



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 164

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JULY 12, 2018

No. 117

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
July 12, 2018.

I hereby appoint the Honorable SCOTT DESJARLAIS 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.

CONGRATULATING PIOGA ON ITS CENTENNIAL ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, in 1918, a group of Pennsylvania crude oil and natural gas producers got together to form a trade organization. The Pennsylvania Oil, Gas and Minerals Association was formed. It is believed to be the oldest continuously operating oil and gas trade association in the United States.

In April 2010, members of the Pennsylvania Oil and Gas Association and the Independent Oil and Gas Association of Pennsylvania, IOGA, unanimously voted to merge the two organizations into a single, comprehensive trade association representing oil and natural gas interests throughout Pennsylvania.

The merger reunited two organizations that had split apart nearly some 30 years earlier to form the Pennsylvania Independent Oil and Gas Association, or PIOGA.

A century later, industry leaders, supporters, and friends will gather to celebrate PIOGA. The centennial celebration will take place next week at the birthplace of the American oil industry, Drake well in Titusville, Pennsylvania, in the Fifth Congressional District, to mark 100 years of the industry's growth and sustainability in Pennsylvania.

PIOGA represents nearly 550 members, including oil and natural gas producers, drilling contractors, service companies, manufacturers, distributors, professional firms, consultants, pipelines, end-users, royalty owners, and others with interests in the success of Pennsylvania's oil and gas industry.

The Commonwealth is blessed with abundant energy resources, particularly clean-burning natural gas. PIOGA works closely with pipelines, utilities, and end-users as well as those developing cutting-edge products and services that revolve around natural gas use.

PIOGA staff also works with educators to increase students' knowledge of energy issues that impact current and future generations of Pennsylvanians. Led by President and Executive Director Dan Weaver, PIOGA is a member-driven organization that works to realize the benefits of Pennsylvania's crude oil and natural gas.

PIOGA is based in Wexford, just north of Pittsburgh, with satellite of-

fices in McKean County and Harrisburg. The association employs an eight-person staff, and each year, PIOGA hosts several conferences, seminars, public educational meetings, presentations, and community events at a variety of locations across the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Speaker, I wish PIOGA the best as it gathers in Titusville to celebrate 100 years of growth and sustainability in the Pennsylvania oil and gas industry. The industry has a rich history in the Commonwealth, and I know that, as PIOGA looks forward to the future, it will continue to uphold the high standards and expertise for which it is known in order to provide access to affordable energy for all and help to continue to fuel our economy.

UPHOLDING CIVIL RIGHTS

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

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week, I sent a bouquet of flowers and a big Puerto Rican flag to Mia Irizarry, a young Puerto Rican woman who lives in Chicago who celebrated her 24th birthday last month.

My wife and I wanted to let her know that we support her and we admire her. You see, her birthday party at a park in Cook County, Illinois, didn't turn out the way she expected. By now, most of us have seen the video of that incident. A 62-year-old man, whom police have identified as Timothy Trybus, verbally abused and harassed Ms. Irizarry because she was wearing a shirt that depicts the flag of our U.S. colony, Puerto Rico.

What unfolds over the 30 minutes is a man physically and verbally intimidating a very polite and poised 24-year-old American woman while a uniformed police officer stands by and does nothing to intervene or help. The officer has been identified as Patrick

This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

Connor of the Forest Preserve District of the Cook County Police Department.

So an older racist yells at a young Latina because he doesn't like what she and other Puerto Ricans living in "his" community represent.

Is that news? No. Sadly, no.

While most police officers would have done the right thing in that incident, this guy was caught on tape doing the wrong thing or, more accurately, doing nothing at all.

For me, this was very personal, because something similar happened to me, and something similar has happened to most Puerto Ricans, most Latinos, most people of color, and most people who are somehow different in this country, at one point or another in their lives.

Twenty-two years ago, when I was a sophomore in Congress, I was entering one of the Capitol office buildings with my daughter, Omaira, and my niece, Maritza. I was new, and I was dressed somewhat casually, because we were just returning from a Puerto Rican celebration, and my daughter was carrying a Puerto Rican flag. The flag came unfurled as it went through the X-ray machine, and one of the officers wanted to stop us from coming in.

I showed my official ID as a Member of Congress, to which the officer said: "I don't think so," indicating that she thought my ID was a fake and that I couldn't possibly be a Member of Congress. She stated my ID was fake, in fact.

There was also the comment at the end: Why don't you and your people go back where you came from?

Twenty-two years after that incident, we are still seeing the same kind of bigotry, the same kind of misunderstanding about who Latinos and Puerto Ricans are, and the same fear that we are outsiders who don't belong here.

Sadly, the same fear and otherness is extended to other people: the handicapped, gay and lesbians, transgender Americans, immigrants, Muslims, and people of color. The list just goes on.

This is certainly not the first time, but, right now, we are in a moment in history when Americans are being told to fear other Americans. One of the reasons I think the video went viral is because it is emblematic of our times.

Bullies who do not understand the first thing about their fellow human beings—Latinos, people of color, immigrants, or Muslims—are being taught to fear that something they have is being taken away from them. Some now feel it is their right, their privilege, and maybe even their duty to go off in public and take action.

I wonder where they get such an idea.

When our President calls Puerto Ricans lazy and expensive to help, it hurts our Nation. When he calls Mexicans rapists and murderers, or calls refugees fleeing violence with their children illegal immigrants, or calls transgender soldiers a threat to our country, and says good people on both sides of a racist rally where a woman was killed are the same, it filters down.

Maybe the President is just reflecting back the fear, anger, and misunderstanding of the voters he wants to mobilize. But all the lying, hostility, and racism are clearly taking a toll on our country.

I just hope that we are all as poised as Ms. Irizarry was, if and when someone gets in your face, whether you are wearing a pussy hat, or a hijab, or a rainbow flag, or a Black lives matter T-shirt.

I hope we are all more willing than Officer Connor to take action when someone is trying to bully someone else. I know most Americans are not like Mr. Trybus, who is afflicted with fear, ignorance, and probably a substance abuse problem.

But the video makes it clear that we all have to step up to defend the United States from this tide of misogyny, homophobia, and xenophobia, and stand up for what America is really all about.

Please, let's just do it all together. If you see hate, stand up and speak.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD my letter to the Civil Rights Division at Main Justice for an investigation into this matter.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, July 10, 2018.

Hon. JOHN M. GORE,

Acting Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, Civil Rights Division, Washington, DC.

DEAR ACTING ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL GORE: I watched video footage of a woman being harassed by an intoxicated male at a forest preserve in Cook County and I write to express my outrage and demand that the Civil Rights Division does all it can to investigate this incident.

This past June, Mia Irizzary recorded her unfortunate encounter with an intoxicated male while at a Forest Preserve of Cook County park outside Chicago. An officer with the Forest Preserve looked on, avoided responding to the man and ignored the pleas for help from the woman who was being harassed. It is clear from the video that she was accosted by the man because of her ethnicity and wearing a Puerto Rican flag T-shirt. The man makes reference to his fear that Hispanics are coming to the United States to change him.

What is even more unacceptable than the man's behavior is the unwillingness of a uniformed officer to intervene when the woman's civil rights were being challenged and the man used physical and verbal intimidation. I have learned that the man was eventually arrested by a different uniformed officer and the initial officer has been consigned to "desk duty" pending an investigation.

Because of the seriousness of the encounter, the fact that it targeted the Puerto Rican community in and around my District, and growing number of anti-Latino and anti-immigrant hate crimes being reported, I demand the Civil Rights Division investigate to see if federal civil rights charges are warranted.

I would like to remind you of your division's responsibilities which are to enforce federal statutes prohibiting discrimination on the basis of race, color, sex, disability, religion, familial status and national origin.

I understand this incident on a gut level because almost exactly the same thing happened to me when I was a freshman in Congress. I was denied entry into the Capitol complex by U.S. Capitol Police despite being

a Congressman with identification, because my daughter was carrying a Puerto Rican flag and the officer doubted that I could possibly be a Member of Congress. So this kind of incident is unfortunately not unusual and though we did not have viral videos 25 years ago, I wish I had done more then to stop the kind of behavior on display in Ms. Irizzary's video, so that we can prevent the cycles of hatred and bigotry that often repeat themselves today.

Thank you and I look forward to your response. If you have any questions please contact me or Rafael Hurtado of my staff.

Sincerely,

LUIS V. GUTIÉRREZ,
Member of Congress.

HONORING CARL WALLNAU

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and the memory of an extraordinary individual from Bucks County, Pennsylvania. Carl Wallnau of Newtown passed away on June 29 at the age of 99.

A man of many talents, Carl paid for his education by playing trumpet in a jazz ensemble. He later served in World War II under General Patton, retiring from the Air Force with the rank of major in 1979.

After his service, Carl began a successful career as a lawyer and as an engineer, eventually becoming acting CEO of Swan Oil Company.

Despite his success, Carl always made time to give back to our community, serving on many charitable boards, including those of the Bucks County Industrial Development Corporation, the Bucks County Chamber of Commerce, the Delaware Valley Philharmonic, the Red Cross, and the United Way of Bucks County.

Mr. Speaker, we send our condolences to Carl's children, Carl, Lance, Kurt, and Joyce, along with the rest of his family. We thank them for sharing him with our community.

RECOGNIZING THE NORTHAMPTON PATRIOTS FLAG PROGRAM

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the Northampton Patriots Flag Program, a longstanding tradition of Northampton Township in Bucks County, Pennsylvania.

The Northampton Patriots Flag Program, established in 2003, honors Northampton residents who have served in the Armed Forces, recognizing their deployment and their return home to Bucks County. While these heroes are serving, a flag signifying their military branch is hung within the administration building of Northampton Township. Upon their return, it is replaced with an American flag.

This program recently recognized Austin Fizel, a Southampton resident who currently serves in the Air Force and who is stationed in the United Arab Emirates. We would like to extend our gratitude to Austin for his service and would like to recognize his

parents, George and Marie, along with his siblings, Derek, Kyle, and Meredith, who all attended the ceremony.

I would also like to thank a local hero who helps run the Northampton Patriots Flag Program, Pete Palestina, along with Northampton Township Chairman Barry Moore, for their work in recognizing our community's bravest citizens.

RECOGNIZING PATROL OFFICERS OF LANSDALE BOROUGH

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize three of the newest additions to the Lansdale Police Department in Montgomery County, Pennsylvania, who will serve as full-time patrol officers.

James McVeigh, who studied at Upper Perkiomen High School and Lock Haven University, graduated from the Montgomery County Police Academy in 2008. Before joining the Lansdale force, Officer McVeigh served with the Upper Perkiomen Police Department for 10 years and is now joining Lansdale.

Christian Gregory is a graduate of my alma mater, LaSalle University, and the Philadelphia Police Academy. Before joining the Lansdale force, Officer Gregory served with the SEPTA Transit Police Department.

Corey Pfister is a graduate of the Souderton Area High School, Gwynedd Mercy University, and the Montgomery County Police Academy. Before joining the Lansdale force, Officer Pfister served with the Pottstown Borough Police Department.

Mr. Speaker, I commend these officers for their bravery and their service to our community, and we wish them well in this new chapter of their careers. I would also like to recognize Police Chief Mike Trail for leading such a fine group of law enforcement professionals in our community.

RUSSIAN COLLUSION

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

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, it was almost exactly 2 years ago, as Donald Trump closed in on the Republican nomination, that the Russians began weaponizing stolen emails it had acquired some time earlier.

This disclosure of stolen emails was only one vector of the Russian active measures campaign. At the same time, the Russians were engaged in a surreptitious social media campaign and a very overt use of their paid media platforms, like Sputnik and Russia Today, to influence the American electorate.

What was this about? Was this new and unprecedented intervention in our affairs merely about choosing one candidate over another in the American Presidential system? Or was there something broader within the Russian aims?

□ 1015

It is certainly true that the Russians had a preferred candidate in Donald

Trump. Candidate Trump had talked disparagingly about NATO. He had talked about doing away with sanctions on Russia over its invasion of its neighbor. He had talked about making common cause with Russia in Syria, where our interests are not at all aligned. And most significant, he had talked about doing away with the penalties we had imposed for Russia's invasion of its neighbor, something we never thought would take place in the last century, the remaking of the map of Europe by dint of military force. That is something we thought we would never see in this century.

It is certainly true they had a preferred candidate in Donald Trump, for all those reasons. It is also true that they had a deep antipathy towards Hillary Clinton, someone who, when people gathered in massive numbers in Russia to protest fraudulent elections in 2011, spoke out on behalf of people's right to protest and assemble, something that the Kremlin felt was a direct threat to the regime.

But far more fundamental was the Russian object of sowing discord in the United States, of pitting one American against another, of playing along the fault lines in our society, of weakening the very fabric of our democracy.

It is very important to recognize that what the Russians did here, they did not do alone in the United States. Yes, it was new and unprecedented for us, but what the Russians did here, they have been doing for years elsewhere in Europe and around the world. It is an attack not only on our democracy, but on the very idea of liberal democracy. This attack takes place at a time in our lives where, when you look around the world, you must conclude objectively that the autocrats are on the rise in places like Poland and in Hungary and the rise of the far right parties in Germany, Austria, and France, with Erdogan in Turkey—Turkey is the now the leading jailer of journalists in the world—and in the Philippines with Duterte.

It cannot be said that an iron curtain is descending, but there is a rising tide of authoritarianism that threatens to submerge some of the great capitals around the globe. For those of us who had lived in the post-World War II generation, I think we were always under the assumption that our freedoms around the world were ever-increasing, that it was some immutable law of nature, that our freedom to express ourselves, to practice our faith, to associate with whom we would, was ever-increasing. To paraphrase Martin Luther King, the moral arc of the universe may be long, but it bends toward justice, only to find that today, it does not bend towards justice.

As much as the idea of America as the indispensable Nation has been given a bad name, we truly are indispensable. All around the world people look to us: people in prison who gathered in Tahrir Square wanting a better government; people in the Philippines,

the victims of a campaign of mass extrajudicial killing; people in prison in Turkey for journalism.

People all over the world look to us. They are not going to look to Russia; they are not going to look to China; they are not going to look to Europe, with all of its problems; and increasingly they do not recognize what they see. They look to our White House and they do not recognize what they see. They see a President more comfortable with autocrats and dictators than they do with Democrats and democracy. This is a terrible tragedy for us. It is a bigger tragedy for the rest of the world.

In 1938, Winston Churchill published a series of speeches he gave on the rise of Nazism. In America, the book was titled, "While England Slept." America is not sleeping, but one of its great parties is. As John Boehner said recently, the Republican Party is off taking a nap somewhere.

Wake up. Freedom-loving people all around the world are looking to us. Wake up. Our democracy is at risk at home, and the very idea of liberal democracy is at risk around the world. Wake up.

COMMEMORATING VICTIMS OF 1994 TERRORIST ATTACK AGAINST JEWISH COMMUNITY IN ARGENTINA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, next Wednesday, July 18, marks 24 years since the horrific terrorist attack on the AMIA Jewish community center in Buenos Aires, Argentina.

This attack, carried out by the Iranian-backed terror group Hezbollah, left 85 innocent people dead and many more wounded. It shook the entire Jewish community in Argentina, and all across South America, who were targeted by Hezbollah just 2 years earlier with a deadly attack at the Israeli Embassy in Buenos Aires, which left 29 dead and 250 wounded.

The AMIA bombing remains the deadliest terror attack in Argentina's history, yet its perpetrators and those responsible for the Embassy bombing have yet to be brought to justice. But that has not been for lack of trying. In fact, Special Prosecutor Alberto Nisman had dedicated his life to identifying those responsible and to bringing them to justice.

Indeed, my friend Alberto ultimately gave his life in this pursuit, having been assassinated just hours before he was to present his complaint to a court implicating then-President Cristina Fernandez de Kirchner and other high-ranking Argentine officials for covering up Iran's role in the bombings.

In 2015, President Macri of Argentina made the brave decision to assign a special prosecutor to investigate and uncover the truth surrounding

Nisman's death, which, under the Kirchner government, was ruled a suicide. But we knew the truth all along, and ultimately the official report released in 2017 confirmed that Nisman was, in fact, murdered, no doubt by those close to Iran and Hezbollah, or those implicated in Alberto's investigation.

Mr. Speaker, this is just the first step in vindicating the work for which he was murdered. But we still have a very long way to go to bring Alberto Nisman justice and see the culmination of his work, which is to hold Hezbollah accountable for these brutal terror attacks against the Jewish community in Argentina.

Last year, I, along with Chairman ROYCE, Ranking Member ENGEL, and Congressmen TED DEUTCH, JEFF DUNCAN, and ALBIO SIRES, introduced H. Res. 201, which expressed support for the government of Argentina for its investigation of the AMIA bombing in 1994 and the bombing of the Israeli Embassy in 1992. The resolution also calls on our government to assist Argentina in ensuring all those responsible for these heinous acts are held accountable.

I would urge the Argentine authorities to do everything within their power to bring all responsible parties to justice and to bring at least some form of closure to the families of over 100 killed by Hezbollah in Argentina. Argentina owes them that much. And we all owe them a chance to see Iran and Hezbollah held accountable for their horrific acts of terror.

Though the AMIA bombing was 24 years ago, and the embassy bombing 26 years ago, the Jewish communities still feel the pain, and because Hezbollah is allowed to go unchecked in many places around the globe, they know that another attack may be possible anywhere in the world.

To commemorate the AMIA bombing, and in remembrance of the lives brutally taken, the American Jewish community's Belfer Institute for Latino and Latin American Affairs will be co-hosting a memorial and candle lighting ceremony with the Skylake Synagogue in North Miami Beach. The south Florida Jewish community holds this event annually to not only commemorate the victims of this attack, but to bring attention to the threat that is Iran and Hezbollah, as well as the hostility and the discrimination that Jews around the world are still facing and the rising tide of anti-Semitism.

Mr. Speaker, as the 24th anniversary of the AMIA bombing nears, let us remember the lives lost and continue working so that these acts do not happen again, and let us work to ensure that Iran and Hezbollah may never be able to carry out such terrible acts again.

Thank you to the south Florida community members for putting together this event and for their work to help bring justice to the families of the lives lost.

MOMENT OF TRUTH

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

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, finally, Scott Pruitt is gone.

After months of scandal, 19 separate investigations, countless ethical failures, abuses of his official office at taxpayer expense, finally, this corrupt, swamp creature who has been heading our Environmental Protection Agency announced his resignation last week.

As welcome as this news is for many of us, let's be clear: Scott Pruitt was far from the only creature in the toxic Trump swamp.

Another great example is our Secretary of Commerce, Wilbur Ross, who profited from short sales in a Russian-linked navigation company. He made those short sales only after learning that journalists with The New York Times were about to expose his conflicts of interest. And apparently, while serving as our Commerce Secretary, Ross was also partial owner of a Chinese company and a Cypriot bank that is a part of Special Counsel Robert Mueller's investigation.

These are scandals that, in any other previous time, would bring down a Cabinet Secretary, but in this swamp climate of the Trump administration, it is just another news cycle and is soon supplanted by the next outrage and the next scandal.

Let's also not forget our Secretary of the Interior, Ryan Zinke, who faces many of his own scandals. Our Secretary of the Interior, of course, oversees oil and gas development on public lands. In this case, the Secretary stands to personally benefit from a land deal with the chairman of Halliburton, a company that has literally billions of dollars of business on the line when Secretary Zinke makes decisions about where, and how, oil drilling will be permitted in this country.

That is just the tip of the iceberg with this administration. It is time for this Republican Congress to wake up and take these issues seriously. Conduct some real oversight and put a stop to this culture of corruption in the Trump administration.

