNIZING HUNTER TRUCK SALES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 80th anniversary of a reputable business headquartered in my hometown of Butler, Pennsylvania: Hunter Truck Sales.

Hunter Truck Sales is a family owned and operated, authorized dealer of Peterbilt and International heavy-duty trucks and is one of the largest heavy-duty truck commercial providers in the Northeast.

□ 1045

Hunter Truck is a staple of the community, and their success over the last 80 years confirms that the American Dream is alive and thriving in Pennsylvania and throughout the whole United States.

Hunter Truck Sales is a name that has been synonymous with reliability since its founding in 1938. The business was started by Homer Hunter. Homer opened a small service station in the rural town of Eau Claire, Pennsylvania, and quickly developed a reputation for his unparalleled commitment to trucking solutions with personalized sales, service, and parts.

With hard work and unwavering dedication, the company has continuously grown and was eventually awarded a new truck sales franchise from International Harvester, followed by earning a Peterbilt heavy-duty truck franchise.

Homer, along with his brothers, created a customer-centric business that focused on teamwork, trust, accountability, and integrity. These very values led the company to its many achievements, and they remain at the core of the Hunter Truck Sales today, which is now owned and operated by the third generation of the Hunter family: Jeff Hunter, Dave Hunter, William Hunter, and Nancy Hunter-Mycka.

Hunter Truck currently operates 20 locations in Pennsylvania, West Virginia, New York, and New Jersey, and proudly employs nearly 1,000 people. Keep in mind all this started with a small service station and a family with big dreams and great work ethic. It is families like the Hunters who help local economies flourish by establishing successful business practices that can be sustained for multiple generations.

While the services provided have evolved and the scope of the business has expanded, Hunter Truck remains fully committed to both their customers and the communities they call home.

As a leader in the heavy-duty truck industry, Hunter truck has invested in its workforce and in unique technologies that align with their mission, which is to build long-term relationships that reflect value, integrity, and teamwork by providing their customers with excellent parts, service, and products.

It is truly an honor to recognize the Hunter family and Hunter Truck Sales for their pioneering spirit in the demonstration of core American values. I encourage them to continue on what they have built with absolute pride—not boastful pride, but pride in knowing what Mr. Hunter started in 1938 has flourished and has provided so many jobs for so many people for so long. It is an incredible tribute to the way Americans think.

Small businesses are the backbone of this country, and Hunter Truck Sales is truly an inspiration to entrepreneurs everywhere.

UPHOLD THE STIMSON DOCTRINE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FERGUSON). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I am concerned that the President of the United States is engaged in a massive campaign of deception that threatens to upend U.S. policy towards Crimea, shake confidence in U.S. global leadership, and override the stated will of the United States Congress.

This dangerous precedent set in Crimea cannot be overstated. Putin's forcible and illegal annexation of Crimea, the first forcible seizure of territory in Europe since World War II, undermines Ukrainian sovereignty and threatens the stability of European borders.

Acquiescence on the part of the United States threatens the security of sovereign nations. Who is next? Moldova? Georgia? The Baltic States?

It is the longstanding policy of the United States not to recognize territorial changes effected by force, as dictated by the Stimson Doctrine established in 1932 by then Republican Secretary of State Henry Stimson.

We upheld that doctrine with the issuance of the Welles Declaration in 1940, which stated emphatically that the United States would not recognize the illegal annexation of the Baltic States by then the Soviet Union. That policy remained in effect for 50 long years.

For more than 50 years, we stood by the Baltic Republics of Estonia, Lithuania, and Latvia, sometimes in the face of ridicule. Today, they are independent sovereign states and good members of NATO. The collective wisdom of the previous and current administrations, Congress, our European allies, and the American public is that similar principles must be adopted with respect to Crimea.

Crimea was Putin's original violation in the Ukraine, and we have limited credibility objecting to Russia's subsequent invasion of the Luhansk and Donetsk if we do not stand firm with respect to Crimea.

The Obama administration established a nonrecognition policy toward Russian sovereignty over Crimea and levied sanctions against individuals and entities enabling Russia's occupation. Our allies in Europe stood with us shoulder to shoulder in emphasizing and enforcing those sanctions.

Congress codified President Obama's Crimea sanctions and has repeatedly used the power of the purse to prohibit the use of government funds for any action that would recognize the de jure or de facto illegal annexation of Crimea.

And in the Countering America's Adversaries Through Sanctions Act, Congress reiterated its support for the Stimson Doctrine and its application to the illegal invasions by Russia and occupations of Abkhazia and South Ossetia in Georgia, Crimea, and eastern Ukraine, and the Transnistria region of Moldova. Even the State Department for the current administration has reiterated our nonrecognition policy and enforced Crimea sanctions.

But through all of this, one man stands alone atop his bully pulpit with opaque intentions and armed with an arsenal of half-truths and downright lies. That person is the President of the United States, Donald Trump.

I do not particularly care that Donald Trump personally admires Vladimir Putin. Everyone needs a role model. However, President Trump's willful ignorance of the crisis in the Ukraine has had him repeat propaganda and support policies that are so foreign that they would make Mr. Putin very happy.

It was candidate Trump who said both ''Crimea has been taken'' and Putin is ''not going into Ukraine.'' I will not attempt to untangle the contradictions therein. I trust President Trump has had time to study and understand why his comments betrayed a shockingly tenuous grasp of U.S. foreign policy and our increasingly dangerous geopolitical climate.

As Commander in Chief, the President has since had time to learn more about the situation in the Crimea and eastern Ukraine. Unfortunately, he has learned all the wrong lessons and has adopted a confrontational approach to current U.S. policy regarding Crimea.

In justifying his position, the President has repeated several myths, some of which were no doubt originated by the Kremlin's own propaganda machine.

Myth number one: The people of Crimea have said they preferred Russia—only in a referendum in an occupied Crimea with Russian troops all over the state. No referendum has validity at the end of a barrel of a gun.

Myth number two: The demographics of Crimea demand they be part of Russia because most of them speak Russian. I am sure Russian speaking populations in the Baltic Republics revolt at that kind of notion. And the claim also erases history because Crimean Tatars were forcibly removed from Crimea by the dictator Stalin.

This is the President's most insidious myth, the third one; recognizing Crimea could help improve relations with Russia.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's time is expired.

Mr. CONNOLLY. I don't think so. Russia has a much more extensive agenda.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's time is expired.

Mr. CONNOLLY. It is time for the United States to recognize——

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is no longer recognized.

Mr. CONNOLLY. * * *.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President of the United States.

ORGANIC AGRICULTURE LISTENING SESSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, on Monday, I hosted and chaired a Listening Session on Organic Agriculture at our State capitol in Harrisburg.

Agriculture is a key economic driver in Pennsylvania and remains the Commonwealth's number one industry. One in seven jobs in Pennsylvania is connected to agriculture, a fact especially important in rural areas, generating some $7.4 billion in sales in 2017.

Yet agriculture in Pennsylvania and around the country goes well beyond our local communities. Our farmers not only feed, clothe, and provide energy and fiber for all Americans, but also to many other nations around the world.

Pennsylvania agriculture is diverse and encompasses a wide array of commodities and production methods. Monday's listening session was specifically focused on the organic agriculture sector in Pennsylvania.

I was proudly joined by my colleagues, Congressman SCOTT PERRY and Congressman TOM MARINO, as well as Pennsylvania's agriculture deputy secretary, Cheryl Cook. We heard from a number of expert panelists, including: Leslie Zuck of Pennsylvania Certified Organic; Dr. Kristy Borrelli of Penn State extension; Scott Sechler of Bell & Evans; Ken Rice, an organic livestock feed seller; Andrew Kline, an organic beef and milk producer; and Hannah Smith-Brubaker of the Pennsylvania Sustainable Agriculture Association, or PASA.

We heard some tremendous testimony from the all-star panel, and I thank them for their insights. Over the past decade, organic agriculture has flourished around the Nation. From 2015 to 2016, the number of certified organic farms nationwide increased to more than 14,000, and the number of certified acres increased by 15 percent, according to the USDA.

Pennsylvania has been a leading State in organic agriculture with more than 800 farms across the Commonwealth. With some farms transitioning and others just starting out in agriculture, organic is being supported in a variety of ways. Through Pennsylvania Certified Organic, Penn State's extension activities, stakeholder organizations, and the State Department of Agriculture, many are working to help farmers who wish to transition to organic farming.

There have also been a variety of supports put in place at the Federal level. Title X of the farm bill is the horticulture portion of the law which covers specialty crops, local and regional foods, and organic agriculture.

The 2014 farm bill included $34 million annually to organic producers. This includes support for USDA's Organic Agriculture Research and Extension Initiative, the National Organic Certification Cost Share Program, the National Organic Program, and the Organic Data Initiative. The farm bill also authorizes the Beginning Farmers and Ranchers Program, the Farmers Market and Local Food Promotion Program, the Market Access Program, the EQIP Organic Initiative, and our bedrock agricultural conservation programs.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, the House and Senate have been working diligently to write the next farm bill as the current law expires in September. Writing a new farm bill is timely, as rural areas have been hit hard by farm recession in recent years with the average farm income roughly half of what it was just 5 years ago.

Since both the House and Senate have passed versions of the farm bill, I look forward to working out the differences in conference. This new law will certainly continue to support both traditional as well as organic agriculture on many fronts, and I look forward to getting the final bill across the finish line.

HONORING WORLD WAR I HEROES IN CLINTON COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of two World War I heroes from Clinton County, Pennsylvania.

Private First Class Ira Cranmer Keller and Corporal Beale Marshall Darby are the hometown soldiers for which the county's Keller & Darby Memorial Park is named. Private First Class Keller was 24 years old and the first Clinton County soldier to be killed during World War I. Corporal Darby was only 18 years old and is the second hometown soldier to lose his life in the Great War.

Their families donated land in North Bend to be used as a public park, forever commemorating their sacrifice for our freedom. This Sunday, there will be a formal memorial and rededication ceremony. A World War I Soldiers' Commemorative Monument will also be unveiled in the park.

Mr. Speaker, a century later, we are celebrating the lives of these two soldiers and honoring the sacrifice that they made to this great Nation. To this day, the park honors these North Bend heroes, as their families intended. It is a place where we will always remember the sacrifices that come with our freedom, and we will never forget.

OUR GUARANTEED FOUR FREEDOMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. SWALWELL) for 5 minutes.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, it was in this Chamber in 1941 that Franklin Roosevelt told the world that every man, woman, and child in the world should be guaranteed four freedoms: the freedom of speech, the freedom of worship, the freedom from fear, and the freedom from want.

And Mr. Speaker, today, our President has taken a wrecking ball to all four of those guarantees. He has declared that the press is the enemy of the American people—going after that treasured freedom of speech, the right for me to speak here in this well, for people to assemble outside, and for the journalists behind me in the gallery to report on it—the freedom of worship that every man and woman and child could pray to the God of their choosing and not be discriminated because of it. Our country, as we speak right now today, has a Muslim ban in place.

□ 1100

Freedom from fear: Nearly daily, the President tweets out that the immigrants fleeing the harshest places in the world from violence and abject poverty are the problem, that they are murderers and rapists.

And freedom from want: The idea that if you work hard, it will mean something. Well, Mr. Speaker, this Chamber passed, and the President signed, a tax cut where 83 percent of the benefits went to the wealthiest among us. Not a tax cut that told our businesses: You can be more competitive, but you have to share the profits with those who generated your productivity.

Those four freedoms that we have all relied upon and depend upon in our country are being knocked down. We have an opportunity in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, to unite and work together to restore those freedoms and rebuild them.

Our Founders, in their wisdom, envisioned that you could have a wrecking-ball, out-of-control Presidency, and they did not leave us helpless. They envisioned that the Article I check and balance of a Congress, elected by the

people, could be a check on the President.

As our President right now is abroad, insulting our allies, drawing us closer to adversaries like Russia, we can be a check. We can say, when it comes to those families separated at the border, we are not going to put a single priority of the President forward until he reunites all of them. When it comes to the press, who are under attack in speech that is constantly being suppressed, we can pass the Journalist Protection Act, which I recently introduced, which would make it a Federal crime to commit violence against anyone in the news gathering business. There is a lot we can do together.

And as it comes to our democracy, Mr. Speaker, we are just 4 months away from an election. The adversary that our President is meeting with is determined to interfere again. The best antidote to stop that would be for us to unite and pass legislation to have an independent commission. That is bipartisan legislation that is out there.

We can be the check that our Founders envisioned. We can be the check that our constituents really need us to be during these trying times.

We are not helpless, Mr. Speaker. We can pick up the pieces, and we can rebuild and restore those freedoms that FDR stood in this Chamber and guaranteed to the world that we would have. That should still be true today in America.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania). Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 3 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

Reverend John Hill, Flint Hill United Methodist Church, Alexander City, Alabama, offered the following prayer:

Gracious, mighty, and wonderful God, I pray for this historic Chamber, and I most humbly ask for Your wisdom, discernment, and grace to be showered upon these representatives of the people.

Allow their decisions to be made with selfless interest, keeping a keen eye upon the good of our Nation as a whole. Let their collegiality and respect for one another be an example of statesmanship to our Nation. Give them the humbleness to bring differing opinions and work together toward the best solution.

Allow them to disagree without vilifying, and may their differences be brought together for the good of the country so that the United States of America may be a shining beacon of hope and liberty to the world. May they be reminded of the sacred trust the people have placed in them and not shrink from this awesome responsibility that they have accepted.

In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. ESTY) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. ESTY of Connecticut led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

MOMENT OF SILENCE HONORING THOSE KILLED OR WOUNDED IN SERVICE TO OUR COUNTRY

The SPEAKER. The Chair asks that the House now observe a moment of silence in honor of those who have been killed or wounded in service to our country and all those who serve and their families.

WELCOMING REVEREND JOHN HILL

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ROGERS) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to welcome our guest chaplain, Reverend John Hill. Reverend Hill lives in Alexander City, Alabama, and is the pastor of Flint Hill United Methodist Church.

In 2010, Reverend Hill had his ordination as elder in the United Methodist Church; and in 2017, he achieved senior chaplain status with the International Conference of Police Chaplains, certification in critical incident stress management, and became a certified instructor for group crisis intervention.

Reverend Hill has done chaplain work with several police departments across the State as well as with the Alabama Department of Public Safety. He also was selected to serve as a volunteer chaplain for the United States Secret Service.

Reverend Hill is joined today by his wife, Jill, and their three children, and it is my honor to welcome him to the House of Representatives and our Nation's Capitol.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio). The Chair will entertain up to 15 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

WELCOMING PENN STATE 4–H TO THE CAPITOL

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to welcome members of the Penn State 4–H program to the Nation's Capital. This afternoon, students will share their 4–H experiences with me and discuss the importance the program has had in their lives.

4–H is open to all young people regardless of where they live, what their backgrounds are, or what interests them. From traditional activities for youth in rural places to after-school programs for city youth, 4–H has it all.

Last month, Penn State 4–H hosted the first Pennsylvania 4–H Science of Agriculture Challenge in State College. Scores of 4–H teams competed in the challenge that was based around the American Farm Bureau's Pillars of Agricultural Literacy.

First place went to the Westmoreland County equestrian team. The marketing team from Clarion County came in second. Third place went to the Armstrong County Idea Makers. Teams from Allegheny County and Washington County rounded out the top five winners.

Mr. Speaker, 4–H plays an incredible role in the lives of American students who are learning leadership, citizenship, and life skills. I am proud that 4–H helps so many reach their full potential.

ACA SABOTAGE

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

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, another week, another two blatant attempts by this administration to sabotage the Affordable Care Act.

On Saturday, the Trump administration announced it is ending payments that help insurers meet the requirement to cover individuals with preexisting conditions. These risk adjustment payments pool risk for insurers so all Americans can be covered, not just the healthiest few.

Just yesterday, the Trump administration announced it is slashing funds for healthcare navigators by 70 percent. These navigators are the individuals trained to help Americans compare and enroll in plans. Without navigator assistance, more Americans will struggle to enroll, and more people will go uninsured.

These changes and other actions previously announced by this administration will result in higher premiums for millions of individuals and small businesses.

Remember this: the 130 million Americans, those of us with preexisting conditions, will pay the heaviest price.

This cynical effort to diminish access to quality, affordable care has to stop. The Trump administration needs to abandon its effort to undermine the ACA and instead start working with those of us who want to improve, rather than tear down, our healthcare system.

CONGRATULATING MIAMI BRIDGE

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Miami Bridge on its 33rd anniversary. Located in my congressional district, Miami Bridge works to provide a safe haven for teens who are abandoned, neglected, and homeless in Miami-Dade County.

Miami Bridge is the only emergency home in south Florida which shelters children from ages 10 to 17. This organization provides and promotes positive youth development programs and strengthens families to enable children and teens to become productive members of our community.

Annually, Miami Bridge houses more than 600 children and teens and provides counseling to more than 550 families. From assisting families in developing the necessary skills to comfort at-risk children to empowering youngsters with opportunities to make positive life choices, Miami Bridge's many services help children overcome the challenges that confront them and realize their full potential.

Mr. Speaker, I am so proud to represent Miami Bridge, and I congratulate its wonderful staff, its board members, and its volunteers for their tremendous efforts to save at-risk youth from a life of victimization and homelessness.

RHODE ISLAND'S FISHERIES

(Mr. CICILLLINE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, Rhode Island's commercial fishing industry provides thousands of good-paying jobs and hundreds of millions of dollars of economic activity every year; but later today, the House is voting on a bill that will jeopardize this critical sector of our State's economy. H.R. 200 undermines the science-based catch limits that we have used in recent decades to keep fisheries sustainable for the long term.

We have seen this movie before. It was just a few decades ago that Congress first put the science-based catch limits in place. Congress had to do so because overfishing had brought America's fisheries to the brink of economic and environmental collapse.

It turns out the science works. Since Congress put these science-based catch limits in place, dozens of fish stocks have been brought back to sustainable levels and overfishing incidents have been cut substantially. Good-paying jobs in the fishing industry have thrived. The industry now, as a whole, generates billions of dollars in economic activity every year.

H.R. 200 will reverse this progress. We cannot let it pass. It is a terrible bill that will harm fishermen in my State and all up and down the coast.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to reject this bill.

THE COLORBLIND BOOM IN JOBS

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, this week, Investor's Business Daily published an editorial titled: ''Colorblind Boom in Jobs.''

The editorial begins: ''It may be a surprise, but President Trump is nowhere near as unpopular among minority voters as the biased mainstream media suggest. Why is that? In a word, jobs.

''Trump, it turns out, has been the most consequential President in history when it comes to minority employment. In June, for instance, the unemployment rate for Hispanics and Latinos 16 years and older fell to 4.6 percent, its lowest level ever. . . . ''

African American unemployment of 6.5 percent ''represents the second lowest unemployment reading ever for Black Americans.

''As for Asian Americans, unemployment similarly bounced off its all-time low. . . . ''

''The truth is, the ripping jobs growth that began when Trump entered office and picked up steam after his tax cuts has been good for everyone in America—even liberal media pundits.''

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

Best wishes, Judge Brett Kavanaugh, with an impeccable record of service to be on the Supreme Court of the United States.

Happy birthday, Jackson Gossett.

PENSIONS

(Mr. HIGGINS of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, many Americans have worked hard their entire lives paying into pension programs with the promise that, after a career of hard labor, they would have a secure transition into retirement.

Our multiemployer pension plans, of which there are 114, covering 1.3 million workers, are severely underfunded and in trouble. The Butch Lewis Act is an important step in responsibly securing the pensions that millions of American workers have earned throughout their years of hard work.

We must ensure that the pensions that American union workers have earned over a lifetime of work are protected well into the future. This Congress needs to take action now to ensure the promise of those who were promised after years of contributions to have a pension in their retirement years.

178 WORDS OF FORGOTTEN HISTORY THAT MUST BE TOLD

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, 100 years ago, on November 11, 1918, the war to end all wars came to an end.

Over 4 million American doughboys went off to fight on the battlefields and in the brutal trenches of Europe. Mr. Speaker, 116,000 of America's sons and daughters were killed in combat, and 200,000 more were wounded.

All the survivors of the great World War I have since died. They are no more. We must never forget their selfless sacrifices to make this world a freer place.

Last year, our country finally broke ground in Washington, D.C., on a memorial to honor their service to our country. I am privileged that Representative CLEAVER and I helped make this memorial a reality. Forever their sacrifice for this Nation and this world will be preserved in bronze and stone in the heart of this city.

May our country never forget their sacred pledge, recited in George Cohan's song:

We'll be over,
We're coming over,
And we won't come back,
Till it's over, over there.

And that is just the way it is.

SAN DIEGO PRIDE

(Mrs. DAVIS of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate Pride Month in San Diego and honor our progress.

In 1974, a group of LGBTQ San Diegans were denied a permit to host a pride parade. Despite facing great danger, dozens bravely marched in the streets. So this weekend, over 200,000 San Diegans are expected to join together to celebrate how far we have come and spread the message of equality.

Though we have made great progress, this month also marks the 1-year anniversary of a lawsuit that was actually

filed against me for displaying a pride flag in front of my office. This frivolous lawsuit is a great reminder of why Pride Month is still necessary and why our work is never done.

The pride flag symbolizes the ideals of liberty, equality, and love that this month celebrates. No lawsuit will deter me from defending these values.

I am proud to be an ally in this fight and will continue to stand shoulder to shoulder with our LGBTQ community.

Happy pride, San Diego.

□ 1215

HONORING THE LIFE OF HERB APPEL

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

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, the heart and soul of Fort Bend County in my hometown of Sugar Land is in great pain today. Herb Appel put on his angel wings and joined our Lord yesterday. We are the most diverse county in America, and the best place to start a family, raise a family, and start a business because of Herb Appel.

Herb was a long-time CEO of the Fort Bend Economic Development Corporation. During his tenure, Schlumberger moved their North American headquarters to Sugar Land, Smart Financial Center opened, and Texas Instruments stayed in Fort Bend County, moving from Stafford to Sugar Land. The list goes on and on and on.

Herb was called home on a cruise he took with his wife, Emelia, and most of his five kids, sixteen grandkids, and two great grandkids. He was at sea with a sea of love around him.

When Herb met God yesterday, God said: Well done, good and faithful servant. God bless Herb Appel.

A BETTER LIFE

(Mr. JEFFRIES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, our so-called Commander in Chief is over in Europe where he criticized some of our closest allies as being delinquent. What is wrong with him? Hypocrisy is clearly not a constraint to behavior.

TrumpCare, the Republican healthcare plan that would strip away protections for preexisting conditions and will cause premiums, copays, and deductibles to go up, is delinquent. The Republican tax scam, where 83 percent of the benefits go to the wealthiest 1 percent in America to subsidize the lifestyles of the rich and shameless is delinquent. The fake Republican infrastructure plan that will do nothing to fix our Nation's crumbling bridges, roads, and tunnels is delinquent.

Republicans have a raw deal. Democrats have A Better Deal. We are going to do everything possible to make life better for the people.

AMERICANS BELIEVE NEWS IS BIASED

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Gallup recently polled Americans on their perceptions of bias, inaccuracy, and misinformation in news reporting. Their survey found:

Sixty-two percent said the news they read in newspapers, see on television, or hear on the radio is biased;

Forty-four percent believe the news they read in newspapers, see on television, or hear on the radio is inaccurate;

More than a third described the news they see on these channels as misinformation—false or inaccurate information that is presented as if it were true. In other words, fake news.

The same poll found 8 out of 10 adults feel angry or bothered by seeing biased information.

It is obvious that the news media have abandoned objective, fact-based reporting and are instead promoting a liberal agenda. Their news reports only tell one side of the story: their side. Until the news media returns to objective reporting, Americans will continue to view them skeptically.

HONORING THE LIFE OF ERICK SILVA

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

Mr. KIHUEN. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to remember the life of Erick Silva.

Erick was a security guard at the Route 91 festival in Las Vegas on October 1. As soon as gunshots went off, he immediately began selflessly helping people and was, unfortunately, shot in the process.

Erick's life goal was to help others by becoming a police officer. He would buy burgers for homeless people, treat relatives to dinner, and help his mom pay her bills by working long shifts and holding yard sales in his free time.

Erick was humble, pure, and real. He was known for being funny and always cracking jokes. He would go above and beyond what was asked of him and would put others first. He is remembered as being the epitome of integrity, service, and excellence.

I would like to extend my condolences to Erick Silva's family and friends. Please know that the city of Las Vegas, the State of Nevada, and the whole country grieve with you.

HONORING THE LIFE OF DAVID FREYLING

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember David Freyling, a dear friend and dedicated patriot who passed away over the weekend.

Dave's entire life was about serving others. He served in the Army from 1956 to 1966 with the 82nd Airborne in Berlin during the construction of the Berlin Wall, and was later stationed in Korea, where he helped build roads, bridges, and other infrastructure.

Dave dedicated his life to fellow veterans. He was the chairman of the Help for Heroes fund and the Veterans Assistance Commission of Macon County for 13 years, and many knew him for his selflessness in getting veterans the help they need. For many years, he voluntarily drove veterans to the Danville VA hospital nearly 90 miles away, taking 389 total trips and racking up over 70,000 miles, to shuttle his fellow veterans to the VA to get the healthcare they deserved.

He was active in his church, volunteered with the American Red Cross, and was a prominent member of both the American Legion and the Macon County Honor Guard. He served on the Decatur Civic Center Board and worked tirelessly to bring to life the World War II Memorial in town, which was finally completed in 2012, thanks to Dave's hard work. By all accounts, Dave was a true example of patriotism and service.

Words cannot express how much he will be missed. He made an immeasurable impact on the lives of veterans and the entire Decatur community. I extend my deepest condolences to his wife, Jeannine, and to all those who knew Dave. I am so glad he got to watch the fireworks before he passed.

CLEMENCY FOR HAMMONDS

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank President Trump for his willingness to resolve a major injustice. I am speaking, of course, about the news that the President has decided to pardon Oregon ranchers Dwight Hammond and his son, Steven Hammond.

They have already served jail sentences for a controlled burn on their land, which was adjacent to Federal lands that were already out of control with a fire. They used the fire tool to try and keep their own land from being overcome by poorly managed Federal lands and the fires that frequently occur upon them.

They served a sentence for that already. Yet overzealous prosecutors, using terrorism legislation in the law, came back after them again and forced them to serve even more time, unfairly. It was the type of law that was used in the case of the Oklahoma City bombing. Approximately 139 acres of Federal land was burned accidentally to try and stop fire.

The Hammonds aren't from my district. They are from Mr. WALDEN's district in Oregon, and I commend him for his work to help make sure this clemency has happened for these people. They are good citizens who are well-known in Oregon. They have relatives and many friends in my northern California district as well.

Their case is a prime example of the previous administration's overbearing regulation and enforcement on the users of public land, while, at the same time, their poor stewardship has caused these dangerous conditions.

It is too bad they will never get the time back that they served. But I am, indeed, glad for President Trump granting clemency to the Hammond family.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, July 11, 2018.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on July 11, 2018, at 9:13 a.m.:

That the Senate agrees to Conference with the House of Representatives H.R. 5515.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, July 11, 2018.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on July 11, 2018, at 11:20 a.m.:

That the Senate passed S. Con. Res. 41.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 50, UNFUNDED MANDATES INFORMATION AND TRANSPARENCY ACT OF 2017, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3281, RECLAMATION TITLE TRANSFER AND NON-FEDERAL INFRASTRUCTURE INCENTIVIZATION ACT

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 985 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 985

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 50) to provide for additional safeguards with respect to imposing Federal mandates, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The amendment recommended by the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such further amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such further amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill, as amended, to the House with such further amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and any further amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 3281) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to facilitate the transfer to non-Federal ownership of appropriate reclamation projects or facilities, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources; and (2) one motion to recommit.

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on House Resolution 985, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring this rule forward on behalf of the Rules Committee. The rule provides for consideration of H.R. 50, the Unfunded Mandates Information and Transparency Act, and also H.R. 3281, the Reclamation Title Transfer and Non-Federal Infrastructure Incentivization Act.

The rule provides for 1 hour of debate for each bill, equally divided by the chair and ranking member of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee and the Natural Resources Committee, respectively. It also provides for a motion to recommit for each bill.

Last night, the Rules Committee had the opportunity to hear from the sponsor of H.R. 3281, Mr. LAMBORN from Colorado, about his bill and its importance for improving the management of water and water-related facilities. We also heard from my friend and a former Rules Committee member, Chairwoman VIRGINIA FOXX, on H.R. 50, which she introduced.

□ 1230

Mr. Speaker, both of these bills are, at their core, about promoting effective government and enhancing the cooperation and collaboration between the government and non-Federal entities.

The Federal Government has its hands in a lot of things. That is not always a bad thing, but we see far too many instances where Federal involvement does more harm than good. That is why Republicans in this Chamber are committed to reining in the Federal Government where it needs to be reined in, to increasing its efficiency and transparency, and to giving the American people a louder voice in the decisions that impact them.

H.R. 3281, the Reclamation Title Transfer and Non-Federal Infrastructure Incentivization Act, empowers water users and seeks to reduce the administrative paperwork and liability Federal taxpayers bear by streamlining the process through which some Bureau of Reclamation projects are transferred to non-Federal entities.

Today, the Bureau of Reclamation is the Nation's largest wholesale water supplier, providing one out of five Western farmers with irrigation water and delivering trillions of gallons to people annually.

Under the current law, the BOR is allowed to transfer day-to-day operational and maintenance responsibilities to project beneficiaries, but the Bureau cannot transfer title or ownership of any of these facilities unless

Congress specifically enacts legislation authorizing such a transfer.

This legislation recognizes that Federal bureaucracy is not doing any favors for water users or for aging infrastructure projects. That is why this bill focuses on empowering local water users and incentivizing non-Federal investment in water infrastructure. This bill helps reduce regulatory paperwork and the Federal backlog on water infrastructure repair, while increasing efficiencies for water users.

Where Congress can streamline Federal operations and increase local control to the benefit of taxpayers and end users, we should act. H.R. 3281 is a step toward accomplishing both of these goals on Bureau of Reclamation projects.

On the next bill, Mr. Speaker, the rule provides for consideration of H.R. 50, the Unfunded Mandates Information and Transparency Act. As I mentioned earlier, this bill continues the trend of empowering State and local governments and lightening the grip of the Federal Government.

In 1995, Congress acted through the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act to prevent the imposition of burdensome and costly Federal unfunded mandates on State and local governments. That was a worthy goal 23 years ago and remains so today.

As a former appropriator at the State level in the State of Georgia, I understand, many times, what good-intentioned work from up here can do, actually, on impacts to State budgets and local budgets, and this is a worthy goal for us to take up.

It has become clear, however, unfunded mandates are slipping through the cracks or, perhaps more accurately, flooding through gaping holes in the system. In fact, according to an Office of Management and Budget report, unfunded mandates and Federal regulations cost States, cities, and the public between $44 billion and $62 billion annually. Even in a town used to throwing around big numbers, that is a big number.

Mr. Speaker, I know the communities in my home of northeast Georgia often struggle to make ends meet. Local governments are rarely flush with cash, and they have to make tough decisions about what priorities receive funding, and in what amounts, in order to best serve their communities. Unfunded mandates, particularly the unexpected ones, can significantly hamper those efforts.

In fact, in recognition of this problem and in pursuit of a solution, those who are most affected by the issue of unfunded mandates—State and local governments—overwhelmingly support this legislation.

The so-called Big 7 organizations representing the State and local governments and officials—the National Governors Association, the National Association of Counties, the National League of Cities, the United States Conference of Mayors, the Council of State Governments, the National Conference of State Legislatures, and the International City/County Management Association—sent a letter earlier this year urging enactment of H.R. 50.

The Unfunded Mandates Information and Transparency Act represents the type of action Congress is supposed to take. It identifies a problem, it acknowledges the need for policy updates, and it incorporates stakeholder feedback in order to solve that problem.

The bill provided for by this rule closes loopholes in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act and applies the requirements of that law to independent agencies. The bill provides for expanded input from State, local, and Tribal governments, as well as from the private sector, by requiring agencies to consult with the government and with the private sector when they are developing significant regulatory mandates.

Mr. Speaker, the importance of this update to the law cannot be overstated. I believe that the men and women eking out a living or building a business on the ground know what problems exist and how to remedy them better than the people who are currently residing in cubicles in Washington, D.C.

When bureaucrats are writing regulations that impact northeast Georgians, they need to consult with and glean insight from northeast Georgians. They also need to understand that what works for northeast Georgia might not work for southeast Georgia, Alabama, Nevada, Maine, Ohio, or anywhere else besides where they are.

If the Federal Government is going to implement regulations that impact private entities—which they do far too often, with far too little benefit, in my opinion—those entities need to have and deserve a voice in the process.

H.R. 50 helps give the private sector that agency. It also requires rules that aren't preceded by a notice of proposed rulemaking to undergo a UMRA analysis if the effects on State, local, and private sectors total $100 million or more. The bill codifies longstanding regulatory principles regarding cost-benefit analysis and when to regulate, and supports more accurate economic analysis.

Mr. Speaker, the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act was designed to promote informed decisionmaking throughout the legislative and regulatory process, in consultation with the entities affected by those processes. Those goals are just as important, if not more important, today as when the UMRA was originally signed into law in 1995.

Congress needs to take responsibility to help reduce the burdens regulatory agencies have placed on State and local governments, as well as private entities. Without question, Congress must work to close these loopholes and reduce bureaucracy.

These are the simple concepts, Mr. Speaker: Unnecessary, burdensome Federal regulations should be identified and reconsidered, and the people and businesses impacted by regulations should have a voice in the regulatory process.

I believe government can operate more efficiently and effectively when we give local stakeholders a voice, when we seek to increase efficiency and remove unwieldy mandates, and when we work to reduce the Federal bureaucracy.

The bill provided for by this rule takes steps in doing just that. I believe that they are steps that we in the House should support to help American communities, citizens, and consumers.

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

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This rule makes in order two bills and four amendments: H.R. 50, Unfunded Mandates Information and Transparency Act of 2017; and H.R. 3281, Reclamation Title Transfer and Non-Federal Infrastructure Incentivization Act.

H.R. 50 amends the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 and the Congressional Budget Act of 1974. This is a bill that Congress already voted on in 2015 in nearly a party-line vote in the House before dying in the Senate.

I understand my colleagues think that this is a very important issue. As a former mayor and council member, I know how difficult Federal regulations can be to implement. This legislation, however, does nothing except grind progress to a standstill, blocking improvements to our Nation's health, safety, and environmental protections.

Perhaps that is why this rule also makes in order H.R. 3281, which assaults our Nation's environmental and health standards in a different way. This legislation, which I opposed in the Natural Resources Committee, would authorize a de facto privatization of Federal infrastructure across the Western U.S., all while stiffing our taxpayers.

The bill does not require that taxpayers be compensated for the loss of publicly owned land and mineral interests. Imagine, once again, this Congress is putting the interests of private business ahead of our hardworking taxpayers.

This legislation is a proposal from President Trump's infrastructure plan, which largely seeks to enrich developers and private businesses at the expense of our hardworking taxpayers and the general public as a whole.

I could understand spending time on these bills if we had finished the pressing work before us, but with thousands—and I mean thousands—of children still separated from their parents due to the cruel actions of this administration, is this really what we are spending time on? Where are the moral priorities and family values of this Congress?

I have spoken with the Department of Homeland Security, and I have spoken with the HHS Office of Refugee Resettlement, and there has been one constant answer from both of them: They have absolutely no idea what they are doing, no idea where the parents of these children are, no idea how many children have been put into foster care, no idea when these families will be reunited, and no idea what comes next.

Congress has a responsibility to act, not next week, not next month, not next year, but today. Once we leave for August recess, let me remind you, it will be 39 days before we come back. That means 39 more days that we are going to allow children to be held in detention, in cages, in cold cells, without their parents.

The Trump administration has already missed the first deadline to reunite families. What assurances do we have that they won't miss the second deadline, or the third one, or possibly the fourth one? How many more deadlines does this Congress, this administration, need before we realize that we are complicit—complicit—in separating children from their parents who care about them?

And while we have them in our custody, we are complicit in not properly taking care of them. ''Full of dirt and lice,'' that is how an immigrant mother described her 14-month-old baby son who had been returned to her after 85 days of separation.

We must act because this administration chooses not to. Failure to do so will mean more families are broken forever, more families like Yasmin's.

On May 22, Yasmin and her two teenage daughters entered the United States and were immediately apprehended and then separated. The mother was transferred to the McAllen holding center—also known as the dog pound, as they call it—with a group of other separated mothers.

After 7 days, the mothers were told that they would be deported without their children. Many of the mothers fainted when they heard this news. One mother had a seizure in a cell. After appearing in court, Yasmin was handcuffed, shackled, and given no information on the status of her children. Family values.

After being transferred to another detention center, Yasmin was informed that her daughters had been reunited with their father. But Yasmin still remains in a detention center, where she has gone more than a month separated from her children. She has received absolutely no information about when she will see her children again and must simply wait and pray. Family values.

These people are fleeing for their lives to the promise and safety of the United States, and we aren't even considering their asylum cases.

Let me tell you another story, Mr. Speaker. A woman from El Salvador decided to flee to the U.S. with her two young boys, ages 4 and 10, after receiving grave threats from MS–13 gang members. Prior to fleeing to the U.S., she had sought protection from Salvadoran authorities through the legal process but had not received any protection.

In March of this year, she presented herself to the border officials, after making a conscious decision not to enter the U.S. at an official port of entry. She had learned that CBP officials are turning away asylum seekers in direct—direct—violation of the United States and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

The mother and her two boys were apprehended and taken to a Border Patrol processing station. The mother was sent to an adult detention center in Laredo, and the boys were sent to a shelter for unaccompanied children under the Office of Refugee Resettlement within Health and Human Services.

At one point, the brothers were separated from one another and placed into two separate foster homes, but were eventually reunited and released to family on the East Coast.

Under current law and procedure—something this Congress could change today—the children have absolutely no right to an appointed lawyer. Without their mother to speak on their behalf, the 4-year-old and the 10-year-old boys must make a case for asylum on their own in separate court cases.

□ 1245

This is what we could be doing today: One, fixing the broken laws that have toddlers, toddlers who are barely out of diapers, representing themselves in court and fixing the root causes of these issues with the Central American Family Protection and Reunification Act, legislation I have offered with Ranking Member ENGEL.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this rule so that we can use our limited time here to act, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up H.J. Res. 31, sponsored by Representatives DEUTCH and MCGOVERN and RASKIN, which would reserve Supreme Court decisions like Citizens United by enshrining in the Constitution of the United States a democracy for all amendments, establishing the right of the American people to enact State and Federal laws that regulate spending in public elections.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH) to discuss this proposal.

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, and, Mr. Speaker, this proposed constitutional amendment will overturn Citizens United and will put voters back in charge of Washington.

Over 90 percent of American voters want background checks on gun sales; three-quarters want aggressive action on climate change; 85 percent want guaranteed paid sick leave; and 75 percent of the people in our country think we ought to raise the minimum wage.

The problem is these are the priorities of voters instead of the priorities of donors, and right now, in this House, donors call the shots. Ninety-three percent of Americans believe that we don't hear their voices. The cynicism is deep and it is bipartisan.

Only 5 percent of Republicans and 6 percent of Democrats believe that their views are heard by their elected Representatives. Why? The Supreme Court's disastrous Citizens United decision held that unlimited election spending doesn't corrupt our political system.

The Citizens United decision was wrong. To American voters, our Congress and our government institutions look like they are bought and paid for.

In recent elections, just 150 wealthy families and the corporations that they control have flooded our elections with hundreds of millions of dollars. That money buys something. Unlimited money in our elections too often determines who can afford to run and sets the legislative agenda here in Washington.

Here is what needs to be asked: If your family can't answer a politician's phone call when they ask for a donation, if they can't afford billboards and television ad buys, how are their voices being heard?

It doesn't matter whether a wealthy donor supports policies on the left or right. Each side has its billionaires. Let's be clear about that. But none of them should be able to spend unlimited resources in our election.

Unlimited spending doesn't produce more speech. It produces louder speech. It compromises the free speech rights of everyone else in America. It corrupts elections when people are sent to Washington to work on behalf of corporate interests rather than voters' interests. And it leaves our elections vulnerable to attacks from foreign adversaries.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to get big money out of politics; it is time to get secret, dark money out of our elections; and it is time to get foreign money out of our campaigns.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, for the sake of our democracy, it is time to overturn Citizens United and put voters back in charge of Washington.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Rules, who has been a leader

on this issue of money and politics for years.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my colleagues to urge Members to vote ''no'' on the previous question so we can bring to the floor the Deutch-McGovern-Raskin bill and so we can at long last have a debate on campaign finance.

The fact of the matter is there is too much money in our politics. The fact of the matter is that this money has a corrupting influence on our politics.

Look at the bills that come before this House of Representatives. It is not about empowering people. It is always about a giveaway to a big corporation, changing the rules on who can sit on scientific advisory boards to include corporate cronies.

The tax bill that my Republican friends brought to the House floor that they voted on and that they take such pride in, basically 85 percent of those benefits went to the top 1 percent income earners in this country.

The bottom line is this place is becoming a place where money can buy anything. There is a culture of corruption that exists in this House of Representatives. There is a culture of corruption that exists in this White House, and people are sick of it.

When I talk to audiences back home—they could be liberal audiences or conservative audiences—the two issues that I mention where everybody nods approvingly are when I say that there is too much money in politics, everybody says ''yes.'' And then when I say that Congress is dysfunctional, they all nod their heads approvingly.

Enough. We need to change this system. People all across the country, an overwhelming majority, want us to change the way we do our politics. They believe that they should have the power, not corporate special interests, not people who are the wealthiest in this country.

Let's give the people of this country what they want. Let's have their voices matter more than the special interest groups.

We have tried time and time and time again to bring these issues to the floor, and we are constantly rebuked. Look, we shouldn't be surprised, because this is now the most closed Congress in the history of the United States of America: more amendments routinely get denied in the Rules Committee; more bills have come to the floor under a completely closed process.

We debate bills, again, that benefit the well-off and the well-connected. We ought to debate some bills that help regular people. And having a real debate on campaign finance reform, having a real debate on how we get big money out of our politics is an issue we should be dealing with right now. It is what the American people want.

Let's do, for once, what the American people want; let's do what our constituents want; and, Mr. Speaker, let me just finish by saying we can have that debate by voting ''no'' on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, let me repeat that to my colleagues, especially those on the Republican side.

If you vote ''no'' on the previous question, we can have this debate. We can have a debate about how we get big money out of politics. We can have a debate about how we drain the swamp, how we clean this place up.

You can go around and say you want to drain the swamp. That is just rhetoric, because what you are really doing is you are helping the well-off and the well-connected.

The people who give the most money, they get their legislation to the floor. Regular people routinely get their interests blocked in this Chamber. It is time to clean up this place.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GALLEGO) to speak on the continuing horror stories about what has happened at our Nation's border.

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share the story of a young mother. Her name is Rosa. Just like my mom, she came to America in search of a better life.

Rosa's home was in Trujillo, Honduras, where she lived with her aging parents and her son, Juan. Violent gangs controlled the town, and Rosa feared her young son would be targeted like so many others in her neighborhood.

Under these desperate circumstances, Rosa did what any loving mother would do. She took her modest life savings and her son and fled north in search of safety. When they finally made it to the U.S. border near Yuma, Arizona, Rosa and Juan were met by American authorities who asked her an ominous question: Don't you know we're separating children from their families here? She told them no, but it was too late. Rosa and Juan are still separated.

Mr. Speaker, the administration is now reuniting a small number of these families due, in part, to Donald Trump's orders. But let's be clear. This isn't happening out of concern for their welfare. As usual, Donald Trump is only doing the right thing because a court is making him do it.

Trump still wants to set up tent camps in our military bases. He still wants to eviscerate legal protections for migrant children, and he still wants to lock up families. Donald Trump's goal is to present mothers and children fleeing unspeakable violence with an impossible choice: immediate deportation or indefinite detention. That is appalling.

On the other hand, the Members of this body have an easy choice: make excuses for Trump, or take a stand against the state-sponsored mistreatment of children. It is not a tough decision. We know what we need to do.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CORREA).

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, as you know, many of us in Congress and the Nation are working hard to reunite children with their parents. Family reunification should be a time of joy, but, sadly, that is not always the case.

One mother waited for 4 months to wrap her arms around her little boy. Another mother waited 3 months. These should be moments of joy, yet, when the children did not recognize their parents, this became a troubling situation.

As a father of four, I know what it is to be loved by your children. As a father of four, I know what that parent-child relationship is like. To have children that fail to recognize you after a number of months because you haven't seen them, well, that is just not right.

The separation of immigrants from their children is just unconstitutional, un-American, and simply wrong, and I demand that all families be united immediately.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from California for yielding.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

One final story to remind all of us what is at stake here.

Earlier this year, a Honduran father was separated from his wife and child just days after President Trump's zero-tolerance policies went into effect. Marco Antonio Munoz crossed the Rio Grande with his wife and 3-year-old son on May 12 near the tiny town of Granjeno, Texas. Soon after Marco and his family were taken into custody, they arrived at a processing station in nearby McAllen and said they wanted to apply for asylum.

Border Patrol agents told the family that they would be separated. That is when Border Patrol officials literally ripped Marco's child from his arms. At no point did Marco attempt to attack or assault the Border Patrol staff, but due to his anguish, he was placed into a padded isolation cell.

Marco began to pray, pray for his family and pray for their safety. Hours passed, and the next morning, after receiving no information about where his family was or when he would see them next, Marco took his life.

Family values.

This is the law and order President Trump has no respect for either. He is disrespecting the rule of law and violating court orders by detaining children, babies, and he is creating

hysteria among families and confusion among Border Patrol and HHS officials.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose the previous question and the rule because we can do better than this. We have family values that we must stand for, and I urge my colleagues to oppose this.

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

□ 1300

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Speaker, I will close by paraphrasing a comment that the Honorable Chairwoman FOXX made yesterday evening in the Rules Committee.

By the way, I want to bring it back: There is a lot of discussion that we are going to have, but, actually, the rule is about two bills that my friends didn't discuss at all. I hope they vote yes on that, so we can move legislation that has helped move the bureaucracy out of the way, so that things can actually, with common sense, get done. We don't choose to talk about that.

We have a lot of issues. I am in agreement on a lot of things that we need to do. We need to fix our immigration system. But today, let's remind ourselves on the floor what we are doing. It is a rule to deal with two specific bills dealing with regulatory issues.

Ms. FOXX said this yesterday in far more eloquent words than I am offering right now, that those opposed to the Unfunded Mandates Information and Transparency Act are those who support unbridled regulations.

I do not support unbridled regulations. I think there are some good regulations, and I think there are some regulations that are necessary. Far too often, we see the Federal Government flooding our community with regulations that do little to achieve their intended benefits, yet come with massive bills, and Washington expects the American people to foot the bill.

Maybe my friends across the aisle enjoy that. Maybe my friends across the aisle want that to continue to happen. Maybe my friends across the aisle who want to vote no on this want to continue to see this happen. We don't. We believe that there is a better way.

The bills provided for by this rule recognize the role of the Federal Government, but they take needed steps to magnify the voices of those closest to the issues.

I support this rule, and I support the underlying bills. I encourage all to do so and look at it honestly from the perspective of those who pay our bills, the people who pay the bills for this government, the ones who go to work every day, who pay their taxes, who want their government to do what the government is supposed to do and stay out of the areas where they are not supposed to be.

This is what this is about, Mr. Speaker, plain and simple, bringing it back to the truth of the rule that we are debating, and that is what I believe is important.

Mr. Speaker, I support this rule and the underlying bill, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

The material previously referred to by Mrs. TORRES is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 985 OFFERED BY MRS. TORRES

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 3. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 31) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to contributions and expenditures intended to affect elections. The first reading of the joint resolution shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the joint resolution are waived. General debate shall be confined to the joint resolution and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the joint resolution shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the joint resolution are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the joint resolution for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the joint resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the joint resolution, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the joint resolution.

SEC. 4. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of House Joint Resolution 31.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308–311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as ''a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge.'' To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that ''the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition'' in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R–Illinois) said: ''The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition.''

The Republican majority may say ''the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever.'' But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: ''Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment.''

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled ''Amending Special Rules'' states: ''a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate.'' (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: ''Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon.''

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida). The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 200, STRENGTHENING FISHING COMMUNITIES AND INCREASING FLEXIBILITY IN FISHERIES MANAGEMENT ACT

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 965 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 965

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant

to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 200) to amend the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act to provide flexibility for fishery managers and stability for fishermen, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources now printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 965 provides for consideration of H.R. 200, the Strengthening Fishing Communities and Increasing Flexibility in Fisheries Management Act.

This structured rule makes in order 11 amendments, including 4 minority and 2 bipartisan amendments.

Mr. Speaker, I was born and raised in coastal Alabama, so I have spent my entire life experiencing the long-held tradition of fishing off the Gulf Coast. Some of my best memories growing up were fishing with my family, and I have carried on that same tradition with my children. I look forward to fishing with my grandchildren once they get a little older.

This isn't a tradition unique to the Gulf Coast. All along America's shores, countless families and friends have made so many memories while fishing.

No one wants to be a better steward of our Nation's fisheries than those of us who actually enjoy fishing. No one wants a healthier fish stock than those of us who have spent our lives on the water.

That is where H.R. 200 comes in. This bill includes commonsense reforms to ensure that our Nation's fisheries remain strong, while also being accessible to fishermen from every walk of life.

Now, I know this bill is about much more than just those of us who like to fish recreationally. Commercial fishing is a major economic engine in many of our coastal communities, so the bill also ensures access to our oceans and ocean resources for our commercial fishermen.

Just consider these numbers that demonstrate the overall impact of fishing on the U.S. economy:

In 2015, the fishing industry generated $208 billion in sales and supported 1.62 million American jobs.

Approximately 11 million saltwater anglers spent a total of $60.9 million on fishing trips, which generated roughly $22.7 billion in income.

And I want to make one other point. The underlying bill will also ensure that all Americans have access to fresh, sustainable seafood. That is important to our Nation's restaurants, but it is also especially important to seafood lovers like me.

If you doubt the importance of the fishing sector, let me tell you about red snapper fishing in my home State of Alabama. It is a major economic driver for our coastal communities. From restaurants, to gas stations, to bait and tackle shops, to the charter boat industry, red snapper fishing is critically important to the economy in our coastal communities and surrounding areas.

Unfortunately, the Federal Government has failed for years to adequately count the number of red snapper in the Gulf. This has resulted in ridiculously short red snapper seasons, which hurt our fishermen and the economies in our coastal communities.

So, how bad was the Federal Government in counting red snapper? Well, they weren't even sampling for red snapper on reefs, despite the fact that red snapper are reef fish. It made absolutely no sense.

Colleges and universities, like the University of South Alabama, have been able to do a much better job of assessing the health of the red snapper stock with far fewer resources. Their data has proven to be much more accurate and up to date.

Thankfully, along with my Gulf Coast colleagues, we have been able to work with the Trump administration and the Commerce Department to ensure adequate recreational red snapper seasons over the last 2 years. But this bill includes reforms I authored to help fix the mismanagement of red snapper for all sectors, once and for all. That means allowing for greater State control, especially as it relates to stock assessments and data collection.

That is one of the best things about H.R. 200. The bill eliminates unscientific timeframes to rebuild fish stocks that unnecessarily restrict access to fisheries. Our national fishery policy should be based on sound, accurate data.

The bill goes against the Washington-knows-best approach that has failed so many times in the past. By providing greater flexibility to fishery managers, we can allow for better management strategies that reflect regional needs and demands. We should empower people who live and work in the local communities, instead of letting bureaucrats in Washington decide what works best.

As I mentioned earlier, the bill will allow more Americans to have access to fresh, sustainable seafood. Currently, around 90 percent of seafood consumed in the United States is imported. This is especially troubling when you consider that we have an abundance of fish right here in our own waters. With reforms included in this bill, we can boost access to affordable domestic fish.

Mr. Speaker, by passing H.R. 200, the House can support our Nation's fishermen, American consumers, our coastal communities, and the overall American economy.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting House Resolution 965 and the underlying bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I thank the gentleman for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule for H.R. 200, the Strengthening Fishing Communities and Increasing Flexibility in Fisheries Management Act. It should be better called the empty oceans act.

H.R. 200 really risks rolling back science-based conservation efforts, destroying jobs, and hurting our fisheries and fish stocks. It undermines successful sustainable fishery management put in place by the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act. That is why so many fishermen, scientists, and business owners have come out in opposition to the empty oceans act. Many people whose livelihood comes from the sea have expressed reservations about the job-destroying provisions of H.R. 200 and how it poses a threat to the commercial fishing industry and their jobs, which rely on sustainable practices.

The Seafood Harvesters of America, a leading trade organization for fishermen, authored a letter expressing their concerns with the bill. More than 1,000 individuals and organizations have expressed their opposition. I had a number of fishermen come by my office today, telling me that this bill could cost them their jobs.

Since its passage, the goal of Magnuson-Stevens has never wavered: managing fisheries to ensure sustainability while, of course, realizing the potential of the resource. Magnuson-Stevens takes a bottom-up approach to resource management where stakeholders on regional fishery management councils work to meet the science-based criteria outlined by the law.

We have some success with this approach. Since the year 2000, we have seen 44 previously depleted fish stocks rebuilt. Currently, 84 percent of fish stocks are no longer overfished.

In 1976, Magnuson-Stevens was passed to end unregulated fishing predominantly by foreign fleets and to develop our own American fleets that could benefit from our abundant fisheries. The act was strengthened in 1996 and 2006 through bipartisan reauthorizations that established science-based fishery management reforms.

The 1996 reauthorization of Magnuson-Stevens bolstered requirements to prevent overfishing and rebuild fish stocks. And, in 2006, a bipartisan authorization maintained the commitment to sustainable fisheries, including accountability and catch limits. These bipartisan efforts succeeded to help create the sustainable fisheries that support coastal economies throughout America and, of course, consumers both in America and worldwide.

Unfortunately, unlike past reauthorizations, H.R. 200 was crafted through a partisan committee process intent on dismantling much of the progress made by Magnuson-Stevens over the last 40 years. In fact, the bill was reported in a party-line vote—Republicans for; Democrats against—with the Republicans continuing to reject attempts to come up with a broad bipartisan approach, as this bill has traditionally been done, that supports both commercial and recreational fishing interests and, of course, maintaining science-based reforms around sustainability.

□ 1315

Sadly, H.R. 200 inserts politics into how we manage our fisheries in several crucial areas. The bill erodes the role that science plays in managing our fisheries.

The bill guts science-based annual catch limit requirements through the creation of many exemptions for key species. These exemptions include many smaller fish that are absolutely critical as prey for valuable commercial and recreational predator species as part of a delicately balanced ecosystem. Hundreds of other species are exempted through this bill which dramatically increases the chances that overfishing will occur, leading to the devastation, both for sportsmen and commercial fishermen.

Catch limits are important to help conserve fisheries and are among the most successful provisions of the Magnuson-Stevens Act. By eroding those provisions, this bill would allow for a long-term depletion of fish stocks. It can devastate the economies of local communities, destroy jobs, and threaten the recovery and stability of our ocean ecosystems.

This bill also weakens the data collection requirements that ensure that data-driven, science-based management is used for our fisheries. Data is currently collected through a broad range of sources, and the determination of the best available data is used by NOAA Fisheries and the regional fishery management councils. H.R. 200 would weaken data collection processes and harm the role of science in successful management of our fishery resources.

Weakening science-based provisions is only one of the ways that this bill inserts politics into what should be a scientific question, the management of our fisheries. This bill not only erodes science-based management practices, but it rolls back meaningful accountability requirements for recreational anglers. Large groups representing a few members of the fishing community and businesses that sell equipment and boats want to see that these jobs are sustained over time.

According to data from the Recreational Boating & Fishing Foundation released in May of 2018, participation in recreational fishing has increased for the past 2 years; 49 million Americans went fishing in 2017, an increase over the prior year. So the recreational side is strong under the current provisions of Magnuson-Stevens.

And, of course, recreational fishermen are not the only beneficiaries of the science-based approach. According to the National Marine Manufacturers Association, U.S. sales of boats and marine products increased 7 percent since the last passage in 2016.

So from 2016 to 2017, we saw a number of States: Florida, Texas, Michigan, North Carolina, Minnesota, California, Wisconsin, South Carolina, and Georgia, with double-digit increases in the sales of new boats, engines, trailers, and accessories, creating good jobs for Americans.

Recreational anglers and the businesses that rely upon their support are doing well and thriving, and this growth is a direct result of science-based fishery management practices fostered by Magnuson that this very bill would systematically dismantle, destroying good American jobs.

Instead of destroying jobs, what the Magnuson-Stevens Act does is ensure that our maritime industries will thrive now and in the future. And because of the success of Magnuson-Stevens, U.S. fisheries are stabilizing and rebounding.

With the bill working as intended, it would be absurd to pass this bill and roll back these very policies that have led to job creation and growth, increased enjoyment for recreational fishermen, and better sustainable practices of ecosystem management.

The Empty Oceans Act also inserts dangerous loopholes into Magnuson and it is including exemptions to rebuilding requirements that have helped recover successfully depleted fish stocks.

H.R. 200 potentially exempts hundreds of species from annual catch limits. That can dramatically increase overfishing, and overfishing may seem to some lucrative, or to some fun in the short-term, but of course it has devastating and nonsustainable consequences for our coastal communities that economically depend on the vital industries of recreational fishing and sports fishing.

These exemptions increase the chance of overfishing and lengthen the time it takes to rebuild depleted stocks to healthy levels, if ever.

These loopholes have a devastating effect as well on the commercial fishing industry and on consumers across the country that enjoy eating healthy fish. In 2015, commercial and recreational saltwater fishing generated $208 billion in revenue, supported 1.6 million jobs, and supported the healthy dining habits of hundreds of millions of American consumers, billions worldwide.

These economic benefits not only support recreational anglers and commercial fishing interests but entire towns and cities that rely on sports fishermen, recreational and commercial, as the entire hub of their economy.

If the Empty Oceans Act were to pass, the long-term prospects of so many communities would be devastated. So I think it is important to have a thoughtful look at how we can continue the bipartisan tradition of building upon the progress of the Magnuson-Stevens Act, making corrections where we need to, but making sure that we put science first in our ocean stewardship, and making sure that we have a sustainable approach to recreational and commercial fishing.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

The gentleman referenced a letter from the Seafood Harvesters of America. In their letter dated June 21 of 2018, this group claims that section 12 of the bill repeals a section of the MSA. There hasn't been a section 12 in this bill since November of 2017. There is no section 12.

The letter also claims that section 4 undermines rebuilding timelines. Section 4 of this bill simply states that all references in H.R. 200 are to the Magnuson-Stevens Act, unless otherwise stated; doesn't do anything like what is claimed.

As the most egregious example, this group is so committed to opposing this

bill, no matter what changes we make, they reference a bill that, for all intents and purposes, no longer exists.

The gentleman also said something about this bill being job-destroying.

Mr. Speaker, let me tell you about the destruction of jobs. When the present regime was running the fishery in the Gulf of Mexico for red snapper, they limited the number of days for fishing to such a small number that it destroyed hundreds, if not thousands of jobs across just my part of the Gulf Coast when people were no longer allowed to go out and go snapper fishing.

Charter boat folks lost their jobs. People that sell ice or bait lost their jobs. It was the Federal bureaucracy that was destroying jobs.

This bill will give us a commonsense regime that will restore jobs. So, far from being a job-destroying bill, this bill is going to create jobs.

The gentleman also referred to a bottoms-up approach. I have been working on this issue for over 4 years, and I can tell you, the bottom, which is us recreational fishermen, we haven't been listened to one single time by the Federal bureaucracy. They closed their doors in our face.

If you want to have a bottoms-up approach to this sort of thing, this bill supplies it. What we have got right now certainly doesn't do it.

One of the most important things that is involved here is, who does the science? Do you let a bunch of Federal scientists far away from where the fisheries are make these decisions? Or do you let scientists that are in the areas where the fisheries exist, do you let them do the science?

I am not talking about just any Tom, Dick, or Harry out there that calls himself a scientist. I am talking about Ph.D. scientists with accredited universities who know the fishery. This bill would allow that to happen, so that you could get good, accurate data, because they don't have it today.

Let me go back to what I said initially on the red snapper issue.

The Federal scientists were sampling for red snapper on sandy bottom. These are reef fish. You are not going to find reef fish on sandy bottom. You find them on reefs. And if you talk to real scientists, they will tell you there is no way you are going to get an accurate assessment of this fish stock if you are looking for them on sandy bottom. You have got to look for them on reefs.

Let me tell you, there are over 170 groups that have signed on to being supportive of this bill. I do not have time to read all the names to you, but let me just read a few. The first one is the Congressional Sportsmen's Foundation. I go to their events up here, like many other Members of Congress. When I was at one just recently, there were hundreds of Members of Congress there from both parties. It couldn't get to be any bigger, and it couldn't get to be any more bipartisan.

The Coastal Conservation Association, the Premier Recreational Anglers Association in America, the Theodore Roosevelt Conservation Partnership, the National Marine Manufacturers Association, which the gentleman referred to as if they were opposed to it. They support the bill.

The National Coalition for Fishing Communities and the Guy Harvey Ocean Foundation. This is a very broadly, deeply supported bill among people who are actually fishing.

Now, it may not be supported by people who don't fish and who don't know anything about fishing; but for those of us who do fish, whether we are commercial fishermen or recreational fishermen, we like it.

And it is time for Congress to understand that the waters of the United States of America do not belong to the Congress, and they do not belong to these Federal departments and agencies. They belong to the people of America, and the people of America have a right to fish in their waters. This bill will help restore that.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CARBAJAL).

Mr. CARBAJAL. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague for yielding me time to voice my opposition to the rule which provides for consideration of H.R. 200.

As it is currently written, H.R. 200 would undermine the conservation gains we have made over the last 2 decades under the Magnuson-Stevens Act, MSA, to prevent overfishing and encourage sustainable fisheries management.

Before reforms were made to the MSA in 1996 and 2006, many fisheries lacked the sustainable quotas and requirements to rebuild depleted stocks. As a result, countless fisheries and fishermen around the country suffered the consequences.

Since Congress changed the law to ensure science-based quotas applied, 44 fisheries around the country have now been restored to healthy levels. The number of stocks that remain overfished is at an all-time low.

H.R. 200 would weaken core sustainability provisions of the MSA. This is a misguided attempt to provide recreational fishermen short-term access at the needless expense of both commercial fishermen and the long-term health of our fisheries. This hurts our coastal communities and businesses that depend on a robust fishing industry and its products.

Additionally, H.R. 200 fails to sufficiently fund stock assessments to ensure effective and efficient management of our Nation's fisheries.

I offered an amendment to authorize an additional $25 million for stock assessments. These funds would allow NOAA to conduct more fishery surveys, which would yield better data and can help reduce the buffers on fishing quotas.

With this funding and research, fishermen can increase their catch rate, while decreasing the uncertainty in the sustainability of a fishery. Unfortunately, the majority at the Rules Committee decided not to make my amendment in order—let me repeat that—decided not to make my amendment in order, which would have allowed the House to debate this important issue.

Mr. Speaker, as a Representative serving the vibrant Central Coast commercial fishing industry in California.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. POLIS. I yield the gentleman from California an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. CARBAJAL. I strongly urge my colleagues to oppose this rule.

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

I appreciate the gentleman's remarks. I want to make sure that I can assure him and everybody in this House this bill doesn't cut funding to anything. It's an authorization bill, and it reauthorizes the Magnuson-Stevens Act with some changes, but those changes do not include a reduction in funding.

But here is the thing about fishing that people that don't fish don't understand. Those of us that fish, we care about this fishery more than anybody else because if we overfish the stock, we don't get to fish anymore. No one has a greater interest in making sure that the species in our waters are maintained than those of us that fish, whether we are commercial fishermen or recreational fishermen. So there is no interest here that is being served to try to somehow harm our fishery.

We believe, and it has actually been demonstrated to be true, that local communities, regional people, can better regulate, sample, bring science to the health of these fish stock than giving it to some bureaucrat in Washington that doesn't know one single thing about our fishery.

We care. We care deeply, because it is a way of life for us, and the last thing we want to do is do anything that would harm these fish stock out there.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

As we approach another election cycle, it is very important for this institution to do everything we can to ensure transparency and safety in our elections and the integrity of the election system itself.

□ 1330

Our democracy is being threatened by corporations, by special interests, and by foreign powers who are stripping away power from our people and our voters with dark money spending.

Secret spending in our elections has exploded since the Supreme Court's 2010 Citizens United decision permitting super-PACs and certain tax-exempt groups to spend unlimited sums, including, in many cases, undisclosed funds. The result is unprecedented levels of spending and a midterm election expected to be the most expensive ever.

Many of these groups don't even have to disclose their donors, allowing wealthy corporations and individuals and illicit foreign influencers to secretly spend unlimited dark money.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up Representative CICILLINE's legislation, H.R. 6239, the DISCLOSE Act, which I am proud to be a cosponsor of. This bicameral bill would require organizations spending money in Federal elections to disclose their donors and guard against hidden foreign interference in our democracy.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) to discuss our proposal.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, Congress is broken. Each day, more and more Americans are losing faith that their government actually works for them. More than 80 percent of Americans say they can't trust Washington to do what is right for them. More than two-thirds feel like our democracy is getting less responsive under Republican control.

And they know what is going on here. They know they are caught in a system that is rigged against them. Their voices are ignored. Their concerns are dismissed. They don't even get a seat at the table.

The Republicans who control this Chamber aren't going to fix it. They have given away all the seats at the table to corporate special interests, to billionaires, to the big banks, the big pharmaceutical companies, and that is why the interests of working people are not being protected. My Republican friends are advancing the interests of powerful special interests that fund their campaigns.

The corruption of our political system in this way has become business as usual here in Washington. In this case, business as usual means billions of dollars in tax cuts for the wealthy and well-connected Republican campaign donors. It means endless attacks on workers' rights and consumer protections, and it means trying to deny the right to vote to millions of eligible citizens while, at the same time, letting corporations spend as much as it takes to keep Republicans in power.

Business as usual for Republicans is a raw deal for the rest of us, and the American people are sick and tired of the raw deal that they have been getting. Democrats know that. We share their frustration. We know that Congress can do better. We know that we need to clean up Washington and get a better deal for our democracy.

Democrats are committed to delivering real reforms to our political system that will restore government by and for the people of this great country, and that starts with fixing the way campaigns are run in America. We need to break the stranglehold that secret corporate spending has on our elections, and we have a chance to do it right now.

If we defeat the previous question, we will have a chance to vote on the DISCLOSE Act, one of the key elements of delivering a better deal for our democracy.

The DISCLOSE Act, which I have introduced, along with 162 cosponsors in this Chamber, will shine a light on the unlimited secret corporate spending that has flooded American elections in recent years.

The DISCLOSE Act is simple. It requires that organizations that spend money in Federal elections have to disclose their donors. It closes one of the biggest loopholes that the Citizens United ruling opened, namely, that corporations, billionaires, and even foreign governments can secretly funnel hundreds of millions of dollars into 501(c)(4)s in order to covertly influence our campaigns.

This is a huge problem. From 2004 to 2016, secret political spending in our Presidential elections increased by over 3,000 percent. Special counsel Robert Mueller is even reportedly investigating right now whether Vladimir Putin's regime in Russia secretly funneled money through the NRA to help elect Donald Trump.

And closer to home for all of us, just a few weeks ago, Speaker RYAN's political fundraising group, the American Action Network, reported receiving a single $24.6 million contribution from an anonymous donor. I don't know who gave the American Action Network that money. You don't know who gave them that money. But I have a feeling that whoever did is expecting something in return.

It is no secret that the American people have lost faith in this institution and in their government. They look to Washington and they see a ruling party that will do whatever it takes to help their friends on Wall Street get ahead, but they won't lift a finger for folks who are struggling to get by.

It doesn't have to be this way. We can restore the faith that has been lost in this institution and in our government. We can build a government that is worthy of the people we serve. We can end the rule of big money and begin a new era where working people get all the seats at the table.

If we want to do that, the first thing we need to do is to make sure that political spending happens out in the open and not in total secret.

Let's defeat the previous question. Let's have a real debate about fixing what is wrong in Washington, and start by passing the DISCLOSE Act to shine some light on dark money in our politics.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, we are here today to talk about the fisheries of America. If the folks on the other side of the aisle want to address the issue that they just referenced, then I am sure they could foreswear taking any corporate contributions, any anonymous contributions to their accounts for themselves. So they could lead by their example, and I look forward to seeing them do that.

Mr. Speaker, we are here today to talk about the fisheries of America, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, when we defeat the previous question, I will offer Mr. CICILLINE's amendment for the DISCLOSE Act. That is why we are talking about that bill today.

The DISCLOSE Act is an alternative to this job-destroying bill and anticonsumer bill that we have before us. So I would encourage my colleagues to defeat the previous question so we can shine a light on the dark money that continues to pervade and pollute and distort our political system. I would hope that that is something we can agree on.

I hope my Republican and Democratic friends will vote to defeat the previous question because it doesn't matter what one's ideology is. What matters is there should be transparency in money in politics, and that is a basic tenet that I hope conservatives and liberals and moderates can agree on, and we can immediately move to that. When we defeat the previous question, I will offer that amendment based on the bill by Mr. CICILLINE, which I am honored to be a cosponsor of.

Mr. Speaker, this is the third attempt to undermine the provisions of the Magnuson-Stevens Act that protects jobs and uses science in decisionmaking with regard to managing our ocean resources. These attempts failed every time, and the biggest reason they failed is the framework of Magnuson is working.

We talked about the increase in boat sales. We talked about the increase in jobs. We talked about the benefit to consumers. I am sure there is some fine tuning to do, but it is not time to push the reset button and start over down a very dangerous path that would destroy jobs and the entire economies of many of our local communities.

This act has been essential, the Magnuson-Stevens Act, in restoring our depleted fishing populations, helping communities devastated by overfishing, getting them back in balance. Science-based reforms over the last two decades have made our fisheries more profitable and rebuilt overfished stocks and have been of great benefit to consumers. These reforms have directly benefited recreational fishing interests, and that is reinforced by their own data of the industry.

So if we continue down the path of sustainable fisheries management, commercial and recreational fishermen will see even greater financial gains and support in the future. In fact, NOAA estimates that fully rebuilt fisheries would add $31 billion to our economy and create 500,000 new jobs.

We need a benchmark and a path to get there, not a pathway to the past of unsustainable practices and job destruction, which this bill does.

These potential jobs and revenues—$31 billion, 500,000 jobs—would support thousands of coastal communities throughout America, consumers across our country and the world, far outweighing any short-term benefit from an empty oceans act.

Only through science-based fisheries management can coastal towns and cities reap enormous environmental benefits. So, instead of throwing it away, we should build upon the proven sustainable fisheries management practices of Magnuson-Stevens in a bipartisan way. Unfortunately, this bill halts decades of progress, ends the science-based approach.

Rather than approving harmful and damaging measures to weaken our economy and harm the environment, let's start again and begin a true bipartisan reauthorization, as this Congress did in 1996, as this Congress did in 2006, to reauthorize the Magnuson-Stevens Act.

I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question so we can move forward with our discussion of requiring that donations into political campaigns and allied groups have to be disclosed and to also vote ''no'' on the rule so that we begin work on a bipartisan reauthorization of Magnuson-Stevens, building upon the tradition of this institution and putting science in the front.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's remarks. There are bipartisan cosponsors to this bill. This is a bipartisan bill.

What is this bill really about? It is about freedom. It is about the freedom of the American people to be able to use their own waters, to fish in their own waters, something the American people have done since before we were a nation.

There is a really great book that just came out that won the Pulitzer Prize called ''The Gulf,'' about the Gulf of Mexico. It recounts the history of our area and how long we have been fishing in the Gulf of Mexico and what it has meant for generations upon generations of both commercial and recreational fishermen.

I have commercial fisherpeople in my family, and they are wonderful people, have a great business. It is important to them and it is their way of life. We need to make sure we do everything to preserve that way of life.

I am a recreational fisherman, and we have been doing it in my family for generations, and I want to preserve that as well.

My grandfather was one of the founders of the Alabama Deep Sea Fishing Rodeo, one of the oldest and largest fishing tournaments in the United States of America. It is really great to see, summer after summer, generations of people who have been fishing in that tournament, literally for three or four or five generations, come down there on Dauphin Island and bring the fish that they catch, so proud of what they have done.

And what have they just done? They have gone out in their own boat at their own expense, spent a day in the open air on a beautiful summer day, or maybe 2 or 3 days, and got some time to spend time together as a family, with friends, and do something Americans have been able to do without the Federal Government trying to tell them how to do it for a couple, 300 years.

It is time for us to restore back to the American people the control of their waters. That is what this bill does. Mr. Speaker, I again urge my colleagues to support H. Res. 965 and the underlying bill.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 965 OFFERED BY MR. POLIS

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 2. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 6239) to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide for additional disclosure requirements for corporations, labor organizations, Super PACs and other entities, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided among and controlled by the respective chairs and ranking minority members of the Committees on House Administration, Ways and Means, Financial Services, and Oversight and Government Reform. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 3. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 6239.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308–311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as ''a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge.'' To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that ''the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition'' in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R–Illinois) said: ''The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition.''

The Republican majority may say ''the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever.'' But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: ''Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment.''

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled ''Amending Special Rules'' states: ''a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate.'' (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: ''Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon.''

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on:

Adoption of the resolution, if ordered;

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 985; and

Adoption of House Resolution 985, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 225, nays 186, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 316]

YEAS—225

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bost
Brady (TX)
Brat
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cloud
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Curtis
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Emmer
Estes (KS)
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frelinghuysen
Gaetz
Garrett
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Handel
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lesko
Lewis (MN)
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Newhouse
Noem
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Russell
Rutherford
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NAYS—186

Adams
Aguilar
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Courtney
Crist
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Engel
Eshoo
Espaillat
Esty (CT)
Evans
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham, M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Smith (WA)
Soto
Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—17

Amodei
Blum
Cheney
Costa
Ellison
Gallagher
Hanabusa
Harper
Jenkins (KS)
Messer
Napolitano
Perlmutter
Rush
Shuster
Speier
Walz
Weber (TX)

□ 1408

Messrs. CAPUANO and DEFAZIO changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. BILIRAKIS changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 227, noes 184, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 317]

AYES—227

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bost
Brady (TX)
Brat
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cloud
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Curtis
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Emmer
Estes (KS)
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frelinghuysen
Gaetz
Garrett
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Handel
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lesko
Lewis (MN)
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Newhouse
Noem
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Russell
Rutherford
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NOES—184

Adams	Gabbard	Murphy (FL)
Aguilar	Gallego	Nadler
Barragán	Garamendi	Neal
Bass	Gomez	Nolan
Beatty	Gonzalez (TX)	Norcross
Bera	Gottheimer	O'Halleran
Beyer	Green, Al	O'Rourke
Bishop (GA)	Green, Gene	Pallone
Blumenauer	Grijalva	Panetta
Blunt Rochester	Gutiérrez	Pascrell
Bonamici	Hastings	Payne
Boyle, Brendan F.	Heck	Pelosi
	Higgins (NY)	Peters
Brady (PA)	Himes	Peterson
Brown (MD)	Hoyer	Pingree
Brownley (CA)	Huffman	Pocan
Bustos	Jackson Lee	Polis
Butterfield	Jayapal	Price (NC)
Capuano	Jeffries	Quigley
Carbajal	Johnson (GA)	Raskin
Cárdenas	Johnson, E. B.	Rice (NY)
Carson (IN)	Kaptur	Richmond
Cartwright	Keating	Rosen
Castor (FL)	Kelly (IL)	Roybal-Allard
Castro (TX)	Kennedy	Ruiz
Chu, Judy	Khanna	Ruppersberger
Cicilline	Kihuen	Ryan (OH)
Clark (MA)	Kildee	Sánchez
Clarke (NY)	Kilmer	Sarbanes
Clay	Kind	Schakowsky
Cleaver	Krishnamoorthi	Schiff
Clyburn	Kuster (NH)	Schneider
Cohen	Lamb	Schrader
Connolly	Langevin	Scott (VA)
Cooper	Larsen (WA)	Serrano
Correa	Larson (CT)	Sewell (AL)
Courtney	Lawrence	Shea-Porter
Crist	Lawson (FL)	Sherman
Crowley	Lee	Sinema
Cuellar	Levin	Sires
Cummings	Lewis (GA)	Smith (WA)
Davis (CA)	Lieu, Ted	Soto
Davis, Danny	Lipinski	Suozzi
DeFazio	Loebsack	Swalwell (CA)
DeGette	Lofgren	Takano
Delaney	Lowenthal	Thompson (CA)
DeLauro	Lowey	Thompson (MS)
DelBene	Lujan Grisham, M.	Titus
Demings		Tonko
DeSaulnier	Luján, Ben Ray	Torres
Deutch	Lynch	Tsongas
Dingell	Maloney, Carolyn B.	Vargas
Doggett		Veasey
Doyle, Michael F.	Maloney, Sean	Vela
	Matsui	Velázquez
Engel	McCollum	Visclosky
Eshoo	McEachin	Wasserman Schultz
Espaillat	McGovern	
Esty (CT)	McNerney	Waters, Maxine
Evans	Meeks	Watson Coleman
Foster	Meng	Welch
Frankel (FL)	Moore	Wilson (FL)
Fudge	Moulton	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—17

Blum	Harper	Scott, David
Cheney	Jenkins (KS)	Shuster
Costa	Messer	Speier
Ellison	Napolitano	Walz
Gallagher	Perlmutter	Weber (TX)
Hanabusa	Rush	

□ 1418

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOMENT OF SILENCE FOR CAPITAL GAZETTE SHOOTING VICTIMS

(Mr. BROWN of Maryland asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, June 28, a gunman targeted a cherished community newspaper and our Nation's free press, killing five people.

The Capital Gazette is one of our Nation's oldest newspapers, having served Maryland's capital city of Annapolis for 291 years. In fact, it was one of the first newspapers to publish the Declaration of Independence, although it appeared on page 2 because local news always took precedence.

The Annapolis community, which Congressman SARBANES and I have the privilege of representing, is a tight-knit community. The men and women lost in this horrific attack were friends, neighbors, and extended family members.

We rise to honor the lives of:

Rebecca Smith, who was quiet but had a ''big heart'' and described herself as a ''bonus mom to the best kid ever'';

John McNamara, who went by Mac, who loved covering sports as much as playing them;

Gerald Fischman, the consummate newspaperman working 12 hours a day or more, who editorialized about gun violence and became a victim of it;

Rob Hiaasen, a giant in stature and in character, who generously mentored young journalists; and

Wendi Winters, a prolific writer, mother of three Navy officers, and an American hero who charged at the gunman and saved lives.

Those who were senselessly gunned down were members of our valued local press cops. In America, we cherish and value our free and independent press. It is a crucial pillar of our democracy. We should not tolerate threats and hatred directed at the media and should support those who bring us the news every day.

Today, we also honor the brave and swift action by first responders who were on the scene within 1 minute of 911 calls.

Today, we honor the enduring courage of the Capital Gazette staff. Their dedication and service to their readers and their commitment to a vibrant, free press are a tribute to their profession and professionalism and to the resilience of the Annapolis community.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask the House to pause for a moment of silence to honor Rebecca, John, Gerald, Rob, Wendi, and all those impacted by the shooting at the Capital Gazette.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would ask all those in the Chamber to rise for a moment of silence.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 50, UNFUNDED MANDATES INFORMATION AND TRANSPARENCY ACT OF 2017, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3281, RECLAMATION TITLE TRANSFER AND NON-FEDERAL INFRASTRUCTURE INCENTIVIZATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 985) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 50) to provide for additional safeguards with respect to imposing Federal mandates, and for other purposes, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3281) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to facilitate the transfer to non-Federal ownership of appropriate reclamation projects or facilities, 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.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 228, nays 184, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 318]

YEAS—228

Abraham	Gaetz	McKinley
Aderholt	Garrett	McMorris Rodgers
Allen	Gianforte	
Amash	Gibbs	McSally
Amodei	Gohmert	Meadows
Arrington	Goodlatte	Messer
Babin	Gosar	Mitchell
Bacon	Gowdy	Moolenaar
Banks (IN)	Granger	Mooney (WV)
Barletta	Graves (GA)	Mullin
Barr	Graves (LA)	Newhouse
Barton	Graves (MO)	Noem
Bergman	Griffith	Norman
Biggs	Grothman	Nunes
Bilirakis	Guthrie	Olson
Bishop (MI)	Handel	Palazzo
Bishop (UT)	Harris	Palmer
Black	Hartzler	Paulsen
Blackburn	Hensarling	Pearce
Bost	Herrera Beutler	Perry
Brady (TX)	Hice, Jody B.	Pittenger
Brat	Higgins (LA)	Poe (TX)
Brooks (AL)	Hill	Poliquin
Brooks (IN)	Holding	Posey
Buchanan	Hollingsworth	Ratcliffe
Buck	Hudson	Reed
Bucshon	Huizenga	Reichert
Budd	Hultgren	Renacci
Burgess	Hunter	Rice (SC)
Byrne	Hurd	Roby
Calvert	Issa	Roe (TN)
Carter (GA)	Jenkins (WV)	Rogers (AL)
Carter (TX)	Johnson (LA)	Rogers (KY)
Chabot	Johnson (OH)	Rohrabacher
Cloud	Johnson, Sam	Rokita
Coffman	Jones	Rooney, Francis
Cole	Jordan	Rooney, Thomas J.
Collins (GA)	Joyce (OH)	
Collins (NY)	Katko	Ros-Lehtinen
Comer	Kelly (MS)	Roskam
Comstock	Kelly (PA)	Ross
Conaway	King (IA)	Rothfus
Cook	King (NY)	Rouzer
Costello (PA)	Kinzinger	Royce (CA)
Cramer	Knight	Russell
Crawford	Kustoff (TN)	Rutherford
Culberson	Labrador	Sanford
Curbelo (FL)	LaHood	Scalise
Curtis	LaMalfa	Schweikert
Davidson	Lamborn	Scott, Austin
Davis, Rodney	Lance	Sensenbrenner
Denham	Latta	Sessions
DeSantis	Lesko	Shimkus
DesJarlais	Lewis (MN)	Simpson
Diaz-Balart	LoBiondo	Smith (MO)
Donovan	Long	Smith (NE)
Duffy	Loudermilk	Smith (NJ)
Duncan (SC)	Love	Smith (TX)
Duncan (TN)	Lucas	Smucker
Dunn	Luetkemeyer	Stefanik
Emmer	MacArthur	Stewart
Estes (KS)	Marchant	Stivers
Faso	Marino	Taylor
Ferguson	Marshall	Tenney
Fitzpatrick	Massie	Thompson (PA)
Fleischmann	Mast	Thornberry
Flores	McCarthy	Tipton
Fortenberry	McCaul	Trott
Foxx	McClintock	Turner
Frelinghuysen	McHenry	Upton

Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NAYS—184

Adams
Aguilar
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Courtney
Crist
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Engel
Eshoo
Espaillat
Esty (CT)
Evans
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham, M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Smith (WA)
Soto
Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—16

Blum
Cheney
Costa
Ellison
Gallagher
Hanabusa
Harper
Jenkins (KS)
Napolitano
Perlmutter
Rush
Serrano
Shuster
Speier
Walz
Weber (TX)

□ 1430

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 229, noes 183, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 319]

AYES—229

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bost
Brady (TX)
Brat
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cloud
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Curtis
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Emmer
Estes (KS)
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frelinghuysen
Gaetz
Garrett
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Handel
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lesko
Lewis (MN)
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Newhouse
Noem
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Russell
Rutherford
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NOES—183

Adams
Aguilar
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Courtney
Crist
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Engel
Eshoo
Espaillat
Esty (CT)
Evans
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham, M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Smith (WA)
Soto
Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—16

Blum
Cheney
Costa
Ellison
Gallagher
Hanabusa
Harper
Jenkins (KS)
Lewis (GA)
Napolitano
Perlmutter
Ruppersberger
Rush
Shuster
Speier
Walz

□ 1437

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION FOR MEMBER TO BE CONSIDERED AS FIRST SPONSOR OF H.R. 1898

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may hereafter be considered to be the first sponsor of H.R. 1898, a bill originally introduced by Representative Meehan of Pennsylvania, for the purposes of adding cosponsors and requesting reprintings pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOST). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE COUNTRIES OF EASTERN EUROPE AND THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the

Committee on Foreign Affairs be discharged from further consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 256) expressing support for the countries of Eastern Europe and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, reserving my right to object, although I don't intend to object, I want to, first of all, thank the chairman for bringing this resolution to the floor.