EXPRESSING APPRECIATION FOR WILDLAND FIREFIGHTERS

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

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to show my appreciation for the wildland firefighters who are working to protect communities and, most importantly, lives throughout Utah.

Many of these firefighters are the same men and women who risk their lives to protect our homes and businesses every day in our towns and communities across Utah.

This fire season has been one of the worst in recent memory, including six

active fires that have consumed over 85,000 acres of land. The Dollar Ridge Fire, located in Duchesne and Wasatch Counties, has consumed over 50,000 acres alone. I drove by this fire last week and saw the devastation firsthand, unable to fully imagine the heartbreak families experience as they watch the fire approach their homes and their livelihoods.

While combating these dangerous situations, wildland firefighters put themselves in harm's way to keep others safe. They work in extreme heat and unpleasant conditions to protect our communities. I will continue to support strong funding for the fire suppression-related activities that these firefighters rely on.

Today, it is important that they receive the recognition that they undoubtedly deserve. Mr. Speaker, please join me in thanking the wildland firefighters of Utah for their continued bravery in keeping Utahns safe.

HELPING SMALL BUSINESSES

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, today, I am pleased to introduce the Small Business Access to Capital and Efficiency Act, also known as Small Business ACE Act.

As a member of the Small Business Committee and a former small business owner myself, I am proud to introduce a bill that will help reduce burdensome and conflicting regulations that are keeping small businesses from growth and access to capital.

The Small Business Administration's 504 loan program helps small business owners grow their company and stimulate job creation, at no expense to taxpayers. Many favorite businesses like Magleby's Restaurant, Market Street Grill, Chobani Yogurt, FatBoys Ice Cream, and so many more, have expanded operations and hired new employees because of the SBA loan program.

I love hearing the success stories of businesses like Premier Building Supply located in Lindon, Utah, a company that started in a garage back in 2009. Since then, Premier has quickly become a leader in supplying the Utah building industry and, with the help of an SBA 504 loan, has now grown into a 50,000-square foot facility with 150 employees.

This is just one example of the many small businesses in Utah that have great potential for tremendous success if they have access to capital. However, as we see far too often, the Federal Government has maintained burdensome and conflicting regulations that weigh down the 504 program with uncertainty, and ultimately hurt the very businesses it was meant to help.

□ 1030

The Small Business ACE Act will eliminate and harmonize conflicting Federal regulations burdening the program to ensure small businesses more efficiently have access to capital without costing the taxpayer a single dollar.

I am grateful to have the support of Chairman CHABOT and stakeholders like NADCO, Mountain West Small Business Finance, and Utah CDC, who know better than anyone just how critical the 504 program is.

I am squarely on the side of helping small businesses and am committed to keeping the Federal Government from getting in the way of their success. I believe the Small Business ACE Act is a great step in the right direction, and I encourage my colleagues to support this commonsense bill.

HATE CRIMES INCREASE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. ESPAILLAT) for 5 minutes.

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Mr. Speaker, in my community and in communities across this Nation, we have seen in the past year a dramatic increase in hate crimes and attacks against immigrants and, generally, against people of color.

In New York City, we saw how a lawyer named Aaron Schlossberg launched a racial verbal attack against workers at the Fresh Kitchen restaurant in Midtown Manhattan simply because they spoke Spanish.

Think about that for a minute, Mr. Speaker. This was in New York City, a city that prides itself on being a city of immigrants, a city which touts the presence of Lady Liberty herself on the harbor. Still, this lawyer felt compelled—without any hesitation, shame, or guilt—to confront workers at the Fresh Kitchen restaurant, verbally assaulting them simply because they spoke Spanish.

Yet we keep seeing more and more examples of aggressors and harassers launching vicious attacks and directing hate speech toward those whom they wrongfully perceive to be un-American.

In another recent incident, Rodolfo Rodriguez, a senior citizen, 91 years old, was brutally attacked for his ethnic background. He is of Mexican descent. He was told to go back to his country before being brutally assaulted with a brick.

In another recent incident at the Caldwell Woods Forest Preserve, Ms. Mia Irizarry was another victim of verbal harassment, abuse, and physical intimidation in an almost unthinkable 20-minute racial rant. Her harasser caught sight of Ms. Irizarry's shirt, patterned with a Puerto Rican flag such as this one, and proceeded to verbally assault her simply for the sighting of a proud American wearing a flag that represents 3.5 million American citizens on the island of Puerto Rico and several million more here in the United States.

The perpetrator said: If you are an American citizen, you should not be wearing that shirt in America.

Let me remind him that Puerto Ricans are U.S. citizens, that they have a long and distinguished tradition

of defending freedom and democracy for our Nation across the world. They have spilled the blood of thousands in support of America and democracy.

Each of these instances and situations come on the heels of a 2017 California report, the first published since President Trump took office, indicating a 17 percent increase in hate crimes. Specifically, anti-Latino, anti-Hispanic hate crimes have soared, with increases of more than 50 percent last year.

Mr. Speaker, according to a Quinnipiac poll, 58 percent of Americans disapprove of the way Donald Trump is handling immigration, and 55 percent of Americans say that the President has made it easier for racists to share their views publicly.

Like Attorney Schlossberg in New York City, like Jones in Los Angeles and Timothy Trybus in Illinois, we find aggressors and perpetrators who do not represent our values as a nation of immigrants.

The problem we have is that these individuals have seen our leaders in elected office participate in hateful and intolerant acts with hateful and intolerant words. Whether in New York City, Los Angeles, or Cook County, we have seen naked racism and blatant bigotry.

To these bigots I say this:

(English translation of the statement made in Spanish is as follows:)

The United States is for all of us—regardless of the color of our skin or the language we speak.

Los Estados Unidos es para todos—independientemente del color de la piel o el idioma hablado.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York will provide the Clerk a translation of his remarks.

U.S. ATTACK ON BREASTFEEDING

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, sometimes it is just hard to keep track of the daily outrages: the President is not just insulting, but attacking allies like Canada on national security grounds; a tariff war; reckless and inaccurate attacks on NATO and our allies, the bedrock of stability in Europe; the President of the United States cozies up to one of the worst people on the face of the planet. Kim Jong-un, the dictator of North Korea, has imprisoned over 100,000 of his people in concentration camps, starved millions more, murdered members of his own family and is held up as some sort of exemplar by Trump. Trump says he likes the way his people pay attention to him. Well, maybe because if they don't, they get killed or sentenced to a concentration camp. This notion that we are forcibly separating children from families at the border, where the family simply is looking for asylum, inflicting probably permanent damage

on these children; and, of course, the countless environmental attacks and the activities of corrupt cronies who have been put in positions of authority.

Last week we witnessed one of the most despicable acts of this disturbing administration: The United States launched a global attack on breastfeeding—yes, breastfeeding.

Think about it for a moment. Mother's milk is the most nutritious way to feed a baby. It contains antibodies that provide it with health protections as a baby and throughout its life.

There was an innocuous resolution that was being advanced before one of the United Nations affiliates, the World Health Assembly, to promote breastfeeding.

This is a serious problem in developing countries. Global giants that sell baby formula have been touting this as a healthier, more convenient alternative. Recent studies show that less than 40 percent of poor women in developing countries are breastfeeding. The use of infant formula in these poor countries not only is inferior, not only does it lack the long-term health benefits, and is it not a cheaper alternative for low-income people. Actually, in many of these countries, mixing formula with dirty water poses a direct threat immediately to the health of the child.

Ecuador, a member of this assembly, was prepared to introduce a routine resolution promoting breastfeeding. Then this administration sprang into action, pressuring Ecuador—allegedly, with retaliation in the trade sector—to not offer the resolution. Ultimately, the bullying was successful; the resolution was not advanced by Ecuador. Although, irony of ironies, it was Russia that stepped up and moved forward with the resolution, which was ultimately adopted with minor changes.

What does it say about America and this administration that it would be doing the bidding of giant international corporations, promoting a practice that actually undermines health in many poor people? Just having a resolution promoting the benefits of breastfeeding was threatening to their business and to this administration.

We have seen a lot of disturbing and shameful acts since Trump became President, but it is hard to imagine something worse than what was on display last week.

It is time for my Republican colleagues to join us, expressing outrage about behaviors like this. We are better people, and we ought to demonstrate it.

NATIONAL DEBT

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

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call upon my colleagues to join me in addressing our Nation's rising debt. As of this week, our national debt is

over \$21 trillion, with a T. When we allocate that to each man, woman, and child, it is \$64,600—Mr. Speaker, \$64,600 for every man, woman, and child.

We are this far in debt because of irresponsible governing and a lack of political courage, regardless of which party has been in control in recent years.

The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office released its long-term budget outlook last month. It showed that the Federal debt held by the public will approach 100 percent of our gross domestic product within the next 10 years if we keep heading down this path.

Sadly, this Congress has chosen to continue this irresponsible, unsustainable fiscal course. It is irresponsible.

The tax cut legislation that our Republican colleagues rammed through Congress last December is projected to add over \$1.45 billion to the deficit over the next 10 years and \$2.2 trillion to our national debt. Some estimate that it will even be more. This is unsustainable.

That is an additional \$2.2 trillion that our children will have to pay unless we do something different. We cannot ask future generations to carry the weight of our shortsighted decisions and political cowardice. Not only is it unfair, but it is just plain wrong.

Yes, reining in our spending will be hard. It is always hard and difficult to make choices. We will get attacked by other political organizations and interest groups who dislike or disagree with our choices, but that is why we are here.

This happened in 2012, when the House had the opportunity to address the rising debt and deficit and supported a budget resolution by my colleague and good friend Congressman JIM COOPER from Tennessee. The resolution was similar to the recommendations made by the bipartisan Simpson-Bowles Commission, and it would have reduced our debt by over \$4 trillion over 10 years. It would just start to bend the curve. I stood with Congressman COOPER and 36 other House Members who supported the resolution, and a lot of groups attacked us.

President Kennedy, many years ago, wrote a book called “Profiles in Courage,” in which he wrote of individual Members of Congress who made politically tough choices. Unfortunately, there are not a lot of those political profiles in courage in Congress these days, sadly.

We were sent here to serve the American people, even when faced with difficult choices. We are not sent here to do the easy thing. We are sent here to try to do the right thing and to come together in a bipartisan fashion. That is the only way you are going to get these things done.

We must find the political courage to make the tough choices and create smart and fiscally responsible policies that will have real and lasting effects in reducing our national debt. This will

require, again, that Democrats and Republicans work together, which is, in itself, sadly, too often in rare supply these days.

But if we don’t put our partisan bickering and electoral fears aside long enough to do what is right for America, then when will we?

If we don’t make decisions now to get the Nation’s fiscal house in order, the programs on which Americans rely—important programs that most of us support like Social Security, like Medicare—will be impacted.

Mr. Speaker, on this day in 1974, the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act became law. Forty-four years ago, the 93rd Congress came together to pass this law to strengthen our budget authority and to increase the capacity to make informed and independent decisions regarding America’s budget to, in essence, put our fiscal house in order.

I stand here today, 44 years later, calling on the 115th Congress to use that information and capacity that we now have to make these difficult choices and have the political courage to put our Nation’s fiscal house back on a responsible path. It is what our country needs; it is part of America’s future; and, my fellow Americans, it is the right thing to do.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 10 o’clock and 45 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 J. Josh Smith, Prince Avenue Baptist Church, Bogart, Georgia, offered the following prayer:

Dear Father,

We pray this morning the words of Psalm 67: “God be gracious to us and bless us and cause Your face to shine upon us that Your way may be known on the Earth, Your salvation among all nations.”

Father, we humbly acknowledge today how much we need You, how we depend on You for everything.

We acknowledge in desperation how much we need Your grace, wisdom, favor, and blessing.

And although You have already blessed us beyond measure, we unashamedly ask You for more of Your blessing, not for our benefit alone, but that through us and through every decision that is made in this place, all people and all nations might come to

know Your love, grace, kindness, mercy, and salvation.

We ask these things in the name of Jesus Christ, who died so that those who trust and follow Him might live forever.

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 gentleman from Montana (Mr. GIANFORTE) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. GIANFORTE 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.

WELCOMING REVEREND J. JOSH SMITH

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JODY B. HICE) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to welcome Reverend Josh Smith as our guest chaplain here at the U.S. House of Representatives, and I greatly appreciate his leading us in prayer this morning. He has been serving in ministry for nearly 20 years.

Josh has faithfully dedicated his life to the Gospel and currently serves as senior pastor of my home church, Prince Avenue Baptist Church in the Athens, Georgia, area.

In addition to earning a bachelor’s degree in cross-cultural studies, a master of divinity, and a doctorate of ministry in expository preaching, he has worked to spread God’s Word on both a national and international level.

As a pastor myself, it gives me absolute pleasure to recognize Josh for his spiritual leadership and guidance.

I also welcome, today, his wife, Andrea, to the people’s House; and we send our best wishes to their five children, Lily, Gracie, Josie, Annalee, and Josiah, back home in Georgia.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask everyone to join me in thanking Pastor Smith for leading us today and opening this session in prayer. It is my deep privilege to not only be a member of his church, but also be a co-laborer with him for the Gospel of Jesus Christ. I am grateful for his outstanding spiritual leadership to the Athens community and the world abroad.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PALAZZO). The Chair will entertain up

to 15 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

THE NEXT SUPREME COURT JUSTICE

(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, President Donald Trump has made an excellent selection of Judge Brett Kavanaugh for the Supreme Court. The Aiken Standard lead editorial today is correct: “Brett Kavanaugh the Right Choice for Court.”

“A judge’s job is to interpret the law, not to make the law or make policy,” writes Judge Brett Kavanaugh. The judge will apply the law as written and enforce the text, structure, and original understanding of the Constitution.

Judge Brett Kavanaugh’s credentials are impeccable. He served on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia for 12 years. He has authored more than 300 opinions.

A graduate of Yale College and Yale Law School, Judge Kavanaugh has clerked on the Supreme Court under Justice Anthony Kennedy and on the Third and Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals. He has taught at Yale, Harvard, and Georgetown.

Judge Kavanaugh has devoted his life to public service, and the Senate should confirm him quickly, as America, he, and his family deserves. The biased media will fail again as it smears the judge, making up more fake news and destroying its own credibility.

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

AMBER ALERT NATIONWIDE ACT

(Ms. BORDALLO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to introduce the AMBER Alert Nationwide Act.

I thank my colleagues from the other U.S. territories for their support as original cosponsors.

In 2003, Congress passed the PROTECT Act, establishing the national AMBER Alert system to mobilize the American public in cases of missing, abducted, and exploited children. However, this 2003 law did not provide for all of the U.S. territories to implement the AMBER Alert system. Guam, American Samoa, and the Northern Mariana Islands are still not integrated into the national system.

Our AMBER Alert Nationwide Act would fix this by integrating Guam and all U.S. territories into the next AMBER Alert system and providing needed Federal support for local law enforcement.

This bipartisan bill would also optimize the system for the territories by authorizing Federal funding for

AMBER Alerts in major transportation hubs such as airports, maritime ports, customs checkpoints, and other ports of exits.

A truly nationwide AMBER Alert system must protect our missing, abducted, or exploited children in the U.S. territories. I urge our House colleagues to join us in cosponsoring this bill.

HONORING THE WARREN ZONTA CLUB ON 90 YEARS OF SERVICE

(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 honor the Zonta Club of Warren, Pennsylvania, as it celebrates 90 years of empowering women through service and advocacy.

Zonta International marks 100 years on the world stage this year, and the Zonta Club of Warren was one of the first clubs to be incorporated. The international service organization was founded in Buffalo, New York, with the mission of advancing the status of women.

The Warren Zonta Club has worked to improve the lives of women locally, nationally, and worldwide. Warren Zonta has worked with various community organizations throughout its 90-year history, and at its core, the club has worked to make Warren County a better place to live and work. The club spearheaded the local March of Dimes campaign for many years and worked with the Girl Scouts, the Salvation Army, and Warren General Hospital.

The word Zonta means honest and trustworthy and is derived from the language of the Native American Sioux.

Mr. Speaker, I wish the Warren Zonta Club the best as it marks 90 years of service, and I thank them for all of their contributions to Warren County.

CONGRATULATING JUDGE CINDY LEDERMAN ON HER RETIREMENT

(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 my friend, the Honorable Judge Cindy Lederman, upon her retirement from the Miami-Dade juvenile court.

Upon starting her work in a juvenile court in 1994, Judge Lederman quickly discovered a child welfare system in turmoil. She witnessed the voices of the children coming in and out of the court being lost in the maelstrom of domestic violence and endless custody hearings. Cindy campaigned to tie the science behind child psychology to the law, making it her mission to transform the system into one that focuses on the well-being of the children.

In her career, Judge Lederman has tirelessly and gracefully presided over

some of the most important cases of our State, including striking down the State’s discriminatory gay adoption ban.

Mr. Speaker, Cindy has my appreciation for her transformative impact on the Miami-Dade children’s court. Her retirement marks the end of an era, and she leaves an impressive legacy. I truly wish Judge Cindy Lederman all the best in the next chapter of her life.

HONORING MELVIN FRANCIS FISHER

(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 sadly but, also, in honor of the passing of a dear friend from Shasta County, Mel Fisher. Melvin Francis Fisher was born in Detroit, Michigan.

I first came to know Mel and his lovely wife, Kathy—what a character this couple was—during the first time I went to a Pearl Harbor survivors event in Shasta County in about 2002.

Mel joined the Navy in 1940 to follow in the footsteps of his father, who was a fighter pilot in World War I. He couldn’t have known what the journey was going to take him to; so, indeed, when he was in Pearl Harbor aboard the USS *Whitney*, that was where they were attacked by the Japanese. His ship was responsible for shooting down two Japanese planes that day.

Mel later went on to serve on the USS *Indiana*, participating in military engagements in Iwo Jima, Guadalcanal, Okinawa, and more.

In 2010, my family and I had the privilege of accompanying Mel, Kathy, and their family to the 69th anniversary commemoration of the Pearl Harbor attack. Indeed, that is something I will always treasure.

His military service was very distinguished, but his family remembers someone who gave back to his community in service. He loved to fish on and around Lake Shasta.

He peacefully passed away on Father’s Day, surrounded by his loving family. He will be greatly missed.

It was an honor for me to know such a man as Mel Fisher, who served his family faithfully and his community with love and is loved by so many.

God bless you, Mel.

URGING CONFIRMATION OF JUDGE BRETT M. KAVANAUGH TO THE U.S. SUPREME COURT

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

Mr. GIANFORTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge the Senate to confirm Judge Brett Kavanaugh to serve on the U.S. Supreme Court.

President Trump considered many well-qualified judges and legal scholars for the High Court, and he selected the best of the best.

Judge Kavanaugh has outstanding academic credentials and an impressive professional record, including clerking for Justice Kennedy and serving on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia since 2006.

Judge Kavanaugh is a constitutional conservative who will interpret our Nation's laws as our Founders intended and not make laws from the bench.

Judge Kavanaugh offers a sound approach to issues important to Montana. Judge Kavanaugh has defended private property rights from governmental interference, protected landowners from outrageous regulations, and rejected Federal overreach, including from the previous administration's overzealous EPA.

Mr. Speaker, Judge Kavanaugh enjoyed bipartisan support when the Senate confirmed him 12 years ago. I urge the Senate to avoid political games, sideshows, and stunts and confirm Judge Kavanaugh to serve on the U.S. Supreme Court.

AMERICANS SUPPORT TRUMP'S IMMIGRATION POLICIES

(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, when it comes to immigration policies, a recent poll shows that the American people are far closer to President Trump than to the liberal media. The results of a Harvard-Harris poll by Mark Penn, a former Hillary Clinton strategist, came up with surprising results, considering what we have heard from the media.