The Foreign Affairs Committee marked up this resolution awhile back. It passed unanimously, and we were under the impression that it might come up for debate on Tuesday under suspension. That is what should have happened.

Members should have had the opportunity to debate this in the House before the NATO summit meeting began this morning, and sent a clear message that this body stands with NATO, that we support this alliance, the most successful in history, that our allies can count on American leadership and American resolve.

Instead, we are rushing it through today, after the summit is halfway over and after President Trump has again insulted our closest friends on the global stage.

This is an important resolution. It should not be swept under the rug because it is important that this body stand up for NATO, even if we are late to the game.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The reservation is withdrawn.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 256

Whereas the United States has shown strong commitment to the independence, sovereignty, territorial integrity, and democratic development of the countries that emerged from the ashes of the former Soviet Union and the communist bloc it once dominated;

Whereas many of these countries have, during the past three decades, undertaken the considerable political and economic reforms necessary to achieve the aspirations for European and Euro-Atlantic integration, or are continuing to do so;

Whereas the incorporation of Eastern European countries into the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) has contributed toward a vision of Europe that is aimed at promoting stability and cooperation, at building a Europe whole and free, united in peace, democracy and common values;

Whereas the mission of NATO since its founding in 1949 is to promote democratic values, cooperation on defense and security issues, and the peaceful resolution of disputes;

Whereas NATO remains the most important and critical security link between the United States and Europe;

Whereas NATO allies and partners in Central and Eastern Europe, including countries of the Western Balkans, and the former Soviet Union have stood alongside the United States in joint peace operations in the Western Balkans, Afghanistan, Iraq, and elsewhere around the globe;

Whereas Russia's aggressive actions against neighboring members of the NATO Alliance and nearby NATO partner countries, including its many violations of Baltic airspace, occupation of Georgian territory in 2008, annexation of Crimea in 2014, and continued threats to Moldovan territorial integrity and sovereignty, not only violate its commitments under the Helsinki Final Act and subsequent Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) agreements but are also key contributors to Europe's instability;

Whereas NATO reaffirmed its military security commitment to the Baltic States in response to increased Russian military activities;

Whereas NATO allies increased their assistance to NATO partner countries by endorsing the Substantial NATO–Georgia Package in support of Georgia at the Wales Summit, the Comprehensive Assistance Package in support of Ukraine at the Warsaw Summit, and developed a phased Defense and Related Security Capacity Building package in support of Moldova;

Whereas the European Reassurance Initiative represents the United States commitment to enduring peace, stability, and territorial integrity in Europe as members and partners of the NATO Alliance;

Whereas British Prime Minister Theresa May stated, ''On defense and security cooperation, we're united in our recognition of NATO as the bulwark of our collective defense and we reaffirmed our unshakeable commitment to this alliance. We're 100% behind NATO.'';

Whereas Estonian President Kersti Kaljulaid stated, ''Our NATO allies can rely on us to act as agreed in recent summits in Chicago, Wales and Warsaw, our UN partners have appreciated and respected our role in peacekeeping operations and our European partners know that Estonia is a reliable partner when there is a crisis'' and Estonian Prime Minister Jüri Ratas stated, ''Our commitment to NATO is steadfast.'';

Whereas Latvian President Raimonds Vējonis stated, ''We [Latvia] continue increasing our defense spending consistently on our own, and our allies appreciate that. A historic decision on deployment of four multinational battalions in the Baltic States and Poland was made at the NATO Summit in Warsaw this summer. This is by far the most serious proof of NATO's readiness to defend independence of the Eastern European countries, including Latvia.'';

Whereas Czech Republic Prime Minster Bohuslav Sobotka stated, ''NATO is the basis for our security'' and that he hopes ''the United States will remain a solid NATO partner.''; and

Whereas the United States must remain committed to our NATO allies in the face of any aggression irrespective of their ability to meet the NATO benchmark of spending: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) condemns any threat to the sovereignty, territorial integrity, freedom and democracy of the Baltic States;

(2) condemns the clear, gross, and uncorrected ongoing violation of the Helsinki principles by the Russian Federation with respect to the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Ukraine;

(3) supports keeping United States sanctions imposed against Russia relating to Crimea in effect until Ukraine's sovereignty over Crimea has been restored, as well as sanctions relating to the Donbas until the Minsk agreements are fully implemented;

(4) considers it essential for the United States to maintain and increase political, economic, and security support for the countries of Central and Eastern Europe;

(5) appreciates the spirit of friendship of the countries of Central and Eastern Europe, including those of the Western Balkans, their commitment to collective security, and their contributions, past and present, to peace operations around the globe;

(6) supports keeping the door to NATO membership open to those countries that are eligible to join the Alliance and meet all the necessary requirements for membership;

(7) supports and encourages the democratic aspirations of the people of all countries concerned, including Ukraine, Georgia, and Moldova; and

(8) calls for continued support to the United States European Reassurance Initiative.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROYCE OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment to the text at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike all after resolving clause and insert the following:

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) affirms the United States enduring commitment to and friendship with its NATO allies;

(2) pledges that the United States will continue to maintain strong leadership and strengthen its commitments to NATO;

(3) condemns any threat to the sovereignty, territorial integrity, freedom and democracy of NATO allies;

(4) condemns the clear, gross, and uncorrected ongoing violation of the Helsinki principles by Russia with respect to the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Ukraine;

(5) supports keeping United States sanctions imposed against Russia relating to Crimea in effect until Ukraine's sovereignty over Crimea has been restored, as well as sanctions relating to the Donbas until the Minsk agreements are fully implemented;

(6) considers it essential for the United States to maintain and increase political, economic, and security support for the countries of Central and Eastern Europe;

(7) appreciates the spirit of friendship of the countries of Central and Eastern Europe, including those of the Western Balkans, their commitment to collective security, and their contributions, past and present, to peace operations around the globe;

(8) calls for the United States to continue to support the countries of Central and Eastern Europe to secure their electoral processes from foreign threats;

(9) supports and encourages the democratic aspirations of the people of all countries concerned, including Ukraine, Georgia, and Moldova;

(10) encourages the countries of Europe to continue to invest in the individual, regional, and collective defense;

(11) calls on all NATO allies whose current proportion of gross domestic product spent on defense is below the 2 percent guideline to meet that guideline;

(12) honors the men and women who served under NATO and gave their lives to promote peace, security, and international cooperation since 1949; and

(13) calls for continued support to the United States' European Deterrence Initiative.

Mr. ROYCE of California (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

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

There was no objection.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

AMENDMENT TO THE PREAMBLE OFFERED BY MR. ROYCE OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. ROYCE of California. I have an amendment to the preamble at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike the preamble and insert the following:

Whereas the United States has shown strong commitment to the independence, sovereignty, territorial integrity, and democratic development of the countries that emerged from the ashes of the former Soviet Union and the communist bloc it once dominated;

Whereas many of these countries have, during the past three decades, undertaken the extensive political and economic reforms necessary to achieve their aspirations for European and Euro-Atlantic integration, or are continuing to do so;

Whereas the incorporation of Central and Eastern European countries into the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) has contributed to a vision of Europe that is whole and free and united in peace, democracy, and common values;

Whereas the mission of NATO since its founding in 1949 is to defend its members from aggression, enhance cooperation on defense and security issues, and promote the peaceful resolution of disputes;

Whereas NATO remains the most important and critical security link between the United States and Europe;

Whereas on November 16, 2016, former President Barack Obama stated, ''NATO, the world's greatest alliance, is as strong and as ready as it's ever been and I am confident that just as America's commitment to the transatlantic alliance has endured for seven decades—whether it's been under a Democratic or Republican administration—that commitment will continue, including our pledge and our treaty obligation to defend every ally.'';

Whereas on July 6, 2017, President Donald J. Trump reiterated the United States' support of NATO by saying, ''To those who would criticize our tough stance, I would point out that the United States has demonstrated not merely with words but with its actions that we stand firmly behind Article 5, the mutual defense commitment.'';

Whereas NATO allies and partners in Central and Eastern Europe, including countries of the Western Balkans, and the former Soviet Union have stood alongside the United States in joint peace operations in the Western Balkans, Afghanistan, Iraq, and elsewhere around the globe;

Whereas NATO established the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council to promote, among other priorities, counter-terrorism, non-proliferation, and crisis management cooperation as well as advancing values, including respect of international law and peaceful resolution of disputes;

Whereas Russia's aggressive actions against members of the NATO Alliance and nearby NATO partner countries, including its many violations of Baltic airspace, occupation of Georgian territory in 2008, illegal occupation of Crimea since 2014, and continued threats to Moldovan territorial integrity and sovereignty, not only violate its commitments under the Helsinki Final Act and subsequent Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) agreements but also foment instability in Europe;

Whereas NATO allies increased their assistance to NATO partner countries by endorsing the Substantial NATO–Georgia Package in support of Georgia at the Wales Summit, the Comprehensive Assistance Package in support of Ukraine at the Warsaw Summit, and developed a phased Defense and Related Security Capacity Building package in support of Moldova;

Whereas the European Deterrence Initiative represents the United States commitment to enduring peace, stability, and territorial integrity in Europe as members and partners of the NATO Alliance;

Whereas from September 14 through September 20, 2017, Russia held a large-scale military exercise in Belarus known as Zapad 2017;

Whereas the last Zapad exercise was in 2013 which laid the foundations for Russia's 2014 annexation of Crimea;

Whereas NATO Secretary-General Jens Stoltenberg expressed concerns about Russia's lack of transparency regarding military exercises;

Whereas Secretary-General Stoltenberg also stated, ''Russia is our neighbor....We don't want to isolate Russia; we don't want a new Cold War.'';

Whereas the Chief of the General Staff of the Armed Forces of Russia, Valery Gerasimov, wrote in 2013 that ''informational conflict'' is a key part of war;

Whereas Baltic and NATO officials believe that Russia was likely responsible for interruptions in Latvia's mobile communications network before the Zapad exercise;

Whereas three Baltic Russian-language news sites known collectively as Baltnews are secretly owned by Rossiya Segodnya, a news agency owned and operated by the Russian Government;

Whereas on June 28, 2017, Vesko Garcevic, Montenegro's ambassador to NATO from 2010 through 2014, testified before the Senate Intelligence Committee that Russia has provided support to extremist groups and even used the country's religious institutions to oppose closer ties to the Western world;

Whereas on April 4, 2018, Russia began a live-fire military exercise in the Baltic Sea, just outside of the territorial waters of NATO member countries, in a move a top Latvian defense official called a ''show of force'' just a day after Baltic leaders met with President Trump;

Whereas at the Wales Summit in 2014, all 28 members of the NATO alliance declared their intention to move towards a minimum security investment of 2 percent of their gross domestic product on defense within a decade;

Whereas on June 8, 2018, NATO Secretary-General Stoltenberg spoke of increases in defense investments by European allies, that ''Allies are making real progress on all aspects of burden sharing, cash, capabilities and contributions... But of course, we still have more work to do. Burden sharing will be a key theme of our Summit next month. And I expect all Allies to continue their efforts.''; and

Whereas the commitment to collective defense in Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty remains at the heart of the Alliance: Now, therefore, be it

Mr. ROYCE of California (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

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

There was no objection.

The amendment to the preamble was agreed to.

The title of the resolution was amended so as to read: ''A resolution expressing support for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the countries of Central and Eastern Europe.''.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Any record vote on the postponed question will be taken later.

□ 1445

CROOKED RIVER RANCH FIRE PROTECTION ACT

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2075) to adjust the eastern boundary of the Deschutes Canyon-Steelhead Falls Wilderness Study Area in the State of Oregon to facilitate fire prevention and response activities in order to protect adjacent private property, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2075

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 ''Crooked River Ranch Fire Protection Act''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) The Crooked River Ranch is an unincorporated community with a population of 5,000 residents.

(2) The current lands located adjacent to Crooked River Ranch are managed by the Bureau of Land Management and are classified as a Wilderness Study Area.

(3) There is currently only one entrance/exit to the Crooked River Ranch.

(4) Jefferson County and Crooked River Ranch have determined that the Wilderness Study Area lands are in the highest risk category for exposure to devastating wildfire due to overstocked juniper stands under the federally mandated and locally promulgated Jefferson County Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP).

(5) The current Wilderness Study Area classification prevents mechanical fire prevention activities within the overstocked juniper stands.

(6) Advancing this proposed legislation will greatly enhance the life and safety of people and property by reducing the extreme fire threat to these lands.

SEC. 3. BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT, DESCHUTES CANYON-STEELHEAD FALLS AND DESCHUTES CANYON WILDERNESS STUDY AREAS, OREGON.

(a) BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT REQUIRED.—The Secretary of the Interior shall adjust the eastern boundary of the Deschutes Canyon-Steelhead Falls Wilderness Study Area and the Deschutes Canyon Wilderness Study Area in the State of Oregon to exclude approximately 832 acres, as depicted on the map entitled ''Deschutes Canyon-Steelhead Falls Wilderness Study Area'' and dated April 6, 2017, in order to facilitate fire prevention and response activities on the excluded public lands and adjacent private property.

(b) EFFECT OF EXCLUSION.—Effective on the date of the enactment of this Act, the public lands to be excluded from the Deschutes Canyon-Steelhead Falls Wilderness Study Area and the Deschutes Canyon Wilderness Study Area pursuant to subsection (a) are no longer subject to section 603(c) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1782(c)).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, Crooked River Ranch is a residential community that is home to approximately 5,500 people. It is located between the Deschutes and Crooked Rivers in Jefferson County, Oregon. Because of this geography, there is only one all-weather road in and out of Crooked River Ranch.

Now, right next to this community, along the Deschutes River, is a roughly 3,200-acre Deschutes Canyon-Steelhead Falls Wilderness Study Area, which is managed—or, more accurately, is mismanaged—by the Bureau of Land Management. This BLM property is thick with vegetation, which poses a very real risk for catastrophic wildfires, in large part because the wilderness study area regulations greatly restrict essential measures for both fire mitigation and firefighting.

For example, in a wilderness or wilderness study area, you can't use mechanized or motorized equipment or transport. This includes chainsaws as well as electrical generators, trucks, and larger equipment essential to fuels management. You can't even use this equipment to cut fire breaks. You can't build fire roads. You can't do mechanical thinning of vegetation. Even the hand thinning that is allowed in such areas is very limited.

Absent a waiver from the Secretary of the Interior, firefighters can't drop fire retardant or use bulldozers to cut fire breaks in the wilderness study area during a fire. Tragically, the benign neglect mandated by these requirements has made all wilderness areas firetraps just waiting for a lighting flash or a careless match.

H.R. 2075, authored by Congressman GREG WALDEN, with the support of the local community, would slightly modify the eastern boundary of the Deschutes Canyon-Steelhead Falls Wilderness Study Area, making it possible to manage the land properly to reduce fuel loads that threaten the neighborhoods in Crooked River Ranch.

The boundary change will reduce the WSA by about 830 acres, but this small change will promote public safety, allow for more efficient fuels treatments on the lands immediately adjacent to Crooked River Ranch, and give critically important flexibility to local firefighters should fire break out in that area.

This is an issue of public safety, and this bill will clearly help protect the lives and property of the thousands of Crooked River Ranch residents from wildfire.

I commend Congressman WALDEN for his work to provide a commonsense solution to a very real public safety concern. I urge adoption of the measure, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, the Crooked River Ranch Fire Protection Act removes 830 acres from the wilderness study area in central Oregon. The land is adjacent to a rural subdivision, and its removal from WSA will arguably make it easier for the local community and the BLM to plan wildfire mitigation projects.

While we take issue with the point that the WSA designation limits mechanical thinning and other necessary forest treatments, the area is not suitable for wilderness designation, and the release from the WSA makes sense.

However, we still have concerns with this bill, because it ignores the collaborative process that was trying to develop a comprehensive plan for the entire area. That plan would have led to lasting conservation gains by designating wilderness and would have done even more to protect the community from wildfire by creating special management areas adjacent to Crooked River Ranch. Unfortunately, the collaborative group stalled out after this legislation was introduced.

Only Congress can permanently change the status of a wilderness study area. Whenever we choose to make a permanent change, we have a responsibility to consider the whole picture and listen to all stakeholders.

While it is disappointing that we are unable to fulfill that commitment with this legislation, we understand the need to prioritize safety of the Crooked River Ranch residents.

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

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN), the author of this legislation and the elected representative of this threatened community.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman MCCLINTOCK and my friend from Arizona for their work on this, especially Chairman BISHOP as well. The Natural Resources Committee has been terrific to work with on this measure over a period of time.

The bill is really an important public safety measure. This is a life-and-death measure. There are more than 5,000 people who live in Crooked River Ranch. This is an unincorporated community in central Oregon. It is wedged between two river systems, river canyons.

You can see it here on this map. I want to point out the two rivers here. It is actually on a peninsula. It sits up. These are deep canyons. To the west over here is where the wilderness study area is that we are talking about. It is juniper. It is cheatgrass. It is sagebrush. These are the most volatile fuels you can have.

Unlike here on the East Coast, where in the summer you get thunderstorms and heavy rain with it, out in Oregon, we have humidity. We call it rain that stays in the ground. But in the summer, we don't get that. What we get is dry lightning and very little rain. When lightning strikes occur in that kind of vegetation, it explodes.

I have talked to the firefighters, and I will show you what happens when this happens. This the terrain. The overstocked juniper, you can see it over here. This is very volatile terrain. That is grasslands. As I say, there are all kinds of other volatile fuels in there.

This is at the highest risk category for exposure to catastrophic wildfire. The wildfire planning community protection plan calls it that in Jefferson County.

Fire season is already underway in central Oregon. In fact, wildfires have already burned 120,000 acres so far this year. It has just gotten started. By the way, that is the equivalent of burning about 2½ times the entire size of Washington, D.C.

So what does that look like? When fire gets into these junipers, they basically explode. It is very volatile. Jefferson County Sheriff Jim Adkins took this picture out of his rig of the Graham fire. This fire nearby—not right at Crooked River Ranch, but in the same county—burned a few weeks ago. It burned two homes. Altogether, it burned about 2,000 acres—2,000 acres—and a couple of homes before they could get in and get it out.

So what we are doing here with this legislation is removing 832 acres. That is it. Three-thousandths of 1 percent of all the WSAs in Oregon, three-thousandths of 1 percent of the acreage, 832 acres, we are saying that we are just going to take it back to the rim of the canyon, and, on that flat land, you can go in and thin out these junipers and get it back to where you can do fire management.

Now, when I have talked to the fire chiefs and crews there, they have told me: Look, in this community of 5,000, there is one road in and out.

If you have a fire that blows up like this out on the peninsula, out on the end, the fire chiefs basically said: If the conditions are wrong and there is wind, I am not going to put my firefighters' lives at risk, so we will probably not go in and fight that fire. We will just try and get people out.

Can you imagine, on a two-lane road, trying to evacuate more than 5,000 people with a monster fire breathing down your back? That is what we are trying to avoid here.

This WSA was determined in 1992 by the Bureau of Land Management and the Forest Service to not be suitable for inclusion as wilderness. They said: No, it doesn't meet the criteria. It should not be included.

But the way the Federal law works, once the agency decides to study one of these areas, all the restrictions come on the land. As you have heard from both sides of the aisle—well, at least our side of the aisle—that means that you can't go in and do mechanical thinning. You can't do the kind of work we need to do.

By the way, if there is a fire, it takes all kinds of permission to drop the retardant or to get in there with mechanical means.

All we are saying is, let's back that up 832 acres along the rim line, send people in, thin this back to where it is in balance and will not cause devastating wildfire to consume Crooked River Ranch. Let's look at what happens when that does occur.

You will remember this tragedy from my friend's home State in Santa Rosa, California. You don't think fires are monsters and killers and deadly? Look at what happened to this community, the homes and lives that were lost.

This is what we are trying to prevent from happening at Crooked River Ranch. With bipartisan support, the House is going to show its will today, and I think overwhelmingly, to say this is a measured, thoughtful piece of legislation with enormous support in the community and the county that will prevent a Santa Rosa from occurring at Crooked River Ranch.

Remember, there is one way in and one way out, and 5,500 people who live in this area.

I thank the gentleman from Alaska for his leadership on this. He and his staff have been terrific.

I thank my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. I know we have some differences about adding other things in. That can be dealt with, discussed at another time, but we have a serious and deadly threat staring us down every summer. We have fires already burning in the area.

If we want to save lives and prevent deadly fires, this is the bill to do it. This is the time to do it. Let's get it done.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the more than 5,000 residents of the Crooked River Ranch and in the name of common sense, I ask for passage of this vital public safety 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 California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2075, as amended.

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

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: ''A bill to adjust the eastern boundary of the Deschutes Canyon-Steelhead Falls and Deschutes Canyon Wilderness Study Areas in the State of Oregon to facilitate fire prevention and response activities to protect private property, and for other purposes.''.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Lasky, one of the clerks, announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H.R. 5895) ''An Act making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.'', disagreed to by the House and agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. SHELBY, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. DAINES, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. LEAHY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. SCHATZ, and Mr. MURPHY, be the conferees on the part of the Senate, with instructions.

STRENGTHENING FISHING COMMUNITIES AND INCREASING FLEXIBILITY IN FISHERIES MANAGEMENT ACT

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material in H.R. 200.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alaska?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 965 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 200.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. BOST) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1457

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 200) to amend the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act to provide flexibility for fishery managers and stability for fishermen, and for other purposes, with Mr. BOST in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alaska.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, today I rise in strong support of my legislation, H.R. 200, the Strengthening Fishing Communities and Increasing Flexibility in Fisheries Management Act.

Mr. Chairman, as one of the sponsors of the original bill way back in 1975, and I fought to secure enactment in 1976, I can say it is probably the most successful legislation that ever passed this House to create a sustainable yield of fisheries for the United States of America.

I first wrote what would become the Magnuson-Stevens Act, and it hasn't been reauthorized since 2006. For 6 years, I have worked with Members of this body on both sides of the aisle to improve this legislation.

I know some of my colleagues will say that I didn't do enough to ensure the act retains the strong bipartisan nature of the original bill. It is important to remember the legislative history. While it is true that the version of the Magnuson-Stevens Act that became law passed the House under suspension of the rules, the original bill passed the Natural Resources Committee after a long markup by a vote of 26–15, with only four Democrats voting in favor of the bill.

□ 1500

So this point that the previous reauthorizations were noncontroversial and nonpartisan is not true.

My legislation, H.R. 200, would make a number of improvements to the original act in order to ensure a proper balance between the biological needs of fish stocks and the economic needs of fishermen in coastal communities.

The legislation tailors Federal fishery authorities in order to give councils the proper tools and flexibility needed to effectively manage their fisheries, and will support a more robust domestic seafood industry and greater job creation across the country.

This legislation allows added flexibility for fishery managers to rebuild depleted fisheries, more transparency for fishermen in science and management, and a requirement for NOAA to provide better accountability on how fees are collected and used. It also authorizes appropriations for the act for 5 years.

I am proud to say my bill protects our commercial and recreational fishing interests, and will allow councils to do their job in a more streamlined and effective manner.

My bill would amend the Magnuson-Stevens Fisheries Conservation Act. It allows for regional management of fisheries. The law gives guidance through its national standards and creates the process that allows the councils to develop fishery management plans.

This legislation was written for fishermen to ensure they are able to catch sustainable yields of fish for the communities. It is critical for the protection of coastal communities and for allowing the stakeholders to be part of the management of the fisheries.

To address the ever-changing needs of fisheries and fishery communities, Congress has passed various amendments to this act. Changes were based on knowledge of the times gained through experience, improvements in science, and better management techniques.

In the mid-1990s, Congress addressed overfishing, included protections of habitat, improvements for fisheries science, and reductions in bycatch. These were the issues of the time, and they were addressed as needed. One of these problems also included the lack of resources to fund stock assessments to provide needed data to the regional fishery management councils, something that continues to be an issue today.

The act was last amended in 2007. Congress included measures that set science-based annual catch limits to prevent overfishing, including a requirement to end overfishing within 2 years. Accountability measures were adopted, which meant harvest reductions if harvest levels were exceeded.

Work to develop H.R. 200 began 6 years ago. The committee held over a dozen hearings, with testimony from over 100 witnesses. As with past reauthorizations, and in line with a main purpose of the act—to balance conservation with economic use of the resource—H.R. 200 takes a middle-of-the-road approach to fisheries management.

While some today may complain the bill's flexibility rolls back scientific protections, that statement is just not accurate. The flexibility in the bill is based on science. Rebuilding of fish stocks will be based on the biology of fish stock. Harvest levels will still be based on science and set at levels where overfishing will not occur. The regional councils will continue to follow recommendations of their science and statistical committee.

During every reauthorization cycle, the Magnuson-Stevens Act is updated to be closely in sync with current-day science, management techniques, and knowledge. As the fishermen, communities, councils, and fishery managers develop better techniques and learn lessons from implementing the law, Congress can take that knowledge to improve that law. Flexibility is a cornerstone of the law. The Magnuson-Stevens Act promotes regional flexibility that recognizes differing ocean conditions, variations in regional fisheries, different harvesting methods and management techniques, and distinct community impacts.

Again, I want to stress: this bill was written for fish and communities, not for the interest groups. I will not stand by and watch other interest groups hijack this piece of legislation, taking away the sustainable concept of our fisheries and the healthy concept of our fisheries and the healthy concept of our communities for other reasons and other causes.

While my name will be on the bill as the sponsor, we all know that bringing legislation to the floor is a group effort and we would not be here today talking about fish without the support of other members and a tremendous amount of hard work from staff. So I thank Chairman BISHOP and even Congressman HUFFMAN and his staff—I had to say that—the bill's cosponsors on both sides of the aisle; staff on the Natural Resources Committee, Lisa Pittman, Charles Park, Richie O'Connell, Bill Ball, and former staffer Dave Whaley; and members of my staff, Mike DeFilippis and Martha Newell.

Mr. Chairman, I have to remind people that when we had this bill passed originally, we were catching about, I would say, 2 percent of our fish, and after the passage of the Magnuson-Stevens Act, we are catching all but 1 percent and foreign countries are only catching 1 percent.

This is a good piece of legislation. It has worked in the past, and it will work better in the future.

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

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act is our country's most important fisheries law. Magnuson is the framework for governing fishing in Federal waters, which is big business in this country: The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration estimates that commercial and recreational fishing generates roughly $200 billion in economic value and supports 1.7 million jobs.

This significant economic impact depends on sustainable management of fish stocks and protecting the ocean ecosystems on which they depend. Now, the 1996 and 2006 reauthorizations of Magnuson moved us in that direction after decades of overfishing had led to the collapse of fisheries and devastation for fishing communities in many parts of the country.

Instead of building on that success, I am sad to say that H.R. 200, which many have called the empty oceans act, would roll back the important conservation and management standards that have helped us get to this point, that have helped end overfishing, and that have helped rebuild a record number of fish stocks. This attempt to return us to the bad old days of failed fishery management policy and overfishing that inevitably follows from loose standards should be seen as unacceptable to everyone who cares about sustainable fisheries.

Now, Magnuson, as has been said, has traditionally been a bipartisan effort. I have tried to work with Mr. YOUNG in good faith to find a path towards a bipartisan compromise, and I thank him for his efforts to get there. We came close. I am disappointed that we fell short.

But we need to be very clear that Democrats are opposing H.R. 200 not for partisan reasons, but for important policy grounds that, in the past, have never been partisan and should not be partisan today.

That is also why many fishery stakeholders oppose this bill in its current form. They don't want to see Magnuson's core conservation provisions undermined. That is why letters have been pouring in in opposition to this bill, because it does undermine the very heart of our country's flagship fisheries law.

We have heard, for example, from the Alaska Longline Fishermen's Association, Fishing Communities Coalition, Cape Cod Commercial Fishermen's Alliance, Seafood Harvesters of America, Maine Coast Fishermen's Association, Marine Fish Conservation Network, Northwest Guides and Anglers Association, Gulf of Mexico Reef Fish Shareholders' Alliance, Association of Northwest Steelheaders, Gulf Restoration Network, American Fly Fishing Tackle Association, and on and on, including hundreds of chefs, scientists, and recreational anglers, among others. In fact, the stack of letters that we have received is quite voluminous, as I have them right here.

The changes my Republican colleagues are proposing to Magnuson are irresponsible. I am disappointed that they are ignoring the concerns that have been expressed from so many stakeholders who are telling them to be more careful as we reauthorize this important bill. There is an old saying: If it ain't broke, don't fix it.

The bottom line with this Magnuson reauthorization is this: the law is working as intended. Reauthorization is important, but it shouldn't come at the expense of the law's core provisions that have made it so successful.

Mr. Chairman, I have offered an alternate amendment to reauthorize Magnuson. It contains constructive, bipartisan ideas on how to best manage our fisheries by allowing for flexibility and modernizing aspects of fisheries management, but doing so without undermining the core provisions of the law.

As an angler myself, who represents many commercial and recreational fishing interests in northern California, I strongly believe that there

needs to be a bipartisan path forward. I would still very much like to have meaningful discussions with my colleagues across the aisle to develop legislation in the spirit of previous bipartisan Magnuson reauthorizations, while leaving the core conservation and management provisions intact.

We can also make progress and do more to support recreational fishing interests. We should do that together, without sacrificing the science-based framework that is so important to the long-term sustainability of fisheries management.

Unfortunately, H.R. 200 falls short in this regard, and I must request that my colleagues vote ''no'' on the bill in its current form.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BABIN).

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Strengthening Fishing Communities and Increasing Flexibility in Fisheries Management Act.

Not only does this bill reauthorize the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act, which is long overdue, but it also updates the language of the act to put more power in the hands of local councils to manage their fisheries effectively. One-size-fits-all approaches rarely work, so I am proud to cosponsor this bill which allows local councils to tailor management plans to the needs of their regions.

Further, this bill would lift burdens of outdated, arbitrary scientific practices and data which limit the American people's access to affordable domestically caught fish. The seafood industry is economically booming and it is past time that we lift these restricting regulations and allow a win for not only the recreational fishermen, which I have been a lifelong proponent of and a participant, but also of our commercial fishermen, the American people will be a winner as well, so I urge a vote for this bill.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maine (Ms. PINGREE).

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague for his eloquent defense of our oceans, and also for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 200.

I represent the great State of Maine, with a rich maritime heritage, strong fisheries, and vibrant coastal communities that I am very proud to represent.

The hardworking men and women who earn their livings on or near the water in my State have been working for decades to follow the Magnuson-Stevens Act and Federal fishery policy. They are responsible stewards of our ocean resources. And while the current law could certainly be improved, it has been successful in allowing Mainers and others to support their families while restoring and preserving the health of their fisheries. They want to pass this maritime heritage on to the next generation, and I am afraid this bill would make that task even harder for them.

The bill before us today, therefore, is a big disappointment to me because it misses the opportunity to update the Magnuson-Stevens Act. By reauthorizing Magnuson, we could work in a bipartisan way to address the current needs of our fisheries and provide more flexibility. We could bring Federal policy further into the 21st century.

This bill is the wrong approach for addressing fishery management. It weakens rebuilding requirements, creates loopholes in some conservation efforts, and has the effect of decreasing accountability that has been put in place to prevent overfishing.

H.R. 200 undoes efforts that have been proven to work, while failing to address some significant challenges in our fisheries. It is a lost opportunity and a bill that I cannot support.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. HIGGINS), my good friend.

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 200, the Strengthening Fishing Communities and Increasing Flexibility in Fisheries Management Act. I am a cosponsor of this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, my State of Louisiana has a heavy presence of both commercial and recreational anglers, and they all know that reforms have been needed to our Federal fisheries data collection systems for decades.

In some cases, especially in relation to the red snapper fishery in the Gulf, rebuilding schedules, season lengths, and catch limits have been based off data models from the 1980s. Technology has come a long way since then, with universities and the Gulf States themselves utilizing new methods of data collection that are producing positive results that are at odds with the 1980s numbers that the Federal Government has been using.

This bill will go a long way in promoting a modern science-backed approach to management of our fisheries.

This reauthorization of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery and Conservation Management Act provides flexibility and stability that will promote economic expansion through enhanced public access and opportunity for recreational fishing in saltwater.

Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend and colleague, Congressman YOUNG, for introducing this bill, and I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support its passage.

□ 1515

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 200, the so-called Strengthening Fishing Communities and Increasing Flexibility in Fisheries Management Act, which would undermine the years of progress made in rebuilding fish stocks and setting effective catch limits under the Magnuson-Stevens Act.

My home State of Rhode Island is home to a vibrant fishing community that relies on healthy fish populations in order to make a living.

Traditionally, reauthorization of fisheries management programs through the Magnuson-Stevens Act has been done on a bipartisan basis with the goal of strengthening sustainable fisheries. However, this entirely partisan bill weakens critical tools, like annual catch limits, which ensure that fisheries remain full for years to come.

This bill will gut science-based management for fisheries, roll back development of effective fisheries management techniques, and reduce accountability for recreational fisheries.

H.R. 200 removes several species from science-based quotas which help ensure that catches are sustainable each year. Under this bill, hundreds of species of fish would no longer have catch limits, which would lead to drastic overfishing.

The bill also harms efforts to rebuild fish stocks by including loopholes which remove rebuilding timeframes from many fish stocks and would extend recovery timeframes for others, thereby endangering healthy stocks of fish available to fishing communities.

In the last week, I have heard from fishermen from all over my district, from Greenville to Portsmouth, who have reached out to my office to tell me that H.R. 200 will harm their way of life by threatening already depleted fish populations and increase the threat of overfishing.

The fishermen in my State need legislation that would build on time-tested tools to strengthen fisheries and prevent overfishing instead of this bill, which would set management programs back and weaken effective conservation tools.

I join with those fishermen in opposing this misguided approach to reauthorizing the Magnuson-Stevens Act. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote ''no'' on final passage.

Mr. Chairman, I again thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES).

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the dean of the House, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), the chairman emeritus, I think, for most committees in the Congress and many other great accomplishments for yielding time and for all the work on this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I find this whole debate interesting in that I have heard speaker after speaker come up on the other side of the aisle talking about the importance of their fisheries, talking about how this bill is going to ruin

resource management and sustainability of fisheries.

Mr. Chairman, I ask you to take a look at this poster right here, and I will also spout out just a few statistics.

Between my home State of Louisiana and the dean's home State of Alaska, I believe we have more than half of the commercial fisheries landings in the United States, and as demonstrated here, we have more than half of the recreational fishing in the United States.

I appreciate the concerns that are being raised, but I am not sure whom they are representing. We represent the recreational fishers. We have the largest commercial fishing industries in the United States.

What this bill does is this bill simply updates the science. It allows for updated science. It allows to build upon successful practices that have been carried out by States for coastal fisheries, for inland fisheries, allowing for better techniques, allowing for better science to ensure the sustainability of the fisheries.

Mr. Chairman, how rational is it that someone who represents Louisiana—and I also want to point to the comments that my colleague from Louisiana (Mr. HIGGINS) made a few minutes ago. We both represent the coast of Louisiana. How rational is it that the two of us and the gentleman who represents the entire State of Alaska would come out and advocate for policies that would undermine the sustainability of fisheries in two incredibly important industries in our State? That is completely nonsensical.

That is why, Mr. Chairman, this bill is bipartisan. It is why we have bipartisan support for this legislation by those who have cosponsored it. It is why the Congressional Sportsmen's Foundation; the National Coalition for Fishing Communities; the National Marine Manufacturers Association; the Theodore Roosevelt Conservation Partnership; the Coastal Conservation Association, or CCA; Guy Harvey Ocean Foundation; Florida Fish and Wildlife Commission; Center for Sport Fishing Policy; Freezer Longline Coalition; Mississippi State Legislature; Johnny Morris, who is the CEO of Bass Pro Shops; American Scallop Association; Garden State Seafood Association; West Coast Seafood Processors Association; Lund's Seafood; North Carolina Fisheries Association; Florida Keys Commercial Fishing Association; Gulf Coast Seafood Alliance; Southeastern Fisheries Association; and many, many others that have a genuine stake in the sustainability of our fisheries, some of the leaders in conservation in our fisheries, are supportive of this legislation.

So let me say it again, Mr. Chairman, this bill improves science. It uses updated science.

I am not going to point to the decades-long tenure of my friend, but I think the original legislation perhaps could use some updating, and so this updates the science, and it provides for more transparency in the science and allows for public participation. These are all good things that we need to be supporting.

I do appreciate the input by my friend from California on this legislation, and I do hope that we can work together to get this to a posture to where everyone is supportive; but I do think it is important to refocus the fact that we are the ones who represent the majority of this economic driver, the majority of these jobs around the country, and they are the ones that represent these families that, for generations, have fished recreationally and that we want to ensure can fish for generations to come.

Mr. Chairman, I also want to thank the gentleman from Alaska for including our Modern Fish Act, which I think helps to update some practices where there is increased demand for recreational and commercial fisheries and providing a little bit better balance there.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support of this important bill. It moves our science and transparency and public participation in the right direction. It is going to improve the sustainability of our fisheries, the jobs associated with recreational and commercial fisheries, and the economic activity that these sustainable fisheries support.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, while I certainly appreciate the size of the Louisiana and Alaska fisheries—and to some extent, I am jealous of some of the fishing opportunities that exist in those places. I have fished, myself, in Alaska, but Mr. GRAVES has yet to invite me to Louisiana for some fishing, and we hope to fix that going forward.

I don't want to leave the impression that the fishing industry and fishing communities in other parts of the country are not just as important. I also don't want to leave the impression that there is universal support for H.R. 200 even in Alaska and Louisiana. So we are going to have a little bit of a battle of the posters, Mr. Chairman.

This is a partial listing of the groups that oppose H.R. 200 in its current form. They oppose it for the reasons that I have mentioned. They consider it irresponsible to undermine the science-based catch limits and rebuilding framework that have been so critical to the success of this bill going forward, and they don't want to see us backslide into the era of loose regulations and overfishing that will inevitably follow. They have seen this movie before, and they know what happens when we undermine core conservation provisions.

So among the many groups and organizations listed in opposition, we certainly have the Alaska Long Line Fishermen's Association, over here, the Gulf Fishermen's Association, and the Gulf of Mexico Reef Fish Shareholders Alliance, among many, many others in opposition to H.R. 200.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from the State of Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL).

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 200, which, unfortunately, I believe, joining my colleagues, would undermine our ability to responsibly manage our fisheries and would ultimately harm our fishing industry in the United States.

Because of the Magnuson-Stevens Act and diligent science-based fisheries management, the United States is viewed as an international leader in the industry.

In my district, since 2000, more than 40 overfished stocks have bounced back not by luck, Mr. Chairman, but because of commonsense regulations that were put in place by the MSA.

The industry has put an emphasis on setting catch limits and rehabilitating these stocks to ensure that the industry can continue to thrive for generations to come. Since 2010, when just 28 of those 40 stocks had been rebuilt, we saw a 54 percent increase in commercial gross revenues, which is income that goes directly back into our communities.

In 2015, commercial fishing in my home State of Washington brought in $1.7 billion, which was lower than some previous years because of those very ongoing overfishing challenges in our oceans, especially in the Pacific Northwest. These rollbacks that are proposed in this bill would make things worse.

Locally, we are focused on increasing revenues by maintaining healthy stocks and healthy oceans. We can grow opportunities for future generations while also protecting our environment and strengthening our economy.

I am so proud to be from the State of Washington, the State that elected Warren Magnuson to this body, and of the fact that the Magnuson-Stevens Act has demonstrated broad bipartisan support as well as support, as my colleagues said, from the fishing industry, environmentalists, scientists, chefs, and business owners. It is our responsibility, Mr. Chairman, to continue to build on those successes, and we can do that today by voting ''no'' on H.R. 200.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN).

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank Chairman YOUNG, the dean of the House, for his efforts on this.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 200, the Strengthening Fishing Communities and Increasing Flexibility in Fisheries Management Act.

As chairman of the Congressional Sportsmen's Caucus and an avid recreational angler, I am proud to be a cosponsor of this bipartisan effort to provide much-needed reform to our Nation's fisheries management.

Mr. Chairman, I would ask the speakers that have gone before me on the

other side of the aisle if any of them fish or are they a member of the Congressional Sportsmen's Caucus. Have they taken the opportunity to educate themselves on the fishery issues that we are facing today?

Generations of folks have enjoyed one of America's greatest pastimes in our coastal waters. Unfortunately, antiquated Federal policies have unnecessarily limited the public's access to abundant marine fisheries.

Commercial and recreational fishing are different activities that require different management strategies. The Magnuson-Stevens Act has lacked the tools necessary to address the needs of recreational fisheries management. H.R. 200 provides an opportunity to recognize the alternative management approach in the Nation's principal fisheries law to the benefit of 11 million saltwater anglers.

Despite what some have said, H.R. 200 does not roll back conservation but, instead, provides Federal fishery managers with the tools to effectively manage both recreational and commercial fisheries. It provides for 21st century technologies to guide fishery management decisions that will further ensure that our marine resources are managed for abundance, long-term sustainability, and to the greatest benefit of the Nation.

As a recreational angler for my entire life, I understand the critical role that we play in conservation resource management. In 2016, anglers and boaters contributed $628 million in excise taxes for sport fish conservation and management, boating safety, infrastructure, and habitat restoration. In addition to that, anglers contributed $693 million through fish and license fees.

This bill will continue to ensure the conservation of our marine fisheries and will restore the public's trust in fisheries management.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly want to respectfully push back on the idea that you have to be a member of the Congressional Sportsmen's Caucus to have standing in this debate.

The fact is, and we have shared some of the groups opposing this legislation, the opposition includes many recreational fishing interests, and opposing legislators include many of us who actually do spend a lot of time on the water catching fish. So let's dispel that notion.

Now, there are some in the recreational fishing sector who will argue that Magnuson is broken, that it does not work for them, because, as they explain, it requires recreational fisheries, just like other fisheries, to abide by overall catch limits that are based on science. In other words, the law doesn't work because they don't want to have to stop fishing when their catch reaches unsustainable levels. That is a situation not of a law that is broken. It actually shows that we have a law that is playing a very, very important role.

Now, what would H.R. 200 do if it were enacted into law? It would enable recreational anglers to take more fish right now without regard for the future.

Proponents of the bill are advocating to increase recreational catch limits, reallocate catch away from commercial fishermen with mandated reallocation reviews, and water down the sustainable fishing mandates in current law.

□ 1530

That would mean taking more fish now, threatening fisheries with the risk of overfishing in the future, which we know, because we have seen this movie before, will lead to bans and closed fisheries in the future.

Managing fisheries sometimes requires tough choices. It shouldn't be about immediate gratification. And let's remember, the recreational fishermen are not disadvantaged under the current management system. In fact, in some regions, like the Gulf of Mexico, recreational fishers currently take home 70 percent of the Gulf's most popular fish. Recreational anglers land an overwhelming majority of species like amberjack, cobia, red drum, king mackerel, spotted sea trout, and triggerfish. And for the Gulf red snapper, the division of quota between the recreational and seafood sectors is a more balanced situation, roughly 50/50.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, with all due respect to my good friends on the other side of the aisle, they are promoting the opposition to this bill from interest groups that don't have any interest in commercial fishing, period. Let's be real about this.

What hurts me, I have heard them say that it removes science from fisheries. Let's explore this. No one is listening, but that is okay.

For starters, the words ''science'' and ''data'' appear 34 times throughout the bill. Section 207 directs the councils to establish a plan for cooperative research that brings together a wide variety of high-quality, non-Federal data to support existing data.

This is about States, coastal areas, villages, communities, fishermen making decisions instead of the Federal Government, and I know they don't like that.

Section 208 directs the Secretary to work with the States to find the best way to incorporate State data, just not their own data.

Section 301 directs the Secretary to develop a strategic plan for conducting stock assessments for every stock in a fishery's management plan.

Again, science.

Section 303 replaces an arbitrary 10-year rebuilding requirement. If the fish come back quicker under this bill, H.R. 200, they could be fished at a sustainable yield level. Under the present law, which I wrote, they can't do that. Otherwise, we lose years and management of the fish for a period of time. That is up to the councils under H.R. 200.

Section 306 directs the Secretary to expedite approval of high-quality State data in the Gulf of Mexico to better advantage those recreational-heavy fisheries.

Finally, everything in this bill continues to be bound by the scientific principle of the Magnuson mandate to utilize the best available science for management decisions. There is nothing in this bill that weakens it, nothing. Yet I keep hearing the constant waves of dissension on the other side because they don't want to renew and make a better bill.

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

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I again would like to talk about this legislation, the H.R. 200 bill. I am disappointed in the other side. It is a partisan issue, and, unfortunately, it is.

I was listening to the speakers on the other side, and they really don't have a concrete reason to object to this bill other than what they are being told by those who don't want commercial fishing, and they don't want recreational fishing. They may not say that, but in reality, that is really what they are seeking.

Now, I again go back to myself and the period of time when the 200-mile limit occurred. Why did it happen?

I was in Kodiak, Alaska. None of you were even born, probably, at that time. I was in Kodiak, Alaska, looked out 12 miles off the shore of Kodiak, and there was a wall of lights. I said: What is that?

This was before I was a Congressman.

He said: That is foreign fishermen catching our fish—catching our fish, America's fish.

When I got elected to Congress, one of the first things I did was try to develop the Magnuson-Stevens Act with Gerry Studds from Massachusetts. He was in the majority; I was the minority; and I explained to him what was happening.

He went back home to a fishing district and then said: You have got a good idea. Let's develop an economic zone 200 miles out, and we will control the fisheries in that area.

So we worked together bipartisanly, wrote a bill with a concrete suggestion for sustainable yield for fish, fishermen, communities for America, and for our coastal States that are involved in commercial fisheries and recreational fisheries.

We passed that bill, yes, out of the House, I believe, pretty much unanimously. Went to the Senate side, and the Senate sided with Magnuson-Stevens and decided to do the same thing.

Out of that, after we had opposition from just about every liberal in the business—for what reason, I don't know, other than they thought it would affect the international sea—it was finally signed into law by President Ford.

From there, we have gone to the best managed fisheries in the world. From there, under the Magnuson-Stevens Act, we have been able to achieve what we should do. But we have grown in science. We have grown in more knowledge about how and where we should fish and when.

People talk about the species that were depleted. There were no species until this bill was established. And we rebuilt them, and we are still rebuilding them under our science under this bill. But it gives that flexibility to States to help manage.

Now, I know on that side of the aisle, they believe that the Federal Government can do everything—in fact, they should do everything because we don't know what we are doing. The States aren't really States, they are part of the Federal Government, instead of the other way around.

I argue that knowledge within States with science available and science under present law under this bill, which we do not extinguish, is really the crux of this issue, that the 200-mile limit, the H.R. 200 bill, my bill today—not because of me. I did not write this bill for myself. I wrote it for the communities, for the fish, and the fishermen for America.

Those that oppose it, I said: Uh-uh. They are not listening to the communities. They believe Big Government can do best for them and States should not be involved. I argue it is the States' issue to protect their fish, yes, with supervision of the Federal Government.

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

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, of course I have great respect for my colleague from Alaska. In fact, in many ways, he deserves credit for helping craft the original Fishery Conservation and Management Act, for bringing to the Nation what could be considered the Alaska model of fisheries management through subsequent Magnuson Act reauthorizations. So I find myself, ironically, in the position of defending the framework that he essentially created against my colleagues' attempts to make changes that I believe are fundamentally threatening to that very framework.

It is this Alaska model that we support, complete with science-based catch limits, industry accountability for sustainable harvest, and the constant march towards sustainable practices. That is what has made U.S. fisheries, under the Magnuson Act, a model for the world, and that is what we are trying to continue.

Now, it has been suggested that rebuilding timeframes are too rigid and too restrictive. We will talk more about this when we get to some of the specific debate on amendments. But it is important to know that there is flexibility on rebuilding goals in the Magnuson Act and that flexibility is being used. It is also working. And a great example of that is what has happened with sea scallops under the Magnuson Act.

Fishery managers implemented a rebuilding plan for sea scallops in 1998. Within a couple of years, the fishery had been rebuilt, and now the scallop fishery is one of the country's most valuable fisheries.

In 1998, a little over 13 million pounds of scallop were landed. By 2016, that amount had tripled to 40 million pounds, resulting in more money in fishermen's pockets.

So there is a lot at stake with these issues, and we should bear in mind not only the numbers we talked about regarding the many jobs, the billions of dollars contributed to the economy from commercial and recreational fishing, but the potential to do even more and to do even better if we manage our fisheries carefully.

NOAA has estimated that rebuilding all U.S. fish stocks would generate an additional $31 billion in seafood sales, support an additional 500,000 jobs, and increase the revenue that fishermen receive at the dock by $2.2 billion. That is why we want to keep these critical provisions that have worked so well, because we can do even better if we stay the course.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN).

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank Congressman YOUNG for his leadership.

Mr. Chairman, it has been said during this debate that recreational fishermen aren't being disadvantaged under the current system. Our fishermen, both commercial and recreational, are absolutely being disadvantaged, and that is exactly why we must pass this bill. I will give you one example.

If you are a commercial fisherman in New York, you could catch 50 pounds of fluke once per day for 7 days. You have to go out. You can catch 50 pounds. That is 350 pounds for the week.

Now, it would make more sense if we were able to have a system in place where they were catching 350 pounds maybe in 1 day, like maybe New Jersey, where you could do 500 pounds for 3 days.

Or if we want to talk about the science where you have black sea bass, 240 percent over the target biomass, yet we are seeing a quota reduction, compared to other States, in New York. Our fishermen are getting disadvantaged under the current system.

Or the NOAA observer program, where you have a fisherman who is taking someone out to go to an area where they know there is not going to be any fish and they end up collecting flawed data that is sitting on a shelf and not even ending up getting used.

The reality right now is that we have fishermen in my district who are desperate to survive 365 days of the year, from early in the morning until late at night, barely making ends meet, on a boat that barely works, with overhead where they are having trouble being able to pay their own bills to get by. They are looking for people to fight for them in this Chamber, to fight for that business owner, to fight for them so that they can make ends meet.

It is about protecting the fishery as those very fishermen care so much about. But they know that the system could get better, and that is why we are here, fighting for them. That is why I thank DON YOUNG for his leadership, because they are watching right now on C–SPAN.

In my district, those fishermen are watching on the internet, they are watching on TV, and they are looking for people to fight for them because they have been struggling for years and decades, and they are desperate to get this passed so that they can afford to pay their bills, so that when they are going out at 3 a.m. tomorrow and they are going to come back late at night, that they know that things are going in the right direction, that their government is going to start working for them at the Federal level, the State level, the regional level, we are doing our part.

Mr. Chairman, I encourage my colleagues to vote for this bill.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN).

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank my longtime friend, Congressman YOUNG, our dean of the House, for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 200, the Strengthening Fishing Communities and Increasing Flexibility in Fisheries Management Act. This bipartisan bill reauthorizes one of the most successful conservation programs in Magnuson-Stevens in a way that recognizes many of the successes of the program.

Magnuson-Stevens was established in 1976 with one primary goal: to reduce overfishing. With a successful update in the 1990s and 2000s, we have now met many of the goals the program was established to meet.

Compared to when the law was established, 84 percent of the stocks are no longer overfished, according to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. Yet we still treat many of these healthy fish stocks as if nothing has changed.

I am an avid sportsman. I have hunted and fished with both my son and my grandchildren. There is no one who

cares more about conservation and protection of endangered species than hunters and recreational fishers. It is time that Magnuson-Stevens reflects a healthy balance between commercial and recreational fishermen.

All too often, recreational fishers take a backseat to the commercial interests. This bill recognizes the unique space that recreational anglers occupy and gives them the certainty they need to enjoy our natural resources.

□ 1545

Saltwater anglers contribute $70 billion annually to the Nation's economy and support jobs all over the country, and there is no one who cares more about the health of our oceans either. In 2016, anglers, through excise taxes, contributed $628 million in support of conservation programs and resource management.

This bill will set catch limits in 3-year time periods to give anglers certainty so they know when to plan trips. All too often, arbitrary changes to seasons have caused problems up and down the Gulf Coast of Texas.

This bill recognizes that technology has advanced in many ways in measuring the health of our fish stocks. State agencies, universities, and local conservation groups have come with up with many innovative ways to measure the health of fish stocks. I am glad that this bill includes language that I worked on to make sure that we had the most scientifically accurate data possible when it comes to determining the number of certain stocks.

Mr. Chair, I am proud to be a cosponsor to this bill and urge all of my colleagues to support it. I thank the gentleman from Alaska for the time.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, we certainly support recreational fishing. I do. I have a lot of it in my district, and that is one of the reasons why, as I worked with Mr. YOUNG to try to achieve a bipartisan reauthorization bill, we were willing to accept many of the provisions regarding recreational fishing. But you don't help recreational anglers when you go too far in relaxing annual catch limits or when you go too far in rolling back the rebuilding framework. Because when these fisheries crash, as inevitably they will, it is not just commercial fishing boats that are going to be out of the water. Everyone suffers. These fisheries will be closed.

And that is why so many recreational fishing interest groups and individuals have weighed in in opposition to H.R. 200. They have concluded, as we have, that the short-term gratification for some is not worth the long-term damage to all.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chair, how much time do I have remaining?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Alaska has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP), the chairman of the full committee who allowed me to bring this outstanding bill to the floor of the House.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chair, this bill is the result of more than 6 years of work with commercial and recreational fishing groups, the seafood industry, coastal communities, and both sides of the aisle. It is a bipartisan bill that codifies the Obama-era guidelines and provides flexibility for fishery managers.

It is a good bill, but I do want to address some of the inconsistencies that have been circulated by Members or NGOs. At least let me hit some of the most gross inaccuracies. In dissenting views, it was written that:

> Don Young agreed to work with Democratic Members and the staff to develop a bipartisan bill. Unfortunately, Chairman Bishop pulled the plug on promising negotiations and rushed to markup with a half-baked mash-up of bad ideas.

This bill was a year in negotiation. Our efforts of trying to put numerous provisions on the table and accepting additional Democratic provisions were simply labeled as nonstarters. Every time Mr. YOUNG agreed to a change, another issue came up. It is a perfect example of Lucy pulling the ball out from under Charlie Brown. Mr. YOUNG is Charlie Brown.

Mr. Chair, I am appreciative, though, of certain off-committee Democrats who jumped at the opportunity to compromise. I especially want to thank Mr. VEASEY and Mr. GREEN for their willingness to work across the aisle and assist with cosponsoring this particular bill.

Opponents of this bill said there is no science; that it is being taken out of the management decisions. Science and data appear 34 times throughout the bill. Sections 207, 208, 301, 303, and 306, all require the Secretary to use science, which means, if Mr. YOUNG were trying to remove science from his bill and the process, he really did a crappy job at it.

This bill is also coming with the old canard that we are going to start overfishing. There is nothing in this bill that removes basic requirements that prevent overfishing, and it is consistent with guidelines for fishery management that were put forth in the Obama administration.

Another dissenting point that was made says that this bill is nothing more than a partisan measure. It is a cute idea, but something that is simply not there. Letters from scientists, many of them—in fact, most of them—do not conduct the type of research that underpins fisheries management. All have said that all of these agencies, the ESA, NEPA, and the Antiquities Act, whatever, are going to be destroyed because of this bill.

There was one specifically from the Seafood Harvesters of America that was brought to my attention because in that particular letter that was dated in June of this year, the group claimed that section 12 repealed sections of the Magnuson-Stevens Act. That is really cute because there is no section 12 in this act.

Section 12 hasn't been a part of this bill since November of 2017. In the opposition letters to this particular bill, there have always been references to previous versions of the bill, or they failed to recognize significant changes that were added, compromises that were added by both Mr. YOUNG and Mr. GRAVES in their manager's amendment.

The kind of rhetoric that is opposed to this particular bill that we are seeing, in the past from NGOs, embodies what is wrong with Washington. I hope that everyone can see these kind of glaring inaccuracies.

I am proud to support this bill. This bill does provide science. This bill does go through the process. This bill does move us forward. This bill does help commercial fishing and recreational fishing and the communities that are involved there. It is a good step forward. It has been 6 years in the coming. It has been 1 year of heavy work right now. It needs to go forward.

Mr. Chair, I appreciate the opportunity of speaking and supporting this bill.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, while we have some differences in the two sides, I don't believe that I have been injecting hyperpartisan rhetoric in this debate. Our differences, as I have emphasized multiple times, are about policy. This is not about which party we are on. In fact, it used to be very bipartisan, that this Congress would defend science-based catch limits and rigorous rebuilding timeframes because we all knew that those were very, very important provisions for sustainable fisheries, whether you were a Democrat or a Republican.

Now, if there is some group out there who has written a letter that refers to the wrong section, or includes inflammatory rhetoric because they feel like they were kept out of the loop as this bill developed, maybe that is an indication that they were kept out of the loop as this bill developed. And maybe that should have been considered along with the pile of letters that have come into my office and into other offices expressing fierce opposition to some of these irresponsible changes being proposed in this Magnuson-Stevens Act reauthorization.

Rather than disparage the stakeholders who are opposing this bill, I think we should listen to them.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I include in the RECORD a list of supporters of this legislation.

MAGNUSON-STEVENS REAUTHORIZATION COALITION (115TH–H.R. 200)

Letters of Support

ORGANIZATION

State of Florida; State of Mississippi; AFTCO Manufacturing Co., Inc; Banks, Inc.; Alliance Sports Group; Bass Pro Shops; American Fishing Wire/Hi-Seas; Beach Marine Products; American Tackle Company; Big Rock Sports, LLC; Anglers Journal TV; Billfish Inc.; Anglers Resource, LLC; Bluefin USA; B.A.S.S., LLC; Bob Sands Fishing Tackle; Bonnier Corporation; Brunswick Boat Group; Classic Fishing Products, Inc.; Bullet Weights, Inc.

Compass 360; Cabin Creek Bait Company; Composites One; Calderone & Associates; Crappie USA, Inc.; Capt. Harry's Fishing Supply; Crook & Crook, Inc.; Careco Multimedia Entertainment LLC; Dave's Bait, Tackle & Taxidermy; Catalyst Marketing Services; DL Ventures, LLC; CB's Saltwater Outfitters; Do-It Corporation; Chris Craft; Marine Division—Americas | Dometic Corporation; Don Coffey Company; FLW, LLC; Eposeidon Outdoor Adventures, Inc.; Forest River Inc.; Etic USA; Formula Boats.

F.J. Neil Company, Inc.; G-Rods International; Faria/Beede Instruments; G5 Products LLC; FISH307, LLC; GEM Products, Inc.; Fishidy, Inc.; Grady-White Boats; Fishunt Essentials, LLC; Hook & Gaff Watch Company; Fluid Motion LLC; Hook & Tackle Outfitters; iAngler Tournament Systems, LLC; Magic Tilt Trailers, Inc.; IMTRA Corporation; Malin Company; INDMAR Products; Marble, LLC; Jay's Sporting Goods; Marine Accessories Corporation; Jones & Company.

Maui Jim Sunglasses; Kureha America, LLC/Seaguar; Maverick Boat Group; L & S Bait Company; Maxima USA; Lew's Fishing Tackle; MCBC Holding Inc.; Lucas Oil Products Inc.; Mercury Marine; Millers Boating Center, Inc.; Pitman Creek Wholesale; Mud Hole Custom Tackle; PRADCO-Fishing; NauticStar Boats; Pro-Troll Fishing Products; Northland Fishing Tackle, LLC; ProNav Marine; On The Water Media Group; Rapala; Outdoor Pro Shop, Inc.; Realtree Active.

Outdoor.media; Red Drum Tackle Shop, Inc.; OutdoorFlics Digital Studios + Media Lab; Robalo Boats; Pacific Catch; Rockfish Sports; Rod-N-Bobb's, Inc.; Southeastern Fishing Tackle Liquidators; Rogers Sports Marketing; Southwick Associates, Inc.; Rome Specality Company, Inc.; Sport Outdoors TV; Rudow's FishTalk Magazine; Sportco Marketing, Inc.; Seasonal Marketing, Inc.; Sportsman Boats Manufacturing, Inc.; SeaStar Solutions; Springfield Marine; Shimano North American Holding, Inc; St. Croix Rods.

Skeeter Boats; Stealth Products, LLC; Smoker Craft, Inc.; SteelShad Fishing Company; Strike King Lure Company; Throw Raft LLC; Syntec Industries LLC; Tim Bailey & Associates; T-H Marine Supplies, Inc.; Tom Posey Company; Tackle Warehouse; Top Brass Tackle; Temple Fork Outfitters; Trik Fish LLC; The Fisherman Magazine; TTI-Blackmore Fishing Group; The Hammond Group; Uncle Josh Bait Company; Thomas F. Gowen & Sons; Vapor Apparel.

Thomas Spinning Lures, Inc.; Vectorply Corporation; Water Gremlin Company; ZEBCO Brands; Water Sports Industry Association; Zee Bait Co.; What The Fin Apparel & Purple Tuna Tees Inc.; White River Marine Group; Wholesale Buying Group; Wright & McGill Co.; Yakima Bait Company; Yamaha Marine Group; Z-Man Fishing Products, Inc.; American Scallop Association; Atlantic Red Crab Company; Atlantic Capes Fisheries; BASE Seafood; California Wetfish Producers Association; Cape Seafood.

Garden State Seafood Association; Inlet Seafood; Long Island Commercial Fishing Association; Lunds Fisheries, Inc.; North Carolina Fishers Association; Rhode Island Commercial Fishermen's Alliance; Seafreeze Ltd.; Town Dock; West Coast Seafood Processors Association; Western Fishboat Owners Association; Freezer Longline Coalition; Florida Keys Commercial Fishing Association; Gulf Coast Seafood Alliance; Southeastern Fisheries Association.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, we have some very critical differences of opinion on whether this bill is a good idea after years of success in rebuilding depleted fish stocks, after all of the economic value that we have created by allowing commercial and recreational fishing to resume in places all over this country, where at one time it was shut down because we failed to properly manage our fisheries.

We think, fundamentally, it is a bad idea at this point to declare mission accomplished and start rolling back the very bedrock provisions that have enabled us to achieve this success. It is with that in mind that I request Members to vote ''no,'' and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman. I have no more speakers, and I am going to close by saying this is good legislation. We may have differences of opinion. It should be done. I am quite proud of the original act. I am proud of this act, too. Because I believe in the fisheries, not only commercial, and recreational, but sustainable; sustainable for the communities, the fish, and everybody in America.

Mr. Chairman, I urge passage of the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources, printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read.

The text of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 200

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 ''Strengthening Fishing Communities and Increasing Flexibility in Fisheries Management Act''.

SEC. 2. TABLE OF CONTENTS.

The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act, any term used that is defined in section 3 of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1802) shall have the same meaning such term has under that section.

SEC. 4. REFERENCES.

Except as otherwise specifically provided, whenever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a provision of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.).

TITLE I—MAGNUSON-STEVENS ACT FINDINGS AND DEFINITIONS AMENDMENTS AND REAUTHORIZATION

SEC. 101. AMENDMENTS TO FINDINGS.

Section 2(a) (16 U.S.C. 1801) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by inserting ''cultural well-being,'' after ''economy,''; and

(2) in paragraph (10), by inserting ''and traditional ways of life'' after ''economic growth''.

SEC. 102. AMENDMENTS TO DEFINITIONS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—Section 3 (16 U.S.C. 1802) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking ''management program'';

(2) in paragraph (34), by striking ''The terms 'overfishing' and 'overfished' mean'' and inserting ''The term 'overfishing' means''; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (8) the following:

''(8a) The term 'depleted' means, with respect to a stock of fish or stock complex, that the stock or stock complex has a biomass that has declined below a level that jeopardizes the capacity of the stock or stock complex to produce maximum sustainable yield on a continuing basis.''; and

(4) by inserting after paragraph (43) the following:

''(43a)(A) The term 'subsistence fishing' means fishing in which the fish harvested are intended for customary and traditional uses, including for direct personal or family consumption as food or clothing; for the making or selling of handicraft articles out of nonedible byproducts taken for personal or family consumption, for barter, or sharing for personal or family consumption; and for customary exchange or trade.

''(B) In this paragraph—

''(i) the term 'family' means all persons related by blood, marriage, or adoption, or any person living within the household on a permanent basis; and

''(ii) the term 'barter' means the exchange of a fish or fish part—

''(I) for another fish or fish part; or

''(II) for other food or for nonedible items other than money if the exchange is of a limited and noncommercial nature.''.

(b) SUBSTITUTION OF TERM.—The Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in the heading of section 304(e), by striking ''OVERFISHED'' and inserting ''DEPLETED''; and

(2) by striking ''overfished'' each place it appears and inserting ''depleted''.

(c) CLARITY IN ANNUAL REPORT.—Section 304(e)(1) (16 U.S.C. (e)(1)) is amended by adding at the end the following: ''The report shall distinguish between fisheries that are depleted (or approaching that condition) as a result of fishing and fisheries that are depleted (or approaching that condition) as a result of factors other than fishing. The report shall state, for each fishery identified as depleted or approaching that condition, whether the fishery is the target of directed fishing.''.

SEC. 103. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 4 (16 U.S.C. 1803) is amended—

(1) by striking ''this Act'' and all that follows through ''(7)'' and inserting ''this Act''; and

(2) by striking ''fiscal year 2013'' and inserting ''each of fiscal years 2018 through 2022''.

TITLE II—FISHERIES MANAGEMENT FLEXIBILITY AND MODERNIZATION

SEC. 201. DEFINITIONS.

For the purposes of implementing this title:

(1) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS.—The term ''appropriate committees of Congress'' means—

(A) the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives.

(2) LIMITED ACCESS PRIVILEGE PROGRAM.—The term ''limited access privilege program'' means a program that meets the requirements of section 303A of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1853a).

(3) MIXED-USE FISHERY.—The term ''mixed-used fishery'' means a Federal fishery in which two or more of the following occur:

(A) Recreational fishing.

(B) Charter fishing.

(C) Commercial fishing.

SEC. 202. PROCESS FOR ALLOCATION REVIEW FOR SOUTH ATLANTIC AND GULF OF MEXICO MIXED-USE FISHERIES.

(a) STUDY OF ALLOCATIONS IN MIXED-USE FISHERIES.—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Commerce shall seek to enter into an arrangement with the National Academy of Sciences to conduct a study of South Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico mixed-use fisheries—

(1) to provide guidance to each applicable Council on criteria that could be used for allocating fishing privileges, including consideration of the conservation and socioeconomic benefits of the commercial, recreational, and charter components of a fishery, in the preparation of a fishery management plan;

(2) to identify sources of information that could reasonably support the use of such criteria in allocation decisions;

(3) to develop procedures for allocation reviews and potential adjustments in allocations; and

(4) that shall consider the ecological, economic and social factors relevant to each component of the mixed-use fishery including but not limited to: fairness and equitability of all current allocations; percent utilization of available allocations by each component; consumer and public access to the resource; and the application of economic models for fully estimating the direct and indirect value-added contributions of the various commercial and recreational fishing industry market sectors throughout chain of custody.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date an arrangement is entered into under subsection (a), the National Academy of Sciences shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on the study conducted under that subsection.

(c) PROCESS FOR ALLOCATION REVIEW AND ESTABLISHMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, and every 5 years thereafter, an applicable Council shall perform a review of the allocations to the commercial fishing sector and the recreational fishing sector of all applicable fisheries in its jurisdiction.

(2) CONSIDERATIONS.—In conducting a review under paragraph (1), an applicable Council shall consider, in each allocation decision, the conservation and socioeconomic benefits of—

(A) the commercial fishing sector; and

(B) the recreational fishing sector.

(d) DEFINITION OF APPLICABLE COUNCIL.—In this section, the term ''applicable Council'' means—

(1) the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council; or

(2) the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council.

SEC. 203. ALTERNATIVE FISHERY MANAGEMENT MEASURES.

Section 302(h) (16 U.S.C. 1852(h)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (7)(C), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a semicolon;

(2) by redesignating paragraph (8) as paragraph (9); and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (7), the following:

''(8) have the authority to use alternative fishery management measures in a recreational fishery (or the recreational component of a mixed-use fishery), including extraction rates, fishing mortality targets, and harvest control rules, in developing a fishery management plan, plan amendment, or proposed regulations; and''.

SEC. 204. MODIFICATIONS TO THE ANNUAL CATCH LIMIT REQUIREMENT.

(a) REGIONAL FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCILS.—Section 302 (16 U.S.C. 1852) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(m) CONSIDERATIONS FOR MODIFICATIONS TO ANNUAL CATCH LIMIT REQUIREMENTS.—

''(1) ANNUAL CATCH LIMIT REQUIREMENT FOR CERTAIN DATA-POOR FISHERIES.—Notwithstanding subsection (h)(6), in the case of a stock of fish for which the total annual catch limit is 25 percent or more below the overfishing limit, a peer-reviewed stock survey and stock assessment have not been performed during the preceding 5 fishing years, and the stock is not subject to overfishing, a Council may, after notifying the Secretary, maintain the current annual catch limit for the stock until a peer-reviewed stock survey and stock assessment are conducted and the results are considered by the Council and its scientific and statistical committee.

''(2) CONSIDERATION OF ECOSYSTEM AND ECONOMIC IMPACTS.—In establishing annual catch limits a Council may, consistent with subsection (h)(6), consider changes in an ecosystem and the economic needs of the fishing communities.

''(3) LIMITATIONS TO ANNUAL CATCH LIMIT REQUIREMENT FOR SPECIAL FISHERIES.—Notwithstanding subsection (h)(6), a Council is not required to develop an annual catch limit for—

''(A) an ecosystem-component species;

''(B) a fishery for a species that has a life cycle of approximately 1 year, unless the Secretary has determined the fishery is subject to overfishing; or

''(C) a stock for which—

''(i) more than half of a single-year class will complete their life cycle in less than 18 months; and

''(ii) fishing mortality will have little impact on the stock.

''(4) RELATIONSHIP TO INTERNATIONAL FISHERY EFFORTS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Each annual catch limit, consistent with subsection (h)(6)—

''(i) may take into account management measures under international agreements in which the United States participates; and

''(ii) in the case of an annual catch limit developed by a Council for a species, shall take into account fishing for the species outside the exclusive economic zone and the life-history characteristics of the species that are not subject to the jurisdiction of the Council.

''(B) EXCEPTION TO ANNUAL CATCH LIMIT REQUIREMENT.—If fishery management activities by another country with respect to fishing outside the exclusive economic zone may hinder conservation efforts by United States fishermen for a fish species for which any of the recruitment, distribution, life history, or fishing activities are transboundary, and for which there is no informal transboundary agreement with that country in effect, then—

''(i) notwithstanding subsection (h)(6), no annual catch limit is required to be developed for the species by a Council; and

''(ii) if an annual catch limit is developed by a Council for the species, the catch limit shall take into account fishing for the species outside the exclusive economic zone that is not subject to the jurisdiction of the Council.

''(5) AUTHORIZATION FOR MULTISPECIES COMPLEXES AND MULTIYEAR ANNUAL CATCH LIMITS.—For purposes of subsection (h)(6), a Council may establish—

''(A) an annual catch limit for a stock complex; or'including'

''(B) annual catch limits for each year in any continuous period that is not more than three years in duration.

''(6) ECOSYSTEM-COMPONENT SPECIES DEFINED.—In this subsection the term 'ecosystem-component species' means a stock of fish that is a nontarget, incidentally harvested stock of fish in a fishery, or a nontarget, incidentally harvested stock of fish that a Council or the Secretary has determined—

''(A) is not subject to overfishing, approaching a depleted condition or depleted; and

''(B) is not likely to become subject to overfishing or depleted in the absence of conservation and management measures.

''(7) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed as providing an exemption from the requirements of section 301(a) of this Act.''.

(b) ACTION BY THE SECRETARY.—Section 304 (16 U.S.C. 1854) is amended—

(1) by striking ''(i) INTERNATIONAL OVERFISHING.—'' and inserting ''(j) INTERNATIONAL OVERFISHING.—'';

(2) in subsection (j)(1), as redesignated, by inserting ''shall'' before ''immediately''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(k) STOCK SURVEYS AND ASSESSMENTS.—Not later than 2 years after the date that the Secretary receives notice from a Council under section 302(m), the Secretary shall complete a peer-reviewed stock survey and stock assessment of the applicable stock of fish and transmit the results of the survey and assessment to the Council.''.

SEC. 205. LIMITATION ON FUTURE CATCH SHARE PROGRAMS.

(a) CATCH SHARE DEFINED.—Section 3 (16 U.S.C. 1802) is amended by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

''(2a) The term 'catch share' means any fishery management program that allocates a specific percentage of the total allowable catch for a fishery, or a specific fishing area, to an individual, cooperative, community, processor, representative of a commercial sector, or regional fishery association established in accordance with section 303A(c)(4), or other entity.''.

(b) CATCH SHARE REFERENDUM PILOT PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 303A(c)(6)(D) (16 U.S.C. 1853a(c)(6)(D)) is amended to read as follows:

''(D) CATCH SHARE REFERENDUM PILOT PROGRAM.—

''(i) The New England, Mid-Atlantic, South Atlantic, and Gulf of Mexico Councils may not submit a fishery management plan or amendment that creates a catch share program for a fishery, and the Secretary may not approve or implement such a plan or amendment submitted by such a Council or a Secretarial plan or amendment under section 304(c) that creates such a program, unless the final program has been approved, in a referendum in accordance with this subparagraph, by a majority of the permit holders eligible to participate in the fishery. For multispecies permits in the Gulf of Mexico, any permit holder with landings from within the sector of the fishery being considered for the catch share program within the 5-year period preceding the date of the referendum and still active in fishing in the fishery shall be eligible to participate in such a referendum. If a catch share program is not approved by the requisite number of permit holders, it may be revised and submitted for approval in a subsequent referendum.

''(ii) The Secretary may, at the request of the New England Fishery Management Council, allow participation in such a referendum for a fishery under the Council's authority, by fishing vessel crewmembers who derive a significant portion of their livelihood from such fishing.

''(iii) The Secretary shall conduct a referendum under this subparagraph, including notifying all permit holders eligible to participate in the referendum and making available to them—

''(I) a copy of the proposed program;

''(II) an estimate of the costs of the program, including costs to participants;

''(III) an estimate of the amount of fish or percentage of quota each permit holder would be allocated; and

''(IV) information concerning the schedule, procedures, and eligibility requirements for the referendum process.

''(iv) For the purposes of this subparagraph, the term 'permit holder eligible to participate' only includes the holder of a permit for a fishery under which fishing has occurred in 3 of the 5 years preceding a referendum for the fishery, unless sickness, injury, or other unavoidable hardship prevented the permit holder from engaging in such fishing.

''(v) The Secretary may not implement any catch share program for any fishery managed exclusively by the Secretary unless first petitioned by a majority of those permit holders eligible to participate in the fishery.''.

(2) LIMITATION ON APPLICATION.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall not apply to a catch share program that is submitted to, or proposed by, the Secretary of Commerce before the date of enactment of this Act.

(3) REGULATIONS.—Before conducting a referendum under the amendment made by paragraph (1), the Secretary of Commerce shall issue regulations implementing such amendment after providing an opportunity for submission by the public of comments on the regulations.

SEC. 206. STUDY OF LIMITED ACCESS PRIVILEGE PROGRAMS FOR MIXED-USE FISHERIES.

(a) STUDY ON LIMITED ACCESS PRIVILEGE PROGRAMS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Commerce shall seek to enter into an arrangement under which the Ocean Studies Board of the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine shall—

(1) study the use of limited access privilege programs in mixed-use fisheries, including—

(A) identifying any inequities caused by a limited access privilege program;

(B) recommending policies to address the inequities identified in subparagraph (A); and

(C) identifying and recommending the different factors and information a mixed-use fishery should consider when designing, establishing, or maintaining a limited access privilege program to mitigate any inequities identified in subparagraph (A); and

(2) submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on the study under paragraph (1), including the recommendations under subparagraphs (B) and (C) of paragraph (1).

(b) TEMPORARY MORATORIUM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), there shall be a moratorium on the submission and approval of a limited access privilege program for a mixed-used fishery until the date that the report is submitted under subsection (a)(1)(B).

(2) EXCEPTION.—Subject to paragraph (3), a Council may submit, and the Secretary of Commerce may approve, for a mixed- use fishery that is managed under a limited access system, a limited access privilege program if such program was part of a pending fishery management plan or plan amendment before the date of enactment of this Act.

(3) MANDATORY REVIEW.—A Council that approves a limited access privilege program under paragraph (2) shall, upon issuance of the report required under subparagraph (a), review and, to the extent practicable, revise the limited access privilege program to be consistent with the recommendations of the report or any subsequent statutory or regulatory requirements designed to implement the recommendations of the report.

(4) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section may be construed to affect a limited access privilege program approved by the Secretary of Commerce before the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 207. COOPERATIVE DATA COLLECTION.

(a) IMPROVING DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS.—Section 404 (16 U.S.C. 1881c) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(e) IMPROVING DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall develop, in consultation with the science and statistical committees of the Councils established under section 302(g) and the Marine Fisheries Commissions, and submit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives a report on facilitating greater incorporation of data, analysis, stock assessments, and surveys from State agencies and nongovernmental sources described in paragraph (2) into fisheries management decisions.

''(2) NONGOVERNMENTAL SOURCES.—Nongovernmental sources referred to in paragraph (1) include the following:

''(A) Fishermen.

''(B) Fishing communities.

''(C) Universities.

''(D) Research and philanthropic institutions.

''(3) CONTENT.—In developing the report under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall—

''(A) identify types of data and analysis, especially concerning recreational fishing, that can be reliably used for purposes of this Act as the basis for establishing conservation and management measures as required by section 303(a)(1), including setting standards for the collection and use of that data and analysis in stock assessments and surveys and for other purposes as determined by the Secretary;

''(B) provide specific recommendations for collecting data and performing analyses identified as necessary to reduce uncertainty in and improve the accuracy of future stock assessments, including whether such data and analysis could be provided by nongovernmental sources, including fishermen, fishing communities, universities, and research institutions;

''(C) consider the extent to which it is possible to establish a registry of persons collecting or submitting the data and performing the analyses identified under subparagraphs (A) and (B); and

''(D) consider the extent to which the acceptance and use of data and analyses identified in the report in fishery management decisions is practicable.''.

(b) DEADLINE.—The Secretary of Commerce shall develop and publish guidelines under the amendment made by paragraph (a) by not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act.

(c) NAS REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS.—The Secretary of Commerce shall take into consideration and, to the extent feasible, implement the recommendations of the National Academy of Sciences in the report entitled ''Review of the Marine Recreational Information Program (2017)'', including—

(1) prioritizing the evaluation of electronic data collection, including smartphone applications, electronic diaries for prospective data collection, and an Internet website option for panel members or for the public;

(2) evaluating whether the design of the Marine Recreational Information Program for the purposes of stock assessment and the determination of stock management reference points is compatible with the needs of in-season management of annual catch limits; and

(3) if the Marine Recreational Information Program is incompatible with the needs of in-season management of annual catch limits, determining an alternative method for in-season management.

SEC. 208. RECREATIONAL FISHING DATA.

Section 401(g) (16 U.S.C. 1881(g)) is amended by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (5), and by inserting after paragraph (3) the following:

''(4) FEDERAL-STATE PARTNERSHIPS.—

''(A) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary shall establish partnerships with States to develop best practices for implementation of State programs established pursuant to paragraph (2).

''(B) GUIDANCE.—The Secretary shall develop guidance, in cooperation with the States, that details best practices for administering State programs pursuant to paragraph (2), and provide such guidance to the State.''.

SEC. 209. MISCELLANEOUS AMENDMENTS RELATING TO FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCILS.