When asked, "Do you think that people who make it across the border illegally should be allowed to stay in the country or sent home?" 64 percent said they should be sent home.

When asked, "Do you think we need stricter or looser enforcement of our immigration laws?" 70 percent said stricter; 60 percent support building a combination of a physical and electronic barrier across the U.S.-Mexico border.

When asked about sanctuary cities, 84 percent of respondents said that cities should be required to notify immigration authorities about taking custody of deportable immigrants, and 69 percent said the Immigration and Customs Enforcement Agency should not be abolished.

The administration's immigration policies do reflect Americans' views.

□ 1215

RECOGNIZING DANISH KHAN AND STEPHEN LOWE

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

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Danish Khan and

Stephen Lowe from Blue Valley Southwest High School, who became the first Kansas team to win the National Speech and Debate Association's national tournament.

Their tireless work over the past year paved the way for them to win this 5-day tournament, which is the largest academic competition in the world. Danish and Stephen debated government funding and regulation of education, a few topics that we continue to debate here in Congress.

In high school, I, too, was on the debate team and went to State. Although I never won a tournament quite this size, I still use what I learned there today while debating important issues before Congress.

Danish and Stephen's amazing accomplishment speaks volumes about their talents, as well as our amazing schools in the Third District of Kansas and the teachers they have, including their debate coach, Jared Zuckerman.

Mr. Speaker, these students are our future leaders, and we can expect great things. Good luck to Danish and Stephen as they continue their debate careers in college. I look forward to seeing what other amazing accomplishments Third District students of Kansas will make as well.

NATIONAL DAY OF CIVILITY

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

Mr. SMUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the second annual National Day of Civility.

This day, July 12, was chosen to mark a verse in Matthew's Gospel, chapter 7, verse 12: "So in everything, do to others what you would have them do to you."

This, of course, is known as the Golden Rule. In fact, it was one of my mother's favorite Bible verses. She had her hands full, I am sure, raising 12 kids—I was number 10—and this was her favorite Bible verse that she would quote to us, the idea that everyone deserves your respect.

Each one of us in this Chamber has the opportunity to live this rule, as do our constituents. We are privileged to live in the United States of America, the greatest country in the history of the world, due in large part to our system of government. It is really an experiment. It is a system of government designed to encourage debate, respect, and resolve differences and rely on citizen input.

Today, there is an alarming decline in our public discourse. People can't even seem to talk to each other, can't come to the table, and can't hear each other out. We urgently need to reverse this trend.

At the beginning of last year, members of the freshman class drafted and signed a commitment to civility, laying out our effort to make the government work more efficiently and effectively, help build consensus and restore

public trust, and serve as a positive influence on society at large.

On this National Day of Civility, let's renew our commitment to civility. Congress may not be able to change the state of public discourse, but we certainly can and should serve as an example to the American people.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 6237, MATTHEW YOUNG POLLARD INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEARS 2018 AND 2019

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 989 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 989

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. 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. 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 Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 115-80. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that 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 amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. 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 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 gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), 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 material on House Resolution 989, 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 forward this rule on behalf of the Rules Committee.

The rule provides for consideration of H.R. 6237, the Matthew Young Pollard Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscals Years 2018 and 2019. The rule provides for 1 hour of debate, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

The rule also provides for a motion to recommit. Additionally, the rule makes in order 12 amendments from Members on both sides of the aisle.

Yesterday, the Rules Committee heard testimony from numerous Members, including Intelligence Committee Chairman NUNES and Ranking Member SCHIFF, as well as Mr. LOBIONDO from New Jersey and Ms. JACKSON LEE from Texas.

In addition to the vigorous debate on this legislation before the Rules Committee, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence held a markup of this legislation on June 27, 2018, where the committee voted unanimously to report the bill to the House floor for consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman NUNES and Ranking Member SCHIFF for their important work on this legislation, and I commend them for the strong demonstration of bipartisanship in moving it forward.

The Intelligence Reauthorization Act is among the most important pieces of legislation we consider in this Chamber. It provides the intelligence community, a community that spans 17 different agencies, with the resources it needs to protect our great country.

Chairman NUNES and Ranking Member SCHIFF approached the task of writing this bill constructively and with a clear understanding of its importance, and their work is evident in the support for this bill we have already seen displayed at the Intelligence Committee markup.

As a result of Mr. NUNES' and Mr. SCHIFF's work, and of the Intelligence Committee, the legislation provided for

by this rule will not only reauthorize programs crucial to the intelligence community, but it will also make a number of critical improvements to the law in support of that community and our national security.

The underlying bill represents an opportunity to pass an important piece of legislation that will enhance our national security in an age of increasingly sophisticated adversaries.

Its provisions include critical functions like deterring nation-state adversaries like Russia and China, countering and defeating ISIS and other terrorist groups, and defending America against cyberattacks, to name a few.

In addition to the critical missions I have listed above, the bill will improve our ability to recruit and retain top cybersecurity professionals, and will provide better benefits to CIA employees injured by acts of terrorism overseas.

Further, the underlying bill will strengthen both internal and congressional oversight over the various components of the intelligence community.

Our government's most fundamental responsibilities are to defend the American people from harm and to protect their liberty. To grasp the weight of these duties, one need only review the preamble of the Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, the reality is that Americans continue to face increasingly sophisticated cyber threats from foreign states and nonstate actors alike. This legislation recognizes the need to ensure that the United States maintains a tactical advantage in the cyber dimension by giving the intelligence community the ability to recruit the very best talent in the field.

This legislation gives the intelligence community the ability to provide increased pay for certain employees who have unique skills to lend to critical cyber missions.

Cyber criminals and other foreign intelligence agencies have increasingly focused on two critical areas of U.S. national security: our energy infrastructure and our election systems. Thanks to the work of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, this legislation will bolster our defense of both areas.

Specifically, this legislation will require the Director of National Intelligence to electronically publish an unclassified advisory report on foreign counterintelligence and cybersecurity threats to election campaigns for Federal office. It will also create an Infrastructure Security Center within the Department of Energy to coordinate intelligence on significant threats.

We must have the tools to combat these threats, and that includes skilled personnel who know how to navigate these challenges. Whether bad actors hone in on our energy resources, election systems, or other strengths, this legislation takes steps to ensure we have the people we need fighting the forces menacing our Nation.

With these improvements in place, those responsible for our Nation's crit-

ical infrastructure will have better intelligence with which to protect it.

To provide for our common defense, the dedicated men and women of the intelligence community work tirelessly to thwart the efforts of our foreign adversaries, which range from terrorists to foreign states to nuclear proliferators.

Many in the intelligence community have seen their work in furtherance of the global war on terror and other missions around the world land them in harm's way. This bill recognizes the commitment of these brave men and women, many whose names we will never know.

Finally, the importance of the intelligence community's work and the inherently secretive nature of its mission necessitate vigilant oversight of these activities. This bill will increase the intelligence community's accountability to Congress by requiring reports on numerous issues, including investigations of leaks of classified information and security clearance processing timelines.

Importantly, it will further bolster intelligence oversight by requiring the intelligence community and the Department of Defense to develop a framework for assessing the numerous roles, missions, and functions of the Defense Intelligence Agency. It will also require the FBI to provide quarterly counterintelligence briefings to the congressional intelligence committees.

This legislation will ensure that America remains safe, and it will ensure that American liberties are protected in the process.

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

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I thank the gentleman, my friend from Georgia, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes for debate.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to debate the rule for this measure, the Matthew Young Pollard Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 2018 and 2019.

Today's bill comes to us through a process that is marginally better than that which we saw last year. As many of you may remember, last year, it took my friends on the other side a couple of tries to get the Intelligence Authorization Act to the floor.

Though that one was, unlike today's bill, cosponsored by the ranking member, Republicans raised the ire of many of us on this side of the aisle by trying to move this bill under suspension of the rules. After that move fell flat, the Republican-led Rules Committee reported the bill under a closed rule, blocking no fewer than 13 amendments. That bill, though passed, never saw sunlight in the Senate.

Today's bill avoids some of those avoidable self-inflicted wounds and is indeed better for it. But unfortunately, drama of some kind or another seems to follow Intelligence Authorization Acts, no matter what.

Last night at the Rules Committee, we witnessed, in my view, the unprecedented silencing of one of our colleagues. Congresswoman NORMA TORRES had just begun her first question of the chairman of the Intelligence Committee, Mr. NUNES, when she was gavelled down by the chairman of the House Rules Committee. Subsequently, he abruptly recessed the meeting.

It is, in my view, Congresswoman TORRES' unquestionable right, based on longstanding committee practice, to question a witness. And it is absolutely unbelievable and, in my view, a great shame that she was not able to continue her line of questioning.

When the hearing reconvened after a near 20-minute recess, rather than answering questions, Chairman NUNES was permitted to leave. He had made the request, indicating that he had matters before the Ways and Means Committee.

This was not just unfortunate for Mrs. TORRES, but also for the rest of us on the committee, because during that short recess, the Trump administration issued its Statement of Administration Policy on today's underlying bill. Frankly, the administration's statement raised more questions than it answered.

□ 1230

It would have been helpful to have Mr. NUNES at the hearing so that we could ask him important and relevant questions about the administration's statement and what that statement meant for his bill.

Now, I look forward to our meetings returning to normal next week, and I look forward to them being run as they have been in the past, with witnesses staying before the committee until all of our members have been able to ask all of their questions.

Mr. Speaker, the bill is also not without its laudatory provisions. As my friend from Georgia has mentioned several of them, let me proceed to add to that particular observation of his.

It increases pay for professionals in the intelligence community who have expertise in the cyber arena or have extensive knowledge in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics—all areas that are crucial to the success of the intelligence community's core mission.

Footnote there: I served for 8 years on the Intelligence Committee, and I know full well, firsthand, the importance of this particular aspect of the committee's duties and the agency's duties.

The bill, at the insistence of Democrats on the committee, addresses Russian meddling in our elections by requiring the intelligence community to brief key congressional leaders and committees on threat assessments related to foreign meddling in our Federal elections. The bill also requires the Director of Intelligence to publicly post a report on foreign counterintel-

ligence and cybersecurity threats to Federal election campaigns.

Although these provisions are welcomed, it is beyond any doubt that more must be done to strengthen our defenses against any foreign interference in our Federal and State elections and to rebuild Americans' confidence in the democratic process and in its institutions.

Mr. Speaker, there has also been good bipartisan work on a matter that has been, for years, as it is today, near and dear to my heart, and that is increasing diversity hires and promotions within the intelligence community. Indeed, I have not stopped championing these twin causes since leaving the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence as its vice chair.

Diversity is a mission imperative for the intelligence community. Three of my predecessors, two of whom are deceased—Lou Stokes from Ohio and Julian Dixon from California—as well as my classmate and colleague SANFORD BISHOP, who served on the committee as well, worked assiduously in an effort to increase minorities and give them opportunities to climb the ranks.

We also, in my view, now need to recruit who will be able to blend in, speak foreign languages, and understand the cultures in countries that are now central to our foreign policy interests. At the end of the day, such diversity is achieved through the hiring process; and, therefore, we need to ensure that we are hiring more Arab Americans, Iranian Americans, Pakistani Americans, Chinese Americans, Korean Americans, and many other Americans from diverse backgrounds as we confront a myriad of threats and work hard to better understand our adversaries wherever they may lurk. We do not seek this diversity in the name of political correctness but, rather, in the name of national security.

Mr. Speaker, even with these sensible additions, I can understand why some of my colleagues are reluctant to support today's bill.

When we live in the shadow of a President who is bent on denigrating the brave men and women of the intelligence community in a brazen attempt to undermine the crucial work they do on a daily basis; when we live under the shadow of a President who has, as a candidate for the highest office in the land, compared those in the intelligence community to Nazis; when we live under the shadow of a President who is quicker to take the word of an authoritarian dictator like Vladimir Putin over the studied and sober word of his own intelligence community—all positions, by the way, that not only undermine our own intelligence community, but also the relationships that we have with allies and the world over—one would be right to pause and consider whether he or she should vote in favor of handing over immense and powerful authorities to such a person.

I certainly understand the great cause for concern in handing such au-

thorities over to this administration. In fact, last night at the Rules Committee, I offered a sensible amendment, in my view, that would have reinstated the cybersecurity coordinator on the National Security Council.

As many may remember, in the not too distant past we had such a coordinator. Why? Because this country faces, on an hourly and, indeed, minute-by-minute, second-by-second basis, attempted and sometimes successful attacks on our Nation's cyber infrastructure, both private and public. It made sense to President Bush's and President Obama's administrations to have a person who could coordinate the complicated responses to these myriad attacks.

The now-President and his national security adviser, on the other hand, had the inspired idea to jettison the position of cybersecurity coordinator from the ranks of the National Security Council. Now, the optics alone of the current administration canning a cybersecurity coordinator are enough to make one shake one's head, but the real-world effects of such a misguided and reckless action should be cause for great concern.

My friends on the other side of the aisle will tell us that sacking the cybersecurity coordinator was done in the name of bureaucratic efficiency, when what the Trump administration has really done, in yet another misguided decision, is make protecting our country more difficult and more cumbersome.

It is time that Republicans take these threats seriously and stop aiding and abetting an administration that puts its own personal interests ahead of those of the American people.

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

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

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TORRES), who is my and Mr. COLLINS' distinguished colleague on the Rules Committee.

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, although I may be the newest member of the Rules Committee, I know that it is our job to discuss how our committees come up with their legislation and, by extension, how the House should consider these bills in a manner that is orderly and respectful. Unfortunately, we were not given that opportunity yesterday.

I had questions for the Intelligence Committee chairman—tough questions, maybe, but fair questions. Questions like: How do we prevent witnesses from lying in our committees? Questions like: How did the committee come up with their findings on the Russian meddling that differ so much from every other intelligence agency?

I had offered an amendment to this bill to give the House the opportunity to vote on the Senate Intelligence Committee's Russia findings, and I wanted to ask the chairman if he felt

that the House was prepared to vote on such an amendment; and, if not, why not. A tough question, maybe, but a fair question.

However, I never got the opportunity to ask that—any of that. Instead, I was shouted down by a male colleague from across the dais and cut off abruptly before I could even finish the first question. It was incredibly disrespectful and a far cry from the decorum that we should uphold as members of the powerful Rules Committee and Congress.

Never before had a member of the committee majority or minority been cut off from active questioning. That is unprecedented. As a fact, I have observed male colleagues talk to each other and ask each other to yield time to each other; but you see, as the only female Latina in that committee, that respect was not extended to me.

I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, what this means for our committee and this Congress. What is more troubling to me is that this is the second time a male colleague has yelled at me from the other side of the dais. This is not to be tolerated—not by me, and not by any Member of Congress.

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

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman an additional 1 minute.

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, if our committee is going to function like this moving forward, it will be the Rules Committee in name only. Regular order will be a thing of the past.

Bills are already developed by the majority behind closed doors. The majority already blocks every single amendment. Now we will not be allowed to even speak. The majority has already turned this Congress into the most closed Congress in history. Now they are going to close off important debates in committee, and that is outrageous.

I take my work on the Rules Committee very seriously. As a matter of fact, the last time this happened, I sat there, patiently, quietly, listening to the debate, although I completely disagreed with what my colleagues were saying. I was respectful to them, and I waited for my turn to speak.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has again expired.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I hope that we can all continue to uphold that standard of mutual respect for not just the male members of our committee, but to extend that respect to the females of that committee.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, there are several issues here. And to clarify, in being one of the members there yesterday and one spoken of, I think there is an issue of when there is a concern by a member.

This has been beyond Mrs. TORRES coming to the committee, and has been before and when Mr. HASTINGS and I have been there, many times, when we have issues with the question, the procedure is to stop and to ask the chairman to suspend the question.

This is what was happening yesterday, because there was a concern that the question was impugning the integrity of the chairman. There needed to be clarification. That was a simple—no matter what member may have asked it. That was the discussion that then continued from there.

Also, though, in the past 4 months, there have been 16 times that the chairman has sent a designee from their committee to testify before the Rules Committee and 14 times that the ranking member has sent a designee. Sending a designee from the committee of jurisdiction is common practice, and the chairman stated at the top of the meeting that that was what was going to be taking place.

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

□ 1245

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I invite, Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Georgia to show me an example of where we shut down a Member that was asking a question.

And I might add, Chairman NUNES did not send a designee. He came to the committee himself, and then Mr. LoBIONDO, which is not unprecedented, as you have outlined the numbers, took his position at that time.

But I know of no time that we have failed to allow a Member of the committee to ask questions. Can the gentleman give me such an example?

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the understanding was not—and my intention at that point in discussing this was not to stop the questioning, but it is in the concern for the integrity of the question.

You and I have talked before in our committee, and when we have said—and you have asked the chairman for clarification, that was my intention in that and that was my entire intention in that, and from there, the chairman took action from there.

I think the interesting thing in here is the chairman did, at the start of the meeting, say that Mr. NUNES would be leaving. That was stated up front and there was no objection at that point for him doing so.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I will take that as my colleague doesn't have an answer. I will take that as my colleague's non-response to my question with reference to show me a precedent in that regard. There was none.

I have been on that committee for 16 years, and we talk all over each other all the time and back and forth, but in an orderly manner, and yesterday's example was not orderly.

If we defeat the previous question, I am going to offer an amendment to the rule to bring up Representative NADLER's bill, H.R. 6135, the Keep Families Together Act. This important proposal would prohibit the Department of Homeland Security from separating children from their parents, except in extraordinary circumstances, and limit the criminal prosecution of asylum seekers.

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 Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL), a member of the Judiciary Committee, to discuss our proposal.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this Keep Families Together Act.

Mr. Speaker, over the last month, our country has reeled from the cruelty at the border. And this week we waited apprehensively to see if the Trump administration would meet the court-ordered deadline to reunite at least the children under 5 who have been taken away from their parents, separated for months at a time.

The Trump administration did not meet that deadline. To date, only 57 children have been reunited with their families. Over 3,000 children were separated from their families, and all of this was a self-imposed tragic, tragic set of circumstances that came from Donald Trump's decision to institute a zero tolerance, zero humanity policy at the border for parents who were seeking asylum for their children.

Mr. Speaker, headlines every day are blaring about what is happening in the short term and the long term in terms of trauma caused to children—to children, Mr. Speaker. One headline said that some of the children who were 2 and 3 years old did not even recognize their parents after 4 months of being separated—children who were breastfeeding at their mother's breast, separated.

Mr. Speaker, the American Association of Pediatrics has said that the long-term trauma and consequences to these children is absolutely devastating. And let me be clear about what we are doing. The United States Government—and I say not in my name—the United States Government is separating children from their families, putting kids in cages, parents in prisons.

Why? To deter people who are coming to the United States to do what I, as a mother, and I believe any parent would do, to seek safety from violence, from persecution, from being killed, gang raped, all kinds of stories that I heard directly from the women and the men who fled and are being held in a Federal prison.

Mr. Speaker, the Keep Families Together Act is the only bill that would help prevent these horrors from occurring again and from happening now. It prohibits the separation of children from their parents; it limits criminal prosecutions for asylum seekers; and it requires the Department of Homeland Security to reunite children and their parents.

I have got to say, Mr. Speaker, I hear these things from people who I believe are deeply good people on both sides of the aisle.

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

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentlewoman from Washington.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that there is any Republican or Democrat that would want this kind of trauma to occur. But I ask my Republican colleagues to stand up for who we are as a country. Do not allow America to become this in the eyes of the world. Do not go back to your children tonight and tell them that you allowed for this to continue.

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

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. KIHUEN), who is a member of the Financial Services Committee, to further discuss our proposal for the previous question, and I apologize for botching his last name.

Mr. KIHUEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for this opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, I am here to urge my colleagues to support H.R. 6135, the Keep Families Together Act.