(a) COUNCIL JURISDICTION FOR OVERLAPPING FISHERIES.—Section 302(a)(1) (16 U.S.C. 1852(a)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), in the second sentence—

(A) by striking ''18'' and inserting ''19''; and

(B) by inserting before the period at the end ''and a liaison who is a member of the Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council to represent the interests of fisheries under the jurisdiction of such Council''; and

(2) in subparagraph (B), in the second sentence—

(A) by striking ''21'' and inserting ''22''; and

(B) by inserting before the period at the end ''and a liaison who is a member of the New England Fishery Management Council to represent the interests of fisheries under the jurisdiction of such Council''.

(b) COUNCIL SEAT.—Section 302(b)(2) (16 U.S.C. 1852(b)(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''or recreational'' and inserting '', recreational, or subsistence fishing''; and

(2) in subparagraph (C), in the second sentence, by inserting '', and in the case of the Governor of Alaska with the subsistence fishing interests of the State,'' after ''interests of the State''.

(c) PURPOSE.—Section 2(b)(3) (16 U.S.C. 1801(b)(3)) is amended by striking ''and recreational'' and inserting '', recreational, and subsistence''.

(d) PROHIBITION ON CONSIDERING RED SNAPPER KILLED DURING REMOVAL OF OIL RIGS.—Any red snapper that are killed during the removal of any offshore oil rig in the Gulf of Mexico shall not be considered in determining under the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.) whether the total allowable catch for red snapper has been reached.

(e) PROHIBITION ON CONSIDERING FISH SEIZED FROM FOREIGN FISHING.—Any fish that are seized from a foreign vessel engaged in illegal fishing activities in the exclusive economic zone shall not be considered in determining under the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.) the total allowable catch for that fishery.

TITLE III—HEALTHY FISHERIES THROUGH BETTER SCIENCE

SEC. 301. HEALTHY FISHERIES THROUGH BETTER SCIENCE.

(a) DEFINITION OF STOCK ASSESSMENT.—Section 3 (16 U.S.C. 1802), as amended by section 102(a) of this Act, is further amended by redesignating the paragraphs after paragraph (42) in order as paragraphs (44) through (53), and by inserting after paragraph (42) the following:

''(43) The term 'stock assessment' means an evaluation of the past, present, and future status of a stock of fish, that includes—

''(A) a range of life history characteristics for such stock, including—

''(i) the geographical boundaries of such stock; and

''(ii) information on age, growth, natural mortality, sexual maturity and reproduction, feeding habits, and habitat preferences of such stock; and

''(B) fishing for the stock.''.

(b) STOCK ASSESSMENT PLAN.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 404 (16 U.S.C. 1881c), as amended by section 207(a) of this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(f) STOCK ASSESSMENT PLAN.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall develop and publish in the Federal Register, on the same schedule as required for the strategic plan required under subsection (b) of this section, a plan to conduct stock assessments for all stocks of fish for which a fishery management plan is in effect under this Act.

''(2) CONTENTS.—The plan shall—

''(A) for each stock of fish for which a stock assessment has previously been conducted—

''(i) establish a schedule for updating the stock assessment that is reasonable given the biology and characteristics of the stock; and

''(ii) subject to the availability of appropriations, require completion of a new stock assessment, or an update of the most recent stock assessment—

''(I) every 5 years; or

''(II) within such other time period specified and justified by the Secretary in the plan;

''(B) for each stock of fish for which a stock assessment has not previously been conducted—

''(i) establish a schedule for conducting an initial stock assessment that is reasonable given the biology and characteristics of the stock; and

''(ii) subject to the availability of appropriations, require completion of the initial stock assessment within 3 years after the plan is published in the Federal Register unless another time period is specified and justified by the Secretary in the plan; and

''(C) identify data and analysis, especially concerning recreational fishing, that, if available, would reduce uncertainty in and improve the accuracy of future stock assessments, including whether such data and analysis could be provided by fishermen, fishing communities, universities, and research institutions, to the extent that use of such data would be consistent with the requirements in section 301(a)(2) to base conservation and management measures on the best scientific information available.

''(3) WAIVER OF STOCK ASSESSMENT REQUIREMENT.—Notwithstanding subparagraphs (A)(ii) and (B)(ii), a stock assessment is not required for a stock of fish in the plan if the Secretary determines that such a stock assessment is not necessary and justifies such determination in the Federal Register notice required by this subsection.''.

(2) DEADLINE.—Notwithstanding section 404(f)(1) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act, as amended by this section, the Secretary of Commerce shall issue the first stock assessment plan under such section by not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 302. TRANSPARENCY AND PUBLIC PROCESS.

(a) ADVICE.—Section 302(g)(1)(B) (16 U.S.C. 1852(g)(1)(B)) is amended by adding at the end the following: ''Each scientific and statistical committee shall develop such advice in a transparent manner and allow for public involvement in the process.''.

(b) MEETINGS.—Section 302(i)(2) (16 U.S.C. 1852(i)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(G) Each Council shall make available on the Internet Web site of the Council—

''(i) to the extent practicable, a Webcast, an audio recording, or a live broadcast of each meeting of the Council, and of the Council Coordination Committee established under subsection (l), that is not closed in accordance with paragraph (3); and

''(ii) audio, video (if the meeting was in person or by video conference), or a searchable audio or written transcript of each meeting of the Council and of the meetings of committees referred to in section (g)(1)(B) of the Council by not later than 30 days after the conclusion of the meeting.

''(H) The Secretary shall maintain and make available to the public an archive of Council and scientific and statistical committee meeting audios, videos, and transcripts made available under clauses (i) and (ii) of subparagraph (G).''.

(c) FISHERY IMPACT STATEMENTS.—

(1) REQUIREMENT.—Section 303 (16 U.S.C. 1853) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking paragraph (9) and redesignating paragraphs (10) through (15) as paragraphs (9) through (14), respectively; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(d) FISHERY IMPACT STATEMENT.—

''(1) Any fishery management plan (or fishery management plan amendment) prepared by any Council or by the Secretary pursuant to subsection (a) or (b), or proposed regulations deemed necessary pursuant to subsection (c), shall include a fishery impact statement which shall assess, specify and analyze the likely effects and impact of the proposed action on the quality of the human environment.

''(2) The fishery impact statement shall describe—

''(A) a purpose of the proposed action;

''(B) the environmental impact of the proposed action;

''(C) any adverse environmental effects which cannot be avoided should the proposed action be implemented;

''(D) a reasonable range of alternatives to the proposed action;

''(E) the relationship between short-term use of fishery resources and the enhancement of long-term productivity;

''(F) the cumulative conservation and management effects; and

''(G) economic, and social impacts of the proposed action on—

''(i) participants in the fisheries and fishing communities affected by the proposed action;

''(ii) participants in the fisheries conducted in adjacent areas under the authority of another Council, after consultation with such Council and representatives of those participants; and

''(iii) the safety of human life at sea, including whether and to what extent such measures may affect the safety of participants in the fishery.

''(3) A substantially complete fishery impact statement, which may be in draft form, shall be available not less than 14 days before the beginning of the meeting at which a Council makes its final decision on the proposal (for plans, plan amendments, or proposed regulations prepared by a Council pursuant to subsection (a) or (c)). Availability of this fishery impact statement will be announced by the methods used by the Council to disseminate public information and the public and relevant government agencies will be invited to comment on the fishery impact statement.

''(4) The completed fishery impact statement shall accompany the transmittal of a fishery management plan or plan amendment as specified in section 304(a), as well as the transmittal of proposed regulations as specified in section (b).

''(5) The Councils shall, subject to approval by the Secretary, establish criteria to determine actions or classes of action of minor significance regarding subparagraphs (A), (B), (D), (E), and (F) of paragraph (2), for which preparation of a fishery impact statement is unnecessary and categorically excluded from the requirements of this section, and the documentation required to establish the exclusion.

''(6) The Councils shall, subject to approval by the Secretary, prepare procedures for compliance with this section that provide for timely, clear, and concise analysis that is useful to decisionmakers and the public, reduce extraneous paperwork and effectively involve the public, including—

''(A) using Council meetings to determine the scope of issues to be addressed and identifying significant issues related to the proposed action;

''(B) integration of the fishery impact statement development process with preliminary and final Council decision making in a manner that provides opportunity for comment from the public and relevant government agencies prior to these decision points; and

''(C) providing scientific, technical, and legal advice at an early stage of the development of the fishery impact statement to ensure timely transmittal and Secretarial review of the proposed fishery management plan, plan amendment, or regulations to the Secretary.''.

(2) EVALUATION OF ADEQUACY.—Section 304(a)(2) (16 U.S.C. 1854(a)(2)) is amended by striking ''and'' after the semicolon at the end of subparagraph (B), striking the period at the end of subparagraph (C) and inserting ''; and'', and by adding at the end the following:

''(D) evaluate the adequacy of the accompanying fishery impact statement as basis for fully considering the environmental impacts of implementing the fishery management plan or plan amendment.''.

(3) REVIEW OF REGULATIONS.—Section 304(b) (16 U.S.C. 1854(b)) is amended by striking so much as precedes subparagraph (A) of paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

''(b) REVIEW OF REGULATIONS.—

''(1) Upon transmittal by the Council to the Secretary of proposed regulations prepared under section 303(c), the Secretary shall immediately initiate an evaluation of the proposed regulations to determine whether they are consistent with the fishery management plan, plan amendment, this Act and other applicable law. The Secretary shall also immediately initiate an evaluation of the accompanying fishery impact statement as a basis for fully considering the environmental impacts of implementing the proposed regulations. Within 15 days of initiating such evaluation the Secretary shall make a determination and—''.

(4) EFFECT ON TIME REQUIREMENTS.—Section 305(e) (16 U.S.C. 1855(e)) is amended by inserting ''the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.),'' after ''the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601 et seq.),''.

SEC. 303. FLEXIBILITY IN REBUILDING FISH STOCKS.

(a) GENERAL REQUIREMENTS.—Section 304(e) (16 U.S.C. 1854(e)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (4)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)(i), by striking ''possible'' and inserting ''practicable'';

(B) by amending subparagraph (A)(ii) to read as follows:

''(ii) may not exceed the time the stock would be rebuilt without fishing occurring plus one mean generation, except in a case in which—

''(I) the biology of the stock of fish, other environmental conditions, or management measures under an international agreement in which the United States participates dictate otherwise;

''(II) the Secretary determines that the cause of the stock being depleted is outside the jurisdiction of the Council or the rebuilding program cannot be effective only by limiting fishing activities;

''(III) the Secretary determines that one or more components of a mixed- stock fishery is depleted but cannot be rebuilt within that timeframe without significant economic harm to the fishery, or cannot be rebuilt without causing another component of the mixed- stock fishery to approach a depleted status;

''(IV) the Secretary determines that recruitment, distribution, or life history of, or fishing activities for, the stock are affected by informal transboundary agreements under which management activities outside the exclusive economic zone by another country may hinder conservation and management efforts by United States fishermen; and

''(V) the Secretary determines that the stock has been affected by unusual events that make rebuilding within the specified time period improbable without significant economic harm to fishing communities;'';

(C) by striking ''and'' after the semicolon at the end of subparagraph (B), by redesignating subparagraphs (B) and (C) as subparagraphs (C) and (D), and by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following:

''(B) take into account environmental condition including predator/prey relationships;''; and

(D) by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (D) (as so redesignated) and inserting ''; and'', and by adding at the end the following:

''(E) specify a schedule for reviewing the rebuilding targets, evaluating environmental impacts on rebuilding progress, and evaluating progress being made toward reaching rebuilding targets.''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(8) A fishery management plan, plan amendment, or proposed regulations may use alternative rebuilding strategies, including harvest control rules and fishing mortality-rate targets to the extent they are in compliance with the requirements of this Act.

''(9) A Council may terminate the application of paragraph (3) to a fishery if the Council's scientific and statistical committee determines and the Secretary concurs that the original determination that the fishery was depleted was erroneous, either—

''(A) within the 2-year period beginning on the effective date a fishery management plan, plan amendment, or proposed regulation for a fishery under this subsection takes effect; or

''(B) within 90 days after the completion of the next stock assessment after such determination.''.

(b) EMERGENCY REGULATIONS AND INTERIM MEASURES.—Section 305(c)(3)(B) (16 U.S.C. 1855(c)(3)(B)) is amended by striking ''180 days after'' and all that follows through ''provided'' and inserting ''1 year after the date of publication, and may be extended by publication in the Federal Register for one additional period of not more than 1 year, if''.

SEC. 304. EXEMPTED FISHING PERMITS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Before the approval and issuance of an exempted fishing permit under section 600.745 of title 50, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor regulation, the Secretary of Commerce shall—

(1) direct a joint peer review of the application for the exempted fishing permit by the appropriate regional fisheries science center and State marine fisheries commission; and

(2) certify that the Council or Federal agency with jurisdiction over the affected fishery has determined that—

(A) the fishing activity to be conducted under the proposed exempted fishing permit would not negatively impact any management measures or conservation objectives included within existing fishery management plans or plan amendments;

(B) the social and economic impacts in both dollar amounts and loss of fishing opportunities on all participants in each sector of the fishery expected to occur as a result of the proposed exempted fishing permit would be minimal;

(C) the information that would be collected through the fishing activity to be conducted under the proposed exempted fishing permit will have a positive and direct impact on the conservation, assessment, or management of the fishery; and

(D) the Governor of each coastal State potentially impacted by the proposed exempted fishing permit, as determined by the Secretary, has been consulted on the fishing activity to be conducted.

(b) CLARIFICATION.—The Secretary may not issue an exempted fishing permit under section 600.745 of title 50, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor regulation that—

(1) establishes a limited access system as defined in section 3 of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1802);

(2) is consistent with section 303A of such Act (16 U.S.C. 1853a); or

(3) establishes a catch share program as defined in section 206(a) of this Act.

(c) SAVINGS PROVISION.—Except for subsection (b)(2), nothing in this section may be construed to affect an exempted fishing permit approved under section 600.745 of title 50, Code of Federal Regulations, before the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 305. COOPERATIVE RESEARCH AND MANAGEMENT PROGRAM.

Section 318 (16 U.S.C. 1867) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by inserting ''(1)'' before the first sentence, and by adding at the end the following:

''(2) Within one year after the date of enactment of the Strengthening Fishing Communities and Increasing Flexibility in Fisheries Management Act, and after consultation with the Councils, the Secretary shall publish a plan for implementing and conducting the program established in paragraph (1). Such plan shall identify and describe critical regional fishery management and research needs, possible projects that may address those needs, and estimated costs for such projects. The plan shall be revised and updated every 5 years, and updated plans shall include a brief description of projects that were funded in the prior 5-year period and the research and management needs that were addressed by those projects.''; and

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) in the heading, by striking ''FUNDING'' and inserting ''PRIORITIES''; and

(B) in paragraph (1), by striking ''including'' and all that follows and inserting the following: ''including—

''(A) the use of fishing vessels or acoustic or other marine technology;

''(B) expanding the use of electronic catch reporting programs and technology; and

''(C) improving monitoring and observer coverage through the expanded use of electronic monitoring devices.''.

SEC. 306. GULF OF MEXICO FISHERIES COOPERATIVE RESEARCH AND RED SNAPPER MANAGEMENT.

(a) FEDERAL GULF OF MEXICO RED SNAPPER MANAGEMENT.—Section 407 (16 U.S.C. 1883) is amended by striking all after the section heading and inserting the following:

''(a) CERTIFICATION OF STATE SURVEYS.—

''(1) INCLUSION OF CERTIFIED STATE SURVEYS.—In establishing the acceptable biological catch and total allowable catch for red snapper in the Gulf of Mexico, the Secretary shall include—

''(A) Gulf State recreational fisheries surveys that are certified under subsection (b); and

''(B) data related to red snapper in the Gulf of Mexico collected by the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission, nongovernmental organizations, and other nongovernmental sources, including universities and research institutions.

''(b) STATE SURVEYS.—

''(1) SUBMISSION.—A Gulf State that conducts a recreational fisheries survey in the Gulf of Mexico to make catch estimates for red snapper landed in such State may submit such survey to the Secretary for certification.

''(2) CERTIFICATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall make a certification or a denial of certification for any survey submitted under paragraph (1) not later than the end of the 6-month period beginning on the date the survey is submitted.

''(B) DEEMED CERTIFIED.—A recreational fisheries survey is deemed to be certified effective upon the expiration of such period if the Secretary has not made a certification or denial of certification.

''(3) MODIFICATION OF SURVEYS DENIED CERTIFICATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—If a survey of a Gulf State is denied certification under paragraph (2), the Secretary shall, not later than 60 days after the date of the denial, provide the Gulf State a proposal for modifications to the survey.

''(B) PROPOSAL.—A proposal provided to a Gulf State for a survey under subparagraph (A)—

''(i) shall be specific to the survey submitted by such Gulf State and may not be construed to apply to any other Gulf State;

''(ii) shall require revision to the fewest possible provisions of the survey; and

''(iii) may not unduly burden the ability of such Gulf State to revise the survey.

''(C) MODIFIED SURVEY.—

''(i) AUTHORITY TO SUBMIT.—If a survey of a Gulf State was denied certification under paragraph (2), the Gulf State may modify the survey and submit the modified survey to the Secretary for certification or denial of certification.

''(ii) SCHEDULE.—The Secretary shall make a certification or denial of certification for any modified survey not later than the end of the 30-day period beginning on the date the modified survey is submitted.

''(iii) DEEMED CERTIFIED.—A modified survey is deemed to be certified effective upon the expiration of the period described in clause (ii) if the Secretary has not made a certification or denial of certification.

''(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) GULF STATE.—The term 'Gulf State' means each of the States of Texas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, or Florida.

''(2) RED SNAPPER.—The term 'red snapper' means the species Lutjanus campechanus.''.

(b) STOCK SURVEYS AND STOCK ASSESSMENTS.—The Secretary of Commerce, acting through the National Marine Fisheries Service Regional Administrator of the Southeast Regional Office, shall for purposes of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.)—

(1) develop a schedule of stock surveys and stock assessments for the Gulf of Mexico Region and the South Atlantic Region for the 5-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act and for every 5-year period thereafter;

(2) direct the Southeast Science Center Director to implement such schedule; and

(3) in such development and implementation—

(A) give priority to those stocks that are commercially or recreationally important; and

(B) ensure that each such important stock is surveyed at least every 5 years.

(c) USE OF FISHERIES INFORMATION IN STOCK ASSESSMENTS.—The Southeast Science Center Director shall ensure that fisheries information made available through fisheries programs funded under Public Law 112–141 is incorporated as soon as possible into any fisheries stock asesssments conducted after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(d) STATE FISHERIES MANAGEMENT IN THE GULF OF MEXICO WITH RESPECT TO RED SNAPPER.—Section 306(b) (16 U.S.C. 1856(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(4) Notwithstanding section 3(11), for the purposes of managing the recreational sector of the Gulf of Mexico red snapper fishery, the seaward boundary of a coastal State in the Gulf of Mexico is a line 9 miles seaward from the baseline from which the territorial sea of the United States is measured.''.

SEC. 307. ENSURING CONSISTENT MANAGEMENT FOR FISHERIES THROUGHOUT THEIR RANGE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Act is amended by inserting after section 4 the following:

''SEC. 5. ENSURING CONSISTENT FISHERIES MANAGEMENT UNDER CERTAIN OTHER FEDERAL LAWS.

''(a) NATIONAL MARINE SANCTUARIES ACT AND ANTIQUITIES ACT OF.—In any case of a conflict between this Act and the National Marine Sanctuaries Act (16 U.S.C. 1431 et seq.) or the Antiquities Act of 1906 (54 U.S.C. 320301 et seq.), this Act shall control.

''(b) FISHERIES RESTRICTIONS UNDER ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT OF.—To ensure transparency and consistent management of fisheries throughout their range, any restriction on the management of fish in the exclusive economic zone that is necessary to implement a recovery plan under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) shall be implemented—

''(1) using authority under this Act; and

''(2) in accordance with processes and time schedules required under this Act.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in the first section is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 3 the following:

''Sec. 4. Authorization of appropriations.
''Sec. 5. Ensuring consistent fisheries management under certain other Federal laws.''.

TITLE IV— STRENGTHENING FISHING COMMUNITIES

SEC. 401. ESTIMATION OF COST OF RECOVERY FROM FISHERY RESOURCE DISASTER.

Section 312(a)(1) (16 U.S.C. 1861a(a)(1)) is amended—

(1) by inserting ''(A)'' after ''(1)'';

(2) by redesignating existing subparagraphs (A) through (C) as clauses (i) through (iii), respectively, of subparagraph (A) (as designated by the amendment made by paragraph (1)); and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(B) The Secretary shall publish the estimated cost of recovery from a fishery resource disaster no later than 30 days after the Secretary makes the determination under subparagraph (A) with respect to such disaster.''.

SEC. 402. DEADLINE FOR ACTION ON REQUEST BY GOVERNOR FOR DETERMINATION REGARDING FISHERY RESOURCE DISASTER.

Section 312(a) (16 U.S.C. 1861a(a)) is amended by redesignating paragraphs (2) through (4) as paragraphs (3) through (5), and by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

''(2) The Secretary shall make a decision regarding a request from a Governor under paragraph (1) within 90 days after receiving an estimate of the economic impact of the fishery resource disaster from the entity requesting the relief.''.

SEC. 403. NORTH PACIFIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT CLARIFICATION.

Section 306(a)(3)(C) (16 U.S.C. 1856(a)(3)(C)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''was no'' and inserting ''is no''; and

(2) by striking ''on August 1, 1996''.

SEC. 404. LIMITATION ON HARVEST IN NORTH PACIFIC DIRECTED POLLOCK FISHERY.

Section 210(e)(1) of the American Fisheries Act (title II of division C of Public Law 105–277; 16 U.S.C. 1851 note) is amended to read as follows:

''(1) HARVESTING.—

''(A) LIMITATION.—No particular individual, corporation, or other entity may harvest, through a fishery cooperative or otherwise, a percentage of the pollock available to be harvested in the directed pollock fishery that exceeds the percentage established for purposes of this paragraph by the North Pacific Fishery Management Council.

''(B) MAXIMUM PERCENTAGE.—The percentage established by the North Pacific Fishery Management Council shall not exceed 24 percent of the pollock available to be harvested in the directed pollock fishery.''.

SEC. 405. ARCTIC COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT QUOTA.

Section 313 (16 U.S.C. 1862) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(k) ARCTIC COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT QUOTA.—If the North Pacific Fishery Management Council issues a fishery management plan for the exclusive economic zone in the Arctic Ocean, or an amendment to the Fishery Management Plan for Fish Resources of the Arctic Management Area issued by such Council, that makes available to commercial fishing, and establishes a sustainable harvest level, for any part of such zone, the Council shall set aside not less than 10 percent of the total allowable catch therein as a community development quota for coastal villages located north and east of the Bering Strait.''.

SEC. 406. REALLOCATION OF CERTAIN UNUSED HARVEST ALLOCATION.

(a) REALLOCATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Effective January 1, 2018, and thereafter annually, if the Regional Administrator receives receipt of written notice that the allocation holder named in section 803 of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2004 (Public Law 108–199, 16 U.S.C. 1851 note), will not harvest some or all of the Aleutian Islands directed pollock, the Regional Administrator, as soon as practicable, shall—

(A) if the allocation as designated in section 803 of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2004 does not exceed the total allowable catch for the Bering Sea subarea, reallocate the projected unused Aleutian Islands directed pollock to the Bering Sea subarea for harvest by the allocation holder named in section 803 of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2004; or

(B) if the allocation exceeds the total allowable catch for the Bering Sea subarea, reallocate a portion of the allocation, up to the total allowable catch for the Bering Sea Subarea.

(2) The allocation shall be provided to the Aleut Corporation for the purposes of economic development in Adak, Alaska, pursuant to the requirement of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.).

(b) IMPLEMENTATION.—For the purposes of this section:

(1) the allocation holder described in subsection (a) shall retain control of the allocation referenced in such subsection, including such portions of the allocation that may be reallocated pursuant to this section; and

(2) the allocations in section 206(b) of the American Fisheries Act (16 U.S.C. 1851 note) apply to the Bering Sea portion of the directed pollock fishery and not to the allocation holder under section 803 of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2004.

(c) CONSENT REQUIREMENT.—The Aleut Corporation will provide written consent for other vessels to take or process the allocation, a physical copy of which must be present on the vessel.

(d) REVISION OF REGULATIONS AND MANAGEMENT PLANS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The North Pacific Fishery Management Council, in consultation with the National Marine Fisheries Service, shall modify all applicable regulations and management plans so that the allocation holder named in section 803 of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2004, may harvest the reallocated Aleutian Islands directed pollock fishery in the Bering Sea subarea as soon as practicable.

(2) MANAGEMENT OF ALLOCATION.—The National Marine Fisheries Service, in consultation with the North Pacific Fishery Management Council, shall manage the Aleutian Islands directed pollock fishery to ensure compliance with the implementing statute and with the annual harvest specifications.

(3) ENFORCEMENT.—Taking or processing any part of the allocation made by section 803 of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2004, and reallocated under this section without the consent required under subsection (c) shall be considered in violation of section 307 of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1857) and subject to the penalties and sanctions under section 308 of such Act (16 U.S.C. 1858), and any fish harvested or processed under such taking or possessing shall be subject to forfeiture.

SEC. 407. PROHIBITION ON SHARK FEEDING OFF COAST OF FLORIDA.

Section 307 (16 U.S.C. 1857) is amended—

(1) by striking ''It is unlawful—'' and inserting the following:

''(a) IN GENERAL.—It is unlawful—''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(b) PROHIBITION ON SHARK FEEDING OFF COAST OF FLORIDA.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—It is unlawful—

''(A) for any diver to engage in shark feeding in covered waters; and

''(B) for any person to operate a vessel for hire for the purpose of carrying a passenger to a site if such person knew or should have known that the passenger intended, at that site, to be a diver—

''(i) engaged in shark feeding in covered waters; or

''(ii) engaged in observing shark feeding in covered waters.

''(2) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subsection:

''(A) COVERED WATERS.—The term 'covered waters' means Federal waters off the coast of Florida.

''(B) DIVER.—The term 'diver' means a person who is wholly or partially submerged in covered water and is equipped with a face mask, face mask and snorkel, or underwater breathing apparatus.

''(C) SHARK FEEDING.—The term 'shark feeding' means—

''(i) the introduction of food or any other substance into covered water for the purpose of feeding or attracting sharks; or

''(ii) presenting food or any other substance to a shark for the purpose of feeding or attracting sharks.

''(3) EXCEPTION.—This subsection shall not apply to shark feeding conducted—

''(A) by a research institution, university, or government agency for research purposes; or

''(B) for the purpose of harvesting sharks.''.

SEC. 408. RESTORATION OF HISTORICALLY FRESHWATER ENVIRONMENT.

Section 3(10) (16 U.S.C. 1802) is amended by inserting '', except that such term shall not include any area previously covered by land or a fresh water environment in a State where the average annual land loss of such State during the 20 years before the date of the enactment of the Strengthening Fishing Communities and Increasing Flexibility in Fisheries Management Act exceeds 10 square miles'' after ''maturity''.

The CHAIR. No amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in House Report 115–786. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF ALASKA

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 115–786.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 17, strike lines 17 through 23 (and redesignate the subsequent quoted clauses).

Page 23, strike lines 20 through 23 and insert the following:

(b) PUBLICATION.—The Secretary of Commerce shall make available on the Internet Website of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration the report required under the amendment made by subsection (a) by not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Beginning at page 31, strike line 23 and all that follows through page 36, line 25.

Beginning at page 40, line 17, strike section 304 and insert the following:

SEC. 304. EXEMPTED FISHING PERMITS.

(a) OBJECTIONS.—If the relevant Council, the Interstate Marine Fisheries Commission, or the fish and wildlife agency of an affected State objects to the approval and issuance of an exempted fishing permit under section 600.745 of title 50, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor regulation, the Regional Administrator of the National Marine Fisheries Service who issued such exempted fishing permit shall respond to such entity in writing detailing why such exempted fishing permit was issued.

(b) 12-MONTH FINDING.—At the end of the 12-month period beginning on the date the exempted fishing permit is issued under section 600.745 of title 50, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor regulation, the Council that prepared the fishery management plan, or the Secretary in the case of a fishery management plan prepared and implemented by the Secretary, shall review the exempted fishing permit and determine whether any unintended negative impacts have occurred that would warrant the discontinuation of the permit.

(c) CLARIFICATION.—The Secretary may not issue an exempted fishing permit under section 600.745 of title 50, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor regulation that—

(1) establishes a limited access system as defined in section 3 of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1802);

(2) is consistent with section 303A of such Act (16 U.S.C. 1853a); or

(3) establishes a catch share program as defined in section 206(a) of this Act.

(d) SAVINGS PROVISION.—Except for subsection (b), nothing in this section may be construed to affect an exempted fishing permit approved under section 600.745 of title 50, Code of Federal Regulations, before the date of the enactment of this Act.

Beginning at page 44, line 1, strike section 306 and insert the following:

SEC. ___. FEDERAL GULF OF MEXICO RED SNAPPER MANAGEMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 407 (16 U.S.C. 1883) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 407. CERTIFICATION OF STATE SURVEYS.

''(a) SUBMISSION.—A Gulf State that conducts a marine recreational fisheries statistical survey in the Gulf of Mexico to make catch estimates for red snapper landed in such State may submit such survey to the Secretary for certification.

''(b) CERTIFICATION STANDARDS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of the Strengthening Fishing Communities and Increasing Flexibility in Fisheries Management Act, the Secretary shall establish and provide the Gulf States with standards for certifying State marine recreational fisheries statistical surveys that shall—

''(1) ensure that State marine recreational fisheries statistical surveys are appropriately pilot tested, independently peer reviewed, and endorsed for implementation by the reviewers;

''(2) use designs consistent with accepted survey sampling practices; and

''(3) minimize the potential for bias and known sources of survey error.

''(c) CERTIFICATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall make a certification or a denial of certification for any marine recreational fisheries statistical survey submitted under subsection (a) not later than the end of the 6-month period beginning on the date that the survey and information needed to evaluate the survey under the standards established under subsection (b) are submitted.

''(2) TIMING.—In the case of a certification request from a Gulf State, the Secretary shall begin evaluation of the request upon receipt of all information necessary to make a determination consistent with the standards set forth under subsection (b).

''(3) DEEMED CERTIFIED.—A marine recreational fisheries statistical survey shall be deemed to be certified effective upon the expiration of the 6-month period described in paragraph (1) if the Secretary has not made a certification or denial of certification.

''(d) MODIFICATION OF SURVEYS DENIED CERTIFICATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—If a marine recreational fisheries statistical survey of a Gulf State is denied certification under subsection (c), the Secretary shall, not later than 60 days after the date of the denial, provide the Gulf State a proposal for modifications to the survey.

''(2) PROPOSAL.—A proposal provided to a Gulf State for a survey under paragraph (1)—

''(A) shall be specific to the survey submitted by such Gulf State and may not be construed to apply to any other Gulf State;

''(B) shall require revision to the fewest possible provisions of the survey; and

''(C) may not unduly burden the ability of such Gulf State to revise the survey.

''(3) MODIFIED SURVEY.—

''(A) AUTHORITY TO SUBMIT.—If a marine recreational fisheries statistical survey of a Gulf State was denied certification under subsection (c), the Gulf State may modify the survey and submit the modified survey to the Secretary for certification or denial of certification.

''(B) SCHEDULE.—The Secretary shall make a certification or denial of certification for any modified survey not later than the end of the 30-day period beginning on the date the modified survey is submitted.

''(C) DEEMED CERTIFIED.—A modified survey is deemed to be certified effective upon the expiration of the period described in subparagraph (B) if the Secretary has not made a certification or denial of certification.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in the first section is amended by striking the item relating to section 407 and inserting the following:

''Sec. 407. Certification of State surveys.''.

Beginning at page 48, line 13, strike section 307.

Beginning at page 52, at line 8, strike section 406 and insert the following:

SEC. ___. REALLOCATION OF CERTAIN UNUSED HARVEST ALLOCATION.

(a) REALLOCATION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, each year upon receipt by the Secretary of Commerce (referred to in this section as the ''Secretary'') of written notice from the allocation holder named in section 803 of division B of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2004 (Public Law 108–199, 16 U.S.C. 1851 note) that such holder will not harvest all or a part of the allocation authorized pursuant to that Act, the Secretary shall reallocate for that year the unused portion of such allocation to the Bering Sea subarea of the BSAI (as defined in section 679.2 of title 50, Code of Federal Regulations) and shall assign the reallocated unused portion of the allocation only to eligible vessels as described in subsection (b)(1) for harvest in the Bering Sea subarea of the BSAI, consistent with any agreements as described in subsection (c).

(b) ELIGIBILITY TO RECEIVE REALLOCATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Only vessels defined in subsection (a), (b), (c), or (e) of section 208 of the American Fisheries Act (16 U.S.C. 1851 note), or any vessels authorized to replace such vessels, may receive a reallocation described in subsection (a).

(2) LIMITATION ON REALLOCATIONS.—The Secretary shall not reallocate the allocation described in subsection (a) in any year if such reallocation exceeds the annual catch limit for pollock in the Bering Sea subarea of the BSAI.

(3) CALCULATIONS.—Any amount of the reallocation described in subsection (a) shall not be used in the calculation of harvesting or processing excessive shares as described in section 210(e) of the American Fisheries Act (16 U.S.C. 1851 note).

(4) CONDITIONS.—In any year, the assignment, transfer, or reallocation shall not violate the requirements of section 206(b) of the American Fisheries Act (title II of the division C of Public Law 105–277; 16 U.S.C. 1851 note).

(c) AGREEMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Each year, the allocation holder named in section 803(a) of division B of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2004 (Public Law 108–199, 16 U.S.C. 1851 note) may establish one or more agreements with the owners of some or all of the eligible vessels as defined in subsection (b)(1).

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—Each agreement described in paragraph (1)—

(A) shall specify those eligible vessels that may receive a reallocation and the amount

of reallocation that such vessels may receive in accordance with subsection (b)(2); and

(B) may contain other requirements or compensation agreed to by the allocation holder named in section 803 of division B of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2004 (Public Law 108–199, 16 U.S.C. 1851 note) and the owners of such eligible vessels, provided such requirements or compensation are otherwise consistent with the American Fisheries Act (16 U.S.C. 1851 note), the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.), and any other applicable law.

(d) EXISTING AUTHORITY.—Except for the measures required by this section, nothing in this section shall be construed to limit the authority of the North Pacific Fishery Management Council or the Secretary under the American Fisheries Act (16 U.S.C. 1851 note), the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.), or other applicable law.

(e) ENFORCEMENT.—Taking or processing any part of the allocation made by section 803 of division B of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2004 (Public Law 108–199, 16 U.S.C. 1851 note), and reallocated under this section in a manner that is not consistent with the reallocation authorized by the Secretary shall be considered in violation of section 307 of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1857) and subject to the penalties and sanctions under section 308 of such Act (16 U.S.C. 1858), and subject to the forfeiture of any fish harvested or processed.

(f) CLARIFICATIONS.—

(1) AMENDMENT.—Subsection (c) of section 803 of division B of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2004 (Public Law 108–199, 16 U.S.C. 1851 note) is amended by striking ''during the years 2004 through 2008''.

(2) PURPOSE OF REALLOCATION.—Consistent with subsection (d) of section 803 of division B of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2004 (Public Law 108–199, 16 U.S.C. 1851 note), the reallocation of the unused portion of the allocation provided to the allocation holder named in subsection (a) of such section for harvest in the Bering Sea subarea of the BSAI is for the purposes of economic development in Adak, Alaska pursuant to the requirements of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.).

Page 55, after line 4, insert the following (and redesignate the subsequent sections accordingly):

SEC. ___. COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT QUOTA PROGRAM PANEL VOTING PROCEDURES.

Section 305(i)(1)(G)(iv) (16 U.S.C. 1855(i)(1)(G)(iv)) is amended to read as follows:

''(iv) VOTING REQUIREMENT.—The panel may act only by the affirmative vote of 5 of its members.''.

Beginning at page 57, line 1, strike section 408 and insert the following:

SEC. ___. RESTORATION OF HISTORICALLY FRESHWATER ENVIRONMENT.

Section 3(10) (16 U.S.C. 1802) is amended—

(1) by inserting a comma after ''feeding''; and

(2) by inserting the following: ''except that such term—

''(A) does not include an area that—

''(i) was previously covered by land or a fresh water environment; and

''(ii) is in a State where the average annual land loss of such State during the 20 years before the date of the enactment of the Strengthening Fishing Communities and Increasing Flexibility in Fisheries Management Act exceeds 10 square miles; and

''(B) does not apply with respect to a project undertaken by a State or local government with the purpose of restoration or protection of an area described in subparagraph (A).''.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 965, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alaska.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, my amendment makes a series of modifications in the underlying bill and removes specific provisions related to the Endangered Species Act, the National Environmental Policy Act, and the Antiquities Act, at the request of my Democrat cosponsors from Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN and Mr. MARC VEASEY.

I introduced H.R. 200 in the early days of the 115th Congress. We have made many changes during the committee markup on H.R. 200. We adopted amendments authored by Ms. BORDALLO from Guam, as well as from the Senate Modern Fish Act that passed the Senate Committee on Commerce with an overwhelming bipartisan majority.

My manager's amendment eliminated some provisions in the bill that were most troublesome to Democrats, even though many outside stakeholders and Members on my side of the aisle considered those to be important components of the bill. The further spirited bipartisan compromise and willingness to support a number of Democratic amendments today—despite the rhetoric coming from the committee Democrats—our actions, our markup, and our willingness to work with House Democrats show that we have, in fact, been willing to work in a bipartisan manner.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and the underlying bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition, although I am not opposed to the manager's amendment.

The CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, in 1996, during floor debate passage of the bipartisan Sustainable Fisheries Act that amended and reauthorized Magnuson, the gentleman from Alaska said the following:

It is crucial that the management agencies within the Federal Government be proactive in protecting fisheries rather than attempting to address overfished stocks after they are in a crisis situation.

I couldn't agree more, and it is true now, more than ever. Twenty-two years ago our fisheries were in shambles. Rampant overfishing had decimated stocks to the point of collapse and Congress needed to make some tough choices to ensure that there were fish left to catch in our oceans.

We made tough choices in 1996, and we made them in 2006, putting in place requirements to end overfishing, to rebuild overfished stocks, and setting science-based annual catch limits. And because we did that, because we made those tough choices, the number of overfished stocks is at an all-time low. The number of rebuilt stocks is at an all-time high, and most stocks are trending in a positive direction that is benefiting fishermen in coastal communities.

I cannot support legislation that would turn our backs on what has worked so well, but H.R. 200, unfortunately, would take us in the wrong direction, back to the bad old days of fisheries management and taxpayer bailouts because we loosen the rules that prevent overfishing.

Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for his many years of service in this Chamber, and I would note that those of us who were not here in 1996 are not so-called johnny-come-latelies, but we are simply younger than the gentleman. In fact, just about everyone in this House is younger than the gentleman, and I say that with great respect.

□ 1600

I have worked on fisheries issues throughout my time in this Chamber and, before that, for 6 years in the California Assembly. In my personal life, I have been fishing as long as I can remember. I have even pulled in set nets on a commercial boat in Cook Inlet in the gentleman's district. So my years of interest in these issues is largely why I am so disappointed to be standing here debating a fisheries bill that is, unfortunately, too partisan.

My staff and I worked hard and in good faith to find a bipartisan compromise, and while the manager's amendment does remove some of the most egregious language that would undermine environmental laws like the Endangered Species Act, the National Marine Sanctuaries Act, the American Antiquities Act, and the National Environmental Policy Act, the fact is those provisions never should have been in a Magnuson reauthorization bill in the first place. They were always nonstarters, and removing them does not fix the serious threat to fisheries posed by H.R. 200's undermining of catch limits and rebuilding timeframes.

What is more, my staff and I did offer compromise language from Senator WICKER's Modernizing Recreational Fisheries Management Act. Even that language that every single Republican on the Senate Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee had supported in markup was rejected, unfortunately, by my colleagues across the aisle and did not find its way into the manager's amendment.

We also offered on these points of disagreement for catch limits and rebuilding timeframes to simply leave existing law in place because it has been working, and that, too, was unacceptable, unfortunately, to our colleagues across the aisle. So what is left before

us in H.R. 200 would fundamentally gut provisions that have made Magnuson so successful.

Now is not the time to move away from catch limits based on sound science and toward catch limits based on wishful thinking. It is not the time to allow rebuilding of overstocked fish to be delayed indefinitely. We have seen this movie before, and we know what happens.

Mr. Chairman, the manager's amendment does remove some poison pill provisions that should never have been in the bill, but it does nothing to fix the wrongheaded rollbacks of catch limits and rebuilding timeframes that will inevitably lead us to overfishing. That is why this bill has been called the empty oceans act, and that is why it is opposed by so many stakeholders.

Mr. Chairman, I include in the RECORD the dozens of letters we have received since the manager's amendment was introduced.

GULF OF MEXICO REEF FISH SHAREHOLDERS' ALLIANCE,
July 5, 2018.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,
Speaker of the House, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.
Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Democratic Leader, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN AND DEMOCRATIC LEADER PELOSI: On behalf of the Gulf of Mexico Reef Fish Shareholders' Alliance (Shareholders' Alliance), I write to you today to express our continued strong opposition to H.R. 200, the ''Strengthening Fishing Communities and Increasing Flexibility in Fisheries Management Act of 2017.''

The Shareholders' Alliance is the largest organization of commercial snapper and grouper fishermen in the Gulf of Mexico, with membership in every Gulf state. We work hard to ensure that our fisheries are sustainably managed so our fishing businesses can thrive and our fishing communities can exist for future generations. We are the harvesters that provide much of the American public with a reliable source of domestically-caught wild Gulf seafood, and we do this through a philosophy that sustainable seafood and profitable fishing businesses depend on healthy fish populations.

It has come to our attention that the House plans to vote on H.R. 200 after Congress resumes from its July 4th recess. We must express our continued concerns with this harmful bill and we strongly encourage you to vote against it. It would significantly harm our nation's fishermen and women, seafood suppliers, and seafood consumers through punitive restrictions and requirements that would not improve recreational fishing. H.R. 200 would make several damaging changes to the bedrock principles of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (Magnuson-Stevens Act).

H.R. 200 would unnecessarily make it more difficult for the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council (Gulf Council) to use limited access privilege programs (LAPPs) and catch shares as management tools. We believe that the decision-makers on the ground in the region should be able to make an informed decision as to whether LAPPs or catch shares may be appropriate for a fishery or not. Congress shouldn't tie the hands of the Gulf Council and preemptively remove these fishery management tools from the toolbox. Using these tools for commercial and charter fishing sectors has no impact on how recreational fishing is managed.

Also, H.R. 200 would promote new limitations and exemptions to annual catch limits (ACLs). ACLs allow fishing at sustainable levels to maximize access while minimizing the risk of overfishing our shared fishery resources. Inherent in this management tool is the acknowledgement that exceeding science-based catch limits reduces future opportunities, and that this should be avoided. The existing generation of fishermen has already sacrificed to rebuild these fisheries—let's not burden the next generation with having to rebuild them again.

Additionally, proponents of H.R. 200 claim that the Magnuson-Stevens Act does not provide adequate flexibility and rigidly imposes a 10-year rebuilding timeframe for overfished fisheries. However, the Magnuson-Stevens Act already allows fishery managers to approve fishery rebuilding timelines greater than 10 years in length due to a range of biological, economic, or social factors. In fact, Gulf of Mexico red snapper—the resource that many of us have built our small businesses on—is already experiencing that flexibility as it is in Year 13 of the current 27 year rebuilding plan. If the red snapper stock rebuilds by 2032 as intended, the stock will have been under a rebuilding program for over 40 years.

Finally, H.R. 200 would overload the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council with allocation review requirements that would leave little time or funding to perform its primary function of managing Gulf fisheries (e.g., setting catch limits and fishing seasons, conducting stock assessments, habitat management, etc.).

Furthermore, some Amendments to H.R. 200 would simply make a bad bill even worse. Specifically, Amendment 26 would open the door to levying additional taxes on commercial fishermen, over and above the maximum amount they are legally required to pay today. We question why this punitive measure is directed only at two regions of the United States—the Gulf of Mexico and the South Atlantic. Why are the other six regional fishery management councils exempted from this measure? Furthermore, Amendment 26 would initiate a process that could lead to eliminating the participation of commercial fishing, seafood industry, and charter fishing businessmen and women in regional fishery management councils. These purported ''conflicts of interest'' are a non-issue, as all regional fishery management councils already enact standard operating procedures to address this concern. Simply put, Amendment 26 is a direct assault on commercial fishermen in these two regions and would only serve to eliminate fishing expertise from regional fishery management councils in order to further the interests of recreational fishing organizations. This would be a disservice to the millions of Americans who only access American seafood though restaurants, fish markets, and grocery stores.

Our nation has set the gold standard for sustainable fisheries because of our commitment to science-based management under the 2007 Magnuson-Stevens Act reauthorization. The science-based conservation requirements of the Magnuson-Stevens Act helped support the development of the commercial individual fishing quota programs in the Gulf of Mexico have played crucial roles in nearly tripling the red snapper quota for all fishermen in the Gulf of Mexico over the last 10 years, from 5 million pounds to nearly 14 million pounds. Clearly, the Magnuson-Stevens Act is working.

The nation's fishermen, seafood suppliers, consumers, and Congressional leaders must protect the gains we have made under the last 40 years of the Magnuson-Stevens Act. It is in everyone's best interests to pass vibrant national fishery resources on to the next generation. H.R. 200 would put that in jeopardy. H.R. 200 is widely opposed by the commercial fishing industry throughout the United States (especially in the state of Florida), as well as by the seafood industry, the restaurant industry, the charter fishing industry, and others who depend on healthy fisheries to support strong businesses. Once again, we ask that you oppose H.R. 200 to ensure Americans have access to sustainable seafood today and for years to come.

Thank you for your consideration on this important matter.

Sincerely,

ERIC BRAZER,
Deputy Director.

GULF FISHERMEN'S ASSOCIATION,
July 2, 2018.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,
Speaker of the House, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.
Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Democratic Leader, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN AND DEMOCRATIC LEADER PELOSI: Please accept this letter from the Gulf Fishermen's Association opposing H.R. 200, the ''Strengthening Fishing Communities and Increasing Flexibility in Fisheries Management Act.'' The Gulf Fisherman's Association represents commercial fishermen in the Gulf of Mexico who are dependent upon healthy fishery resources to support our way of life.

H.R. 200 is a threat to the success record of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (Magnuson-Stevens Act), weakening the science-based management that has made the U.S. a leader in the field. The provisions within H.R. 200 that will add exceptions to rebuilding timelines, exemptions to annual catch limits, and mandate allocation reviews are unnecessary. The Magnuson-Stevens Act in its current form is working and is responsible for rebuilding dozens of stocks. In fact, NOAA's Status of the Stocks released in March showed that overfished stocks are at an all-time low. Why change what's already working?

Additionally, Rep. Graves' Amendment 26 to H.R. 200 makes it clear that this bill is being used to harm commercial snapper and grouper fishermen in the Gulf of Mexico. This amendment would open the door for additional taxation of commercial fishermen through resource rents and royalties. It also is an attempt to eliminate charter-for-hire and commercial representation on the Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic Fishery Management Councils Council by unfairly implying that they have a ''fiduciary conflict of interest''. The language in this amendment makes us ask the following questions:

Why is it reasonable to impose a tax on commercial fishermen while at the same time eliminating their voice in the decision-making process?

If commercial fishermen should not serve on the Gulf Council because of a supposed financial ''conflict of interest,'' why should marine suppliers and scientists whose companies and universities have received funding from recreational lobbying groups be able to serve?

In conclusion, H.R. 200 is not the fix for our fisheries that it is advertised to be. It threatens to turn back the clock on fisheries management and take us back to a time when there was less fish for everyone. That hurts both commercial and recreational fishermen. It would also damage the Council system, which has been effective at creating regional solutions for their fisheries. Lastly, this bill is a failure in bi-partisanship, as evidenced

by a shortage of democratic co-sponsors and a lack of consideration for all sectors of fisheries. It seeks to help recreational fishermen at the expense of commercial fishermen who work hard to provide this great country with wild sustainable seafood. That's something the Gulf Fishermen's Association cannot support and urge all representatives to vote ''no'' on H.R. 200.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the ''Strengthening Fishing Communities and Increasing Flexibility in Fisheries Management Act.'' We hope that you will take our concerns seriously and urge you to vote ''no''.

Sincerely,

GLEN BROOKS.

JULY 9, 2018.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: As leading manufacturers, retailers, guides, outfitters and media serving the fly fishing industry, we write to urge you to oppose H.R. 200, a bill that threatens the health and abundance of marine fisheries. H.R. 200, the ''Strengthening Fishing Communities and Increasing Flexibility in Fisheries Management Act,'' would amend the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (MSA). The MSA has been methodically rebuilding fisheries decimated by once-rampant overfishing. Since 2000, forty-four previously overfished stocks have been fully rebuilt, and NOAA Fisheries just reported that the number of overfished stocks is at an all-time low.

Thriving and healthy fish populations are at the heart of our businesses, and saltwater fly fishing is a vibrant and growing segment of our industry. The Magnuson-Stevens Act is working as intended to maximize fishing opportunities while ensuring the long-term sustainability of marine fisheries. Yet the work is not done. While the science-based management required under the Magnuson-Stevens Act has dramatically reduced overfishing, fifteen percent (15%) of assessed fisheries are still overfished. Now is the time to double-down on our proven management system, not undermine it.

Unfortunately, H.R. 200 attacks the very provisions in the Magnuson-Stevens Act that are responsible for putting America's ocean fish on a secure path to full recovery. If enacted, H.R. 200 would allow many different fisheries to be exempted from the annual catch limits and accountability measures identified by independent scientific bodies. Setting clear, science-based limits on catch and enforcing those limits is a hallmark of prudent management. H.R. 200 would also undermine the recovery of fisheries by allowing fisheries managers to relax timelines for rebuilding depleted stocks. Healthy fisheries support the greatest number of angling opportunities, and should be rebuilt as quickly as possible, as currently directed by the Magnuson-Stevens Act.

Make no mistake, H.R. 200 seeks to undermine our conservation progress in service of increasing short-term economic gain. As successful business leaders, we assure you that prioritizing the health of our nation's fishery resources is the best way to invest in American businesses like our own. We urge you to vote no on H.R. 200.

Sincerely,

Jeff Patterson, Abel Reels, Montrose, CO; Eli & Tara Lucas, Alaska Coastal Hunting, Kupreanof City, AK; Tim Romano, Angling Trade Media, Boulder, CO; Kirk Deeter, Angling Trade Media, Boulder CO; Greg Blessing, Blessing Enterprises, Colorado Springs, CO; Ted Upton, Cheeky Fishing, Watertown, MA; Ben Kurtz, Fishpond Inc., Denver, CO; John Torok, Hatch Outdoors Inc., Vista, CA; Rick Wittenbraker, Howler Brothers, Austin, TX; John Barrett, JB Fly Fishing, Peoria, AZ; Abbie Schuster, Kismet Outfitters, Martha's Vineyard, MA; Bob Triggs, Little Stone Flyfisher, Port Townsend, WA; Lucas Bissett, Low Tide Charters, Slidell, LA.

Tom Sadler, Middle River Group, Verona, VA; Colby Trow, Mossy Creek Fly Fishing, Harrisonburg, VA; Chris Gaggia, Patagonia, Ventura, CA; Corrine Doctor, RepYourWater, Erie, CO; Michelle East, River Sister Fly Fishing LLC, Colorado City, CO; Jeff Patterson, Ross Reels, Montrose, CO; Taylor Vavra, Stripers Forever, South Portland, ME; Art Web, Silver Kings Holdings Inc., Tavernier, FL; Tom Bie, The Drake Magazine, Denver, CO; Neville Orsmond, Thomas & Thomas, Greenfield, MA; Scott Hunter, Vedavoo, Leominster, MA; Ted Upton, Wingo Belts, Watertown, MA; Jim Klug, Yellow Dog Fly Fishing Adventures, Bozeman, MT.

SEAFOOD HARVESTERS OF AMERICA

Arlington, VA, July 9, 2018.

DEAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS: We understand that H.R. 200, the ''Strengthening Fishing Communities and Increasing Flexibility in Fisheries Management Act,'' is on the schedule for floor debate and a vote on Wednesday afternoon The Seafood Harvesters of America (SHA) remains staunchly opposed to this bill as it would do very little to improve the management of the recreational fishing industry while severely undermining the sacrifices the commercial fishing industry has made to ensure that we are sustainably harvesting fisheries resources.

The Seafood Harvesters of America is a broadly-based organization that represents commercial fishermen and their associations. Our members reflect the diversity of America's coastal communities, the complexity of our marine environments, and the enormous potential of our commercial fisheries. As domestic harvesters of an American public resource, we recognize and embrace our stewardship responsibility. We strive for accountability in our fisheries, encourage others to do the same, and speak out on issues of common concern that affect the U.S. commercial fishing industry, the stewardship of our public resources, and the many millions of Americans who enjoy seafood.

In addition to the threats posed by H.R. 200 as we've outlined in previous letters (below), we are concerned with a proposed amendment to H.R. 200 that will be debated during the floor vote. Specifically, we are concerned with Amendment #26 which directs the General Accountability Office to develop a report to Congress on the ''resource rent'' of Limited Access Privilege Programs (LAPPs) in the Gulf of Mexico and Southeast, and examine ''fiduciary conflicts of interest'' on these Regional Fishery Management Councils. First, by studying only LAPPs without also studying recreational fishing and non-LAPP fisheries, this language unfairly singles out LAPPs and is aimed at attacking these successful programs. Commercial fishermen already pay for their commercial permits, quota, licenses, vessel registration, business taxes, observer costs, among other costs. On top of that, fishermen in LAPPs pay an additional fee to recover costs of administering the program. There is no reason to limit an analysis of the fishing value extracted to LAPPs and such a biased analysis would lead to false conclusions. Second, the Regional Fishery Management Councils were purposely created to involve fishery stakeholders from all sectors in the Council process to guide policy and regulations. The process by which Council Members are appointed is thorough and well-vetted, and already requires financial disclosure of their fishing interests. This language shows a misunderstanding of the Council structure designed within the Magnuson-Stevens Act (MSA). Targeting commercial and charter fishermen representatives on Councils for these two regions would not only undermine the intended Council appointment process to encourage stakeholder participation in management of our fisheries resources, but set a dangerous precedent for the rest of the country.

As we've outlined in our previous letters, the Harvesters remain opposed to H.R 200 because of a number of sections that pose a direct threat to sustainable fisheries management:

(1) H.R. 200 risks overfishing and imperils rebuilding of overfished species

Despite significant flexibility already incorporated into the MSA, Section 303 establishes multiple exceptions to the rebuilding timeline. Congress previously strengthened the rebuilding timeline requirements because many fish stocks were not recovering and were at risk of continued overfishing. Without this statutory standard, rebuilding timelines could vary dramatically, perpetuating depleted stock conditions and harming our businesses' bottom lines.

Overfishing has been illegal since the MSA was first signed into law in 1976, but the 2007 requirement for annual catch limits (ACLs) truly put an end to the practice Section 204 waives the requirement for ACLs for a large number of species, including virtually all bycatch species and many fish that are caught in international waters, significantly raising the risk of overfishing.

Repealing MSA Section 407 entirely (Section 306 in H.R. 200) would remove backstops against recreational quota overages and allocations for Gulf of Mexico red snapper which, combined with H.R. 200's sweeping ACL exemptions, increases the risk of overfishing and makes it difficult for management bodies to allocate quota to prevent quota overages.

(2) H.R. 200 hinders Councils' ability to manage our fishery resources

Councils already have the flexibility to conduct allocation reviews as necessary, so requiring that the South Atlantic and Gulf Councils conduct a review of commercial and recreational allocations every 5 years (Section 202) is duplicative, costly, and would effectively prevent these Councils from having the time and money to manage the resource (i.e. stock assessments, habitat management, among other responsibilities).

Section 304 establishes a suite of procedures that would make the use of Exempted Fishing Permits (EFPs) nearly impossible, removing a pathway for Councils to work with industry to develop and test innovative gear, fishing, and management technologies aimed at improving resource management. Additionally, this Section bans the use of EFPs to test for Limited Access Privilege Programs (LAPPs).

(3) H.R. 200 would impose unnecessary Congressional interference

Fishermen are deeply involved in the development of catch share programs, which often take years of deliberation with extensive public input. Under current law, Councils can require referenda on these programs at their discretion. Mandating additional referenda and specifying who should be allowed to vote in them is unnecessarily intrusive to the Council process and creates undue hurdles to catch share development (Section 205). While we recognize that a catch share program may not be appropriation for every fishery, we feel strongly that this management tool should remain a viable option

We are disappointed to see this bill move along near partisan lines. The reauthorization of the MSA has traditionally been a bipartisan effort that advances the sustainability of our nation's fisheries. Instead,

what we see today is a partisan effort to advance the interests of the recreational fishing industry at the expense and to the detriment of the commercial fishing industry.

As thousands of commercial fishermen around the country stand in opposition to this bill, we urge House Leadership to reconsider bringing this bill to the House floor for a vote. We are serve as a direct connection to the ocean for many inland citizens and we take our responsibility as stewards of the ocean very seriously. We stand ready to work with Mr. Young and others to develop a bill that works for all sectors and progresses fisheries management across the board.

We appreciate your consideration of our request. Please reach out to our Executive Director, Leigh Habegger, should you have any further questions.

Sincerely,

CHRISTOPHER BROWN,
President,
Seafood Harvesters of America.

MEMBER ORGANIZATIONS

Alaska Whitefish Trawlers Association; Cape Cod Commercial Fishermen's Alliance; Cordova District Fishermen United; Fishing Vessel Owners' Association; Fort Bragg Groundfish Association; Georges Bank Fixed Gear Cod Sector, Inc; Gulf Fishermen's Association; Gulf of Mexico Reef Fish Shareholder's Alliance; Midwater Trawlers Cooperative; New Hampshire Groundfish Sectors; North Pacific Fisheries Association; Purse Seine Vessel Owners Association; Rhode Island Commercial Fishermen's Association; South Atlantic Fishermen's Association; United Catcher Boats.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I include in the RECORD this column recently written by the head of the National Marine Fisheries Service and also the chief scientist for the National Marine Fisheries Service under the Bush administration.

I would like to call special attention to this statement by these experts from the Bush administration, who say: ''We believe this is an ill-conceived, dangerous piece of legislation that would undermine the tremendous progress in fisheries rebuilding and sustainable management that has occurred since the last reauthorization of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act in 2007.''

DON'T HURT FISHERIES WITH DANGEROUS LEGISLATION

(By William Hogarth and Steven Murawski, special to the Tampa Bay Times)

This Wednesday the U.S. House of Representatives is scheduled to vote on H.R. 200, the Strengthen Fishing Communities and Increasing Flexibility in Fisheries Management Act. We believe this is an ill-conceived, dangerous piece of legislation that would undermine the tremendous progress in fisheries rebuilding and sustainable management that has occurred since the latest reauthorizations of the Magnuson Stevens Fisheries Conservation and Management Act in 2007.

Since 2007, more than 40 of the most overfished and historically important fish stocks in the nation have been recovered. Overfishing now occurs for fewer than 10 percent of stocks, the lowest proportion since records have been kept. Rebuilding stocks has resulted in increases in fisheries yields and translated into lower prices to consumers, more business-friendly approaches to commercial fisheries management and more healthy recreational fisheries.

The term ''flexibility'' in H.R. 200 is a code word that would undermine timely, effective management of stocks when downturns inevitably occur. Heavy on requirements for studies and other administrative requirements, H.R. 200 would make fisheries management more cumbersome. The bill as written would delay timely, effective conservation responses and would limit the flexibility to use innovative management tools. Healthy fisheries without healthy stocks is a non sequitur. We urge the House to reject this piece of legislation that seeks to solve problems that simply do not exist.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I have no other speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. COURTNEY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 115–786.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Chairman, the Clerk has an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of title II add the following:

SEC. ___. NORTHEAST REGIONAL PILOT RESEARCH TRAWL SURVEY AND STUDY.

(a) INDUSTRY-BASED PILOT STUDY.—Within 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Commerce shall, in coordination with the relevant Councils selected by the Secretary and the Northeast Area Monitoring and Assessment Program (NEAMAP), develop a fishing industry-based Northeast regional pilot research trawl survey and study to enhance and provide improvement to current National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration vessel trawl surveys.

(b) COMPONENTS.—Under the pilot survey and study—

(1) the Secretary—

(A) may select fishing industry vessels to participate in the study by issuing a request for procurement;

(B) may use the NEAMAP Southern New England/Mid-Atlantic Nearshore Trawl Survey as a model for the pilot survey; and

(C) shall outfit participating vessels with a peer-reviewed net configuration; and

(2) the selected Councils shall, in partnership with the National Marine Fisheries Service Northeast Fisheries Science Center and the Virginia Institute of Marine Science, collect data and evaluate discrepancies between fishing industry vessel data and National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration vessel data, for 5 years.

(b) REPORT.—Upon completion of the pilot survey and study, the Secretary and the selected Councils shall submit a detailed report on the results of the pilot survey and study to the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 965, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Chairman, at the beginning, I first of all want to salute both Mr. YOUNG and Mr. HUFFMAN for their hard work on this legislation, which is very contentious and requires a lot of interests to be balanced. Again, hopefully, as the process moves forward through the next Chamber, we will get to that sweet spot for good policy for our Nation.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment at the desk is a simple amendment, which creates a 5-year, industry-based pilot trawl survey for the New England and Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Councils. Such a program would follow the model industry-based trawl surveys used in the Pacific Northwest under NOAA's supervision that have been a great success.

The reason I am offering this bipartisan amendment with Congressman LEE ZELDIN from New York is that NOAA trawl surveys have been seriously hampered by a string of mechanical and performance problems with NOAA's ship Henry B. Bigelow over the last 2 years.

For example, from August 2017 to March 2018, Bigelow missed several trawls while in its shipyard for chronic propulsion problems. Even when the Bigelow is operational, one-third of its trawls are not performing, and these bad trawls generally have yields that are 67 percent lower than when it performs properly.

These problems are unacceptable, given the critical importance of that data to accurately calculate catch limits on the East Coast, which, as we have heard, is a highly contentious issue.

In addition to the Bigelow's gear issues, the vessel is too large for nearshore studies. It draws a lot of water and cannot enter shallow littoral areas to trawl. Because of that, NOAA already contracts with the Northeast Area Monitoring and Assessment Program, NEAMAP, to survey shallower areas. NEAMAP contracts industry vessels outfitted with peer-reviewed NOAA gear for near-shore surveys, proving that surveying can be done on industry vessels.

I want to emphasize that this pilot program contemplated in the amendment will be a pilot program coordinated with NOAA, the councils, and industry. While we don't dictate a specific framework, we recommend that the pilot mirror the NEAMAP survey, which the executive directors of both the New England and Mid-Atlantic Councils have described as the gold standard of cooperative, collaborative fisheries surveys.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is a responsible initiative to solve a real-life problem using a trusted precedent in the Pacific Northwest and under the careful supervision of NOAA and fisheries experts.

I want to thank the Northeast Trawl Advisory Panel for bringing attention to the trawl gaps that are happening on the East Coast and working with my office to craft this amendment.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, although I do not oppose it.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN), who sponsored the bill.

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank my colleague, JOE COURTNEY from Connecticut, for his bipartisan cooperation on this and so many other issues that are important to the hardworking men and women who make their living on the Long Island Sound, a precious waterway we are both so fortunate to represent.

This amendment creates an industry-based trawl survey program for the New England and Mid-Atlantic regions. Improving survey data so that the quotas and regulations imposed on our fishermen are transparent, equitable, and fair is a critical goal of the underlying bill, and it is the purpose of this important bipartisan amendment.

Increasing industry buy-in and cooperation with the NOAA survey program is essential for improving data collection. Without the right data, fishermen in our region will continue to be shortchanged while their counterparts in the Pacific Northwest are already benefiting from increased cooperation between NOAA and the private sector.

What we have right now in our region is a massive failure on behalf of NOAA because their vessel has fudged trawl after trawl. The people who work on the water every day have the equipment, the vessels, and the expertise to get this important data collection done, and done right.

I am proud to be a cosponsor of this amendment, and I commend my friend from Connecticut for his hard work on this issue. I look forward to continuing to work together with him and others on bipartisan solutions to help our hardworking commercial fishermen, charter boat captains, and all the small businesses that are a part of the coastal economy.

Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of this amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Chairman, I have no further speakers for the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a ''yes'' vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. LANGEVIN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 115–786.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of section 209 (page 27, after line 7) add the following:

(f) ADDITION OF RHODE ISLAND TO THE MID-ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL.—Section 302(a)(1)(B) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1852(a)(1)(B)) is amended—

(1) by inserting ''Rhode Island,'' after ''States of'';

(2) by inserting ''Rhode Island,'' after ''except North Carolina,'';

(3) by striking ''21'' and inserting ''23''; and

(4) by striking ''13'' and inserting ''14''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 965, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, today I offer an amendment with immense importance to Rhode Island fishermen. My amendment would provide voting representation for Rhode Island on the Mid-Atlantic Fisheries Management Council, which regulates numerous species found in the waters off our coast.

I want to emphasize that this is not a provincial matter. This is about providing fair representation and a sense of equity for those invested in our regional fisheries council system. It only makes sense that those who haul in these fish species should have a seat at the table.

Mr. Chairman, despite our location in New England, we do haul in these so-called Mid-Atlantic species. Using the most recent statistics, Rhode Island lands half of all squid caught on the East Coast.

Let me repeat that, Mr. Chairman. Half of all squid caught on the East Coast is landed by Ocean State fishermen. These squid are the key ingredient in the famous Rhode Island calamari, a dish that many of us undoubtedly enjoy.

Beyond squid, Rhode Island lands 85 percent of all East Cost butterfish, far exceeding any other State. Butterfish is regulated by the Mid-Atlantic Council. We haul in more scup than any other East Coast State. Scup is also regulated by the Mid-Atlantic Council.

Additionally, we are among the top three States for landing bluefish, summer flounder, and monkfish. Mr. Chairman, bluefish, summer flounder, and monkfish are all regulated by the Mid-Atlantic Council. For our recreational fishermen, summer flounder, black sea bass, bluefish, and scup comprise the bulk of the recreational harvest in Rhode Island.

So, Mr. Chairman, it should also be noted that the Rhode Island Sound is a part of the Mid-Atlantic Bight. In other words, Mr. Chairman, we are a part of the same marine ecosystem that stretches down to the Outer Banks of North Carolina. The same species live all along these waters, and they are regulated by the Mid-Atlantic Council.

While this inequity already exists today, the threat of climate change will only make this worse as species migrate northward in search of colder waters.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out to my colleagues that there is precedent for such a change. In 1996, we amended fisheries law to ensure that North Carolina could sit on two regional fisheries councils. All we ask is the same consideration be provided to Rhode Island. It is only fair.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I understand the intent of my good friend's amendment, but I reluctantly oppose it.

The amendment would begin to unravel, I believe, this council's structure that was made in the Magnuson-Stevens Act, the gold standard of global fisheries management. At best, it erodes MSA's emphasis on regional management.

Fish stocks migrate up and down the Atlantic coast frequently incorporated in a prospective of States invested in shared fishery resources, a goal we all share. That is why Congress authorized the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission and why my bill before us today creates a liaison between the Mid-Atlantic Council and the New England Council and vice versa.

These two mechanisms adequately address overlapping Atlantic coast fisheries without undermining the fundamental council structure.

Mr. Chairman, reluctantly, for those reasons, I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, once again, I would point out to my friend, whom I have deep respect for, that there is precedent for such a change.

In 1996, we amended fisheries law to ensure that North Carolina could, in fact, sit on two regional fisheries councils, so what we are asking is not unprecedented.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my colleague from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment offered by my friend and colleague, Congressman LANGEVIN. I am proud to be an original cosponsor of my colleague's legislation, the Fishermen's Fairness Act, which serves as the basis for this amendment.

This amendment would provide our home State of Rhode Island with representation on the Mid-Atlantic Fisheries Management Council. This move

would allow Rhode Island fishing communities to have a voice on the council which manages stocks for species that are among the most valuable to fisheries in our State.

Rhode Island fishermen account for nearly 56 percent of total summer scup landings and 54 percent of all Atlantic squid landings, both stocks being managed by the Mid-Atlantic Council.

Squid landings are critical to Rhode Island's overall fishing economy, landing more squid than all other States combined and the second most of any other State in the country. In 2015, Rhode Island landed roughly 16 million pounds of squid, nearly 12 million pounds more than its nearest competitor.

□ 1615

The following year was even more significant for Rhode Island, with nearly 23 million pounds in squid landings valued at more than $29 million.

All told, Rhode Island accounts for more fish landings under the jurisdiction of the Mid-Atlantic Fisheries Management Council than any other State in the region, with the exception of New Jersey.

Yet, despite all of this, my State does not have a seat on this council, leaving Rhode Island fisheries without a say in how a significant portion of its industry is managed.

This amendment will provide a commonsense solution to this problem by adding two additional seats to the Mid-Atlantic Fisheries Management Council in order to represent Rhode Island's interests in the region.

As Congressman LANGEVIN said, this is not unprecedented. We have done this before. In 1996, North Carolina, which also had significant fishing interests in the mid-Atlantic region, was given a seat on the council. This amendment would extend this same right to a seat at the table to my State.

I really want to thank my colleague for his work on this issue, and I strongly encourage adoption of this amendment, particularly out of a sense of comity, since we have done this in the past. Rhode Islanders deserve to be treated fairly. Our fishermen deserve a voice. I urge my colleagues to support this excellent amendment.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. HUFFMAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 115–786.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 37, strike lines 5 through 6 (and redesignate the subsequent subparagraphs accordingly).

Page 38, after line 7, insert the following (and redesignate the subsequent quoted subclauses accordingly):

''(IV) the new plan, amendment, or proposed regulation has at least a 75 percent chance of rebuilding the overfished fishery within the time limit proposed by the Council, as calculated by the scientific and statistical committee of the Council with jurisdiction over the fishery pursuant to section 302(g)(1)(B);

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 965, the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, supporters of this bill argue that the requirement to rebuild overfished stocks needs more ''flexibility,'' but it is important to note that the Magnuson Act already provides a lot of flexibility.

While I am fully aware that it isn't always easy or popular to implement fishing restrictions, management tools like annual catch limits and rebuilding plans are essential to ensuring a future for our fisheries and fishing industry.

In my district, fishermen went through several tough years while groundfish stocks were depleted. Magnuson provided the scientific and regulatory framework to bring those fisheries back. We have now rebuilt half of our groundfish species, and more are on the way to recovery.

These accomplishments certainly did not come easily. Our fishermen had to make sacrifices. But the long-term health of our fisheries and communities that depend on them in making these tough decisions has benefited from it. That is why these decisions were supported by commercial and recreational fishermen. That support has been integral to sustaining the fisheries that are critical for West Coast communities. This success story, by the way, has been replicated around the country time and again.

Our success and the sustainability of the fishing industry rely on harvesting from healthy and productive fish stocks. Fishing restrictions are only put in place because they are absolutely necessary. If there aren't enough fish to support strong harvests both now and in the future, we have no choice but to cut back in order to avoid the tragedy of the commons.

It is important to note that the law allows councils to delay rebuilding when the biology of the stock, environmental conditions, or international management considerations present challenges. Because of these broad but fair exemptions, more than 50 percent of all overfished stocks today have rebuilding plans that are longer than the 10-year baseline in the act. So there is flexibility, and it is being used.

Further, current law gives councils 2 years to put a rebuilding plan in place and another year to reduce rather than end overfishing. That is 3 years of lead time before significant harvest restrictions go into effect.

My amendment requires that an exemption to strong rebuilding timelines would only be permitted if rebuilding plans have at least a 75 percent chance of success. That is contrasted with the 50 percent chance of success that ordinarily applies to rebuilding plans.

Now, I am proud that, without being required to do so, most of the West Coast groundfish fishery recovery plans have a greater than 75 percent chance of meeting their rebuilding goals, and we have seen the success of that. Unfortunately, the same cannot be said of all the regions.

The bottom line is that we should not be weakening standards unless we have a very robust rebuilding plan in place. That is what this amendment addresses.

I want to note that, in addition to all of that, the current Magnuson Act requires a rebuilding timeline be as short as possible. H.R. 200 would change that requirement to be as short as practicable. This is a very problematic weakening of the law, with real consequences.

Currently, the agency has to do whatever is possible, whatever is feasible. Practicable is a lower standard. It means the stocks would not be built in a reasonable timeframe, and this change could even allow the agency to do little or nothing to rebuild a stock.

History has shown us what happens if we don't do that. We need to tackle rebuilding aggressively in order to succeed. Rebuilding plans that take a weak approach to harvest or drag on rebuilding for many years inevitably fail.

So, unless the law is very clear and strong on this point, managers could choose not to deal with rebuilding situations proactively. My amendment addresses this to be sure that we continue to see fish stocks rebuild so that fishermen can ultimately reap the rewards.

Mr. Chairman, I request an ''aye'' vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would not only hamstring the flexibility of rebuilding fish stocks that this bill provides, it would add serious bureaucratic delays in the development of fishery management plans across the country.

Furthermore, according to NOAA, this amendment would eliminate some of the flexibility currently provided under the national standard, one which was updated under the Obama administration, and would cause an unnecessary reduction in the catch.

NOAA also expressed concerns regarding the potential impact on international fishing agreements that would

change how the U.S. can negotiate on rebuilding plans. According to a letter authored by the National Coalition for Fishing Communities, this amendment would undermine the act, impede reforms that are desperately needed, and attack jobs in coastal communities.

Mr. Chair, I include in the RECORD a letter to the leadership of the House and to myself where they say such an amendment sponsored by Mr. JARED HUFFMAN of California and Mr. ALCEE HASTINGS of Florida will ensure it does not: ''We believe it would actually undermine the MSA, impede reforms that are desperately needed, and attack jobs in coastal communities around the country, including in California and Florida, the home States of Mr. HUFFMAN and Mr. HASTINGS.''

NATIONAL COALITION
FOR FISHING COMMUNITIES,
July 10, 2018.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,
Speaker, United States House of Representatives, Washington, DC.
Hon. KEVIN MCCARTHY,
Majority Leader, United States House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

SPEAKER RYAN AND MAJORITY LEADER MCCARTHY: H.R. 200 (formerly H.R. 1335), the ''Strengthening Fishing Communities and Increasing Flexibility in Fisheries Management Act'' is the product of three Managing our Nations Fisheries (''MONF'') conferences, and numerous hearings with well over a hundred witnesses (from to 2009 through 2017). These many efforts were held in large part to address unintended consequences in the implementation of the 2006 reauthorization.

The Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (MSA) has largely been a success, but no law is perfect, and H.R. 200 contains a number of important updates and refinements. But as a result of a barrage of last-minute amendments, proposed outside of the committee process, years of hard work to create honest reform of the MSA is now in jeopardy.

One such amendment, sponsored by Congressman Jared Huffman (D-California) and Alcee Hastings (D-Florida) purports to ''ensure that rebuilding plans are successful in rebuilding overfished fish stocks.'' However, we believe it would actually undermine the MSA, impede reforms that are desperately needed, and attack jobs in coastal communities around the country, including in California and Florida, the home states of Mr. Huffman and Mr. Hastings.

In a letter delivered to their offices on last week, we asked Mr. Huffman and Mr. Hastings to please explain to us how they foresee that this amendment could be enacted without having the effect of reducing commercial, charter and recreational fishing quotas significantly. We also asked that since they represent California and Florida, and since our membership includes members who represent fishing interests in California and Florida, that they explain how they see this amendment improving conditions for seafood harvesters and processors in your respective home states. Unfortunately we did not receive a response to those questions.

In the provisions contained in this amendment were implemented, the required theoretical probability of management measures rebuilding a stock in the shortest time period as possible would increase from 50% to 75% for many species. The ''Huffman-Hastings Amendment'' would impose a burden on many U.S.-managed fisheries.

While this sounds like an innocuous effort to strengthen and improve the law, the fact is, the only way to meet the requirements of the amendment would be to significantly reduce many commercial, charter and recreational fishing quotas significantly. Considering the status of U.S. fish stocks recently described in NOAA's 2018 Report to Congress as ''Overfishing remains near all time lows and we reached a new milestone with the number of overfished stocks at the lowest level ever'', the validity and intent of the ''Huffman Amendment'' should be seriously questioned.

Why, if the current Act's requirements are having success in rebuilding stocks, is there a reason to require the law to be substantially more conservative?

In addition, the amendment removes a subtle but important update to the MSA.

Section 304 of MSA states that ''For a fishery that is overfished, any fishery management plan, amendment, or proposed regulations . . . shall . . . specify a time period for rebuilding the fishery that shall . . . be as short as possible, taking into account the status and biology of any overfished stocks of fish, the needs of fishing communities, recommendations by international organizations in which the United States participates, and the interaction of the overfished stock of fish within the marine ecosystem.''

There is widespread support to change the term ''possible'' to ''practicable'' in this section. The intent of this change is not to compromise or weaken the effectiveness of the MSA, but rather to help better fulfill one of the fundamental and original goals of the Act, emphasized in National Standard 1—to prevent overfishing while achieving, on a continuing basis the optimum yield from each fishery. Changing the terminology from ''possible'' to ''practicable'' would provide Regional Fishery Management Councils with much-needed flexibility and the option to choose between several rebuilding scenarios to achieve specified conservation and management objectives, not just the shortest and, quite often, most harmful to fishing communities.

We must remain committed to restoring common sense to MSA. We must not undermine our Nation's fisheries law in the name of improving it, and cause harm to commercial charter and recreational fishermen from Alaska to Maine.

Coastal communities and fishing families are relying on the passage of clean legislation, as developed in committee.

We urge Members to vote NO on the Huffman Amendment to H.R. 200!

Sincerely,

American Scallop Association, John Whiteside, General Counsel, Members in MA, NJ, NC; Ariel Seafoods, David Krebs, Owner, FL; Atlantic Capes Fisheries, Dan Cohen, Owner, MA, NJ; Atlantic Red Crab Co., Jon Williams, Owner, MA; California Wetfish Producers Association, Diane Pleschner-Steele, CA; Fishermen's Dock Co-Op, Jim Lovgren, Board Member, NJ; Fishing Partnership Support Services, J.J. Bartlett, Executive Director, MA; Florida Keys Commercial Fishermen's Association, Bill Kelly, Executive Director, FL; Garden State Seafood Association, Greg DiDomenico, Executive Director, NJ; Gulf Coast Seafood Association, David Krebs, Founding Member, FL, AL; Hawaii Longline Association, Sean Martin, Owner, HI.

Inlet Seafood, William Grimm, Secretary and Treasurer, NY; Long Island Commercial Fishermen's Association, Bonnie Brady, Executive Director, NY; Lunds Fisheries, Inc., Jeff Reichle, Chairman, CA, NJ; North Carolina Fisheries Association, Glen Skinner, Executive Director, NC; Pacific Seafood, Jon Gonzales, Fisheries Policy Analyst, OR, WA; Rhode Island Commercial Fishermen's Association, Rich Fuka, Executive Director, RI; Seafreeze, Ltd., Meghan Lapp, Fisheries Liaison, RI; Southeastern Fisheries Association, Bob Jones, Executive Director, FL; Viking Village, Jim Gutowski, Owner, NJ; West Coast Seafood Processors Association, Lori Steele, Executive Director, CA, WA, OR; Western Fishboat Owners Association, Wayne Heikkila, Executive Director, AK, CA, OR, WA.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I am suggesting, respectfully, that this amendment is uncalled for and, frankly, will gut the bill and the MSA, period.

Mr. Chairman, I ask my colleagues to reject this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. WEBSTER OF FLORIDA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 115–786.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk as the designee of the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. FRANKEL).

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end the following:

TITLE ___—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. ___. MITIGATION FOR IMPACTS TO SUBMERGED AQUATIC VEGETATION.

Requirements to conserve or to provide compensatory mitigation for impacts to submerged aquatic vegetation under section 305(b) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1855(b)) shall not apply when a non-Federal entity conducts maintenance dredging for an authorized Federal navigation project on an inland waterway, inlet, or harbor located in North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, or Florida pursuant to a permit issued under section 404 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1344) or section 10 of the Act of March 3, 1899 (33 U.S.C. 403; 30 Stat. 1151, chapter 425).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 965, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WEBSTER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Chair, I rise today on behalf of my colleague from Florida, Ms. LOIS FRANKEL, to offer a nonpartisan amendment that Ms. FRANKEL and I have been working on for some time.

The amendment applies common sense to routine maintenance and dredging in the inland navigational channels. Specifically, this amendment would waive a duplicative requirement for routine maintenance dredging.

When a waterway is initially dredged, the project sponsor has to mitigate for the impact on aquatic vegetation like seagrass. In the Florida Intracoastal Waterway, seagrass grows like a weed and must be routinely dredged to keep it clear. Unfortunately, the project sponsor is required

to do costly environmental mitigation every time just to keep the waterway open and operating, instead of using the permit that has already been given and the mitigation that has already happened for that particular area. This additional round of mitigation is unnecessary, since seagrass removal has already been accounted for in the environmental review for the initial dredging.

Florida's Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway requires routine maintenance dredging akin to mowing your grass. The waterway annually transports tons of commercial cargo and is used by more than 500,000 recreational vehicles. It provides $30 billion in economic output, including $3 billion in wages, creates 155,000 jobs, and generates more than $540 million in tax revenues. Without regular maintenance dredging, this powerful economic driver is at risk.

This amendment itself is limited in scope and maintains an existing environmental protection while ensuring that the maintenance dredging mitigation requirements make sense.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment because it would set a bad precedent by waiving the requirements to provide compensatory mitigation for federally authorized maintenance dredging projects in inland waterways, inlets, or harbors located in North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and Florida.

As it should, Magnuson requires compensatory mitigation to protect essential fish habitat, including seagrass. This mitigation requires the restoration, establishment, enhancement, and/or preservation of aquatic resources to offset unavoidable adverse impacts from activities like dredging.