Mr. Speaker, it is immoral, it is inhumane, and it is un-American to separate children from their parents. You know, I was at the border just a few weeks ago, and I got an opportunity to see firsthand and talk to these children. And these are children who are in jail cells. These are children who should be out in a playground, not in a prison. These are parents who left their home country because they were being persecuted because gangs and cartels were looking to assassinate them, and they were coming to America to say: I need help. Me and my children need help.

They were coming to America, the most powerful country in the world, asking for help, a country that has traditionally been made up of immigrants. Because let's face it, unless you are Native American, we all come from somewhere else. This country is made up of immigrants. These folks, all they wanted was an opportunity to succeed and to achieve the American Dream, and, today, they are in prisons.

These parents are away from their children. That is immoral. It is inhumane. And now we have an administration who made a promise to reunite these families, and the deadline passed, and yet these children are still not reunited with their parents. And those

few children who are having that opportunity to see their parents again, the parents are complaining that their children don't even recognize them anymore. That is inhumane, it is immoral, and it goes against all American values.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 6135, the Keep Families Together Act.

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

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, may I ask how much time is left on both sides of the aisle?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida has 5½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Georgia has 24 minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ESPAILLAT), who is a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Education and the Workforce, and the Committee on Small Business, to further discuss our proposal for the previous question.

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman HASTINGS for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I continue to urge my colleagues to find some humanity deep in your hearts. I know America has a huge heart, but I continue to ask my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to look deep inside of your soul and your heart and find humanity and help us pass the Keep Families Together Act to help reunite mothers like Yeni Gonzalez, who I have been pushing to help reunite with her three children. Yeni brought her three children seeking asylum as they escaped gang violence in Guatemala.

President Trump and Attorney General Jeff Sessions have made it harder for victims of violence to come to the United States by stating—get this—that domestic violence should not be grounds for asylum. And in the fiscal year 2019 budget, the President proposed a \$180 million cut to funding that would address the root causes of this migration, including domestic violence.

The Northern Triangle countries of El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras have among the 18 highest homicide rates in the world. We need to be doing more to address these root causes, and we need to be doing more to make sure families are kept together—freely, not in detention centers and facilities. Some of these children are being kept in cages that look like kennels.

This week, the President and this administration once again failed to reunite all these children with their family. This administration is using its agency to demonize immigrants—mothers and their children. We need to save the soul of our Nation. I ask, I implore the other side of the aisle to look deep inside of their soul as they go to church on Sunday.

This time our Nation's history will forever be tainted, the reputation of our Nation, as free and a beacon of hope for the entire world.

I ask my colleagues to vote against the previous question so that we can immediately bring the Keep Families Together Act to the floor and stand with our Nation's children.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Mr. Speaker, we consider today's important bill as we approach the hour of our President, Donald John Trump's, private sit down with President Vladimir Putin in Russia. We don't know what will come of this meeting, but if past is indeed prologue and we look to the President's handling of his negotiations with North Korean dictator Kim Jong-un, or his steadfast denial of the obvious, namely Russia's meddling in our elections, or his policy of tearing toddlers away from their mothers and fathers, then we can assume that nothing good will come from this upcoming get together.

And I would urge those traveling with him to sweep the room with Vladimir Putin because he will certainly be being listened to.

We can assume that there will be further concessions that benefit Russian interests. We can assume that the President will further insult our friends and allies, as he did yesterday morning in Brussels. We can assume that he will further erode the institutions created by the greatest generation, institutions that have made and kept the United States the dominant power in an uncertain world, institutions that have kept war off of western European soil for more than a generation, institutions that have kept at bay those nation-states that champion oppression and fear rather than freedom and the rule of law.

Finally, I will say this. In the current environment, it is more important than ever to stand united against those forces that wish to see us divided. It is more important than ever that we support the difficult and brave work of those individuals who make up our intelligence community. And the latter can be achieved, quite simply, by Republicans in this Chamber taking a note from our Republican friends on the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence and learn how to call a spade a spade.

The assessment that the Russians meddled in our election; that the Russians concertedly attempted to undermine Secretary Clinton's chances to be elected the first female President of the United States; that the Russians did this work to favor the election of the current President are all trustworthy and well-founded assessments.

□ 1300

And remember, that it is not ALCEE LAMAR HASTINGS saying that, though I do. That is the assessment of the entire Republican-led Senate Select Committee on Intelligence. That is the assessment of the intelligence agencies of this community.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a “no” vote on the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, this is a time when we come to the floor and debate great things. Sometimes, Mr. Speaker, you actually find out things that you did not know, and I now found out that my friend from Florida's middle name is LAMAR as we go forward.

Mr. Speaker, this rule provides for legislation that does what we came here to do, and that is to protect our Nation and preserve our civil liberties. The underlying legislation goes a step further than simply reauthorizing critical programs. It takes a hard look, and a smart look, at how we can strengthen programs, better respond to new and existing threats, and conduct vigorous, effective oversight of the intelligence community, while ensuring it has the resources it needs to serve American citizens well.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to supporting this rule and the underlying bill to strengthen public safety, protect our Nation and the American people, and to guard our civil liberties.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, the Rules Committee report (H. Rept. 115–815) to accompany House Resolution 989 should have included the following summary of amendments:

SUMMARY OF THE AMENDMENTS MADE IN ORDER

1. Keating (MA): Adds Russian to the list of the languages in Sec. 1501. (10 minutes)

2. Schneider (IL): Amends Sec. 1503 to include a list of foreign state or foreign nonstate actors involved in the threats to election campaigns for Federal offices. (10 minutes)

3. Jackson Lee (TX): Amends the Sense of Congress already in the bill on the importance of re-review of security clearances held by individuals by adding consideration of whether the security clearance holder's association or sympathy with persons or organizations that advocate, threaten, or use force or violence, or any other illegal or unconstitutional means, in an effort to prevent others from exercising their rights under the Constitution or laws of the United States or of any state, including but not limited to race, religion, national origin, or disability. (10 minutes)

4. Vargas (CA): Adds "the use of virtual currencies" to "section 1505" to ensure it is included in the assessment of threat finance. (10 minutes)

5. Torres (CA), Wagner (MO): Directs Director of National Intelligence, in coordination with the Assistant Secretary of State for Intelligence and Research and the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury for Intelligence and Analysis, to produce a national intelligence estimate of the revenue sources of the North Korean regime. (10 minutes)

6. Hastings, Alcee (FL): Directs the Director of National Intelligence to create and implement a plan that expands the recruitment efforts of all intelligence agencies geographic parameters used in recruitment efforts so that rural and other underserved regions across the nation are more fully represented in such efforts. (10 minutes)

7. Schneider (IL), Meadows (NC), Torres (CA), Sinema (AZ): Directs the DNI to report on Iran's support for proxy forces in Syria and Lebanon, including Hezbollah, and an assessment of the threat posed to Israel and other U.S. regional allies. (10 minutes)

8. Bera (CA), Connolly (VA), Garamendi (CA), Larsen, Rick (WA): Requires a briefing to relevant Congressional committees on the anticipated geopolitical effects of emerging infectious disease and pandemics, and their implications on the national security of the United States. (10 minutes)

9. Kennedy (MA): Requires the Director of National Intelligence to submit a report on the potential establishment of the "Foreign Malign Influence Response Center," comprised of analysts from all elements of the intelligence community, to provide comprehensive assessment of foreign efforts to influence United States political processes and elections. (10 minutes)

10. Rice, Kathleen (NY), King, Peter (NY): Requires the Director of National Intelligence to report on the possible exploitation of virtual currencies by terrorist actors. (10 minutes)

11. Lipinski (IL): Requires an annual report from the Director of National Intelligence describing Iranian expenditures on military and terrorist activities outside the country, such as on Hezbollah, Houthi rebels in Yemen, Hamas, and proxy forces in Iraq and Syria. (10 minutes)

12. Davidson (OH): Enhances oversight by augmenting existing semiannual reporting requirements regarding disciplinary actions. (10 minutes)

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 989 OFFERED BY
MR. HASTINGS

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

SEC. 2 That 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. 6135) to limit the separation of families at or near ports of entry. 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 chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary and the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Homeland Security. 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. 6135.

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. 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. HASTINGS. 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, the Chair

will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 229, nays 182, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 322]

YEAS—229

NAYS-182

Adams	Bonamici	Carbajal	mand a recorded vote.	Beyer	Cartwright	Crist
Aguilar	Boyle, Brendan	Cárdenas	A recorded vote was ordered.	Blumenauer	Castor (FL)	Crowley
Barragán	F.	Carson (IN)	The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a	Blunt Rochester	Castro (TX)	Cuellar
Bass	Brady (PA)	Cartwright	5-minute vote.	Bonamici	Chu, Judy	Cummings
Beatty	Brown (MD)	Castor (FL)	The vote was taken by electronic de-	Boyle, Brendan	Cicilline	Davis (CA)
Bera	Brownley (CA)	Castro (TX)	vice, and there were—ayes 235, noes 178,	F.	Clark (MA)	Davis, Danny
Beyer	Bustos	Chu, Judy	not voting 15, as follows:	Brady (PA)	Clarke (NY)	DeFazio
Blumenauer	Butterfield	Cicilline		Brown (MD)	Clay	DeGette
Blunt Rochester	Capuano	Clark (MA)		Brownley (CA)	Cleaver	Delaney

DeLauro	Krishnamoorthi	Price (NC)
DelBene	Kuster (NH)	Quigley
Demings	Langevin	Raskin
DeSaulnier	Larsen (WA)	Rice (NY)
Deutch	Larson (CT)	Richmond
Dingell	Lawrence	Rosen
Doggett	Lawson (FL)	Roybal-Allard
Doyle, Michael F.	Lee	Ruiz
Engel	Levin	Ruppersberger
Eshoo	Lewis (GA)	Rush
Espaillat	Lieu, Ted	Ryan (OH)
Esty (CT)	Lipinski	Sánchez
Evans	Loebssack	Sarbanes
Foster	Lofgren	Schakowsky
Fudge	Lowenthal	Schiff
Gabbard	Lowey	Schrader
Gallego	Lujan Grisham, M.	Scott (VA)
Garamendi	Luján, Ben Ray	Scott, David
Gomez	Lynch	Serrano
Gonzalez (TX)	Maloney,	Sewell (AL)
Green, Al	Carolyn B.	Shea-Porter
Green, Gene	Maloney, Sean	Sherman
Grijalva	Matsui	Sires
Gutiérrez	McCollum	Smith (WA)
Hastings	McEachin	Soto
Heck	McGovern	Swalwell (CA)
Higgins (NY)	Meeks	Takano
Himes	Meng	Thompson (CA)
Hoyer	Moore	Thompson (MS)
Huffman	Murphy (FL)	Titus
Jackson Lee	Nadler	Tonko
Jayapal	Napolitano	Torres
Jeffries	Neal	Tsongas
Johnson (GA)	Nolan	Vargas
Johnson, E. B.	Norcross	Veasey
Jones	O'Rourke	Vela
Kaptur	Pallone	Velázquez
Keating	Panetta	Visclosky
Kelly (IL)	Pascrall	Walz
Kennedy	Payne	Wasserman
Khanna	Peters	Schultz
Kihuen	Peterson	Waters, Maxine
Kildee	Pingree	Watson Coleman
Kilmer	Pocan	Welch
Kind	Polis	Wilson (FL)
		Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—15

Bishop (GA)	Hanabusa	Moulton
Black	Harper	Pelosi
Cheney	Kustoff (TN)	Perlmutter
Ellison	LoBiondo	Sanford
Frankel (FL)	McNerney	Speier

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minute remaining.

□ 1335

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.

MATTHEW YOUNG POLLARD INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEARS 2018 AND 2019

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 989 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. 6237.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WEBER) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1337

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. 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, with Mr. WEBER of Texas 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.

General debate shall not exceed 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

The gentleman from California (Mr. NUNES) and the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. NUNES).

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 6237, the Matthew Young Pollard Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 2018 and 2019.

Passing an annual intelligence authorization bill is the most important tool Congress has to conduct effective oversight of the intelligence activities of the United States Government.

Today, the Intelligence Committee is bringing its annual intelligence authorization bill to the floor. Once again, the bill is a bipartisan product that reflects contributions from all committee members. It was reported out of the committee by a unanimous voice vote.

The legislation provides the intelligence community the necessary resources and authorities to protect and defend the United States. For example, this bill authorizes a committee initiative to streamline defense intelligence related to the Defense Intelligence Agency. It enhances congressional oversight of intelligence activities by mandating intelligence community reports on threats to Federal elections, leaks of classified information, security clearance processing, and other vital activities. Furthermore, the bill increases pay for employees with unique cyber skills and creates a security center at the Department of Energy to protect our energy infrastructure.

Mr. Chairman, the bill authorizes enhanced injury benefits to CIA employees injured overseas due to hostile acts of terrorist activities. Moreover, it reauthorizes the Public Interest Declassification Board, aligns the reporting structure of the intelligence community chief financial officer and chief intelligence officer with statutes that govern other Federal agencies, and codifies longstanding congressional re-

porting requirements regarding the intelligence community information technology environment.

Mr. Chairman, the intelligence community comprises thousands of patriotic Americans who do difficult jobs, sometimes at great personal risk, to keep Americans safe from foreign threats. Today, these threats take many different forms and emanate from various parts of the world.

In the Middle East, the threat from ISIS has not ceased, despite its dramatic loss of territory. In fact, our intelligence professionals now face the daunting task of tracking ISIS fighters fleeing Syria for countries throughout the region and beyond.

Meanwhile, Iran is solidifying its influence, often through armed proxy militias, in its quest to control a Shiite Crescent across a wide swath of the Middle East.

In Asia, China poses numerous security challenges related to its expanding military capabilities, its growing international force projection, and its extensive extraterritorial claims. Additionally, the Chinese regime is engaged in widespread efforts, including licit and illicit means, to acquire critical U.S. national security technologies and intellectual property.

Furthermore, Russia continues to pose a pressing threat to the United States and many of our allies.

This is just a small snapshot of the threats the intelligence community addresses every day.

Additionally, our intelligence professionals confront an array of challenges posed by failed states, cyber warfare, nuclear proliferation, and many other matters.

This bill will ensure that the dedicated men and women of our intelligence community have the funding authorities and support they need to carry out the mission to keep the United States safe, while providing Congress with the tools it needs to provide robust oversight over their actions.

I would like to thank the men and women of this country who serve in our intelligence community. I am honored to get to know so many of them in the course of the committee's oversight work.

I would also like to thank all of the committee's members for their contributions to our oversight over the past year, and especially to our subcommittee chairmen and ranking members for their time and their efforts. The many hearings, briefings, and oversight visits our members carry out during the year provide the input for this authorization and the direction of this bill.

Finally, I would like to thank all the committee staff for their hard work and for their daily oversight of the intelligence community.

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

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY,
Washington, DC, July 11, 2018.
Hon. DEVIN NUNES,
Chairman, Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN NUNES: I am writing to you regarding H.R. 6237, the “Matthew Young Pollard Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 2018 and 2019.” The bill includes provisions that fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Homeland Security.

I recognize and appreciate the desire to bring this legislation before the House of Representatives in an expeditious manner, and accordingly, the Committee on Homeland Security will forego action on this bill. However, this is conditional based on our mutual understanding that by foregoing consideration of H.R. 6237 at this time does not prejudice the Committee on Homeland Security with respect to the appointment of conferees or to any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matter contained in this bill or similar legislation.

This waiver is also given with the understanding that the Committee on Homeland Security reserves its authority to seek conferees on any provision within its jurisdiction during any House-Senate conference that may be convened on this or similar legislation, and requests your support for such a request.

I would appreciate your response to this letter confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 6237, and ask that a copy of this letter and your response be included in the Congressional Record during consideration of this bill on the House floor. I look forward to working with the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence as this bill moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL T. McCaul,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE,
July 11, 2018.

Hon. MICHAEL T. McCaul,
Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 6237, the Matthew Young Pollard Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 2018 and 2019. As you noted, certain provisions of the bill are related to the jurisdictional interests of the Committee on Homeland Security. I agree that your letter in no way diminishes or alters the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Homeland Security with respect to the appointment of conferees or any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill or any similar legislation.

I appreciate your willingness to assist in expediting this legislation for floor consideration. I will include a copy of your letter and this response in the Congressional Record during consideration of the legislation on the House floor. Thank you for your assistance with this matter.

Sincerely,

DEVIN NUNES,
Chairman.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I join the chairman in urging support for the combined 2018 and 2019 Intelligence Authorization Act, which has been named in honor of Matthew Young Pollard, a Senate Intelligence Committee staffer who recently passed away, leaving behind a

young son and bereaved colleagues both in the Senate and here in the House.

For well over a year now, considerable attention has been focused on the House Intelligence Committee and the profound disagreements that we have had about the Russia investigation. Those differences remain, and the American people should know that my Democratic colleagues on the Intelligence Committee and I continue the important work of investigating Russia’s interference in the 2016 Presidential election.

Despite our disagreements over Russia with the majority, however, I have consistently and publicly maintained that the committee must seek to cordon off our disagreements over the Russia investigation and continue with our other work on a bipartisan basis as possible. We owe the tens of thousands of men and women in the intelligence community nothing less, not only because they put themselves at personal risk every day, but also because their work is so important to the country that it demands the shared responsibility and oversight of the Congress.

□ 1345

The Intelligence Committee has a history of producing bipartisan bills even under the most difficult political circumstances.

I am pleased that our staffs have worked to reach a mutually acceptable final text, and have been able to weed out provisions that would have made it impossible to move forward jointly.

Much of the committee’s oversight work is reflected in the bill as classified, but we can discuss some of the 2018–2019 IAA’s elements openly, including the fact that the bill helps to better ensure that our elections are free from interference or manipulation.

This is essential to our democracy, and the bill includes important provisions that continue the work that we have been doing in the committee during the course of the work on the Russia investigation, and as a part of our normal oversight to maintain the integrity of our election system.

The bill also provides funding to our intelligence community in order to meet all threats from terrorism to nation-state actors. The bill authorizes funding across a wide range of endeavors that will allow the intelligence community and the Department of Defense to not only respond to threats, but to preempt them.

The bill takes steps to prevent a repeat of the Russian active measures campaign that targeted our 2016 election, by including a minority-authored provision requiring a briefing to key congressional leaders, including members of the intelligence community and committee, if the United States faces a significant foreign cyber intrusion or active measures campaign directed at a federal election.

The bill also ensures that America’s technological advantage remains a pri-

ority for our intelligence services. As such, the bill resources and directs efforts that will promote our advantages across a range of cutting-edge domains, from space to artificial intelligence.

It enhances transparency and allows public access to certain work of the IC. The bill reauthorizes for 10 years the Public Interest Declassification Board which advises the President and executive branch agencies on the review and declassification of IC records of historical importance.

The bill also includes minority provisions related to parental leave, student loan repayment, and diversity and inclusiveness that are intended to make an exceptional workforce even better.

In the end, the men and women who serve in the intelligence community and the Defense Department are the most important factor in the success of our national security.

There are many other provisions in the bill that will build on the work of past years and move us further along technical and other pathways to meet new challenges and those still on the horizon.

This bill advances our national security, reinforces the principle of congressional oversight, and honors our values as a Nation.

Mr. Chair, I urge the support of the House, and look forward to considering amendments that will make a good bill even better. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY), the chairman of the Agriculture Committee.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for yielding and for his dedicated work on the committee leading us through these rather tumultuous times on a lot of fronts, but he has done a terrific job, and I have been proud to serve on the committee with him.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to speak in support of the 2018 Intelligence Authorization Act. Intelligence gathering is of utmost importance in our national security and is essential in keeping Americans safe here at home.

It is imperative that we provide to those dedicated individuals of our intelligence community the tools, resources, and support they need to carry out missions successfully, and Mr. Chairman, this bill does just that.

The successful completion of increasingly difficult missions by these consummate professionals ensures policymakers are provided the crucial information that they need to make the most informed decisions to counter our near-term threats and those peaking on the horizon.

This bill addresses both challenges of a constantly changing threat environment and advances in technology to keep American cybersecurity at the forefront of global efforts and a step ahead of our adversaries.

Mr. Chair, as you and others in the room know as well, our democratic

elections have become the target of foreign influence campaigns, not only here at home, but across the Western world by adversaries seeking to undermine and disrupt one of our most sacred democratic institutions.

Mr. Chair, this bill allows for a path for the IC to advise and inform those on the front lines of our elections of the perceived threats from abroad. In addition, it also ensures that Congress stays informed of ongoing adversarial influence campaigns against democratic elections across the globe and here at home as well, as well as the actions that our IC is taking to counter those threats.

Mr. Chair, I rise in strong support of this year's Intelligence Authorization Act. I encourage all of my colleagues to vote for it. I look forward to implementing this in the next year, and the oversight, authorities and tools that it gives Congress to be able to continue to provide the correct oversight for our intelligence agencies across the executive branch.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, it gives me great pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. CARSON). He is the ranking member on the Emerging Threats Subcommittee and brings a wealth of experience in homeland security to the Congress.

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF).

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to say a few words about this very important bill. I say important because as we face threats around the world, threats like Russia, China, North Korea, Iran, and terrorism, the annual Intelligence Authorization Act is meant to provide our intelligence personnel with the resources and authorities they need to keep America safe.

In some respects, Mr. Chairman, this bill accomplishes that very goal. We refocus our resources on countering our most significant adversary states. We better equip the intel community to counter foreign interference in our elections, which is very critical going into 2018, all the way to 2020.

We give new authorities related to pervasive challenges, including threats to our supply chain, recruitment and development of minority talent, and strengthening of the cyber and technical workforce.

I support these very important developments. Unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, the bill also supports or indicates significant problematic changes to many classified authorities. I am particularly concerned about what this means for the way we conduct counterterrorism operations.

Mr. Chairman, the Trump administration has changed counterterrorism policies in a way that does not make America safer. By expanding the areas where the U.S. Government may be operating and broadening authorities, Mr. Chairman, we are planting the seeds of anger and hate which will fester and grow, increasing the threat of an attack in the future.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly believe in protecting the United States and her allies. But, if two decades of the war against terrorism have taught us anything, it is that we can't fight our way out of this. Yes, we need to target known terrorist leaders, Mr. Chairman, but we also need to actively minimize actions that spur new hatred and drive people to terrorism.

After years of striving for a more comprehensive, targeted, and productive counterterrorism approach, this bill sends us back to the days of broad unrestrained authorities. With so much on the line, Mr. Chairman, we should be using this bill to send a message to this administration that America must maintain her values.

Success at any cost is not success at all, but a foolhardy approach to leverage power. We must keep America safe, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Alabama (Ms. SEWELL). She is the ranking member on the Department of Defense Intelligence and Overhead Architecture Subcommittee and does a fabulous job for our committee.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of the Intelligence Authorization Act for fiscal years 2018 and 2019. This bill recognizes the critical work that every member of the intelligence community performs to protect our Nation: first, by enhancing resources and authorities for our highest priority intelligence initiatives, and secondly, by enforcing and reinforcing the principles of good governance, transparency, and accountability to the American people.

Mr. Chairman, I am a strong advocate for transparency, which is a challenge for the intelligence community because of the need to protect sensitive sources and equities, but a challenge that can be met. One groundbreaking example is the unclassified January 2017 intelligence community assessment that notified Americans about the Russian attack on our democracy in the 2016 election.

This bill directs the intelligence community to continue public awareness reporting related to election security because the threat from Russia is still ongoing.

As a ranking member on the HPSCI Subcommittee on Department of Defense Intelligence and Overhead Architecture for the last 3 years, one of my priorities is to ensure that the United States achieves and maintains a leadership position in next-generation technologies, especially in space.

Space is an emerging battleground, so it is imperative for our national security that America maintains a strategic advantage in space as well as we do on the ground and at sea. Over the last year, the subcommittee has continued our dialogue with the intelligence community about its accomplishments, but also the challenges it

faces and the resources it needs to meet these challenges.

I am pleased to report that this bill includes provisions that strengthen our Nation's access and resilience in space by investing in next-generation technologies and assets.

Mr. Chairman, I am also a strong believer that the success of our Nation's intelligence operation hinges on our most important asset: our people. As our intelligence missions and objectives continue to evolve, we will undoubtedly require a more diverse workforce in the intelligence community to meet our needs. We must work together to build and promote an intelligence community that is truly representative of the rich diversity and inclusive society that makes our Nation great.

In order to more effectively address these emerging and ongoing threats, we need an agile workforce with a wide range of backgrounds, experiences, skill sets, and talents. For that reason, Congress has invested in American universities and colleges to provide all students with the skills that they need to serve in our intelligence community.

As smart investors, we want to see that the investment is accomplishing the objectives and encouraging qualified graduates to apply to join the intelligence community. This bill directs the Director of National Intelligence to take a more active role in ensuring that one program, in particular, the Intelligence Community Centers for Academic Excellence, achieves that objective of diversity.

I also strongly support the Hastings amendment that directs the intelligence community to intensify recruitment outreach at every corner of our Nation. Encouraging geographical diversity in the intelligence community will naturally also enhance racial, gender, cultural, and economic diversity.

I want to see that every interested student, whether in a big city or a small town, is aware of the career opportunities in the intelligence community. It is a path that is most important.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Alabama.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Chair, in conclusion, I believe for these reasons and others that my colleagues should support this bill.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chair, it is now my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HECK), someone who we have come to rely on in our committee in a great many areas, but, in particular, the threat posed by foreign actors investing in American technologies, with an eye toward either appropriating our intellectual property, or making use of those

technologies for the purpose of spying on Americans.

Mr. HECK. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member. I am here to support the Matthew Young Pollard Intelligence Authorization Act.

Mr. Chair, I was just placed on the Intel Committee a year ago January, and I have learned an awful lot, most notably, how incredibly difficult it really is to do the work of an intelligence officer. And I want to, frankly, take this opportunity to thank all of the members of the IC for their dedication and service.

For as difficult a job as it is, it is even more difficult, if not impossible, to do it without a security clearance. In the first quarter—you are hearing this number correctly—of this year, the average processing time for a top security clearance was 534 days. That backlog creates difficulties in hiring in the intelligence and defense agencies. And, frankly, it is creating a legacy problem for our future.

And you are hearing this number correctly, too. The backlog of people waiting for those clearances is now over 700,000, and that is what has led the Government Accountability Office to declare this “a high risk issue,” and that means that it is one of the areas that the GAO believes is most in need of reform.

The country cannot wait 2 years to recruit top talent for our IC. Applicants for clearance, of course, should be carefully scrutinized, and the United States should take care that only responsible and trustworthy parties gain access to our Nation’s classified information.

□ 1400

We absolutely should guard it as a national treasure. But we need to give the IC the people it needs to collect, process, analyze, and distribute information, pure and simple. So the bill before us today does, in fact, include language to address the issue of security clearances.

As we progress forward, we must do so methodically, with feedback from the most affected. We have a long process ahead of us, but if we don’t take steps now, frankly, pretty soon it is going to be too late. We must address the security clearance dilemma, and we must pass this bill to begin that process.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RUPPERSBERGER), who is the former ranking member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence and a great stalwart for the men and women who work within the IC.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the ranking member for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this bipartisan bill. First and foremost, intelligence is about people.

We cannot collect, analyze, and utilize intelligence effectively unless we can recruit, hire, and retain the best people possible. Therefore, I want to thank Chairman NUNES and Ranking Member SCHIFF, and their staffs, for working with me to include provisions in this bill that improve parental leave policies of the intelligence community.

These provisions will ensure that these benefits are, to the fullest extent possible, in line with the private sector. Doing so will help the IC develop and retain the workforce required to keep America safe against all our foes, both new and old.

This legislation also takes important steps to ensure the IC provides critical updates to Congress in the event the United States faces a foreign cyber attack or other active measures that threaten the heart of our democracy: our elections. There is no doubt that Russia will continue to exert a malign influence on the heart and soul of our democracy.

This cannot be tolerated, and I strongly support the efforts of the chairman and ranking member to ensure Congress will be informed of the most critical threats to our democracy.

I thank the chairman and ranking member, and the entire intelligence community and staff, for their dedicated oversight of the intelligence community and their commitment to enhancing national security.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Chair, I will briefly say that the former ranking member, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, who has many intelligence professionals in his district, is highly regarded in our committee, and I respect and am thankful for his support of the bill.

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

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, might I inquire of the gentleman whether he has any further speakers?

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Chairman, I have no further speakers.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I will take this opportunity to close, and I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, 1 month ago, the CIA held its annual memorial ceremony to honor its fallen. This year, the agency added four stars to the memorial wall, signifying four officers killed in the line of duty but who cannot be publicly named even in death. That, Mr. Chairman, is the sacrifice that we ask of our intelligence professionals, and it is one that they are prepared to make.

In exchange for that fidelity, it is our job to provide the intelligence community with the tools and authorities that it needs to keep us safe, all while exercising our constitutional authority of oversight and direction. This bill meets that responsibility, and I urge its passage by the House.

I would also like to take this opportunity to thank my colleagues on the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence and our incredible staff. In particular, I thank Shannon Stuart, Carly Blake, Alan Souza, Mark Stewart,

Wells Bennett, Scott Glabe, Rheanne Wirkkala, Amanda Rogers Thorpe, Thomas Eager, Kris Breaux, Christine Bocchino, Maher Bitar, Shannon Green, Linda Cohen, Patrick Boland, and Tim Bergreen.

These staff members labor three floors below the Capitol in a space we affectionately call—and sometimes unaffectionately call—the bunker. They do so for long hours and without daylight. We are very grateful to them and for their service.

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

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I thank the staffs on both the majority and minority sides. They do put in a lot of effort. It is one of the smallest staffs in the Capitol of any committee, so we are thankful that we were able to get this bill done in a bipartisan manner. We look for its passage on the floor this afternoon.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I rise to speak on House consideration of H.R. 6237, the “Matthew Young Pollard Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018 and 2019.”

I thank Chairman NUNES, Ranking Member SCHIFF for their work to bring this bill before the full House of consideration.

Our nation’s national security professionals require our support in words as well as deeds in the form of legislation like the authorization measure we are debating and sufficient funding to carry out the work of protecting our great nation from our enemies.

I offered several Jackson Lee Amendments for consideration under this bill.

I thank the Rules Committee for making in order Jackson Lee Amendment No. 3, designated as No. 33 on the Rules Committee roster for consideration for this bill.

This Jackson Lee Amendment, amends the Sense of Congress already in the bill on the importance of re-review of security clearances held by individuals by adding consideration of whether the security clearance holder’s association or sympathy with persons or organizations that advocate, threaten, or use force or violence, or any other illegal or unconstitutional means, in an effort to prevent others from exercising their rights under the Constitution or laws of the United States or of any state, on account of race, religion, national origin, disability, or other impermissible factors.

In addition to this amendment, I offered three other Jackson Lee Amendments to H.R. 6237:

The first Jackson Lee Amendment is designated as No. 32 on the Rules Committee roster, and would have amended the Sense of Congress already in the bill that addresses the importance of conducting background checks for retention of security clearances or the issuance of new clearances to also consider an applicant’s membership in a hate group and their participation in activities espoused by hate groups that involve violence or incitement of violence which disrupts civic life.

The second Jackson Lee Amendment is designated as No. 34, on the Rules Committee rosters, and would have amended the Sense of Congress already in the bill on the

importance of review of a security clearance by adding that a security clearance should not be held by an individual who actively engages in violent acts in the United States or its territories that target persons based upon their race, religion, ethnicity, national origin, sexual orientation, or gender identity for the purpose of inflicting physical harm or emotional distress with the objective of normalizing anti-social behavior towards vulnerable groups.

The third Jackson Lee Amendment is designated as No. 38 on the Rules Committee rosters, and would have required that the Director of National Intelligence conduct an assessment and report to Congress on the reliance of intelligence activities on civilian contractors to support Government activities, including intelligence analysis.

Each of these Jackson Lee Amendments sought to strengthen and improve the process of security clearance awards and oversight of contractors engaged in national security work.

The rights and dignity of all Americans must be held dear and protected from assaults that challenge the very freedom we value most.

It is our diversity and our capacity for tolerance of others who are different that is the essence of American exceptionalism.

As a nation we have come through many struggles and challenges to reach a point where we accept the diversity of our nation as a strength and not a weakness.

A period in our history that challenges the very foundation of our nation was framed by a speech given by Abraham Lincoln on the occasion of his nomination to become the Senator from the State of Illinois.

He said: "A house divided against itself, cannot stand. I believe this government cannot endure, permanently, half slave and half free. I do not expect the Union to be dissolved—I do not expect the house to fall—but I do expect it will cease to be divided. It will become all one thing or all the other. Either the opponents of slavery will arrest the further spread of it, and place it where the public mind shall rest in the belief that it is in the course of ultimate extinction; or its advocates will push it forward, till it shall become lawful in all the States, old as well as new—North as well as South."

He was speaking of the pernicious national shame of slavery that led ultimately to the Civil War that cost more than 600,000 lives over the very question of human rights and human dignity for all persons.

Although the question of equality and justice for all has been asked and answered during pivotal moments in our nation's history today we are facing another challenge to our core beliefs.

I offered these Jackson Lee Amendments to establish that this Congress is not wavering in its commitment to protect the lives, liberties or freedom of Americans from those who seek to do them harm.

Specifically, four of the Jackson Lee Amendments were prompted by the actions of Mr. Miselis who has a security clearance and worked for Northrup Grumman, a major defense contractor, at the time he engaged in physical violence against persons protesting racism and white supremacy in Charlottesville, Virginia.

In May 2018, Northrup Grumman was informed of Mr. Miselis' membership in RAM and the violent assaults he initiated while he was in Charlottesville participating in activities

in support of white supremacy, which were captured on video and in photos.

Mr. Miselis worked for a government contractor and held a security clearance authorizing him to work on projects that were of vital interest to our nation and its defense.

Northrup Grumman did not dismiss him until the story broke earlier this month with media reports on the violence Mr. Miselis engaged in at the white supremacists' rally held in Charlottesville, Virginia.

The violence of RAM members has been a hallmark of the group and its members.

The Anti-Defamation League describes RAM as a white supremacist group whose members believe they are fighting against a "modern world" corrupted by the "destructive cultural influences" of liberals, Jews, Muslims and non-white immigrants.

They refer to themselves as the "premier MMA (mixed martial arts) club of the Alt-Right."

RAM is characterized as operating like a street-fighting club.

Members actively train to do physical battle with their ideological foes, and have been involved in violent clashes during political rallies and demonstrations.

RAM members consider themselves to be part of the "Alt Right."

RAM's membership has deep roots in California's racist skinhead movement, and includes individuals who have faced serious criminal charges, including assault, robbery and weapon offenses.

RAM consists of several dozen loosely affiliated neo-Nazis and racist skinheads who were formerly known as the DIY Division, but rebranded themselves as the Rise Above Movement in the spring of 2017.

The FBI has opened an informal investigation into this group because of the violence associated with its members.

The United States is a nation of laws, which gives us the freedom to agree and most importantly disagree with not only each other but with our government.

But the limitations to the right to disagree can be best described by the ancient wisdom: "Your right to swing your arms ends just where the other person's nose begins."

There is a limit to the expression of free speech and the freedom to assemble and that limit is violence.

I know that the work of our intelligence community is difficult and often goes without notice by the American public.

I firmly believe that the actions of those who hold security clearances as they go about their lives should reflect the higher goals and values of nation.

To engage in violent acts against persons engaged in constitutionally protected activity on account of race, religion, color, gender, sexual orientation, language of original, immigration status, or creed is an affront to the framers of the Constitution for this great nation.

The actions of Mr. Miselis put at risk not only his career, but also the reputation of people who hold national security clearances.

The awarding of security clearances to contractors must be better managed and the consequences for involvement in activities that would be cause for dismissal from the armed services or any federal agency should not go unnoticed.

I am committed to the task of building the capacity and resources of the intelligence

community to ensure that our nation's national security and national defense are all that they need to be.

I ask that my colleagues support the Jackson Lee Amendment made in order for consideration of H.R. 6237, and support the underlying bill.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. POE of Texas). All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommend by the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 115-80. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 6237

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; ORGANIZATION OF ACT INTO DIVISIONS.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This Act may be cited as the "Matthew Young Pollard Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 2018 and 2019".

(b) **ORGANIZATION.**—This Act is organized into two divisions as follows:

(1) **DIVISION A.**—Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018.

(2) **DIVISION B.**—Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019.

DIVISION A—INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018

SEC. 101. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This division may be cited as the "Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018".

(b) **TABLE OF CONTENTS.**—The table of contents for this division is as follows:

Sec. 101. Short title; table of contents.

Sec. 102. Definitions.

TITLE I—INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES

Sec. 1101. Authorization of appropriations.

Sec. 1102. Classified Schedule of Authorizations.

Sec. 1103. Personnel ceiling adjustments.

Sec. 1104. Intelligence Community Management Account.

TITLE II—CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY SYSTEM

Sec. 1201. Authorization of appropriations.

Sec. 1202. Computation of annuities for employees of the Central Intelligence Agency.

TITLE III—GENERAL INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY MATTERS

Sec. 1301. Restriction on conduct of intelligence activities.

Sec. 1302. Increase in employee compensation and benefits authorized by law.

TITLE IV—MATTERS RELATING TO ELEMENTS OF THE INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY

Sec. 1401. Authority for protection of current and former employees of the Office of the Director of National Intelligence.

Sec. 1402. Designation of the program manager-information sharing environment.

Sec. 1403. Technical modification to the executive schedule.

TITLE V—REPORTS AND OTHER MATTERS

- Sec. 1501. Period of overseas assignments for certain foreign service officers.
- Sec. 1502. Assessment of significant Russian influence campaigns directed at foreign elections and referenda.
- Sec. 1503. Foreign counterintelligence and cybersecurity threats to Federal election campaigns.
- Sec. 1504. Intelligence community reports on security clearances.
- Sec. 1505. Assessment of threat finance relating to Russia.
- Sec. 1506. Report on cyber exchange program.
- Sec. 1507. Review of Intelligence Community whistleblower matters.
- Sec. 1508. Report on role of Director of National Intelligence with respect to certain foreign investments.
- Sec. 1509. Semiannual reports on investigations of unauthorized disclosures of classified information.
- Sec. 1510. Reports on intelligence community participation in vulnerabilities equities process of Federal Government.
- Sec. 1511. Sense of Congress on notifications of certain disclosures of classified information.
- Sec. 1512. Technical amendments related to the Department of Energy.

SEC. 102. DEFINITIONS.

In this division, the terms “congressional intelligence committees” and “intelligence community” have the meaning given those terms in section 3 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003).

TITLE I—INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES**SEC. 1101. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2018 for the conduct of the intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the following elements of the United States Government:

- (1) The Office of the Director of National Intelligence.
- (2) The Central Intelligence Agency.
- (3) The Department of Defense.
- (4) The Defense Intelligence Agency.
- (5) The National Security Agency.
- (6) The Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, and the Department of the Air Force.
- (7) The Coast Guard.
- (8) The Department of State.
- (9) The Department of the Treasury.
- (10) The Department of Energy.
- (11) The Department of Justice.
- (12) The Federal Bureau of Investigation.
- (13) The Drug Enforcement Administration.
- (14) The National Reconnaissance Office.
- (15) The National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency.
- (16) The Department of Homeland Security.