Many of the inland waterways in the Southeast that need maintenance dredging are actually home to seagrasses, so these States are required to mitigate the negative impacts. Compensatory mitigation is the most obvious, commonsense solution for offsetting the damage to these important habitats.

Fish depend on healthy seagrass habitats to survive and reproduce, not only in the Southeast but all across the Nation's coasts, including in my district.

Moreover, we need all the help that we can get to recover seagrasses. Globally, 30 percent of seagrass meadows have disappeared. Of the seagrasses that remain, nearly a quarter are threatened or near threatened. In fact, the only marine plant listed as endangered in the United States is a seagrass found in Florida.

Seagrasses are highly productive hotspots for biodiversity and can act as a carbon sink, making this habitat a critical component in buffering oceans against the impacts of climate change. Protecting and restoring essential fish habitat and seagrass is very important to maintain productive fisheries and healthy oceans.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no,'' and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I will say this. This is so duplicative and ridiculous. It is typical government regulation.

Here you have an inland waterway, the Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway. The seagrass removal has been already mitigated. That requires maintenance. As you do maintenance, you have to come back and do more mitigation on the exact same piece of property for the same seagrass.

It is ridiculous; it is duplicative; and I submit it is a good amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chair, I am sitting here listening to this. These channels were built for navigation and commercial use by taxpayers' dollars many years ago, and the seagrass grows back. Each time, they mitigate when trying to maintain it. Where is the logic?

Where is the logic when we built those channels with American tax dollars for commerce and now, each time they dredge it—they already dredged it once—it grows back and they have to come back and file another ES statement. Why are we doing this?

□ 1630

Who is this helping out? Not the fish because the eelgrass grows back again, because they have to dredge it again. It costs money, slows down commerce, and that is interfering with the economy of this country.

I have been through these channels. They can't show me where the dredging hurts. In fact, it helps. It is like you said, mowing the grass. You let it grow too long, you are going to get in trouble. We let this eelgrass grow too long, you are going to hurt the channel or you are going to hurt the fish in the long run.

So I compliment the gentleman on his amendment, and I will support this amendment strongly.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I will close by stating that I can appreciate the frustration that the gentleman may be feeling, feeling like this is a process of remitigating for the same thing over and over again.

I think it is a little more complicated than that, but if the gentleman is willing to work going forward on some ways to perhaps consolidate the regulatory burden and find something for the long term that provides a little more certainty and streamlining, I would be happy to work with him on that.

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

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WEBSTER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. GRAVES OF LOUISIANA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in House Report 115–786.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end the following:

TITLE ____—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. ____. REPORT ON LIMITED ACCESS PRIVILEGE PROGRAMS AND CONFLICTS OF INTEREST WITH RESPECT TO GULF OF MEXICO AND SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERIES.

No later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Congress a report on—

(1) the resource rent of limited access privilege programs in the Gulf of Mexico and the South Atlantic Ocean;

(2) how to reclaim resource rent in the Gulf of Mexico and the South Atlantic as revenue the United States Treasury; and

(3) the fiduciary conflicts of interest in the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council and the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council, and effective ways to eliminate such conflicts.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 965, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana.

MODIFICATION TO AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. GRAVES OF LOUISIANA

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that a modified amendment at the desk be considered.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the modification.

The Clerk read as follows:

Modification to amendment No. 6 offered by Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana:

TITLE ____—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. ____. REPORT ON LIMITED ACCESS PRIVILEGE PROGRAMS AND CONFLICTS OF INTEREST WITH RESPECT TO GULF OF MEXICO AND SOUTH ATLANTIC OCEAN RED SNAPPER.

(a) STUDY.—No later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Congress a report on—

(1) the resource rent of limited access privilege programs for red snapper in the Gulf of Mexico and the South Atlantic Ocean;

(2) how to reclaim resource rent for red snapper in the Gulf of Mexico and the South Atlantic Ocean as revenue to the United States Treasury; and

(3) the fiduciary conflicts of interest in the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council and the South Atlantic Fishery Management

Council relating to red snapper, and effective ways to eliminate such conflicts.

(b) LIMITATION.—In implementing this section the Comptroller General shall not consider—

(1) fisheries programs in any region other than the Gulf of Mexico and the South Atlantic Ocean; and

(2) fisheries management programs for species other than red snapper.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana (during the reading). Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the amendment is modified.

There was no objection.

The ACTING Chair. The gentleman from Louisiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, this amendment simply authorizes a GAO study, a Government Accountability Office study, for the purposes of evaluating how we currently manage the red snapper species in the Gulf of Mexico and the South Atlantic.

I want to be very clear, Mr. Chairman. This amendment does not affect any other region of the Nation. It doesn't affect any other species. It is a unique scenario that we are facing in the Gulf of Mexico and the South Atlantic pertaining to the red snapper.

This is a species where the increased demand from both recreational and commercial fishers has resulted in contentious debate and challenging situations for resource managers across the Gulf Coast and the South Atlantic.

This amendment is designed to have the GAO perform a study that would provide information to resource managers. We have been able to work through EFPs for the past 2 years, but in the future we are not guaranteed any type of solution.

When I was a child, we could fish for red snapper year-round. We are no longer allowed to do that. We were limited by as many as 3 days—proposed—by the Federal Government in recent years. This is designed to provide better information, better tools for how we manage these species moving forward in a sustainable manner.

Mr. Chairman, the modifications that I made to this amendment were a result of discussions with Members near me right now.

As a matter of fact, someone sitting near me may or may not have threatened to fillet me with a butter knife if I didn't change some text in the amendment, so some of the text has been changed to reflect the very narrow scope of this amendment.

Mr. Chair, I urge adoption of the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, regrettably, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by my friend, Mr. GRAVES. This amendment requires the Comptroller General to submit a report to Congress, but it is unclear what the overall purpose of this report would be.

In fact, because of the vagueness of that purpose, there has been concern that it may be about identifying what would happen if the overall value of the red snapper fishery commercial quota was completely taken away or given to private anglers. Would this report be used to make the argument that the red snapper quota should be reallocated to recreational fishermen? I can't support either of those propositions, nor a reporting requirement with such ambiguous goals and potentially significant impacts on the fishery.

When it comes to setting these allocations, picking winners and losers from among commercial and recreational fishing interests, that should be the job of regional councils, not of Congress. In fact, the entire structure of Magnuson and the council system is designed to encourage stakeholder participation on the councils, from a regional perspective.

We need to let the fishery management councils do their job and not have Congress micromanaging these type of decisions.

It is unclear, also, why this amendment only targets limited access privilege permits. Every type of commercial or recreational fishing activity could be viewed as having a ''resource rent.'' So it is questionable that every other form of commercial and recreational activity would be excluded from this type of report. There is no reason why an analysis of the economic value commercial and recreational fishermen extract from a Federal resource would be limited to just catch share programs.

Finally, with respect to the conflict of interest provisions in this bill, I would have supported—and I have talked to the gentleman about this—this amendment, had it been a report on ways to eliminate conflicts of interest on all fishery management councils, because there are concerns, bipartisan concerns, in that regard, and it is something that should be addressed to improve fishery management in all councils.

Unfortunately, this seems to be a rather targeted and direct attack on what many view as a well-managed commercial red snapper fishery, and we should not be devoting public resources to such a report.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no,'' and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG).

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for modifying this amendment. I still have concerns, as I have told the gentleman. I know the problem.

If I ever hear about a red snapper again, we change this to the Graves snapper. That is what we are going to call it. I know there is a problem, and I look forward to working with the gentleman to strengthen the language and, especially, to making sure this does not include any other areas, because I want Alaska and the Pacific Northwest left out. I will say that is being selfish, but I know what the gentleman over there said.

I understand what the gentleman is trying to do here. We have a little ways to go. We will work together and try to get something done.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I do appreciate the concerns raised by the gentleman from Alaska. I am committed to working with the gentleman and to working with my friend from California in trying to get this amendment in a better posture. I do want to work together with both the gentlemen to make sure that we get this done in a way that does not cause injury to other places.

In response to my friend from California, I do want to be clear that this is information. All this is is information that our committee, that this Congress, would then have the option to act upon.

I don't think information in this case, on such a contentious issue, that does have a very unclear future—we have dealt with contentious issues and bought ourselves 2 years. Beyond that, we are going to be right back in the same situation.

We are trying to get additional information. I want to say, in regard to the conflict issues, in regard to the balance of commercial and recreational, that is good feedback, and I am happy to adopt those changes to the amendment, to include those as we work through the process.

I will say it again. I am committed to working with the gentleman. Mr. Chairman, I sent the gentleman the text of the amendment—the first person I sent it to—to ensure that I had input from both sides. We did make some modifications as a result, the changes requested by Mr. YOUNG, but I am committed to working together with the dean and with the gentleman from California to perfect this as we move forward.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment, as modified, offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES).

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. KEATING

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in House Report 115–786.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end the following:

TITLE ___—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. ___. PLAN FOR ELECTRONIC MONITORING AND REPORTING PROCEDURES FOR THE NORTHEAST MULTISPECIES FISHERY.

The Secretary, acting through the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, shall submit a plan to the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate not less than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act that will establish fully operational electronic monitoring and reporting procedures for the Northeast Multispecies Fishery by not later than September 30, 2021. The plan shall include the proposal of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to cover vessel equipment and installation costs, with daily, half-day, or quarter-day operational costs to be borne by the fishing vessels.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 965, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEATING) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, my amendment requires the National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration, NOAA, to develop a strategy for how they plan to implement electronic monitoring in the Northeast Multi-Species Fishery by 2021.

Today, the majority of monitoring is conducted by at-sea, in-person monitors who NOAA sends on only about 30 percent of the trips. What is more, vessel owners must pay the cost of this in-person monitoring, at a cost of $900 a day. Not only is this a financial burden, especially on the small boat fleet owners, but it is also less effective because it leaves massive gaps for bad actors to exploit the system.

Modernizing fisheries monitoring programs by the full-scale adoption of electronic monitoring is critical for the future sustainability and the development of the North Atlantic's multispecies fishery. Full implementation of electronic monitoring will mean better data for making stock assessments and making sure that every fishing trip is monitored. This means better protections for our environment and more sustainable fisheries so that our fishing industry can remain strong for the generations to come.

This is why, in my district, there is already broad support among fishermen for moving to an electronic monitoring regime. It costs less. It rewards fishermen who play by the rules. It ensures that sustainability of the fisheries that their industry depends upon goes forward.

In fact, the Northeast Fisheries Council has already outlined the goal of total adoption of an electronic monitoring regime. However, NOAA's Marine Fishery Service does not have a strategy in place to make that goal a reality. Without an implementation strategy from NOAA, fishermen who elect to invest in electronic monitoring for their vessels would still be subject to the costly at-sea monitoring regime, so, in effect, would be forced to pay twice.

We need to move forward on this issue, take advantage of the new technologies that not only make it cheaper and easier to monitor, but more effective as well. We have an opportunity for a win-win scenario, but it requires that we commit to pursuing it.

Step one is NOAA reporting to Congress on what full implementation of the electronic monitoring should look like and by focusing first on the Northeast region. This strategy will serve as a model for other fishery regions around the country as they take their own steps towards adopting electronic monitoring across the country.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chair, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG).

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chair, I want to compliment the gentleman on his amendment. This is long overdue.

We have the technology. The imposition of putting bodies on board ships that don't really do anything, and I don't think make a great count, can be done better through technology. So I compliment the gentleman on his amendment, and I will be supporting his amendment.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chair, I thank my colleague from Alaska. I think the gentleman understands full well that that monitor on the ship poses very challenging times from the time that they are on that ship, and the $900 a day is simply something that fishermen can't afford right now. It is not necessary.

Mr. Chair, I thank my colleague from Alaska for joining with me in this effort, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEATING).

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 1645

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. POLIQUIN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 8 printed in House Report 115–786.

Mr. POLIQUIN. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end the following:

TITLE ___—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. __01. STUDY OF FEES CHARGED TO LOBSTER FISHING INDUSTRY.

Not later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Commerce, acting through the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, shall study and report to the Congress on all fees imposed by such Administration on the lobster fishing industry.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 965, the gentleman from Maine (Mr. POLIQUIN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. POLIQUIN. Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman YOUNG very much for this opportunity to be here.

Mr. Chairman, ''Maine is Vacationland.'' Everybody in the country and everybody on this floor should know that. In fact, Mr. Chairman, we put ''vacationland'' on our license plates just to make sure everybody knows that.

Our population in the great State of Maine is 1.3 million hardy souls, but we have 40 million people vacation in our State every year. We have 3,000 miles of breathtaking coastline and hundreds and hundreds of clear lakes and streams and hundreds of miles of swift-running streams and rivers.

Everybody that is stressed out in this country, Mr. Chairman, should go to Maine and have their summer vacation because, Mr. Chairman, the tourist industry in the State of Maine employs about 150,000 people.

Maine, Mr. Chairman, is also lobster. There isn't a person in this country who does not relate the great State of Maine to lobsters. Now, I know Mr. Chairman over here has some great critters up in Alaska called crabs, king crabs. Now, they are a good species, but Maine lobsters are a great species, and we need to stand up for our lobsters, Mr. Chairman.

On the water in the State of Maine, on the water we have 10,000 jobs that support our lobster industry—10,000. These are folks who pull traps in their stern.

We have a terrific staffer, Mr. Chairman, here on this committee, Bill Ball, who got through college pulling lobster traps. It is hard work, very hard work.

In addition to the folks who pull the traps, we have folks on land who process them and ship them all over the world. It is a $1 billion industry, all said, in the State of Maine.

Mr. Chairman, when these folks rise before the Sun comes up and they head out to sea, sometimes in January and February, they are pulling up to 800 traps, and they get their critters on the boat and they have got to rebait those traps. They have got to keep their catch alive on the boat. They have got to get them back to the dock, and then they have got to get them to a processor and then to someone who is a dealer who packages these things and ships them all over the world.

Every time in this process, I fear, Mr. Chairman, there are fees, Federal, State, and maybe local fees, that are charged to get that critter from the bottom of the cold Maine ocean to the plate of hungry folks around the world.

So my bill, Mr. Chairman, that I am honored to bring up, my amendment to H.R. 200, requires NOAA, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, do something very common sense. We want to make sure we have an inventory of all the fees that are charged

to get this product to market, because our guys on the docks are coming up to me and our dealers and our processors, saying: Bruce, why are you making it so hard for us?

Government, Mr. Chairman, is supposed to make it easy for our families to live better lives and our small businesses, and all these lobster fishermen are running small businesses. We need to make sure their fees are lower and the regulations are fewer and the taxes are lower because that helps them grow their business, hire more people and pay them more, and live better lives with fatter paychecks and more freedom.

So I am asking everybody, Mr. Chairman—and I am grateful, Mr. Chairman, for the opportunity to speak about H.R. 200—I am asking every Republican and every Democrat in this Chamber to do what is right, which is to inventory these fees, because once we find out what I think are going to be one big boatload of fees, I am going to come back to this body and ask to get rid of those fees.

Mr. Chairman, I am grateful for this opportunity, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chair, we are not opposed.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, although I am not opposed.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Alaska is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I wasn't going to rise in opposition until I heard about Maine and how beautiful and the free-running streams and all the tourists and the king crab and all those other things. I do admit, I have been to Maine, and I would agree with him, but his is just a little tiny one. We are a great big thing with bigger streams, bigger fish, bigger crab, but no lobsters, though.

I have no lobsters, and I am going to ask Mr. POLIQUIN why we haven't seen more lobsters from Maine. I am not sure why, but I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. POLIQUIN. Mr. Chairman, I know deep down in Mr. YOUNG's heart, he is a Mainer at heart. I know that. I have been to Alaska. It is a good State. Maine is a great State, and, as a result, I know Mr. YOUNG is going to support this amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I didn't say I wouldn't support it. I just wanted to make sure I get my licks in for Alaska.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I do not object to the amendment and will support it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIQUIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maine (Mr. POLIQUIN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. ZELDIN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 9 printed in House Report 115–786.

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end the following:

TITLE ____—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. __01. LIMITATION ON APPLICATION OF PROHIBITION ON ATLANTIC STRIPED BASS FISHING IN BLOCK ISLAND SOUND TRANSIT ZONE.

Any prohibition on fishing for Atlantic striped bass in the Exclusive Economic Zone of the United States imposed under Executive Order 13449 or section 697.7(b) of title 50, Code of Federal Regulations, shall not apply in the the area described in section 697.7(b)(3) of title 50, Code of Federal Regulations, commonly referred to as the Block Island Sound transit zone.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 965, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Chairman, my amendment to H.R. 200 will provide needed regulatory relief for fishermen from the east end of Long Island and the entire region who are struggling under confusing and arbitrary Federal restrictions on striped bass fishing in the Block Island Sound.

The unique maritime geography of our region means that making the 15-mile journey by boat from Montauk Point, New York, to Block Island, Rhode Island, requires passing through a segment of waters considered to be part of the EEZ, known as the Block Island transit zone.

For recreational anglers, charter boat captains, and commercial fishermen, this shift in jurisdiction can mean the difference between a nice day on the water and committing a Federal offense. My amendment would permanently restore the right to fish for striped bass in this waterway, ending decades of confusion and arbitrary punishment for local fishermen.

These are hardworking men and women who run small businesses either on the commercial, charter, or recreational side, and in my district, they are the backbone of our coastal economy and part of our island's way of life. No other species of fish, besides striped bass, are subject to this confusing ban, which was meant to impact the high seas of the EEZ, not a small segment of local waters situated between two State boundaries. Fishermen should be able to legally fish for striped bass in this limited area just as they currently can in adjacent State waters.

We also must lift this unfair ban so that the resources of the U.S. Coast Guard can be focused on their important national security and safety mission, not waste it on the enforcement of an arbitrary ban in a small waterway.

A recreational angler or boat captain on the water off of Montauk Point can easily go from fishing legally and responsibly in State waters to violating Federal law once they pass over the 3-mile limit where New York State waters end and the transit zone begins. Many of these individuals lack the expensive GPS technology to know if and when they have crossed the boundary, and there are no buoys to warn them.

These are responsible men and women who have the greatest vested interest in preserving the striped bass fishery, but they also desperately need relief from confusing government regulations that are hurting their livelihoods and access to local fisheries.

Last Congress, my stand-alone bill to address this issue, H.R. 3070, the EEZ Clarification Act, passed this House with a unanimous vote. I also passed two similar amendments on this topic through the House last September, again, with unanimous support.

This amendment is supported by the Recreational Fishing Alliance, Long Island Commercial Fishing Association, Montauk Boatman & Captains Association, and the newly formed New York Recreational & For-Hire Fishing Alliance.

On behalf of the hardworking men and women of Long Island who rely on fishing as a way of life, I ask for all my colleagues' support on this commonsense amendment.

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

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chair, I do rise in opposition to this amendment offered by the gentleman from New York. This is an amendment that would lift the ban on striped bass fishing in the Block Island transit zone between Montauk, New York, and Block Island, Rhode Island.

Commercial and recreational fishing is allowed in State waters, as the gentleman said, from shore to 3 miles offshore. Striped bass is managed by the States from Maine through North Carolina through the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission.

Federal waters have been closed to striped bass fishing since 1990 when a moratorium went into effect to protect juvenile fish entering the spawning population and to help rebuild a fishery that was recovering from decades of overfishing.

There has been an ongoing effort to reopen the striped bass fishery in the transit zone, yet there is no science to justify it. In contrast, the science shows that allowing fishing in this transit zone, which encompasses about 155 square miles of habitat, could disproportionately impact spawning females and, thus, threaten the overall health of the striped bass stock.

This would be detrimental to some of biggest recreational and commercial fishing ports on the East Coast. Opening up Federal waters in one region would undermine the protections and commitment to rebuilding that others along the coast have invested in. It would set a bad precedent in managing the striped bass fishery, which still has a long way to go.

Finally, Congress should not be legislating on species-specific fishery management actions. This issue is regularly assessed by the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission. We need to let that commission do its job and make decisions that are based on science.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no,'' and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Chairman, this should not be treated as Federal waterways. It should be treated as a small local waterway in between two State boundaries. It shouldn't have been designated EEZ in the first place.

This amendment doesn't declare open season on striped bass fishing. It is still going to be subject to the same management that currently exists for surrounding waterways where striped bass fishing is currently acceptable.

The science shows biomass for the striped bass fisheries strong in our area, and, also, a science that is not discussed enough in this debate is the science of my fishermen and those small-business owners who are struggling to make ends meet.

So you have the science of the biomass being where it needs to be, plus we have the science that we are not speaking about enough where people right now are desperate for this kind of relief. They want people in Congress representing them in Washington who get it, who are going to fight for them.

We can't be lost in this beltway argument where, here, I am a Representative from the east end of Long Island, the First Congressional District of New York, and we have people who represent the other end of the United States of America telling us what is best for us.

We are here pleading for people to listen to us, to hear us, to hear from these fishermen, the commercial fishermen, the recreational fishermen, and to fight for them as well, especially when biomass backs it up.

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

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chair, these certainly are arguments that can and should be made at the Atlantic Council. In fact, they are made regularly, and that council has representation regionally, has representation from all the key stakeholders, and has access to the best available science, the state-of-the-art science on this issue. So I think we need to let that council do its job, and, with that, I request a ''no'' vote.

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

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Chair, may I ask how much time I have left?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Chair, I would say that every level of government needs to get it better than the way that we have the current laws, current rules, current regulations, whether it is the Federal Government, whether it is the regional councils, whether it is the State governments.

Earlier on, when we were having a debate on the underlying bill and I was talking about the fluke fishery for commercial fishermen, 50 pounds a day for 7 days, 350 pounds, you are not going to let them catch 350 pounds in 1 day. You will make them catch 50 pounds a day for 7 days, while the neighboring State of New Jersey could do 500 pounds a day for 3 days.

Well, guess what happened today. Talk about not getting it at other levels of government. Our Governor in New York State, out of no notice, cuts off the commercial food fishery. These people are struggling to make ends meet.

So instead of pointing fingers at other levels of government and regional councils where everyone is making mistakes and no one gets it, how about we do our part? How about we get it? How about we listen to them? we hear from them? we make a difference?

We are leaders. We are elected to represent our people. I am elected to represent my people, and I would respectfully urge my colleagues, especially those who are from faraway places several hundred miles away, to do a better job listening and allowing me to represent my folks and stop trying to undercut people who are hardworking business owners struggling to make ends meet, especially when science is on our side.

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

□ 1700

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. KEATING

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 10 printed in House Report 115–786.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end the following:

TITLE ____—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. _01. FUNDING FOR MONITORING IMPLEMENTATION OF NORTHEAST MULTI-SPECIES FISHERY MANAGEMENT PLAN.

Section 311(f)(4) (16 U.S.C. 1861(f)(4)) is amended by striking ''pursuant to this section'' and all that follows through the end of the sentence and inserting ''to enforce and monitor (including electronic monitoring) implementation of that Plan.''

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 965, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEATING) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, this is another amendment that will reduce the cost of monitoring on fishermen.

My amendment would allow the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, NOAA, to spend the fees they collect from penalties that are assessed against violators of fisheries regulations to help defray the costs related to monitoring. Being able to use the fees in this way will actually help NOAA prevent against future violations, as well as possibly reduce the cost to fishermen themselves.

Currently, these fees can be used only to support NOAA enforcement actions. While enforcement is important, it unnecessarily prevents NOAA from spending these funds on preventing violations in the first place. Electronic monitoring and at-sea monitoring trips help to ensure that these kinds of abuses do not occur. This makes them a critical tool to NOAA in enforcing regulations and ensuring that our fisheries remain sustainable.

Countless fishermen in my district have been suffering this past year because a select few decided to abuse the system. Greater investments in monitoring may have helped prevent this massive fraud that occurred. However, now that it has, it is important that measures be put in place to prevent anything like this from ever happening again. That means funding for prevention and monitoring.

NOAA should be able to use the funds it collects from the recent cases and any other cases that inevitably arise to double down on protecting the sustainability of fisheries and preventing as much abuse as possible before the harm is ever done.

My amendment does just that by allowing NOAA to use the fees it collects to support prevention efforts. This gives NOAA and the fisheries managers greater flexibility to find the right balance between prevention and enforcement, and, at the same time, lowers the cost of monitoring for fishermen.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support of this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition, even though I do not oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. POE of Texas). Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I thank Mr. KEATING for his amendment. This is long overdue. Collecting those fees and using them for observer coverage is something that should be done.

If I go back to his first amendment, I want to mechanize it and use technology to make sure the fishermen have an opportunity to, I believe, report better.

This is a good amendment. I will be voting for it, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague from Alaska for his support. He knows full well how difficult it is, particularly in our region, for fishermen just to sustain themselves, let alone sustain the fish. We want to sustain the fishermen themselves. These small vessels are out there, and they are facing $900-a-day monitoring charges. This is another means by which we will be able to do it.

So I find myself agreeing three times in the last few minutes with my colleague from Alaska—twice on my amendments and the other, indeed, on a prior amendment where he rightfully pointed out the rather hyperbolic description of the State of Maine, as wonderful as it is, and remind and agree with him that, indeed, this was just a mere portion of Massachusetts at one time.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEATING).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. GAETZ

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 11 printed in House Report 115–786.

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

TITLE V—REEF ASSASSIN ACT

SEC. 501. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Reef Assassin Act''.

SEC. 502. ENCOURAGING ELIMINATION OF LIONFISH.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title III of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1851 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 321. ENCOURAGING ELIMINATION OF LIONFISH.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall issue regulations under which a participating State may issue to an individual submitting lionfish taken in Federal or State waters a tag authorizing the taking of a fish of a covered species in Federal waters in addition to any other fish of that species the individual is authorized to take in Federal waters.

''(b) REQUIREMENTS FOR ISSUANCE OF TAG.—The regulations shall require—

''(1) the submission of 100 lionfish for each tag issued;

''(2) that lionfish taken in State waters must be taken by an individual holding a valid license to engage in such fishing issued under the laws of such State; and

''(3) that each lionfish shall be submitted by removing the tail, placing it in a resealable plastic bag, and submitting such bag to a participating State before the tail has significantly deteriorated.

''(c) NO LIMITATION ON NUMBER OF TAGS.—The regulations shall not limit the number of tags that may be issued to an individual.

''(d) USE OF TAGS.—The regulations shall provide that a tag issued under the regulations—

''(1) shall be valid for the 5-year period beginning on the date it is issued;

''(2) shall authorize only the recreational or commercial taking of a fish that complies with any size limit that otherwise applies to fishing for such fish in the waters in which it is taken;

''(3) shall authorize such taking without regard to any seasonal limitation that otherwise applies to the species of fish taken;

''(4) shall authorize—

''(A) the transfer of tags to any other person; and

''(B) use of transferred tags in the same manner as such tags may be used by the person to whom the tags were issued; and

''(5) shall require that any fish taken under such tag outside any seasonal limitation that otherwise applies to such fish must have the tag fastened between the mouth and gill before being placed in any cooler.

''(e) APPROVAL OF STATE TO PARTICIPATE.—

''(1) CONDITIONS.—The regulations shall require that as a condition of approving a State to issue tags under this section the Secretary shall require the State to designate a repository for lionfish submitted for such tags.

''(2) PROVISION OF FREEZER.—The Secretary shall provide to each participating State freezers in which to store submitted lionfish, at a cost of not more than $500 for each freezer.

''(f) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary shall—

''(1) encourage participating States to use existing infrastructure and staff or volunteers to conduct the State's program under this section;

''(2) include on the webpage of the National Marine Fisheries Service information about the program under this section; and

''(3) encourage State and local governments to work with retailers and distributors to advance the purchasing and consumption of lionfish.

''(g) OTHER PROVISIONS NOT AFFECTED.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—This section—

''(A) is intended to protect species of fish that are native to waters of the United States or the exclusive economic zone; and

''(B) shall not be construed to constrain any fishery, fishing quota, or fishing allocation.

''(2) LIMITATION ON CONSIDERATION OF TAGS.—This section and tags issued or authorized to be issued under this section shall not be considered in any determination of fishing levels, quotas, or allocations.

''(h) DEFINITION.—In this section—

''(1) the term 'covered fish'—

''(A) except as provided in subparagraph (B), means red snapper, gag grouper, triggerfish, amberjack; and

''(B) does not include any species included in a list of endangered species or threatened species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.); and

''(2) the term 'participating State' means a State that has applied and been approved by the Secretary to issue tags under regulations under this section.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in the first section of such Act is amended by adding at the end of the items relating to title III the following:

''Sec. 301. Encouraging elimination of lionfish.''.

(c) DEADLINE FOR REGULATIONS.—The Secretary of Commerce shall issue regulations under the amendment made by subsection (a) by not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 965, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GAETZ) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

MODIFICATION TO AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. GAETZ

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the modified version of my amendment at the desk be considered.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the modification.

The Clerk read as follows:

Modification to amendment No. 11 offered by Mr. GAETZ:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

TITLE V—REEF ASSASSIN ACT

SEC. 501. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Reef Assassin Act''.

SEC. 502. ENCOURAGING ELIMINATION OF LIONFISH.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to the approval of an exempted fishing permit submitted by a participating state. Title III of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1851 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 321. ENCOURAGING ELIMINATION OF LIONFISH.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to the approval of an exempted fishing permit submitted by a participating state, the Secretary shall issue regulations under which a participating State may issue to an individual submitting lionfish taken in Federal or State waters a tag authorizing the taking of a fish of a covered species in Federal waters in addition to any other fish of that species the individual is authorized to take in Federal waters.

''(b) REQUIREMENTS FOR ISSUANCE OF TAG.—The regulations shall require—

''(1) the submission of 100 lionfish for each tag issued;

''(2) that lionfish taken in State waters must be taken by an individual holding a valid license to engage in such fishing issued under the laws of such State; and

''(3) that each lionfish shall be submitted by removing the tail, placing it in a resealable plastic bag, and submitting such bag to a participating State before the tail has significantly deteriorated.

''(c) NO LIMITATION ON NUMBER OF TAGS.—The regulations shall not limit the number of tags that may be issued to an individual.

''(d) USE OF TAGS.—The regulations shall provide that a tag issued under the regulations—

''(1) shall be valid for the 5-year period beginning on the date it is issued;

''(2) shall authorize only the recreational or commercial taking of a fish that complies with any size limit that otherwise applies to fishing for such fish in the waters in which it is taken;

''(3) shall authorize such taking without regard to any seasonal limitation that otherwise applies to the species of fish taken;

''(4) shall authorize—

''(A) the transfer of tags to any other person; and

''(B) use of transferred tags in the same manner as such tags may be used by the person to whom the tags were issued;

''(5) shall require that any fish taken under such tag outside any seasonal limitation that otherwise applies to such fish must have the tag fastened between the mouth and gill before being placed in any cooler; and

''(6) shall only be utilized for species caught in the same water adjacent a state where the lionfish were originally caught.

''(e) APPROVAL OF STATE TO PARTICIPATE.—

''(1) CONDITIONS.—The regulations shall require that as a condition of approving a State to issue tags under this section the Secretary shall require the State to designate a repository for lionfish submitted for such tags.

''(2) PROVISION OF FREEZER.—The Secretary shall provide to each participating State freezers in which to store submitted lionfish, at a cost of not more than $500 for each freezer.

''(f) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary shall—

''(1) encourage participating States to use existing infrastructure and staff or volunteers to conduct the State's program under this section;

''(2) include on the webpage of the National Marine Fisheries Service information about the program under this section; and

''(3) encourage State and local governments to work with retailers and distributors to advance the purchasing and consumption of lionfish.

''(g) OTHER PROVISIONS NOT AFFECTED.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—This section—

''(A) is intended to protect species of fish that are native to waters of the United States or the exclusive economic zone; and

''(B) shall not be construed to constrain any fishery, fishing quota, or fishing allocation.

''(2) LIMITATION ON CONSIDERATION OF TAGS.—This section and tags issued or authorized to be issued under this section shall not be considered in any determination of fishing levels, quotas, or allocations.

''(h) DEFINITION.—In this section—

''(1) the term 'covered fish'—

''(A) except as provided in subparagraph (B), means red snapper, gag grouper, triggerfish, amberjack; and

''(B) does not include any species included in a list of endangered species or threatened species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.); and

''(2) the term 'participating State' means a State that has applied and been approved by the Secretary to issue tags under regulations under this section.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in the first section of such Act is amended by adding at the end of the items relating to title III the following:

''Sec. 301. Encouraging elimination of lionfish.''.

(c) DEADLINE FOR REGULATIONS.—The Secretary of Commerce shall issue regulations under the amendment made by subsection (a) by not later than 60 days after the approval of an exempted fishing permit submitted by a participating state.

(d) RESTRICTION.—Nothing in section 321 shall be construed as to allow for the transfer of fisheries allocation or catch among the various states.

Mr. GAETZ (during the reading). Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent that the reading be dispensed with.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the amendment is modified.

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Chairman, this amendment contains the relevant provisions of the Reef Assassin Act, which would attack the lionfish problem that is very pervasive in the warm waters of the Gulf of Mexico and the Atlantic Ocean.

Lionfish are an invasive species that are decimating our reef fish. One lionfish can consume up to 65 juvenile reef fish in one sitting. A female lionfish can release up to as many as 10 million eggs over the course of one lifetime.

This legislation would allow our resources to be used to protect our resource by creating an incentive for fishers who harvest the lionfish and then turn them in to participating States that would choose, on a volunteer program, to be able to issue tags for one prized, coveted reef fish—a triggerfish, a gag grouper, or a red snapper—in the event that 100 lionfish tails were produced. Anyone who goes and slays 100 lionfish certainly has saved far more than one of our prized reef fish.

That is why it is my belief that this amendment makes a great deal of sense for our environment and also for the overall health of our fisheries.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SOTO), the Democrat lead on the Reef Assassin Act.

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this good, bipartisan amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GAETZ).

Lionfish are disrupting Florida's natural ecosystem. Lionfish are taking away prey from our native fish stocks and prey on reef fish that perform essential ecological services on the reefs.

This amendment would give an incentive for fishermen to remove the lionfish by awarding a tag for desired reef fish in return for every 100 lionfish tails turned in. That is quite the bounty.

The amendment will promote cooperation between local, State, and Federal governments to eradicate lionfish from Florida waters.

This amendment is derived from a bill of which I am a cosponsor.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Florida for offering this amendment, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition, although I don't intend to oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Florida for bringing this issue up.

The lionfish has certainly, according to many reports, been a species that is causing an adverse impact to red snapper. The solution that he proposes here is a solution whereby States could submit a modified or a new exempted fisheries permit, where they could provide for additional access, on top of their existing allocation, to red snapper in exchange for harvesting a certain number of lionfish species, which are predators to the red snapper.

As folks will see, there is a lot of handwriting on this amendment. We did sit back and make some changes to this, so there is an excellent chance that there are some imperfections here.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for working with us on this. I thank my friends from Florida and California for working with us on this as well. It is likely that we are going to need some additional work on this as we move forward. There are some enforcement issues; there are science issues; and there is introduction of a new mechanism that causes some significant concern in the form of tags, in some cases.

But I, again, thank the gentleman from Florida for raising this issue, for working to ensure that we continue to have access to red snapper in the Gulf of Mexico. I look forward to working with my friend from Florida, as well as the folks across the aisle, in perfecting this as we move through the conference committee.

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

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Louisiana for offering his insight and his views. It is certainly my hope that any animal that is delicious, like the lionfish, but that is also invasive and destructive to our environment, would be one that we would be able to work together across the aisle to harvest out of existence, so that we protect our environment and protect our coveted reef fish.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment, as modified, offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GAETZ).

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. HANDEL) having assumed the chair, Mr. POE of Texas, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. H.R. 200) to amend the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act to provide flexibility for fishery managers and stability for fishermen, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 965, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole?

If not, the question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. GOMEZ. Madam Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. GOMEZ. I am opposed in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Madam Speaker, I reserve a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Gomez moves to recommit the bill H.R. 200 to the Committee on Natural Resources with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Page 49, line 22, strike ''and''.

Page 50, line 4, strike the second period and insert ''; and''.

Page 50, after line 4, insert the following:

(4) in clause (ii) of paragraph (1)(A), as amended by paragraphs (1) and (2) of this section—

(A) by inserting ''(I)'' before ''regulatory restrictions''; and

(B) by inserting ''or (II) unilateral tariffs imposed by other countries on any United States seafood exports or unilateral tariffs imposed by any country on materials necessary for the economic viability of the United States' fishing industry'' after ''environment''.

Mr. GOMEZ (during the reading). Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the reading be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

□ 1715

Mr. GOMEZ. Madam Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill, which will not kill the bill or send it back to committee.

If adopted, the bill would immediately proceed to final passage as amended.

Mr. Speaker, President Trump claims his trade policy is meant to level the playing field for the United States, but workers and businesses in other parts of the economy will suffer unintended consequences.

Despite his claims to pursue a trade agenda that will put American workers first, this administration's trade policy shows a lack of strategy and planning that risks putting working families last and threatens our economy.

Any trade agenda must fix the problems with existing policy rather than making matters worse. Escalating tariffs and alienating our closest trading partners does nothing to advance a trade agenda that puts working families first.

Our trade policy should prioritize strong environmental protections, penalize cheaters, enforce labor protections for workers, and strengthen rules of origin so we can advance a trade agenda that is fair to every American worker instead of picking winners and losers.

But President Trump isn't known for his discretion or his deep knowledge of policy. He doesn't realize or doesn't care that his America First trade agenda puts America last by undermining our competitiveness and innovation. The idea of unintended consequences didn't even cross his mind when announcing these unilateral tariffs.

But as Members of Congress representing constituents from around the country, we know that there are very real consequences for these actions.

That is why I am offering this motion to recommit, which would allow a Governor or elected official or appointed official to request that the Secretary of Commerce declare a fishery disaster if fishermen suffer negative impacts from these tariffs.

The Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act restored dozens of fishery stocks to healthy levels, and we cannot allow the ill-conceived or half-baked ideas of the President to hurt the workers or the progress we have actually made.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote for the motion to recommit, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I withdraw the reservation of a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas). The reservation of a point of order is withdrawn.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I claim the time in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. The parliamentarian, I think, made a mistake, but they have a right to do that, as others Members do, but that is the way it goes.

Mr. Speaker, let's not kid ourselves. If you listen to the presentation, it has nothing to do with a fish bill. This is a procedural trick to delay passage of this bipartisan legislation. And I keep saying this is a fish bill that has been in existence for many years, since 1976, and it has been a success, and then we come up with a recommit motion that has nothing to do with this bill.

The prize is fish communities, sustainable yields, domestic seafood industry, and a job creation bill.

With all due respect, I strongly urge a rejection of the motion, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by a 5-minute vote on passage of the bill, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 187, nays 228, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 320]

YEAS—187

Adams	Gallego	Nadler
Aguilar	Garamendi	Neal
Barragán	Gomez	Nolan
Bass	Gonzalez (TX)	Norcross
Beatty	Gottheimer	O'Halleran
Bera	Green, Al	O'Rourke
Beyer	Green, Gene	Pallone
Bishop (GA)	Grijalva	Panetta
Blumenauer	Gutiérrez	Pascrell
Blunt Rochester	Hastings	Payne
Bonamici	Heck	Pelosi
Boyle, Brendan F.	Higgins (NY)	Peters
	Himes	Peterson
Brady (PA)	Hoyer	Pingree
Brown (MD)	Huffman	Pocan
Brownley (CA)	Jackson Lee	Polis
Bustos	Jayapal	Price (NC)
Butterfield	Jeffries	Quigley
Capuano	Johnson (GA)	Raskin
Carbajal	Johnson, E. B.	Rice (NY)
Cárdenas	Jones	Richmond
Carson (IN)	Kaptur	Rosen
Cartwright	Keating	Roybal-Allard
Castor (FL)	Kelly (IL)	Ruiz
Castro (TX)	Kennedy	Ruppersberger
Chu, Judy	Khanna	Ryan (OH)
Cicilline	Kihuen	Sánchez
Clark (MA)	Kildee	Sarbanes
Clarke (NY)	Kilmer	Schakowsky
Clay	Kind	Schiff
Cleaver	Krishnamoorthi	Schneider
Clyburn	Kuster (NH)	Schrader
Cohen	Lamb	Scott (VA)
Connolly	Langevin	Scott, David
Cooper	Larsen (WA)	Serrano
Correa	Larson (CT)	Sewell (AL)
Courtney	Lawrence	Shea-Porter
Crist	Lawson (FL)	Sherman
Crowley	Lee	Sinema
Cuellar	Levin	Sires
Cummings	Lewis (GA)	Smith (WA)
Davis (CA)	Lieu, Ted	Soto
Davis, Danny	Lipinski	Suozzi
DeFazio	Loebsack	Swalwell (CA)
DeGette	Lofgren	Takano
Delaney	Lowenthal	Thompson (CA)
DeLauro	Lowey	Thompson (MS)
DelBene	Lujan Grisham, M.	Titus
Demings		Tonko
DeSaulnier	Luján, Ben Ray	Torres
Deutch	Lynch	Tsongas
Dingell	Maloney, Carolyn B.	Vargas
Doggett		Veasey
Doyle, Michael F.	Maloney, Sean	Vela
	Matsui	Velázquez
Engel	McCollum	Visclosky
Eshoo	McEachin	Walz
Espaillat	McGovern	Wasserman Schultz
Esty (CT)	McNerney	
Evans	Meeks	Waters, Maxine
Foster	Meng	Watson Coleman
Frankel (FL)	Moore	Welch
Fudge	Moulton	Wilson (FL)
Gabbard	Murphy (FL)	Yarmuth

NAYS—228

Abraham	Banks (IN)	Bishop (UT)
Aderholt	Barletta	Black
Allen	Barr	Bost
Amash	Barton	Brady (TX)
Amodei	Bergman	Brat
Arrington	Biggs	Brooks (AL)
Babin	Bilirakis	Brooks (IN)
Bacon	Bishop (MI)	Buchanan

Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cloud
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Curtis
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Emmer
Estes (KS)
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frelinghuysen
Gaetz
Garrett
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Handel
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lesko
Lewis (MN)
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Newhouse
Noem
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Russell
Rutherford
Sanford
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—13

Blackburn
Blum
Cheney
Ellison
Gallagher
Hanabusa
Harper
Jenkins (KS)
Napolitano
Perlmutter
Rush
Scalise
Speier

□ 1745

Messrs. MARINO, MITCHELL, NEWHOUSE, and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. CROWLEY, RUPPERSBERGER, and CLEAVER changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 222, nays 193, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 321]

YEAS—222

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bergman
Biggs
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Bost
Brady (TX)
Brat
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Chabot
Cloud
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Cuellar
Curtis
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Emmer
Estes (KS)
Faso
Ferguson
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frelinghuysen
Gaetz
Garrett
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gonzalez (TX)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Handel
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Higgins (NY)
Hill
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
Lesko
Lewis (MN)
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lynch
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Newhouse
Noem
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Thomas J.
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Russell
Rutherford
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Veasey
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NAYS—193

Adams
Aguilar
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Costello (PA)
Crist
Crowley
Culberson
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Engel
Eshoo
Espaillat
Esty (CT)
Evans
Fitzpatrick
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gomez
Gottheimer
Granger
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hastings
Heck
Himes
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham, M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Panetta
Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Pelosi
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rooney, Francis
Ros-Lehtinen
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Smith (WA)
Soto
Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Vargas
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—13

Blackburn
Blum
Cheney
Ellison
Gallagher
Hanabusa
Harper
Jenkins (KS)
Napolitano
Perlmutter
Rush
Scalise
Speier

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1753

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 320 and "yea" on rollcall No. 321.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 200, STRENGTHENING FISHING COMMUNITIES AND INCREASING FLEXIBILITY IN FISHERIES MANAGEMENT ACT

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the engrossment of the bill, H.R. 200, the

Clerk be authorized to make technical corrections and conforming changes to the bill, including the change I have placed on the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the modification.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 14, line 15, strike ''including''

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

There was no objection.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 6237, MATTHEW YOUNG POLLARD INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEARS 2018 AND 2019

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 115–815) on the resolution (H. Res. 989) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 6237) to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2018 and 2019 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

HONORING THE LIFE OF NATHANIEL ''NAT'' REED

(Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Nathaniel ''Nat'' Reed of Jupiter Island, a Florida environmental icon who died today at the age of 84.

Mr. Reed loved nature and the Florida environment and devoted most of his life to fighting for Florida's natural wonders like the Everglades. My finest memory of him will be hunting quail near Hobe Sound.

As an aide to former Governor Claude Kirk, Mr. Reed successfully stopped the construction of an airport in the Florida Everglades because the construction would have meant devastation to the Everglades and Big Cypress Swamp.

Mr. Reed appreciated wildlife and was also one of the authors of the Endangered Species Act, which protects many animals, including several in Florida. He later ended up founding 1000 Friends of Florida, to preserve special places in our State.

Nat Reed is an institution in the State of Florida, and he was a wonderful mentor to me. Our State lost a real leader and a friend to many, and he will be greatly missed.

FAILURE TO ACT HAS CONSEQUENCES

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, sometimes it seems that the United States moves from one crisis to the next. We have to keep our eye on the ball.

As Members of Congress, we have a duty to protect everyone in this country from unnecessary suffering. We cannot forget that the Trump administration is still holding children in cages, ''Cages 'R' Us.''

Congress should step up and end this terrible policy. We cannot forget that thousands—maybe even millions—of people in this country are served by water systems that violate the Safe Water Drinking Act. Congress should invest in rebuilding community water infrastructures.

We cannot forget that this year there is nearly one school shooting a week. Congress needs to dump the NRA and pass reasonable gun laws.

Mr. Speaker, ignoring the problem doesn't make it go away, and each moment we fail to act puts human lives at risk.

□ 1800

HONORING PHILIP W. HOLMES, JR.

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

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of one of my hometown's finest. The founder and owner of Rock Hill, South Carolina's iconic PW's Ice Cream, Mr. Philip W. Holmes, Jr. has passed away at the age of 82.

For 25 years, PW's has served our community proudly. Following his service in the Marine Corps and his experience in the hospitality industry, Mr. Holmes took the risk every business owner does and opened PW's in 1993. It was named after his two sons, Philip III and Wayne. He believed that ice cream was one of the greatest ways to bring families together.

After his passing, both of his sons continue his legacy at PW's. You can now find the phrase, ''Dad got his wings'' on the store's sign.

Philip Holmes, Jr. will be remembered by our community for giving every scoop with a smile. He was a great South Carolinian, and he was a great American.

NATO

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, it is important for my colleagues and as well the American people to know that NATO is not just section 5, when one is attacked all are attacked. NATO is thought. It is purpose. It is a sense of collaborative viewpoints on the value of democracy.

It is important that any Commander in Chief, no matter what party affiliation, passes the standard of decorum to recognize our allies and to strengthen the relationships and to give criticism where necessary and to seek improvement, but not to be an embarrassment.

I think it is important, as meetings are proceeding, that we recognize that our allies are far more important than an individual who continues to provide nerve gas to kill people on foreign soil, to be behind attacks on airplanes taking over Crimea and other places. It is important to recognize that, yes, you engage with your enemy, but you recognize that they are your enemy.

I would also suggest that it is hardly the American way for the U.S. delegation to oppose a breastfeeding resolution at the World Health Organization and to punish a little country like Ecuador.

I want us to be better internationally, Mr. Speaker, and stand for the values of America.

JULIA RUELLE AND THE BOUNDARY WATERS

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

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, last year, 16-year-old Julia Ruelle of Minnetonka, Minnesota, started having headaches and exhaustion. A sophomore at Minnetonka High School, she was diagnosed with a very rare brain tumor.

Julia grew up loving the outdoors, and as she began her treatment, she would often think about the Boundary Waters Canoe Area where her family vacationed for years.

Today, Julia is recovering and is back to outdoor physical activity. She recently won an essay contest on why the Boundary Waters are so important and why it matters to her—winning a prize of a parent-free weekend canoeing in the Boundary Waters wilderness.

Julia, looking strong and healthy, just visited my office last month to advocate for protecting the Boundary Waters. She is a brave girl, and she is a perfect example of what this national treasure means to Minnesota and what it means to our country.

I include in the RECORD a copy of her essay.

2018 BOUNDARY WATERS CANOE AREA ESSAY CONTEST

(Winning Essay by Julia Ruelle, Minnetonka, Minn.)

It's the start of the school year: everyone is sullen for being forced to sit still all day and teachers try in vain to pull us out of our school-induced slumber with a myriad of get-to-know-you activities. As I fill out yet another form with questions I am tired of answering, I come to the question asking me to list my favorite activities. I pause for a moment, wondering which activities to include this time: running, cross country skiing, downhill skiing, sledding, ice skating, kayaking, canoeing, paddle boarding, camping, gardening, walking, hiking, biking, hammocking, or exploring. As a shortcut and

with a melancholy glance at the sun shining through the window, I settle with writing, ''being outside''.

Though such get-to-know-you forms are rarely very honest, one fact always holds true to me: I love being outside. In the summer, a typical day usually starts with running with the cross country team as the sun rises, paddling with a friend in the afternoon, and an evening walk with Rio, our faithful seven year old rescue dog, around a small lake of the over 10,000 our state is known for. For the past 5 years, Rio and my family have been lucky to have a change in scenery to the beautiful, pristine Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness for about four days each summer. These days are when I feel most connected to my soul and surroundings and most at home, with no social media or material concerns to distract me from the purity of the air in my lungs, dirt beneath my feet, and the sounds of birds, water, and all things natural in my ears. My love for these lands has caused me to be involved with the Campaign to Save the Boundary Waters movement, regularly donating and wearing the logo on shirts, stickers, and pins as frequently as possible. All my classmates know of this passion of mine, as I take any opportunity to educate my peers about the threat the proposed Twin Metals mine poses to the pristine waters so unique to the Boundary Waters and the many watersheds it affects.

Though Jerry Vandiver, a country singer with an album or two about the Boundary Waters area, sings that ''winter is for . . . pull[ing] out the map'' and ''plan[ning] a new route'' while keeping close to the warmth of the fireplace, to me, the snow and sub-zero temperatures of Minnesota winters make venturing outside even more exciting! I joined the cross country ski team last year and immediately regretted not having tried it earlier. Skiing taught me to love winter and pray for more snow, instead of begrudging it. Though I grew up loving to ice skate at the park across the street, learning to ski ignited a desire to be outside everyday, even when the cold was biting.

Unfortunately, this winter has been a little different. Around Thanksgiving, I started experiencing exhaustion, headaches, and nausea at rates I had never before had to withstand. As doctors didn't perceive any viruses to be concerned about, we wrote it off as migraines and I continued to participate in life as usual, going to school and ski practices everyday. However, after trying to fight through it for two weeks, I ended up in Urgent Care one night and scheduled an appointment with my doctor three days later. During those three days, I slept pretty much all day and barely ate, thanks to debilitating headaches and nausea. Arriving at the doctor's appointment, I threw up in the waiting room and the nurses deemed my low body temperature and slow heart rate alarming enough to rush me to the emergency room in an ambulance. At the end of that day, they still didn't have any answers as to what was causing it all. However, the next day, my doctor suggested getting an MRI and I squeezed into their last slot of the day. Halfway through the MRI, my parents were rushed into a special room and my doctors got in contact with the radiologist and a neurologist. All in all, the verdict was that there was a mass in my brain causing pressure build up, also known as hydrocephalus. I required an endoscopic third ventriculostomy, which is essentially a tube put into my head to allow the fluids to flow, and a biopsy to find out what it was. So there I was, getting brain surgery, which is definitely not the curveball most expect during sophomore year. The biopsy revealed that I had a rare brain tumor called a germinoma, luckily with a high cure rate. Obviously, this has changed my life completely and kept me from doing most normal teen things. But, the worst part was not being allowed to run, ski, skate, or do anything that had the potential of making me fall until the surgeons deemed me ready. Still, I made it my priority to be outside at least once a day, usually taking short walks. Getting outside even when I felt unable to do most other things has been a type of therapy for me. Breathing fresh air and feeling the cold on my face refreshed me and made me feel better, at least for a little while, every time.

After six weeks of limited activity, the Friday I got the OK to do any activity I wished began the best weekend since the diagnosis. In the afternoon, I went snowshoeing on a trail through the cattails. At night, I ice skated with friends. The next morning, I cross country skied on a frozen creek. On Sunday, I ran for the first time since the diagnosis and though it was incredibly slow-paced, the feeling of fighting through the burn and completing an entire loop of my go-to trail can only be understood by those who have experienced the phenomenon of a runner's high. Better yet was the soreness that almost kept me from making it down the stairs Monday morning. I had been sore many times due to the chemotherapy, but this pain was something I had caused myself by working hard and, in a weird way, made me very proud of myself.

Reading the announcement of this essay contest in the paper this Thursday, I could hardly withhold my excitement! I danced around the house, imagining the essay I would write and how much fun it would be to share my favorite place with my friends. Though I am such a lover of the BWCA, most of my friends have never experienced its hypnotic serenity and I've always wanted to share it with them, but not wanted to have to bring my parents along. This contest has the potential of granting me this wish. In addition, I am lucky to have a short treatment plan of chemotherapy and radiation that will be wrapped up in early May with no physical restrictions. This enables me to be perfectly ready for a summer trip to the greatest place on Earth with my closest friends.

As I reviewed the details of the contest, I found something additional that links me to this mission: Joseph [one of the contest judges]. Hi! I read that you were diagnosed with leukemia at 13 years old and I imagine you and I share many similar experiences. Other than just the typical cancer similarities, I wonder if you share the experience of growing a little sick of your parents. I know, it might seem impossible to them, but after being surrounded and worried about almost exclusively by my parents for the last couple months, I'm very ready to escape their concern for a little while. Of course, I have always and will always love and appreciate them for their constant love and support, but distance makes the heart grow fonder, right? My desire to spend a couple days deep in the wilderness, sharing unique experiences with my closest friends, has increased greatly in the last couple months.

As a long-time lover of the outdoors and the Boundary Waters and a recent parent-escape hopeful, I would cherish this opportunity to navigate the lakes and portages I'm so fond of with my friends. I know my dreams will soon be filled with mornings looking out over the water, long days of paddling, dinners laughing beside the campfire, and nights sleeping with only a tent between me and a sky full of stars. I pray these dreams will be made a reality.

NATO

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, today, the House passed a resolution which I authored with the help of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of which ED ROYCE is the chairman supporting NATO and the NATO countries that are endangered by Russian aggression, particularly Estonia, Lithuania, Latvia, and the Baltic area. The Balkan countries also have been threatened, including Montenegro, Georgia, Moldova, and Ukraine.

The resolution speaks of our support of the sanctions against Russia. And the sanctions should remain until Crimea is returned to Ukraine and the Donbas no longer has war. Then we continue to support the Baltics who have their airspace invaded by Russian aggression.

I am pleased that Speaker RYAN allowed this resolution to come to the floor and was passed by voice vote unanimous consent as the Senate had passed a similar resolution 97–2. The House and the Senate stand together in support of NATO and our allies in Eastern, Central, and Western Europe.

HONORING FORMER MAYOR JIMMY DELOACH

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember someone who dedicated his life to public service in the First Congressional District of Georgia, Mr. James Mondell DeLoach, Sr., who passed away on July 3 at the age of 86.

Jimmy DeLoach truly dedicated his whole life to serving others. He was a staple of government in Garden City, Georgia, between 1970 and 1990, serving three terms as the mayor of Garden City and then for 8 more years as a Chatham County commissioner.

As county commissioner, Mr. DeLoach was integral in the construction of the nationally important Mighty Eighth Air Force Heritage Museum dedicated to the airmen who served in the European theater during World War II.

Because of his exceptional service to the area, one of the area's most popular roadways was given his name, the Jimmy DeLoach Parkway.

Jimmy DeLoach was the epitome of a public servant. And he set the bar high for all of us who followed him in public service.

His family, including his son, the mayor of Savannah, Eddie DeLoach, are all in my thoughts and prayers. We truly lost a giant in west Chatham County.

NATO

(Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, for nearly 70 years now, the United States has led the Western alliance standing up to first the Soviet Union and then Russia within the organization known as NATO.

Whether the President of the United States was Democrat or Republican, Truman, Kennedy, Reagan, Bush, Obama, it made no difference. Standing up and supporting our Western European allies, standing up and supporting NATO was an absolute given and, frankly, not even a partisan issue. Yet under this President and this administration, we now have, for the first time ever in the post-World War II era, a real question about American commitment to NATO and to the Western alliance.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Trump administration to follow the bipartisan lead of the House Foreign Affairs Committee to support NATO and support our Western allies. It has underpinned peace for 70 years.

HONORING NEW YORK STATE TROOPER NICHOLAS CLARK

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

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and remember the life of New York State Trooper Nicholas Clark. A lifelong resident of Steuben County and a star football player from my alma mater, Alfred University, Nick Clark honorably served his community and the State of New York as a New York State trooper. Since 2015, he has protected the people that he called his friends and neighbors.

Trooper Clark put his life on the line every day to serve his community. In the early morning of Monday, July 2, 2018, Trooper Clark responded to a call in the town of Erwin and was shot and killed in the line of duty.

Mr. Speaker, he is truly a hero for his actions and the sacrifices he made for all of us. Trooper Clark will be missed by the communities that he served and the lives that he touched. Together we stand with his family and friends as they mourn.

I thank him for his service to our community and for his bravery. I pray he rests in peace.

Mr. Speaker, I ask this legislative body to pause its deliberations and join me in remembering and honoring the 29-year life of Trooper Nicholas Clark.

REUNITE CHILDREN WITH FAMILIES: WE WILL NOT STOP UNTIL EACH CHILD IS WITH THEIR PARENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SMUCKER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from California (Mr. CORREA) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the subject matter of this Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for the opportunity to address this body, once again, on the urgency of reuniting migrant children with their families.

The administration's zero-tolerance policy has caused chaos and systematically torn immigrant children away from their parents. Many innocent children are still being held under inhumane conditions at detention facilities apart from their parents. In total, almost 5,000 children—let me repeat—almost 5,000 children who have been separated from their parents because of this zero-tolerance policy are still suffering.

Last month, U.S. District Judge Sabraw ruled that children under the age of 5 must be reunited with their parents within 14 days. That deadline was yesterday. It came and passed, and only about half the children were actually reunited.

Mr. Speaker, this is unacceptable. There needs to be consequences for the administration's disregard for the law and failure to comply with the Federal Court order.

The United Nations has noted that children who arrive at the U.S. border who plead for asylum with their parents is a legal form of entry according to international law. Many of these children are fleeing from countries plagued with gang violence and drug wars. The administration continues to highlight the threat of the MS–13. Yet the administration does not acknowledge that actually MS–13 is one of the reasons why children and families are seeking protection in our country.

Asylum seekers are not illegal immigrants. They are individuals seeking refuge. It is the law to ensure that asylum seekers are given an opportunity to state their case in front of a judge. Furthermore, separating children away from their parents is an illegal violation of human rights.

This violation of human rights is being exacerbated by DHS' poor recordkeeping. Today the administration does not have the recordkeeping capability necessary to reunite children with their parents, and, instead, they are now relying on DNA tests to figure out what child belongs to what parent.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, 120 of my colleagues and I have called upon the Inspector General of the Department of Health and Human Services and Homeland Security to investigate on how the administration plans to reunite children with their families. We are concerned that there are no records of the children to reconnect them with their proper parents.

The administration's actions are causing irreparable harm to these vulnerable children, and it is time for the administration to immediately reunite these families.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS), who is my good friend and distinguished colleague.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Mr. CORREA for this Special Order.

Mr. Speaker, the Trump administration has just missed their court deadline for reuniting the youngest children separated from their parents, and there seems to be no solution in sight for these innocent children.

Over 20 days ago, even before the court order, I led my colleagues in writing a letter to Homeland Security and Health and Human Services asking what their plans were for reuniting separated children with their families.

□ 1815

I have yet to get an answer. The American people deserve to know where the children are and how they will be safely returned to their families.

In a world where we can track nearly everything in real time, how is a Federal agency unable to provide answers to Congress on the whereabouts of kids in their care?

We are told that agencies did not coordinate their efforts. Did they not plan for this? Do they not understand the concept of interoperability that we have come to use within our administrations?

This administration's cruel policies are overwhelming our already burdened judicial and foster care systems, and the American people are stuck paying the price. It is time for this administration to realize that policy decisions have consequences.

Even the few children who have been reunited with their families will carry the scars of this appalling experience throughout their lives. We have already heard reports that some of the youngest do not recognize their parents as they are reunited. That is understandable. In fact, it is even anticipated. Families, as we are seeing, are traumatized. They are scared. They are heartbroken, as anybody would be in their shoes.

Mr. Speaker, I once again call on this administration to answer critical questions about the whereabouts of the children and reunite them with their families immediately.

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California, Mr. SALUD CARBAJAL, my good friend and colleague.

Mr. CARBAJAL. Mr. Speaker, I, too, am an immigrant to this country.

What has become evident is the cruel, self-imposed crisis that this administration has created. It has created a chaotic process for detaining and separating children from their families.

This is an administration that has now missed the court's order to start reuniting children, something that is unacceptable. We are talking about more than 2,000 children, kids that remain separated from their families.

About a week ago, I visited the El Tornillo detention center in Texas. I saw firsthand the conditions in which these children are being detained. I spoke to the children firsthand to get their own personal thoughts on what was going on.

They talked to me in detail about how they were woken up at 5 a.m. in a regimented fashion. They were rushed through showers and made to take showers in less than 5 minutes. They were given only 10 to 15 minutes once or twice a day for recreation, because they are out in the middle of the desert where it is extremely, extremely hot.

This administration has said that they are on track to reunite children with their families, but there is no clear plan. There are no details. There is a Department of Homeland Security four-point plan to nowhere that has been put forth. In this plan, there are no details. There is really an absence of a coherent process that will reunite these children with their families. This is unacceptable.

This is a self-imposed crisis and a cruel crisis that has been created by this administration. This is why we need a congressional hearing and oversight to get to the bottom of this and to really show the American people how misguided this policy has been and the inhumane conditions that have resulted from this policy.

America was once that beacon on the hill other countries looked to, in terms of how we treated our immigrants and those seeking shelter and asylum. We have lost that moral ground, because this administration has sought to destroy the values and ideals that our country has held up high for decades and centuries.

We also need legislation because, clearly, this administration reminded us that their zero-tolerance policy could be put in effect and implemented any other day again.

What this administration has done is un-American. This President has chosen to divide us again as a country, to go after the most vulnerable, and to go after immigrants in the most inhumane way. This is not the United States that we all love and care for.

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS), my good friend and distinguished colleague.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from California, Congressman CORREA, for leading this important discussion.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to reiterate my alarm about the child abuse at the border.

Due either to complete incompetence, deliberate indifference, or both, this administration failed to fully comply with one of the first court-ordered deadlines to reunite innocent children with their parents from whom they were separated.

The Trump administration failed to implement an effective system for identifying and reconnecting children with their parents before executing its family separation policy. As a result, they have been unable to accurately report the number of children in their custody, the location of each child, and the immigration status of the parents, many of whom who have already been deported.

Adding insult to injury, it was recently revealed that one of the detained children under the age of 5 may actually be an American citizen. Such a mistake should never happen and should shock every American to their core.

This is a despicable humanitarian crisis created by Donald Trump, and one which the Trump administration has shown no ability to solve.

Despite the President's attempt to divert attention from the crisis, thousands of children remain separated from their families. This is a national disgrace. Every parent, every grandparent, and every patriotic American should be appalled by the harm that this President has inflicted on children.

We must all exercise our First Amendment right to speak out against this unconscionable family separation crisis. I urge my colleagues in Congress to make every effort to ensure that these children are reconnected with their parents. If the crisis proves impossible for the administration to fully solve, Congress must hold accountable those who are responsible.

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas, Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ.

Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to tell my fellow Americans and fellow Members of Congress that I am appalled over reports of mistreatment and abuse toward children at the Shiloh Residential Treatment Center.

The facility is under contract with the Department of Health and Human Services, and is located just south of Houston, Texas. The Shiloh facility is owned and operated by the same entity that formerly operated Daystar Treatment Center in Manvel, Texas. Daystar was closed because the way they physically restrained children led to the death of three teenagers. In most cases, the children were hog-tied. Now, instead of hog-tied, they are drugging children into submission.

One child was prescribed 10 different shots and pills, including the antipsychotic drugs Latuda, Geodon, and Olanzapine; the Parkinson's medication Benztropine; the seizure medication Clonazepam; and many, many others, such as nerve and pain medications, antidepressants, and cognitive enhancers. This is a crime.

A Federal judge in California, Judge Laughrey, recently explained: ''Psychotropic drugs are powerful medications that directly affect the central nervous system. They are particularly potent when administered to children. . . . They are more vulnerable to psychosis, seizures, irreversible movement disorders, suicidal thoughts, aggression, weight gain, organ damage, and other life-threatening conditions.''

The message is clear. The U.S. Department of Health and Human Services needs to be reprimanded for letting these horrific actions take place, and provide answers to the American people. You cannot hide behind subcontractors. You are on notice.

Let me make this even clearer. The Federal Government must act at once. Stop placing these children in traumatic and dangerous environments that right now are causing children to suffer in pain.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join in this argument, utilize their powers of congressional oversight, and call on the administration to end these procedures and abide by simple rules of decency and humanity.

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY), my good friend and distinguished colleague.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend and colleague from the great State of California (Mr. CORREA), for yielding and for his leadership on this very important humanitarian issue and so many other issues before this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the Trump administration missed its court-ordered deadline to reunite the toddlers and babies it kidnapped at our southern border with their families.

And, yes, I say kidnapped. I don't know how else to describe this. That is the only appropriate word to describe the implementation of the so-called zero-tolerance policy when there was clearly no forethought as to how children would be returned to their parents.

The cruelty and inhumanity at the border has led to nearly 3,000 children being torn away from their families and imprisoned. Instead of having a plan in place to reunite these families, the administration lost, destroyed, or never even created records, and clearly did not care or think about reuniting these children.

Now we have a crisis of a whole different kind: figuring out how we put the pieces back together, how we put the families together again. Some parents of these children have already been deported. Some are totally unaccounted for.

President Trump and his administration are utterly failing to fix this tragedy that they created. We have so

many tragedies in the world that we are reacting to. This was one that was literally created by this administration.

While we deal with this unorganized chaos and incompetence, the children still in custody continue to suffer irreparable trauma in unimaginable conditions, all because the President wanted to punish those who sought safety for their children and a better life in the United States of America.

We will not rest until each one of these children is back safely in their parents' arms. We will continue to demand information on how these children will be reunited with their families and insist that officials who took part in this tragedy are held accountable.

I have visited two facilities with my colleagues. One was in Elizabeth, New Jersey. We went there on Father's Day with permission from lawyers and the inmates to visit with them. At first, they would not allow us access. Finally, after we pushed and pushed, we were allowed to see five gentlemen, four of whom entered the country legally. They entered the country and immediately turned themselves over to immigration authorities. One came in illegally because there was violence at the border, and he then immediately turned himself over to immigration facilities.

They all had very sad stories to tell. I share one from a man, from which country, we can't say, but there was a lot of violence and drug violence. His partner was killed, and his business was destroyed. They went to the school, threatening to take his daughter. She, luckily, was not in school at the time. The thugs were looking for her.

So he grabbed his daughter and fled to America. He was in detention when they came to his cell at 3 o'clock in the morning and tore his 8-year-old daughter from his arms.

Along with my five colleagues, Members of Congress from New York and New Jersey, we asked to speak to the head of the facility, the head representing ICE, the head of the detention facility.

□ 1830

They said they had no records of where his daughter was. To this day, they have not reunited this father with his 8-year-old daughter. He broke down in tears.

I also visited a facility in New York City, Cayuga in East Harlem. This is a facility that I feel was very well-run. It is for foster care. Children are there in the daytime, and then they are placed in foster homes during the night.

Again, the children did not know where their parents were. The professionals said it usually takes them 59 days to find a relative, an appropriate guardian, or the parents.

I just have to join my colleagues in saying that this is a disaster. Mr. Speaker, 3,000 migrant children who were taken from their parents at the border are still waiting to be reunited.

There are accounts of pregnant women being shackled in detention and callously denied prenatal care or medical attention when they are clearly experiencing symptoms of miscarriage.

On Tuesday, the administration missed the court-ordered deadline to reunite all children under 5 years of age. I understand there are more than, roughly, 100 children in this category. Very few have been reunited.

Neither HHS nor DHS have consistent answers about how and when any of these children under 5, or over 5, are going to be returned to their parents. In short, there is no plan.

There was no planning. They took children from the arms of their parents and did not keep records on where they are now.

Repeatedly, I have joined with Ranking Member ELIJAH CUMMINGS in calling for hearings in the Oversight and Government Reform Committee. Despite numerous, numerous requests from him and others, we have not had one single hearing about this humanitarian crisis being put forth by our own government. Yet, there is a hearing planned tomorrow on Hillary Clinton's emails.

The election is over. Let's focus on the crisis before us: these children.

Again, we will keep calling for and asking for hearings on this crisis before our country.

I want to thank my colleague for working so hard and trying to find answers. I support his work completely, and I will continue working with him and others to reunite these families who came to our country looking for a better life.

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentlewoman from New York for her comments.

Mr. Speaker, just recently, a 14-month-old baby boy was reunited with his mother. The baby boy was traumatized after being separated for almost 90 days from his loving mother. Not only did he look like he wasn't bathed for that time, but he also was covered with lice.

His mom said that her son was not the same since they were reunited. He hasn't been the same since they have been separated. He cries for fear of being alone. Her son is afraid of losing his mother again.

Another parent, Milka Pablo, received a different response from her 3-year-old daughter, Darly, when they were reunited in Phoenix after 4 months of being separated. Let me repeat: after being separated for 4 months. Darly did not recognize her mother.

Milka was met with cries of rejection, and Darly, the daughter, screamed as she tried to wiggle away from her mother's arms.

I cannot believe these small children are subjected to such conditions. Mr. Speaker, some are as young as 1 year old. One of these individuals—a 1-year-old—was obligated to appear in front of a judge for deportation proceedings while separated from his parents.

These children don't have the rights to a court-appointed attorney and are clearly frightened, yet they are still forced—a 1-year-old—to appear in front of a judge and answer questions that, clearly, they cannot comprehend.

Many of these children can barely form sentences, yet they are expected to talk about the violence-plagued countries they are fleeing.

Even Judge John Richardson told a lawyer representing a 1-year-old that he was embarrassed to ask a baby questions on whether they understood the immigration proceedings before them.

The separation of immigrant children from their parents is unconstitutional and simply wrong. I demand that all families be reunited immediately.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, contemporary deportation policies are traumatizing families. The inhumane policy of separating families is terrorizing parents to detrimental ends. Currently, more than 1,300 families are going through unnecessary and harmful separation enacted under our current administration.

Last month, Mr. Munoz and his family crossed the border to apply for asylum. For 40-year-old Marco Antonio Munoz, the fear and anxiety became overwhelming. After being separated from his wife and 3-year-old son, Mr. Munoz strangled himself in a detention center in Texas. His suicide shows the fear they felt during the border crossing and on the road to safety in the U.S.

The law allows families to escape violence and prosecution by seeking shelter in the United States. Currently, the administration refers to asylum as a loophole and family separation as part of a zero-tolerance policy. This policy of zero tolerance is designed to deter and punish immigrants seeking asylum, making them illegal.

While we should all focus on the negative effects on the children, we can't forget the negative effects on the parents as well. Families that present themselves to border agents seeking asylum have not violated any laws. However, the administration is criminally prosecuting all immigrants crossing the U.S.-Mexico border.

These families are following domestic and international laws, making their prosecution illegal and against our American values. We should not terrorize these families.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, unless you are an American Indian, we are all immigrants to this country. Whether we ourselves or our forefathers came to this country, we came to seek freedom, a better life, and a better future for our families. Asylum seekers, likewise, are not new. What is new is the zero-tolerance policy.

Zero tolerance is clearly a violation of U.S. laws. It violates international law. It is inhumane. It is shameful.

I ask that the administration come up with real solutions for these folks

seeking asylum. I ask the administration to follow the law, follow American law, follow international law. Let's do the right thing. Let's do the American thing. Let's reunite these families.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, Congressman CORREA is a valued member of this body and one of the outstanding members of the Homeland Security Committee, where he is Ranking Member of the Subcommittee on Oversight and Management Efficiency.

We are here today to call upon the President, the Department of Health and Human Services, and the Congress of the United States to act without delay to ensure separated immigrant children are reunited with their parents in an expeditious manner.

On June 26, 2018, a federal judge ruled that unless reunification is not in the best interest of the child, a child under 5 years old must be reunited within 14 days of its order.

Yesterday was the deadline that this administration failed to meet.

To President Trump, I say ''Time's Up!''

This act committed was not only mortifying, but an illegal act.

This individual has proven he lacks depth and experience, has violated the ethics that this country prides itself on, and he should be ashamed.

This is a senseless act that must not go unnoticed.

We must hold him accountable for these not clearly formulated decisions.

Yesterday, I met with faith and community leaders to bring attention to yesterdays' deadline, imposed by a federal judge, to reunite the youngest separated children with their parents due to the President's egregious ''zero-tolerance'' policy.

In our country, the rule of law and its implementation is an essential component of our democracy.

Twenty years ago, Flores v. Reno, also known as the Flores Agreement, established that migrants or immigrants could not be separated from their children for long periods of time.

Earlier this year, President Trump and his administration implemented a ''zero-tolerance policy'' of separating immigrant children from their parents upon arrival into the United States.

To be certain, the administration's plan was half-baked.

As the Founder and Chair of the Children's Caucus and as a parent and grandparent, I am outraged that the administration represented what they did not know and could not do.

They did not know the true number of the children separated, they could not reunite these children, and there is no plan for their reunification.

When Americans and the international community from all walks of life began to challenge this cruel and inhumane policy, the courts got involved.

It appears as if a fortnight was more than enough time for this administration to make a complete mess of this process, and in the process damage families—perhaps irreparably.

According to the American Civil Liberties Union, fewer than half of the migrant children who are under five years-old will be reunited with their parents.

Studies have documented that when young children are forcibly removed from their parents, the traumatic experience engenders long-term negative effects on their physical and mental health and well-being suffers.

Stressful situations that would usually prompt physiological responses in other people—increased heart rate, sweaty palms—would provoke nothing in the children forcibly removed from their parents because their fight-or-flight response system appeared permanently broken.

This is outrageous and unacceptable in a nation which has a long and noble tradition of providing sanctuary to the persecuted and oppressed.

Last Friday afternoon, July 6, 2018, the administration asked for more time to reunite these young children with their parents, which again was nothing more than a tacit admission that its plan for separating children was implemented without a way to eventually reunite them with their parents.

After it was ordered to reunite these children, and in asking for more time to comply with the federal court, the President's lawyers asked ''can I keep these children away from their parents for a longer time?''

My response is ''these children have been away from their parents long enough.''

When I visited the border and the federal detention facilities that housed parents and children quarantined from one another, what I witnessed was horrific and was echoed in heartbreaking audio recordings released by the press revealing children crying, aching for their parents, as all face a fate uncertain, and inconsistent with the American ideal.

I will never forget the little children I met during my visit to the border.

One baby, 9-month-old Roger, had been taken from his 19-year-old sister after she was prosecuted for crossing the border illegally.

Their mother is dead, and they were coming here to find family.

Little Leah, was just one year-old and was taken from a grandmother and a sister.

The pain was no less visceral when speaking with mothers wondering where their children have gone.

In South Texas I met Gabby, from Honduras, who had a 45 day-old baby taken from her, and while housed at the facility had not yet been treated or given medical attention.

Yesterday, a federal judge ruled that the administration's argument in favor of child separation was ''tortured.''

Put another way, the Administration has no leg to stand on.

Trump knows that he is advancing a cruel and inhumane policy, but he refuses to accept responsibility for this matter blaming, alternatively: Congress, the courts and prior presidents.

This is no surprise, of course: all who have watched this president know his proclivity to shirk responsibility for any of his actions.

In a bizarre turn of events, the President actually tried to blame the courts for his own cruel child separation policy.

A federal judge appropriately chastised the President and cast as ''cynical'' any attempt to blame the courts for his mess, which is entirely of this Administration's own doing.

Tellingly, the judge went one profound step further and indicated that the President and his administration knew—at least for over a year—that there was no facility which would house parents and children together.

Thus, when it proceeded with this new immigration policy, the President knew that the segregation of children from their parents was inevitable and chose to implement this policy anyway.

The last time this nation had policies that promoted the forcible separation of children from newly arrived persons was slavery: a dark and shameful chapter in this nation's history that we cannot revisit.

Earlier this year, President, in proclaiming April as National Child Abuse Prevention Month, stated, ''we must always remember that all children are blessings from our Creator'' and endowed with value, purpose and human dignity.''

It is time for this President and the administration he leads, to act with reason, foresight and compassion and immediately and completely rectify this crisis.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, while the Trump administration has clearly taken steps to reunite immigrant children with their families, there are still 100 children under the age of five in the government's custody. The court ordered deadline to reunite all of these children with their parents was yesterday. The Departments of Homeland Security and Health and Human Services must continue to make it a top priority to locate these children's parents and reunite these families in a timely manner.

The Trump administration's inhumane ''zero-tolerance'' policy was finally stopped by the President, but the terrible effects of this policy continue. DHS' poor recordkeeping has resulted in the prolonged separation of these children. Twelve of these children's parents have already been deported, making it much more difficult for them to reunite with their children. The Department of Homeland Security has had to resort to DNA testing to ensure that children are properly reunited, a costly and tedious process that prolongs the trauma these children are experiencing. This excess cost to American taxpayers could easily have been avoided had the Trump administration thought about the reunification process rather than solely focusing on separating children from their parents.

These children have already endured an incredibly dangerous journey from their home countries, and the Trump administration has subjected them to even more suffering. The American Medical Association has stated that separation from parents can cause lifelong psychological trauma for these children, particularly children who are under the age of five. Sadly, there are already reports of children who no longer recognize their parents after these prolonged periods of separation.

The Departments of Homeland Security and Health and Human Services must take immediate action to expedite the process of reunification, and Congress must use its legislative authority to hold these departments accountable and ensure that these human rights violations are corrected. Children have been taken from their parents, and it is all of our responsibility to ensure that this administration are reuniting them as quickly as possible.

HONORING CONGRESSWOMAN ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentlewoman from

New York (Ms. TENNEY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on my Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to stand here with my colleagues to honor our friend and our great colleague, Representative ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, who will be retiring at the end of the 115th Congress after more than 35 years in public service.

I know I speak for everyone on both sides of the aisle when I say that we will sincerely miss ILEANA's bright smile, strong leadership, and fierce advocacy for her constituents.

Today, we look back on her service with gratitude. We recognize her commitment to human rights, providing equal opportunity to all, supporting public education and especially our Nation's veterans. We recall our memories of her great sense of humor and wish her a fond farewell as she begins her next journey in life.

Representative ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN broke through barriers, becoming the first Hispanic woman to serve in the Florida statehouse and senate, later rising to become the first woman to chair the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. Her record of service is beyond reproach.

At the age of 8, ILEANA's family fled the oppressive communist regime of Fidel Castro in Cuba. This life-changing experience has guided her journey in public service and led her to remain committed to protecting human rights.

Although I haven't had the opportunity to serve as long as other Members alongside ILEANA, the time I have spent serving with her has been inspirational and an incredible honor.

One of my great memories with ILEANA was a congressional delegation where we traveled to South Korea, Taiwan, and India to study the issues impacting the region and our Nation's relationship with our important allies in Asia. Together, we met with U.S. servicemen and -women near the demilitarized zone in South Korea. Then, later on, we were received by His Holiness the Dalai Lama in the Tibetan community in exile in Dharamshala, India.

During our trip, ILEANA shared with me her experience in Cuba and her family's struggle and journey to the United States. Although the struggle facing the Tibetan people is different than the suffering the Cubans faced under the Castro regime, ILEANA has applied her experience and firsthand knowledge on human rights issues, including Tibetan autonomy and Taiwanese independence, which were highlighted on our trip.

While on the visit, ILEANA was presented with a sash for the Order of the Propitious Clouds, with a special grand cordon for her significant contributions to strengthening U.S.-Taiwan relations.

I thought it would be fun to share a cute story about ILEANA. As we were getting ready to give her this great award as the Propitious Cloud, the Taiwanese Government officials were placing her sash that she received on her. As they were adjusting it and putting it on her, she was so funny. She said: ''I haven't been through this since I was Miss America,'' which I thought was really cute.

She worked as a teacher and a principal in the Miami-Dade County schools. She saw firsthand stories of financial hardship, which eventually inspired her to run for office.

Throughout her time in Congress, she passed legislation that helped thousands of teenagers go to college, and she fought for LGBTQ rights. ILEANA has a servant's heart and was a champion of issues that were of importance to her and the people of Florida.

Although Representative ROS-LEHTINEN may be retiring from her post in this Chamber, we know that she will continue to look for ways to serve the State and country she so dearly loves.

Today, we join with her team and her family in recognizing her many years of service. We all wish Congresswoman ROS-LEHTINEN, her husband, four children, and five beautiful grandchildren all the best in the next chapter.

For me personally, it was a deep honor to work with someone so committed to the greater good. The State of Florida, the United States, and countries throughout the world facing oppression are a better place because of ILEANA's fierce advocacy and commitment to our most vulnerable.

I am joined today by some of my colleagues, although we changed our time. We will be getting to people as soon as we can. A number of colleagues wanted to be here, and, hopefully, they will catch up with us, those people who worked with ILEANA over the years and even had more time with her.

I see in the Chamber we now have Congressman CHARLIE CRIST, who will be getting up and saying a few nice things about Ms. ILEANA and may be reflecting on his probably extensive experience serving side by side with her as a Representative in Florida.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida, Mr. CHARLIE CRIST, my colleague.

We are going to stand side by side for this one. ILEANA would love it.

Mr. CRIST. Mr. Speaker, this is very bipartisan. First, I thank Ms. TENNEY for putting this together. It is wonderful of the gentlewoman to do that.

Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to say a few words about ILEANA, what everybody knows. I am sure Mr. GAETZ will echo this, too. Just a wonderful lady, a great public servant, a heart of gold, and always with a smile on her face. Around this place, that is very uplifting and wonderful to see.

I wanted to come down here and testify, if you will, on her behalf.

□ 1845

What a wonderful shining light she really is. So, again, I thank CLAUDIA for organizing this and putting this together. It is great of her to do so.

And, ILEANA, if you are watching, God bless you and your wonderful family, and I know your future is going to be very, very bright. Thank you so much.

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman so much for his comments. I appreciate it.

I am a new Member, and the Congressman from Florida (Mr. CRIST) is also a new Member, but we have been touched by ILEANA. And part of the way I got to know her was through 1-minute speeches, which you all see us do on the floor of the House. We sit down in the front row. She is kind of the queen of 1 minutes. She gets to have position A on our side, and no one dares to sit in ILEANA's seat, although she is the most loving, kind person you could ever meet. That is how I got to know her.

She got me so excited and inspired about coming to Asia and joining with her and kind of taking on her love and her portfolio on human rights, particularly helping the people in Taiwan, and especially fighting for the Tibetan Government in exile in Dharamshala, India, with the Dalai Lama.

It was such an honor for me to actually go to Dharamshala with Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN and to be able to meet the Dalai Lama and sit there with him for an hour as he entertained us. He was really charming and just an incredible inspiration not only to the Tibetan people, but also to the world.

And we are now joined by our terrific colleague, the boy Congressman, our great freshman Representative from Florida's First District, MATT GAETZ. We are honored to have him.

I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GAETZ).

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New York for yielding, and I also thank my colleague, the gentlewoman from Florida, ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, for her lifetime of service.

ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN was my State Representative the day I was born. This is a fact she does not frequently like being reminded of, but it shows the duration and the level of her commitment to the community in south Florida, to the country, and to the world.

What I always remember ILEANA's service for is the commitment that she had to vulnerable people. Whether it was children who were in need of good schools or seniors in need of hospice care, ILEANA could always be counted on to fight for the vulnerable, for those who might not have the fancy lobbyists

or the powerful special interests in their corner. But when ILEANA was in someone's corner, they had a pretty good chance to be successful, whether it has been in the Halls of Congress or in our State capital in Tallahassee.

I am perhaps most moved by the role model that ILEANA has set for women all over the world. Recently, I had the opportunity to travel with ILEANA to Jordan, where there are the initial sprout-ups of democracy. ILEANA met with young women who had an interest in the political process, running for office, campaigning, organizing in their neighborhoods and in their communities for a better life.

They were able to bear witness to this amazing American lady who had done so much, who had broken through so many barriers. It showed, through her life, the great potential that women have all over this world to be able to make such a meaningful contribution to their governments and to their communities.

For all Floridians, and particularly those in south Florida who have benefited from ILY's great service, I just want to thank her, thank her family.

I want to wish my friend, Dexter Douglas, ILEANA's spouse, the best of luck in all the extra time he will have with ILY. I know they are looking forward to spending time with their children and grandchildren, and I look forward to ILEANA's next chapter because I know that, even in her retirement from the Congress, she will never stop fighting for vulnerable people in my State, in our country, and all around the world.

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. GAETZ for his absolutely perfect description of ILEANA as a champion of human rights and the most vulnerable.

I would just like to mention her husband, Dexter. I haven't had the honor to meet him, but we talked about him quite a bit. Obviously, traveling to Asia, we had a lot of long flights, and it is really such an honor for me as a freshman Member—and you heard from me and Congressman GAETZ, Congressman CRIST, two freshmen Members, and now three who are just so inspired by Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

Now I am so honored to also invite one of our great women leaders in the U.S. Congress, Mrs. BARBARA COMSTOCK, Congresswoman BARBARA COMSTOCK, to say a few words about ILEANA. She has had a little more time to serve, but we are so honored to have our great Representative from Virginia.

I yield to the gentlewoman from Virginia (Mrs. COMSTOCK).

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak about our wonderful colleague, ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, and who I was first privileged to meet when I was a staffer here in Congress in the 1990s.

She has gracefully served the people of Florida's 27th District since 1989, and she embodies the type of success story that people think of when they think of people, wherever they come from all over the world, who come here to the United States.

At just 8 years old, she escaped the brutal regime of Fidel Castro with her family to come to America in pursuit of a better life, to a place where she and her family could find success, and certainly they have found that. But she has never forgotten where she came from and always fought for the oppressed all around the world and those less fortunate.

So she was not only the first Hispanic woman in Congress who fought for all of the things that we have been illuminating here, but she was the first—she had many firsts here, but the first chairwoman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, where she was able to take that experience that she had at 8 years old and now, really, bring it all around the world and to be able to bring that kind of heart that we know ILEANA has.

Every bit of her heart is matched by a wonderful sense of humor. And you know when you see ILEANA on the floor, or wherever you see her anywhere, she is cheerleading for everybody. She is fighting for everybody, and she is always happy. She is here with her grandchildren, and she is just a joyful person. We will miss that great smile of hers.

She has been a mentor here to so many women. When she was first here in Congress, there were not many Republican women; and certainly as the first Hispanic woman, she was the first Republican Hispanic woman, also. So she was a great mentor for those of us who were staffers at the time, which is how I was first privileged to meet her. And she has taken this calling to heart as a public servant and has always done the best for her constituents.

She is a woman of great honor, a devoted wife, mother, and grandmother. She has changed this Congress and our colleagues for the better. She is someone for whom we join together in the ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN fan club. And there are, I think, pretty close to 435 Members you could have for that fan club.

We will miss her insight, her intellect, her graciousness, and, as I said, her sense of humor and her passion for representing her constituents, representing the oppressed, and representing human rights all around the world.

ILEANA, it has been a pleasure to serve with you—first as a staffer, now, for these past 3½ years as a Member of Congress where you were such a great mentor, and all of us know you will continue to serve your community even when you leave here in Congress. We know that is in your heart, and we know you will always be a woman who gives to others, and we are so proud to have been able to serve here with you in Congress. God bless.

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Speaker, we really appreciate Ms. COMSTOCK's kind words.

And now BARBARA is my mentor, as well as one of the early women Republicans who has been an inspiration and a hard worker and really instrumental in coming up with great legislation and really leading our communities.

One of the great honors, I got to be with ILEANA, actually, in, as I said, the Tibetan Government in exile.

I know we have a couple of Members we are waiting to come in. We had to change our time, but we have another Member. Before we get to him, I just want to say a couple of things.

I got to travel to the amazing Tibetan Government in exile, and, obviously, to meet the Dalai Lama in Dharamshala, India, and was greeted by amazing students. It was just a life-changing experience, and to be able to go there with Ms. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, our wonderful Congresswoman.

We were able to get these scarves. I am going to wear this in honor of ILEANA. It is called the khata, and it is a Tibetan Buddhist scarf. When you are handed this scarf, the words are ''tashi deley,'' which the children in Tibet and everyone greets you with when you go there. It is such an amazing experience. I want to wear this scarf in honor of ILEANA.

And, also, I might add, it is very long, and ILEANA is not as tall as I am, so we had to fold her scarf up a couple of times so she wouldn't drag it on the floor.

But it was such a beautiful memory to be able to receive this scarf and to know how important her advocacy has been on behalf of the Tibetan people, who have been suffering under an oppressive regime in Beijing that has really bullied this amazing community and left them in exile in India, and her fight to bring the Tibetan people back to their home country some day.

We are going to continue on that front, and I hope to carry on the tradition and carry on the fight, as ILEANA has, with compassion and with courage and the inspiration that we received from so many.

Now it is my great honor to yield to my colleague from California (Mr. LAMALFA) to say a few words about our great leader, ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN.

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ms. TENNEY, my good friend from New York, as well, for leading this night and for this tribute. It is well deserved for the great friend ILEANA is and a great friend to us here, as well as an amazing Member for her district, for representing her people with energy and with all that it takes to be effective for the many years that she did so. And so you saw that level of energy here in this place and in our Conference.

I was always pleased to be able to work with her on issues, but just seeing her for a minute each time because she would—CLAUDIA talked a little bit about the height disparity, so for her and me, it is quite something else. But she would always come up to me. And me coming from a ranching background and farming background in

northern California, I have always got these cowboy boots on. So I just got the handle from her: Hey, Cowboy, how are you doing?

And I didn't really know what to call her, so I just went with ''Cowgirl.'' So she is my Miami cowgirl friend. So that was just part of the fun of having such a great colleague like that, and I was really, indeed, disappointed to see and to hear and to know that she was deciding to hang it up here. But everybody—everybody—has that time.

She led here with, again, grace and dignity, but also with enough fire to get the job done. I know she was an amazing Representative for the people of her district and for all of us to hear the diverse sides of all the issues that affect her part of Florida and how that might contrast with my part of California. And you take that into mind because she is effective at getting a point across respectfully but, again, with the pizzazz it takes to be an effective leader here. So we will dearly miss her.

To my friend, from Cowboy: Cowgirl, enjoy your next endeavor here, and it has been a pleasure to work with you. God bless you.

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Speaker, it is a beautiful tribute to a wonderful woman who has inspired us all. So much of what Mr. LAMALFA said about her sense of humor.

I always think of the great leaders that you meet. You think of some towering figure, but ILEANA was a towering figure in her very small body, and I think of a few things about her:

Her courage and her tenacity and her willingness to be truthful and to fight the fight. And also a couple of things that I learned from my father that I find that, when I find people with these rare qualities, like ILEANA, her unwillingness to succumb to victimhood.

She is a fighter. She has never felt sorry for herself. She is always fighting the good fight for other people who are less fortunate than she is. She probably doesn't even recognize that is one of her great, inspiring qualities that I saw in her.

And, also, her willingness to not hold a grudge and to be bipartisan and to reach across the aisle and to work with other Members without sacrificing her values and her integrity.

This may be the first Special Order that we are going to hear on the great Congresswoman ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, but I am not sure it is going to be the last. We still have, luckily, hopefully, a few more months, or several more months of her right to the end of the year, and we will be able to continue to honor this really amazing person who has graced this institution with leadership, with tenacity, with courage, with passion and compassion for those who are less fortunate.

I know that she is going to continue in her private life, outside of politics, on the same mission that she is on because that is who she is. She is going to fight the fight every day. She is going to stand up for the most needy and the most vulnerable in our communities.

And just on a personal note, I am so grateful for this position and the privilege of serving New York's 22nd District, that I had the honor of being able to be in the presence of greatness, to be with Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN and her amazing inspiration. And I just want to say thank you so much to her and to her family and to Dexter, whom I hope I get to meet some day; and to her children and grandchildren, who are so lucky to be among someone and to be able to grow up with someone like ILEANA; and her constituents, who I am sure are grateful every day for the work that she has done in this institution and to change it forever for the better.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you so much for this tribute to Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, the first Hispanic woman to serve in Florida state's House or Senate—went on to become the first Latina in Congress and rose to be the first woman to chair the House Committee on Foreign Affairs.

She's inspired many of us to follow her public service example.

For over three decades she's been a champion for the LGBTQ community, a critical voice in promoting democracy in Cuba and Venezuela, a leader in advancing the well-being of the Hispanic Community, and a tireless human rights advocate across the globe.

I've been proud to work with Rep. ROS-LEHTINEN on initiatives like:

BRIDGE

United States-Israel Agriculture Strategic Partnership Act

Hurricane Irma Disaster Relief in Florida

Hurricane Maria Disaster Relief in Puerto Rico

She has a gift of bringing people together. Floridians are proud to have had ILEANA as a public servant and her legacy will live on.

□ 1900

ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, there was an interesting story in Politico this week titled: ''The Secret Story of How America Lost the Drug War With the Taliban.'' It was written by Josh Meyer. It says: ''As Afghanistan edged ever closer to becoming a narco-state five years ago, a team of veteran U.S. officials in Kabul presented the Obama administration with a detailed plan to use U.S. courts to prosecute the Taliban commanders and allied drug lords who supplied more than 90 percent of the world's heroin . . .''.

Mr. Speaker, that is incredible. I have been hearing from DEA agents, local police, deputies, so many law enforcement people, about how incredibly abundant heroin is in America. How we had so many people that would get hooked on opioids, and then they would ultimately find heroin was cheaper and more plentiful. It destroyed a lot of lives, and it continues to destroy lives in America.

To have this report come out that the Obama administration could have done something in a timely manner to have saved tens of thousands, if not hundreds of thousands of lives from being lost or being wasted in this opioid epidemic of addiction, it is really staggering to think that our United States Government, the Obama administration, with all of its tools, had the chance to do something that would prevent the massive personal destructions that we have witnessed, it runs over into the unconscionable area.

This article says: ''The plan, according to its authors, was both a way of halting the ruinous spread of narcotics around the world and a new—and urgent—approach to confronting ongoing frustrations with the Taliban, whose drug profits were financing the growing insurgency and killing American troops. But the Obama administration's deputy chief of mission in Kabul, citing political concerns, ordered the plan to be shelved, according to a Politico investigation.''

Now, I have not always been the biggest Politico fan, but this is extraordinary.

''Now, its authors—Drug Enforcement Administration agents and Justice Department legal advisers at the time—are expressing anger over the decision, and hope that the Trump administration, which has followed a path similar to former President Barack Obama's in Afghanistan, will eventually adopt the plan as part of its evolving strategy.

'' 'This was the most effective and sustainable tool we had for disrupting and dismantling Afghan drug trafficking organizations and separating them from the Taliban,' said Michael Marsac, the main architect of the plan as the DEA's regional director for Southwest Asia at the time. 'But it lies dormant, buried in an obscure file room, all but forgotten.'

''A senior Afghan security official, M. Ashraf Haidari, also expressed anger at the Obama administration when told about how the U.S. effort to indict Taliban narcotics kingpins was stopped dead in its tracks 16 months after it began.

'' 'It brought us almost to the breaking point, put our elections into a time of crisis, and then our economy almost collapsed,' Haidari said of the drug money funding the Taliban. 'If that operation had continued, we wouldn't have had this massive increase in production and cultivation as we do now.' ''

This is a photograph showing scoring a poppy to extract raw opium in April of 2004.

''Afghan drug lords have pledged financial support to the Taliban in exchange for protection of their vast swaths of poppy and cannabis fields, drug processing labs, and storage facilities.

''Poppy cultivation, heroin production, terrorist attacks and territory controlled by the Taliban are now at or near record highs. President Ashraf Ghani''—who I have met. He seems like a very decent gentleman—''said recently that Afghanistan's military—and the government itself—would be in danger of imminent collapse, perhaps within days, if U.S. assistance stops.''

When we heard the Obama administration condemning the opioid addiction epidemic, we didn't know that that administration had a chance to end 90 percent of the heroin coming into this country. Apparently, so much of that flows across our southern border.

And I realize that the leaders in the U.S. Senate and the leaders in the United States House did not support the pillars of Donald Trump's platform that got him elected President of the United States. Every bill that we have brought out of the House or that has come out of the Senate, even a couple of times there has been a little bit of money for a border wall, it is not as serious as it should be that this Congress should be doing something about the travesty on our southern border.

As long as it remains so open, the drug cartels will continue to make tens, hundreds of billions of dollars. I read that just the drug money across our southern border last year was around $80 billion, and I have also understood that the projections are that the drug cartels may be making more from human trafficking across our southern border than they are even from their drug money. That money is being used to keep our Mexico friend and neighbor oppressed and in bondage.

The best thing that we could do, if we really and truly cared about the people of Mexico, about the people of Guadalajara, El Salvador, of so many countries in Central America, and even South America, that are caught up in human trafficking, drug trafficking, and sex trafficking that is going on and coming across the U.S. border is stop it. We stop the flow of the billions that are being spent, or made, by the drug cartels, then they don't have the money for the corruption that resides in so much of Mexico and south of Mexico.

That is what a good neighbor should do. That is what this House should do. That is what the Senate should do. Tell our rich lobbyist friends that we are going to save American lives, and we are going to make Mexico one of the 10 top economies in the world by gutting their corruption, because we are going to enforce a secure border to our south, and they need to get ready and used to it. But we are going to have to have leadership in both the House and the Senate that will step up to the task.

Enough lives have been lost, enough girls have been subjected to sex trafficking, enough lives have been wasted in drug addiction, enough lives have been lost in trying to get here, evilly lured here by the attraction of what might come. Fathers that would even provide birth control to daughters, knowing they are likely to be raped on the way to the United States. What kind of people are we that we would lure people into that kind of situation? Well, we are doing it.

And I hear it over and over from those people that guard our border and from the people that are not insane, they are not crazy, they are not stupid, they are just ignorant about the role of ICE in America. ICE does not protect our borders. That is the Border Patrol. We also have that supplemented by others that are assisting the Border Patrol.

ICE is really the one that sometimes has been referred to by—that part of Homeland Security, has been labeled by drug cartels, according to people on the border, as the drug cartel's logistics. Because they get people illegally across our border, and then Homeland Security, with the help of ICE—there are children involved that involves Health and Human Services, HHS—they ship them around the country to whatever address the drug cartels give the individuals and tell them that this is where you are going, and you can finish paying off your fee to us by working for us at the address where we send you, either in sex trafficking, drug trafficking, or whatever.

□ 1915

Yes, so we are taking United States Government money; we are prying it out of the hardworking hands of Americans; and we are using it to help the drug cartels build up their employee base all over America.

It is time that people in the Republican Party woke up and realized the amount of human suffering that our failure to secure our southern border is causing. President Trump is doing what he can, but he could do a whole lot more if we gave him the tools to do it.

How heartless can we be not to secure our southern border and allow the deaths, the rapes, the drug abuse that is overwhelming our country. We have got to stop it.

The Obama administration had a chance to cut it off at its root source. They killed the program.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think it would be a good idea—I know our friend Mike Pompeo is busy right at this moment, but there are others in the State Department, there are people in Homeland Security, Secretary Nielsen, others. We can do something about it. We have got to do something about it. It is what decent, caring people would do.

And those, including any judge who says you have got to give these children back to people who may not be their parents, people who have convictions for human trafficking and sex trafficking or child molestation, ought to come up on charges themselves.

Fortunately, one judge backed off of the deadline that had been set for getting certain children back to their parents, because Homeland Security and HHS is doing everything they can as quickly as they can to make sure if they give children to adults, they are not sex traffickers and they are not drug traffickers, there is a family relationship. And it appears a great deal of work has been done along those lines. So there are at least five or six children who have not been turned over to people who were not their family or people who had drug or child molestation offenses.

But this is serious stuff. It is what we do. It is why our Nation, so many of us, became outraged when we found out that young, beautiful little girls competing as Olympians for the United States in the world were sexually molested by an adult monster.

And then we have the wannabes, adult men who set records and won wrestling matches. They could take down the strongest and best in the country, take them down if they didn't like what they were doing. They could take them down if they got in a ring and the match started. They could take them down. And two guys like that come forward, say: Yeah. Okay. So I was an adult. So I could have been out in Afghanistan shooting and killing people. I was no match for some wimpy doctor who made come-on comments.

Somebody like that would be allowed to besmirch the name of JIM JORDAN. It is disgusting. And any group that would glom on to something like that, it is disgusting.

Assassinating an honorable character used to be a virtually unpardonable sin in America. But what happens when you quit teaching about right and wrong, you quit teaching about the Ten Commandments, you quit teaching that we are all accountable for our own actions, and you start teaching, instead, that everything is relative? There is no right. There is no wrong. There is only convenient and politically expedient. When political expedience becomes more important in America, like it has for some, and right and wrong goes out the window, we have no business maintaining the same form of governance.

It is time to get back to teaching right and wrong, because there are such.

C. S. Lewis said he used to enjoy making fun of Christians when he was an atheist by saying: How can you say there is a just God in the world when there is so much injustice in the world?

And no matter what they would come back with as a response, these Christians, Lewis would say: Yes, yes, that is all well and good, but wouldn't it be easier just to admit there can't be a just God in the universe when there is so much injustice?

And then one day he finally realized: If there is not some absolute source of right and wrong in the world, justice and injustice, then how could he ever know there is so much injustice in the world? It would be like a man blind from birth being unable to know what light is.

But there is an absolute source of justice in the world, and that is why, in 1787, in Philadelphia, when our Nation's leaders struggled to come up with a new constitution, that Ben Franklin, who so many teachers across the country wrongly say was a deist, as some do about Washington, said:

I have lived, sir, a long time, and the longer I live, the more convincing proofs I see of this truth: God governs in the affairs of men, and if a sparrow cannot fall to the ground without His notice, is it possible an empire could rise without His aid?

We have been assured, sir, in the Sacred Writing, that unless the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it.

Franklin said:

I firmly believe this: I also believe without His concurring aid, we shall succeed in our political building no better than the builders of Babel. We will be confounded by our local partial interests and we, ourselves, shall become a byword down through the ages.

He went on to move that they start having prayer to start each of their days at Independence Hall working on the Constitution, just like they did throughout the Revolution. But if you go back and look at the debate, you find the reason that was voted down. They didn't have anybody who everybody else would agree would do a fair prayer for all the different Christian denominations.

So during the Revolution, they hired a chaplain who always did what all the Christian denominations believed was a fair prayer, but as they explained in debate: We are not getting paid. We don't have a treasury. We can't hire a chaplain. We can't do that right now.

And so next they moved to Randolph of Virginia, his motion: Okay. Here we are at the end of June. I move that we recess—this is not his exact words, but in essence:

Let's recess, reconvene on our Nation's birthday, Independence Day, at one of the local churches. Let's worship God together. And after we as a group here have worshiped God together, then let's come back and try this again. We are not making progress.

That passed. They went to the Reformed Calvinistic Church in Philadelphia. And it must have gone well. You can find prayers that the presiding pastor, the Reverend William Rogers, prayed. He brought that group together through prayer by the grace of God, and they came back and gave us the greatest founding document in the history of the world.

We have got to get back to where we teach right and wrong. That is why John Adams in 1797, as President of the United States, said:

This Constitution was meant for a moral and religious people. It is wholly inadequate for the government of any other.

And he was right. And when you fail to instill those moral understandings that brought C. S. Lewis around from being an atheist to being one of the most effective and greatest apologists for Christianity in its history, we have got to get back to that or the Constitution cannot work, and you will have administrations that commit heinous, reproachable acts as leaders of the Nation.

We ask that God bless America, but there are certain things a nation of people are supposed to do to be blessed people and merit the blessings of Heaven, as our Founders often referred to them.

Let's stand up for what is right. Let's stop the political vindictiveness, and the Nation will be better and be more likely to be blessed.

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

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. Con. Res. 41. Concurrent resolution recognizing 100 years of the United States-Australia relationship—100 years of Mateship; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on July 10, 2018, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills:

H.R. 770. To require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in recognition of American innovation and significant innovation and pioneering efforts of individuals or groups from each of the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and the United States territories, to promote the importance of innovation in the United States, the District of Columbia, and the United States territories, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2061. To reauthorize the North Korean Human Rights Act of 2004, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 28 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, July 12, 2018, at 10 a.m. 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:

5504. A letter from the Secretary, Division of Economic and Risk Analysis, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting Commission's final rule — Inline XBRL Filing of Tagged Data (RIN: 3235-AL59) received July 2, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

5505. A letter from the Regulatory Specialist, LRAD, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency (OCC), Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Securities Transaction Settlement Cycle [Docket ID: OCC-2017-0013] (RIN: 1557-AE24) received June 25, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

5506. 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; New Hampshire; Delegation of Authority [EPA-R01-OAR-2018-0069; FRL-9979-29-Region 1] received June 21, 2018, 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.

5507. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; SC; VOC Definition [EPA-R04-OAR-2017-0557; FRL-9979-92-Region 4] received June 21, 2018, 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.

5508. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; South Dakota; Revisions to the Permitting Rules [EPA-R08-OAR-2018-0148; FRL-9979-69-Region 8] received June 21, 2018, 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.

5509. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Minnesota; Regional Haze Progress Report [EPA-R05-OAR-2015-0034; FRL-9980-09-Region 5] received June 21, 2018, 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.

5510. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; State of Montana; Revisions to PSD Permitting Rules [EPA-R08-OAR-2018-0136; FRL-9979-76-Region 8] received June 21, 2018, 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.

5511. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Acetochlor; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2017-0235; FRL-9976-41] received June 21, 2018, 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.

5512. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; AK; Interstate Transport Requirements for the 2010 Nitrogen Dioxide and Sulfur Dioxide National Ambient Air Quality Standards [EPA-R10-OAR-2016-0590; FRL-9979-87-Region 10] received June 21, 2018, 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.

5513. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Outer Continental Shelf Air Regulations Update to Include New Jersey State Requirements [EPA-R02-OAR-2017-0723; FRL-9977-64-Region 2] received June 21, 2018, 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.

5514. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental

Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Oxirane, 2-methyl-, polymer with oxirane, mono[2-[2-(2-methoxymethlethoxy)methylethoxy] methylether] ether; Tolerance Exemption [EPA-HQ-OPP-2018-0071; FRL-9978-08] received June 21, 2018, 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.

5515. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Alaska; Interstate Transport Requirements for the 2012 PM2.5 NAAQS [EPA-R10-OAR-2017-0745; FRL-9980-00-Region 10] received June 21, 2018, 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.

5516. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Iowa; Amendment to the Administrative Consent Order, Grain Processing Corporation, Muscatine, Iowa [EPA-R07-OAR-2017-0143; FRL-9979-97-Region 7] received June 21, 2018, 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.

5517. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Thiencarbazone-methyl; Pesticide Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2017-0448; FRL-9978-50] received June 21, 2018, 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.

5518. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Tolfenpyrad; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2017-0156; FRL-9976-21] received June 21, 2018, 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.

5519. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Mercury; Reporting Requirements for the TSCA Mercury Inventory [EPA-HQ-OPPT-2017-0421; FRL-9979-74] (RIN: 2070-AK22) received June 21, 2018, 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.

5520. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; SC: Multiple Revisions to Air Pollution Control Standards [EPA-R04-OAR-2017-0385; FRL-9979-80-Region 4] received June 21, 2018, 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.

5521. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; SC; Definitions and Open Burning [EPA-R04-OAR-2017-0387; FRL-9979-78-Region 4] received June 21, 2018, 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.

5522. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Fluroxypyr; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2017-0225; FRL-9978-70] received June 21, 2018, 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.

5523. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Benzovindiflupyr; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2017-0167; FRL-9977-94] received June 21, 2018, 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.

5524. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval of Nebraska Air Quality Implementation Plans; Adoption of a New Chapter under the Nebraska Administrative Code [EPA-R07-OAR-2017-0386; FRL-9979-85-Region 7] received June 21, 2018, 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.

5525. A letter from the Sanctions Regulations Advisor, Office of Foreign Assets Control, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Removal of the Sudanese Sanctions Regulations and Amendment of the Terrorism List Government Sanctions Regulations received June 28, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5526. A letter from the Sanctions Regulations Advisor, Office of Foreign Assets Control, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Global Magnitsky Sanctions Regulations received June 28, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5527. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting DC Act 22-392, ''Public Housing Credit-Building Pilot Program Amendment Act of 2018'', pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5528. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting DC Act 22-380, ''Commission on the Arts and Humanities Temporary Amendment Act of 2018'', pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5529. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting DC Act 22-395, ''Green Finance Authority Establishment Act of 2018'', pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5530. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Ocean Dumping; Withdrawal of Designated Disposal Site; Grays Harbor, Washington [EPA-R10-OW-2018-0284; FRL-9979-31-Region 10] received June 21, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5531. A letter from the FMCSA Regulatory Ombudsman, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Process for Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) Physicians To Be Added to the National Registry of Certified Medical Examiners [Docket No.: FMCSA-2016-0333] (RIN: 2126-AB97) received June 26, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5532. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's interim final rule — Previously-incurred costs in the WIFIA program [EPA-HQ-OW-2016-0569; FRL-9979-90-OW] received June 21, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5533. A letter from the Chairman, National Transportation Safety Board, transmitting the Board's 2017 Annual Report to Congress, pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 1117; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5534. A letter from the Assistant Chief Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's correcting amendments — Hazardous Materials: Miscellaneous Amendments; Response to Appeals [Docket No. PHMSA-2013-0225 (HM-218H)] (RIN: 2137-AF27) received June 26, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5535. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulations and Reports Clearance, Social Security Administration, transmitting the Administration's Major rule — Rules of Conduct and Standards of Responsibility for Appointed Representatives [Docket No.: SSA-2013-0044] (RIN: 0960-AH63) received July 2, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5536. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Administration's Fiscal Year 2017 Report, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 3213; Public Law 89-136, Sec. 603 (as added by Public Law 105-393, Sec. 102(a)); (112 Stat. 3614); jointly to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure and Financial Services.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ROYCE of California: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H.R. 5105. A bill to establish the United States International Development Finance Corporation, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 115–814). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 989. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 6237) to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2018 and 2019 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes (Rept. 115–815). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. KNIGHT (for himself and Ms. CLARKE of New York):

H.R. 6330. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to modify the method for prescribing size standards for business concerns; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. BISHOP of Utah:

H.R. 6331. A bill to allow States to elect to observe daylight savings time for the duration of the year, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. TIPTON (for himself and Ms. SINEMA):

H.R. 6332. A bill to require the Director of the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network to submit a report to Congress on the way in which data collected pursuant to title 31 is being used, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. CARTER of Georgia (for himself, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. BARTON, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. FLORES, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. MITCHELL, and Mr. PERRY):

H.R. 6333. A bill to require the Commissioner of Internal Revenue to submit a report on the Taxpayer Identification Number Perfection Program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CÁRDENAS (for himself and Mr. OLSON):

H.R. 6334. A bill to support coding education; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. ESTY of Connecticut (for herself, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. HIMES, and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut):

H.R. 6335. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 322 Main Street in Oakville, Connecticut, as the ''Veterans Memorial Post Office''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. FUDGE (for herself and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia):

H.R. 6336. A bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture to grant farm numbers to individuals with certain documentation, to amend the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act to include qualified intermediaries as recipients of farm ownership loans, to provide for a study of farmland tenure, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GALLAGHER (for himself, Mr. KIND, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. LANCE, Mr. COFFMAN, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. COOPER, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. BEYER, and Mr. CURTIS):

H.R. 6337. A bill to amend the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 to require Congressional approval before the President adjusts imports that are determined to threaten to impair national security; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. NORMAN:

H.R. 6338. A bill to prohibit the use of Federal funds by the National Endowment for the Arts to award a grant for South Dakota State University's ''Historic Hobo Day''; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. NORMAN:

H.R. 6339. A bill to prohibit the use of Federal funds by the Department of Health and Human Services to award a grant for any virtual reality platform designed to teach children in China how to cross the street; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Education and the Workforce, and Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. ROSEN (for herself, Mr. WELCH, and Ms. SHEA-PORTER):

H.R. 6340. A bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to cap prescription drug cost-sharing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WALZ (for himself and Mr. PETERSON):

H.R. 6341. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the extension or renewal of certain reasonable cost reimbursement contracts under the Medicare program through 2020; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY (for herself, Mr. BEYER, Ms. LEE, Ms. DELAURO, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. WELCH, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. MOORE, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. MENG, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. NADLER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. COHEN, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. MATSUI, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. POCAN, Mr. PETERS, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. RASKIN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. RUSH, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. SOTO, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. KILMER, Mr. NOLAN, Mrs. TORRES, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, and Ms. KELLY of Illinois):

H. Res. 987. A resolution condemning the Attorney General's decision in ''Matter of A-B-'' seeking to declare domestic violence and gang violence as invalid grounds for seeking asylum; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASTRO of Texas (for himself and Mrs. COMSTOCK):

H. Res. 988. A resolution recognizing the importance of diversity in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics, acknowledging a necessity to increase diversity and representation within physics, and expressing support for the American Physical Society Bridge Program for its work toward increasing the number of underrepresented minorities earning physics doctoral degrees; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana (for himself, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. HARPER, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. BARLETTA, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. MAST, Mr. DESANTIS, Mrs. LESKO, Mr. DUNN, Mr. GIANFORTE, Mr. WALKER, Mr. GARRETT, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. PERRY, Mr. BABIN, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. BUCK, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. BIGGS, Mrs. HANDEL, Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. RUSSELL, and Mr. SMUCKER):

H. Res. 990. A resolution supporting the officers and personnel who carry out the important mission of the United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Homeland Security, and Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. KNIGHT:

H.R. 6330.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. BISHOP of Utah:

H.R. 6331.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, which states that Congress has the power ''to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.''

By Mr. TIPTON:

H.R. 6332.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution: ''to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.''

By Mr. CARTER of Georgia:

H.R. 6333.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 14 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CÁRDENAS:

H.R. 6334.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 1

By Ms. ESTY of Connecticut:

H.R. 6335.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 7, ''The Congress shall have Power to . . . establish Post Offices and Post Roads . . .''

By Ms. FUDGE:
H.R. 6336.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution gives Congress the power ''to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.''
By Mr. GALLAGHER:
H.R. 6337.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, subsection 1: ''Congress shall have Power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises''
and
Article 1, Section 8, subsection 3: ''To regulate commerce with foreign nations''
By Mr. NORMAN:
H.R. 6338.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8
By Mr. NORMAN:
H.R. 6339.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8
By Ms. ROSEN:
H.R. 6340.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clauses 3 and 18 of the United States Constitution.
By Mr. WALZ:
H.R. 6341.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
This bill is enacted pursuant to Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 173: Mr. BERGMAN.
H.R. 184: Mrs. LESKO and Mr. KELLY of Mississippi.
H.R. 365: Mr. ESTES of Kansas.
H.R. 398: Mr. NADLER.
H.R. 574: Mr. KHANNA.
H.R. 712: Mr. SOTO.
H.R. 756: Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 785: Mr. CRAMER and Mr. ESTES of Kansas.
H.R. 795: Mr. MCEACHIN.
H.R. 943: Mr. GAETZ.
H.R. 1080: Mr. KHANNA.
H.R. 1102: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD and Mr. SOTO.
H.R. 1150: Mr. KINZINGER, Mr. YODER, and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1160: Miss RICE of New York.
H.R. 1171: Mr. EMMER.
H.R. 1175: Mr. ESTES of Kansas.
H.R. 1201: Mr. ROTHFUS.
H.R. 1227: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 1267: Mr. ESTES of Kansas.
H.R. 1300: Mr. CLAY and Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 1421: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.
H.R. 1439: Mr. KIND and Ms. CLARKE of New York.
H.R. 1444: Mr. BOST.
H.R. 1606: Mr. MARSHALL and Mr. CUELLAR.
H.R. 1615: Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. CRIST, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. LAMB, Ms. PINGREE, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 1651: Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, and Mr. KHANNA.
H.R. 1697: Mr. NORMAN.
H.R. 1734: Mr. SCHNEIDER.
H.R. 1876: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.
H.R. 1881: Mr. BYRNE.
H.R. 1898: Mrs. COMSTOCK and Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 2015: Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. CARBAJAL, and Mr. SHERMAN.
H.R. 2101: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio and Mr. BIGGS.
H.R. 2276: Mr. ROTHFUS.
H.R. 2293: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.
H.R. 2306: Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 2409: Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico.
H.R. 2514: Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. AGUILAR, and Ms. KAPTUR.
H.R. 2556: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.
H.R. 2566: Mr. MOULTON.
H.R. 2583: Mr. SOTO.
H.R. 2648: Mr. UPTON.
H.R. 2856: Mr. GOHMERT.
H.R. 2871: Mr. FORTENBERRY.
H.R. 2943: Ms. ESTY of Connecticut.
H.R. 3000: Mr. GOHMERT.
H.R. 3032: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. LYNCH, and Mr. NOLAN.
H.R. 3145: Mr. CORREA.
H.R. 3330: Mr. HARRIS.
H.R. 3536: Mr. KHANNA.
H.R. 3602: Ms. MOORE, Mr. CRIST, and Mr. HASTINGS.
H.R. 3692: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. KILMER, and Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico.
H.R. 3842: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.
H.R. 3960: Mr. SHERMAN and Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 3976: Mr. SOTO.
H.R. 3988: Mr. BARR.
H.R. 4022: Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.R. 4024: Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico.
H.R. 4106: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
H.R. 4117: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.
H.R. 4122: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 4184: Mr. BACON.
H.R. 4251: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.
H.R. 4253: Mr. HIGGINS of New York and Mr. LEVIN.
H.R. 4260: Ms. KAPTUR.
H.R. 4265: Mr. BIGGS.
H.R. 4312: Mr. POSEY.
H.R. 4413: Mr. GOHMERT.
H.R. 4444: Mr. TED LIEU of California and Ms. SPEIER.
H.R. 4549: Mr. GOHMERT.
H.R. 4556: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 4610: Mr. SMUCKER.
H.R. 4616: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.
H.R. 4649: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
H.R. 4886: Mr. ESTES of Kansas and Mr. KINZINGER.
H.R. 4898: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H.R. 4944: Mr. KENNEDY.
H.R. 4952: Mr. GUTHRIE.
H.R. 4962: Mr. BABIN.
H.R. 4969: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
H.R. 5001: Mr. CÁRDENAS and Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 5011: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.
H.R. 5034: Ms. SÁNCHEZ and Mr. MEEKS.
H.R. 5061: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 5090: Ms. SPEIER.
H.R. 5105: Mr. HECK.
H.R. 5107: Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. PITTENGER, and Mr. ARRINGTON.
H.R. 5108: Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. ESHOO, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
H.R. 5116: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H.R. 5138: Mr. ESTES of Kansas.
H.R. 5153: Mr. CRAMER and Mrs. BLACKBURN.
H.R. 5160: Mr. KHANNA.
H.R. 5171: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 5223: Mr. BROWN of Maryland.
H.R. 5238: Mr. PAYNE, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. EVANS, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mrs. DEMINGS, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. CLAY, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. BASS, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. NORTON, Ms. PLASKETT, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, and Ms. MOORE.
H.R. 5266: Mr. MEEKS and Mr. DUFFY.
H.R. 5281: Mr. AMASH.
H.R. 5288: Mr. POLIQUIN.
H.R. 5292: Mr. SCHNEIDER.
H.R. 5300: Mr. WESTERMAN.
H.R. 5339: Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 5343: Mr. MCKINLEY.
H.R. 5354: Mr. HUNTER.
H.R. 5374: Mr. SCHNEIDER.
H.R. 5413: Mr. MOULTON.
H.R. 5508: Ms. SPEIER, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, and Mr. KING of Iowa.
H.R. 5533: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. TORRES, Mr. RUSH, Ms. DEGETTE, and Mr. SHERMAN.
H.R. 5538: Mr. COFFMAN and Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico.
H.R. 5571: Mr. MOULTON.
H.R. 5573: Ms. KAPTUR.
H.R. 5576: Mr. SCHNEIDER.
H.R. 5588: Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 5595: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.
H.R. 5598: Mr. BUCSHON.
H.R. 5618: Mr. COLLINS of New York and Mr. DIAZ-BALART.
H.R. 5649: Ms. ESTY of Connecticut.
H.R. 5671: Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, and Mr. SHUSTER.
H.R. 5697: Mr. GALLEGO.
H.R. 5701: Ms. ESTY of Connecticut.
H.R. 5771: Mr. BARR.
H.R. 5849: Ms. KAPTUR.
H.R. 5863: Ms. SPEIER.
H.R. 5882: Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico.
H.R. 5922: Mr. COFFMAN and Mr. SUOZZI.
H.R. 5924: Mr. ROTHFUS.
H.R. 5938: Mr. COFFMAN.
H.R. 5942: Mr. FOSTER and Ms. SPEIER.
H.R. 5988: Mr. ROKITA, Mr. ROTHFUS, and Mr. RENACCI.
H.R. 6010: Mrs. HARTZLER and Mr. GOHMERT.
H.R. 6014: Ms. TITUS.
H.R. 6016: Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. NOLAN, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, and Mrs. LAWRENCE.
H.R. 6018: Mr. PERRY and Mrs. WAGNER.
H.R. 6048: Mr. DESAULNIER and Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 6086: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.
H.R. 6108: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.
H.R. 6131: Mr. COHEN, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 6143: Mr. LEVIN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. POCAN, Mr. RASKIN, and Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 6144: Mr. LEVIN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. POCAN, Mr. RASKIN, and Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 6159: Mr. BABIN.
H.R. 6178: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. TIPTON.
H.R. 6180: Ms. PINGREE.
H.R. 6216: Mr. BUCK and Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 6217: Mr. BUCK and Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 6236: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.
H.R. 6260: Mr. PALLONE.
H.R. 6261: Mr. ROKITA.
H.R. 6287: Mr. DONOVAN.
H.R. 6312: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 6313: Ms. SINEMA.
H.R. 6314: Mr. ROKITA.

H.J. Res. 48: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H.J. Res. 135: Mr. EVANS.
H. Con. Res. 61: Mr. HOLDING.
H. Con. Res. 72: Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H. Res. 202: Mr. WENSTRUP and Mr. HIMES.
H. Res. 220: Mr. KING of New York.
H. Res. 256: Mr. COSTA.
H. Res. 395: Mrs. LOWEY.
H. Res. 750: Mr. RASKIN.
H. Res. 785: Mr. ROTHFUS and Mr. PALMER.
H. Res. 826: Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. BACON, and Mr. LATTA.
H. Res. 864: Mr. GUTIÉRREZ and Mr. LIPINSKI.
H. Res. 910: Mr. FITZPATRICK and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H. Res. 919: Mr. FLORES and Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida.
H. Res. 943: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H. Res. 966: Mr. WEBER of Texas.
H. Res. 967: Mr. COOK and Mr. BYRNE.
H. Res. 975: Mr. KIND.
H. Res. 982: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. RUSH, Mr. TONKO, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. WELCH, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. PETERS, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. LOEBSACK, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 164 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JULY 11, 2018 *No. 116*

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable TOM COTTON, a Senator from the State of Arkansas.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

O God, most holy, wise, and powerful, You are the Governor of the Universe. Keep our lawmakers this day in health of body, soundness of mind, and purity of heart. Infuse them with a spirit of courage that comes from believing that their times are in Your hands. Lord, strengthen them to labor for the fulfillment of Your purposes, empowered by You to navigate through life's turbulent waters. Direct them through every difficulty, comfort them in times of sorrow, and supply their needs according to the riches of Your grace.

We pray in Your great Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, July 11, 2018.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable TOM COTTON, a Senator from the State of Arkansas, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ORRIN G. HATCH,
President pro tempore.

Mr. COTTON thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Brian Allen Benczkowski, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

NOMINATION OF BRETT KAVANAUGH

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, yesterday I had an opportunity to meet with Judge Brett Kavanaugh as we begin preparations for his confirmation process to the Supreme Court. It is really impossible not to come away impressed. Judge Kavanaugh is the real deal. He has the all-star legal resume and the top-light academic credentials. His extensive judicial record is defined by fairness, thoughtfulness, thoroughness, and analytical precision. I was already confident the President had made an outstanding choice. Now I am even more confident. My colleagues here and Americans around the country won't have to take my word for it; just look to one of Judge Kavanaugh's former professors at Yale Law School. Here is what Professor Akhil Amar wrote in the New York Times: ''It is hard to name anyone with judicial credentials as strong as those of Judge Kavanaugh.''

Current faculty at Yale Law described him as a ''true intellectual,'' ''a leading thinker,'' and ''a wonderful mentor and teacher to our students.''

Even at Harvard, his alma mater's archrival, a scholar agrees that Judge Kavanaugh is ''a generous, honorable, kind person.''

Ask the legal professionals who have clerked for him on the DC Circuit. They are in a better position than most to speak to his writing as a jurist. In a letter to our colleagues on the Judiciary Committee, 34 of them share that Judge Kavanaugh ''drafts opinions painstakingly, writing and rewriting until he is satisfied each opinion is clear and well-reasoned, and can be understood not only by lawyers but by the parties and the public.''

As the confirmation process gets underway, I have a distinct feeling this isn't the only testimony of this sort that we will be hearing. Judge Kavanaugh seems to impress everyone with whom he crosses paths—at least those who haven't blindly announced in a fit of partisanship their opposition to this nomination before he was even named.

I am glad that President Trump has made such a strong selection, and I look forward to our colleagues in the Judiciary Committee taking up this nomination.

Mr. President, speaking of the personnel business, we are continuing this week to process President Trump's qualified nominees for other important positions in the judicial and executive branches. Yesterday, we confirmed the

22nd circuit court judge since January of 2017.

Now we are considering Brian Benczkowski, the President's choice to serve as Assistant Attorney General for the Criminal Division at the Department of Justice. His resume includes distinguished service in five different leadership positions at the Department of Justice under three Attorneys General. His nomination has won praise from a number of former Justice Department officials who served under Presidents of both parties. Their letter describes this nominee as ''a tireless worker . . . a fine leader and colleague . . . honest and a straight shooter.'' I look forward to voting to confirm him later today and to continuing to confirm more of the President's team.

JOB GROWTH

Mr. President, on one final matter, last week, the Labor Department released its monthly jobs report. As has become a pattern, it contained good news about the state of job opportunities across our country. In June alone, our economy created 213,000 new jobs, with contributions from nearly every sector. That continues a prolonged streak of strong jobs performance month after month, quarter after quarter.

The pro-growth, pro-jobs policies of this united Republican government—from historic tax relief to sweeping regulatory reform—are helping unleash this wave of new opportunity and new prosperity for America's workers and middle-class families.

More than 600,000 Americans entered the workforce last month alone—another sign that the Obama-era stagnation continues to lose its grip on our communities. The rate of hiring reached its highest level in more than a decade. Here is another promising sign: the rate at which Americans are quitting their jobs voluntarily. Economists tell us this is an important sign of a healthy job market because it indicates workers are moving upward, seeking better pay or superior benefits at a different employer. That number just hit its highest level in more than 17 years.

More jobs; more opportunities; more Americans coming off of the sidelines and getting back into the workforce; more Americans moving up the ladder to bigger and better things and opening up their current positions for other jobseekers at the same time—helping to produce conditions like these is what Republicans had in mind when we chipped away at the regulatory rust that kept American job creators from doing what they do best. That is what we had in mind when we used the Congressional Review Act a record 16 times to relieve bureaucratic bloat that had forced job creators and entrepreneurs to cut back or close up shop. That is what we had in mind when we overhauled our Tax Code so it better rewards workers and more strongly encourages job creators to deepen their roots in American soil. Republicans are proud of this thriving job market, and we are proud that our policies are playing a part in making it happen.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The assistant Democratic leader.

THAI RESCUE MISSION

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, the world breathed a sigh of relief. For almost 2 weeks now, we have had our attention focused on 12 children, Thai soccer team players who were lured into a cave with their coach and were thought to be lost for days. They couldn't be found in that flooded cave.

Then came the good news that they were discovered. They were still alive. It was a miracle.

Then came an extraordinary challenge: how to safely bring these 12 children out of this trap they were in and bring them to safety. I cannot imagine the effort that was undertaken. It included countries from around the world and the United States coming together to provide extraordinary levels of assistance at great cost to save the lives of these 12 children, to bring them out of this trap they were in and reunite them with their families.

All the prayers and all the hard work, all the bravery and all the investment paid off. These children are safe, as is their coach. They are currently being tended to for medical care, but the day will soon come when they will be back in the warm embrace of their families.

It was a great illustration of the caring heart of people around the world for children they had never seen; children who, through no fault of their own, found themselves in a deadly circumstance; children separated from their families with no hope when it came to their future. People responded. It was a great moment for the world to reflect on those children.

FAMILY SEPARATION

Mr. President, I wish to reflect on some other children. I wish to reflect on the 3,000 children forcibly removed from their parents' arms at the borders of the United States of America over the last several months. These children were victims of the zero tolerance policy of the Trump administration—a policy which Attorney General Sessions announced that resulted in those who appeared at the border, whether or not they were there for legitimate claims of asylum, being treated as criminals, and, treated as criminals, their children were removed from them.

I met with some of those children. It was 2 weeks ago in Chicago. It was at one of the agencies that the Department of Health and Human Services has used for decades to provide safe care for children who are unaccompanied at our border. Historically, those children came to the borders of United States without an adult, but in this circumstance, there were 66 children in Chicago who fit a different definition. While at the border, they were actually removed by the U.S. Government from the arms of their parents. Of the 66 children in the Chicago facility, 22—one-third of them—were under the age of 5. It is an important fact to keep in mind as we consider what has happened.

I come to the floor to speak about the Trump administration's shameful policy of forcibly removing innocent children from their parents. Since our Nation's tragic failure during World War II to rescue Jewish refugees who fled Hitler, generations of Americans and leaders of both political parties—Republicans and Democrats—have tried to set an example for the world by providing safe haven to the world's most vulnerable people.

Ask the Cuban Americans which country opened its doors for them when they tried to escape the communism of Fidel Castro. It was the United States of America, and we are better for it. Three Members of the U.S. Senate are Cuban Americans who can trace their lineages to that refugee flow from the island to our shores.

Ask the Soviet Jews, who were persecuted under Soviet rule and who finally found freedom of religion and opportunity here in the United States, whether the U.S. refugee policy was good for them. Of course, it was, and it was good for America.

Ask those who came out of Vietnam, who stood by our side during that bloody war and came to this country as refugees to escape persecution, whether that was the right choice for them. It was, and it was the right choice for America, most certainly.

Now we face the worst refugee crisis in history, and what is the United States of America's official policy? The Trump administration is doing everything in its power to prevent innocent victims of war and terrorism from even seeking safe haven in our country.

The Northern Triangle countries of Honduras, El Salvador, and Guatemala are the sources of the vast majority of migrants who arrive at our southern border. These people are driven to our borders by horrific gang and sexual violence. What is at the root cause of that violence? It is the appetite for narcotics in the United States. It is the drug money that flows south from our border into Mexico and Central America. It is the firearms that flow by the thousands into South and Central America from the United States of America. This creates these gangs and creates these cartels that bring such violence on local people.

These countries have among the highest homicide rates in the world. Girls face a constant threat of sexual violence and rape and have little protection from local authorities. Is it any wonder that in desperation so many of them seek our shores and seek our country for the safety of their kids? This is why families are taking extraordinary risks to flee to our border. Any parent would do the same to save a child.

What has been the Trump administration's response to these families

who flee for their lives and to the mothers and fathers who try to protect their girls from sexual violence and rape?

On April 6, Attorney General Jeff Sessions announced that the Trump administration had adopted a new zero tolerance approach in prosecuting border cases, making family separation the official policy of the United States of America. It declares that all who present themselves at our borders, even those who legitimately seek asylum, are to be treated as criminals.

The goal is clear. White House Chief of Staff John Kelly said that separating families is a ''tough deterrent'' to parents who flee persecution. Kelly also dismissed any concerns because ''the children will be taken care of—put into foster care or whatever.''

Under this harsh and harmful policy, thousands of children have been forcibly removed from their parents by our government. They have been transferred to facilities all over the country, often thousands of miles away from their parents. The American Academy of Pediatrics and the American Medical Association have condemned this Trump policy. In the starkest terms, the President of the American Academy of Pediatrics has called it ''government-sanctioned child abuse.''

Two weeks ago, on June 26, a Federal court in California mercifully stepped in. Judge Dana Sabraw was appointed to the Federal bench by Republican President George W. Bush. Judge Sabraw held that these family separations result in ''irreparable harm.'' He ordered the children who were separated by the Trump administration under the zero tolerance policy be returned to their parents within 30 days and within 14 days for those kids who were under the age of 5.

The Trump administration has tried to paint a rosy picture of the situation. On June 26, Health and Human Services Secretary Alex Azar testified to the Senate Committee on Finance: ''Every parent has access to know where their child is.'' Secretary Azar said: ''There is no reason why any parent would not know where their child is located.'' He also claimed that HHS had 2,047 separated children in custody. Last Thursday, Secretary Azar admitted that, actually, ''up to 3,000'' separated kids are still in its custody. As has been documented in numerous heartbreaking reports, many parents of the separated kids still do not know where their children are, and their attempts to contact them have been unsuccessful.

Yesterday was the deadline imposed by Judge Sabraw for reuniting children under the age of 5. What did we learn? The Trump administration notified the court that it had identified 102 separated children under the age of 5 and that only 4 of those 102 children would be reunited before the deadline. The administration only has concrete plans to reunite about half of these 100 children. It has made no effort to contact 12 parents whom the government deported, and it can't even identify the parents of one toddler. We still don't know the fate of thousands of other children who are supposed to be reunited in just a few days.

This is an outrage. This is a toxic mix of cruelty and incompetence. The Trump administration continues to try to shift the blame for this humanitarian crisis to Congress and the courts, but Judge Sabraw said that this is a ''chaotic circumstance of the government's own making.'' He went on to say yesterday, as reported in the New York Times, that these are firm deadlines and not aspirational goals—admonishing the government.

In another Federal courtroom, the administration's real plan was made clear. Because of the backlash from the courts and the public, it is no longer separating families. Instead, this administration wants to jail these families indefinitely. Experts tell us that separation is child abuse, that jail is no place for children, and that even short-term detention can do permanent damage to a child's health and well-being.

The administration asked the Federal district court to set aside the Flores settlement—a legally binding agreement to protect the best interests of kids that has been in place for over two decades. On Monday, the Federal court rejected the Trump administration's request, saying it was ''wholly without merit.'' According to media reports, the Trump administration plans to appeal, and it is asking Congress to pass legislation to overturn the Flores agreement. Instead of putting social workers to work in reuniting families and children, the Trump administration wants to lawyer up so that it can be spared from the standards that Democratic and Republican administrations have faced in the humane treatment of children.

The Trump administration's goal is clear. In the midst of the world's worst refugee crisis, it wants to make the situation for families who flee persecution as painful as possible in order to deter them from seeking safe haven.

Let me be clear. This Senator will do everything in his power to stop legislation that would authorize the Trump administration to put migrant children in jail. It is immoral. It is shameful. It is un-American. I call on my colleagues—Republicans and Democrats—to join me in opposing the Trump administration's cruel immigration policy.

I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Democratic leader is recognized.

THANKING THE SENATOR FROM ILLINOIS

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, let me first thank my friend and colleague from Illinois. He is a lamp of light in this horrible moment when children are being separated from their parents, when we don't even know where they are, and when we don't even know who their parents are. He is showing the inhumanity and the incompetence of this administration rolled into one. He has been a constant and vigilant voice to reunite the families and bring some justice, some peace, some calm to these poor kids. So I thank him for the work he has done.

NOMINATION OF BRETT KAVANAUGH

Mr. President, President Trump's nomination of Judge Kavanaugh to the Supreme Court will bring up many issues. The next Justice on the Supreme Court will have an ability to impact labor rights, women's reproductive rights, LGBTQ rights, voting rights, civil rights, environmental rights, and so much more for generations to come. We need to know how Judge Kavanaugh views those issues.

On the issue of a woman's freedom to make her own health decisions, for example, yesterday, while shepherding Judge Kavanaugh around the Capitol, Vice President PENCE said that he wanted to see Roe v. Wade overturned. This isn't some ancient belief that the country has pushed aside. There are people in high parts of the government—the Vice President yesterday, the President constantly, and some others—who want to repeal Roe v. Wade tomorrow. Americans should not be complacent. The vast majority of Americans wants to see Roe in place, but there is an active movement here now, personified by Judge Kavanaugh's potential elevation to the Bench—I hope it doesn't happen—and we have to be vigilant.

Vice President PENCE's remarks that he wants Roe overturned was a prescient reminder that both the President and Vice President have explicitly promised to appoint ''strict constitutionalists to the Supreme Court'' who would ''consign Roe v. Wade to the ash heap of history.'' Those are the Vice President's words.

Judge Kavanaugh has also written some troubling things about environmental protections, consumer protections, commonsense gun safety laws, all of which should be carefully examined by this Senate and by the American people before we have any hearings. His history as a Republican partisan lawyer during the Clinton and Bush eras—documents, emails, writings—needs to be thoroughly examined, particularly his more recent writings about executive authority.

Judge Kavanaugh argued that a President should not be subject to an investigation while he is in office, that a President should be above criminal and civil indictments, even going so far as to say that a President need not enforce a law that the President deems unconstitutional.

Those are serious and dangerous beliefs. They are particularly dangerous—maybe even more dangerous now—because we have a President who clearly wishes to aggregate all power to himself regardless of the separation of powers, regardless of the norms this country has had for centuries, regardless of the rule of law. Senators from

both parties need to scrutinize what Judge Kavanaugh has said because, if he is the swing vote on any kind of rational check on this President, I worry. We should all worry.

Conservatism has always believed in small aggregations of power so that the individual would have more freedom. That is the core of conservatism. Yet, when conservatives embrace Donald Trump, who wishes to aggregate power and roll over any checks to his power and now chooses to get behind Judge Kavanaugh, who seems to have an almost monarchical view of Presidential power, we have trouble. We had better be awfully careful here in this country. The Senate is going to have to look at each and every one of these issues in due time.

Today, however, I want to focus on the issue that might have the most profound consequences for the average American most immediately—healthcare and the protections for Americans who have preexisting conditions. In a few minutes, I will be joined by some of my colleagues over in the Mansfield Room to discuss this issue at length. Right now, though, here is what I would like to say.

Prior to Judge Kavanaugh's selection, President Trump promised to nominate a judge who ''would do the right thing, unlike Judge Roberts on health care.'' Those are Trump's words.

He commissioned a list of judges from the Heritage Foundation—a far-right special interest group that is dedicated to dismantling government, including and especially the healthcare law. It is the place where the government spends a lot of money. These rich people who are behind the Heritage Foundation—the Kochs and others—don't want to pay any taxes. Those poor folks. They are struggling. Where do more taxes go than any other place? They go to healthcare. Why? Because that is what the American people want. Who wouldn't give everything they have if their spouse, their children, their relatives were sick and needed a lot of money to be cured?

That is why we have insurance, and that is why we have the government involved with things like Social Security and Medicare and Medicaid, but the Heritage Foundation—a handful of rich people who fund them and the so many Republicans who dance to their tune—don't want that. They hide it from the American people because the American people don't agree with it, but they don't want it. They have pushed forward Judge Kavanaugh to be the torchbearer on the Court for their mission.

The list of 25 that President Trump selected from was vetted and approved by this very Heritage Foundation. The Heritage Foundation would not give its stamp of approval to anyone who would maintain or grow our healthcare law, particularly protections for Americans with preexisting conditions.

The American people deserve to know where Judge Kavanaugh stands. This is a serious issue. This is not something we can allow a nominee to hide behind and say: I will follow existing law. We need to know their view of the government's ability to be involved in people's healthcare; to help it be funded when the average person can't afford it, given how high the costs are.

Right now, several cases that challenge the structure and constitutionality of the law are wending through our courts. If one or many reach the Supreme Court, I will say to my fellow Americans, your right to be protected if, God forbid, someone in your family is sick is at risk. Your right to have an insurance company not cut you off if, God forbid, someone in your family is sick is at risk if Judge Kavanaugh ascends to the Bench. That is probably the No. 1 reason he is opposed by so many of us on this side of the aisle.

Can you imagine a Supreme Court thrusting us back to a time when you could be denied health insurance precisely because you needed it so desperately, to a time when a mother with a child who has cancer is made to watch her daughter suffer in agony because they can't get affordable healthcare because no insurer will insure someone who has a child with cancer in their family? Do we want to go back to that? Come on. This is not Democrat or Republican; this is what America believes in. The hard right, through subterfuge and, to their credit, long-term diligence, is getting these people on the Court. They could never pass such a law in the Congress, the elected body of the people, even with the Republican majorities, but the Court, the unelected branch, is where they are headed, and that is why we have to be so vigilant.

Up to 130 million nonelderly Americans have a preexisting condition—more than one-third of Americans. For insurance companies, it used to be the case that a condition as commonplace as asthma was justification for jacking up rates to unaffordable levels. The law we wrote to prevent those despicable abuses by insurance companies is potentially on the chopping block, in my view, and likely to go if Judge Kavanaugh becomes Justice Kavanaugh. How can we afford that?

The American people should have their eyes wide open to the stakes. The Supreme Court may very well hear a challenge to the legal protections for people with preexisting conditions, and President Trump's own Justice Department is currently arguing in court that those protections are unconstitutional. I would like President Trump, at one of his rallies, to tell the people at the rally he is for taking away their protections when they have someone with a preexisting condition in their family. He wouldn't dare, but that is what his legal departments in HHS and Justice are doing.

The President doesn't tell people what he is doing. He brings these hard-right people in and says: I am with you. He whispers: I am with you. He doesn't dare tell the American people.

That is why it is our job in the minority, since the Republican side, by and large, has shown so little spine on this issue—it is our job to let the American people know the peril they are in, that their healthcare is in.

If anyone doesn't believe that President Trump is still intent on tearing down our healthcare system, just look at what the administration did yesterday. The President decimated funding that helps people sign up for health insurance, cutting it to one-sixth of what it was 2 years ago. This funding is used to help people navigate the complex landscape of health insurance and select the plan or program that is right for their family. Even worse, of the little funding that remains, Trump mandated that it be used to direct people into his junk insurance plans that don't cover basic essential healthcare. Yesterday's news should remind us that President Trump remains ruthlessly committed to tearing down our healthcare system. He will not admit it at his rallies. He does not dare talk about it, but that probably is the most important thing he is doing in terms of effect on the American people, and we are not going to let him hide it. Anyone who thinks President Trump did not make this Supreme Court nomination without an end goal of furthering healthcare sabotage is kidding themselves.

So while there are many rights and freedoms at stake on the Supreme Court, the right of all Americans to be able to afford healthcare is at the very top of the list. The selection process for Judge Kavanaugh and President Trump's own words should motivate Americans from all corners of the country to contact their Senators and urge them to oppose this nominee.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CALLING FOR THE RELEASE OF PASTOR ANDREW BRUNSON

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, I come here in fulfillment of a promise that I made a couple of months ago to bring to the attention of the American people an injustice that is occurring in Turkey.

I am here to talk about an American pastor, Andrew Brunson. He is from a church. He is from western North Carolina. He spent 20 years in Turkey as a missionary. He started out just doing missionary work without a church. Then he built a very small church that maybe can house 100 people, in Izmir.

After the coup in 2016, Pastor Brunson was apprehended, and he has

been in prison ever since. He was imprisoned for almost 19 months without any charges. For the vast majority of that time, he was in a cell designed for 8 people that had 21 in it, without charges. Earlier this year there were charges levied against him that are just absolutely absurd. I know from firsthand experience.

After the indictment was issued, I heard through channels and through his wife Norine that Pastor Brunson was afraid that the American people were going to read this indictment, believe it, and turn their backs on him. So it was important for me to go to Turkey and let him know that is the last thing we are going to do and that I was going to bring this to the American people's attention until he was released.

I went back about a month later. I sat through a court proceeding in a Turkish courtroom for about 12 hours, and I heard some of the most absurd claims you can possibly imagine. They were charges that would not keep an American citizen or a foreign national in an American jail for the afternoon. Yet they have kept him in prison for 642 days.

This afternoon I am going to be traveling to Brussels to be a part of the NATO meeting that we have. I am going to seek to speak once again with the Turkish officials to tell them that justice needs to be served. Pastor Brunson needs to come home.

Pastor Brunson has a court date next week. It could be the last hearing, and he could be subject to a 35-year sentence. He is a little over 50 years old. So that is effectively a life sentence.

The charges are basically this. He has been a missionary. He has been providing humanitarian relief to Syrian refugees, to the Turkish people, and actually just offering and preaching the Word to those who want to hear it.

So I ask President Erdogan and the Turkish officials to please let justice be served. Let Andrew Brunson come home.

The last thing we are working on—and I hope it no longer has to be a provision in the NDAA—is that if he doesn't get released, we have to rethink our relationship with this NATO ally that has been in the NATO alliance since 1952. We have to ask ourselves about ramifications if a NATO ally will hold people illegally, imprison them, sweep them up—in a legitimate effort to tamp down an illegal coup—and hold this man hostage.

I hope I come to the floor in a couple of weeks thanking the Turkish Government, the Turkish people, and the Turkish judiciary for having justice served. The only way I believe justice will be served is when Andrew Brunson comes home. Until he does, I will come back here every week to continue to bring attention to this issue. It should be important to every American.

If any American is traveling to Turkey, right now I am not sure I would because you could have a meal, you could have a light on for a couple of hours in your hotel room. These are the types of charges that have been used as a basis for saying that this man was conspiring to plot a coup and was conspiring to support terrorist organizations—eating a meal that looks like a meal that certain terrorist organizations like, which, incidentally, is a very popular meal in the Middle East; having a light on upstairs, in a room, incidentally, that doesn't have windows that some secret witness said could only be on because they were plotting some nefarious activity.

I thank the Members of this body—some 70 Members—who signed on to a letter expressing their concern with his illegal detention. I promise Pastor Brunson and I promise any American citizen and some of those Turkish citizens who work with the State Department that as long as I am a Senator, I will be bringing attention to this injustice until justice is served.

IMMIGRATION AND CUSTOMS ENFORCEMENT

Mr. President, I wish to very quickly bring attention to something about which I think people need to speak up on the other side of the issue; that is, this movement now called End ICE, or Immigration and Customs Enforcement.

We have a gubernatorial candidate in New York who said ICE is a terrorist organization—not ISIS, which is a terrorist organization, but ICE. These men and women in uniform go out every day and put their lives on the line to protect the American people.

Let me tell my colleagues what people who are part of the End ICE movement are for. This chart represents what they are for if they are for ending ICE. These are 2017 numbers. They are for ending the arrest of some 143,000 people who have broken our laws. They are for ending the seizure of tons of fentanyl.

I will give you an idea of what that means in terms of potential risk of human life. You are talking about gangs—some 5,000 gang members who were arrested last year because they were clearly related to gang activity, with MS–13 being one of the first among them. They are for ending all of our protections and having all of these activities go unchallenged on American soil.

If you are for ending ICE, you are for ending almost 7,000 pounds of heroin seized, and that is only a fraction of what these criminal elements are bringing to this country.

If Members come to this floor and talk about fighting the opioid epidemic, I can't imagine anyone who is sincere about fighting the opioid epidemic saying that they want more poison on the streets. You can't have it both ways. You are either for solving the problem of the opioid epidemic, which means that we have to have law enforcement to specialize in seizing it, or you are against it. You are for poisoning our youth. You are for poisoning people who are addicted to opioids. You can't have it both ways. If you want to end ICE, you are for this.

If you want to end ICE, you are for people who have tattoos that clearly indicate that they are part of a gang on the streets. We have gangs that, actually, as a part of getting initiated, want you to kill or harm somebody to prove that you will when you are asked to. If you want to end ICE, you are for more of these folks on the streets—some 4,800 of them.

Again, if you want to end ICE, then you want to end the careers of people who have such a dangerous job that, oftentimes, when they do drug seizures, they have to wear HAZMAT suits because if they touch the fentanyl, they could die or go into an overdose. If you want to end ICE, you want that poison to be in the hands of a child or someone else who, if they touch it, is going to die or have a profound overdose.

That is what ending ICE means. Just to sum up, if you want to end ICE, you want that seizure of a ton of fentanyl coming across our border, mainly from Mexico, that has enough potency to kill 500 million people.

Now, I honestly believe that nobody in this body really means that they want to end ICE, that they want to cause human traffickers, gun traffickers, drug traffickers—more of them. But you can't have it both ways. If you want to go on the stump and say you want to end ICE, then add this to your stump speech. Add this to the logical consequence of what happens when you insult the men and women in uniform in ICE and you say you want to end what they are doing, because if you do, the negative consequences are clear. All you have to do is look at what ICE has done over the last year, and what they would not do this year, if you really believe what they say about ending ICE.

So I think they need to ice the ''end ICE'' narrative and start getting smart about making sure that we maybe make changes that we need to in any organization. But for people to go to such an extreme, to say that they want to end one of the most important law enforcement agencies combating illegal immigration and illegal trafficking across our border, you had better be honest on the stump. You had better let them know what you mean because that is what they mean.

I think it is important for our Members to step up and let people know the consequences of this ridiculous rhetoric and to show the men and women in uniform—police officers, ICE agents, and everybody else—that people like me care about them. People like me respect them for what they do.

We know that their assaults were up by three times last year. It is a dangerous job. Many of them don't even know if they are going to come home when they leave in the morning.

It is an insult for anybody in this body to come into this Chamber and say that they need to be ended. They

need to be thanked. They need to be revered. Agencies always need to be improved, but if you believe we should end ICE, you had better own the consequences.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SULLIVAN). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, today the Senate is considering one of the most troubling executive branch nominations that this President has made to date—the nomination of Brian Benczkowski to lead the Criminal Division of the Justice Department.

For years, I have studied and have been aware of the Criminal Division. This is an amazing nomination. I think it is enough to oppose Mr. Benczkowski's nomination because he is objectively unqualified for this important position, but there are also compelling reasons to believe that it would be uniquely reckless to confirm him to this position.

Now, speaking about Mr. Benczkowski's lack of qualifications for this role is not meant to denigrate. Many of us know him, as I did, from his service in the Judiciary Committee as the staff director for the then Ranking Member Jeff Sessions. The fact is, this nominee to head the Criminal Division has virtually no criminal law experience. Even at this age, he has never tried a case. He has never served as a prosecutor. He has almost zero courtroom experience. Instead, his experience has been to serve as a political aide to various officials.

As a former prosecutor, I know there is no substitute for actual courtroom experience, actually going into a courtroom and trying a criminal case, arguing criminal cases on appeal, determining whether you bring a charge or don't bring a charge. These are things an experienced prosecutor has to do. For the last several decades, under Republican and Democratic administrations, every head of a criminal division—which is probably the most important litigating arm of the Justice Department—has had substantial prosecutorial experience, with the exception of one individual whose nomination I simply could not support. This shouldn't be a partisan issue. I voted for nominees in Republican administrations and in Democratic administrations because they were qualified, and there are countless qualified prosecutors the President could select.

For this reason alone, the Senate should not consent to Mr. Benczkowski's nomination. But there are two other reasons, aside from the fact that he has absolutely zero qualifications for this important position. It is sort of like sending somebody in to do brain surgery when their main experience has been clipping hedges. You have to have some experience in there, but aside from the fact that he has no experience, there are two other reasons he shouldn't be confirmed.

First, he has demonstrated, at a minimum, exceptionally poor judgment when it comes to perhaps our Nation's most critical ongoing national security investigation—the Russian Government's attack on our democracy. We all know, if we have read the intelligence reports, Russia attacked the U.S. democracy and vote in the last election.

After serving on Mr. Trump's transition team, Mr. Benczkowski represented a Putin-connected Russian bank, Alfa-Bank, regarding its bizarre server communications with the Trump organization during the height of the Presidential campaign. Alfa-Bank was at the very center of scrutiny into ties between the Trump campaign and Russia, even making an appearance in the Steele dossier. Yet Mr. Benczkowski took on Alfa-Bank as a client on an issue related to the Russia investigation at the same time he was being considered for a senior position in the Trump Justice Department, totally blinded to the obvious conflict of interest. In fact, he continued to represent Vladimir Putin's connected bank until the day he was formally nominated to lead the criminal division.

Now, some have said we should give Mr. Benczkowski the benefit of the doubt. Giving him the benefit of the doubt, you have to admit, at least demonstrates an embarrassingly poor sense of judgment for someone who is nominated to lead the Criminal Division to look into the criminal activities of places like Alfa-Bank. Now, we find Mr. Benczkowski has refused to recuse himself from matters related to the Russia investigation or the Steele dossier.

You can't make these things up. It is just conflict of interest 101. As Senator DURBIN and Senator WHITEHOUSE have warned, as head of the Criminal Division, Mr. Benczkowski would therefore have visibility and be able to look into investigations of individuals related to the Trump campaign. He could serve as a conduit of information to the Attorney General about these sensitive matters.

According to the Department of Justice, it is possible Special Counsel Mueller's office ''will seek approvals from the Criminal Division as required . . . or may simply want to consult with subject-matter experts in the Criminal Division as appropriate in the normal course of department investigations,'' and who would have availability to that? Mr. Benczkowski. He could even be in a position to share secret grand jury information directly with the President.

What is also concerning is that if Mr. Benczkowski were to be confirmed and Deputy Attorney General Rosenstein were then to be removed, the President, under the Federal Vacancies Reform Act, could simply install Mr. Benczkowski as the Acting Attorney General, with respect to the Russia investigation.

So what do we have? We have Mr. Benczkowski, under those circumstances, gaining direct control over the special counsel's investigation. He would even have the power to stop the special counsel's probe. Gosh, we wonder, could that ever occur to someone at the White House; that he could suddenly stop Mr. Mueller from his investigations?

On qualifications, the man who is going to be head of the Criminal Division has never tried a case, never handled any criminal matter, never had anything to do with criminal matters. He is really unqualified for this role by any objective measure. The only apparent qualification that Mr. Benczkowski has is his close relationship with, and political loyalty to, the Attorney General and the President. In fact, that is likely the very reason he was nominated to this critical position. That is all the more troubling given his terrible judgment with respect to the Russia investigation. We are putting someone in who has been involved as an attorney for a bank involved in this Russia investigation.

Many of my fellow Republican Senators, to their credit, have stated their commitment to ensuring that Special Counsel Mueller be allowed to carry out his investigation independently and without political interference. I hope they keep this commitment in mind when considering Mr. Benczkowski's nomination. I hope they join me in voting no. Apparently, his only qualification is he is going to be put in a position where he could stymie Mueller's investigation of Russia.

I have voted for a lot of nominees, both Republicans and Democrats, in this position because of their qualifications—not because of their ideology but their qualifications. No President of either party has ever nominated somebody for this critical position who is less qualified. In fact, it is pretty hard to find anybody in this country less qualified.

Mr. President, I see other Senators on the floor, so I yield to them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

SECTION 232

Mr. PERDUE. Mr. President, I rise to talk about my opposition to the section 232 motion which will be voted on later today.

I have utmost respect for my colleagues who are bringing this motion. I totally understand their logic, and I respect their point of view on this and many other issues. One of the great things about this deliberative body is that we deliberate. Unfortunately, I just don't understand why this body continues to try to tie the hands of this President at every turn.

We all know that enacting tariffs on imports is not the goal here. This

President is committed to creating a more level playing field for our workers and our companies here at home that compete on the unlevel playing field which exists in the trade world we know of today. We need to give this President, and every future President, frankly, room to negotiate.

The 1962 Trade Expansion Act was passed by Congress to give the executive branch the authority and flexibility to negotiate on trade. It was this authority that paved the way for negotiations on the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade—GATT—which helped reduce global trade barriers.

Most of my career, I have dealt within the GATT restrictions and opportunities we have to trade across borders internationally. I think, more than anybody else in this body, I have actually transacted products across borders internationally. I am very concerned, in this era of entrenchment in Congress, where we are so paralyzed that we can't even fulfill our most basic constitutional function of funding the government on time—which we have only done four times in 44 years—in that environment, if we get the authority on trade back, that we will not be able to even hold a vote and have a debate and will hamstring any administration's negotiating efforts.

Credibility in negotiating trade terms is absolutely critical. Imagine a head of state in another part of the world dealing with our head of state, knowing that before he can make any deal, he has to wait on us in this body to act. I have been waiting 3 years to see this body act on healthcare. We haven't been able to find a way to even solve one of the most near crises we all know exists today. So imagine what a world would look like if we are trying to do that in the trade environment.

Like me, President Trump is an outsider to this political process. He is a business guy who has seen the impact of unfair trade practices in the real world. For years, he has seen how America has often been treated unfairly when it comes to trade. I know, and most people who have traded internationally in the last four decades know, these rules were written by us. We wrote these rules. It created an unlevel playing field that allowed the rest of the world to develop, but guess what. In the last 40 years, we have seen global poverty be reduced by almost two-thirds, while our poverty rate in the United States, since the Great Society was signed into law, has not been reduced one iota. That is partly a function of our trade practices.

This President has made it a priority to restore fairness and balance to this trade imbalance with our trading partners around the world. He needs credibility and he needs flexibility in order to achieve that.

Looking at what we are up against today, it is easy to see why the President is insisting on getting America a better deal. Today, Canada has a 270-percent tariff on U.S. milk; the EU keeps a 10-percent tariff on American autos; Brazil bans U.S. fresh, frozen, and processed pork products; China has a 15-percent tariff on American cars; the EU has a tariff of up to 26 percent on U.S. seafood; and you cannot sell fresh American potatoes in most of Mexico. I could do this all day.

We know there is an imbalance in trade around the world. This is about making sure America is treated fairly and is in the best place to do business in the world. It is about making America more competitive and secure. It is about ensuring our economic and national security for the next 100 years.

The President is taking a different approach, sometimes controversial, but I believe he is a pragmatist, and I believe he only wants one thing for America; that is, results and a level playing field with the rest of the world.

I believe we ought to give the executive branch—just like the 1962 act did—space to negotiate. We need to give him space to succeed for American workers and for American companies here at home.

With that, I urge my colleagues to oppose this motion.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, I rise in support of the Corker-Toomey-Flake motion that we are going to be voting on soon. Let me be clear. This is a motion that simply would reflect—if it is adopted—the consensus of the Senate that Congress should have a role in determining the use of section 232 to impose tariffs.

Let me give a little bit of context. First of all, I want to be very clear that free trade is enormously constructive, enormously helpful for our economy and our standard of living. The United States has been a leader in promoting free trade around the world for many decades, and that is part of the reason we are the most affluent society on the globe by far, consistently outperforming the rest of the world. What it does is it provides our consumers with many choices and lower costs and therefore a more affordable standard of living, and it provides our workers with foreign markets.

Ninety-five percent of the world's population lives somewhere else. I want to sell to them, and we do that through an environment of free trade. Take NAFTA, for instance. Since NAFTA was enacted in 1994, Pennsylvanians have seen exports to Mexico increase by more than 500 percent. That is what happened because of the reduction in the barriers to trade that existed prior to NAFTA. Of course, it also encourages investment in the United States—new plants, factories, and all the jobs that come with that.

Tariffs and quotas and other obstacles to trade do the exact opposite. They reduce our consumers' choices. They raise costs. They limit our opportunity to sell our products, whether it is agricultural products or manufactured products. They reduce the opportunities to sell these abroad. Of course, inevitably, the imposition of these barriers involves the government's deciding which sectors and which industries will be winners and losers because very seldom are these broadly and uniformly applied. Individual sectors are usually selected.

So where are we today? It has been 16 weeks since the President invoked section 232 of our trade law to impose tariffs on imported steel and aluminum. First and foremost, I have to say this is a misuse of section 232 of our trade law.

Section 232 is supposed to be invoked when there is a specific threat to America's national security. Well, let's consider the case of steel. The United States produces domestically 75 percent of all the steel we consume. Our defense needs consume 3 percent of total steel consumption. How could one possibly make the case that we don't have a plentiful abundance of domestically produced steel to satisfy our defense needs? But it is not only that. Where are the biggest sources for the 25 percent of steel that we consume but we don't produce ourselves? Well, that would be Mexico and Canada. Those are the two countries that provide the most steel. With both of those countries, we have a surplus of trade in steel. The Canadians actually buy more steel from us than we buy from them, and so do the Mexicans.

Where is the security threat to America when my constituents choose to buy some portion of the steel we consume from Canada? We know the answer. There is no security threat from Canada and Mexico, and the fact that they provide a modest percentage of our steel needs does not constitute a national security threat, and we know it doesn't. Yet the administration invoked section 232 to impose this tax on American consumers when we choose to buy steel and aluminum from Canada and Mexico and the European Union, by the way, for that matter.

The harmful effects we have feared have already begun. We have increased prices on U.S. consumers and a real threat to workers and businesses. I have heard from many Pennsylvania manufacturers that happen to rely, for some portion of their products, on imported steel, and now their products are no longer competitive because they, alone in the world, are being forced to pay this additional tax when they import this steel.

I have to say this is part of what looks like a pattern to me—and this is one of my concerns—of this administration moving away from support for free trade. First, there was a sugar deal negotiated with Mexico which is designed to artificially inflate the price American consumers have to pay for sugar. It works out very well if you are one of the handful of people who produce sugar in the United States, but it is a terrible deal for everyone else. Then we had tariffs applied to solar panels and washing machines under a

different provision. Now we have an ongoing and apparently escalating trade war with China. This motion has absolutely nothing to do with China; I am just presenting that as a matter of context. And we are hearing that the administration is threatening now to again misuse section 232, in my view, to impose new taxes on Americans who choose to buy automobiles that originate in Europe. That would be terrible for our economy and for our consumers. It would be a bad idea, but we are told that is under active consideration.

My view is that it is about time Congress restores to Congress the constitutional responsibility we have to establish tariffs. The Constitution is completely unambiguous about this. Article I, section 8, clause 1, states that ''the Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises.'' Clause 3 says that ''the Congress shall have the power . . . to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations.'' We made a mistake in recent decades when we ceded this constitutional responsibility to the executive branch. I think that was a mistake, and I have argued that for a long time. Now we are seeing a price being paid as the administration, I think, is misusing this important tool.

What our motion does is it would simply take a step in the direction of restoring this responsibility the Constitution assigns to us in the first place. This does not tie the President's hands at all. The President is free to negotiate better trade agreements if he can, and I think he should. What it does say, though, is that if he wants to invoke national security as the reason for imposing taxes on Americans when they buy foreign products—when he wants to do that, Congress ought to have a role. That is all it says. That is what this motion to instruct says.

I am very pleased to be working with Senator CORKER from Tennessee and Senator FLAKE from Arizona. I think this is a very modest step. It takes us in a direction that would be very constructive, which is to restore the constitutional responsibility we have been shirking. I am pleased there is bipartisan support for this. I hope this motion to instruct our conferees will be adopted by a wide margin.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I rise to speak on the same topic on which my friend from Pennsylvania just spoke. I want to thank him for laying out the rationale for this vote. I also thank Senator FLAKE for his efforts. I know Senator ALEXANDER, the senior Senator from Tennessee and my friend, will speak on this topic in just a few moments. I do hope we will have an overwhelming vote for this motion to instruct. It is just a step in the direction that we would like to go relative to Congress's role.

Section 232 of the Trade Act was never intended to be used the way this administration is using it. The Senator from Pennsylvania laid out the fact that this certainly is not being imposed for national security reasons. As a matter of fact, the White House has said loosely on many occasions that they are only using section 232 in order to try to create some kind of leverage on NAFTA. I don't understand how putting tariffs in place on our allies in Europe has anything to do with NAFTA. I don't understand how putting tariffs on our neighbors has anything to do with combating what China is doing in stealing our intellectual property, and I know the Presiding Officer knows full well what is happening there. We do need to counter that kind of activity, and I don't know if we are doing it in the best way now.