(b) CERTAIN SPECIFIC AUTHORIZATION.—Funds appropriated by the Department of Defense Missile Defense and Defense Enhancements Appropriations Act, 2018 (division B of Public Law 115–96) for intelligence or intelligence-related activities are specifically authorized by the Congress for purposes of section 504 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3094), as specified in the classified Schedule of Authorizations pursuant to section 1102, and are subject to such section 504.

SEC. 1102. CLASSIFIED SCHEDULE OF AUTHORIZATIONS.

(a) SPECIFICATIONS OF AMOUNTS.—The amounts authorized to be appropriated under section 1101 and, subject to section 1103, the authorized personnel ceilings as of September 30, 2018, for the conduct of the intelligence activities of the elements listed in paragraphs (1) through (16) of section 1101, are those specified in the classified Schedule of Authorizations prepared to accompany this division.

(b) AVAILABILITY OF CLASSIFIED SCHEDULE OF AUTHORIZATIONS.—

(1) AVAILABILITY.—The classified Schedule of Authorizations referred to in subsection (a) shall be made available to the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, and to the President.

(2) DISTRIBUTION BY THE PRESIDENT.—Subject to paragraph (3), the President shall provide for suitable distribution of the classified Schedule of Authorizations referred to in subsection (a), or of appropriate portions of such Schedule, within the executive branch.

(3) LIMITS ON DISCLOSURE.—The President shall not publicly disclose the classified Schedule of Authorizations or any portion of such Schedule except—

(A) as provided in section 601(a) of the Implementing Recommendations of the 9/11 Commission Act of 2007 (50 U.S.C. 3306(a));

(B) to the extent necessary to implement the budget; or

(C) as otherwise required by law.

SEC. 1103. PERSONNEL CEILING ADJUSTMENTS.

(a) AUTHORITY FOR INCREASES.—The Director of National Intelligence may authorize employment of civilian personnel in excess of the number authorized for fiscal year 2018 by the classified Schedule of Authorizations referred to in section 1102(a) if the Director of National Intelligence determines that such action is necessary to the performance of important intelligence functions, except that the number of personnel employed in excess of the number authorized under such section may not, for any element of the intelligence community, exceed—

(1) 3 percent of the number of civilian personnel authorized under such schedule for such element; or

(2) 10 percent of the number of civilian personnel authorized under such schedule for such element for the purposes of converting the performance of any function by contractors to performance by civilian personnel.

(b) TREATMENT OF CERTAIN PERSONNEL.—The Director of National Intelligence shall establish guidelines that govern, for each element of the intelligence community, the treatment under the personnel levels authorized under section 1102(a), including any exemption from such personnel levels, of employment or assignment in—

(1) a student program, trainee program, or similar program;

(2) a reserve corps or as a reemployed annuitant; or

(3) details, joint duty, or long-term, full-time training.

(c) NOTICE TO CONGRESSIONAL INTELLIGENCE COMMITTEES.—Not later than 15 days prior to the exercise of an authority described in subsection (a), the Director of National Intelligence shall submit to the congressional intelligence committees—

(1) a written notice of the exercise of such authority; and

(2) in the case of an exercise of such authority subject to the limitation in subsection (a)(2), a written justification for the contractor conversion that includes a comparison of whole-of-Government costs.

SEC. 1104. INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY MANAGEMENT ACCOUNT.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated for the Intelligence Community Management Account of the Director of National Intelligence for fiscal year 2018 the sum of \$546,900,000.

(b) AUTHORIZED PERSONNEL LEVELS.—The elements within the Intelligence Community Management Account of the Director of National Intelligence are authorized 797 positions as of September 30, 2018. Personnel serving in such elements may be permanent employees of the Office of the Director of National Intelligence or personnel detailed from other elements of the United States Government.

(c) CLASSIFIED AUTHORIZATIONS.—

(1) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—In addition to amounts authorized to be appropriated for the Intelligence Community Management Account by subsection (a), there are authorized to be appropriated for the Intelligence Community Management Account for fiscal year 2018 such additional amounts as are specified in the classified Schedule of Authorizations referred to in section 1102(a).

(2) AUTHORIZATION OF PERSONNEL.—In addition to the personnel authorized by subsection (b) for elements of the Intelligence Community Management Account as of September 30, 2018, there are authorized such additional personnel for the Community Management Account as of that date as are specified in the classified Schedule of Authorizations referred to in section 1102(a).

TITLE II—CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY SYSTEM**SEC. 1201. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**

There is authorized to be appropriated for the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability Fund for fiscal year 2018 the sum of \$514,000,000.

SEC. 1202. COMPUTATION OF ANNUITIES FOR EMPLOYEES OF THE CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY.**(a) COMPUTATION OF ANNUITIES.—**

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 221 of the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement Act (50 U.S.C. 2031) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)(3)(B), by striking the period at the end and inserting “, as determined by using the annual rate of basic pay that would be payable for full-time service in that position.”;

(B) in subsection (b)(1)(C)(i), by striking “12-month” and inserting “2-year”;

(C) in subsection (f)(2), by striking “one year” and inserting “two years”;

(D) in subsection (g)(2), by striking “one year” each place such term appears and inserting “two years”;

(E) by redesignating subsections (h), (i), (j), (k), and (l) as subsections (i), (j), (k), (l), and (m), respectively; and

(F) by inserting after subsection (g) the following:

“(h) CONDITIONAL ELECTION OF INSURABLE INTEREST SURVIVOR ANNUITY BY PARTICIPANTS MARRIED AT THE TIME OF RETIREMENT.—

“(1) AUTHORITY TO MAKE DESIGNATION.—Subject to the rights of former spouses under subsection (b) and section 222, at the time of retirement a married participant found by the Director to be in good health may elect to receive an annuity reduced in accordance with subsection (f)(1)(B) and designate in writing an individual having an insurable interest in the participant to receive an annuity under the system after the participant’s death, except that any such election to provide an insurable interest survivor annuity to the participant’s spouse shall only be effective if the participant’s spouse waives the spousal right to a survivor annuity under this Act. The amount of the annuity shall be equal to 55 percent of the participant’s reduced annuity.

“(2) REDUCTION IN PARTICIPANT’S ANNUITY.—The annuity payable to the participant making such election shall be reduced by 10 percent of an annuity computed under subsection (a) and by an additional 5 percent for each full 5 years the designated individual is younger than the participant. The total reduction under this subparagraph may not exceed 40 percent.

“(3) COMMENCEMENT OF SURVIVOR ANNUITY.—The annuity payable to the designated individual shall begin on the day after the retired participant dies and terminate on the last day of the month before the designated individual dies.

“(4) RECOMPUTATION OF PARTICIPANT’S ANNUITY ON DEATH OF DESIGNATED INDIVIDUAL.—An

annuity which is reduced under this subsection shall, effective the first day of the month following the death of the designated individual, be recomputed and paid as if the annuity had not been so reduced.”.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY RETIREMENT ACT.—The Central Intelligence Agency Retirement Act (50 U.S.C. 2001 et seq.) is amended—

(i) in section 232(b)(1) (50 U.S.C. 2052(b)(1)), by striking “221(h),” and inserting “221(i),”; and

(ii) in section 252(h)(4) (50 U.S.C. 2082(h)(4)), by striking “221(k)” and inserting “221(l)”.

(B) CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY ACT OF 1949.—Subsection (a) of section 14 of the Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949 (50 U.S.C. 3514(a)) is amended by striking “221(h)(2), 221(i), 221(l),” and inserting “221(i)(2), 221(j), 221(m),”.

(b) ANNUITIES FOR FORMER SPOUSES.—Subparagraph (B) of section 222(b)(5) of the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement Act (50 U.S.C. 2032(b)(5)(B)) is amended by striking “one year” and inserting “two years”.

(c) PRIOR SERVICE CREDIT.—Subparagraph (A) of section 252(b)(3) of the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement Act (50 U.S.C. 2082(b)(3)(A)) is amended by striking “October 1, 1990” both places that term appears and inserting “March 31, 1991”.

(d) REEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION.—Section 273 of the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement Act (50 U.S.C. 2113) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (b) and (c) as subsections (c) and (d), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (a) the following:

“(b) PART-TIME REEMPLOYED ANNUITANTS.—The Director shall have the authority to reemploy an annuitant on a part-time basis in accordance with section 8344(l) of title 5, United States Code.”.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE AND APPLICATION.—The amendments made by subsection (a)(1)(A) and subsection (c) shall take effect as if enacted on October 28, 2009, and shall apply to computations or participants, respectively, as of such date.

TITLE III—GENERAL INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY MATTERS

SEC. 1301. RESTRICTION ON CONDUCT OF INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES.

The authorization of appropriations by this division shall not be deemed to constitute authority for the conduct of any intelligence activity which is not otherwise authorized by the Constitution or the laws of the United States.

SEC. 1302. INCREASE IN EMPLOYEE COMPENSATION AND BENEFITS AUTHORIZED BY LAW.

Appropriations authorized by this division for salary, pay, retirement, and other benefits for Federal employees may be increased by such additional or supplemental amounts as may be necessary for increases in such compensation or benefits authorized by law.

TITLE IV—MATTERS RELATING TO ELEMENTS OF THE INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY

SEC. 1401. AUTHORITY FOR PROTECTION OF CURRENT AND FORMER EMPLOYEES OF THE OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR OF NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE.

Section 5(a)(4) of the Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949 (50 U.S.C. 3506(a)(4)) is amended by striking “such personnel of the Office of the Director of National Intelligence as the Director of National Intelligence may designate;” and inserting “current and former personnel of the Office of the Director of National Intelligence and their immediate families as the Director of National Intelligence may designate;”.

SEC. 1402. DESIGNATION OF THE PROGRAM MANAGER-INFORMATION-SHARING ENVIRONMENT.

(a) INFORMATION-SHARING ENVIRONMENT.—Section 1016(b) of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (6 U.S.C. 485(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “President” and inserting “Director of National Intelligence”; and

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking “President” both places that term appears and inserting “Director of National Intelligence”.

(b) PROGRAM MANAGER.—Section 1016(f)(1) of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (6 U.S.C. 485(f)(1)) is amended by striking “The individual designated as the program manager shall serve as program manager until removed from service or replaced by the President (at the President’s sole discretion).” and inserting “Beginning on the date of the enactment of the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018, each individual designated as the program manager shall be appointed by the Director of National Intelligence.”.

SEC. 1403. TECHNICAL MODIFICATION TO THE EXECUTIVE SCHEDULE.

Section 5315 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“Director of the National Counterintelligence and Security Center.”.

TITLE V—REPORTS AND OTHER MATTERS

SEC. 1501. PERIOD OF OVERSEAS ASSIGNMENTS FOR CERTAIN FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS.

(a) LENGTH OF PERIOD OF ASSIGNMENT.—Subsection (a) of section 502 of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 3982) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3) In making assignments under paragraph (1), and in accordance with section 903, and, if applicable, section 503, the Secretary shall assure that a member of the Service may serve at a post for a period of not more than six consecutive years.”

(b) FOREIGN LANGUAGE DEPLOYMENT REQUIREMENTS.—Section 702 of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 4022) is amended by—

(1) redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection:

“(c) FOREIGN LANGUAGE DEPLOYMENT REQUIREMENTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of State, with the assistance of other relevant officials, shall require all members of the Service who receive foreign language training in Arabic, Farsi, Chinese (Mandarin or Cantonese), Turkish, Korean, and Japanese by the institution or otherwise in accordance with subsection (b) to serve three successive tours in positions in which the acquired language is both relevant and determined to be a benefit to the Department.

“(2) OVERSEAS DEPLOYMENTS.—In carrying out paragraph (1), at least one of the three successive tours referred to in such paragraph shall be an overseas deployment.

“(3) WAIVER.—The Secretary of State may waive the application of paragraph (1) for medical or family hardship or in the interest of national security.

“(4) CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION.—The Secretary of State shall notify the Committees on Appropriations and Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and Committees on Appropriations and Foreign Relations of the Senate at the end of each fiscal year of any instances during the prior twelve months in which the waiver authority described in paragraph (3) was invoked.”.

SEC. 1502. ASSESSMENT OF SIGNIFICANT RUSSIAN INFLUENCE CAMPAIGNS DIRECTED AT FOREIGN ELECTIONS AND REFERENDA.

(a) ASSESSMENT REQUIRED.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act,

the Director of National Intelligence shall submit to the congressional intelligence committees a report containing an analytical assessment of the most significant Russian influence campaigns, if any, conducted during the 3-year period preceding the date of the enactment of this Act, as well as the most significant current or planned such Russian influence campaigns, if any. Such assessment shall include—

(1) a summary of such significant Russian influence campaigns, including, at a minimum, the specific means by which such campaigns were conducted, are being conducted, or likely will be conducted, as appropriate, and the specific goal of each such campaign;

(2) a summary of any defenses against or responses to such Russian influence campaigns by the foreign state holding the elections or referenda;

(3) a summary of any relevant activities by elements of the intelligence community undertaken for the purpose of assisting the government of such foreign state in defending against or responding to such Russian influence campaigns; and

(4) an assessment of the effectiveness of such defenses and responses described in paragraphs (2) and (3).

(b) FORM.—The report required by subsection (a) may be submitted in classified form, but if so submitted, shall contain an unclassified summary.

(c) RUSSIAN INFLUENCE CAMPAIGN DEFINED.—In this section, the term “Russian influence campaign” means any effort, covert or overt, and by any means, attributable to the Russian Federation directed at an election, referendum, or similar process in a country other than the Russian Federation or the United States.

SEC. 1503. FOREIGN COUNTERINTELLIGENCE AND CYBERSECURITY THREATS TO FEDERAL ELECTION CAMPAIGNS.

(a) REPORTS REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—As provided in paragraph (2), for each Federal election, the Director of National Intelligence, in coordination with the Under Secretary of Homeland Security for Intelligence and Analysis and the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, shall make publicly available on an internet website an advisory report on foreign counterintelligence and cybersecurity threats to election campaigns for Federal offices. Each such report shall include, consistent with the protection of sources and methods, each of the following:

(A) A description of foreign counterintelligence and cybersecurity threats to election campaigns for Federal offices.

(B) A summary of best practices that election campaigns for Federal offices can employ in seeking to counter such threats.

(C) An identification of any publicly available resources, including United States Government resources, for countering such threats.

(2) SCHEDULE FOR SUBMITTAL.—A report under this subsection shall be made available as follows:

(A) In the case of a report regarding a special election held for the office of Senator or Member of the House of Representatives during 2019, not later than the date that is 60 days before the date of such special election.

(B) In the case of a report regarding an election for a Federal office during any subsequent year, not later than the date that is 1 year before the date of the election.

(3) INFORMATION TO BE INCLUDED.—A report under this subsection shall reflect the most current information available to the Director of National Intelligence regarding foreign counterintelligence and cybersecurity threats.

(b) TREATMENT OF CAMPAIGNS SUBJECT TO HEIGHTENED THREATS.—If the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Under Secretary of Homeland Security for Intelligence and Analysis jointly determine that an election campaign for Federal office is subject to a

heightened foreign counterintelligence or cybersecurity threat, the Director and the Under Secretary, consistent with the protection of sources and methods, may make available additional information to the appropriate representatives of such campaign.

SEC. 1504. INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY REPORTS ON SECURITY CLEARANCES.

(a) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) despite sustained efforts by Congress and the executive branch, an unacceptable backlog in processing and adjudicating security clearances persists, both within elements of the intelligence community and in other departments of the Federal Government, with some processing times exceeding a year or even more;

(2) the protracted clearance timetable threatens the ability of elements of the intelligence community to hire and retain highly qualified individuals, and thus to fulfill the missions of such elements;

(3) the prospect of a lengthy clearance process deters some such individuals from seeking employment with the intelligence community in the first place, and, when faced with a long wait time, those with conditional offers of employment may opt to discontinue the security clearance process and pursue different opportunities;

(4) now more than ever, therefore, the broken security clearance process badly needs fundamental reform; and

(5) in the meantime, to ensure the ability of elements of the intelligence community to hire and retain highly qualified personnel, elements should consider, to the extent possible and consistent with national security, permitting new employees to enter on duty immediately or nearly so, and to perform, on a temporary basis pending final adjudication of their security clearances, work that either does not require a security clearance or requires only a low-level interim clearance.

(b) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 506H of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3104) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)(ii), by inserting “and” after the semicolon;

(B) in subparagraph (B)(ii), by striking “; and” and inserting a period; and

(C) by striking subparagraph (C);

(2) by redesignating subsection (b) as subsection (c);

(3) by inserting after subsection (a) the following new subsection (b):

“(b) **INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY REPORTS.**—(1) Not later than March 1 of each year, the Director of National Intelligence shall submit to the congressional intelligence committees, the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate, and the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives a report on the security clearances processed by each element of the intelligence community during the preceding fiscal year. Each such report shall separately identify security clearances processed for Federal employees and contractor employees sponsored by each such element.

(2) Each report submitted under paragraph (1) shall include each of the following for each element of the intelligence community for the fiscal year covered by the report:

“(A) The total number of initial security clearance background investigations sponsored for new applicants.

“(B) The total number of security clearance periodic reinvestigations sponsored for existing employees.

“(C) The total number of initial security clearance background investigations for new applicants that were adjudicated with notice of a determination provided to the prospective applicant, including—

“(i) the total number that were adjudicated favorably and granted access to classified information; and

“(ii) the total number that were adjudicated unfavorably and resulted in a denial or revocation of a security clearance.

“(D) The total number of security clearance periodic background investigations that were adjudicated with notice of a determination provided to the existing employee, including—

“(i) the total number that were adjudicated favorably; and

“(ii) the total number that were adjudicated unfavorably and resulted in a denial or revocation of a security clearance.

“(E) The total number of pending security clearance background investigations, including initial applicant investigations and periodic reinvestigations, that were not adjudicated as of the last day of such year and that remained pending as follows:

“(i) For 180 days or less.

“(ii) For 180 days or longer, but less than 12 months.

“(iii) For 12 months or longer, but less than 18 months.

“(iv) For 18 months or longer, but less than 24 months.

“(v) For 24 months or longer.

“(F) In the case of security clearance determinations completed or pending during the year preceding the year for which the report is submitted that have taken longer than 12 months to complete—

“(i) an explanation of the causes for the delays incurred during the period covered by the report; and

“(ii) the number of such delays involving a polygraph requirement.

“(G) The percentage of security clearance investigations, including initial and periodic reinvestigations, that resulted in a denial or revocation of a security clearance.

“(H) The percentage of security clearance investigations that resulted in incomplete information.

“(I) The percentage of security clearance investigations that did not result in enough information to make a decision on potentially adverse information.

“(J) The report required under this subsection shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.”; and

(4) in subsection (c), as redesignated by paragraph (2), by striking “subsection (a)(1)” and inserting “subsections (a)(1) and (b)”.

SEC. 1505. ASSESSMENT OF THREAT FINANCE RELATING TO RUSSIA.

(a) **REPORT REQUIRED.**—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence, in coordination with the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury for Intelligence and Analysis, shall submit to the congressional intelligence committees a report containing an assessment of Russian threat finance. The assessment shall be based on intelligence from all sources, including from the Office of Terrorism and Financial Intelligence of the Department of the Treasury.

(b) **ELEMENTS.**—The report required by subsection (a) shall include each of the following:

(1) A summary of leading examples from the 3-year period preceding the date of the submittal of the report of threat finance activities conducted by, for the benefit of, or at the behest of—

(A) officials of the Government of Russia;

(B) persons subject to sanctions under any provision of law imposing sanctions with respect to Russia;

(C) Russian nationals subject to sanctions under any other provision of law; or

(D) Russian oligarchs or organized criminals.

(2) An assessment with respect to any trends or patterns in threat finance activities relating to Russia, including common methods of conducting such activities and global nodes of money laundering used by Russian threat actors described in paragraph (1) and associated entities.

(3) An assessment of any connections between Russian individuals involved in money laundering and the Government of Russia.

(4) A summary of engagement and coordination with international partners on threat finance relating to Russia, especially in Europe, including examples of such engagement and coordination.

(5) An identification of any resource and collection gaps.

(6) An identification of—

(A) entry points of money laundering by Russians and associated entities into the United States;

(B) any vulnerabilities within the United States legal and financial system, including specific sectors, which have been or could be exploited in connection with Russian threat finance activities; and

(C) the counterintelligence threat posed by Russian money laundering and other forms of threat finance, as well as the threat to the United States financial system and United States efforts to enforce sanctions and combat organized crime.

(7) Any other matters the Director determines appropriate.

(c) **FORM OF REPORT.**—The report required under subsection (a) may be submitted in classified form.

(d) **THREAT FINANCE DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “threat finance” means—

(1) the financing of cyber operations, global influence campaigns, intelligence service activities, proliferation, terrorism, or transnational crime and drug organizations;

(2) the methods and entities used to spend, store, move, raise, conceal, or launder money or value, on behalf of threat actors;

(3) sanctions evasion; and

(4) other forms of threat finance activity domestically or internationally, as defined by the President.

SEC. 1506. REPORT ON CYBER EXCHANGE PROGRAM.

(a) **REPORT.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence shall submit to the congressional intelligence committees a report on the potential establishment of a fully voluntary exchange program between elements of the intelligence community and private technology companies under which—

(1) an employee of an element of the intelligence community with demonstrated expertise and work experience in cybersecurity or related disciplines may elect to be temporarily detailed to a private technology company that has elected to receive the detailee; and

(2) an employee of a private technology company with demonstrated expertise and work experience in cybersecurity or related disciplines may elect to be temporarily detailed to an element of the intelligence community that has elected to receive the detailee.

(b) **ELEMENTS.**—The report under subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) An assessment of the feasibility of establishing the exchange program described in such subsection.

(2) Identification of any challenges in establishing the exchange program.

(3) An evaluation of the benefits to the intelligence community that would result from the exchange program.

SEC. 1507. REVIEW OF INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY WHISTLEBLOWER MATTERS.

(a) **REVIEW OF WHISTLEBLOWER MATTERS.**—The Inspector General of the Intelligence Community, in consultation with the inspectors general for the Central Intelligence Agency, the National Security Agency, the National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency, the Defense Intelligence Agency, and the National Reconnaissance Office, shall conduct a review of the authorities, policies, investigatory standards, and other practices and procedures relating to intelligence community whistleblower matters, with respect to such inspectors general.

(b) **OBJECTIVE OF REVIEW.**—The objective of the review required under subsection (a) is to

identify any discrepancies, inconsistencies, or other issues, which frustrate the timely and effective reporting of intelligence community whistleblower matters to appropriate inspectors general and to the congressional intelligence committees, and the fair and expeditious investigation and resolution of such matters.

(c) CONDUCT OF REVIEW.—The Inspector General of the Intelligence Community shall take such measures as the Inspector General determines necessary in order to ensure that the review required by subsection (a) is conducted in an independent and objective fashion.

(d) REPORT.—Not later than 270 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Inspector General of the Intelligence Community shall submit to the congressional intelligence committees a written report containing the results of the review required under subsection (a), along with recommendations to improve the timely and effective reporting of intelligence community whistleblower matters to inspectors general and to the congressional intelligence committees and the fair and expeditious investigation and resolution of such matters.

SEC. 1508. REPORT ON ROLE OF DIRECTOR OF NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN FOREIGN INVESTMENTS.

(a) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence, in consultation with the heads of the elements of the intelligence community determined appropriate by the Director, shall submit to the congressional intelligence committees a report on the role of the Director in preparing analytic materials in connection with the evaluation by the Federal Government of national security risks associated with potential foreign investments into the United States.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The report under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) a description of the current process for the provision of the analytic materials described in subsection (a);

(2) an identification of the most significant benefits and drawbacks of such process with respect to the role of the Director, including the sufficiency of resources and personnel to prepare such materials; and

(3) recommendations to improve such process.

SEC. 1509. SEMIANNUAL REPORTS ON INVESTIGATIONS OF UNAUTHORIZED DISCLOSURES OF CLASSIFIED INFORMATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title XI of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3231 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“SEC. 1105. SEMIANNUAL REPORTS ON INVESTIGATIONS OF UNAUTHORIZED DISCLOSURES OF CLASSIFIED INFORMATION.

“(a) INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY REPORTING.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not less frequently than once every 6 months, each covered official shall submit to the congressional intelligence committees a report on investigations of unauthorized public disclosures of classified information.

“(2) ELEMENTS.—Each report submitted under paragraph (1) shall include, with respect to the preceding 6-month period, the following:

“(A) The number of investigations opened by the covered official regarding an unauthorized public disclosure of classified information.

“(B) The number of investigations completed by the covered official regarding an unauthorized public disclosure of classified information.

“(C) Of the number of such completed investigations identified under subparagraph (B), the number referred to the Attorney General for criminal investigation.

“(b) DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE REPORTING.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not less frequently than once every 6 months, the Assistant Attorney General for National Security of the Department of Justice, in consultation with the Director of

the Federal Bureau of Investigation, shall submit to the congressional intelligence committees, the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate, and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives a report on the status of each referral made to the Department of Justice from any element of the intelligence community regarding an unauthorized disclosure of classified information made during the most recent 365-day period or any referral that has not yet been closed, regardless of the date the referral was made.

“(2) CONTENTS.—Each report submitted under paragraph (1) shall include, for each referral covered by the report, at a minimum, the following:

“(A) The date the referral was received.

“(B) A statement indicating whether the alleged unauthorized disclosure described in the referral was substantiated by the Department of Justice.

“(C) A statement indicating the highest level of classification of the information that was revealed in the unauthorized disclosure.

“(D) A statement indicating whether an open criminal investigation related to the referral is active.

“(E) A statement indicating whether any criminal charges have been filed related to the referral.

“(F) A statement indicating whether the Department of Justice has been able to attribute the unauthorized disclosure to a particular entity or individual.

“(g) FORM OF REPORTS.—Each report submitted under this section shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may have a classified annex.

“(h) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) COVERED OFFICIAL.—The term ‘covered official’ means—

“(A) the heads of each element of the intelligence community; and

“(B) the inspectors general with oversight responsibility for an element of the intelligence community.

“(2) INVESTIGATION.—The term ‘investigation’ means any inquiry, whether formal or informal, into the existence of an unauthorized public disclosure of classified information.

“(3) UNAUTHORIZED DISCLOSURE OF CLASSIFIED INFORMATION.—The term ‘unauthorized disclosure of classified information’ means any unauthorized disclosure of classified information to any recipient.

“(4) UNAUTHORIZED PUBLIC DISCLOSURE OF CLASSIFIED INFORMATION.—The term ‘unauthorized public disclosure of classified information’ means the unauthorized disclosure of classified information to a journalist or media organization.”.

“(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in the first section of the National Security Act of 1947 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 1104 the following new item:

“Sec. 1105. Semiannual reports on investigations of unauthorized disclosures of classified information.”.

SEC. 1510. REPORTS ON INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION IN VULNERABILITIES EQUITIES PROCESS OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.

(a) REPORTS ON PROCESS AND CRITERIA UNDER VULNERABILITIES EQUITIES POLICY AND PROCESS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence shall submit to the congressional intelligence committees a written report describing—

(A) with respect to each element of the intelligence community—

(i) the title of the official or officials responsible for determining whether, pursuant to criteria contained in the Vulnerabilities Equities Policy and Process document or any successor document, a vulnerability must be submitted for

review under the Vulnerabilities Equities Process; and

(ii) the process used by such element to make such determination; and

(B) the roles or responsibilities of that element during a review of a vulnerability submitted to the Vulnerabilities Equities Process.

(2) CHANGES TO PROCESS OR CRITERIA.—Not later than 30 days after any significant change is made to the process and criteria used by any element of the intelligence community for determining whether to submit a vulnerability for review under the Vulnerabilities Equities Process, such element shall submit to the congressional intelligence committees a report describing such change.

(3) FORM OF REPORTS.—Each report submitted under this subsection shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

(b) ANNUAL REPORTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not less frequently than once each calendar year, the Director of National Intelligence shall submit to the congressional intelligence committees a classified report containing, with respect to the previous year—

(A) the number of vulnerabilities submitted for review under the Vulnerabilities Equities Process;

(B) the number of vulnerabilities described in subparagraph (A) disclosed to each vendor responsible for correcting the vulnerability, or to the public, pursuant to the Vulnerabilities Equities Process; and

(C) the aggregate number, by category, of the vulnerabilities excluded from review under the Vulnerabilities Equities Process, as described in paragraph 5.4 of the Vulnerabilities Equities Policy and Process document.

(2) UNCLASSIFIED INFORMATION.—Each report submitted under paragraph (1) shall include an unclassified appendix that contains—

(A) the aggregate number of vulnerabilities disclosed to vendors or the public pursuant to the Vulnerabilities Equities Process; and

(B) the aggregate number of vulnerabilities disclosed to vendors or the public pursuant to the Vulnerabilities Equities Process known to have been patched.

(3) NONDUPLICATION.—The Director of National Intelligence may forgo submission of an annual report required under this subsection for a calendar year, if the Director notifies the congressional intelligence committees in writing that, with respect to the same calendar year, an annual report required by paragraph 4.3 of the Vulnerabilities Equities Policy and Process document already has been submitted to Congress, and such annual report contains the information that would otherwise be required to be included in an annual report under this subsection.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) VULNERABILITIES EQUITIES POLICY AND PROCESS DOCUMENT.—The term ‘Vulnerabilities Equities Policy and Process document’ means the executive branch document entitled ‘Vulnerabilities Equities Policy and Process’ dated November 15, 2017.

(2) VULNERABILITIES EQUITIES PROCESS.—The term ‘Vulnerabilities Equities Process’ means the interagency review of vulnerabilities, pursuant to the Vulnerabilities Equities Policy and Process document or any successor document.

(3) VULNERABILITY.—The term ‘vulnerability’ means a weakness in an information system or its components (for example, system security procedures, hardware design, and internal controls) that could be exploited or could affect confidentiality, integrity, or availability of information.

SEC. 1511. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON NOTIFICATIONS OF CERTAIN DISCLOSURES OF CLASSIFIED INFORMATION.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that section 502 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3092) requires elements of the intelligence community to keep the congressional intelligence

committees “fully and currently informed” about all “intelligence activities” of the United States, and to “furnish to the congressional intelligence committees any information or material concerning intelligence activities *** which is requested by either of the congressional intelligence committees in order to carry out its authorized responsibilities.”.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) section 502 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3092), together with other intelligence community authorities, obligate an element of the intelligence community to submit to the congressional intelligence committees written notification by not later than 7 days after becoming aware, that an individual in the executive branch has disclosed covered classified information to an official of an adversary foreign government using methods other than established intelligence channels; and

(2) each such notification should include—

(A) the date and place of the disclosure of classified information covered by the notification;

(B) a description of such classified information;

(C) identification of the individual who made such disclosure and the individual to whom such disclosure was made; and

(D) a summary of the circumstances of such disclosure.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ADVERSARY FOREIGN GOVERNMENT.—The term “adversary foreign government” means the government of any of the following foreign countries:

(A) North Korea.

(B) Iran.

(C) China.

(D) Russia.

(E) Cuba.

(2) COVERED CLASSIFIED INFORMATION.—The term “covered classified information” means classified information that was—

(A) collected by an element of the intelligence community; or

(B) provided by the intelligence service or military of a foreign country to an element of the intelligence community.

(3) ESTABLISHED INTELLIGENCE CHANNELS.—The term “established intelligence channels” means methods to exchange intelligence to coordinate foreign intelligence relationships, as established pursuant to law by the Director of National Intelligence, the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, the Director of the National Security Agency, or other head of an element of the intelligence community.

(4) INDIVIDUAL IN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH.—The term “individual in the executive branch”, means any officer or employee of the executive branch, including individuals—

(A) occupying a position specified in article II of the Constitution;

(B) appointed to a position by an individual described in subparagraph (A); or

(C) serving in the civil service or the senior executive service (or similar service for senior executives of particular departments or agencies).

SEC. 1512. TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS RELATED TO THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY.

(a) NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION ACT.—

(1) CLARIFICATION OF FUNCTIONS OF THE ADMINISTRATOR FOR NUCLEAR SECURITY.—Subsection (b) of section 3212 of the National Nuclear Security Administration Act (50 U.S.C. 2402(b)) is amended—

(A) by striking paragraphs (11) and (12); and

(B) by redesignating paragraphs (13) through (19) as paragraphs (11) through (17), respectively.

(2) COUNTERINTELLIGENCE PROGRAMS.—Section 3233(b) of the National Nuclear Security Administration Act (50 U.S.C. 2423(b)) is amended—

(A) by striking “Administration” and inserting “Department”; and

(B) by inserting “Intelligence and” after “the Office of”.

(b) ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACT.—Section 4524(b)(2) of the Atomic Energy Defense Act (50 U.S.C. 2674(b)(2)) is amended by inserting “Intelligence and” after “The Director of”.

(c) NATIONAL SECURITY ACT OF 1947.—Paragraph (2) of section 106(b) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3041(b)(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (E), by inserting “and Counterintelligence” after “Office of Intelligence”;

(2) by striking subparagraph (F);

(3) by redesignating subparagraphs (G), (H), and (I) as subparagraphs (F), (G), and (H), respectively; and

(4) in subparagraph (H), as so redesignated, by realigning the margin of such subparagraph 2 ems to the left.

DIVISION B—INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2019

SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This division may be cited as the “Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019”.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this division is as follows:

Sec. 201. Short title; table of contents.

Sec. 202. Definitions.

TITLE I—INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES

Sec. 2101. Authorization of appropriations.

Sec. 2102. Classified Schedule of Authorizations.

Sec. 2103. Intelligence Community Management Account.

TITLE II—CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY SYSTEM

Sec. 2201. Authorization of appropriations.

TITLE III—GENERAL INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY MATTERS

Sec. 2301. Restriction on conduct of intelligence activities.

Sec. 2302. Increase in employee compensation and benefits authorized by law.

Sec. 2303. Modification of special pay authority for science, technology, engineering, or mathematics positions and addition of special pay authority for cyber positions.

Sec. 2304. Repeal of Joint Intelligence Community Council.

Sec. 2305. Permanent enhanced procurement authority to manage supply chain risks.

Sec. 2306. Intelligence community information technology environment.

Sec. 2307. Development of secure cellular voice solution for intelligence community.

Sec. 2308. Policy on minimum insider threat standards.

Sec. 2309. Submission of intelligence community policies.

TITLE IV—MATTERS RELATING TO ELEMENTS OF THE INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY

Subtitle A—Office of the Director of National Intelligence

Sec. 2401. Chief Financial Officer of the Intelligence Community.

Sec. 2402. Chief Information Officer of the Intelligence Community.

Subtitle B—Central Intelligence Agency

Sec. 2411. CIA subsistence for personnel assigned to austere locations.

Sec. 2412. Special rules for certain monthly workers’ compensation payments and other payments for CIA personnel.

Sec. 2413. Expansion of security protective service jurisdiction of the Central Intelligence Agency.

Sec. 2414. Repeal of foreign language proficiency requirement for certain senior level positions in the Central Intelligence Agency.

Subtitle C—Office of Intelligence and Counterintelligence of Department of Energy

Sec. 2421. Consolidation of Department of Energy Offices of Intelligence and Counterintelligence.

Sec. 2422. Establishment of Energy Infrastructure Security Center.

Sec. 2423. Repeal of Department of Energy Intelligence Executive Committee and budget reporting requirement.

Subtitle D—Other Elements

Sec. 2431. Collocation of certain Department of Homeland Security personnel at field locations.

Sec. 2432. Framework for roles, missions, and functions of Defense Intelligence Agency.

Sec. 2433. Consultation by Secretary of Defense with Director of National Intelligence for certain functions.

Sec. 2434. Construction of National Security Agency East Campus Building 3.

Sec. 2435. Establishment of advisory board for National Reconnaissance Office.

TITLE V—REPORTS AND OTHER MATTERS

Sec. 2501. Public Interest Declassification Board.

Sec. 2502. Repeal of certain reporting requirements.

Sec. 2503. Notification of significant foreign cyber intrusions and active measures campaigns directed at elections for Federal offices.

Sec. 2504. Reports on intelligence community loan repayment and related programs.

Sec. 2505. Comptroller General of the United States report on senior executives of the Office of the Director of National Intelligence.

Sec. 2506. Briefings on counterintelligence activities of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Sec. 2507. Briefing on FBI offering permanent residence to sources and cooperators.

Sec. 2508. Technical and clerical amendments to the National Security Act of 1947.

SEC. 202. DEFINITIONS.

In this division, the terms “congressional intelligence committees” and “intelligence community” have the meaning given those terms in section 3 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003).

TITLE I—INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES

SEC. 2101. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2019 for the conduct of the intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the following elements of the United States Government:

(1) The Office of the Director of National Intelligence.

(2) The Central Intelligence Agency.

(3) The Department of Defense.

(4) The Defense Intelligence Agency.

(5) The National Security Agency.

(6) The Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, and the Department of the Air Force.

(7) The Coast Guard.

(8) The Department of State.

(9) The Department of the Treasury.

(10) The Department of Energy.

(11) The Department of Justice.

(12) The Federal Bureau of Investigation.

(13) The Drug Enforcement Administration.

(14) The National Reconnaissance Office.

(15) The National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency.

(16) The Department of Homeland Security.

SEC. 2102. CLASSIFIED SCHEDULE OF AUTHORIZATIONS.

(a) SPECIFICATIONS OF AMOUNTS.—The amounts authorized to be appropriated under section 2101 for the conduct of the intelligence activities of the elements listed in paragraphs (1) through (16) of section 2101, are those specified in the classified Schedule of Authorizations prepared to accompany this division.

(b) AVAILABILITY OF CLASSIFIED SCHEDULE OF AUTHORIZATIONS.—

(1) AVAILABILITY.—The classified Schedule of Authorizations referred to in subsection (a) shall be made available to the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, and to the President.

(2) DISTRIBUTION BY THE PRESIDENT.—Subject to paragraph (3), the President shall provide for suitable distribution of the classified Schedule of Authorizations referred to in subsection (a), or of appropriate portions of such Schedule, within the executive branch.

(3) LIMITS ON DISCLOSURE.—The President shall not publicly disclose the classified Schedule of Authorizations or any portion of such Schedule except—

(A) as provided in section 601(a) of the Implementing Recommendations of the 9/11 Commission Act of 2007 (50 U.S.C. 3306(a));

(B) to the extent necessary to implement the budget; or

(C) as otherwise required by law.

SEC. 2103. INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY MANAGEMENT ACCOUNT.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated for the Intelligence Community Management Account of the Director of National Intelligence for fiscal year 2019 the sum of \$514,524,000. Within such amount, funds identified in the classified Schedule of Authorizations referred to in section 2102(a) for advanced research and development shall remain available until September 30, 2020.