This is an abuse of Presidential authority. It is an abuse of Presidential authority. What I hope is going to happen today is that, in a bipartisan way, in an overwhelming vote, we are going to pass this motion to instruct, moving Congress into its rightful role as it relates to this issue.

The reason the President, by the way—for those of you who may not be following this closely—is invoking section 232 is that under 232, no one has really an ability to oppose it. I mean, with the China tariffs—and this has nothing to do with the China tariffs that are being imposed today and that were recently imposed. They go under different sections of the Trade Act where you have to actually make a case for what you are doing. In January, the President used section 201 of the Trade Act, but he has to make a case to be successful there. He recently used section 301 on China tariffs. Again, this particular motion has nothing to do with China tariffs, but he has to make a case for that. He has to deal with the World Trade Organization and ITC.

Section 232—basically, he can just wake up and decide he is going to use section 232, the way it is now written. It has never been used in this manner by any President ever, but if we have a situation where we set up a rules-based society in dealing with trade, and any executive officer of a country can wake up and one day decide they have a national security issue and have to make no case, then, in effect, treaties relative to trade have no effect. You move into a place of not using rules to implement trade.

Now, as the Senator from Pennsylvania mentioned, our country has benefited greatly from trade. The State of Tennessee is one of the destinations for foreign direct investment in our country. It is a place where we export all around the world. And what the President is doing is shaking the very regime by not being able to even articulate where he is going.

The Senator from Georgia is my friend, and he has worked all around the world, and I am surprised that he would oppose Congress having a role only when section 232 is utilized. But the fact is that Congress should have a role.

We gave this authority away in the 1960s and again in 1974. It was a mistake for us to have done that. We never expected the President of the United States to use 232 in the way it is being utilized today. This is a vote for Congress to assume its rightful role. It is a baby step.

I hope to have legislation coming behind us where 15 Senators—Republicans, Democrats, and an Independent—have come together on a piece of legislation to absolutely ensure that Congress has a role. This is just a motion to instruct to say that we agree that Congress should have a role when 232 is invoked. We will decide what that role is down the road.

I urge all Senators to support this motion.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, I join my colleagues today. I thank Senator TOOMEY from Pennsylvania and Senator CORKER from Tennessee especially for working this out.

Let's be clear. This is a rebuke of the President's abuse of trade authority. The President has abused section 232 to impose tariffs on steel and aluminum, impacting our allies, such as Canada, Mexico, and countries in the EU. Can you imagine being in Canada and being told that your steel and aluminum exports to the United States represent a national security threat? Canadian Prime Minister Justin Trudeau rightfully called the President's recent tariffs an ''affront to the longstanding security partnership between Canada and the United States'' and, he continued, ''kind of insulting.''

Canada is the largest consumer of U.S. goods. It buys more goods from the United States than China, Japan, and the UK combined. Canadian companies operating in the United States directly employ 500,000 Americans. Canada and the United States share more than 5,500 miles of a peaceful border. Close to 400,000 people cross that shared border each day for business, pleasure, or to maintain family ties. Canada has been our partner in the War on Terrorism since 2001. More than 40,000 Canadian Armed Forces members served alongside us in Afghanistan between 2001 and 2014. Canada has been our ally, our partner, and our friend, and now they are told that their steel and aluminum exports to us represent a national security threat. That is an abuse of section 232 of the Trade Act.

I am so glad that Congress is finally pushing back on this. We have neglected our constitutional role. We gave the President authority years ago, under the 1962 act, to exempt from that act imports that represent a true national security threat. These imports do not. This is an abuse of that authority, and that is why Congress needs to speak up today.

This is a nonbinding resolution. This will not have an effect that will actually get to the President in legislation. That is the next step, and we need to go there. We have to go there. Those voting on this today need to know that is where we will go. We have to rein in an abuse of Presidential authority and to restore Congress's constitutional authority in this regard.

I thank my colleagues for bringing this to the floor. I urge all of my colleagues to support it—not just that, but once we go from here, taking this symbolic step, this nonbinding resolution, to take actual steps on legislation that will return the actual authority to Congress once again to impose or to manage tariffs.

With that, I yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE PROGRAM

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, my motion to instruct conferees to the minibus appropriations bill, H.R. 5895, is a simple 6-month extension of the National Flood Insurance Program, currently set to expire July 31, 2018—in about 2 weeks. The same timeline in this motion was passed by the Senate a few weeks ago by unanimous consent during consideration of the farm bill.

The National Flood Insurance Program insures properties in every State, insuring over 5 million homes and businesses and $1.2 trillion in assets. If the NFIP is not extended, people will not be able to renew or purchase new flood insurance policies, and more people would be without flood insurance during peak hurricane season. This is so to the moment because, given the series of emergency supplemental appropriations bills the Senate has passed, an expiration of the NFIP puts the U.S. taxpayer in the very vulnerable position of funding more uninsured losses in emergency supplemental appropriations legislation.

I thank Senators CRAPO and BROWN for their work in providing a path forward to a bipartisan long-term reauthorization of the NFIP, which ideally includes commonsense reforms providing for greater investment in flood mitigation, updated flood mapping technology, greater accountability, and consumer choice. However, these discussions will not conclude in the next 2 weeks, prior to the upcoming NFIP expiration deadline.

It is imperative that Congress provide for a 6-month extension of NFIP now, so progress can continue on long-term reauthorization and reform of the NFIP through the Banking Committee.

I urge my colleagues to vote to protect the taxpayer, the homeowner, and to support this motion to instruct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

ENERGY AND WATER, LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS, AND MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS LEGISLATION

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, in the next few minutes, the Senate will be taking the next steps on an appropriations process that is being conducted the way an appropriations process is supposed to be conducted. Boy Scouts shouldn't get a merit badge for telling the truth, and Senators shouldn't get a pat on the back for conducting an appropriations process the way it is supposed to be conducted. It is worth noting that we are doing it, since it has been a long time since we have done it.

The right way means we are moving ahead on three bills: Energy and Water, legislative affairs, and Military Construction. The right way means we have had hearings on all of these bills. We have consulted with Senators. I know that in our Energy and Water bill, Senator FEINSTEIN and I heard from 83 different Senators and tried to respond to them in our bill. We marked up the bills unanimously in most cases.

What was missing was allowing the other 70 Senators to participate on the floor. We did that this time; 40 amendments, 7 rollcall votes. We got off the floor without a cloture vote; that is, a motion to cut off debate. We are doing it the way it is supposed to be done. That was done by showing something that needs to be shown more in the Senate—restraint. Restraint means that when you have a lot of freedom, it doesn't mean you exercise all of your freedoms all at once because nothing will happen.

We avoided controversial riders. We even had 20 Republican Senators vote to table something we agree with, which is the waters of the United States provision, because we thought this was not the appropriate bill for it.

Now we are moving to motions to instruct, which are nonbinding resolutions. It is important, though, because they give the Senate a chance to say what Senators want to say. That is why we are here.

One of those issues has to do with tariffs. The administration has imposed tariffs on aluminum and steel, and now other products, provoking a response of tariffs on soybeans and other products grown and manufactured in our country. In general, these tariffs are a big mistake. Using national security as an excuse to impose them is an even bigger mistake.

I have urged President Trump instead to focus on reciprocity; tell other countries to do for our country what we do for you.

Imposing tariffs as a way of achieving that is like shooting ourselves in both feet as a way of solving our problem. Tariffs are taxes. They raise the price of what we buy and sell. Tariffs reduce revenues, profits, wages, and jobs.

U.S. tariffs on aluminum and steel hurt 136,000 Tennesseans who work in more than 900 auto plants in 88 of our 95 counties; that is, one-third of our manufacturing jobs. Retaliatory tariffs hurt Tennessee soybean farmers by lowering prices and making markets disappear.

Our goal should be to persuade our trading partners to do for us what we do for them. Shooting ourselves in both feet at once is not a good way to do that. There are better ways to achieve the goal.

This doesn't just hurt auto parts workers in Tennessee. I was in Springfield, TN, the other day. They had been excited about an expansion of an Electrolux plant, a $250 million expansion for that community. Electrolux canceled it when word of the steel tariffs came, even though Electrolux, which makes washing machines, buys all of their steel in the United States. Tariffs on imported steel raise the price of steel sold in United States.

In Chestnut Hill, Bush Brothers cans about one-third of all beans canned in the United States. You wouldn't think that is such a big deal, but it involves a lot of people and a lot of beans. They say that 8½ percent of their revenues will go down as a result of the tin-plated steel that is used for their cans. Not enough is produced in the United States.

Then, we have Bridgestone and Hankook. They make tires in Tennessee. They are big companies. They use steel wire in every tire, and none of it is produced in the United States. The price goes up.

For 40 years, I worked to bring the auto industry to Tennessee. It has done more than anything that has happened to raise our standard of living, to raise families' incomes. Tariffs will lower our standard of living. They will hurt our State more than almost any other State.

As respectfully and as effectively as I can, I have said to the President: Mr. President, we agree on taxes. We agree on regulations. We agree on judges. We are proud of having the best economy in 18 years, the lowest employment rate that anyone can remember. But these tariffs are a big mistake. They will take us in the wrong direction.

I have not been successful in talking with the President about this, but I intend to keep trying. There are other, better ways to persuade our trading partners to do for us what we do for them instead of shooting ourselves in both feet at once, which is what we do when we impose these tariffs.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, before we vote this morning, I want to express my support for the appointment of conferees and my belief that this is yet another encouraging sign of a return to regular order in the appropriations process.

The package of appropriations bills that will be conferenced with the House received overwhelming bipartisan support in the Senate. This broad agreement was facilitated by a concerted effort by both parties to prevent partisan riders from poisoning the well. Thus far, we have been able to translate bipartisan cooperation among members of the Appropriations Committee into success on the Senate floor.

At this time, I want to recognize and to commend the continued efforts of the committee members in the process, especially the Republican and Democratic managers of this package. In particular, I want to thank Vice Chairman LEAHY for his strong partnership in this effort and Senator ALEXANDER, who is here on the floor, who has guided this process and will chair the conference committee.

We will continue to consolidate critical mass for a return to regular order, but we still have a long way to go. This is another step in the right direction. Senator ALEXANDER, Vice Chairman LEAHY, and I will have a strong slate of conferees joining us. On the Republican side, it will be Senators BOOZMAN, DAINES, and LANKFORD. On the Democratic side, it will be Senators FEINSTEIN, SCHATZ, and MURPHY.

Our objective will be to build upon the momentum we have generated in the Senate by urging the same type of bipartisan cooperation in the conference. We will aim to return to the Senate floor—hopefully, sooner than later—with a conference report that reflects bipartisan agreement and merits the support of our colleagues.

It is, I believe, the right thing to do for the American people. Whatever partisan fights may ensue in the coming weeks, I believe the appropriations process should not suffer those wounds, and we should continue our hope and work. Thus far, it has been immune from such a fate. It is my hope that we can continue on that path. That will be our goal in this conference committee. I hope others will join us.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

ENERGY AND WATER, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH, AND MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND VETERANS AFFAIRS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2019

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume legislative session.

The Presiding Officer laid before the Senate the following message from the House of Representatives:

Resolved, That the House disagree to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 5895) entitled ''An Act making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.'', and ask a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

COMPOUND MOTION

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and the Chair be authorized to appoint conferees on the part of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, I have a motion to instruct conferees at the desk, and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. CASSIDY] moves that the managers on the part of the Senate at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 5895 be instructed to insist that the final conference report include provisions that have the effect of extending the National Flood Insurance Program, and the authority of the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to issue notes and obligations with respect to that Program, through January 31, 2019.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I have a motion to instruct conferees at the desk, and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. CORKER] moves that the managers on the part of the Senate at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 5895 be instructed to include language providing a role for Congress in making a determination under section 232 of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 (19 U.S.C. 1862).

MOTION TO INSTRUCT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are now 2 minutes, equally divided, on the Cassidy motion to instruct.

The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, very briefly, this is a 6-month reauthorization of current law, which will allow continued work for a longer term reauthorization. It protects American families and the U.S. taxpayers from the consequences of a lapsed program during peak hurricane season.

I urge its adoption.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the motion to instruct.

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. ERNST). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 94, nays 5, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 150 Leg.]

YEAS—94

Alexander	Graham	Perdue
Baldwin	Grassley	Peters
Bennet	Harris	Portman
Blumenthal	Hassan	Reed
Blunt	Hatch	Risch
Booker	Heinrich	Roberts
Boozman	Heitkamp	Rounds
Brown	Heller	Rubio
Burr	Hirono	Sanders
Cantwell	Hoeven	Sasse
Capito	Hyde-Smith	Schatz
Cardin	Inhofe	Schumer
Carper	Isakson	Scott
Casey	Johnson	Shaheen
Cassidy	Jones	Shelby
Collins	Kaine	Smith
Coons	Kennedy	Stabenow
Corker	King	Sullivan
Cornyn	Klobuchar	Tester
Cortez Masto	Leahy	Thune
Cotton	Manchin	Tillis
Crapo	Markey	Toomey
Cruz	McCaskill	Udall
Daines	McConnell	Van Hollen
Donnelly	Menendez	Warner
Duckworth	Merkley	Warren
Durbin	Moran	Whitehouse
Ernst	Murkowski	Wicker
Feinstein	Murphy	Wyden
Fischer	Murray	Young
Gardner	Nelson	
Gillibrand	Paul	

NAYS—5

Barrasso	Flake	Lee
Enzi	Lankford	

NOT VOTING—1

McCain

The motion was agreed to.

CHANGE OF VOTE

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, on rollcall vote No. 150, I voted yea. It was my intention to vote nay. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to change my vote since it will not affect the outcome of the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The foregoing tally has been changed to reflect the above order.)

MOTION TO INSTRUCT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are now 2 minutes, equally divided, on the Corker motion to instruct.

The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CORKER. Madam President, I rise to speak in favor of this motion, where Congress would have an appropriate role in section 232 of the Trade Act as invoked on national security grounds. This is something that anybody who supports the Senate playing its proper role should support.

I thank Senator TOOMEY, Senator FLAKE, and 15 other Senators who supported this overall effort. This is a baby step in a good direction for the U.S. Senate and for our country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, you all know where I stand on section 232 steel tariffs. I strongly support them because thousands of steelworkers across the country have lost their jobs due to Chinese steel overcapacity. Tough trade enforcement against

China cheating has long been overdue. These tariffs are a tool to bring China to the table and to get long-term structural changes to support American jobs.

My colleagues know I strongly oppose the Corker-Toomey legislation, which would undo China's tariffs, let China off the hook, and gut the section 232 status. That is why I stood on the floor 2 weeks ago to block that.

What we are considering today is different. With this motion to instruct, the Senate will reaffirm that it has a role in section 232 determinations. Of course, we should. That is why I have talked regularly with Secretary Ross and Ambassador Lighthizer throughout this process.

I will vote for the motion to instruct not because I think it makes sense to consider trade policy on an appropriations bill that has nothing to do with tariffs but because, of course, Congress should have a role in 232 determinations. It should have a role in all trade policies. I have been saying that for years. I am glad my colleagues finally agree.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time is expired.

Mr. BROWN. I ask unanimous consent for 10 seconds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BROWN. Let me be clear. Today's vote is not a vote for undermining the trade agenda. It is not a vote to rescind steel tariffs. I will do everything in my power to defeat any efforts to do that.

I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. TOOMEY. Madam President, if there is any time remaining, let me just stress that this vote is a vote to move in the direction of restoring to Congress our constitutional authority and, ultimately, if we do that right, to revisiting the misuse of the section 232 provisions of our trade law, which is applying inappropriate tariffs on steel and aluminum from our allies and close friends.

I urge my colleagues to vote yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to instruct.

Mr. LEE. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TILLIS). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 88, nays 11, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 151 Leg.]

YEAS—88

Alexander	Gillibrand	Paul
Baldwin	Grassley	Peters
Bennet	Harris	Portman
Blumenthal	Hassan	Reed
Blunt	Hatch	Roberts
Booker	Heinrich	Rounds
Boozman	Heitkamp	Rubio
Brown	Hirono	Sanders
Burr	Hoeven	Sasse
Cantwell	Isakson	Schatz
Cardin	Johnson	Schumer
Carper	Jones	Shaheen
Casey	Kaine	Shelby
Cassidy	Kennedy	Smith
Collins	King	Stabenow
Coons	Klobuchar	Sullivan
Corker	Lankford	Tester
Cornyn	Leahy	Thune
Cortez Masto	Lee	Tillis
Cotton	Manchin	Toomey
Cruz	Markey	Udall
Daines	McCaskill	Van Hollen
Donnelly	McConnell	Warner
Duckworth	Menendez	Warren
Durbin	Merkley	Whitehouse
Ernst	Moran	Wicker
Feinstein	Murkowski	Wyden
Fischer	Murphy	Young
Flake	Murray	
Gardner	Nelson	

NAYS—11

Barrasso	Graham	Perdue
Capito	Heller	Risch
Crapo	Hyde-Smith	Scott
Enzi	Inhofe	

NOT VOTING—1

McCain

The motion was agreed to.

The Presiding Officer appointed Mr. SHELBY, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. DAINES, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. LEAHY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. SCHATZ, and Mr. MURPHY conferees on the part of the Senate.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume executive session.

The Senator from West Virginia.

NOMINATION OF BRETT KAVANAUGH

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. President, I want to take a few moments to talk about what I believe is an excellent choice that President Trump made on Monday, and that is in selecting Judge Brett Kavanaugh to fill the vacancy on the Supreme Court.

Judge Kavanaugh's credentials are those of a person very well suited for the U.S. Supreme Court. He excelled as an undergraduate and as a law student at Yale and clerked for Justice Anthony Kennedy, who is retiring—the man he would replace—and was also a clerk for two Federal appeals court judges. He served in a very critical position in President George W. Bush's administration.

Beyond his resume is a record of respect and effectiveness. Judge Kavanaugh is highly regarded by his colleagues in the Federal judiciary. I think that says a lot about his potential and his character in terms of potential to become a Supreme Court Justice. He has also impressed others over his long and very prestigious career.

We saw his wonderful family on Monday night. We can tell they are very proud of their dad and their mom, and I was very honored to have the opportunity to meet all of them, along with Judge Kavanaugh's parents.

He has been very effective. As a matter of fact, this Supreme Court has adopted his reasoning in their opinions on 11 separate occasions, and the 300 opinions he has written are frequently cited by Federal judges all across the country.

But perhaps Judge Kavanaugh's most qualifying characteristic is something I heard him say at the White House on Monday evening. When the President announced his nomination, Judge Kavanaugh committed to be open-minded in the cases that come before him as a Supreme Court Justice. Open-minded—I think that is critical, and his record backs up that commitment.

He has a long and clear record of fairly applying the text of our Constitution and our laws. There will be a lot to consider on Judge Kavanaugh because he has such a long and very clear record of writing, and the President mentioned his very precise writing skills.

When I consider nominees for the Supreme Court, I don't look for a person who promises particular policy outcomes or someone who is out to actually create laws; what I look for is a person who reflects experience, fairness, and respect for the Constitution as it is written. That is because the Constitution assigns legislative authority to us, to elected representatives in the Congress. Accountability to the American people is diminished when unelected judges pursue their own policy goals.

A newspaper in the Northern Panhandle of our State, the Wheeling Intelligencer, editorialized today:

> Kavanaugh has said that if confirmed to the Supreme Court, his allegiance will be to the Constitution as it is written, not to his personal preferences. That is precisely what the Nation needs.

Another editorial appearing in West Virginia today—this one from the Daily Mail—said:

> A conservative Supreme Court justice interprets the U.S. Constitution for all, not just those on the right or the left.

I believe Judge Kavanaugh truly understands a Justice's and a judge's proper role, and I think no one puts that better than the judge himself. I would like to read a portion of a speech he gave last fall:

> One overarching goal for me is to make judging a more neutral, impartial process in all cases, not just statutory interpretation. The American rule of law, as I see it, depends on neutral, impartial judges who say what the law is, not what the law should be. Judges are umpires, or at least should always strive to be umpires. In a perfect world, at least as I envision it, the outcomes of [cases] would not often vary based solely on the backgrounds, political affiliations, or policy views of judges. This is the rule of law

as the law of rules; the judge as umpire; the judge who is not free to roam in the constitutional or statutory forest as he or she sees fit.

In my view, too, this goal is not merely a preference of mine but a constitutional mandate in a separation-of-powers system.

I believe that Judge Kavanaugh and I share the belief that faithfulness to the text of the law as written, not the pursuit of a particular policy outcome, should be the goal of a judge.

In the same speech last year, Judge Kavanaugh discussed his meeting with then-West Virginia Senator Robert C. Byrd during his confirmation process to the DC Circuit. Most West Virginians and Americans know the reverence that Senator Byrd had for the text of the Constitution. During his speech, Judge Kavanaugh spoke of reading the text of Article I with Senator Byrd. Senator Byrd was among the Democrats who voted to confirm Judge Kavanaugh to the DC Circuit. I think Judge Kavanaugh's record on the DC Circuit and his experience merit a bipartisan confirmation process—the same type of bipartisanship that Senator Byrd showed when he voted for Judge Kavanaugh.

For all of the noise and debate outside of this Chamber, the confirmation process for a well-qualified Supreme Court nominee does not have to focus on trying to guess how a Justice Kavanaugh might rule in a particular case. As a matter of fact, I think that will be a futile exercise and quite damaging to the process at the same time. If we are looking for a fair umpire, which we are looking for, there is no reason a nominee with a strong record of applying the text of the Constitution and the law should not be confirmed with overwhelming support.

President Trump made clear in his campaign that he would appoint judges with respect for the Constitution. I believe he kept his commitment when he nominated Brett Kavanaugh to become a Supreme Court Justice.

The process is just beginning where Judge Kavanaugh's record will be scrutinized to the nth degree. We are going to have hearings, and I hope all of us—and I am certainly putting myself in this category—will have the opportunity—and I think we will—to sit down one-on-one, to talk with Judge Kavanaugh, to make our own judgments about his qualifications and his abilities in terms of becoming a Supreme Court Justice.

I look forward to advancing the process, and I look forward to meeting with Judge Kavanaugh.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I first wish to associate myself with the remarks from the outstanding Senator from West Virginia. We had a chance to be together on Monday night when the President announced the nomination of Judge Brett Kavanaugh to serve on the U.S. Supreme Court, and I agree with my colleague from West Virginia that it is a fantastic choice.

I said before that there are three things I want to see in any nominee for the Court: the appropriate judicial philosophy, a strong intellect, and a solid character. Everything I have seen so far confirms that Judge Kavanaugh satisfies all three of these requirements.

I would like to talk today about a few things I think we can expect to see over the next couple of months. First, I think it is safe to say that throughout this process, Judge Kavanaugh will not announce how he is going to rule on cases that might come before him on the Supreme Court. The Presiding Officer and I know—as we walked back from the visit at the White House and were heading home after having a chance to visit with the President of the United States before he actually told the country Judge Kavanaugh would be the nominee—that it is a very appropriate thing for the judge to do, to not announce how he is going to rule on cases that might come before him at the Supreme Court. In fact, the ethics rules say it is exactly what a nominee should do. They should avoid making these sorts of comments. The rules say that judges and nominees should not answer questions about how they would rule on a case they might consider, so I expect that Judge Kavanaugh will follow the rules and not get into specifics on which side he may favor.

It is what Ruth Bader Ginsburg, a current member of the Court, did during her confirmation process in 1993. She said that ''a judge sworn to decide impartially can offer no forecasts, no hints''—no hints, no forecasts, no previews. She said that this would ''display disdain for the entire judicial process,'' and she was confirmed. That is the Ginsburg standard. Every nominee since then has followed that standard.

Well, the second thing I expect to happen is that Democrats are going to complain that Judge Kavanaugh follows the Ginsburg standard, and we have heard it already. They are going to complain that he will not promise to take their side in cases that might come before the Court. They are going to complain—and have already—that some of the cases he has decided in the past didn't work out the way they wanted them to work out—not what the law said, not what was right, but what they wanted. That is what Democrats in the Judiciary Committee did when Neil Gorsuch was nominated to the Supreme Court last year.

We have seen this movie before. We know the playbook. They have criticized him for some of the rulings they didn't like. Even though the rulings followed the law, they didn't like the rulings, so they criticized the judge for following the law. They suggested he should have ignored the law, sided with the little guy, the sympathetic side in a case, regardless of what the law said. But Judge Gorsuch knew the same thing Judge Kavanaugh knows: Judges are absolutely not supposed to consider who they think is sympathetic in a case, where the empathy lies. It is where the law lies. They are supposed to be making decisions and rules based on the law.

Federal judges actually swear an oath, and the oath is to ''administer justice without respect to persons, and to do equal right to the poor and to the rich.'' That is what Judge Kavanaugh has done during his 12 years as a member of the DC Circuit Court.

The minority leader, Senator SCHUMER, has already said that is not good enough for him—not good enough for Senator SCHUMER. He wrote an op-ed in the New York Times on July 2, and he wrote this op-ed before the President had even made a decision as to who he might nominate. At the time, the President was considering a number of names. It didn't matter to Senator SCHUMER; he made it clear that he is going to fight any mainstream nominee unless he can confirm that the nominee will rule in a certain way. Judges don't do that. Judges shouldn't do it. Well, that is the litmus test now for liberal Democrats in the U.S. Senate. They are going to try to make people believe that they know how Judge Kavanaugh is going to rule in the Supreme Court.

When President Obama was picking people to serve as judges and Justices, he said that he was looking for people who would decide cases based on—this was his word—''empathy.'' Well, President Trump has consistently selected judges—and we have approved and confirmed quite a few now as we have been here since President Trump has taken office—and Justices who decide cases based upon the law and the Constitution of the land. Judge Kavanaugh is exactly that kind of judge. He understands that writing the laws is not his job. It hasn't been his job in the circuit court, and it would not be his job on the Supreme Court. He gave a speech last year in which he said that Congress and the President, not the courts, possess the authority and the responsibility to legislate. Let me repeat that. Congress and the President, not the courts, possess the authority and responsibility to legislate.

The third thing I expect to happen in this whole process is we will vote on Judge Kavanaugh's nomination before the next Supreme Court session starts in October. That is what the American people want us to do. NBC News did a recent poll, and they found that 62 percent of Americans want us to vote on this nomination before the November election, and only 33 percent said that we should wait. But Democrats want to delay. They want to delay the process. The American people are saying to get on with it.

It is early July now. We are going to work through the month of August. It gives us plenty of time to consider this nomination. When you look at the people serving on the Supreme Court today, we typically spend about 66 days to confirm each of them. That is going

to put it around the middle of September. There is no reason we need to take any longer than that.

Judge Kavanaugh has been through this process before and has been confirmed by the Senate before. He was confirmed to the circuit court by a vote of 57 to 36 in this body. Four Democrats supported his confirmation.

Judge Kavanaugh has served on the circuit court for over 12 years, has written a number of rulings—I think over 300. His background as a judge gives us powerful evidence of the kind of Justice he will be. He is going to take the law and the Constitution at face value. He is not going to treat them like blank pages on which he can rewrite the laws the way he wishes they were. In a speech last year, he made it very clear. He said: ''The judge's job is to interpret the law, not to make the law or make policy.'' This view—and every example I have seen from Judge Kavanaugh's record—is squarely in the mainstream of American legal thinking today. He is smart, he is fair, and I believe he is very well qualified.

Regrettably, none of this matters to some of the Democrats. They are going to use the same scare tactics they use every time a Republican President nominates someone to the Supreme Court. They did it 40 years ago when President Gerald Ford nominated John Paul Stevens to the Court. Liberals accused him of ''antagonism to women's rights.'' When President Reagan nominated Justice Kennedy 31 years ago, the Justice who has just retired from the Court, Democrats said his nomination ''should be unsettling to those concerned with the health and legal status of women in America.'' They have been using the same old lines for more than 40 years. It is never true; it is never reality. But apparently for the Democrats, it never gets old.

I hope the Democrats in the Senate will give Judge Kavanaugh a chance. I hope they will take the time to consider his qualifications and actually sit down and talk with him before they rush to condemn him, although quite a few rushed to condemn him even before the President had decided and he was named to the Court.

I also look forward to sitting down with the nominee and exploring some of his views more fully, but everything I have seen so far suggests to me that it is going to be a very good conversation and that Judge Kavanaugh would make an excellent Justice of the Supreme Court.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, today I rise to oppose the nomination of Brett Kavanaugh to the Supreme Court. This is an issue I will return to in the coming weeks and months at greater length, but I did want to say a few words about why I am in opposition to Mr. Kavanaugh.

I think many Americans have a pretty good sense of what the function of Congress is and what the President of the United States does, but, in fact, I think many Americans do not fully appreciate the role that the Supreme Court plays in our lives. In the past decade alone, the Supreme Court has issued some incredibly controversial and, to my mind, disastrous decisions that have had a profound impact on the lives of the American people.

Let me review for a moment why this nomination is so very important by looking at what the Supreme Court, often by a 5-to-4 vote—a one-vote majority—has done in recent years. If you go out onto the streets of any community in the United States of America—whether it is a conservative area or a progressive area—what most people will tell you is that we have a corrupt campaign finance system—a system that today, as we speak, allows billionaires to spend hundreds of millions of dollars to buy elections. Most Americans, whether they are Democrats or Republicans or Independents, do not think that is what American democracy is supposed to be about. What most people think is that the majority should rule. Sometimes you win, and sometimes you lose, but everybody gets a vote—not a situation in which billionaires can spend unlimited sums of money to support candidates who represent their interests. That is, in fact, what goes on right now.

Many Americans may think that was a decision made by Congress, made by the President. That is not so. That disastrous decision that is undermining American democracy came about by a 5-to-4 vote of the U.S. Supreme Court in the Citizens United case.

That is what a Supreme Court decision can do. It can undermine American democracy and create a situation where the very wealthiest people in this country can buy politicians and influence legislation.

Several years ago, the Supreme Court upheld the constitutionality of the Affordable Care Act, but the Court also ruled that the Medicaid expansion as part of the Affordable Care Act had to be optional for States.

I am on the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee, which helped to write that bill. I can tell you that there was almost no discussion—I don't recall any discussion—about whether or not that legislation would apply and all elements of the legislation would apply to every State in the country.

The Supreme Court ruled that this was not the case. They said that the decision of expanding Medicaid was up to the States. Today, we have 17 States in our country that still have not expanded Medicaid. What that means in English—in real terms—is that today there are millions and millions of people, in 17 States in this country, who are ill, people who can't afford healthcare, people who are literally dying because they don't go to the doctor when they should, and that is all because of a decision of the U.S. Supreme Court.

It is not only the issue of campaign finance or the issue of Medicaid and healthcare where the Supreme Court has acted in a disastrous way. I think everybody knows that our country has a very, very shameful history in terms of civil rights. It has been a very long and hard struggle for us to finally say that in America, regardless of the color of your skin, regardless of your economic position, you have the right to vote. It is not a radical idea, but it is a struggle for which very brave people fought for many decades.

In 1965 the Congress finally passed the Voting Rights Act, which had the impact of eliminating racial discrimination in voting. That Act, passed by Congress, has been reauthorized multiple times since. In other words, what Congress said is that everybody in this country has the right to vote, regardless of the color of your skin.

In 2013 the Supreme Court—again, by a 5-to-4 vote—ruled that parts of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 were outdated, and they struck down a major part of that law that guaranteed that all Americans had the right to vote. Literally days after that decision was rendered by the Supreme Court, officials in State after State responded by enacting voting restrictions targeted at African Americans, poor people, young people, and other groups of citizens who don't traditionally vote Republican.

Literally days after that Supreme Court decision, State officials said: Wow, we now have the opportunity to make it harder for our political opponents to vote.

They moved very, very quickly with restrictive voting rights laws. That situation was created by, once again, a 5-to-4 vote by a conservative Supreme Court.

Just this year, we saw the Supreme Court rule against unions in a really outrageous decision in the Janus case, designed to weaken the ability of workers and public employees to negotiate fair contracts. Just this year, we saw the Supreme Court uphold President Trump's Muslim ban and other important pieces of legislation.

This is already a Supreme Court that, given the option, will rule, as they have time and again, often by a 5-to-4 vote, in favor of corporations and the wealthy and against working people; that will continue to undermine civil rights, voting rights, and access to healthcare; that are edging closer and closer to ruling that a person's religious beliefs should exempt them from following civil rights laws.

Having said that, let me say very briefly why I oppose the nomination of

Judge Kavanaugh. As it happens, I do not usually believe anything that President Trump says because I think, sadly, that he is a pathological liar, but I do think this is a moment where we should believe one thing that he said during the campaign. I think, in this instance, he was actually telling the truth. During the campaign, he was asked if he wanted to see the Court overturn Roe v. Wade, the landmark decision that protects a woman's right in this country to control her own body. He responded to that question:

Well, if we put another two or perhaps three justices on, that's really what's going to be—that will happen. And that'll happen automatically, in my opinion, because I am putting pro-life justices on the court.

That is Donald Trump during the campaign.

On a separate occasion, as many recall, Trump suggested that women who have abortions should be punished. I have very little doubt that while he may evade the question of whether or not he wants to overturn Roe v. Wade—I have zero doubt—he would not have been appointed by Donald Trump unless that is exactly what he will do.

As I think we all know, President Trump put forth a list of 25 potential justices, all of whom were handpicked by the Heritage Foundation and the Federalist Society. These two extreme rightwing groups claim they have ''no idea'' how any of the people on that list would rule on Roe v. Wade, but overruling Roe has been a Republican dream for 40 years. Please do not insult our intelligence by suggesting it is possible that any of these candidates could secretly support a woman's right to control her own body. That will not be the case.

That brings us to Judge Kavanaugh. You may remember that last year the Federal Government was sued by an undocumented teenage girl they were keeping in detention in Texas. She discovered that she was pregnant while in detention and tried to obtain an abortion. Judge Kavanaugh wanted to force her to delay the proceeding, presumably until it was no longer legal under Texas law for her to obtain an abortion in that State. When he was overruled by the full DC Circuit, he complained in a dissent that his colleagues were creating a right to ''abortion on demand.'' Does that sound like someone who is going to strike down State laws that create undue barriers to abortion access, or does it sound like somebody who had no problem with forcing a teenage girl to carry a pregnancy to term?

There is also another case percolating out of Texas that could have even graver consequences for tens of millions of Americans. The State of Texas and 17 other Republican States have sued the Federal Government, claiming that the Affordable Care Act is unconstitutional, and the Department of Justice under Donald Trump agrees with them. While I do not know how Judge Kavanaugh would rule on this case—nobody could, of course, know that—I will note that in another case about the ACA, he suggested that the President could simply refuse to enforce laws that he deems unconstitutional, regardless of what the Courts say.

What we are dealing with here is, literally, a life-and-death decision regarding preexisting conditions, regarding the issue of whether today you have cancer, heart disease, diabetes, or some other life-threatening illness. Before the Affordable Care Act, an insurance company could say to you: Oh, you have a history of cancer, we are not going to insure you because we can't make money out of you because that cancer might recur. It might be: You are too sick and we are going to lose money on your case and we are not going to insure you or, if we do insure you, your rates are going to be five times higher than somebody else's of your age.

One of the major achievements of the Affordable Care Act, which was supported by 90 percent of the American people, is that we must not end the protections the American people have today against insurance companies that would bring back preexisting conditions—that would discriminate against people who were ill. It is very likely that case will come before the U.S. Supreme Court. Yet 90 percent of the American people say we should not discriminate against people who have cancer or heart disease and that insurance companies should not be allowed to deny them coverage or raise their rates to levels that people cannot afford.

The Trump administration has supported the argument of the Republican Governors and will not defend the ACA in court, which will come to the Supreme Court. Unless I am very mistaken, Judge Kavanaugh will vote with the rightwing majority and allow discrimination against people who have serious illnesses to, once again, be the law of the land.

Time and again, Judge Kavanaugh has sided with the interests of corporations and the wealthy instead of the interests of ordinary Americans. He has sided with electric power utilities and chemical companies over protecting clean air and fighting climate change.

He has argued, if you can believe it, that the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, which has saved consumers billions and billions of dollars from the greed and illegal behavior of Wall Street and financial institutions, is unconstitutional because its structure does not give enough power to the President. He has also argued against net neutrality.

He dissented in an OSHA case and argued that SeaWorld should not be fined for the death of one of its whale trainers because the trainer should have accepted the risk of death as a routine part of the job.

While nobody can predict the future, we can take a hard look at Judge Kavanaugh's record and extrapolate from his decisions what kind of Supreme Court Justice he will be. I think the evidence is overwhelming that he will be part of the 5-to-4 majority, which has cast decision after decision against the needs of working people, against the needs of the poor, and against the rights of the American people to vote freely, without restrictions.

This is an issue to which I will return. I just want the American people to understand, when they hear this debate taking place here and think, well, it is the same ol' same ol'—with people yelling at each other—that this is an enormously important decision which will impact the lives of tens and tens of millions of people. I hope very much that the American people become engaged on this issue, learn about Judge Kavanaugh's record, and join with those of us who are in opposition to his nomination.

I yield the floor.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I am pleased the Senate is considering Brian Benczkowski to serve as the Assistant Attorney General for the Criminal Division. This is a critical position at the Department of Justice and its extended vacancy has hindered the agency's effectiveness. Mr. Benczkowski has the experience and qualifications to lead the Criminal Division. I am proud to support his nomination on the floor today.

Mr. Benczkowski was nominated 400 days ago. The Judiciary Committee held his confirmation hearing nearly a year ago. A fully staffed and well-functioning Criminal Division is vitally important to the Department of Justice's mission.

Over a dozen former U.S. Attorneys, from both the Bush and Obama administrations, support his nomination. They wrote that the head of the criminal division is ''the nerve center of federal prosecution, and the absence of a confirmed occupant can diminish the effectiveness of our law enforcement program throughout the country.''

The former prosecutors went on to state: ''Those of us who know Brian recognize that he is the right person to provide that leadership and to be a strong and effective partner with the United States Attorneys' Offices.''

Mr. Benczkowski already has an impressive legal career. He previously served as the Republican staff director on the Senate Judiciary Committee from 2009–2010.

He also served as a counsel on the House Judiciary Committee. Before that time, he worked on the Senate Budget Committee and served as a counsel to Senator Domenici for 4 years.

Mr. Benczkowski excelled as a leader during his time on the Judiciary Committee. During his time as staff director, he was instrumental in passing the Fair Sentencing Act. This law reduced the disparity in federal criminal sentencing between crack and powder cocaine. His leadership was instrumental

in several pieces of bipartisan legislation, including the Crime Victims Fund Preservation Act of 2009, the Secure and Responsible Drug Disposal Act of 2009, the Judicial Survivors Protection Act of 2009, and the Combat Meth Enhancement Act of 2009.

Mr. Benczkowski also served in several different roles at the Department of Justice. In 2008, he became the chief of staff to the Attorney General and the Deputy Attorney General. He also served as the chief of staff to the ATF. In total, he held five senior leadership positions in different divisions in the Department of Justice, working with components and law enforcement agencies across the Department.

During Mr. Benczkowski's decade in the private sector, he gained extensive litigation management experience that will serve him well as he oversees the Criminal Division.

Some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have said they will not support his nomination because he allegedly lacks experience. They say this because Mr. Benczkowski was never a prosecutor.

But the head of the Criminal Division is not a prosecutor. The position oversees criminal matters and formulates and implements criminal enforcement policy. It requires a deep knowledge of Federal criminal law, experience in government investigations, and strong management skills. Mr. Benczkowski, with his years of experience in relevant fields, is clearly qualified for this position.

But don't just take my word for it. Five former heads of the Criminal Division appointed under the Bush and Obama administrations said this about Mr. Benczkowski's nomination: ''Mr. Benczkowski has the necessary leadership, management and substantive experience to lead the Division.'' They noted that, ''by virtue of our service in the position to which Mr. Benczkowski has been nominated, we are familiar with the qualifications and experience necessary for success in the job.''

They went on to say ''throughout his career, on the criminal defense side in private practice and in the Department, he has worked on complex criminal investigations on a range of issues; significant criminal legislation matters; important criminal policy matters; and domestic and international law enforcement matters.''

These former heads of the Criminal Division know better than anyone the background and qualifications required to do the job, and they think that Mr. Benczkowski is a good fit for this role.

Some of my colleagues have raised a different concern, related to Mr. Benczkowski's legal representation of Alfa Bank while he was working at the law firm of Kirkland and Ellis. The Senate learned of this matter when reviewing his FBI background investigation.

Normally the committee doesn't publicly discuss any matters contained in the background investigation but because this matter raised some concerns for some senators, Mr. Benczkowski voluntarily waived his privacy rights, so we could freely and publicly question him on this matter.

At his hearing, the committee members extensively questioned him about his representation of Alfa Bank. He answered all our questions. He was not evasive. His testimony was public. It was very credible and uncontroverted.

Mr. Benczkowski also then responded in writing to several rounds of written questions submitted to him.

After this hearing, I helped Senator DURBIN arrange an intelligence briefing with the Office of the Director of National Intelligence related to Alfa Bank.

I also helped arrange for the Deputy Attorney General to call Senator DURBIN to explain the Department's longstanding tradition that it does not confirm nor deny investigations, particularly when it comes to a nominee's client.

When clients are under investigation, they need lawyers to represent them. Are we now going to have a political litmus test for nominees based upon the clients they stepped forward to represent in private practice?

There is no credible allegation that Mr. Benczkowski did anything wrong or unethical related to his limited representation of Alfa Bank or otherwise. He has promised to recuse himself from handling any matters involving Alfa Bank, and he has promised to consult with ethics officials regarding any other times he may need to recuse.

I believe Mr. Benczkowski will be an outstanding head of the Criminal Division. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting his nomination.

Mr. SANDERS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I come to the floor to raise concerns both about the next vote we will take—a vote that will or will not confirm President Trump's nominee Brian Benczkowski to be the Assistant Attorney General of the Criminal Division of the U.S. Department of Justice—and to express my concern about our President's actions at the NATO summit and his upcoming meeting with Vladimir Putin, the President of the Russian Federation.

Let me start with Mr. Benczkowski. I come to the floor to speak in opposition to our proceeding to his confirmation. Mr. Benczkowski has been nominated to serve as an Assistant Attorney General and will be in charge of the Criminal Division at the U.S. Department of Justice.

How big of a division is that—10, 50, 100? It actually has 900 employees and 600 career Federal prosecutors. The U.S. Department of Justice takes up, handles, investigates, and prosecutes cases of an unbelievable range, complexity, and sophistication in every district court in the entire United States. One would have to assume that to take on such a significant—such an important—role as overseeing, supervising, and managing 900 professionals and 600 career prosecutors that Mr. Benczkowski must be very qualified to serve.

As someone who is himself an admitted member of the Delaware bar and serves on the Judiciary Committee, I hesitate to suggest that I have the qualifications because I have never tried a criminal case in court, so I am not sure how I would directly supervise a whole team of career Federal prosecutors. Mr. Benczkowski has never prosecuted a case. He has never supervised a criminal prosecution. In fact, he has not ever appeared in Federal court, by his own admission, except for on one or two limited occasions in order to address routine scheduling or other matters.

Mr. Benczkowski is before us, in his having been nominated to supervise the single largest, most complex, most sophisticated law firm in America for criminal matters on behalf of the people of the United States, without his having the relevant experience. In my view, that alone is disqualifying. That alone should lead us to pause in terms of whether we should confirm this man to lead the Criminal Division as the Assistant AG.

Virtually all of the last several Senate-confirmed Assistant Attorneys General for the Criminal Division have had extensive prior experience as prosecutors, as former U.S. attorneys, as career or elected folks who have either been within the Department of Justice or have been attorneys general. This is for good reason, for the Federal Government holds enormous power and discretion when it comes to criminal prosecutions. The Assistant Attorney General is responsible for overseeing offices that investigate and prosecute money laundering, fraud, organized crime, public corruption, and a host of other serious offenses. It is that AAG who ultimately signs off on some of the edgiest or most difficult or most questionable prosecutorial decisions. Every American should expect that the person who is nominated for this important job is qualified to meet the weighty demands of this job.

Secondly, every American is entitled to the assurance that the Department of Justice will be independent and that criminal prosecutions will rise and fall with the facts and the law and nothing else. Sadly, Mr. Benczkowski fails to pass this test too.

He led the Department of Justice's transition team for the Trump administration. He previously served with our now-Attorney General and former Senator Jeff Sessions. Yet, after leaving the transition team for the Trump

administration, he went on to private practice in a law firm where he represented Alfa-Bank, which is one of the largest Russian banks. It is a Russian bank which, through its owner, a Russian oligarch, has close ties to Vladimir Putin.

At times, it is hard for me to believe how many people immediately around the President, his Cabinet, his campaign team, or around him personally have had concerning, inexplicable, difficult-to-understand ties to Russian entities, but here we are again. To be frank, I am concerned that Mr. Benczkowski's position—if confirmed by this Senate in just 5 minutes in a vote we are about to take—could enable him to directly interfere with Special Counsel Mueller's ongoing investigation into Russian interference.

I have raised concerns about this, about ensuring that Attorney General Sessions fully complies with his recusal from matters related to the last election. Adding Mr. Benczkowski to the mix in his absolutely central role as the Assistant Attorney General who will oversee the Criminal Division raises these concerns even further. Adding another senior person to the Justice Department's leadership team who raises these concerns about real independence gives me real pause.

I joined all of the Senate Judiciary Committee Democrats in a letter that asked the administration to move Mr. Benczkowski to some other position and to send us a qualified, capable nominee who does not have concerning Russian connections. Unfortunately, the administration hasn't done that. My friends on the other side of the aisle seem poised to confirm this gentleman today.

NATO

Mr. President, this concerns me more than ever because of what has just been said by our President in Europe to our vital NATO allies. There is a number I have been holding in my heart this week—1,044. That is the number of NATO troops who have died in combat in Afghanistan while having served shoulder to shoulder with the United States.

President Trump is correct to raise the issue of contributions to our mutual defense. President Trump has had a real impact. He has gotten our NATO allies to up the ante by more than $14 billion in the last year and a half. I wish he had gone to Brussels and simply said: Thank you, folks, for increasing your contributions. Now let's focus on interoperability and deployability and on linking arm-to-arm and facing our real adversary—Russia.

The NATO alliance exists for mutual defense. How can you successfully defend when you can't successfully identify your real adversary?

I have just returned from a bipartisan trip to visit Sweden, Denmark, Latvia, and Finland—two NATO allies and two very close security partners. All four of these countries have fought alongside us in Afghanistan and have suffered combat deaths. For two of those countries, they have been the first combat deaths since the Second World War.

When our President makes misleading, mistaken comments that NATO doesn't pay its fair share or is using us as a piggybank or, as he said in a campaign-style rally in Montana, that NATO is killing us, it really weighs upon the hearts of our vital allies that have sent their young men and women to serve alongside ours and, in 1,044 cases, to die.

We need to respect our vital allies and recognize that for seven decades, our NATO allies and our security partners—whether the 4 I just visited with the Republican chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee or the others among the 29 in NATO—are stepping up their investments, but they have already paid a price that few other countries have paid of sending their sons and daughters, alongside ours, into combat.

Rather than question their commitment to our mutual security, I wish our President would celebrate that they have increased their investments, thank them for their strong partnerships and alliances, and begin facing our country toward its true adversary—Russia.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all time be yielded back.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

All postcloture time is expired.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Benczkowski nomination?

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 48, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 152 Ex.]

YEAS—51

Alexander	Boozman	Cassidy
Barrasso	Burr	Collins
Blunt	Capito	Corker
Cornyn	Hoeven	Portman
Cotton	Hyde-Smith	Risch
Crapo	Inhofe	Roberts
Cruz	Isakson	Rounds
Daines	Johnson	Rubio
Enzi	Kennedy	Sasse
Ernst	Lankford	Scott
Fischer	Lee	Shelby
Flake	Manchin	Sullivan
Gardner	McConnell	Thune
Graham	Moran	Tillis
Grassley	Murkowski	Toomey
Hatch	Paul	Wicker
Heller	Perdue	Young

NAYS—48

Baldwin	Harris	Nelson
Bennet	Hassan	Peters
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Reed
Booker	Heitkamp	Sanders
Brown	Hirono	Schatz
Cantwell	Jones	Schumer
Cardin	Kaine	Shaheen
Carper	King	Smith
Casey	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Coons	Leahy	Tester
Cortez Masto	Markey	Udall
Donnelly	McCaskill	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Menendez	Warner
Durbin	Merkley	Warren
Feinstein	Murphy	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Murray	Wyden

NOT VOTING—1

McCain

The nomination was confirmed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

CLOTURE MOTION

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Paul C. Ney, Jr., of Tennessee, to be General Counsel of the Department of Defense.

Mitch McConnell, Mike Crapo, Tom Cotton, Johnny Isakson, John Kennedy, John Thune, John Boozman, Tim Scott, Richard Burr, Thom Tillis, Roy Blunt, Cory Gardner, Roger F. Wicker, Mike Rounds, John Cornyn, John Barrasso, Jerry Moran.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Paul C. Ney, Jr., of Tennessee, to be General Counsel of the Department of Defense, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 74, nays 25, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 153 Ex.]

YEAS—74

Alexander	Gardner	Murray
Barrasso	Graham	Nelson
Bennet	Grassley	Perdue
Blunt	Hassan	Portman
Boozman	Hatch	Reed
Burr	Heinrich	Risch
Cantwell	Heitkamp	Roberts
Capito	Heller	Rounds
Cardin	Hoeven	Rubio
Carper	Hyde-Smith	Sasse
Cassidy	Inhofe	Scott
Collins	Isakson	Shaheen
Coons	Johnson	Shelby
Corker	Jones	Smith
Cornyn	Kaine	Tester
Cotton	Kennedy	Thune
Crapo	King	Tillis
Cruz	Klobuchar	Toomey
Daines	Lankford	Udall
Donnelly	Manchin	Van Hollen
Durbin	McCaskill	Warner
Enzi	McConnell	Whitehouse
Ernst	Moran	Wicker
Fischer	Murkowski	Young
Flake	Murphy	

NAYS—25

Baldwin	Harris	Sanders
Blumenthal	Hirono	Schatz
Booker	Leahy	Schumer
Brown	Lee	Stabenow
Casey	Markey	Sullivan
Cortez Masto	Menendez	Warren
Duckworth	Merkley	Wyden
Feinstein	Paul	
Gillibrand	Peters	

NOT VOTING—1

McCain

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. On this vote, the yeas are 74, the nays are 25.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Paul C. Ney, Jr., of Tennessee, to be General Counsel of the Department of Defense.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TOOMEY). The Senator from Connecticut.

NOMINATION OF BRETT KAVANAUGH

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, we are at a crossroads, a historic turning point for the U.S. Supreme Court and our country. This body is often called upon to consider court nominations for the district courts and the courts of appeals, but we are at an extraordinary decision point for the U.S. Supreme Court—the highest Court in the land, a branch of government that can shape the law and culture of this country for generations to come.

When we are called upon to consider a Supreme Court nominee, ordinarily we have to read tea leaves. Ordinarily we have no way to know with certainty the values and beliefs that someone will bring to the Court. Ordinarily Presidents make every effort to persuade us that their nominees were picked on the basis of merit, not ideology. So ordinarily we look forward to hearing what nominees tell us about their beliefs and values, since they are unknown when we first hear their names.

We live in times that are the opposite of ordinary. These are not ordinary times. We live at a time when there is, right before our eyes, an ongoing assault on the rule of law in this country, coming from the President of the United States on down. We live at a time when the courts are critically important to our democracy because they are a bulwark for fundamental rights and liberty, and when the history of this era is written, I believe that our judiciary and our free press will be the heroes because they stood between the President defying the law and preserving those key freedoms and rights that are foundational to our democracy.

What we know about the President's nominee for the highest Court in the land—the most important to that effort against this assault on the rule of law—is that he will ''automatically'' vote to overturn Roe v. Wade. We know that he will vote effectively to eliminate the Affordable Care Act and to undermine protections for millions of Americans who suffer from diabetes, obesity, alcohol abuse, addiction to opioids, stroke, Parkinson's, and many other preexisting conditions. Millions of Americans suffer from those kinds of sicknesses, including more than 500,000 Connecticut residents. We are a State of about 3.5 million people, so you can do the math. There are a lot of Americans who suffer from preexisting conditions.

We know these facts because we have heard them from none other than the President of the United States, who said that his nominee would automatically overturn Roe v. Wade and who berated Chief Justice Roberts for upholding the Affordable Care Act in his decisive swing vote. When a President tells you he is trying to eliminate basic legal rights and liberties for the people of the United States, you better take him at his word, and I do. But in this case, actually we need not take the President at his word because we can review the facts—in fact, the circumstantial evidence surrounding this nomination.

The President has allowed himself to become a puppet of rightwing fringe groups—the Federalist Society and the Heritage Foundation, which have been trying to strike down Roe v. Wade and overturn it for decades. As one recent news story put it, if you want a seat on the Supreme Court, the man to see is not Donald Trump; it is Leonard Leo, the executive vice president of the Federalist Society.

Leonard Leo and the Federalist Society have made clear their desire to overturn Roe v. Wade for years, and Mr. Leo's friend, Ed Whelan, brags about Leo's efforts, stating: ''No one has been more dedicated to the enterprise of building a Supreme Court that will overturn Roe v. Wade than the Federalist Society's Leonard Leo.''

The President of the United States outsourced this decision to the Federalist Society and other groups long intent on overturning Roe v. Wade. They produced for him a list. He selected from that list, and the rest is an unfortunate, deeply tragic chapter in American history.

The Heritage Foundation has been vehement in its desire to overturn and strike down the Affordable Care Act and deny many Americans access to health insurance. It has fought to end protections for people who suffer from these conditions, and they are not only the ones I have mentioned but also many others that are common throughout our society. Its efforts to shape the Supreme Court are a part of a conscious, concerted strategy in a war on the ACA.

Perhaps as troubling as any other fact about this nominee, to many of us who have seen the horrific, unspeakable effects of gun violence, Judge Kavanaugh is the dream candidate of the NRA. He has taken the view that almost all commonsense, sensible measures to stop gun violence violate the Constitution.

He is the dream pick of the NRA. He is a nightmare for the students of Parkland, the survivors of Orlando, Columbine, San Bernardino, and all of the mass shootings, including Sandy Hook, and all of the victims and survivors, their loved ones, families, and friends, who know the tragic effects of those 90 people gunned down every day in America. Those 90 victims every day in this country who die as a result of gun violence bear witness to why we should reject this nominee.

Just minutes after Judge Kavanaugh's nomination was announced, the NRA endorsed him, showering praise on his extreme record against gun safety. As an appellate judge, Judge Kavanaugh heard the sequel to Heller, a case regarding the constitutionality of the District of Columbia's gun registration requirement and semiautomatic assault rifle ban. On a panel of all Republican appointees, Judge Kavanaugh was the only judge to vote to strike down both gun safety measures as unconstitutional.

His basic premise is that gun laws have to be similar or identical to laws that he considers ''traditional'' or ''longstanding.'' He rejects bans on assault weapons and gun registration requirements. He has no clear definition of what is ''longstanding'' and enables a statute to be upheld. But consider his logic. He has, in effect, ruled out any statute that bears no resemblance or connection to laws on gun violence on the books in 1789. That is a breathtaking concept of the constitutional test that should be applied to measures against gun violence.

The Founders almost certainly never considered the possibility of universal background checks at a time when it might have been impossible to do it anyway and when the kinds of firearms available were very different than they are now. By Judge Kavanaugh's logic,

Congress would seemingly be prohibited from requiring universal background checks, even though more than 90 percent of all Americans want them on the books.

That is a radical view, even for the far right. Should Judge Kavanaugh be confirmed to the U.S. Supreme Court, you can say good-bye to a slew of gun safety measures around the country in States like Connecticut, California, New York, or, now, Florida. Many other States are realizing that they should be on the right side of history and the right side of the American people and adopt commonsense, sensible measures. They would be struck down by the logic that Judge Kavanaugh would bring to the Supreme Court. We would have fewer safeguards against the scourge of gun violence.

There is now one mass shooting every day and 90 deaths every day in America. This country is in the midst of an epidemic of gun violence—a public health emergency. With Judge Kavanaugh as a member of the Nation's highest Court, this epidemic would continue unabated.

This nominee is part of a concerted, coordinated effort to roll back the clock, to take the Nation back to a time—one of our darkest eras—when abortion was criminalized, when women died and they were denied access to contraception and the morning-after pill, when Americans were denied healthcare because of those preexisting conditions, and when civil rights, LGBT rights, voting rights, and workers' rights were largely ignored.

That prospect is frightening. For President Trump, the nomination of Judge Kavanaugh is about more than just undermining or eviscerating these fundamental rights. It is about undermining and eviscerating the rule of law.

Judge Kavanaugh has written that the President can refuse to enforce a law if he believes that it is unconstitutional—if he alone believes it is unconstitutional—even if that law was duly passed by Congress and upheld by the courts. He has written that special counsels—like Robert Mueller, who is investigating the President—should be appointed only by the President and should be removable by the President. Under that rule, Robert Mueller never would have been appointed as special counsel, and the President would be able to fire him for no reason at all—except that he is investigating the President.

Finally, Judge Kavanaugh has written that the President should not have to deal with those responsibilities or burdens that the rest of us, ordinary Americans, fulfill. A President under Judge Kavanaugh's rule could not be investigated or indicted, could not be held accountable under the law, and would not have to respond to a civil suit, a subpoena, or a request to be investigated by law enforcement. He need not be interviewed by the FBI or cooperate with law enforcement because under Judge Kavanaugh's concept the President is above the law. Nothing is more fundamental, no principle more sacrosanct in this country—no one is above the law. No President. No one is above the law.

A President who has demonstrated unprecedented disdain for the rule of law has nominated a Justice who will tell him he can ignore the law. A President who has fought tooth and nail against the special counsel's investigating some of the most serious crimes has nominated a Justice who would allow him to fire the special counsel at will for no reason. A President who faces not only the prospect of indictment but an ongoing civil suit brought by nearly 200 Members of Congress—I am proud to be leading them—for his violation of the chief anti-corruption provision in the Constitution would be declared above the law, immune from lawsuit and accountability.

We are going to continue with that lawsuit to make sure that the President obeys the Constitution and comes to Congress for consent before he accepts the payments and benefits in the hundreds of millions of dollars that he is doing every day. Judge Kavanaugh would absolve him of accountability.

These are no ordinary times. In the coming days, I will be speaking out on other areas where Judge Kavanaugh would undermine the rights of everyday Americans and put the rights of corporations and special interests above them.

Judge Kavanaugh would prevent Congress and the States from passing commonsense gun violence laws that will save lives. He would invalidate a slew of existing laws in States across the country, and he would leave powerful corporations to prey on consumers, workers, and anybody who wants to breathe clean air or drink clean water.

These prospects are not imaginary or abstract. Read his opinions and his writings. In one area of law after another, Judge Kavanaugh poses a clear and present danger to our fundamental liberties, to effective government, and to the rule of law. To the people who say to me ''What can we do?'' our challenge is a call to action. It is to mobilize and galvanize America, just as we did during the healthcare debate, when they said the Affordable Care Act would be repealed, and we mustered Americans' sense of outrage and alarm.

I say to the students of Parkland who spoke so eloquently and movingly, your time has come; to the patients who came to my townhalls in Connecticut and spoke so powerfully about their fear of what would happen to them and their insurance coverage if preexisting conditions were declared in violation of those insurance policies, your time has come; to all who care about civil rights and civil liberties, workers' rights, and gay rights, your time has come. We need to hear your voice here, just as we did during the healthcare debate, as powerfully and eloquently. The challenge is yours in stopping this nomination, as it is our responsibility to demand specific answers that this nominee recuse himself from any consideration of the President's financial dealings or the special counsel and to reject the phony platitudes and the evasive and vague answers that have been accepted before, because we know that the old platitudes adhering to settled precedent is meaningless. We do not live in ordinary times. We need extraordinary efforts to make sure that the U.S. Supreme Court remains faithful to the rule of law.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I definitely agree with one thing that my friend from Connecticut just said, which is that there is a long record here on the President's nominee. It is a record I want to look at. It is a record I want to be sure that I talk about to the people I work for as we go through this process. In this process, we will have some time. My guess is it will take about the same amount of time that it has taken for the last two nominees, which means sometime in the month of September, in all likelihood, we will be on the floor, voting, and we will see where that vote takes us.

A lot of people have jumped to a lot of conclusions here. It wasn't my friend Senator BLUMENTHAL at all, but somebody had a news release yesterday at a news conference I was in. One of our fellow Senators had, apparently, gotten it out a little too quickly. The news release read that Supreme Court nominee XXX is the most extreme candidate that the President could have possibly picked. Another one of our colleagues said yesterday that he didn't care who the President nominated but that he wouldn't be voting for him. We are going to hear a lot of that over the next few weeks.

At least going back to 1975, I think every single Republican nominee has supposedly been the nominee that would bring an end to so many things that people have tried to focus on when these nominations have come up. With Gerald Ford's nominee in 1975, who turned out to be Justice Stevens, these exact same things were said then. I don't know that it is what the President said during the campaign that matters as much as what the nominee will say during the next few days.

I do know of the job the nominee currently has. I want to talk to him, and I want to look at the record. I want to visit with him about his philosophy personally before I reach a final conclusion. I do know the job that Judge Kavanaugh currently has is often cited as the second most significant court in the country, the DC Court of Appeals. I do know that his 100 most often cited opinions have been cited by more than 210 judges around the country. I do know that the Supreme Court has endorsed his opinions of the law at least a dozen times and has adopted them as the opinions of the Supreme Court.

Remember the way this works with the job that Brett Kavanaugh currently has as a circuit judge with the court of appeals. Unlike all the others, it is the court that often has the real jurisdiction over a constitutional case. So there have been lots of cases, and we will be looking through the 12 years of what he has done as a judge.

I know there are some requests to see every piece of paper that Brett Kavanaugh had in his hands when he was the Staff Secretary, the Assistant to the President, when George W. Bush was President. That would be every piece of paper that had gone to the White House. Yet the job of the Staff Secretary is not to have an opinion on those pieces of paper. In fact, he is probably the highest level official appointed by the President in the White House whose job it is not to have an opinion but to facilitate the work, to get the paper to whom it needs to go. I suppose we could get, virtually, every piece of paper from the National Archives and the George W. Bush Library. That is possible but not necessary and not justified.

What is justified is to look at all of these opinions. What is justified is to look at the individual, to look at what he does on the court, to look at what he does in the community, to look at his opinions. These are, without any question, important responsibilities not just for the President but for the Senate.

Once again, Americans are reminded that it matters who is in the Senate. It matters who composes a majority in the Senate. My guess would be, in 2½ months or so from now, that a majority of votes will be cast for Judge Kavanaugh, that they will be bipartisan in nature, and that he will go to the Court, probably, before its new term begins on October 1. In fact, that should be one of our goals here—to have a Justice in place by that time.

Three of the current Justices on the Court, by the way, were put on the Court in an election year, in an off year—Justice Kagan in 2010. It was almost exactly analogous. A Democratic President and a Democratic Senate put a Democratic nominee on the Court who had, by the way, worked at the White House. The only difference was there was not as large a body of work to demonstrate the commitment we would hope to find to the Constitution and the law.

In my mind and, I think, in the minds of a vast majority of the people I work for, the goal of a Federal judge and a Supreme Court Justice is to judge a case based on the law and the Constitution. It is to look and be sure that those match up and to be sure that the law is applied as it is written, not as a judge thinks it should have been written. It is to be sure the Constitution is applied as it is written, not as a judge thinks it should be amended. There is a way to pass a new law, and there is a way to amend the Constitution, but that is not to be done by the Court.

It seems to me that in the Scalia tradition and in the Gorsuch nomination tradition, we have a judge here who appears to be committed in every way to looking at the law and enforcing the law. I think it was Judge Scalia who said and others who have said that good judges are often not happy with the opinions they have to render because the opinions they have to render are based on the facts of the cases and may not be the way they would have liked the cases to have worked out at all. It is not their job to decide how they would like the cases to work out. The job of a judge is to judge the application of the law and the application of the Constitution.

Seven Justices, including our most recent nominee to the Court, Justice Gorsuch, served as law clerks on the Supreme Court. If he is confirmed, Judge Kavanaugh will be the eighth. His background, his training, and his work as a circuit judge appear to qualify him in a significant way. He was a Supreme Court clerk for Justice Kennedy.

We ought to understand what is happening here. Justice Kennedy has been on the Court for 30 years. He filled a vacancy that was created in 1987. He served on the Court for 15 years after the person who nominated him to the Court had died. Talk about a long-term impact of both the President who nominates and the Senate that confirms. Three decades of impact on one of the branches of government is pretty substantial.

In addition to being the clerk for Justice Kennedy, Judge Kavanaugh was, as I said, not only in the private sector but, for 5 years, served in the Bush administration. Probably the most important job he held in that administration was, simply, of seeing that things got done in an orderly way to produce a result. In 2006, President Bush nominated him to serve on the DC Court of Appeals. Twelve years later, we are here today.

Judge Kavanaugh's opinions are cited by judges around the country. Again, the Supreme Court has endorsed his opinions at least a dozen times. He has written that the judge's job is to interpret the law, not to make the law or to make policy. It is to read the words of the statute as written and to read the text of the Constitution as written, being mindful of history and tradition—an important point. It is to be consistent with the law and the Constitution and to read the text of the Constitution as written while being mindful of history and tradition. Don't make up new constitutional rights that are not in the text of the Constitution. Don't shy away from enforcing constitutional rights that are in the text of the Constitution. That is in one of his many writings, and we have lots of things to look at here.

Since 2009, he has been the Samuel Williston Lecturer in Law at Harvard Law School. In addition to being a brilliant legal mind, he is devoted to his community and, as we saw the other night, to his family and to his faith. He spends his time coaching youth basketball and serving as a church volunteer, as well as mentoring in local schools. His mom was a schoolteacher and went to law school while she was a schoolteacher and, eventually, became a judge. He takes these qualifications to the Court.

I think this is an important part of our job—to advise and consent. Yet we have a lot of people who have rushed to a determination that they absolutely would not be for Judge Kavanaugh. I think a majority is likely to come to the determination that we should be for Judge Kavanaugh.

I look forward to visiting with him over the next few days. I look forward to learning more about his philosophy as a judge and how he thinks the Supreme Court would be different and how his job there may or may not vary from being on that second-most important court in the country. My guess is he will say that it doesn't vary at all. The job of a Supreme Court judge, just like the job of a court of appeals judge, is to apply the Constitution, apply the law, and not try to make the law or to rewrite the Constitution. I look forward to that opportunity. I look forward to looking at many of the judge's opinions.

I noticed two Pinocchios in the Washington Post today about one of the cases that has already been brought up—the determination of this argument about the right way to deal with a President while he is in office—certainly not a nuisance lawsuit. If the topic of a lawsuit is wrong, if it is the wrong thing for the President to do, there is clearly a way to remove the President.

That is the point, I think, in what will be a much discussed law journal article that Judge Kavanaugh was making. He didn't suggest that the law now prohibited a President from being indicted. He just said that there is a constitutional way to return a President to the status of a private citizen, and then the President will have all of the same vulnerabilities that a private citizen would have if 200 Members of Congress filed a lawsuit. There is a place in the Constitution that says what 200 Members of the Congress should do if they think the President should be removed. That place in the Constitution does not say you should harass the President all you can about everything you can whenever you can.

It is going to be an interesting debate for the American people. Once again, they are going to be reminded as to how important the courts are, as to the incredible impact of the appointing power and the nominating power to the Federal courts, and of the partnership responsibility and important impact that the U.S. Senate has.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, I, along with the rest of the Senate, look

forward to going through the process with Brett Kavanaugh, who is an exceptionally qualified judge. He has been described as a judge of judges. He is one to whom judges look around the country to see what he has written and what his opinions have noted. In fact, historically, the Supreme Court has also looked to his opinions on the circuit court and has taken high notice of those and has quoted several of his opinions verbatim in Supreme Court opinions.

This person has had a lot of respect for what he has done and how he has done it in the process. I have enjoyed getting a chance to meet his family and to have been introduced to not only his personal faith but to his passion for people and his work with the homeless and other things that he has done for so many years.

This will be an interesting process. Over the next 2 months or so, this body should do as it has done before with Justice Gorsuch and Justice Sotomayor—about 66 days for both of them as we worked through their nomination processes until we actually got to the final votes.

We will see how this goes in the days ahead. I look forward to getting a chance to visit with Judge Kavanaugh in my office in the days ahead to ask him specific questions. I am reserving judgment on him until I have the opportunity to visit with him personally and to finish going through all the opinions he has written.

He seems like an exceptional candidate. I look forward to walking through this process judiciously.

IMMIGRATION

Mr. President, I did want to mention today, though—and to step back a little bit from the immigration conversation—there are a lot of issues with immigration that we deal with on a regular basis, but it is more conversation than it is solutions.

It has been my great frustration that we talk about H–2B visas, refugees in asylum, talk about overstaying visas, temporary protective status, illegal entry, quotas and diversity lottery, and families. We don't ever seem to resolve the issue. We talk about it.

The great frustration is, many of the issues we deal with right now on immigration are a direct result of Congress not fixing the issue. My encouragement to this body is to stop pointing the finger at the President and ask a very simple question: Why is there conversation about a zero tolerance policy and what does that really mean?

In its most simple form, I think we could agree that if someone illegally crosses the American border into the country, they should be stopped and at least asked: Who are you? Why are you here? Because in the last year, 1.1 million people became legal citizens of the United States. They made legal applications, worked through that process, received a green card, were evaluated with background checks, and became citizens of the United States.

Today, on the southern border between Mexico and the United States, there will be half a million legal crossings into the United States. The question is, for individuals who illegally cross the border, should we stop those individuals and ask: Who are you? What are you doing here? Why are you crossing into the country? Because not every person crossing into the country is just crossing for work that we would consider good work.

Today, U.S. Customs and Border Protection released an announcement that the officers referred a 38-year-old male for further inspection as he crossed into the United States. Following a positive alert from a K–9 unit, officers seized 21 pounds of cocaine from the vehicle's firewall. Not everyone who is entering the country is coming for a legal reason. Not everyone who is crossing our border is coming just to work. So the zero tolerance policy is really a question of should we stop individuals to evaluate someone who is illegally crossing the border—not one of the half a million people today who will legally cross the border? If you are one of the individuals not crossing the border legally, should we stop you, and should we prosecute you?

Previous administrations used what they called prosecutorial discretion. They have taken folks in, and they released them into the country until they determined who to prosecute and who to not prosecute. This administration has stepped up and said: Let's take a moment where we are going to prosecute everyone and try to slow down the process.

There has been a noticeable increase in something that a lot of people have not noticed, and that is the number of families coming across the border. Why would that be? It is not just individuals crossing the border as a family. It is individuals who are bringing children with them to cross the border because they have been treated differently over the past several years.

Over the first 5 months of this fiscal year, there has been a 315-percent increase in apprehensions of groups fraudulently claiming to be families. Let me run that past you again. This year, in the last 5 months, there has been a 315-percent increase in apprehensions of groups who fraudulently claim to be families—not a 315-percent increase in families. These are smugglers who bring a child with them because they know if you bring a child with you, then you are treated differently at the border. Historically, you have been released.

This administration has said to stop this. We are going to start prosecuting and try to figure out who is actually a family, who is not a family to figure out how to prosecute them because there has been such a dramatic change. The numbers are just increasing for family units that are coming.

Let me run some of the numbers past you. According to Customs and Border Patrol, there is a 407-percent increase in the number of family units detained in June 2018 compared to June 2017. In May, it was a 600-percent increase. In April, it was an 863-percent increase. We are seeing a dramatic shift in the number of units that are coming at us.

No matter your view on immigration reform, increases of this kind of magnitude should cause us to slow down and ask simple questions. Are the loopholes in our law and the prosecutorial discretion to release families to show up later for a hearing causing more individuals to pretend to be families or more families to come? I think it is causing more individuals to come who are coming not as a family unit but who are pretending to be a family unit, though we also have, obviously, family units that are coming as well.

A key issue we need to address is pretty straightforward. Of the 1 million-plus people who come here legally, should we have greater respect for those individuals who have gone through the legal process? I believe we should. In fact, I had a small townhall meeting in Lawton, OK, just last week. There were lots of questions about keeping families together. I am one of those individuals who says, as often as we possibly can, the default position should be keeping families together, but for those individuals who were at this meeting in Lawton, all the questions were about what are we doing about immigration. How are we handling this? How are we prosecuting this? Are we treating people humanely? Those are reasonable questions for us as Americans.

At the very end of the townhall meeting, one gentleman asked me: What about legal immigration? He asked it in a very specific way. Are there issues we should deal with, with that?

I followed up with him and asked: Why do you ask that?

The reason he asked that is because he is a legal immigrant. He went through the process and is in his final stages. In fact, just the week before, he had received his green card. He is a little frustrated with people who are treated differently—who came into the country illegally versus people who are actually doing it the right way.

It has been interesting to me to watch this whole movement about abolishing ICE and saying maybe we shouldn't have ICE enforcement at all—no immigration and customs enforcement at all. The entity was created after 9/11 because the 9/11 terrorists were individuals who came into the country, overstayed their visas, and they were not stopped. ICE was created to help us with our immigration enforcement because we had just been penetrated by a group of individuals who were terrorists and killed thousands of Americans.

After that was created in 2003, there is now this big movement, as if we have lost all we have learned since 2001. Now there is a whole group saying maybe we just need to abolish ICE entirely.

Let me run through a few things on that. Last year, ICE seized 2,370 pounds of fentanyl. That may not seem like a lot—just over a ton of fentanyl that they seized—but according to the DEA, 2 milligrams of fentanyl is a deadly amount to take in. Fentanyl is laced into heroin or into cocaine to dramatically increase the high, but if you have up to 2 milligrams of it, it is not going to increase your high. It will kill you.

The amount of fentanyl that ICE seized last year is a deadly dosage amount for just over 537 million people; 537 million people could have been killed with just the amount of fentanyl that ICE seized last year. On top of that, ICE agents seized almost 7,000 pounds of heroin, and a total of 1 million pounds of narcotics were seized just in 2017.

We also know that ICE freed 518 victims of human trafficking. They freed 904 children from child exploitation. They picked up 800 MS–13 gang members as an arrest, and almost 5,000 gang members were taken off the street just by ICE.

We hear a lot about ICE raids, as if ICE is wandering around neighborhoods looking to pick people up. I would like to remind folks, the majority of what ICE does is detain individuals at the border. In fact, last year, ICE agents removed 62,913 more people who were detained at the border than arrested in the United States.

ICE agents are law enforcement. They are enforcing the law of our country. It is quite remarkable to me to hear some people, even in this Chamber, discuss with seriousness abolishing Federal law enforcement that is taking human traffickers off the street, has taken gang members off the street, that is taking legal doses of fentanyl off the street, and taking tons of narcotics off the street. Why don't we show them some respect?

If there are things that need to be done to reform it, the ICE agents would be the first ones to step up to this body and say: Here are some ideas and things that can be done to reform it. Abolishing ICE is a ticket to lawlessness in our country.

As a reminder, the President asked Congress 21 days ago to enact legislation that would allow families to stay together. This Congress has failed to act on that at all. As we all know, over the course of 1 month, roughly 2,000 children were separated from their parents and placed in HHS custody while the parents were referred to the Department of Justice for prosecution. A great deal of attention, rightly so, has been focused on HHS to ensure that those children are reunited with those parents, especially those children under age 5. To do this, HHS has to first verify that adult is actually the parent of that child. As I mentioned before, just in the first 5 months of this fiscal year, there was a 315-percent increase of family units coming in that pretended to be family units but are really not family units.

I heard a lot of criticism saying put that adult back with that child again. This should be easy, but it is not that simple. Many of those adults who came with that child are really not their parent. They were using them as a vehicle to get easy access into the country.

What does that really look like? Well, let me give you a couple ideas on this. As we talk through the different numbers that are related to some of these children and how many of these children were connected or not connected with the adults who were with them, let me give you a few of these stats: Of those children who are 4 and under, 14 of those are not eligible for reunification because their parents have major issues—or those individuals claiming to be their parents.

Let's just talk about the people who are parents whom we know are parents. Eight of those parents had serious criminal history discovered when they did the background check, including child cruelty, narcotics, and human trafficking. One had a warrant for murder and robbery. So as Americans, we are not reconnecting those eight. Five adults were found not to be the parent of the accompanying child at all. These were of the children 4 and under. One of those individuals faced incredible evidence of child abuse in the process. We are not reconnecting those.

I hear a lot in the news of individuals saying every one of those folks needs to be reconnected as fast as possible. I hear a lot of criticism, saying they are doing DNA testing of these individuals. They are trying to figure out if that adult is really the parent of that child or has that adult picked up a child somewhere through Mexico or Central America to use them as a tool to try to get into the United States? I only wish that wasn't happening. It is.

Reconnecting families is a major priority. I said before, and would say it again, our default position should be keeping families together, but part of our struggle is determining who are the actual families we can keep together and who are individuals who could very well do that child harm?

So let's do this: Let's keep the attention on the reunification of families. Let's continue to ask very fair and reasonable questions of the administration as they are reconnecting these families. But let's also make sure this Congress actually acts on the issues that need to be addressed on immigration.

Twenty-one days ago, there was a request in this body to deal with the issue of family reunification. It still has not been acted on.

In February of this year, this body had a vote on dealing with what is called the Flores settlement. That is what causes the separation of these families. It is a settlement that goes all the way back to 1997. Every single administration since 1997 has struggled with the Flores settlement because the Flores settlement says that if you arrest a family illegally entering the country, the children of that family can be detained for only 20 days. That sounds reasonable, except that, on average, it takes 35 days just to have a hearing. So since that settlement all the way back in 1997, every administration has said: I either have to separate families, or I have to release those families into the country and hope they show up for a court hearing at a future date.

By the way, we called and checked on some of the future court dates. If you are in line to get a court date—if you are released into the country and told to come in for a court date—the longest period of time that you will wait, depending on the region you are headed to, is 4 years and 2 months from now. That is the next available date. So as a family unit, you are released into the country for 4 years, and then we hope you show up for your court date 4 years from now.

This body knows all these numbers, and we have not acted to solve the problem. We need to address these issues. We need to be a country that continues to be open to legal immigration. We need to be a country that is open to workers—even workers who cross the border on both sides, north and south. We need to be a nation that deals with things like H–2B visas and asylum and refugees. We need to continue to keep the promise that we are a nation built on a set of values and the American dream that says: If you want to come and live under the law and live in a land of freedom, where you can become anything you want to become, you are welcome to be here if you come legally.

We need to be that Nation, but we also need to not just ignore illegal immigration and assume there aren't real problems with gang violence, the movement of drugs, human trafficking, and child-trafficking, because they are real. Is it every family who comes across? Absolutely not. But are you OK with it happening at all? What if it is 1 in 10 who is child-trafficking or drug-smuggling? Is that an acceptable number, or should we know the people who are crossing the border and know the issues that are there?

We can do better than this. Let's solve this. Let's keep the debate going, and let's actually resolve this in the days ahead.

With that, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GARDNER). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOMINATION OF BRETT KAVANAUGH

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Mr. President, I rise to speak in opposition to President Trump's nominee to the Supreme Court, Judge Brett Kavanaugh.

In my home State of New York, more than 8 million people have health problems. That is almost half my State. They are living with diabetes. They have had treatment for cancer. They have a childhood disease.

Before the Affordable Care Act became law, if you had a health problem and you needed to see a doctor, health insurance companies were allowed to make you pay much more. The health insurance companies were allowed to turn you away. They were allowed to tell you ''Sorry, you are not profitable for us because you are sick,'' and they did it many times. Let's not forget that included women who were pregnant.

But they can't tell them that anymore because of the Affordable Care Act. The Affordable Care Act made that simple statement illegal.

Now insurance companies must cover you if you are sick. They must cover you if you have had a health problem in the past. And millions of Americans are better off now because of that fact.

So what does this have to do with the Supreme Court? President Trump has made it clear that one of his biggest goals as President is to destroy the Affordable Care Act. He has already tried hard to get Congress to repeal the law, and luckily for us, he failed. He failed because people don't want their health insurance taken away from them. It is really that simple.

Millions of Americans raised their voices and told Congress that if the Affordable Care Act were repealed, they would lose their insurance, and that would be devastating for them and their families. And Congress listened to them.

But now there is a new challenge to the law in Federal court, and the Trump administration is refusing to defend the Affordable Care Act.

When this case makes it to the Supreme Court in a few more years, then the next Supreme Court Justice could be the deciding vote on whether the Affordable Care Act is overturned. That means the next Supreme Court Justice could have the power to decide that insurance companies don't have to cover patients anymore if they have a health problem. He could have the power to decide that insurance companies don't have to cover you or your child anymore if your child is sick.

Healthcare costs in my State have already skyrocketed because of the fact that the Trump administration has attacked this law over and over again. But repealing the law would be absolutely devastating to so many families. More than 8 million New Yorkers could lose their health insurance or pay more for their coverage. So would millions more all across the country. I am very concerned that is exactly what Judge Kavanaugh would do if he were given this opportunity.

Just look at his record. When Judge Kavanaugh had a case before him that was attacking another part of the Affordable Care Act, he dissented in the case, and he said that even though the Affordable Care Act requires employers to cover birth control medicines for their workers, they shouldn't have to do it if they don't want to. He even took it so far as to say that if the President doesn't like a law—if the President doesn't like a law—then the President could ignore the law and ignore the courts.

Listen to this one opinion. This will interest the Presiding Officer, I am sure. Tell me if you think this is sound judicial judgment. He wrote: ''Under the Constitution, the President may decline to enforce a statute that regulates private individuals when the President deems the statute unconstitutional, even if a court has held or would hold the statute constitutional.''

Anyone with the most basic understanding of how the constitutional system of government works in this country knows that this is not what our Founding Fathers intended.

If this judge is confirmed, then there is a dangerously high likelihood that he will strike down the Affordable Care Act.

We must not go back to the days when an insurance company could charge a person more just because they have health problems. We cannot go back to the days when an insurance company could say no to a patient because they could say: You are just not going to make us enough money.

We must listen to our constituents—listen to the millions of men, women, and children all across this country who need access to basic healthcare, and they cannot afford to lose their insurance.

We must reject this nominee.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RESERVOIR PROJECT IN FLORIDA

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I received very good news for Florida this morning. The Army Corps of Engineers has signed off on a long-awaited report that will allow Congress to authorize a new reservoir project south of Lake Okeechobee in the upcoming Water Resources Development Act—what we refer to as the water bill. Many of us in Florida have been pushing the Army Corps and the Trump administration to approve this project for months and months.

Last week I was in the area of Lake Okeechobee visiting with folks affected by the algae blooms on the west coast over in Fort Myers on the Caloosahatchee River and on the east coast in Stuart on the St. Lucie River. They are facing a problem that seems to repeat itself almost every year.

The heat of summer and the excess nutrients in the water—put those together, and you get the algae blooms that suck the oxygen out of the river, making it a dead river because there is not enough oxygen in the water for the fish. There was a similarly bad algae bloom back in 2016, in 2013, and many times in years past.

The pollution in Lake Okeechobee created a toxic brew of a blue-green algae that blooms and that at one point this summer covered 90 percent of Lake Okeechobee. Because the lake has risen to a 14½-foot level, the Army Corps will most likely have to resume releasing water to the east in the St. Lucie and to the west in the Caloosahatchee because of the pressure on the dike around Lake Okeechobee. Thus, here we go again—more nutrient-laden water flowing into these waterways in the heat of summer, and then the algae blooms just keep going and going.

There is one of many projects that can help, which is definitely a step in the right direction. The reservoir project that the Army Corps approved today is so critical because once it is constructed, it will provide storage so that the Corps doesn't have to discharge as much water to the east and to the west. When you combine that with the fact that just last week, the Army Corps, through the White House budget office, let us know they have approved the funds to strengthen the dike and accelerate its construction—the combination of these kinds of things is going to help, so that the Army Corps of Engineers doesn't have to release that nutrient-rich water, which will cause the algae blooms.

This reservoir to the south of the lake will include water treatment features so that the water can be cleaned as well as stored before it is sent farther south in the long journey that Mother Nature intended—sending that water in a slow, gravity-drained, southward flow through the river of grass otherwise known as the Florida Everglades. Many of us were cheering the news today that this project will be ready for inclusion in the water bill, which the Senate will be taking up perhaps next week. It was interesting timing to get the Corps of Engineers' report so that we could get this project in as a part of the overall Everglades restoration project.

REMEMBERING NATHANIEL REED

Unfortunately, Mr. President, we received the very somber, sad news this afternoon that one of our great Everglades restoration advocates, Nathaniel Reed, has passed away. Nat Reed leaves behind a long legacy as an environmental champion.

Nat served as environmental adviser to Governor Claude Kirk beginning in 1967. In 1971, he became Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Fish, Wildlife and National Parks under President Nixon and stayed in that position through the Gerald Ford Presidency. Nat returned to Florida in 1977 and continued his career in public service by working under seven different Governors in various capacities, including

chairman of the Commission on Florida's Environmental Future, which was instrumental in the land acquisition projects that we now know as Everglades restoration. He also served as a board member for the National Audubon Society, the Nature Conservancy, the National Parks Conservation Association, and the Natural Resources Defense Council, as well as the National Geographic Society.

One of Nat Reed's most passionate projects was to expedite construction of this reservoir south of Lake Okeechobee—the project the Army Corps approved today. I had spoken to Nat numerous times about this important project and about our shared goal of restoring the Everglades.

We have lost a real environmental champion who was bipartisan in his approach. I mentioned that he served seven Governors. It didn't make any difference whether the Governor was a Republican or a Democrat—Nat was about restoring as much of Mother Nature as possible back to its functioning self.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a column written by Nat in 2012 that lays out the history of the Everglades' environmental problems and how we can fix them.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From TC Palm, Nov. 25, 2012]

NATHANIEL REED: DON'T BLAME THE ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS FOR OKEECHOBEE, EVERGLADES WOES

Until a few weeks ago, billions of gallons of polluted water was flowing into the St. Lucie River, the Indian River and the Caloosahatchee Estuary from Lake Okeechobee.

The environmental damage is massive. After four years of drought and no large releases of excess water from Lake Okeechobee, the near record rainy season again has quickly filled the lake. Every time there is a wet tropical storm or series of hurricanes such as those that hit Florida in 2004–05, the lake rapidly rises 3–4 feet within days, threatening the Hoover Dike and the communities south of the lake.

The Corps has no options. It must reduce the water level in Lake Okeechobee in case of a potential wet hurricane, common in even October like Hurricanes Wilma and Isaac.

Before we collectively blame the Corps for the incredible damage that is being inflicted on our once productive waters, especially the remarkable recovery of seagrasses and inland fisheries since the Okeechobee flood gates were last opened in 2010, we collectively need a short history lesson and then a firm guide on how to stop these all too frequent environmental outrages.

The great Everglades ecosystem has been brutalized by a number of thoughtless decisions.

The private construction of Tamiami Trail by the Collier family to open up Naples to east coast tourists in the 1915–20's formed a dike preventing natural water flow from the northern Everglades marshes into what have become Everglades National Park and the great fishery of Florida Bay.

Although there are gated discharge structures and culverts under Tamiami Trail, they allow a fraction of the excess rain water to flow south as the everglades system once functioned. Water is backed up throughout the Florida Everglades known as water conservation areas.

Overly high water is inundating the unique ''Tree Islands,'' a major feature of the everglades system which provides essential habitat for deer and other mammals indigenous to the Everglades during times of excessive rain water. The Tree Islands also are ''sacred sites'' for the Miccosukee Native Americans.

Before the 1928 great hurricane that destroyed the small dike that then surrounded much of Lake Okeechobee, small farming communities grew around the south side of the lake. Winter vegetables were the main crop, but thousands of acres were devoted to raising cattle on the lush grass that the muck fields provided. U.S. Sugar grew a total of 50,000-plus acres of sugar cane. Their main profit was made from the sale of some of the finest Brahma cattle raised in the world for warm weather cattle ranches in Cuba, Central America and South America. The King Ranch had a similar operation for their famous crossbred cattle.

The low dike failed during a 1926 hurricane, and once again in 1928, drowning 3,000 people. President Herbert Hoover requested the Congress to pass legislation authorizing the construction of a high dike around Lake Okeechobee.

When there were long, wet summer rain seasons and fall hurricanes in the 1940s, excess water flowed through the Everglades and even over Tamiami Trail into what is now the Everglades National Park. The Corps of Engineers studied the average size of Lake Okeechobee and designed a dike to surround it. The dike was made from local sand and gravel. The Corps then made a fateful engineering decision to cut off the natural flow-way from Lake Okeechobee to the downstream Everglades and dump it more ''efficiently'' to the east and west estuaries.

Perhaps the nearly 700,000 acres now known as the Everglades Agricultural Area of rich organic soils—the byproduct of centuries of dying marsh grasses—was the incentive, but this error in judgment has created a conflict that will continue until sufficient land is acquired to restore a flow-way from Lake Okeechobee to the northern Florida Everglades and is then allowed to flow south and under Tamiami Trail into Everglades National Park.

The decision by the power brokers to persuade the then-governor of Florida and the congressional delegation to dredge the Kissimmee River to allow drainage in the headwaters of Lake Okeechobee was an ecological disaster. Thousands of acres of wetlands that served as storage for Lake Okeechobee and slowed down rain-driven floods moving south into the Kissimmee chain of lakes allowed developers to sell real estate around those lakes, guaranteeing an unnatural low water level. The Kissimmee chain of lakes during high rainfall periods used to hold billions of gallons of water that was slowly released down the Kissimmee into Lake Okeechobee naturally. The wetland marshes flanking the Kissimmee's two-mile-wide flood plain were wildlife treasures that were drained and turned into cattle pastures when the project was completed. Excessive rainwater then flowed at unnatural speed into the lake, raising it to dangerous levels and carrying a pollution-filled muck that now covers half the lake's bottom.

The Caloosahatchee River first was connected to Lake Okeechobee by Hamilton Disston, one of Florida's pioneer speculators who envisioned steamboats moving up from Ft. Myers and then the Kissimmee River to pick up winter crops and bring their loads back to Ft. Myers for shipment north.

After about 10 years, the St. Lucie Canal was completed in 1926 to provide easy access from the lake to Stuart, where ships would carry vegetables and fruit to the upper east coast and provide access for the east to the west coast for pleasure boats.

It did not take any length of time for the Corps to realize that an overflowing Lake Okeechobee threatened the ''suspect construction'' of the Hoover Dike and that the two outlets—the St. Lucie Canal and the Caloosahatchee River—would serve as escape valves whenever there was excessive rainfall and a rising lake that could threaten the integrity of the Hoover Dike, especially on the south side, where farming communities had grown in size. With the connection to the Everglades now severed, the present day colonel of the Corps of Engineers and his staff have no options other than releasing billions of gallons of water that is polluted from years of agricultural back-pumping from the Everglades Agricultural Area and now large amounts of nutrients flowing down the Kissimmee and the other headwaters of the lake.

During his tenure, Gov. Bob Graham announced in the early 1980s a major effort to restore the Everglades system. Each successive governor has made a contribution toward that goal. The state has spent $1.8 billion acquiring land to clean up the excess water flowing from the 500,000 acres of sugar cane—a crop that enjoys a federal taxpayer guaranteed price. The amount of cane sugar that is permitted to be imported into the United States is controlled by the sugar cartel to guarantee them maximum profit. Their leadership is unrelenting in its efforts to produce maximum profits at the Everglades' expense.

Unless excessive Lake Okeechobee water is cleansed through a vast series of pollution-control artificial marsh systems built principally by the taxpayers of the 16 counties of South Florida for the sugar cane and winter crop growers, drainage cannot be allowed to flow into the Everglades, as it will change the botanical makeup of the River of Grass within months.

So where are we?

Before the flow way and the pollution control marshes are built and are operational, additional storage—both upstream in the lake's headwaters and within the Everglades Agricultural Area—must be acquired, and a number of other priorities must be addressed.

First, Tamiami Trail must be modified to allow massive amounts of water to flow southward into the park. A one-mile bridge and limited road raising are currently under construction. While this is a very positive first step, more needs to done! The trail needs more bridges and road raising (up to another 2 feet) so that it is protected when the Everglades and the lake are once again connected.

Additionally, the southeast corner of the vast Everglades system known as Water Conservation Area 3B has a vital role in delivering Okeechobee and Florida Everglades' excess water to flow under the proposed five-mile bridge. The Corps admits that when the eastern dike of Water Conservation Area 3B was constructed, it did not consider leakage to be a potential problem, as no one farmed or lived near the dike. Now, there are hundreds of acres of fruit trees and thousands of homes that could be impacted if the dike allowed significant seepage.

This problem must be solved before excess water can be released into Everglades National Park, relieving the entire system of too much water which forces the discharges of billions of gallons of water down the Caloosahatchee and St. Lucie rivers.

We also have some local problems that must be faced with private drainage systems

that drain millions of gallons of excess water into the St. Lucie River. Canals C–23, 24 and 25 were built at the urging of the Martin and St. Lucie County citrus growers and developers, who wanted their lands drained at public expense. Together with the C–44 and the St. Lucie Canal, more than 498,000 acres drain through canals into the estuary and lagoon.

These decisions have all combined to seriously add damaging amounts of polluted runoff into the St. Lucie and Indian rivers. There are plans to complete a pair of reservoirs? one on the St Lucie, the other on the Caloosahatchee? to capture local runoff, hold it and clean it before slowly releasing it to flow into the two estuaries.

What is the hope for the two rivers that are being used as drainage escape routes?

The federal and state governments must pay for the cost of modifications of the eastern dike of Water Conservation 3B to prevent seepage.

The Federal government should use fuel tax revenue to raise Tamiami Trail and build additional bridges to allow water to flow into ENP.

The state of Florida must acquire significant amounts of additional land both north and south of the lake or, at minimum, enforceable easements to contain excessive water until it can be leaked slowly down to the lake from the north and south through a flow-way into the Everglades system.

The gross pollution of Lake Okeechobee must become a state priority. Recent phosphorus loads to Lake Okeechobee have been in the 500-ton range, more than three times the goal of 140 tons. Today, estimates are that so much phosphorus has already been spread in the watershed to keep these heavy loads coming for decades. Today, nutrients from the EAA are less than 5 percent of the total into Lake Okeechobee. More than 90 percent is from the northern Lake Okeechobee watersheds. The failure to control phosphorus runoff is shared by the Florida Department of Agriculture and the Department of Environmental Regulation.

Agricultural and water utility interests must accept the fact that Lake Okeechobee's level must be held below 16 feet and that 'back pumping' polluted water from the EAA even in times of drought must not be permitted. Lake Okeechobee cannot continue to be considered a sewer.

Additional lands within the vast EAA must be acquired by the state and the South Florida Water Management District to construct major additional storage capacity and pollution control marshes that will dramatically reduce the nutrients flowing off the sugar cane plantations into the Everglades system.

The sugar cane plantations should be forced to control and treat the thousands of gallons of polluted water on their land before they discharge it into the waters of the state. They should pay a far greater share for cleaning up their wastes for the needed additional pollution control marshes.

These are tall orders, but think for a moment before we continue to rail against the Corps' decision to lower Lake Okeechobee to protect the integrity of the Hoover Dike.

Everything on my ''must do'' list represents one week of the Afghanistan War expenses.

Everything on my wish list is obtainable.

Our congressional delegation has significant power in Congress. Our governor and Florida commissioner of agriculture are very persuasive with our legislature, even in times of recession.

Despite the need to reduce the incredible national deficit, don't you think manmade disasters like what is threatening our rivers and the Everglades ecosystem are worthy of national and state investments?

Mr. NELSON. Nat recommended focusing on projects like bridging the Tamiami Trail, which is U.S. 41—virtually a dike across the southern peninsula of Florida. It is now being bridged, first with a mile-long bridge, and now—under construction—with a 2½-mile bridge so the water can flow under the road into the water-starved Everglades National Park.

He recommended focusing on projects like restoring the Kissimmee River to its natural meandering state. Half a century ago, when all the emphasis was on flood control, getting the water off the land, they took this meandering stream called the Kissimmee River that cleansed the water as it oozed south in all of the marsh grasses, and what did they do? They dug a straight ditch. Nat was one of the leaders in advocating restoring the river to its natural meandering state so that by the time the water gets to Lake Okeechobee, it will have been cleaned up by natural processes.

Both of those projects—Tamiami Trail and the Kissimmee River—are now well underway, and we are already seeing the benefits to the environment and to the wildlife.

Nat also wrote about the importance of water storage and treatment projects both north and south of the lake—a refrain this Senator often repeats as well. That is why I not only respect and appreciate so much what Nat contributed to our country and to our State but also loved him as a friend. His untimely death today in an accident in Canada is a huge loss. Nat and I had been so focused on advancing this new reservoir project south of Lake Okeechobee. It saddens me so much to announce this good news at the same time that I announce the death of one of the Nation's true environmental champions. In the years to come, as we go about actually constructing that reservoir, it would be a fitting tribute to name that project in Nat Reed's honor. All we can do is try to continue his life's work protecting Florida's unique environment.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I spoke before the Fourth of July recess about two financial risks that are coming our way thanks to not getting anything done on climate change.

One, of course, is the risk to coastal properties—not something the Presiding Officer has to worry too much about given his home State but something that Rhode Island, the Ocean State, has to care a lot about and that the distinguished Senator from Florida and his constituents have to care a lot about.

There is a point where rising sea levels intrude on the saleability, the mortgageability, and the insurability of houses. None other than Freddie Mac, the huge Federal housing corporation, is predicting that there will be a coastal property meltdown.

The other risk is that of a carbon bubble. There is a lot of talk in the economic literature about a carbon bubble. One recent financial study reports that ''the potential effects of a carbon bubble on financial stability have been recently discussed in the academic literature and are increasingly on the agenda of [bank] regulators and supervisors.'' Indeed, in an official statement, the Bank of England has warned that ''investments in fossil fuels and related technologies . . . may take a huge hit.'' That huge hit is the other side of a carbon bubble: It pops, and you have a crash. So let's look at the prospects for not just a carbon bubble but a carbon crash.

There are several elements in the runup to a crash. Some of these we witnessed in the crash of the housing bubble back in 2008. When these conditions exist, we should take warning.

One condition is whether you can trust the players. In the housing crash, the rating agencies were in bed with the banks, and you couldn't trust their risk evaluations. The whole thing was cooked. The big fees the rating agencies were taking also took their eye off the ball, and they gave wildly erroneous ratings to high-risk investments. So at the heart of the 2018 housing crash was a failure of trustworthiness.

Can we trust the fossil fuel industry any better than those rating agencies? There is no reason to think so, and there is plenty of reason to think not. This is an industry that has been lying about fossil fuel's effect on our climate for decades, and once you get used to lying about one thing, it is hard to contain the spread of the rot. Exxon even once gave its CEO the infamous, phony Oregon Petition, which urged the United States to reject the Kyoto Protocol, to cite to shareholders at an annual meeting.

I have spoken before about what I consider to be the untrustworthiness of Exxon's response to the BlackRock shareholder resolution, which required Exxon to report the predicted effect of climate policies on Exxon's business model. As fossil fuels are priced out of the market by renewable energy and as nations enact carbon emissions restrictions, fossil fuel reserves now claimed as assets by energy companies may become undevelopable stranded assets.

In a nutshell, Exxon seems to have wildly—indeed, so wildly, you can only conclude deliberately—overestimated the adoption of carbon capture utilization and storage, wildly underestimated the adoption of electric vehicles, and wildly underestimated renewable energy growth, all to reach its rosy conclusions that its assets were more or less secure.

On the subject of trustworthiness, right now big oil companies are still being untrustworthy, telling the world they want a price on carbon, while at the same time telling their political fixers in Congress to kill any such thing. Who knows how much they push around their analysts and others who

are curious about a carbon bubble. What we know is that trusting this industry is asking a lot. That is condition one for a bubble in a crash—untrustworthy actors.

Condition two is market failure. Markets usually correct and have a smoothing effect. If there is market failure, markets can go off course until the correction comes, and then the correction is so immediate and so big that it amounts to a crash. There is market failure in fossil fuel that props up this bubble. Indeed, there are several. The biggest is that the fossil fuel industry rides on what the IMF calculates is a global multitrillion-dollar annual subsidy: $700 billion in subsidy every year in the United States alone, says the International Monetary Fund. That subsidy massively warps the operation of the market.

There is also what appears to be a methodological issue. The oil industry is ordinarily measured financially by net asset value analysis. As one paper noted, this is an ''industry valuation methodology [that] assumes full extraction of fossil fuel reserves.'' A methodology that assumes full extraction of fossil fuel reserves becomes a problem when the question is whether extraction of those reserves is even possible.

There is also what I would call a ''massiveness factor'' at work here. Lehman Brothers and Bear Stearns were so massive that it was hard to imagine them vanishing, but they did. The market value of fossil fuel reserves that can't be burned is around $20 trillion, according to the World Bank. That is such a big wipeout that it is hard to comprehend, let alone anticipate. People wait until tomorrow. Then, the tomorrows pile up into a bubble, and then the crash comes when the first person panics and everybody runs.

One other market failure is actually how the crooked political pressure of this industry is causing us not to focus on the 2-degree Celsius ceiling that scientists warn us about for global warming, or, actually, safer yet is the 1.5-degree Celsius ceiling, which burning existing reserves will blow us through. We cannot have both a safe planet and full extraction, and the fossil fuel industry is choosing extraction.

That political castle of climate denial will fall sooner or later. It is false. Not only is condition one met—untrustworthy players—but condition two is met: There is a massive, multiple market failure in fossil fuel awaiting correction, which brings us to condition three: The energy market is undermining fossil fuels as a technology.

We are reaching a tipping point. Here is Lazard's cost curve for onshore wind energy. It shows, over 8 years, a 67-percent decrease in cost. This line shows the cost of wind energy steadily declining from 2009 until 2017.

At the same time these wind costs were dramatically declining, utility-scale solar costs and rooftop solar costs also declined dramatically. This line represents rooftop solar costs. This line below it represents utility-scale solar costs. Again, there was a percentage decrease of 86 percent.

New solar and wind energy projects are already becoming more economical than existing coal plants, as we just saw in Colorado. New solar and wind projects now compete on price with new natural gas plants, as a recent auction in Arizona showed.

The cost trajectory for renewables continues steeply downward. When you compare U.S. wind and solar to other energy sources, you see the trend is clear, and here is the result. On cost, the lowest cost providers are onshore wind and utility-scale solar. More expensive than them is natural gas. More expensive is coal. More expensive still is nuclear. That is not counting the subsidy. That is apparent price.

This same trend is also happening globally. This graphic is prepared by the World Economic Forum, and it shows the same thing for renewables. In particular, here is the rapidly declining cost of solar photovoltaic. Here is the cost of coal, and here, right now, they cross over. We are at the tipping point, where it is cheaper worldwide to develop solar and wind than it is to burn coal.

Stanford economist Tony Seba studies economic disruptions, and he likes to see these two photographs. It will be hard to see from where you are. This is Fifth Avenue in New York City in 1900. If you look at the photograph, you can see that every vehicle there is drawn by a horse. In 1900, every vehicle was drawn by a horse. If you look very closely, it appears there is one leading-edge, non-horse-drawn vehicle. The whole street is filled with horse-drawn carriages and wagons in 1900. Thirteen years later, on Fifth Avenue in New York City, every single vehicle in that street is now an automobile. In only 13 years, there was a complete transition in transportation. If you were a harness maker, this was a tough transition for you. In just 13 years, the world changed, illustrating the point that major economic disruptions can take place fast. Think land lines and cell phones, if you want a modern example.

People still ride horses, and they probably always will, but our transportation sector shifted rapidly from horse-drawn conveyance to automobiles because horse-drawn conveyance was an antiquated technology that got left behind. People still have landlines. I have one at home. We hardly ever use it. The communications industry shifted rapidly, as antiquated landline technology got left behind.

As the energy market shifts to cleaner, cheaper, more efficient renewable technologies, fossil fuels soon will not compete in the marketplace. There is our third condition: not just untrustworthy players, not just market distortion, but also a technological tipping point making the fossil fuel technology obsolete.

There is a fourth condition. This fourth condition basically puts an accelerator on condition three in certain sectors of the energy market. Condition four is based on the fact that the marginal cost of production of a unit of fossil fuel energy varies considerably. Some fuels are low cost and high cost to produce. Some geographical locations are low cost and high cost locations. In this variance, coal is pretty much dead already at the hands of oil and gas, purely because of cost. We can set coal aside for a moment.

In the world's oil markets, much of this cost of production variant is masked right now by energy cartels that prop up the price of oil. Cartel behavior to prop up the price of your product makes economic sense if you can maintain monopoly pressure to prop up the price, but it also only makes sense for the cartel participants if you can anticipate that you can sell your product out into the future. You hold back your output to drive up price and to maximize your return in the hopes that in the future you will be able to keep doing the same thing and you will be able to sell your product.

If you are not sure that there will be another day to sell your product at the propped-up price, you start to get anxious about your product becoming stranded and about your product becoming valueless. At that point, it doesn't make sense to engage in cartel behavior. What makes sense is to maximize your output and to sell as much as you can while your commodity still has value—basically, to have a fire sale.

Low-cost fossil fuel energy producers would be rational to drop their prices and maximize their market-share, fire-sale pricing while their fossil fuel still has value. Get the dammed stuff out the door while you still can. That behavior—dropping the cost, pricing at your marginal cost of production, and selling as much of your product as you can—will fend off the inevitable for low-cost producers for a while. However, for those producers that can't match that fire-sale price, the downward trajectory of their crash steepens catastrophically. As soon as you can't produce not at the cartel price but at the lowered fire-sale price—as soon as you cannot meet that price—you are out of business. There still is a fossil fuel market. You are just not in it. The bad news for the United States is that this is where much of our market is. Economists looking at this carbon bubble mess warn that high-cost regions like the United States could ''lose almost their entire oil and gas industry.'' Let me quote that again: ''lose almost their entire oil and gas industry.''

To recap about a fossil fuel ''carbon bubble,'' the players aren't trustworthy; the fossil fuel markets aren't efficient in the economic sense; fossil fuels as a technology are now tipping into being obsolete, priced out by renewables; and our U.S. industry is particularly vulnerable to an accelerated market meltdown when the tide shifts.

Those four conditions don't make a great scenario. That is a warning we need to start considering. What should we do?

Everyone seems to agree on two safety measures. First, there is one sensible hedge: Don't invest all in fossil fuel. Invest more in renewables. Be on the winning side of the shift. Start making carburetors, not just a mule harness. There is also one important, sensible economic strategy; that is, to manage the transition.

As one paper on this subject concluded, ''The issue of concern is the lack of any transitional strategy. . . . Inadequate, conflicting or slow responses to climate change in investment and finance can entail risks that could be avoided under a more orderly transition.''

You could equate it to jumping out of an airplane. You are going to end up on the ground anyway. Wouldn't you like a parachute to make it a gentler and more survivable voyage? What is the parachute but a transition plan for managing this shift? The best one is a price on carbon.

This takes us back to the discreditable conduct of the fossil fuel industry, which, far from leading through this transition, far from trying to build itself a parachute, is busily still trying to deny that there is any such transition, including, in my view, their falsely reporting to shareholders that this is all going to be OK, and we are going to be able to extract and sell all of our reserves. This is an industry that is still fighting like a wounded bear to prevent anyone from organizing the orderly transition they need.

At some point, there has to be a grownup in the room. The fossil fuel industry has shown no capacity for that role, which makes it up to us in Congress to help America prepare for both the predicted crash in coastal property values, as sea level begins to enter the mortgage and insurance horizon for those properties, and the predicted carbon bubble we see coming and that economists write about coming that we can manage our way through if we are responsible. In that regard, it is time for us to wake up.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEE). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOMINAION OF BRETT KAVANAUGH

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, there was a time when Blacks and Whites couldn't get married or go to the same school. The Supreme Court changed that. There was a time when gay people could be arrested for loving one another and when it was illegal for them to get married. The Supreme Court changed that. There was a time when thousands of women died from having illegal, unsafe abortions. The Supreme Court changed that.

The Justices on the Supreme Court matter to each and every one of our lives. That is why there is so much concern over President Trump's nominee to fill the vacancy on the Supreme Court—Judge Brett Kavanaugh.

Rightwing groups, like the Heritage Foundation and the Federalist Society, have been working for decades to set the stage to pack our Federal courts with ideologically driven conservatives. They have invested millions of dollars and decades of time in this effort. These two organizations have played the primary role in vetting and selecting Donald Trump's nominees to the Supreme Court. By including Judge Kavanaugh on their list of potential nominees, these two organizations certainly expect that he will reflect their own ideological perspectives, which include overturning Roe v. Wade and repealing the Affordable Care Act, the ACA. They certainly expected Neil Gorsuch—another name on their list—to do the same when he got on the Supreme Court. In the short time he has been on the Court, Justice Gorsuch has not disappointed them.

Is it any wonder that millions of people across the country are raising concerns over the nomination of yet another nominee on the Federalist Society and Heritage Foundation's wish list? Isn't it reasonable to conclude that Judge Kavanaugh will also reflect the ideological agendas of these organizations?

This is why Judge Kavanaugh does not deserve the benefit of the doubt. He has the exceptionally high burden of proof to assure the American people he can be fair and objective. The Senate has a constitutional obligation that is equal to the President's to vet a President's nominee to the Supreme Court and fulfill its advice and consent obligation responsibilities. I take this responsibility seriously because a fight for the future of the Supreme Court will have ramifications for so many issues that we care about.

Our Federal courts have been at the center of the Republican Party's strategy to dismantle, gut, and weaken the Affordable Care Act, the ACA, since it was passed over 8 years ago. The Supreme Court narrowly upheld the constitutionality of the ACA's core provisions in 2012. The ACA provides affordable, accessible health insurance to millions of people in our country who would otherwise not have such insurance. But the Republican Party's effort to sabotage this critically important law through the courts continues unabated.

Right now, Texas and 19 other States have a lawsuit pending in Federal court that claims, among other things, that the Affordable Care Act's protections for Americans living with preexisting conditions—illnesses such as diabetes, asthma, and cancer—are invalid. The Trump administration filed a brief supporting Texas in its attack on the ACA's protections for millions of people in our country with preexisting conditions. This case will likely end up before the Supreme Court. If Texas wins its lawsuit, the healthcare of millions of Americans will be at stake—meaning one in four Americans could either lose their health coverage or pay exponentially more for healthcare.

The outcome of this case is personal to millions of Americans and their families, and it is certainly personal to me. A little over 1 year ago, I was diagnosed with kidney cancer. I was fortunate. I have health insurance that allows me to focus on fighting my illness rather than worrying about how I will pay for my treatment. I now join the millions of Americans living with a preexisting condition—illnesses that don't discriminate on the basis of age, gender, or political ideology.

As this case makes its way to the Supreme Court, the American people should not forget that Donald Trump and this administration have been openly hostile to the ACA, a law that has helped millions of people. In fact, the President has openly bragged about all the things he has done to gut the ACA. Does the President expect his nominee, Judge Kavanaugh, to protect the ACA? I don't think so—quite the opposite.

The next Supreme Court Justice will also play a determining role in the future of a woman's right to make her own reproductive health decisions. I remember vividly the stories of women dying in America, unable to access safe, legal abortions. The fight for reproductive freedom, prompted by these stories, was one of the reasons I got involved in politics.

When I was in college, the first letter I ever wrote to Hawaii's congressional delegation was about abortion at a time when our State legislature was debating whether to legalize abortion. Hawaii became the first State in the country to do so. Those of us who lived in a time before Roe v. Wade, when a woman was forced to have a child against her will, are deeply concerned about the future of a woman's right to have an abortion, to have that freedom of choice.

Throughout his campaign for the Presidency, Donald Trump repeatedly promised to appoint Justices to the Supreme Court who would favor overturning the core holding in Roe v. Wade. The Heritage Foundation and Federalist Society share this goal, and it is not a stretch to assume that the names they included on their Supreme Court wish list hold the same views.

Judge Kavanaugh's record on this issue is deeply troubling and of significant concern. Last year, Judge Kavanaugh issued a dissent in a case that granted a 17-year-old immigrant in the custody of the Department of Health and Human Services, HHS, the right to get an abortion. Kavanaugh argued in his dissent that holding the

young woman in custody, refusing to release her for a medical appointment for a procedure until HHS was able to find her a sponsor who would serve as a foster parent, was not an undue burden under the Supreme Court's legal test.

He did not consider holding someone in government custody to be an undue burden. This is the view of someone who will not follow the law as it is currently set forth by the Supreme Court if confronted with challenges to Roe. Let us remember, it is the Supreme Court that sets precedent, and that can happen if Judge Kavanaugh is on the Court. Really, his dissent in this case is a view of someone chosen for a reason, ready to fulfill Donald Trump's campaign promise to see Roe v. Wade overturned.

This fight matters. Who sits on our courts matters. How we exercise our constitutional duty to examine a nominee for the highest Court in our land matters. Just as well-financed conservative interests have spent decades setting the stage for the court packing going on today, those of us who oppose this agenda need to mobilize, resist, and stay engaged for the long haul in the fight for a fair and independent judiciary.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE OVERSIGHT

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to discuss the continuing need for addressing hard-hitting oversight of the Department of Defense. That need for oversight is as great today as it ever was. Waste is alive and very well at the Pentagon.

I have a poster, a blowup of a cartoon published in the Washington Post in 1985, during my early years in the U.S. Senate. It shows Ernie Fitzgerald, a famous whistleblower, confronting what are quite obviously his chief adversaries, the big spenders at the Pentagon.

As a senior Air Force official, Ernie Fitzgerald committed a crime. He says he ''committed truth.'' Ernie Fitzgerald is famous for, in 1968, exposing a $2.3 billion cost overrun on the C–5 aircraft program. In those days, having a senior Pentagon official like Ernie Fitzgerald speak the truth about a cost overrun on a high visibility program was unheard of. In fact, it was dangerous. It was so dangerous that it cost Ernie Fitzgerald his job. That is why I like to call Ernie Fitzgerald the father of whistleblowers.

The cartoon also depicts the infamous $640 toilet seat that made history back in those days as one example of the terrible waste at the Defense Department. That happened in 1985, when I, as a first-term Senator, began watchdogging the Pentagon. After a report uncovered a $640 toilet seat and a $400 hammer, I began asking very tough questions, such as: How could the bureaucrats possibly justify paying such exorbitant prices? I am still waiting for a straight answer.

A lot has changed since the 1980s. The internet, which was in its infancy in the 1980s, is now a part of everyday life. Mobile phones back then were once the size of bricks. Now those mobile phones can fit in the palm of your hand and do a lot more work than just making telephone calls. But one thing hasn't changed in all those decades—wasteful Department of Defense procurement practices.

Since I began my work on this issue, there have been 6 Presidents and 12 Secretaries of Defense, yet the problem of wasteful spending at the Defense Department keeps going on. Since those earliest revelations, there has been a steady flow of new reports on spare part rip-offs. No political party is immune from these horror stories.

During the administration of George H.W. Bush, oversight efforts uncovered soap dishes that cost $117 and pliers that cost nearly $1,000. In some cases the Department of Defense admitted that some high prices didn't pass the smell test.

True, better deals were negotiated. People tried to make some changes, but to offset losses on lower prices, the contractors jacked up overhead and management charges, making the overall contract price the same.

Exercising oversight on these contracts is like working with a balloon. You know the famous balloon—when you squeeze it in one place, the problem pops out someplace else.

Under President Bill Clinton, a report by the Government Accountability Office—we know it here as the GAO—revealed that one defense contractor paid its top executives more than $33 million a year, an amount that was reimbursed by the Federal Government as part of a contract.

I happen to agree that a company has a right to pay its executives whatever it wants; however, when the government enters into cost-reimbursement contracts, those contracts in which the government directly repays the company for costs incurred instead of paying a fixed price, the contractor loses incentive to control costs, and top executives draw sky-high salaries at the taxpayers' expense.

I introduced an amendment in the 1997 Defense authorization bill to curb executive compensation billed directly to the taxpayers, but as you might expect, with the respect the Defense Department has in this body, that amendment was voted down.

During the Bush administration in the early 2000s, I worked with the GAO to expose abuse of government charge cards by Defense Department employees. We found some truly egregious expenditures—for examples, over $20,000 at a jewelry store, over $34,000 on gambling, and over $70,000 on tickets to sporting events and Broadway shows. In some cases, employees who spent thousands of taxpayer dollars on personal expenses—way beyond anything that was an ordinary business expense—were not only not asked to repay the money to the taxpayers but oddly were promoted and even issued new charge cards. Instead of being held accountable, it is quite obvious they were rewarded for their illegal activity.

During the Presidency of President Obama, I pressed the Pentagon to answer for a $43 million gas station built in Afghanistan. This project was revealed as part of an audit conducted by the Special Inspector General for Afghan Reconstruction. When I pressed for answers, the Defense Department responded by saying that the direct cost was actually only $5 million, but the number didn't include the massive overhead costs charged to the project, which pushed the overall price tag up to that $43 million. Anybody anywhere else—outside the beltway—knows that doesn't meet the smell test, and that is not even a commonsense answer to my overall question. How did we waste $43 million there?

Even more alarming is what happened to the rest of the $800 million provided for other business development projects in our efforts to help Afghanistan recover. Auditors could only find documentation to support about half of the money spent, leaving about $400 million unaccounted for. This kind of sloppy bookkeeping means we may never know how the rest of the money was spent. Was it used for unauthorized purposes or pocketed by crooked people? We will probably never know.

Now, under the Presidency of Donald Trump, over 30 years since all this started with me, the overpriced airborne toilet seat has really gained altitude. Instead of the $640 that this cost, the new pricetag was reported by the Air Force to be $10,000, and that happens to be only for the lid of the toilet stool. Any American can tell you that $10,000 for a toilet seat cover is ridiculous. Americans work too hard to see their precious tax dollars flushed down the toilet.

I asked the Department of Defense for confirmation that the seats cost $10,000. They still haven't answered my letter, but after my inquiry, the Department of Defense has changed their story. They clarified to the media that they are now 3D printing the toilet seat lids for much less, but they never answered my questions. We don't know how many seat covers were purchased at the $10,000 pricetag; we don't know when they moved to 3D printing instead of purchasing; and we still don't have documentation or official confirmation on the true price of toilet seat lids.

Even if the issue of the toilet seat has been sorted out, it is clear the Department of Defense still does not have a grip on spending. OIG reports have revealed that the Pentagon frequently overpays for simple parts and does not perform adequate cost analysis.

One of the primary culprits for continuing waste and misuse of tax dollars is the Department of Defense's noncompliance with the congressional

mandate to pass an audit. The Department of Defense has a very bad record. It is impossible to know how much things cost or what is being bought when nobody is keeping good track of the money being shoveled out the door.

For nearly 30 years, we have been pushing the Pentagon to earn a clean opinion on any of their audits. Way back in 1990, Congress passed the Chief Financial Officers Act, which required all departments of the government to present a financial statement to an inspector general for audit by March 1992. All departments have complied and earned clean opinions except one and that is the Department of Defense. Instead of clean opinions, the Department of Defense has earned a long string of failing opinions called disclaimers. It boils down to the fact that the books at the Department of Defense are unauditable.

In 2010, 20 years after that 1990 congressional action, Congress finally got fed up and passed a new law requiring the Pentagon to be ready for audit by September 2017. The Department was given 7 long years to get its act together and to meet the same requirements as every other Federal agency entrusted with public money. Obviously, that deadline has come and gone like other deadlines have come and gone. According to the Comptroller and Chief Financial Officer, Mr. David Norquist, a clean audit is still at least 10 years away. That is 10 years of not being able to follow the money. If you can't follow the money, you don't know whether it is spent legally.

There is a longstanding, underlying problem preventing the Pentagon from reaching the goal of a clean audit. This is the so-called feeder system. I will not describe a feeder system, but feeder systems are supposed to capture transaction data, but those feeder systems are broken. Auditors cannot connect the dots between contracts and payments. You can't follow the money because there is no reliable transaction data and little or no supporting documentation. You tend to spend money without knowing what you even bought. The Pentagon will never earn a clean opinion until those accounting systems are able to produce reliable financial data that meet accepted standards.

Over the last 25 years, the Department of Defense has spent billions trying to fix these outdated accounting systems but with no success. How is it that the very mighty Pentagon can develop the most advanced weapons in the world but can't seem to acquire something as simple as an accounting system? We need to get to the bottom of this problem and fix it.

I am working with my colleagues on the Budget Committee to get the Government Accountability Office to conduct an independent review of the Pentagon's effort to acquire modern accounting systems. What is the problem? That is what we are trying to find out. Should the Defense Department keep trying to fix the antiquated feeder systems or is it time to develop new, fully integrated systems that can deliver reliable financial information? We need and we want some answers.

The Department of Defense is currently attempting to conduct a full financial audit. Secretary Mattis has directed all employees to support the audit, and the results are expected in November. Although the new Chief Financial Officer appears to be making a good-faith effort to get a handle on the problem, he also happens to be spending hundreds of millions of dollars a year for audits with a zero probability of success. It could be very wasteful spending that kind of money if they don't have a feeder system in place.

The first priority of our Federal Government remains and ought to be national security. We must ensure that our military forces remain strong enough to deter any potential aggressor and, as a result, preserve the peace.

The men and women on the frontlines deserve fair compensation and the best weapons and equipment money can buy. We want to field the most capable military force in the world. Because national defense is so very important, congressional watchdogging of defense spending is very essential. We don't want one single dollar to be wasted—not even a penny.

Until the Defense Department is able to earn a clean opinion on a very regular basis, we have no assurance that Defense dollars are being spent wisely and, most importantly, according to law. Report after report shows that precious Defense dollars are being wasted, misused, and unaccounted for. Reforms have been made, but very clearly the war on waste has not been won. Much more work needs to be done.

From my oversight post in the Senate, I will continue to apply pressure on the Pentagon to step up the war on waste. I don't expect much help from the inspector general. Mr. Fine seems to be AWOL on waste. I raised the issue of the $10,000 toilet seat cover with him over a month ago and still haven't received an answer. His office found the time to update the media about the toilet seat cover. Yet my letter has gone unanswered.

However, after revelations about the $43 million gas station, Secretary Mattis's reaction was sweet music to my ears. He issued an all-hands memo. In that memo, he stated flatout: I will not tolerate that kind of waste. Known for being a man of your word, Secretary Mattis, I am counting on you for your help. Maybe together we can wipe out the culture of indifference toward the American people's money by the Pentagon.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FAMILY SEPARATION

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Mr. President, I want to share with my colleagues and the American people what I witnessed on a visit to a couple of immigration detention facilities on our southern border and the stories of the people, children, and infants being held there.

On a visit to an adult detention facility, I sat down with a group of six mothers whose children had been taken from them. One of them, Anna, had a 5-year-old daughter she brought with her to the United States. After witnessing a brutal murder in her neighborhood and receiving death threats in her home country, she decided to leave that country to keep her 5-year-old daughter safe.

She traveled 3,000 miles to get to our southern border, and when she finally arrived, she thought: I am safe. I made it. I am going to tell them who I am and why I am here because I know I finally made it to safety.

She flagged down Customs and Border Patrol agents thinking that they would help her, but when she did, CBP officials arrested her. They took her into custody, and then they separated her from her daughter. Anna's daughter was put on a bus and driven hundreds of miles away.

As Anna was telling this story to me, every single one of the mothers began to cry. Anna told me this was the first time she had ever been separated from her 5-year-old daughter, and she had no idea—no idea—where her daughter was and what they were doing with her. All of the women, as Anna was telling me the story, had experienced the same thing.

Each one of the women I spoke with had children under the age of 12 who were taken away from them. Their stories were the same. They had all faced horrific gang violence and abuse in their home country and fled to protect their families. They had been raped and tortured. They saw loved ones killed before their very eyes.

Another one of the women I spoke with, Griselda, explained that in her community, the gangs expect extortion payments every week from business owners, such as herself, and if you can't pay, they come to your house and kidnap or rape or kill your children.

One day, gang members came and started threatening her son. She knew in that moment she had two options: stay and watch her son die or pack up her children and run.

I asked the group of women: Why didn't you go to the police for help? They explained to me that the police in their country are just as corrupt as the gangs. In their country, there is no rule of law. There are no protections. If you want to save your children's lives, your only option is to run, and that is what these women did.

They came to the United States expecting to find freedom and protection, but instead they were thrown in jail, and their children were loaded on buses and driven away. These parents want to now know, where are their children?

When they asked me, I told them I didn't have the information they needed, and that I, too, was asking the same questions, but I promised them I would take their stories back with me to Washington, DC, and share them with the American people.

Because of President Trump's inhumane family separation policy, we have almost 3,000 children separated from their parents. Their moms and dads just want to have their children back in their arms.

Just recently, Secretary Azar testified that there is no reason why any parent would not know where their child is located. Well, that is absolutely false. I spoke with 10 mothers and fathers who have no clue where their children are. They look at me with tears running down their faces. They pleaded with me to help them find their children.

This administration gave no thought to the damage inflicted on these families, and they clearly had no plan for how they would reunite them.

We have three different entities working to reunify these families. Two are under the umbrella of the Department of Homeland Security, U.S. Customs and Border Protection and Immigration and Customs Enforcement, and one under the Department of Health and Human Services, the Office of Refugee Resettlement, but none of them are working together. As a result, the Trump administration has missed its court-ordered deadline to reunite young children under 5 with their parents.

There are 102 children under 5 years old waiting to be reunited with their families, but as far as we know, only 4 families have been united.

The Trump administration has been ordered to reunite up to 3,000 children with their parents by July 26, but they are on track to miss that deadline too.

In the midst of all of this, HHS officials discovered they have been holding a toddler, who may be a U.S. citizen, in detention for over a year. How could that be possible? How could the reunification process be so erratic, inefficient, and slow?

This administration has been making excuses left and right, trying to pin the blame on anyone but themselves. They have suggested that the reunification process is slow because too many Members of Congress are taking tours of these detention facilities. I couldn't help but laugh when I heard that because I can guarantee you, I was not taking a tour when I tried to enter a children's detention facility, and they locked me out. They would not let me in. I was not allowed in to check on the condition of these children or even to talk to anyone in charge about how they were taking care of children, toddlers, and infants—kids under the age of 12 who have been separated from their parents, many for the first time.

I was there to find out how taxpayer money was being spent and how the kids were being treated, but the facilities manager locked the door and gave me the number for a communications director to call to seek assistance. With a handful of exceptions, most of my colleagues have also been turned away.

The Trump administration is also saying they are having trouble locating some of the parents. Part of the problem is, at least 12 of the parents with children under 5 years old have already been deported. Can you imagine that? Babies who can't even speak have no clue where their moms and dads went, and they might never know.

The Trump administration can't pin the blame for this on Congress, Democrats, or anyone else. They are missing the deadline for one reason and one reason only: because they never made a plan to reunite these families. They never intended to.

They didn't have a plan 2 weeks ago, when I went down to the border, and they don't have one now. They created this chaos with no plan to put the broken pieces back together.

They had to start from scratch trying to locate parents and children detained across the country, and now we are hearing heartbreaking stories of reunification—toddlers who do not recognize their mothers anymore. The physiological trauma this administration has inflicted on these children will last a lifetime.

So, today, I am calling on President Trump to finally do his job and provide us with a concrete plan. I want to see results, and I will not stop fighting until every child has been reunited with their parents. Stop making excuses. Stop blaming Democrats for the crisis you created, President Trump.

The other thing I keep hearing from this administration and from President Trump's allies is, the Democrats want open borders. This is not about open borders. I support strong, secure borders. I have spent my career fighting to uphold the law as the attorney general of the State of Nevada for 8 years, fighting to secure our borders. It is not about secure borders. We need a plan to reunite these families because this is about our values. This is about human rights. This is about who we are as a country, and separating families is not who we are. We do not tear babies out of their mothers' arms.

We have always—always—had a guiding principle when it comes to children: We do no harm. Whether they are Honduran children, Guatemalan children, Salvadoran children, or American children, we do no harm.

I call on President Trump, abandon your inhumane, zero tolerance immigration policy; abandon the heartless decision to separate families.

We should be looking for humane, cost-effective alternatives to detention for families fleeing violence. We don't need the Department of Defense to build internment camps for babies, toddlers, and kids.

Locking up families who are seeking asylum under the laws we have put in place to protect them will be a moral stain on our country for generations to come.

President Trump, the American people demand that you explain how you plan to reunite these families you have scarred forever and whom you ripped apart. Work with Democrats to solve the refugee crisis in Central America. Don't treat innocent parents and children as political pawns. Don't turn your back on everything this country stands for.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY). The majority leader.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume legislative session for a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REMEMBERING ROGER L. SHERMAN

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. President, I wish to acknowledge the loss of one of West Virginia's brightest and recognize the life of a dedicated advocate, educator, veteran, and good man: Roger L. Sherman.

Throughout his life, Roger was known for his dedication to responsible forestry and the people of rural West Virginia. From championing economic development to advancing graduate-level education, Roger made significant contributions in the areas of public advocacy, education, and community service that benefit West Virginians to this day. Above all, Roger was highly regarded as a man of conscience, whose integrity pervaded every aspect of his life and work.

A veteran, Roger served in the U.S. Army for 3 years until 1969. He graduated from North Carolina State University with a bachelor's of science in forestry and went on to obtain a master's degree in forestry from Yale University. He joined Westvaco as public affairs forester in 1977, and from there, embarked on a more than 40-year career advancing the interests of private landowners in West Virginia. During this time, he served as volunteer chair of the legislative committee of the West Virginia Forestry Association, WVFA, a position he held for 38 years. He also received numerous awards and recognitions, including the Outstanding Service to Forestry Award

and the President's Service Award from the WVFA and the Society of American Foresters' John A. Beale Memorial Award; and in 2011, he was inducted into the West Virginia Agriculture and Forestry Hall of Fame.

In addition to his storied career, Roger was an active participant in his community and various organizations. He was a board member of the West Virginia Chamber of Commerce and forcefully advocated for the interests of rural West Virginia, organizing the informal rural caucus in the West Virginia House of Delegates. He also organized and obtained funding for a graduate-level course in economics that he cotaught with professors at West Virginia University.

Above all, Roger was a man of faith and family. He is survived by his beloved wife, Marlo, and son, Zachary, as well as his mother and sister.

Roger's love of forestry and West Virginia lives on through the positive impacts he made on the State and countless West Virginians. He approached his job with integrity and positivity, and I think I speak for many when I say he will be sorely missed. It was an honor to call him a friend and fellow West Virginian.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO BRIGADIER GENERAL MICHAEL T. HESTON

● Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, today I wish to honor BG Michael T. Heston of Richmond, VT. This Sunday, July 15, 2018, Brigadier General Heston will relinquish command of the Vermont Army National Guard and celebrate his military retirement. We are truly fortunate to have such a dedicated leader as Brigadier General Heston serving in our Armed Forces, and I sincerely thank him for his 32 years of extraordinary service to Vermont and our country.

Brigadier General Heston began his military career as an enlisted member of the U.S. Marine Corps Reserve. He received his commission from Vermont's officer candidate school in 1990 as a second lieutenant and then swiftly rose through the ranks, reaching his current rank of brigadier general in 2014.

Throughout his career, Brigadier General Heston has commanded at all levels, from platoon leader of an armor platoon to commanding the entire Vermont Army National Guard, leading the women and men of the Green Mountain Boys in critical missions within our State of Vermont, as well as overseas, including three deployments to Afghanistan in support of Operation Enduring Freedom. His unwavering leadership and dedication has been recognized with numerous awards and decorations, including the Bronze Star Medal with bronze oakleaf cluster, the Meritorious Service Medal with three oakleaf clusters, the Army Commendation Medal with three oakleaf clusters, the Army Reserve Components Achievement Medal with silver oakleaf cluster and two oakleaf clusters, the Vermont Career Service Award, and many others.

In addition to his military service, Brigadier General Heston served as a member of the Vermont State police from 1983 until his retirement in 2009. He has also served as the deputy adjutant general of the Vermont National Guard since 2014, a position he will continue to fill as he enters civilian life. We are fortunate to continue benefiting from Brigadier General Heston's many years of experience as he mentors leaders and members of Vermont's National Guard and provides invaluable advice and support to the adjutant general.

There is no doubt that Brigadier General Heston's decades of dedication, leadership, and service will be long remembered by a grateful State and Nation. I know his wife, June, their children Kelsey and Keegan, and his fellow members of the Vermont National Guard join me in congratulating him on his many accomplishments so far and wishing him well in the next phase of his career. The State of Vermont is lucky to count him as one of our own, and we look forward to his continued presence with the Vermont National Guard.●

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 11:18 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1700. An act to amend the Small Business Act to reauthorize the SCORE program, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1861. An act to award a Congressional Gold Medal in honor of Lawrence Eugene ''Larry'' Doby in recognition of his achievements and contributions to American major league athletics, civil rights, and the Armed Forces during World War II.

H.R. 2259. An act to amend the Peace Corps Act to expand services and benefits for volunteers, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2655. An act to amend the Small Business Act to expand intellectual property education and training for small businesses, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4537. An act to preserve the State-based system of insurance regulation and provide greater oversight of and transparency on international insurance standards setting processes, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5626. An act to amend the Intercountry Adoption Act of 2000 to require the Secretary of State to report on intercountry adoptions from countries which have significantly reduced adoption rates involving immigration to the United States, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5729. An act to restrict the department in which the Coast Guard is operating from implementing any rule requiring the use of biometric readers for biometric transportation security cards until after submission to Congress of the results of an assessment of the effectiveness of the transportation security card program.

H.R. 5749. An act to require the appropriate Federal banking agencies to increase the risk-sensitivity of the capital treatment of certain centrally cleared exchange-listed options and derivatives, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5793. An act to authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to carry out a housing choice voucher mobility demonstration to encourage families receiving such voucher assistance to move to lower-poverty areas and expand access to opportunity areas.

H.R. 5877. An act to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to allow for the registration of venture exchanges, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5953. An act to provide regulatory relief to charitable organizations that provide housing assistance, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5970. An act to require the Securities and Exchange Commission to carry out a cost benefit analysis of the use of Form 10–Q and for other purposes.

H.R. 6139. An act to require the Securities and Exchange Commission to carry out a study to evaluate the issues affecting the provision of and reliance upon investment research into small issuers.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH) announced that on today, July 11, 2018, he has signed the following enrolled bills, which were previously signed by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MCHENRY) of the House:

H.R. 1496. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3585 South Vermont Avenue in Los Angeles, California, as the ''Marvin Gaye Post Office''.

H.R. 2673. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 514 Broadway Street in Pekin, Illinois, as the ''Lance Corporal Jordan S. Bastean Post Office''.

H.R. 3183. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 13683 James Madison Highway in Palmyra, Virginia, as the ''U.S. Navy Seaman Dakota Kyle Rigsby Post Office''.

H.R. 4301. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 201 Tom Hall Street in Fort Mill, South Carolina, as the ''J. Elliott Williams Post Office Building''.

H.R. 4406. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 99 Macombs Place in New York, New York, as the ''Tuskegee Airmen Post Office Building''.

H.R. 4463. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 6 Doyers Street in New York, New York, as the ''Mabel Lee Memorial Post Office''.

H.R. 4574. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 108 West Schick Road in Bloomingdale, Illinois, as the ''Bloomingdale Veterans Memorial Post Office Building''.

H.R. 4646. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1900 Corporate Drive in Birmingham, Alabama, as the ''Lance Corporal Thomas E. Rivers, Jr. Post Office Building''.

H.R. 4685. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 515 Hope Street in Bristol, Rhode Island, as the ''First Sergeant P. Andrew McKenna Jr. Post Office''.

H.R. 4722. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 111 Market Street in Saugerties, New York, as the ''Maurice D. Hinchey Post Office Building''.

H.R. 4840. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located

at 567 East Franklin Street in Oviedo, Florida, as the ''Sergeant First Class Alwyn Crendall Cashe Post Office Building''.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH) announced that on today, July 11, 2018, he has signed the following enrolled bills, which were previously signed by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MITCHELL) of the House:

H.R. 219. An act to correct the Swan Lake hydroelectric project survey boundary and to provide for the conveyance of the remaining tract of land within the corrected survey boundary to the State of Alaska.

H.R. 220. An act to authorize the expansion of an existing hydroelectric project, and for other purposes.

H.R. 446. An act to extend the deadline for commencement of construction of a hydroelectric project.

H.R. 447. An act to extend the deadline for commencement of construction of a hydroelectric project.

H.R. 951. An act to extend the deadline for commencement of construction of a hydroelectric project.

H.R. 2122. An act to reinstate and extend the deadline for commencement of construction of a hydroelectric project involving Jennings Randolph Dam.

H.R. 2292. An act to extend a project of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission involving the Cannonsville Dam.

H.R. 5956. An act to incentivize the hiring of United States workers in the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and for other purposes.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 1700. An act to amend the Small Business Act to reauthorize the SCORE program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

H.R. 4537. An act to preserve the State-based system of insurance regulation and provide greater oversight of and transparency on international insurance standards setting processes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 5626. An act to amend the Intercountry Adoption Act of 2000 to require the Secretary of State to report on intercountry adoptions from countries which have significantly reduced adoption rates involving immigration to the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

H.R. 5749. An act to require the appropriate Federal banking agencies to increase the risk-sensitivity of the capital treatment of certain centrally cleared exchange-listed options and derivatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 5793. An act to authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to carry out a housing choice voucher mobility demonstration to encourage families receiving such voucher assistance to move to lower-poverty areas and expand access to opportunity areas; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 5877. An act to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to allow for the registration of venture exchanges, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 5953. An act to provide regulatory relief to charitable organizations that provide housing assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 5970. An act to require the Securities and Exchange Commission to carry out a cost benefit analysis of the use of Form 10–Q and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 6139. An act to require the Securities and Exchange Commission to carry out a study to evaluate the issues affecting the provision of and reliance upon investment research into small issuers; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bills were read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 2259. An act to amend the Peace Corps Act to expand services and benefits for volunteers, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2655. An act to amend the Small Business Act to expand intellectual property education and training for small businesses, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC–5832. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Standard for Baby Changing Products'' (Docket No. CPSC–2016–0023) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 6, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5833. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Children's Products, Children's Toys, and Child Care Articles: Determinations Regarding Lead, ASTM F963 Elements, and Phthalates for Engineered Wood Products'' (Docket No. CPSC–2017–0038) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 6, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5834. A communication from the Deputy Chief, Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Misuse of Internet Protocol (IP) Captioned Telephone Service; Telecommunications Relay Services and Speech-to-Speech Services for Individuals with Hearing and Speech Disabilities'' ((CG Docket No. 13–24) (FCC 18–79)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 29, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5835. A communication from the Associate Bureau Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Accelerating Wireline Broadband Deployment by Removing Barriers to Infrastructure Investment'' ((RIN3060–AK67) (FCC 18–74)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 2, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5836. A communication from the Associate Bureau Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Promoting Telehealth in Rural America'' ((RIN3060–AK57) (FCC 18–82)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 2, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5837. A communication from the Chief Counsel, National Telecommunications and Information Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Revision to the Manual of Regulations and Procedures for Federal Radio Frequency Management'' (RIN0660–AA35) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 2, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5838. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2017–1099)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 3, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5839. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2017–0779)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 3, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5840. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2015–1421)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 3, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5841. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2018–0507)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 3, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5842. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2017–0904)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 3, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5843. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2018–0074)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 3, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5844. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier Inc., Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2017–1247)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 3, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5845. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2018–0490)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 3, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5846. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2017–1020)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 3, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5847. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2017–1063)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 3, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5848. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Dassault Aviation Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2018–0117)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 3, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5849. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Aircraft Industries a.s. Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2018–1099)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 3, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5850. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc., Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2017–1246)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 3, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5851. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc., Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2017–1175)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 3, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5852. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Engine Alliance Turbofan Engines'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2018–0501)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 3, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5853. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Pratt and Whitney Division Turbofan Engines'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2017–0817)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 3, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5854. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; International Aero Engines Turbofan Engines'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2018–0564)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 3, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5855. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Honeywell International Inc. Turboprop and Turboshaft Engines'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2016–9450)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 3, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5856. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Gulfstream Aerospace Corporation Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2017–1163)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 3, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5857. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Gulfstream Aerospace Corporation Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2018–0104)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 3, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5858. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Part 95 Instrument Flight Rules, Miscellaneous Amendments'' ((RIN2120–AA63) (Docket No. 31201)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 3, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5859. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Class D Airspace and Class E Airspace; Greenwood, MS'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2017–0994)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 3, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5860. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Class D and E Airspace; Van Nuys, CA'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2017–0221)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 3, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5861. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Class D Airspace and Establishment of Class E Airspace; Norman, OK; and Amendment of Class E Airspace; Oklahoma City, OK'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2017–0825)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 3, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5862. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Establishment of Class D Airspace; Burns Flat, OK; Revocation of Class D Airspace; Clinton-Sherman Airport, OK; and Amendment of Class E Airspace for the following Oklahoma Towns; Burns Flat, OK; Clinton; OK; and Elk City, OK'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2017–0618)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 3, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5863. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Class E Airspace; Duncan, OK'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2018–0100)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 3, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5864. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Class E Airspace; Flint, MI, and Establishment of Class E Airspace; Owosso, MI'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2018–0020)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 3, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5865. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Class B Airspace; San Francisco, CA'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2017–0653)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 3, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5866. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Class D Airspace and Class E Airspace, and Removal of Class E Airspace; Binghamton, NY'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2017–1061)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 3, 2018; to the

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5867. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Class E Airspace; Kenansville, NC'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2017–1238)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 3, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5868. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Class E Airspace; Altoona, PA'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2018–0129)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 3, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5869. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Restricted Area R–2302; Flagstaff, AZ'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2018–0520)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 3, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5870. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Revocation of Class E Airspace; Seven Springs, PA, and Amendment of Class E Airspace; Somerset, PA'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2017–0610)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 3, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5871. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Revocation and Amendment of Class E Airspace; Phillipsburg, PA'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2017–0755)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 3, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5872. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Modification to Restricted Area R–5601F and Establishment of Restricted Area R–5601J; Fort Sill, OK'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2018–0470)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 3, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5873. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Revocation of Restricted Area R–2530, Sierra, Army Depot, CA'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2017–0476)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 3, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5874. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Establishment of Class E Airspace; Pago Pago, American Samoa'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2018–0082)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 3, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5875. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment and Removal of VOR Federal Airways in the Vicinity of Lansing, MI, and Pontiac, MI'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2017–0724)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 3, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5876. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Modification of Air Traffic Service (ATS) Route in the Vicinity of Newberry, MI'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2018–0222)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 3, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5877. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Modification of Air Traffic Service (ATS) Routes in the Vicinity of Richmond, IN'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2017–1144)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 3, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5878. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (21)'' (RIN2120–AA65) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 3, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5879. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (62)'' (RIN2120–AA65) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 3, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5880. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (20)'' (RIN2120–AA65) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 3, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5881. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (102)'' (RIN2120–AA65) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 3, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5882. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Updates to Rulemaking and Waiver Procedures and Expansion of the Equivalent Level of Safety Option'' ((RIN2120–AK76) (Docket No. FAA–2016–6761)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 3, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5883. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Regulatory Relief: Aviation Training Devices; Pilot Certification, Training, and Pilot Schools; and Other Provisions'' ((RIN2120–AK28) (Docket No. FAA–2016–6142)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 3, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5884. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zones; Recurring Events in Captain of the Port Duluth Zone'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2018–0102)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 2, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5885. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway, Surf City, NC'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2018–0604)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 2, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5886. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; San Francisco Giants Fireworks Display, San Francisco Bay, San Francisco, CA'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2018–0507)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 2, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5887. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway, Swansboro, NC'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2018–0612)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 2, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5888. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Lower Tchefuncte River, Madisonville, LA'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2018–0332)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 2, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5889. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Lower Mississippi River, New Orleans, LA'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2018–0606)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 2, 2018; to the

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5890. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Lafitte, LA'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2018–0514)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 2, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5891. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Lower Mississippi River, Reserve, LA'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2018–0587)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 2, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5892. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Willamette River, Lake Oswego, OR'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2018–0380)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 2, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5893. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Columbia River, Kennewick, WA'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2018–0633)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 2, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5894. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Tennessee River, Gilbertsville, KY'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2018–0239)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 2, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5895. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Officer Lehner Memorial Vintage Regatta; Buffalo Outer Harbor, Buffalo, NY'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2018–0078)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 2, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5896. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Wine and Walleye Festival; Ashtabula River, Ashtabula, OH'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2018–0468)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 2, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5897. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Lakewood Independence Day Fireworks; Lake Erie, Lakewood, OH'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2018–0467)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 2, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5898. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Monongahela mile 32.0 to 36.0, Gallatin, PA'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2018–0611)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 2, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5899. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Fireworks Display, Delaware Bay, Lewes, DE'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2018–0450)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 2, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5900. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Lower Mississippi, New Orleans, LA'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2018–0331)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 2, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5901. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zones; Marine Events held in the Captain of the Port Long Island Sound Zone'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2018–0333)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 2, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5902. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Security Zone; Seattle's Seafair Fleet Week Moving Vessels, Puget Sound, WA'' ((RIN1625–AA87) (Docket No. USCG–2018–0105)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 2, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5903. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Technical Amendment; Removal of obsolete drawbridge operating regulations'' ((RIN1625–AA09) (Docket No. USCG–2018–0443)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 2, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5904. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Special Local Regulation; Gulf of Mexico; Sarasota, FL'' ((RIN1625–AA08) (Docket No. USCG–2018–0316)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 2, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5905. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Special Local Regulation; Wyandotte Invites, Detroit River, Trenton Channel, Wyandotte, MI'' ((RIN1625–AA08) (Docket No. USCG–2018–0626)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 2, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5906. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Special Local Regulation; Corpus Christi Bay, Corpus Christi, TX'' ((RIN1625–AA08) (Docket No. USCG–2018–0340)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 2, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5907. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Special Local Regulation; Corpus Christi Bay, Corpus Christi, TX'' ((RIN1625–AA08) (Docket No. USCG–2018–0340)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 2, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5908. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Anchorage Grounds; Saint Lawrence Seaway, Cape Vincent, New York'' ((RIN1625–AA01) (Docket No. USCG–2017–1125)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 2, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5909. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Transit Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Private Investment Project Procedures'' (RIN2132–AB27) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5910. A communication from the Regulatory Ombudsman, Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Process for Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) Physicians To Be Added to the National Registry of Certified Examiners'' ((RIN2126–AB97) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5911. A communication from the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Organization; Funding and Fiscal Affairs, Loan Policies and Operations, and Funding Operations; Investment Eligibility'' (RIN3052–AC84) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2018; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–5912. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Pyroxsulam; Pesticide Tolerances'' (FRL No. 9978–15) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2018; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–5913. A communication from the Director of Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Department's development of a plan for integrated overhead persistent infrared capabilities (OSS–2018–0766); to the Committees on Appropriations; Armed Services; and Select Committee on Intelligence.

EC–5914. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Gina M. Grosso, United States Air Force, and her advancement to the grade of lieutenant general

on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–5915. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting a report on the approved retirement of General Darren W. McDew, United States Air Force, and his advancement to the grade of general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–5916. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of an officer authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of brigadier general in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–5917. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition and Sustainment), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Report to Congress on Department of Defense Fiscal Year 2017 Purchases from Foreign Entities''; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–5918. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency that was declared in Executive Order 13441 with respect to Lebanon; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–5919. A communication from the White House Liaison, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, three (3) reports relative to vacancies in the Department of Housing and Urban Development, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2018; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–5920. A communication from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report on the activities of the U.S. Economic Development Administration (EDA) for fiscal year 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–5921. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval of California Air Plan Revisions, Yolo-Solano Air Quality Management District'' (FRL No. 9980–43–Region 9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–5922. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plan Revisions; Colorado; Attainment Demonstration for the 2008 8-Hour Ozone Standard for the Denver Metro/North Front Range Nonattainment Area, and Approval of Related Revisions'' (FRL No. 9979–64–Region 8) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–5923. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Air Plan Approval; AL; Section 128 Broad Requirements for Infrastructure SIPs'' (FRL No. 9980–50–Region 4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–5924. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Delaware; Interstate Transport Requirements for the 2012 Fine Particulate Matter Standard'' (FRL No. 9980–62–Region 3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–5925. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; West Virginia; Revised Motor Vehicle Emission Budgets for the Charleston, Huntington, Parkersburg, Weirton, and Wheeling 8-Hour Ozone Maintenance Areas; Correction'' (FRL No. 9980–36–Region 3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–5926. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Miscellaneous Corrections'' ((RIN3150–AK13) (NRC–2018–0086)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–5927. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Consolidated Guidance About Materials Licenses: Program-Specific Guidance About Self-Shielded Irradiator Licenses'' (NUREG–1556, Volume 5, Revision 1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–5928. A communication from the Regulations Officer, Federal Highway Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''National Performance Management Measures; Assessing Performance of the National Highway System Freight Movement on the Interstate System, and Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program'' (RIN2125–AF76) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–5929. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Report to Congress on the Medicaid Health Home State Plan Option''; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–5930. A communication from the Chief of the Trade and Commercial Regulations Branch, Bureau of Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Import Restrictions Imposed on Archaeological and Ethnological Material from Libya'' (RIN1515–AE38) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 3, 2018; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–5931. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the designation of a group as a Foreign Terrorist Organization by the Secretary of State (OSS–2018–0767); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–5932. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed license for the export of firearms, parts, and components abroad controlled under Category I of the U.S. Munitions List of semi-automatic pistols to Canada for commercial resale in the amount of $1,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 18–035); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–5933. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) and (d) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed license for the manufacture of significant military equipment abroad and the export of defense articles, including technical data, and defense services to Japan to support the manufacture of the Mk 45 Mod 4 gun system in the amount of $100,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 18–030); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–5934. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed license for the export of firearms, parts, and components abroad controlled under Category I of the U.S. Munitions List of automatic rifles, silencers, and spare parts to Indonesia in the amount of $1,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 17–108); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–5935. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed license for the export of firearms, parts, and components abroad controlled under Category I of the U.S. Munitions List of 12.7 x 99mm and 7.62 x 51mm machine guns with primary and spare barrels and accessories for Saudi Arabia in the amount of $1,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 18–093); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–5936. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed transfer of major defense equipment of 25 F/A–18A/B aircraft, including spare parts and support equipment from the Government of Australia, to the Government of Canada with a sales value of $40,000,000 (Transmittal No. RSAT–18–6183); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–5937. A communication from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Annual Report to Congress on the Activities of the Western Hemisphere Institute for Security Cooperation for 2017''; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–5938. A communication from the Executive Secretary, U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), transmitting, pursuant to law, two (2) reports relative to vacancies in the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2018; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–5939. A communication from the Secretary of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Program Integrity and Improvement'' (RIN1840–AD39) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2018; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–5940. A communication from the Regulations Coordinator, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Health, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Federal Policy for the Protection of Human Subjects: Six Month Delay of the General Compliance Date of Revisions While Allowing the Use of Three Burden-Reducing Provisions during the Delay Period'' (RIN0937–AA05) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 18, 2018; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–5941. A communication from the Officer, Office for Civil Rights and Civil Liberties, Department of Homeland Security,

transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department's fiscal year 2017 annual report relative to the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act); to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5942. A communication from the Director of the Peace Corps, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Office of Inspector General's Semiannual Report for the period of October 1, 2017 through March 31, 2018; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Ms. MURKOWSKI, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute and an amendment to the title:

S. 1459. A bill to establish Fort Sumter and Fort Moultrie National Park in the State of South Carolina, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 115–295).

By Ms. MURKOWSKI, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, without amendment and an amendment to the title:

S. 1646. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study of President Station in Baltimore, Maryland, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 115–296).

By Ms. MURKOWSKI, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with an amendment:

H.R. 2786. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act with respect to the criteria and process to qualify as a qualifying conduit hydropower facility (Rept. No. 115–297).

By Mr. BURR, from the Select Committee on Intelligence:

Report to accompany S. 3153, An original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2018 and 2019 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 115–298).

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF COMMITTEE

The following executive report of a nomination was submitted:

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, for the Committee on Foreign Relations I report favorably the following nomination list which was printed in the RECORD on the date indicated, and ask unanimous consent, to save the expense of reprinting on the Executive Calendar that this nomination lie at the Secretary's desk for the information of Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

*Foreign Service nomination of Jason Alexander.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. SMITH, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 3192. A bill to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act to update and modernize the reporting requirements for contaminants, including lead, in drinking water, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. LEE:

S. 3193. A bill to limit the establishment or extension of national monuments in the State of Utah; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. WARREN (for herself, Mr. NELSON, Mr. WYDEN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. SMITH, Mr. LEAHY, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. UDALL, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. REED, and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 3194. A bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to cap prescription drug cost-sharing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CARDIN:

S. 3195. A bill to encourage greater community accountability of law enforcement agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PORTMAN (for himself, Mr. UDALL, Mr. COONS, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. BURR):

S. 3196. A bill to defend economic livelihoods and threatened animals in the greater Okavango River Basin, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mr. WARNER):

S. 3197. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to promote retirement savings on behalf of small business employees by making improvements to SIMPLE retirement accounts and easing the transition from a SIMPLE plan to a 401(k) plan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. LEE:

S. 3198. A bill to require annual reports on allied contributions to the common defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mr. COTTON, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. CASSIDY, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. HELLER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mrs. ERNST, Mr. DAINES, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. CRAPO, and Mr. LEE):

S. Res. 572. A resolution supporting the officers and personnel who carry out the important mission of U.S. Immigration and Custom Enforcement; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 539

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 539, a bill to designate the area between the intersections of 16th Street, Northwest and Fuller Street, Northwest and 16th Street, Northwest and Euclid Street, Northwest in Washington, District of Columbia, as ''Oswaldo Paya Way'' .

S. 684

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 684, a bill to establish a national, research-based, and comprehensive home study assessment process for the evaluation of prospective foster parents and adoptive parents and provide funding to States and Indian tribes to adopt such process.

S. 1121

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1121, a bill to establish a postsecondary student data system.

S. 1278

At the request of Mr. CARPER, the names of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) were added as cosponsors of S. 1278, a bill to provide for the admission of the State of Washington, D.C. into the Union.

S. 1308

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) were added as cosponsors of S. 1308, a bill to increase authorized funding for the Soo Locks.

S. 1503

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1503, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in recognition of the 60th anniversary of the Naismith Memorial Basketball Hall of Fame.

S. 1933

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1933, a bill to focus limited Federal resources on the most serious offenders.

S. 2037

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2037, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 regarding proprietary institutions of higher education in order to protect students and taxpayers.

S. 2101

At the request of Mr. DONNELLY, the names of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. CORKER) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) were added as cosponsors of S. 2101, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the crew of the USS Indianapolis, in recognition of their perseverance, bravery, and service to the United States.

S. 2109

At the request of Mr. CARPER, the name of the Senator from Minnesota

(Ms. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2109, a bill to count revenues from military and veteran education programs toward the limit on Federal revenues that certain proprietary institutions of higher education are allowed to receive for purposes of section 487 of the Higher Education Act of 1965, and for other purposes.

S. 2406

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2406, a bill to advance cutting-edge research initiatives of the National Institutes of Health.

S. 2490

At the request of Mr. SCOTT, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2490, a bill to amend the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act of 1974 to modify requirements related to mortgage disclosures.

S. 2835

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2835, a bill to require a study of the well-being of the newsprint and publishing industry in the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 2845

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) were added as cosponsors of S. 2845, a bill to provide collective bargaining rights for public safety officers employed by States or their political subdivisions.

S. 2946

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2946, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to clarify the meaning of the terms ''act of war'' and ''blocked asset'', and for other purposes.

S. 3063

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3063, a bill to delay the reimposition of the annual fee on health insurance providers until after 2020.

S. 3125

At the request of Mr. ROUNDS, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3125, a bill to modify the H–2B nonimmigrant returning worker exemption.

S. 3172

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3172, a bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to establish, fund, and provide for the use of amounts in a National Park Service Legacy Restoration Fund to address the maintenance backlog of the National Park Service, and for other purposes.

S. 3178

At the request of Ms. HARRIS, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3178, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to specify lynching as a deprivation of civil rights, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 61

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 61, a resolution calling on the Department of Defense, other elements of the Federal Government, and foreign governments to intensify efforts to investigate, recover, and identify all missing and unaccounted-for personnel of the United States.

S. RES. 525

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 525, a resolution designating September 2018 as National Democracy Month as a time to reflect on the contributions of the system of government of the United States to a more free and stable world.

S. RES. 557

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 557, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding the strategic importance of NATO to the collective security of the transatlantic region and urging its member states to work together at the upcoming summit to strengthen the alliance.

AMENDMENT NO. 3393

At the request of Ms. SMITH, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3393 intended to be proposed to H.R. 8, a bill to provide for improvements to the rivers and harbors of the United States, to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mr. WARNER):

S. 3197. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to promote retirement savings on behalf of small business employees by making improvements to SIMPLE retirement accounts and easing the transition from a SIMPLE plan to a 401(k) plan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, Ensuring that more Americans are better prepared financially for retirement is one of my top priorities.

That is why I rise today to introduce the SIMPLE Plan Modernization Act with my colleague from Virginia, Senator MARK WARNER. Our legislation will provide greater flexibility and access to both employees and their employers seeking to utilize the popular SIMPLE plans as an option for saving for retirement.

According to the non-partisan Center for Retirement Research, there is an estimated $7.7 trillion gap between the savings American households need to maintain their standard of living in retirement and what they actually have. A recent Gallup poll found that only 51 percent of working Americans believe that they will have enough money to live comfortably in retirement. Though this is the highest percentage of confidence in nearly a decade, we must continue to work to ensure that even more Americans will have the resources they need to enjoy their ''golden years.''

Another contributing factor is that employees of small businesses are much less likely to participate in employer-based retirement plans. According to a study by the PEW Charitable Trusts, roughly 30 million U.S. private-sector full-time workers continue to lack access to a work-based plan to save for retirement.

SIMPLE retirement plans were established in 1996 to encourage small businesses to provide their employees with retirement plans that are less costly and easier to navigate. A business with 100 or fewer employees can create a SIMPLE retirement savings account so long as it does not offer another employer-sponsored retirement plan.

The SIMPLE Plan Modernization Act would help to expand access to SIMPLE plans by increasing the contribution limit for most small businesses. This would achieve two important goals, Mr. President: first, it would encourage more small businesses to offer a retirement savings benefit to their employees; and second, it would allow employees of small businesses to save even more for retirement each year on a tax-deferred basis.

This legislation is a win-win proposition for retirement security. There are many small employers that simply cannot afford a 401(k) plan. For them, this legislation would provide enhanced savings opportunities. At the same time, the legislation is carefully constructed to prevent employers with a 401(k) plan from dropping that plan to adopt a SIMPLE plan. And the legislation preserves strong incentives for small businesses that become more successful to move from a SIMPLE plan to a 401(k) plan. We believe our approach will encourage businesses and their employees to take steps to save for retirement, and eventually move towards a more substantial retirement package, like a 401(k) plan.

In my home state of Maine, the vast majority of businesses are eligible to sign their employees up for SIMPLE Plans. Financial advisors from Presque Isle to Portland have shared their concerns that neither employees nor their employers are in a good position to save for retirement. We must give

small businesses and employees a better opportunity to save for retirement and this legislation will provide such an opportunity. I urge my colleagues to join Senator WARNER and me in supporting the SIMPLE Plan Modernization Act. Thank you, Mr. President.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 572—SUPPORTING THE OFFICERS AND PERSONNEL WHO CARRY OUT THE IMPORTANT MISSION OF U.S. IMMIGRATION AND CUSTOM ENFORCEMENT

Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mr. COTTON, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. CASSIDY, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. HELLER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mrs. ERNST, Mr. DAINES, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. CRAPO, and Mr. LEE) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 572

Whereas the national security interests of the United States are dependent on the brave men and women who enforce the immigration laws of the United States;

Whereas abolishing U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (referred to in this preamble as ''ICE'') would eliminate the agency responsible for removing individuals who enter or remain in the United States illegally, resulting in open borders;

Whereas the call to abolish ICE is an insult to the heroic law enforcement officers of ICE who make sacrifices every day to secure the borders and laws of the United States and to protect the safety and security of United States citizens;

Whereas abolishing ICE would allow dangerous criminal aliens, including violent and ruthless members of the MS–13 gang, to remain in communities in the United States;

Whereas, during fiscal year 2017, ICE Enforcement and Removal Operations (referred to in this preamble as ''ERO'') arrested more than 127,000 aliens with criminal convictions or charges;

Whereas criminal aliens arrested by ICE ERO in fiscal year 2017 were responsible for more than—

(1) 76,000 dangerous drug offenses;

(2) 48,000 assault offenses;

(3) 11,000 weapon offenses;

(4) 5,000 sexual assault offenses;

(5) 2,000 kidnapping offenses; and

(6) 1,800 homicide offenses;

Whereas ICE Homeland Security Investigations made 4,818 gang-related arrests in fiscal year 2017 and prevents cross-border financial crimes, money laundering, bulk cash smuggling, commercial fraud, intellectual property theft, cybercrimes, and other criminal activities;

Whereas ICE plays a key role in the worldwide fight against human trafficking and child sexual exploitation through the Blue Campaign, the Child Exploitation Investigations Unit, the Human Exploitation Rescue Operative (''HERO'') Child-Rescue Corps Program, and Homeland Security Investigations;

Whereas abolishing ICE would mean that countless illegal aliens who could pose a threat to public safety would be allowed to roam free instead of being removed from United States soil;

Whereas abolishing ICE would result in more dangerous illegal drugs flowing into communities in the United States, causing more United States citizens to needlessly suffer;

Whereas ICE plays a critical role in combatting the drug crisis facing the United States;

Whereas ICE seized more than 980,000 pounds of narcotics in fiscal year 2017, including thousands of pounds of the deadly drugs fueling the opioid crisis;

Whereas ICE seized approximately 2,370 pounds of fentanyl and 6,967 pounds of heroin in fiscal year 2017;

Whereas ICE logged nearly 630,000 investigative hours directed toward fentanyl in fiscal year 2017;

Whereas abolishing ICE would allow those drugs to remain in communities in the United States, causing more devastation;

Whereas abolishing ICE would eliminate the agency that deports aliens that pose a terrorist threat to the United States;

Whereas ICE was created in 2003 to better protect national security and public safety after the terrorists responsible for the terrorist attacks on the United States on September 11, 2001, exploited immigration rules to gain entry into the United States;

Whereas the National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States found that many of the hijackers involved in the attacks on September 11, 2001, committed visa violations;

Whereas ICE identifies dangerous individuals before they enter the United States and locates them as they violate United States immigration laws; and

Whereas abolishing ICE would enable the hundreds of thousands of foreign nationals who illegally overstay visas each year to remain in the United States indefinitely: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) expresses continued support for all officers and employees of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (referred to in this resolution as ''ICE'') who carry out the important mission of ICE;

(2) denounces calls for the complete abolishment of ICE; and

(3) supports the efforts of officers and employees of the United States Armed Forces and Federal and State law enforcement agencies who bring law and order to the borders of the United States.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. President, I have 11 requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 11, 2018, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled ''Complex Cybersecurity Vulnerabilities: Lessons Learned from Spectre and Meltdown.''

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

The Committee on Environment and Public Works is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 11, 2018, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled ''the Long-term Value to U.S. Taxpayers of Low-cost Federal Infrastructure Loans''.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 11, 2018, to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 11, 2018, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on the following nominations: Ryan Douglas Nelson, of Idaho, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit, Stephen R. Clark, Sr., to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Missouri, John M. O'Connor, to be United States District Judge for the Northern, Eastern and Western Districts of Oklahoma, Joshua Wolson, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, and James W. Carroll, Jr., of Virginia, to be Director of National Drug Control Policy.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Indian Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 11, 2018, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing on H.R. 597.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Indian Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 11, 2018, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing on S. 2599.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 11, 2018, at 10:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled ''Election Security Preparations: Federal and Vendor Perspectives''.

COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

The Committee on Rules and Administration is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 11, 2018, at 10:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled ''Election Security Preparations: Federal and Vendor Perspectives''.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PARKS

The Subcommittee on National Parks of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 11, 2018, at 3 p.m. to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON FEDERAL SPENDING OVERSIGHT AND EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT

The Subcommittee on Federal Spending Oversight and Emergency Management of the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 11, 2018, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing entitled ''Examining Warrantless Smartphone Searches at the Border''.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SOCIAL SECURITY, PENSIONS, AND FAMILY POLICY

The Subcommittee on Social Security, Pensions, and Family Policy of the Committee on Finance is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 11, 2018, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing entitled ''Examining the Importance of Paid Family Leave for American Working Families''.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my intern, Whitney Wagner, have privileges of the floor for the remainder of the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, JULY 12, 2018

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m. on Thursday, July 12; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; further, that following leader remarks, the Senate proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the Ney nomination; finally, that notwithstanding rule XXII, all postcloture time on the nomination expire at 1:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MCCONNELL. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order, following the remarks of Senators RUBIO and MERKLEY.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Florida.

ENVIRONMENTAL CRISIS IN FLORIDA

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, my home State of Florida is once again experiencing an environmental and economic catastrophe—a real crisis. It is a crisis that was caused extending back decades—decades of bad decisions, decisions made on things people didn't think about, neglect, and myopic water management. Nowhere is that crisis more acute and more apparent than at Lake Okeechobee, the liquid heart of the Everglades, and our surrounding communities, including the city of Stuart, which is on the verge of seeing conditions very similar to what they experienced in the year 2016.

That is what this picture here is about. What we see on this photo is algae—thick, toxic algae—that was gathering underneath that bridge back in 2016.

This really goes back decades. The historic Florida Everglades—the head waters began in Lake Okeechobee. This massive lake, this reservoir, is right in the center of our State. What would happen is when rainfall would come in and when water would overflow, it would just continue to flow south into the Everglades and down into the Florida Bay. But then people began to move in and develop Florida, and therefore there was a need for the Army Corps to step in and carefully script the flow of water in the southern half of Florida.

This all began since the construction of something called the Herbert Hoover Dike and then, subsequently, the development beginning in 1948 of the Central and South Florida projects to manage flood risks. Unfortunately, this flood control system that was designed to keep the water from coming out of Lake Okeechobee and flooding communities to the south of it has significant limitations and neglects to use the Everglades' natural flow wave. That is why Everglades restoration is something that, apart from ecosystem and wildlife benefits, is so critically important for our Nation and for my State of Florida. Everglades restoration is not simply about restoring a national treasure, it is also about allowing much more flexibility for water management at greatly reduced costs and at reduced harm to coastal communities.

The best way to understand it for those who are new to this issue is that we have this massive lake. The lake used to overflow, and when it did, the water would flow down. Communities and agriculture moved into the southern part of the State, just south of that lake; therefore, there was a need to construct a dam to hold back the water and prevent the flooding and loss of life, which is natural, and then a canal system to allow the waters to flow east and west.

The problem that has developed over the years is what we are dealing with now, and that is that as of today, when water levels in Lake Okeechobee rise too high, that water must be released in massive quantities. Today, the water levels are over 4½ feet deep—a full 2 feet higher than the Corps would prefer at this time of year as the rainy season kicks in. So they look at the dike and they look at its capacity and they worry that, knowing it is going to continue to rain throughout the summer, if the water levels get too high, we could have the dike compromised, and we could have flooding and loss of life. Therefore, they are forced to release water.

Last year, as an example, we saw large amounts of water and rainwater. Among other causes, of course, was Hurricane Irma, which caused Lake Okeechobee to rise to record-high levels. Again this year, Florida has experienced large amounts of rain. This rainfall carries nutrients into the lake from upstream.

The lake is in the center part of the State. Just north of it are areas such as Kissimmee and Orlando and population. People move in and fertilize their lawns, and all kinds of nutrients get into the groundwater. It rains, and it flows into Lake Okeechobee. The more it rains, the more it flows out. So the water level of the lake gets higher, and the nutrient flow into the lake also gets higher.

As we can see from these time-lapse images, when that nutrient-rich water flows in on top of the nutrient-rich water that is already there—and heat comes into play—the result is algae blooms. That is where it was on the 12th of June. This is where it was on the 20th. All of that red represents algae. This is where it was on the 21st and then on the 24th. If you looked at an image of this today, almost the entire lake is covered by thick, toxic algae.

To make sure there is no damage or threat to the dike, which itself is being worked on in order to strengthen it, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers releases water from the lake to the east to the St. Lucie River and to the west to the Caloosahatchee River. We remember it used to flow south, and now it has been diverted into these canal systems to the east and to the west. So if you are living to the west or if you are living to the east, what you know is that when these releases happen, all of that algae you see here and all of that green algae I just showed you in that picture, which is toxic and kills life, not to mention—it is harmful to people who come into contact with it, potentially even breathe it in, and all of that stuff is headed your way when those releases happen.

Unfortunately, those discharges have a catastrophic impact on the environment and on the Floridians living along our coastal ecosystems. They are especially destructive when these releases export, as I said, nutrient-rich waters with toxic blue-green algae blooms from the lake to the waterways and the estuaries that are downstream because there, those blooms—that algae, which kills fish, fouls the water, and shutters all sorts of small businesses along the coast, has a tremendous negative impact on property values, the real estate market. It creates respiratory irritation for people as well as contact dermatitis for residents who get too close to it.

Imagine you live in this area. Maybe you are a small business that depends on visitors. Maybe you invested a lot of money to retire near the water. Maybe you grew up there or lived your entire life there or spent summers there, or maybe your greatest memories are of times your family spent on the water, and this is headed your way. I assure you that this does not increase your property values; it collapses them. I assure you that it does not encourage

visitors to come to your area. It not only discourages them from coming now, but the reputation gets out, and all of these small businesses that depend on access to the water are now being threatened by that as well.

We see this picture here, this green. That is all toxic algae—all of that—on one of the waterways. That is not Chicago on St. Patrick's Day. That is not food coloring. That is toxic algae in the Caloosahatchee River. Images like this are becoming all too common for the residents in this area.

The picture does not do it justice. This is not just the color of the water; this is thick algae of a kind that is inches deep. You can imagine that everything underneath that is not just being cut off from sunlight and oxygen, but it is toxic. It is killing everything underneath it as well. You can't go underneath that water, you can't touch it, and everything that is in it is going to struggle to survive.

Over the weekend, particularly on Sunday morning, I began to raise concerns and the concerns of our coastal communities that were on the receiving end of this. Imagine if you live in one of these communities. You see the pictures of the lake that is basically all green, and you know that on Monday morning, they are going to open it up, and all of this stuff is going to come pouring down in your area. They are frightened. It is like impending doom.

We reached out to the President. We reached out to the administration. Thankfully, they acted quickly. They called the Army Corps, and the Army Corps paused the discharges that were scheduled for Monday. So on Monday—Sunday night, early Monday morning—people woke to the positive news that these releases were not going to start on Monday.

By the way, if you go over to the release points where the water is let out, it is all backed up with this algae. All you have to do is stand there and see it, and you know that as soon as they open it, all of this stuff is coming out and come at you.

They gave us this 3- or 4-day reprieve—however long it takes to allow water managers to conduct a full assessment of system conditions and to look for other available options for moving water.

While this was a positive response, it is not a long-term answer to this problem. At some point over the next few days, this is going to have to be released. It is going to happen. It is just a matter of time. And the result is that 2018 is shaping up to be another lost summer along the Caloosahatchee and Indian River Lagoon estuaries, just as it was in 2013 and just as it was in 2016.

I want to be frank. Over the last 20, 30, 10, and 5 years, the Federal Government has not done enough for anyone to expect that anything will change in the next 5 years.

Here is full candor. There are really no good, viable, short-term options that will fix this overnight. That is a fact. We know that. Ultimately, no matter how much we push the Army Corps to hold back releases, at some point they will have to because we are in rainy season, and there comes a point where the risk of flood and loss of life compels them to release some of it. You hope they pulse it. You hope they spread it out. You hope they don't release more than they need to. You hope they stretch it as much as possible. But in the end, you know it is going to happen, and so do the residents in this region. What is frustrating is that not only is the release coming, but nothing seems to be happening to prevent this from continuing on forever.

That is why it is so important for us that while we work to try to spread out these releases to minimize to the extent possible the impact they have, we have to begin to work on the things that ultimately will solve this. What ultimately will solve this are the issues that we are committed to continuing to work on. It is multipronged, and it will take a number of years to get it done.

The Senate will soon take up the water infrastructure bill. That bill is going to allow us to move forward with the Everglades agriculture area reservoir. This project, by the way, is connected to the broader project called the Central Everglades Planning Project, which the Congress authorized in 2016's water resources bill. That reservoir is vital to ensuring that more water is sent south through the Everglades as nature intended.

This reservoir will basically be at pace for some of that water—instead of having to go east and west, it can go into this reservoir south of the lake; it can be cleansed of many of those nutrients; and then, instead of being released east and west, that cleaner water could be released south into the Everglades, the way some of it once was back in the historic Everglades.

That project, that piece of it—the agriculture area reservoir—was at the Office of Management and Budget. That is why we worked with them and really spoke to them a number of times to get them to quickly approve the Army Corps' review of the storage reservoir project. I am happy for the residents of Florida and particularly these impacted areas that these efforts succeeded.

Yesterday, the administration and the Office of Management and Budget approved the Corps' review of the project so that its design and construction can now be authorized by Congress. We also must continue to move with expediency to finish the rehabilitation of the dike. We fought hard to include appropriations in the most recent disaster supplemental that would provide enough funding to, once and for all, ensure this is made a priority for completion. So I appreciate the administration's heeding this request.

Just last week, the Army Corps allocated more than $514 million for the dike. That means that with all the money needed to complete the project now allocated, the money is now available, and the dike can be finished by 2022. What we hope that means is that now that the dike is repaired and stronger, they will be able to hold back more water for longer periods of time.

But that alone isn't going to solve the problem. It will have some impact and it certainly is important, and we certainly need to do it. We never want to see the dike compromised, but, ultimately, that alone will not be enough. We have to continue to do all the other things, including the reservoir I spoke about a moment ago.

We also have to remain focused on bottlenecks at the southern end of the flow management system to allow for increased flow of water. This includes ensuring our partnership with the State of Florida, the Army Corps, and the Department of the Interior—that we all continue to work together to meet the important timelines and project funding targets.

I have spoken to President Trump about this. I recall at some point in the summer of last year, as we flew to Miami for an event, we had a chance in our flight path to fly over part of the Everglades. The President is a part-time resident of Florida; he knows the area well. Palm Beach in particular is one of the areas impacted by all this. We talked about the opportunity the President had to be the infrastructure President and, when it comes to Florida, to be the President who actually gets this done for the Florida Everglades.

I have asked him and talked to him about doubling Federal investment in Everglades restoration infrastructure, like the Central Everglades Planning Project, to clean and store and move water into South Florida's natural flood plain and away from where people live along the coasts.

In 2000, Congress authorized the Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan. It was a complete framework for everything that needs to happen, and we have to continue to move forward on finally getting it done. There were too many delays. It took too long. There wasn't enough of a Federal commitment.

Hopefully now—just in the last couple of years—we have begun to make headway on it because these infrastructure projects aren't just about restoring the Everglades. This is not just an environmental project. If it were just an environmental project, that alone would justify it, but it is not just an environmental project. It is about economic development. It is about water quality and about water supply. It is about the value of property. It is about quality of life. It impacts millions of our residents and visitors.

We have to finish the projects. We have to stay focused. If we take our eye off the ball, if we divert attention somewhere else, if we interrupt the work of these projects—every one of these delays just makes more and more

of these events. If Congress in 2000 had moved at the speed we are moving now, some of this would have been avoided, and with every year that we delay—not acting—these are the real world consequences; it only gets worse, not better.

That is why I remain committed, and among my highest priorities for the State of Florida is to get this done in a timely fashion, with the Federal support and the Federal commitment necessary to match what the State has already done with great urgency. I hope we can continue to make progress on all of this. Otherwise, we are going to have more loss, and the lives of millions of people will continue to be impacted in catastrophic ways.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

NOMINATION OF BRETT KAVANAUGH

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, the most important words of our Constitution are its first three, ''We the People.'' It is the mission statement of our Constitution, the mission statement of our country, a nation ''of the people, by the people, for the people,'' as President Lincoln so eloquently stated, not a nation by, for, and of the powerful and the privileged.

Critical to that vision of ''we the people'' is a strong and independent judiciary, particularly a strong and independent Supreme Court, since all the decisions from the lower courts can be appealed right on up to the very top.

Today, there is a vacancy on the Supreme Court with Anthony Kennedy's announced retirement. On Monday night, President Trump announced his nominee to fill that seat—Judge Brett Kavanaugh.

A single vote can make all the difference in the world on the Supreme Court in protecting the freedoms we hold dear. A single vote can tip the scales toward the vision of our Constitution, the ''we the people'' vision of our Constitution, or it can tip the scales away from that vision toward government by and for the powerful.

We can see the impact of the single vote when we look at Justice Kennedy's own legacy, his own record of 5-to-4 decisions. Time and again during his three decades on the Court, he made the deciding vote in a critical decision—a single vote making a big difference.

In 1992, he wrote the majority opinion in Planned Parenthood v. Casey, not only reaffirming Roe v. Wade but protecting a woman's fundamental right to make decisions about her own healthcare. As Justice Kennedy wrote, ''These matters, involving the most intimate and personal choices a person may make in a lifetime . . . are central to the liberty protected by the Fourteenth Amendment,'' the amendment prohibiting States from depriving a person of liberty without due process.

In 2005, he wrote the ruling in Roper v. Simmons, which barred the execution of juveniles, declaring it cruel and unusual punishment banned by the Eighth Amendment, highlighting the ''evolving standards of decency that mark the progress of a maturing society.'' Justice Kennedy said that even when a child commits the most heinous of crimes, ''the State cannot extinguish his life and his potential to attain a mature understanding of his own humanity.''

In Boumediene v. Bush, he appealed to the better angels of our nature and channeled the sentiment behind Benjamin Franklin's adage that ''Those who would give up essential Liberty, to purchase a little temporary Safety, deserve neither Liberty nor Safety'' when he wrote the majority opinion that detainees at Guantanamo Bay had the constitutional right of habeas corpus to challenge their detention.

Certainly, in looking at Justice Kennedy's legacy and the importance of a single vote, it is worth noting cases that involve the rights of opportunity for our LGBTQ brothers and sisters. Because of that 5-to-4 vote, our Nation declared finally that love is love and that everyone has the right to marry whomever they love, regardless of gender or sexual orientation.

In United States v. Windsor, he helped strike down the Defense of Marriage Act, declaring it unconstitutional under the Fifth Amendment's due process clause after the surviving spouse of a legally recognized same-sex marriage was denied the Federal estate exemption given to all surviving spouses.

Then, in Obergefell v. Hodges, he wrote: ''No union is more profound than marriage, for it embodies the highest ideals of love, fidelity, devotion, sacrifice, and family.'' Justice Kennedy went on to say that same-sex couples who sought legal recognition of their unions in the case asked only ''for equal dignity in the eyes of the law,'' and that ''the Constitution grants them that right.''

Think about these powers, these freedoms, these rights: due process under the 14th Amendment; protection from cruel and unusual punishment under the 8th Amendment; the right to petition for a writ of habeas corpus granted in article I, section 9 of the Constitution; due process under the 5th Amendment, all upheld by a single vote.

If there is any doubt about how much difference that vote can make, look at some of the recent decisions handed down by the court.

The Janus case was a 5-to-4 decision undermining the rights of workers to organize. The ability of workers to organize is a fundamental right, a key power to be able to participate in the wealth that you work to create, yet it was undermined just the week before last by a 5-to-4 court decision.

Trump v. Hawaii was a 5-to-4 decision upholding a travel ban against Muslims, effectively shutting the door of our country to a group of people simply because of their religion. What a 5-to-4 assault that was on the freedom of religion.

Abbot v. Perez was another 5-to-4 decision green-lighting racial gerrymandering in Texas, violating the Voting Rights Act.

One case after another has come down in recent weeks against ''we the people,'' decided by a single vote. How many cases are we going to see in the coming years where a single vote transforms the landscape of our country as we know it, where a single vote takes away a fundamental right in the vision of a ''we the people'' nation? That is why this nomination is so unlike any other recent confirmation; the impacts on the court and on our Nation will reverberate for decades to come.

So many core issues are under consideration: the influence of money in politics; the power of big corporations to prey on consumers and workers; marriage equality; the right of every American to have their voice heard at the ballot box. How can you believe in the foundation and vision of a democratic republic if you don't believe in voter empowerment? Yet we have members of the Supreme Court who don't. The right of every American to receive a quality education, affordable healthcare and a woman's right to choose—it is clear that the very soul of our ''we the people'' Nation is hanging in the balance.

But here is a certain circumstance that we may never have seen before; that is, we have a President who is under investigation for the possibility of colluding with an enemy, with an adversarial foreign power. In case after case, time after time, he has sought to make it difficult to conduct an investigation into the Presidency and the campaign that preceded it. He said in a tweet: ''As has been stated by numerous legal scholars, I have the absolute right to PARDON myself, but why would I do that when I have done nothing wrong?''

I ask this: Why would he tweet that topic if he is not worried about needing a pardon? He is a President who talks openly about the possibility of pardoning himself—something there is no precedent for, which no President has considered? This is the situation we are in.

With a President at this moment nominating a Supreme Court Justice who well may have the power to determine whether it is possible under our Constitution for a President to pardon himself, who may well determine under our Constitution whether a President can fire a special counsel at will, the march to an authoritarian nation is one that should concern us at this moment because that is the issue of the expansive power of the Presidency. Is it so broad, so large that the checks and balances written into the Constitution become irrelevant? This is exactly what President George Washington warned the Nation about in his Farewell Address, when he said, ''The spirit

of encroachment tends to consolidate the powers of all the departments in one, and thus to create whatever the form of government, a real despotism.'' He said this ''is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed.''

Here we have this issue of the President having chosen as a nominee, off a long list of possibilities, an individual who has gone to great lengths to talk about the President being above the law. Therefore, we have every right to worry.

About this expansive view of Executive power, in a 2009 Minnesota Law Review article, he said:

> We should not burden a sitting President with civil suits, criminal investigations, or criminal prosecutions.

He said:

> [A] possible concern is that the country needs a check against a bad-behaving or lawbreaking President. But the Constitution already provides that check. If the President does something dastardly, the impeachment process is available.

So here he is saying directly that his reading of the Constitution is that the check on the President is through impeachment.

''The President,'' he says, ''should have absolute discretion . . . whether and when to appoint an independent counsel.''

In another point, he argued that it should be the President who has the power to dismiss an independent counsel and to do so without cause. In a 1998 panel discussion called ''The Future of the Independent Counsel Statute,'' he said: ''If the President were the sole subject of a criminal investigation, I would say no one should be investigating that.''

When the moderator asked how many on the panel believed a sitting President cannot be indicted, it is Mr. Kavanaugh who raised his hand.

In his dissent in Seven-Sky vs. Holder, Kavanaugh wrote a footnote stating: ''Under the Constitution, the president may decline to enforce a statute that regulates private individuals when the president deems the statute unconstitutional, even if a court has held or would hold that statute constitutional.''

Wow, not only does this nominee believe that the only power to address a misbehaving President is impeachment—the power granted to the Congress—but also that the President has the power to ignore laws just by virtue of feeling that they are unconstitutional, even if a court says they are constitutional. That is not the system of checks and balances set up in our Constitution.

That is a big concern, and it leads us to the conclusion that when a President is under investigation for the possibility of a serious crime of collaborating with the enemy, that President should not have this Chamber considering holding hearings and proceeding to take a debate and a vote on that nominee. Let that cloud be cleared first.

There is more to be concerned about. There is a lot to be concerned about in healthcare. In Garza v. Hargan, he dissented from a decision protecting a woman's constitutional right to control her own reproductive health decisions. Then, there is Priests for Life v. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, where he wrote a dissenting opinion in which he stated that the Affordable Care Act's contraceptive coverage requirement violated religious nonprofits' religious freedom. The nonprofits said that even submitting the one-page form from the Obama administration to allow religious nonprofits to opt out might make them complicit.

As for net neutrality, in U.S. Telecom Association v. Federal Communications Commission, he wrote an opinion in favor of striking down the FCC's net neutrality rule. He argued that the net neutrality rule violated the First Amendment by ''restricting the editorial discretion of internet service providers.''

The editorial discretion of internet service providers? This issue of net neutrality is whether or not an internet service provider can charge a series of fees based on the content of the information. If you want to protect freedom of speech, then you protect net neutrality. This net neutrality issue was about whether an internet service provider can charge fees based on the type of platform you are using or the computer program you are using. It was about whether you can create a fast lane on the internet for those wealthy enough to afford it while the rest of us in America are stuck in the slow lane behind a truck going 30 miles per hour. That is what net neutrality is about.

Did he even understand the basic fundamentals of the issue? He said it is about the editorial decision of the internet service providers—talk about a decision warped and twisted and crafted to support the powerful or the fundamental opportunity for us as a nation to make rules that regulate fair opportunity on the internet.

Our Nation is at a pivotal moment. We have a Court that in a 5-to-4 decision, a 5-to-4 decision, and a 5-to-4 decision has proceeded to weigh in on behalf of the powerful, against the people, against the workers of America, against the consumers of America, against the women of America and healthcare rights in America. Now we have the possibility of a nominee being considered who wants to make the Presidency of the United States above the law, not subject to investigation, not subject to the possibility of indictment, not subject to the courts saying that a law is constitutional or unconstitutional.

Perhaps it is appropriate for a King in a kingdom but not for a democratic republic, not for a ''we the people'' constitution. That is why we absolutely should not proceed to consider this nominee until the President is cleared of the investigation for conspiring, for collaborating with an enemy of the United States of America. It is absolutely why if that cloud is cleared, we should still be dramatically concerned about the viewpoints of this nominee, who doesn't respect the healthcare opportunities and rights of Americans, who doesn't respect the government's ability to create a fair playing field, equal lanes for individuals on the internet, and who certainly doesn't understand that no one is above the law under the vision of the Constitution, not even the President of the United States.

Thank you.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 10 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 6:38 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, July 12, 2018, at 10 a.m.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate July 11, 2018:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

BRIAN ALLEN BENCZKOWSKI, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

RECOGNIZING BOB BURLESON FOR HIS YEARS OF SERVICE TO THE STATE OF FLORIDA

HON. MARIO DIAZ-BALART

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 2018

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of his retirement from the Florida Transportation Builders' Association (FTBA), I rise today to commemorate the years of service Mr. Bob Burleson has given to the state of Florida. Bob is a remarkable individual who I have had the privilege of working closely with for many years, dating back to my time in the Florida State legislature.

Mr. Burleson's retirement closes a forty year chapter in the transportation construction industry. Prior to his longstanding success at FTBA, he served as a top executive for Wiley N. Jackson Company in Virginia from 1970 to 1988. He then took the prestigious role of President of FTBA in 1989 and has remained in this capacity to this day. Due in large part to his determination and vision, Bob restored the FBTA to strong fiscal health within seven years and increased membership after previous years of steady decline.

Under his guidance at FTBA, Florida history was made in 1990 when Mr. Burleson helped secure the largest transportation funding increase for the state. Throughout his extraordinary career, he has received numerous awards, including the Golden Eagle Award by the Floridians for Better Transportation in 1997 and the CUTR's 2008 Transportation Achievement Award. Perhaps Bob's most impressive recognition was his induction into the ARTBA–TDF's Inaugural Hall of Fame, which is the nation's highest honor in the transportation construction industry, an acknowledgement which he undoubtedly deserves.

Having known Bob for many years, his determination and passion for bettering the state of Florida cannot be understated. While his approaching retirement marks a sad day for Florida, the legacy that he has imprinted will remain. I am lucky to have had the privilege of working with such a talented and honorable individual and I am grateful to be able to call Bob a close friend.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to pay tribute to my dear friend and mentor, Mr. Bob Burleson, for his outstanding accomplishments in the transportation construction industry, and I ask my fellow colleagues to join me in recognizing this remarkable individual.

REMEMBERING MR. R.C. RILEY

HON. JAMES COMER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 2018

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, today the First District of Kentucky fondly reflects on the life of Mr. R.C. Riley of Benton, Kentucky. A community leader revered for his commitment to his industry, Mr. Riley served as an integral facet of business development and economic prosperity in Western Kentucky.

Mr. Riley was instrumental in the founding, management and growth of Peel & Holland Financial Group, beginning his career in 1965 and serving the organization as President, Chief Executive Officer, and Chairman of the Board. During his tenure, he was not only a distinguished industry leader known throughout the Commonwealth, but represented the region on national association boards and garnered the most prestigious nationwide accolades in the insurance industry.

On behalf of all who knew him, I send my greatest sympathies to his family, including his two sons, Roy and Keith Riley through whom his legacy lives on. I join with his family and friends to celebrate his meaningful presence in the lives of everyone he touched and honor his outstanding legacy of selfless, compassionate service to others.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LUIS V. GUTIÉRREZ

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 2018

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent in the House chamber for Roll Call votes 314 and 315 on Tuesday, July 10, 2018. Had I been present, I would have voted Yea.

HONORING AND REMEMBERING THE LIFE OF TROOPER NICHOLAS CLARK

HON. TOM REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 2018

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and remember the life of Trooper Nicholas Clark.

A star athlete, Nick Clark made his mark at both Canisteo-Greenwood Central Schools and Alfred University. At Canisteo-Greenwood Central Schools, Nick became a two-time state champion in wrestling and excelled on the football field. While he pursued a BA in Environmental Studies at our shared Alma Mater of Alfred University, Nick was a star on the football field. He was named to the Empire 8 all-conference First Team and the conference Defensive Player of the Year for three straight seasons, breaking the Alfred University record for tackles. These accomplishments highlighted Nick's hard work and dedication that led the Buffalo Bills to offer him an invitation for a professional tryout. Following his football career, Nick directed his leadership skills and dedication towards his passion of serving others.

Nick Clark honorably served his community and the State of New York as a New York State Trooper. He graduated from the 203rd session of the Basic School in 2015 and was originally assigned to Troop C/SP Ithaca and Troop E/SP Auburn. In August 2017, Trooper Clark transferred to Troop E/SP Bath. As a lifelong resident of Steuben County, Trooper Clark spent his days at work serving the citizens that he called his friends and neighbors.

In the early morning of Monday July 2, 2018, Trooper Clark responded to a call in the town of Erwin, where he was shot and killed. He bravely answered the call to duty and lost his life while trying to selflessly protect others.

While my thoughts and prayers go out every time a member of law enforcement is killed in the line of duty, this tragedy strikes especially close to not only my home but heart. Trooper Clark bravely put his life on the line to protect his community and he should be recognized as a hero for his actions.

Trooper Clark will be missed by the communities that he served and the lives that he touched. Together, we stand with his family and friends as they mourn. I thank him for his service and pray he will rest in peace.

Given the above, I ask that this Legislative Body pause in its deliberations and join me to remember the life of Trooper Nicholas Clark.

RECOGNIZING THE UNIVERSITY OF GUAM CENTER FOR EXCELLENCE IN DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES, EDUCATION, RESEARCH AND SERVICE (GUAM CEDDERS) FOR 25 YEARS OF SERVICE TO THE COMMUNITY

HON. MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 2018

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the University of Guam Center for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities Education Research and Service (Guam CEDDERS) as they celebrate their 25th anniversary.

The University of Guam Center for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities Education, Research and Service (Guam CEDDERS), previously known as Guam University Affiliated Program (Guam UAP) on Developmental Disabilities, was founded by and continues to be led by Dr. Heidi San Nicolas. She recognized the importance of Guam being funded for the full complement of Developmental Disabilities Bill of Rights and Assistance Act Federal Programs from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services including funding for a University Affiliated Program on Developmental Disabilities providing Interdisciplinary Training, Technical Assistance and Demonstration; Research, Evaluation and Dissemination of Information and best practices on Guam.

The primary mission of UOG CEDDERS is to create partnerships and pathways to increase the quality of life of individuals with developmental disabilities and their families. Since its official founding on Feb. 14, 1993, Guam CEDDERS has remained at the forefront of providing comprehensive interdisciplinary training, technical assistance, model demonstration, clinical services, research, evaluation and dissemination of information beneficial to those with developmental disabilities and their families, and advocates on Guam and in the Western Pacific Region.

Throughout the years, the organization has grown tremendously in staff, funding, and outreach. Guam CEDDERS has been able to leverage funding in excess of $138 million to support its mission address the needs of our island's community.

Guam CEDDERS, is a dynamic, responsive and innovative organization recognized by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services as one of 67 National Centers of Excellence in Developmental Disabilities. Guam CEDDERS is also a member of the National Association of University Center on Disabilities (AUCD); and collaborates locally with Guam's Tri-Agency DD Act partners.

Guam CEDDERS is a valuable resource having worked directly in supporting priorities and needs within Guam's local agencies. Additionally, Guam CEDDERS has implemented and collaborated with institutions of higher education in offering training programs to build capacity in serving persons with developmental disabilities throughout the community. The Center has also partnered with local and national organizations to implement a variety of research initiatives related to disability on Guam.

Guam CEDDERS has provided leadership in areas of technology on Guam through creating loan programs for assistive technology for individuals with disabilities with the first low interest loan made in 2006. They have additionally collaborated with the Guam Election Commission to ensure accessibility of voting locations; established Guam's System for Assistive Technology (GSAT) Resource Center and model accessible home; partnered with the Wheelchair Foundation and disseminated 250 wheelchairs on Guam to those in need; among many other valuable contributions.

Guam CEDDERS researched, developed, and wrote Guam's Early Learning Guidelines Supports that enabled community-based child care centers to be inclusive of children with disabilities through staff training as well as facility modifications to support the inclusion of children with disabilities.

Guam CEDDERS has supported children and youth with emotional and behavior problems through administering two SAMHSA Community Action Grants. Guam CEDDERS contributed to the organization and compilation of the first and subsequent island wide needs assessment processes and summits related to disabilities leading publication of much needed resource documents for planning, policy and program development, and likewise brought together and published proceedings from Pacific Basin Interagency Leadership Consortium meetings.

Guam CEDDERS has provided education and context to federal policymakers and local policymakers regarding policy issues at the national and local level impacting individuals with disabilities; has sponsored focused input sessions; a Federal Public Hearing on the Reauthorization of IDEA; Summits and Conferences on topics including: Emergency Preparedness, Evaluation, Early Childhood, Inclusion, Employment, Self-Advocacy Transportation, and Assistive Technology; and has brought national leaders to Guam to provide Grand Rounds and other training opportunities to Guam's Physicians, specialists, and allied health providers.

Guam CEDDERS publishes many valuable newsletters and educational materials to serve its mission in a variety of languages and are available in accessible formats upon request, and are continuously updated and accessible through their website.

I commend the University of Guam Center for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities, Education Research and Service Center for their tremendous contributions to Guam and the Western Pacific area. I extend my sincere congratulations to Guam CEDDERS on their 25th Anniversary.

On behalf of the people of Guam, I thank the University of Guam CEDDERS and all government agencies and community partners for their assistance in spreading disability awareness and affirming full inclusion of all individuals with disabilities as valued, contributing citizens on Guam. I look forward to countless contributions from Guam CEDDERS as they continue to create partnerships and pathways to increase the quality of life of individuals with developmental disabilities and their families.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ALEXANDER X. MOONEY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 2018

Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, due to a family member's funeral, I was unable to attend the scheduled floor period on July 10, 2018. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 314; and YEA on Roll Call No. 315.

SOPHIA HORTIN—ILLINOIS STATE FFA PRESIDENT

HON. JOHN SHIMKUS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 2018

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Sophia Hortin for being elected Illinois' State FFA President.

Sophia's love for agriculture began on her family farm just outside of Fisher, IL. Sophia embraces all aspects of farming from cleaning grain bins, raising hogs, and even field tillage work. However, her favorite job is hauling grain to local elevators, a job Sophia has done since she got her Class B license when she was 16.

Over the course of the next calendar year, Sophia will live in Springfield, IL and work out of the State FFA office. Sophia will be leading a historic group of young leaders as she heads up the first ever all-female Illinois FFA officer team.

After Sophia completes her year-long term as State President, she will enroll in the University of Illinois Champaign-Urbana with the ultimate goal of becoming a teacher and FFA adviser.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to send my most sincere congratulations to Sophia Hortin for receiving this tremendous accomplishment.

CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 256—NATO

HON. EDWARD R. ROYCE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 2018

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, as leaders gather at the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Summit this week, it is important that we send a strong message of support and commitment for trans-Atlantic security.

For more than six decades, the NATO alliance has promoted peace, freedom, and prosperity in Europe and the United States. Its continued strength is vital to America's national interests.

Mr. Speaker, I've just returned from an important trip to the Nordic and Baltic regions, where I met with partners who are facing increasing pressure from Russia. Russia's naval vessels in the Baltic Sea are ratcheting up their aggression. Russian jets frequently violate Baltic airspace. Recently, Russia conducted its largest land based military exercises to date along the border with our Baltic allies, the ''ZAPAD'' exercises.

General Pavel, Head of NATO's Military Committee, stated that the ZAPAD exercises appeared to be a ''serious preparation for big war,'' and raised concerns that Russia's lack of communication with NATO forces nearby greatly increased the possibility that human or technological error could cause skirmishes and lead to a full-scale conflict.

After announcing its intention to increase collaboration and military exercises with U.S. Marines, Norway was directly threatened by Russian leaders that it would suffer ''consequences'' for that decision.

And our allies in the region that are not formal members of NATO, Finland and Sweden, are also feeling the pressure.

In fact, last year Sweden discovered that Russia had covertly stationed a submarine just off the coast of Stockholm.

Russia has combined its traditional military with asymmetric hostile actions, including by leveraging energy supplies for political influence as well as increasing the frequency and scope of propaganda among minority populations to destabilize and weaken Eastern and Central European countries.

House Resolution 256, authored by Congressman STEVE COHEN of Tennessee, sends a strong message of support to our allies in the region that are confronted by this increasing pressure from Russia.

Specifically, it condemns any threat to the sovereignty and territorial integrity of NATO allies and pledges that the U.S. will continue to maintain strong leadership and its commitments to the alliance.

It condemns Russia's ongoing illegal occupation of Crimea and supports maintaining related U.S. sanctions on Russia until Ukraine's sovereignty over that region is restored.

House Resolution 256 also calls for keeping related strong sanctions on Russia for its illegal and aggressive actions in the Donbas region of eastern Ukraine, and for the full implementation of the Minsk agreements which, among other things, calls for the full removal of Russian military equipment, as well as illegal armed groups, fighters and mercenaries from Ukrainian territory . . .

This resolution also supports the U.S. European Deterrence Initiative program of military support to our Eastern European and Baltic allies, and calls on our European allies to make the promised investments in their individual, regional and collective defenses in accordance to the NATO guidelines for membership.

Finally, this measure acknowledges the valuable contributions by Central and Eastern European allies to NATO's collective security and peace operations around the globe, such as ongoing operations in Iraq, Afghanistan, and Kosovo.

This is an important message to send to our allies at a critical moment in history. I encourage my colleagues to join me in support.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. STEVE RUSSELL

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 2018

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, due to travel delays out of my control, I was unable to be present for votes on July 10, 2018. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 314 and YEA on Roll Call No. 315.

ATTACK ON THE MEK RALLY

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 2018

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, recently a large group of Iranian dissidents held a peaceful rally in Paris calling for a free Iran. The participants expressed their demand for an end to the evil regime ruling Iran and a secular democracy put in its place.

We have seen countless times how the mullahs in Iran are not fans of Iranians rallying for freedom. Repeatedly they have responded with violence to crush protests in the streets of Iran, including public hangings of government protestors.

But this year they had the audacity to order an attack on the Iranian dissidents rallying in Paris. European police arrested multiple suspects armed with explosives, including an Iranian diplomat, who intended to target the rally that many Americans, including members of Congress, were attending.

The mullahs in Iran are the leading state sponsors of terrorism, so it should be no surprise that they would attempt to use terrorism to silence Iranians living in exile. The evil of this regime knows no limits. They will murder their own people wherever they speak out. Those responsible, including members of the regime in Tehran, must be held accountable.

The best hope for Iran and world peace is a regime change through free and fair elections. The land of Iran does not belong to the mullahs. It belongs to the people of Iran. It is long past time for the people of Iran to get their land back. The United States should publicly and politically support a regime change from the evil tyrants of Iran.

The cause of freedom in Iran is just and righteous. It will never be silenced. In the end democracy and justice will prevail. The torch of freedom cannot be quenched.

And that's just the way it is.

IN HONOR OF THE PROMOTION OF LIEUTENANT COLONEL PAUL R. DELANO, JR. TO THE RANK OF COLONEL

HON. CHRIS COLLINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 2018

Mr. COLLINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Paul R. Delano, Jr. as he is promoted to Colonel in the United States Air Force Reserve.

Paul Delano, Jr. enlisted into the Air Force Reserve in 1986 and was assigned to the 914th Security Police Squadron at Niagara Falls Air Reserve Station. In 2007, Paul deployed as Commander of the 407th Expeditionary Force Support Squadron, supporting Operation Iraqi Freedom. Paul then became the first Force Support Squadron Commander assigned to the 914th Airlift Wing and in 2011, he deployed as Deputy Group Commander of the 651 Air Expeditionary Group to support Operation Enduring Freedom. Recently, he served as a House Legislative Liaison Officer for Secretary of the Air Force where he guided the staff of 67 members on Air Force priorities.

In addition to his service in the Air Force Reserve, Paul joined the Buffalo Police Department in 1988, serving as Lieutenant of Narcotics and SWAT. He has two daughters, Mary and Gina. Gina enlisted in the Air Force Reserve, following in her father's footsteps at the Niagara Falls Air Reserve Station.

I congratulate Paul on his promotion from Lieutenant Colonel to Colonel and his transition to Detachment 6 Commander at MacDill Air Force Base. I thank Paul Delano, Jr. for his service to our nation, his work for the Buffalo Police Department, and his unwavering support to the Niagara Falls Air Reserve Station.

CELEBRATING THE CLINTON COUNTY FAIR'S 70TH YEAR

HON. ELISE M. STEFANIK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 2018

Ms. STEFANIK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of the Clinton County Fair's 70th celebration.

Since its debut in 1948, what was then the Clinton County Agricultural and Industrial Fair has been known for showcasing Clinton County's agricultural industry. For 70 years, the Clinton County Fair has provided the surrounding community with a family-friendly environment filled with attractions while exposing all of its attendees to the world of agriculture. Each summer, the fair welcomes community members to a variety of exciting exhibits and showcases all that the county's farmers and manufacturers have to offer. Attendees can experience livestock shows and demonstrations, a demolition derby, wildlife exhibits and more throughout the six-day celebration of the county's agricultural and industrial achievements.

On behalf of New York's 21st District, I would like to congratulate the Clinton County Fair and its board on 70 years of honoring Clinton County agriculture, and join the residents of Clinton County in celebrating the important role that agriculture plays in their daily lives.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LLOYD DOGGETT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 2018

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, due to flight difficulties out of my control, I missed the June 25th vote on H.R. 299, the Blue Water Navy Vietnam Veterans Act of 2018, a bill I have long been supportive of. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 289.

HONORING THE HISTORIC INAUGURATION OF SAN FRANCISCO MAYOR LONDON BREED

HON. NANCY PELOSI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 2018

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I proudly rise with my colleagues, Congresswoman BARBARA LEE and Congresswoman JACKIE SPEIER, to recognize a historic moment: the inauguration of London Breed as the 45th Mayor of San Francisco on this day. Her swearing-in ceremony is a civil rights and public service milestone. London Breed will be the first African-American woman and only the second woman to serve as Mayor of our city. Senator DIANNE FEINSTEIN was the first.

Mayor London Breed until recently served as President of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors and Acting Mayor, leading San Francisco following the tragic passing of Mayor Edwin Lee. Her trailblazing leadership on the Board of Supervisors began when she first won election in November 2012. In January of 2015, her colleagues elected her President of the Board. She was re-elected as District 5 Supervisor in November 2016 and unanimously re-elected as Board President two months later.

London Breed's extraordinary and historic journey to Room 200 in City Hall began in a public housing project only blocks away. Raised by her grandmother in Plaza East Public Housing in the Western Addition, she has never forgotten where she comes from. She graduated with honors from Galileo High School and attended the University of California, Davis, earning a Bachelor of Arts degree in Political Science/Public Service with a minor in African American Studies. She went on to earn a Master's degree in Public Administration from the University of San Francisco.

Before her election as District 5 Supervisor, Breed effectively served as Executive Director

of the African American Art & Culture Complex in the Western Addition for over a decade, transforming the struggling center into a vital, financially-stable community resource that provides vital after-school arts and cultural programs for youth and seniors. She has also served our city as a San Francisco Redevelopment Agency Commissioner for five years, and as a San Francisco Fire Commissioner until her election to the Board of Supervisors.

The Mayor has been a transformative leader in passing landmark legislation to increase housing along transit corridors and prioritize neighborhood residents for the affordable homes in their community. She helped transform unused public housing units into homes for homeless families, and is leading the effort to revitalize thousands more. Breed has successfully fought for more navigation centers for the homeless and launched a task force to study if safe injection facilities can help get IV drug users off the streets and into treatment, as she works to improve mental health services.

Mayor Breed has made bold, life-saving improvements to public safety in San Francisco, effectively tackling the City's ambulance response crisis in 2014 and cutting ambulance response times by over 26 percent. She has fought for more police officers, and passed a complete overhaul of the City's graffiti policies, as well as first-in-the-country legislation to protect music and nightlife venues.

Her ground-breaking legislative accomplishments are many, including passing the strongest Styrofoam ban in the country and legislation that has kept over 40 tons of medical waste out of the Bay and landfills, spearheading San Francisco's clean electrical energy program CleanPowerSF, and passing legislation to replace hundreds of Muni buses and the entire fleet of Muni trains, creating a more reliable and quiet Muni. She has consistently advocated for safe streets for all users, whether on the bus, a bike, car, or on foot.

Mayor Breed has fully dedicated her entire adult life to serving our community and improving the City's housing, environment, public safety, transportation, and quality of life. As Mayor, she will ensure that San Francisco maintains its steadfast dedication to equality, inclusivity, and justice.

We extend our warm congratulations and look forward to working with Mayor London Breed for a better future for all.

RECOGNIZING STEVE FETVEIT

HON. GREG GIANFORTE

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 2018

Mr. GIANFORTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Steve Fetveit, an award-winning broadcaster who served for decades as a trusted source for Montana news.

Steve retired as a television news anchor for NBC Montana last week, capping a distinguished 42-year broadcast career that took him throughout the state.

Steve was born and raised in Montana, graduated from Montana State University, and understands what is important to Montanans. Viewers recognized and appreciated his knowledge of our state, his easygoing personality, and his credibility.

The Greater Montana Foundation and the Montana Broadcasters Association recognized Steve as Montana's ''Television On-Air Broadcaster of the Year'' in 2006.

Steve has served the wider community of broadcast journalists, including as a board member and chairman of the Montana Broadcasters Association. His experience and professionalism are an example to the young broadcasters he mentors. He dedicates his time to up-and-coming journalists, promoting their careers and reinforcing the importance of the profession's ethics.

Dewey Bruce, president and CEO of the Montana Broadcasters Association, said, ''Steve is a fantastic newsman, very fair, and has made valuable contributions to broadcasters and the state of the Montana. He is very deserving of recognition.''

For his outstanding career as a broadcast journalist and his dedication to serving our Montana communities, I recognize Steve Fetveit for embodying the spirit of Montana.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF DR. ASAHEL ''ASH'' E. HAYES

HON. DARRELL E. ISSA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 2018

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize and celebrate the life and accomplishments of Dr. Asahel ''Ash'' E. Hayes, who passed away in California on July 10, 2018.

Ash dedicated 60 years of his abundant life to the fitness industry and inspired many others to develop a love and appreciation for exercise.

He was appointed to the President's Council on Physical Fitness and Sports by presidents Gerald Ford and Ronald Reagan. Ash served as a member of the Board of Directors of the American Council on Exercise since its inception, and continued on the Board serving as emeritus historian.

For decades, Ash served in leadership roles on local boards and committees, including the U.S. Olympics Committee, the San Diego Unified School District, the IDEA Foundation, and at his alma mater, the University of California, Los Angeles.

His lifelong advocacy of physical fitness and health continued to be recognized throughout his life. In 2007, Ash was honored with the San Diego State Alumni Association's Distinguished Alumni Service Award. And in 2009, he received the President's Council on Physical Fitness and Sports Lifetime Achievement Award. These accolades reflect Ash's strong dedication to the bettering of our community. He was a wise mentor, a supportive teacher, and most importantly, he instilled others with passion.

My deepest sympathies and prayers go to his wife Juanita and their family. While we mourn the loss of a great husband, father, mentor, and much more, we can find joy in the fact that Ash's legacy will continue to enrich the lives of generations to come.

NORTH KOREA ABUSES HUMAN RIGHTS

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 2018

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the cause of the Korean people is essential—not just from a national security perspective but also from a moral obligation as Christians. It is the duty of the free to demand justice for those who suffer under tyranny.

For decades, the North Korean regime has silenced its people and subjected thousands to the most brutal conditions on Earth. The horrific repression of the Kim family is no secret, but lately the focus has been dominated by the nuclear threat.

This is a crucial challenge which we must address. But it must not come at the cost of the Korean people. What would we say to God if we turned our backs on them? That we would have liked to help but we were too worried about our own well-being? This would be unacceptable.

We must not shut the door on their hopes for freedom so that we can live in peace. History has taught us that no man, woman, or child is safe so long as tyrants are able to rule. North Korea is only the most recent example of this enduring lesson.

The Kim regime has ruled the hermit kingdom for three generations, and throughout that time it has crushed all the liberties and human rights of the North Korean people to preserve its power. With unrivaled power over the North, the regime has turned its cruelty towards the outside world. By building nuclear weapons, the regime can hold all of humanity hostage.

Kim Jong Un is hoping through nuclear blackmail, he can force other nations into accepting his rule and his demands. Addressing the nuclear threat cannot be separate from ensuring human rights for all Koreans. The regime must be held to account for its abuses, despite the dangers.

We must not be naïve in talks with this evil regime. Many past presidents wanted to believe we could reason with them. But the Kims achieved their power through violence and oppression. Absolute control is what they are accustom to, so negotiating a mutual peace with the world achieves little for them.

For the regime, peace is only acceptable when we remove sanctions, normalize relations, and accept the unfettered imprisonment of the Korean people. But we cannot accept this. We will not be bullied or bargain away the future of Korea's children.

They are entitled to the same freedom and respect which our children enjoy. As we move forward in pursuing denuclearization on the Korean peninsula, we must also advocate for the rights of the Korean people.

For our freedom from fear is inevitably linked to the freedom of the Korean people. Democracies and free societies do not act like this regime—and certainly do not threaten other people's children to achieve their own goals. That is what terrorists do.

We must also keep in mind the broader implications of a deal with the regime. If we reward the Kim dynasty for their development of nuclear arms, we will be setting a precedent for all dictators around the world.

They will see that threatening the lives of millions with nuclear weapons brings rewards and acceptance by the international community. If a deal must be made, it must require safeguards and direct humanitarian assistance for the Korean people.

Kim Jong Un cannot be permitted to use our gestures of good will as a weapon against his people. One day the Korean people will be united in freedom and security. We have it in our power to work towards that goal.

The first step requires us not rewarding the regime's threats. And that's just the way it is.

SAM FARR AND NICK CASTLE PEACE CORPS REFORM ACT OF 2018

SPEECH OF

HON. JOSEPH P. KENNEDY III

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 2018

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, about 15 years ago, I walked into a community in the Dominican Republic with a loose grasp of the Spanish language and little idea about the history or culture of those I would be living with for the next two years.

For months, I worked hand in hand with that community to build sustainable ecotourism that continues to grow today.

Wrestling with the existing industry there was hard.

Battling with entrenched government interests was hard.

But the hardest part, the one that took months to achieve, was earning the trust of those people. People who to this day I'm proud to call some of my closest friends.

And that is what the Peace Corps is all about.

Men and women, young and old, walking into foreign lands and remote neighborhoods offering their own helping hand on behalf of this nation.

Diplomats of democracy and decency embedded in the farthest corners of our globe.

Volunteers exporting our values and our ideals in search of a kinder, fairer world.

American might can be found on battlefields and military bases, yes, but it can also be found in the college graduate teaching in a small village in India or the recent retiree teaching a stranger in Belize how to build a business.

Enactment of this bill will allow current and future Peace Corps Volunteers to carry out their important duty while improving their access to care and ensuring their safety and security abroad.

Before they even step foot on a plane, Volunteers will be made fully informed of the risks they face in the country in which they have been invited to serve.

And once the jetlag has worn off and they've written their first letter home, we will guarantee that these Volunteers will have access to well-qualified medical officers and support staff at overseas Peace Corps posts.

In addition, this bill promises to take a number of steps to address and combat instances of sexual assault by reauthorizing the Sexual Assault Advisory Council through 2023 and requiring the Peace Corps to provide information to host families regarding sexual assault prevention and awareness.

And because we recognize that tragedies can occur and this service is not without risks, for any Volunteer who returns home with a service-connected disability, this legislation will help minimize bureaucratic delay and work to ensure that they receive the medical care they deserve without delay.

Through their selfless and tireless work, Peace Corps Volunteers leave lasting, positive impressions in countries all across the world that can endure generations.

With the bipartisan passage of this bill, we are one step closer to protecting our Volunteers currently serving around the world and ensuring the Peace Corps' influence reaches new heights. I thank Congressman POE for his advocacy and his staff for helping advance this important piece of legislation.

Before concluding, I would like to offer one point of clarification.

Under Section 102 of this bill, if the Director of Peace Corps determines that the injury or illness is probably related to their service outside of the U.S., a former Peace Corps Volunteer will be able to access health care for such condition for 120 days. During this 120 period, the Department of Labor will provide a written authorization for physician or medical facility to provide medical treatment or examination to a former Peace Corps Volunteer. This authorization is referred to as a ''voucher'' under this legislation, and is the mechanism by which the Peace Corps Volunteer secures medical services from a medical provider when they seek medical services. For purposes of clarification, this voucher will be similar to Form CA–16 issued by the U.S. Department of Labor provides medical coverage for a 60 day period. Under FECA, a federal employee injured while in the performance of duty has the initial right to select a physician of his/her choice to provide necessary treatment. These medical expenses will be paid out of the Employees' Compensation Fund established under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. GRACE F. NAPOLITANO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 2018

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I was absent during roll call votes No. 314–321. Had I been present, I would have voted ''Yea'' on H.R. 5793 the Housing Choice Voucher Mobility Demonstration Act, ''Yea'' on H.R. 5749, Options Markets Stability Act, ''Nay'' on ordering the previous question on H. Res. 965, ''Nay'' on H. Res. 965, Providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 200) Strengthening Fishing Communities and Increasing Flexibility in Fisheries Management Act, ''Nay'' on H. Res. 985, ''Nay'' on H. Res. 985, Providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 50) Unfunded Mandates Information and Transparency Act and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3281) Reclamation Title Transfer and Non-Federal Infrastructure Incentivization Act, ''Yea'' on the Motion to Recommit H.R. 200, and ''Nay'' on H.R. 200, Strengthening Fishing Communities and Increasing Flexibility in Fisheries Management Act.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, July 12, 2018 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

JULY 17

9:45 a.m.

Committee on Environment and Public Works

To hold hearings to examine an original bill entitled, ''Endangered Species Act Amendments of 2018''.

SD–406

10 a.m.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To hold hearings to examine the Semi-annual Monetary Policy Report to the Congress.

SH–216

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings to examine the Department of the Interior's final list of critical minerals for 2018 and opportunities to strengthen the United States' mineral security.

SD–366

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

To hold hearings to examine reducing health care costs, focusing on eliminating excess health care spending and improving quality and value for patients.

SD–430

11 a.m.

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe

To hold hearings to examine Russia's occupation of Georgia and the erosion of the international order.

SD–124

JULY 18

9:30 a.m.

Special Committee on Aging

To hold hearings to examine supporting economic stability and self-sufficiency as Americans with disabilities and their families age.

SD–562

10 a.m.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To hold hearings to examine sharks.

SR–253

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings to examine the Administration's government reorganization proposal.

SD–342

Committee on the Judiciary
To hold hearings to examine promoting justice for victims of crime, focusing on the Federal investment in DNA analysis.
SD–226

2:30 p.m.
Committee on Finance
Subcommittee on International Trade, Customs, and Global Competitiveness
To hold hearings to examine trade and commerce at United States ports of entry.
SD–215

Committee on Indian Affairs
To hold hearings to examine S. 3060, to repeal section 2141 of the Revised Statutes to remove the prohibition on certain alcohol manufacturing on Indian lands, and S. 3168, to amend the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 to make Reclamation Water Settlements Fund permanent.
SD–628

JULY 19

10 a.m.
Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs
To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Dennis Dean Kirk, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Merit Systems Protection Board, and to be Chairman of the Merit Systems Protection Board, Julia Akins Clark, of Maryland, and Andrew F. Maunz, of Ohio, both to be a Member of the Merit Systems Protection Board, and Carmen Guerricagoitia McLean, to be an Associate Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia.
SD–342

CORRECTION

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate insisted on its amendment to H.R. 5895, Energy and Water, Legislative Branch, and Military Construction and Veterans Affairs Appropriations Act, agreed to the request from the House for a conference, and appointed conferees.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, Pages S4881–S4922

Measures Introduced: Seven bills and one resolution were introduced, as follows: S. 3192–3198, and S. Res. 572. **Page S4916**

Measures Reported:

S. 1459, to establish Fort Sumter and Fort Moultrie National Park in the State of South Carolina, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. (S. Rept. No. 115–295)

S. 1646, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study of President Station in Baltimore, Maryland. (S. Rept. No. 115–296)

H.R. 2786, to amend the Federal Power Act with respect to the criteria and process to qualify as a qualifying conduit hydropower facility, with an amendment. (S. Rept. No. 115–297)

Report to accompany S. 3153, to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2018 and 2019 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System. (S. Rept. No. 115–298) **Page S4916**

House Messages:

Energy and Water, Legislative Branch, and Military Construction and Veterans Affairs Appropriations Act: Senate insisted on its amendment to H.R. 5895, making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, agreed to the request of the House for a conference, and authorized the Chair to appoint conferees on the part of the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill to be instructed to insist on the inclusion in the final conference report the following motions proposed thereto: **Page S4890**

Adopted:

By 94 yeas to 5 nays (Vote No. 150), Cassidy Motion to Instruct Conferees to insist that the final conference report include provisions that have the effect of extending the National Flood Insurance Program, and the authority of the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to issue notes and obligations with respect to that program, through January 31, 2019. **Pages S4890–91**

By 88 yeas to 11 nays (Vote No. 151), Corker Motion to Instruct Conferees to insist that the conference report include language providing a role for Congress in making a determination under section 232 of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 (19 U.S.C. 1862). **Pages S4890–91**

The Chair appointed the following conferees on the part of the Senate: Senators Shelby, Alexander, Boozman, Daines, Lankford, Leahy, Feinstein, Schatz, and Murphy. **Page S4891**

Ney Nomination—Agreement: Senate resumed consideration of the nomination of Paul C. Ney, Jr., of Tennessee, to be General Counsel of the Department of Defense. **Pages S4897–S4909**

During consideration of this nomination today, Senate also took the following action:

By 74 yeas to 25 nays (Vote No. 153), Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the nomination. **Pages S4896–97**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the nomination, post-cloture, at approximately 10 a.m., on Thursday, July 12, 2018; and that notwithstanding Rule XXII, all post-cloture time on the nomination expire at 1:30 p.m. **Page S4919**

Nomination Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nomination:

By 51 yeas to 48 nays (Vote No. EX. 152), Brian Allen Benczkowski, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Attorney General. **Pages S4881–90, S4891–96, S4922**

Messages from the House: **Pages S4910–11**

Measures Referred: **Page S4911**

Measures Placed on the Calendar: **Page S4911**

Executive Communications: **Pages S4911–16**

Executive Reports of Committees: **Page S4916**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S4916–17**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S4917–18**

Additional Statements: **Page S4910**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Pages S4918–19**

Privileges of the Floor: **Page S4919**

Record Votes: Four record votes were taken today. (Total—153) **Page S4890–91, S4896–97**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 6:38 p.m., until 10 a.m. on Thursday, July 12, 2018. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S4919.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

CYBERSECURITY VULNERABILITIES

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Committee concluded a hearing to examine complex cybersecurity vulnerabilities, focusing on lessons learned from Spectre and Meltdown, after receiving testimony from Donna Dodson, Chief Cybersecurity Advisor, and Director, National Cybersecurity Center of Excellence, National Institute of Standards and Technology, Department of Commerce; Jose-Marie Griffiths, Dakota State University, Madison, South Dakota; Joyce Kim, Arm, San Jose, California; Art Manion, Carnegie Mellon University Software Engineering Institute, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania; and Sri Sridharan, University of South Florida Center for Cybersecurity, Tampa.

RESTORE OUR PARKS ACT

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Subcommittee on National Parks concluded a hearing to examine S. 3172, to amend title 54, United States Code, to establish, fund, and provide for the use of amounts in a National Park Service Legacy Restoration Fund to address the maintenance backlog of the National Park Service, after receiving testimony from Senator Warner; Lena McDowall, Deputy Director, Management and Administration, National Park Service, Department of the Interior; Marcia Argust, The Pew Charitable Trusts, and Kristen Brengel, National Parks Conservation Association, both of Washington, D.C.; and Holly Fretwell, Property and Environment Research Center, Bozeman, Montana.

FEDERAL INFRASTRUCTURE LOANS

Committee on Environment and Public Works: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the long-term value to United States taxpayers of low-cost Federal infrastructure loans, after receiving testimony from Douglas Holtz-Eakin, American Action Forum, Washington, D.C.; Brian Motyl, DelDOT, Dover, Delaware; and Vicente Sarmiento, Orange County Water District, Fountain Valley, California.

PAID FAMILY LEAVE

Committee on Finance: Subcommittee on Social Security, Pensions, and Family Policy concluded a hearing to examine the importance of paid family leave for American working families, after receiving testimony from Senators Ernst and Gillibrand; Andrew G. Biggs, American Enterprise Institute, and Vicki Shabo, National Partnership for Women and Families, both of Washington, D.C.; and Carolyn O'Boyle, Deloitte Services LP, Boston, Massachusetts.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. Res. 557, expressing the sense of the Senate regarding the strategic importance of NATO to the collective security of the transatlantic region and urging its member states to work together at the upcoming summit to strengthen the alliance, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute; and

A routine list in the Foreign Service.

WARRANTLESS SMARTPHONE SEARCHES

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Subcommittee on Federal Spending Oversight and Emergency Management concluded a hearing to examine warrantless smartphone searches at the border, including S. 823, to ensure the digital contents of electronic equipment and online accounts belonging to or in the possession of United States persons entering or exiting the United States are adequately protected at the border, after receiving testimony from Laura K. Donohue, Georgetown University Law Center, Neema Singh Guliani, American Civil Liberties Union, and Matthew Feeney, Cato Institute, all of Washington, D.C.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Indian Affairs: Committee ordered favorably reported H.R. 597, to take lands in Sonoma County, California, into trust as part of the reservation of the Lytton Rancheria of California.

LEECH LAKE BAND OF OJIBWE RESERVATION RESTORATION ACT

Committee on Indian Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine S. 2599, to provide for the transfer of certain Federal land in the State of Minnesota for the benefit of the Leech Lake Band of Ojibwe, after receiving testimony from Leslie Weldon, Deputy Chief, National Forest System, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture; and Faron Jackson, Sr., Leech Lake Band of Ojibwe, Cass Lake, Minnesota.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Ryan Douglas Nelson, of Idaho, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit, who was introduced by Senator Risch, Stephen R. Clark, Sr., to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Missouri, who was introduced by Senator Blunt, John M. O'Connor, to be United States District Judge for the Northern, Eastern and Western Districts of Oklahoma, who was introduced by Senator Lankford, Joshua Wolson, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, who was introduced by Senators Toomey and Casey, and James W. Carroll, Jr., of Virginia, to be Director of National Drug Control Policy, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

ELECTION SECURITY PREPARATIONS

Committee on Rules and Administration: Committee concluded a hearing to examine election security preparations, focusing on Federal and vendor perspectives, after receiving testimony from Thomas Hicks, Chair, and Christy McCormick, Vice Chair, both a Commissioner, United States Election Assistance Commission; Charles H. Romine, Director, Information Technology Laboratory, National Institute of Standards and Technology, Department of Commerce; Matt Masterson, Senior Cybersecurity Advisor, National Protection and Programs Directorate, Department of Homeland Security; Scott Leiendecker, KNOWiNK, St. Louis, Missouri; Peter Lichtenheld, Hart InterCivic, Inc., Austin, Texas; and Bryan Finney, U.S. Election Infrastructure Sector Coordinating Council, Snoqualmie, Washington.

BUSINESS MEETING

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee met in closed session to consider pending intelligence matters.

Committee recessed subject to the call.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 12 public bills, H.R. 6330–6341; and 3 resolutions, H. Res. 987–988, 990, were introduced. **Pages H6110–11**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H6112–13**

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

H.R. 5105, to establish the United States International Development Finance Corporation, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 115–814); and

H. Res. 989, providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 6237) to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2018 and 2019 for intelligence an l intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 115–815). **Page H6110**

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Marshall to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H6043**

Recess: The House recessed at 11:03 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon. **Page H6050**

Guest Chaplain: The prayer was offered by the Guest Chaplain, Rev. John Hill, Flint United Methodist Church, Alexander City, Alabama. **Page H6050**

Moment of Silence: The House observed a moment of silence in honor of those who have been killed or wounded in service to our country and all those who serve and their families. **Page H6050**

Unfunded Mandates Information and Transparency Act and Reclamation Title Transfer and Non-Federal Infrastructure Incentivization Act—Rule for Consideration: The House agreed to H. Res. 985, providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 50) to provide for additional safeguards with respect to imposing Federal mandates, and providing

for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3281) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to facilitate the transfer to non-Federal ownership of appropriate reclamation projects or facilities, by a recorded vote of 229 ayes to 183 noes, Roll No. 319, after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 228 yeas to 184 nays, Roll No. 318. **Pages H6053–57, H6064–65**

Expressing support for the countries of Eastern Europe and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization: The House agreed to discharge from committee and agree to H. Res. 256, expressing support for the countries of Eastern Europe and the North Atlantic Treaty Organizations, amended by Representative Royce. **Pages H6065–67**

Agreed to amend the title so as to read: ''Expressing support for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the countries of Central and Eastern Europe.''. **Page H6067**

Suspensions: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measure:

Crooked River Ranch Fire Protection Act: H.R. 2075, amended, to adjust the eastern boundary of the Deschutes Canyon-Steelhead Falls Wilderness Study Area in the State of Oregon to facilitate fire prevention and response activities in order to protect adjacent private property. **Pages H6067–69**

Agreed to amend the title so as to read: ''To adjust the eastern boundary of the Deschutes Canyon-Steelhead Falls and Deschutes Canyon Wilderness Study Areas in the State of Oregon to facilitate fire prevention and response activities to protect private property, and for other purposes.''. **Page H6069**

Strengthening Fishing Communities and Increasing Flexibility in Fisheries Management Act: The House passed H.R. 200, to amend the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act to provide flexibility for fishery managers and stability for fishermen, by a yea-and-nay vote of 222 yeas to 193 nays, Roll No. 321. **Pages H6069–98**

Rejected the Gomez motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Natural Resources with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with an amendment, by a yea-and-nay vote of 187 yeas to 228 nays, Roll No. 320. **Pages H6097–98**

Pursuant to the Rule, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources now printed in the bill. **Page H6076**

Agreed to:

Young (AK) amendment (No. 1 printed in H. Rept. 115–786) that strikes sections 302(c) and 307, and modifies sections 205, 207, 304, 306, 406, and 408; also includes a new section regarding voting procedures for the Western Alaska Community Development Quota Program's administrative panel; **Pages H6082–86**

Courtney amendment (No. 2 printed in H. Rept. 115–786) that creates an industry-based pilot trawl survey for the New England and Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council regions; **Pages H6086–87**

Webster (FL) amendment (No. 5 printed in H. Rept. 115–786) that waives compensatory mitigation requirements for maintenance dredging projects in certain inland waterways, inlets, or harbors; **Pages H6089–90**

Graves (LA) amendment (No. 6 printed in H. Rept. 115–786), as modified, that requires the Comptroller General to submit a report to Congress on resource rent of LAPPs in the Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic Fishery Management Councils, ways to the Treasury can reclaim that resource rent, and ways to eliminate fiduciary conflicts of interest in the South Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Councils; **Pages H6090–91**

Keating amendment (No. 7 printed in H. Rept. 115–786) that directs the Secretary to submit a plan to establish fully operational electronic monitoring and reporting procedures for the ortheast Multispecies Fishery; **Pages H6091–02**

Poliquin amendment (No. 8 printed in H. Rept. 115–786) that requires NOAA to conduct a study on all fees it charges the lobster industry and report those findings to Congress; **Pages H6092–93**

Zeldin amendment (No. 9 printed in H. Rept. 115–786) that lifts the ban on striped bass fishing in the Block Island transit zone between Montauk, NY and Block Island, RI; **Pages H6093–94**

Keating amendment (No. 10 printed in H. Rept. 115–786) that directs the Secretary to use funds collected from penalties and fines for monitoring in addition to traditional enforcement activities; and **Pages H6094–95**

Gaetz amendment (No. 11 printed in H. Rept. 115–786), as modified, that rewards the elimination of lionfish from United States waters by allowing individuals to exchange lionfish for tags authorizing fishing for certain species in addition to the number of such species otherwise authorized to be taken by such individuals. **Pages H6095–96**

Rejected:

Langevin amendment (No. 3 printed in H. Rept. 115–786) that sought to provide voting representation for Rhode Island on the Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council (MAFMC); and **Pages H6087–88**

Huffman amendment (No. 4 printed in H. Rept. 115–786) that sought to ensure that rebuilding plans are successful in rebuilding overfished fish stocks. **Pages H6088–89**

Agreed that in the engrossment of the bill, the Clerk be authorized to make technical corrections and conforming changes to the bill including the change placed at the desk. **Pages H6098–99**

H. Res. 965, the rule providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 200) was agreed to by a recorded vote of 227 ayes to 184 noes, Roll No. 317, after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 225 yeas to 186 nays, Roll No. 316. **Pages H6057–64**

Senate Referral: S. Con. Res. 41 was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. **Page H6109**

Senate Messages: Message received from the Senate and messages received from the Senate by the Clerk and subsequently presented to the House today and appear on pages H6053 and H6069.

Quorum Calls—Votes: Four yea-and-nay votes and two recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H6063, H6063–64, H6064–65, H6065, H6097–98, and H6098. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 7:28 p.m.

Committee Meetings

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Appropriations: Full Committee held a markup on FY 2019 Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill. The FY 2019 Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill was ordered reported, as amended.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE'S ROLE IN FOREIGN ASSISTANCE

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities held a hearing entitled ''Department of Defense's Role in Foreign Assistance''. Testimony was heard from Robert Jenkins, Deputy Assistant Administrator for Democracy, Conflict and Humanitarian Assistance, U.S. Agency for International Development; Jason Ladnier, Director, Office of Partnerships, Strategy, and Communications, Bureau of Conflict and Stabilization Operations, Department of State; Mark Mitchell, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Special Operations/Low-Intensity Conflict, Department of Defense; and public witnesses.

OPPORTUNITIES TO IMPROVE THE 340B DRUG PRICING PROGRAM

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Health held a hearing entitled ''Opportunities to Improve the 340B Drug Pricing Program''. Testimony was heard from Debra Draper, Director, Health Care Team, Government Accountability Office; and public witnesses.

PROTECTING CUSTOMER PROPRIETARY NETWORK INFORMATION IN THE INTERNET AGE

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Communications and Technology held a hearing entitled ''Protecting Customer Proprietary Network Information in the Internet Age''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

EXAMINING DRUG-IMPAIRED DRIVING

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Digital Commerce and Consumer Protection held a hearing entitled ''Examining Drug-Impaired Driving''. Testimony was heard from Jennifer Harmon, Assistant Director, Forensic Chemistry, Orange County Crime Laboratory, Orange County Sheriff's Department, California; and public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Financial Services: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 3555, the ''Exchange Regulatory Improvement Act''; H.R. 6177, the ''Developing and Empowering our Aspiring Leaders Act''; H.R. 6319, the ''Expanding Investment in Small Businesses Act''; H.R. 6322, the ''Enhancing Multi-Class Stock Disclosure Act''; H.R. 6324, the ''Middle Market IPO Underwriting Cost Act''; H.R. 6320, the ''Promoting Transparent Standards for Corporate Insiders Act''; H.R. 6321, the ''Investment Adviser Regulatory Flexibility Improvement Act''; and H.R. 6323, the ''National Senior Investor Initiative Act of 2018. H.R. 6321, H.R. 6319, and H.R. 6320 were ordered reported, without amendment. H.R. 3555, H.R. 6177, H.R. 6322, H.R. 6323, and H.R. 6324 were ordered reported, as amended.

ADVANCING U.S. INTERESTS IN THE WESTERN HEMISPHERE

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Advancing U.S. Interests in the Western Hemisphere''. Testimony was heard from Kenneth H. Merten, Acting Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Western Hemisphere Affairs, U.S. Department of State; and Sarah-Ann Lynch, Senior Deputy Assistant Administrator, Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean, U.S. Agency for International Development.

CHINA'S PREDATORY TRADE AND INVESTMENT STRATEGY

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on Terrorism, Nonproliferation, and Trade; and Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific held a joint hearing entitled "China's Predatory Trade and Investment Strategy". Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

DHS'S PROGRESS IN SECURING ELECTION SYSTEMS AND OTHER CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE

Committee on Homeland Security: Full Committee held a hearing entitled "DHS's Progress in Securing Election Systems and Other Critical Infrastructure". Testimony was heard from Christopher Krebs, Under Secretary, National Protection and Programs Directorate, Department of Homeland Security; and Nellie Gorbea, Secretary of State, Rhode Island.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Natural Resources: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 577, to designate a peak in the State of Nevada as Maude Frazier Mountain; H.R. 1482, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to maintain or replace certain facilities and structures for commercial recreation services at Smith Gulch in Idaho, and for other purposes; H.R. 3764, the "Little Shell Tribe of Chippewa Indians Restoration Act of 2017"; H.R. 5613, the "Quindaro Townsite National Historic Landmark Act"; H.R. 6077, the "National Comedy Center Recognition Act"; and H.R. 6302, to enact as law certain regulations relating to the taking of double-crested cormorants. H.R. 577, H.R. 1482, and H.R. 6077 were ordered reported, without amendment. H.R. 3764, H.R. 5613, and H.R. 6302 were ordered reported, as amended.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURES

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Water, Power and Oceans held a hearing on H.R. 6038, to establish a procedure for the conveyance of certain Federal property around the Dickinson Reservoir in the State of North Dakota; H.R. 6039, to establish a procedure for the conveyance of certain Federal property around the Jamestown Reservoir in the State of North Dakota, and for other purposes; H.R. 6040, the "Contra Costa Canal Transfer Act"; and H.R. 5556, the "Environmental Compliance Cost Transparency Act of 2018". Testimony was heard from Craig Headland, North Dakota State Legislative Assembly, Montpelier, North Dakota; Stephen Welch, Assistant General Manager, Contra Costa Water District, California; and Austin Ewell, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Water and Science, Department of the Interior; and public witnesses.

THE MUSLIM BROTHERHOOD'S GLOBAL THREAT

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Subcommittee on National Security held a hearing entitled "The Muslim Brotherhood's Global Threat". Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MATTHEW YOUNG POLLARD INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEARS 2018 AND 2019

Committee on Rules: Full Committee held a hearing on H.R. 6237, the "Matthew Young Pollard Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 2018 and 2019". The Committee granted, by record vote of 6–4, a rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 6237 under a structured rule. The rule provides one hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. The rule makes in order as original text for purpose of amendment an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 115–80 and provides that it shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute. The rule makes in order only those further amendments printed in the Rules Committee report. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question. The rule waives all points of order against the amendments printed in the report. The rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions. Testimony was heard from Chairman Nunes, and Representatives LoBiondo, Schiff, Hastings, Torres, and Jackson Lee.

INNOVATION NATION: HOW SMALL BUSINESSES IN THE DIGITAL TECHNOLOGY INDUSTRY USE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY

Committee on Small Business: Full Committee held a hearing entitled "Innovation Nation: How Small Businesses in the Digital Technology Industry Use Intellectual Property". Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Ways and Means: Full Committee began a markup on H.R. 6301, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide high deductible health plans with first dollar coverage flexibility; legislation

to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that direct primary care service arrangements do not disqualify deductible health savings account contributions, and for other purposes; H.R. 6305, the "Bipartisan HSA Improvement Act of 2018"; H.R. 6312, the "PHIT Act"; H.R. 6309, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow individuals entitled to Medicare Part A by reason of being over age 65 to contribute to health savings accounts; H.R. 6199, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to include certain over-the-counter medical products as qualified medical expenses; H.R. 6306, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the contribution limitation for health savings accounts, and for other purposes; H.R. 6313, the "Responsible Additions and Increases to Sustain Employee Health Benefits Act of 2018"; H.R. 4616, to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to provide for a temporary moratorium on the employer mandate and to provide for a delay in the implementation of the excise tax on high cost employer-sponsored health coverage; H.R. 6314, the "Health Savings Act of 2018"; and H.R. 6311, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to modify the definition of qualified health plan for purposes of the health insurance premium tax credit and to allow individuals purchasing health insurance in the individual market to purchase a lower premium copper plan.

Joint Meetings

JOHN S. McCAIN NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

Conferees met to resolve the differences between the Senate and House passed versions of H.R. 5515, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2019 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, but did not complete action thereon, and recessed subject to the call.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY, JULY 12, 2018

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: to hold hearings to examine the credit bureaus and the Fair Credit Reporting Act, 10 a.m., SD–538.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: to hold hearings to examine the policy issues facing interstate delivery networks for natural gas and electricity, 10 a.m., SD–366.

Committee on Foreign Relations: to hold hearings to examine tariffs, focusing on implications for United States foreign policy and the international economy, 10 a.m., SD–419.

Committee on the Judiciary: business meeting to consider S. 2946, to amend title 18, United States Code, to clarify the meaning of the terms "act of war" and "blocked asset", and the nominations of Britt Cagle Grant, of Georgia, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eleventh Circuit, David James Porter, of Pennsylvania, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Third Circuit, A. Marvin Quattlebaum, Jr., of South Carolina, and Julius Ness Richardson, of South Carolina, both to be a United States Circuit Judge for the Fourth Circuit, Roy Kalman Altman, and Rodolfo Armando Ruiz II, both to be a United States District Judge for the Southern District of Florida, Raul M. Arias-Marxuach, to be United States District Judge for the District of Puerto Rico, and Maria Chapa Lopez, to be United States Attorney for the Middle District of Florida, and Richard E. Taylor, Jr., to be United States Marshal for the Northern District of Texas, both of the Department of Justice, 10 a.m., SD–226.

Select Committee on Intelligence: to receive a closed briefing regarding certain intelligence matters, 2 p.m., SH–219.

House

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 959, the "Title VIII Nursing Workforce Reauthorization Act of 2017"; H.R. 1676, the "Palliative Care and Hospice Education and Training Act"; H.R. 3728, the "Educating Medical Professionals and Optimizing Workforce Efficiency Readiness Act of 2017"; H.R. 5385, the "Children's Hospital GME Support Reauthorization Act of 2018"; H. Res. 982, of inquiry requesting the President, and directing the Secretary of Health and Human Services, to transmit, respectively, certain information to the House of Representatives referring to the separation of children from their parents or guardians as a result of the President's "zero tolerance" policy; H.R. 2278, the "Responsible Disposal Reauthorization Act of 2017"; H.R. 2389, to reauthorize the West Valley demonstration project, and for other purposes; H.R. 1320, the "Nuclear Utilization of Keynote Energy Act"; H.R. 6140, the "Advanced Nuclear Fuel Availability Act"; H.R. 6032, the "State of Modern Application, Research, and Trends of IoT Act"; H.R. 2345, the "National Suicide Hotline Improvement Act of 2017"; H.R. 3994, the "ACCESS BROADBAND Act"; H.R. 4881, the "Precision Agriculture Connectivity Act of 2018"; H.R. 5709, the "Preventing Illegal Radio Abuse Through Enforcement Act", 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Financial Services, Full Committee, hearing entitled "The Annual Testimony of the Secretary of the Treasury on the State of the International Financial System", 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Terrorism and Illicit Finance, hearing entitled "Countering the Financial Networks of Weapons Proliferation", 2 p.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere, hearing entitled ''Nicaraguan Crisis: Next Steps to Advancing Democracy''; and markup on H. Res. 981, condemning the violence, persecution, intimidation, and murders committed by the Government of Nicaragua against its citizens, 2 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations, hearing entitled ''Combating Tuberculosis in Southern Africa'', 3 p.m., 2255 Rayburn.

Committee on Homeland Security, Subcommittee on Counterterrorism and Intelligence; and Subcommittee on Oversight and Management Efficiency, joint hearing entitled ''Access Denied: Keeping Adversaries Away from the Homeland Security Supply Chain'', 10 a.m., HVC–210.

Committee on the Judiciary, Full Committee; and full Committee of the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, hearing entitled ''Oversight of FBI and DOJ Actions Surrounding the 2016 Election: Testimony by FBI Deputy Assistant Director Peter Strzok'', 10 a.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Committee on Natural Resources, Subcommittee on Federal Lands, hearing entitled ''The Essential Role of Livestock Grazing on Federal Lands and its Importance to Rural America'', 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, Subcommittee on Energy; and Subcommittee on Research and Technology, joint hearing entitled ''Big Data Challenges and Advanced Computing Solutions'', 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Full Committee, business meeting to assign Representative Bill Flores of Texas to subcommittees; amend the Committee Rules to establish a Subcommittee on Technology Modernization; set the membership ratio of the subcommittee; assign a chair and ranking member of the subcommittee; assign majority and minority members of the subcommittee; and for other purposes, 10 a.m., 334 Cannon.

Full Committee, markup on H.R. 2409, to allow servicemembers to terminate their cable, satellite television, and Internet access service contracts while deployed; H.R. 2787, the ''VET MD Act''; H.R. 5538, to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the inclusion of certain additional periods of active duty service for purposes of suspending charges to veterans' entitlement to educational assistance under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs during periods of suspended participation in vocational rehabilitation programs; H.R. 5649, the ''Navy SEAL Chief Petty Officer William 'Bill' Mulder (Ret.) Transition Improvement Act of 2018''; H.R. 5693, the ''Long-Term Care Veterans Choice Act''; H.R. 5864, the ''VA Hospitals Establishing Leadership Performance Act''; H.R. 5882, the ''Gold Star Spouses Leasing Relief Act''; H.R. 5938, the ''Veterans Serving Veterans Act of 2018''; H.R. 5974, the ''VA COST SAVINGS Enhancements Act''; and H.R. 6066, to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the productivity of the management of Department of Veterans Affairs health care, and for other purposes, 10:15 a.m., 334 Cannon.

Committee on Ways and Means, Full Committee, continue markup on H.R. 6301, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide high deductible health plans with first dollar coverage flexibility; legislation to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that direct primary care service arrangements do not disqualify deductible health savings account contributions, and for other purposes; H.R. 6305, the ''Bipartisan HSA Improvement Act of 2018''; H.R. 6312, the ''PHIT Act''; H.R. 6309, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow individuals entitled to Medicare Part A by reason of being over age 65 to contribute to health savings accounts; H.R. 6199, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to include certain over-the-counter medical products as qualified medical expenses; H.R. 6306, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the contribution limitation for health savings accounts, and for other purposes; H.R. 6313, the ''Responsible Additions and Increases to Sustain Employee Health Benefits Act of 2018''; H.R. 4616, to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to provide for a temporary moratorium on the employer mandate and to provide for a delay in the implementation of the excise tax on high cost employer-sponsored health coverage; H.R. 6314, the ''Health Savings Act of 2018''; and H.R. 6311, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to modify the definition of qualified health plan for purposes of the health insurance premium tax credit and to allow individuals purchasing health insurance in the individual market to purchase a lower premium copper plan, 10 a.m., 1100 Longworth.

Joint Meetings

Conference: meeting of conferees on H.R. 5895, making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, 11 a.m., SVC–202/03.

Joint Economic Committee: to hold hearings to examine the innovation economy, entrepreneurship, and barriers to capital access, 2:30 p.m., SH–216.

Next Meeting of the **SENATE**

10 a.m., Thursday, July 12

Senate Chamber

Program for Thursday: Senate will continue consideration of the nomination of Paul C. Ney, Jr., of Tennessee, to be General Counsel of the Department of Defense, post-cloture, and vote on confirmation of the nomination at 1:30 p.m.

Next Meeting of the **HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

10 a.m., Thursday, July 12

House Chamber

Program for Thursday: Consideration of H.R. 3281—Reclamation Title Transfer and Non-Federal Infrastructure Incentivization Act. Consideration of H.R. 6237—Matthew Young Pollard Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 2018 and 2019 (Subject to a Rule).

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Congressional Record

The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087–390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Publishing Office, at *www.govinfo.gov*, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Publishing Office. Phone 202–512–1800, or 866–512–1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, *contactcenter@gpo.gov*. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197–9000, or phone orders to 866–512–1800 (toll-free), 202–512–1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202–512–2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Publishing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.