(b) CLASSIFIED AUTHORIZATIONS.—In addition to amounts authorized to be appropriated for the Intelligence Community Management Account by subsection (a), there are authorized to be appropriated for the Intelligence Community Management Account for fiscal year 2019 such additional amounts as are specified in the classified Schedule of Authorizations referred to in section 2102(a).

TITLE II—CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY SYSTEM**SEC. 2201. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**

There is authorized to be appropriated for the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability Fund for fiscal year 2019 the sum of \$514,000,000.

TITLE III—GENERAL INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY MATTERS**SEC. 2301. RESTRICTION ON CONDUCT OF INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES.**

The authorization of appropriations by this division shall not be deemed to constitute authority for the conduct of any intelligence activity which is not otherwise authorized by the Constitution or the laws of the United States.

SEC. 2302. INCREASE IN EMPLOYEE COMPENSATION AND BENEFITS AUTHORIZED BY LAW.

Appropriations authorized by this division for salary, pay, retirement, and other benefits for Federal employees may be increased by such additional or supplemental amounts as may be necessary for increases in such compensation or benefits authorized by law.

SEC. 2303. MODIFICATION OF SPECIAL PAY AUTHORITY FOR SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY, ENGINEERING, OR MATHEMATICS POSITIONS AND ADDITION OF SPECIAL PAY AUTHORITY FOR CYBER POSITIONS.

Section 113B of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3049a) is amended—

(1) by amending subsection (a) to read as follows:

“(a) SPECIAL RATES OF PAY FOR POSITIONS REQUIRING EXPERTISE IN SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY, ENGINEERING, OR MATHEMATICS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding part III of title 5, United States Code, the head of each element of the intelligence community may, for 1 or more categories of positions in such element that require expertise in science, technology, engineering, or mathematics—

“(A) establish higher minimum rates of pay; and

“(B) make corresponding increases in all rates of pay of the pay range for each grade or level, subject to subsection (b) or (c), as applicable.

“(2) TREATMENT.—The special rate supplements resulting from the establishment of higher rates under paragraph (1) shall be basic pay for the same or similar purposes as those specified in section 5305(j) of title 5, United States Code.”;

(2) by redesignating subsections (b) through (f) as subsections (c) through (g), respectively;

(3) by inserting after subsection (a) the following:

“(b) SPECIAL RATES OF PAY FOR CYBER POSITIONS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding subsection (c), the Director of the National Security Agency may establish a special rate of pay—

“(A) not to exceed the rate of basic pay payable for level II of the Executive Schedule under section 5313 of title 5, United States Code, if the Director certifies to the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence, in consultation with the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness, that the rate of pay is for positions that perform functions that execute the cyber mission of the Agency; or

“(B) not to exceed the rate of basic pay payable for the Vice President of the United States under section 104 of title 3, United States Code, if the Director certifies to the Secretary of Defense, by name, individuals that have advanced skills and competencies and that perform critical functions that execute the cyber mission of the Agency.

“(2) PAY LIMITATION.—Employees receiving a special rate under paragraph (1) shall be subject to an aggregate pay limitation that parallels the limitation established in section 5307 of title 5, United States Code, except that—

“(A) any allowance, differential, bonus, award, or other similar cash payment in addition to basic pay that is authorized under title 10, United States Code, (or any other applicable law in addition to title 5 of such Code, excluding the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 201 et seq.)) shall also be counted as part of aggregate compensation; and

“(B) aggregate compensation may not exceed the rate established for the Vice President of the United States under section 104 of title 3, United States Code.

“(3) LIMITATION ON NUMBER OF RECIPIENTS.—The number of individuals who receive basic pay established under paragraph (1)(B) may not exceed 100 at any time.

“(4) LIMITATION ON USE AS COMPARATIVE REFERENCE.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, special rates of pay and the limitation established under paragraph (1)(B) may not be used as comparative references for the purpose of fixing the rates of basic pay or maximum pay limitations of qualified positions under section 1599f of title 10, United States Code, or section 226 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 147).”;

(4) in subsection (c), as redesignated by paragraph (2), by striking “A minimum” and inserting “Except as provided in subsection (b), a minimum”;

(5) in subsection (d), as redesignated by paragraph (2), by inserting “or (b)” after “by subsection (a)”; and

(6) in subsection (g), as redesignated by paragraph (2)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of

the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017” and inserting “Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019”; and

(B) in paragraph (2)(A), by inserting “or (b)” after “subsection (a)”.

SEC. 2304. REPEAL OF JOINT INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY COUNCIL.

(a) REPEAL.—Section 101A of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3022) is hereby repealed.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents at the beginning of such Act is amended by striking the item relating to section 101A.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 102A(c)(1)(B) of such Act (50 U.S.C. 3024) is amended by striking “and, after obtaining the advice of the Joint Intelligence Community Council”.

SEC. 2305. PERMANENT ENHANCED PROCUREMENT AUTHORITY TO MANAGE SUPPLY CHAIN RISKS.

Section 309 of the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112-87; 125 Stat. 1875; 50 U.S.C. 3329 note) is amended by striking subsection (g).

SEC. 2306. INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ENVIRONMENT.

(a) ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES.—

(1) DIRECTOR OF NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE.—The Director of National Intelligence shall be responsible for coordinating the performance by elements of the intelligence community of IC ITE, including each of the following:

(A) Ensuring compliance with all applicable IC ITE rules and regulations.

(B) Ensuring IC ITE measurable performance goals exist.

(C) Documenting IC ITE standards and practices.

(D) Acting as an arbiter among elements of the intelligence community related to any disagreements arising out of the implementation of IC ITE.

(E) Delegating responsibilities to the elements of the intelligence community and carrying out such other responsibilities as are necessary for the effective implementation of IC ITE.

(2) KEY SERVICE PROVIDERS.—Key service providers shall be responsible for—

(A) providing key services, in coordination with the Director of National Intelligence; and

(B) providing the Director with information requested and required to fulfill the responsibilities of the Director under paragraph (1).

(3) USE OF KEY SERVICES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), each element of the intelligence community shall use key services when such services are available.

(B) EXCEPTION.—The Director of National Intelligence may provide for a written exception to the requirement under subparagraph (A) if the Director determines there is a compelling financial or mission need for such exception.

(b) MANAGEMENT ACCOUNTABILITY.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence shall designate and maintain one or more accountable IC ITE executives to be responsible for—

(1) IC ITE management, financial control, and integration;

(2) ensuring the performance of each key service, including establishing measurable service requirements and schedules;

(3) ensuring independent testing of each IC ITE core service, including testing by the intended users, to evaluate performance against measurable service requirements and to ensure the capability meets user requirements; and

(4) coordinate IC ITE transition or restructuring efforts, including phase out of legacy systems.

(c) SECURITY PLAN.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the

Director of National Intelligence shall develop and maintain a security plan for IC ITE.

(d) LONG-TERM ROADMAP.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and during each of the second and fourth fiscal quarters thereafter, the Director of National Intelligence shall submit to the congressional intelligence committees a long-term roadmap that shall include each of the following:

(1) A description of the minimum required and desired key service requirements, including—
(A) key performance parameters; and
(B) an assessment of current, measured performance.

(2) IC ITE implementation milestones, including each of the following:

(A) A schedule for expected deliveries of key service capabilities during each of the following phases:
(i) Concept refinement and technology maturity demonstration.
(ii) Development, integration, and demonstration,
(iii) Production, deployment, and sustainment.
(iv) System retirement.

(B) Dependencies of such key service capabilities.
(C) Plans for the transition or restructuring necessary to incorporate key service capabilities.
(D) A description of any legacy systems and discontinued capabilities to be phased out.

(3) Such other matters as the Director determines appropriate.

(e) BUSINESS PLAN.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and during each of the second and fourth fiscal quarters thereafter, the Director of National Intelligence shall submit to the congressional intelligence committees a business plan that includes each of the following:

(1) A uniform approach to identify IC ITE key service funding requests within the proposed budget, including multiyear plans to implement the long-term roadmap required by subsection (d).

(2) A uniform approach by which each element of the intelligence community shall identify the cost of legacy information technology or alternative capabilities where IC ITE services will also be available.

(3) A uniform effort by which each element of the intelligence community shall identify transition and restructuring costs for new, existing, and retiring IC ITE services, as well as IC ITE services that have changed designations among core service, service of common concern, and agency unique service.

(4) A fair and equitable rate structure for use of IC ITE.

(f) QUARTERLY PRESENTATIONS.—Beginning not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence shall provide to the congressional intelligence committees quarterly updates regarding ongoing implementation of IC ITE as compared to the requirements in the most recently submitted security plan required by subsection (c), long-term roadmap required by subsection (d), and business plan required by subsection (e).

(g) ADDITIONAL NOTIFICATIONS.—The Director of National Intelligence shall provide timely notification to the congressional intelligence committees regarding any policy changes related to or affecting IC ITE, new initiatives or strategies related to or impacting IC ITE, and changes or deficiencies in the execution of the security plan required by subsection (c), long-term roadmap required by subsection (d), and business plan required by subsection (e).

(h) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term “agency unique service” means a capability that is unique to and used only within one element of the intelligence community.

(2) The term “core service” means a capability that is available to multiple elements of the intelligence community and required for consistent operation of IC ITE.

(3) The term “intelligence community information technology environment” or “IC ITE” means all of the information technology services across the intelligence community, including the data sharing and protection environment across multiple classification domains.

(4) The term “key service” is a core service or service of common concern, but is not an agency unique service.

(5) The term “key service provider” is the entity responsible and accountable for implementing a key service within the IC ITE.

(6) The term “service of common concern” means a capability available across IC ITE that is of interest to two or more elements of the intelligence community.

(i) SUNSET.—The section shall have no effect on or after September 30, 2024.

SEC. 2307. DEVELOPMENT OF SECURE CELLULAR VOICE SOLUTION FOR INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Director of National Intelligence shall certify and approve the operation of a National Intelligence Program enterprise-wide secure voice cellular solution that leverages commercially available technology and operates on existing commercial cellular networks.

(b) POLICY.—The Director of National Intelligence shall establish an intelligence community policy for the cellular voice solution required by subsection (a) that addresses each of the following:

(1) Determinations regarding eligibility to use a device covered by such cellular voice solution.

(2) The appropriate classification levels associated with the use of secure cellular phones.

(3) Measures that should be taken prior to initiating or receiving a secure cellular call.

(4) Appropriate methods for storage of secure devices when not in the physical possession of an authorized user.

(5) Such other matters as the Director determines appropriate.

(c) COSTS.—The Director of National Intelligence shall ensure that annual operating costs of the secure cellular solution requirement in subsection (a), excluding initial development and deployment, are born on a cost-reimbursable basis by each relevant element of the intelligence community.

SEC. 2308. POLICY ON MINIMUM INSIDER THREAT STANDARDS.

(a) POLICY REQUIRED.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence shall establish a policy for minimum insider threat standards.

(b) IMPLEMENTATION.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the head of each element of the intelligence community shall implement the policy established under subsection (a).

SEC. 2309. SUBMISSION OF INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY POLICIES.

(a) SUBMISSION OF POLICIES.—

(1) CURRENT POLICY.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence shall submit to the congressional intelligence committees using the electronic repository all non-publicly available policies, directives, and guidance issued by the Director of National Intelligence for the intelligence community that are in effect as of the date of the submission.

(2) CONTINUOUS UPDATES.—Not later than 15 days after the date on which the Director of National Intelligence issues, modifies, or rescinds a policy, directive, or guidance of the intelligence community, the Director shall—

(A) notify the congressional intelligence committees of such addition, modification, or removal; and

(B) update the electronic repository with respect to such addition, modification, or removal.

(b) ELECTRONIC REPOSITORY DEFINED.—In this section, the term “electronic repository” means the electronic distribution mechanism, in

use as of the date of the enactment of this Act, or any successor electronic distribution mechanism, by which the Director of National Intelligence submits to the congressional intelligence committees information.

TITLE IV—MATTERS RELATING TO ELEMENTS OF THE INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY

Subtitle A—Office of the Director of National Intelligence

SEC. 2401. CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER OF THE INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY.

Section 103I(a) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3034(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: “The Chief Financial Officer shall report directly to the Director of National Intelligence.”.

SEC. 2402. CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER OF THE INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY.

Section 103G(a) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3032(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: “The Chief Information Officer shall report directly to the Director of National Intelligence.”.

Subtitle B—Central Intelligence Agency

SEC. 2411. CIA SUBSISTENCE FOR PERSONNEL ASSIGNED TO AUSTERE LOCATIONS.

Subsection (a) of section 5 of the Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949 (50 U.S.C. 3506) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “(50 U.S.C. 403-4a,)” and inserting “(50 U.S.C. 403-4a);”;

(2) in paragraph (6), by striking “and” at the end;

(3) in paragraph (7), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(4) by adding at the end the following new paragraph (8):

“(8) Upon the approval of the Director, provide, during any fiscal year, with or without reimbursement, subsistence to any personnel assigned to an overseas location designated by the Agency as an austere location.”.

SEC. 2412. SPECIAL RULES FOR CERTAIN MONTHLY WORKERS’ COMPENSATION PAYMENTS AND OTHER PAYMENTS FOR CIA PERSONNEL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949 (50 U.S.C. 3501 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 19 the following new section:

“SEC. 19A. SPECIAL RULES FOR CERTAIN INDIVIDUALS INJURED BY REASON OF WAR, INSURGENCY, HOSTILE ACT, OR TERRORIST ACTIVITIES.

“(a) ADJUSTMENT OF COMPENSATION FOR CERTAIN INJURIES.—

“(1) INCREASE.—The Director of the Central Intelligence Agency may increase the amount of monthly compensation paid to a covered employee under section 8105 of title 5, United States Code. Subject to paragraph (2), the Director may determine the amount of each such increase by taking into account—

“(A) the severity of the qualifying injury;

“(B) the circumstances by which the covered employee became injured; and

“(C) the seniority of the covered employee.

“(2) MAXIMUM.—Notwithstanding chapter 81 of title 5, United States Code, the total amount of monthly compensation increased under paragraph (1) may not exceed the monthly pay of the maximum rate of basic pay for GS-15 of the General Schedule under section 5332 of title 5, United States Code.

“(b) COSTS FOR TREATING QUALIFYING INJURIES.—The Director may pay the costs of treating a qualifying injury of a covered employee, a covered individual, or a covered dependent, or may reimburse a covered employee, a covered individual, or a covered dependent for such costs, that are not otherwise covered by chapter 81 of title 5, United States Code, or other provision of Federal law.

“(c) TREATMENT OF AMOUNTS.—For purposes of section 104 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, amounts paid pursuant to this section

shall be treated as amounts paid under chapter 81 of title 5, United States Code.

“(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) COVERED DEPENDENT.—The term ‘covered dependent’ means a family member of a covered employee who, on or after September 11, 2001—

“(A) accompanies the covered employee to an assigned duty station in a foreign country; and

“(B) becomes injured by reason of a qualifying injury.

“(2) COVERED EMPLOYEE.—The term ‘covered employee’ means an officer or employee of the Central Intelligence Agency who, on or after September 11, 2001, becomes injured by reason of a qualifying injury.

“(3) COVERED INDIVIDUAL.—The term ‘covered individual’ means an individual who—

“(A)(i) is detailed to the Central Intelligence Agency from other agencies of the United States Government or from the Armed Forces; or

“(ii) is affiliated with the Central Intelligence Agency, as determined by the Director; and

“(B) who, on or after September 11, 2001, becomes injured by reason of a qualifying injury.

“(4) QUALIFYING INJURY.—The term ‘qualifying injury’ means the following:

“(A) With respect to a covered dependent, an injury incurred—

“(i) during war, insurgency, hostile act, or terrorist activities occurring during a period in which the covered dependent is accompanying the covered employee to an assigned duty station in a foreign country; and

“(ii) that was not the result of the willful misconduct of the covered dependent.

“(B) With respect to a covered employee or a covered individual, an injury incurred—

“(i) during war, insurgency, hostile act, or terrorist activities occurring during a period of assignment to a duty station in a foreign country; and

“(ii) that was not the result of the willful misconduct of the covered employee or the covered individual.”.

(b) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency shall—

(1) prescribe regulations ensuring the fair and equitable implementation of section 19A of the Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949, as added by subsection (a); and

(2) submit to the congressional intelligence committees such regulations.

(c) APPLICATION.—Section 19A of the Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949, as added by subsection (a), shall apply with respect to—

(1) payments made to covered employees (as defined in such section) under section 8105 of title 5, United States Code, beginning on or after the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(2) treatment described in subsection (b) of such section 19A occurring on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 2413. EXPANSION OF SECURITY PROTECTIVE SERVICE JURISDICTION OF THE CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY.

Subsection (a) of section 15 of the Central Intelligence Act of 1949 (50 U.S.C. 3515(a)) is amended—

(1) in the subsection heading, by striking “POLICEMEN” and inserting “POLICE OFFICERS”; and

(2) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in subparagraph (B), by striking “500 feet;” and inserting “500 yards;”; and

(B) in subparagraph (D), by striking “500 feet.” and inserting “500 yards.”.

SEC. 2414. REPEAL OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY REQUIREMENT FOR CERTAIN SENIOR LEVEL POSITIONS IN THE CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY.

(a) REPEAL OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY REQUIREMENT.—Section 104A of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3036) is amended by striking subsection (g).

(b) CONFORMING REPEAL OF REPORT REQUIREMENT.—Section 611 of the Intelligence Author-

ization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108–487) is amended by striking subsection (c).

Subtitle C—Office of Intelligence and Counterintelligence of Department of Energy

SEC. 2421. CONSOLIDATION OF DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY OFFICES OF INTELLIGENCE AND COUNTERINTELLIGENCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 215 of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7144b) is amended to read as follows:

“OFFICE OF INTELLIGENCE AND COUNTERINTELLIGENCE

“SEC. 215.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—There is in the Department an Office of Intelligence and Counterintelligence. Such office shall be under the National Intelligence Program.

“(b) DIRECTOR.—(1) The head of the Office shall be the Director of the Office of Intelligence and Counterintelligence, who shall be an employee in the Senior Executive Service, the Senior Intelligence Service, the Senior National Intelligence Service, or any other Service that the Secretary, in coordination with the Director of National Intelligence, considers appropriate. The Director of the Office shall report directly to the Secretary.

“(2) The Secretary shall select an individual to serve as the Director from among individuals who have substantial expertise in matters relating to the intelligence community, including foreign intelligence and counterintelligence.

“(c) DUTIES.—(1) Subject to the authority, direction, and control of the Secretary, the Director shall perform such duties and exercise such powers as the Secretary may prescribe.

“(2) The Director shall be responsible for establishing policy for intelligence and counterintelligence programs and activities at the Department.

“(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the terms ‘intelligence community’ and ‘National Intelligence Program’ have the meanings given such terms in section 3 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003).”.

(b) CONFORMING REPEAL.—Section 216 of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7144c) is hereby repealed.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents at the beginning of the Department of Energy Organization Act is amended by striking the items relating to sections 215 and 216 and inserting the following new item:

“215. Office of Intelligence and Counterintelligence.”.

SEC. 2422. ESTABLISHMENT OF ENERGY INFRASTRUCTURE SECURITY CENTER.

Section 215 of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7144b), as amended by section 2421, is further amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (e); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (c) the following new subsection (d):

“(d) ENERGY INFRASTRUCTURE SECURITY CENTER.—(1)(A) The President shall establish an Energy Infrastructure Security Center, taking into account all appropriate government tools to analyze and disseminate intelligence relating to the security of the energy infrastructure of the United States.

“(B) The Secretary shall appoint the head of the Energy Infrastructure Security Center.

“(C) The Energy Infrastructure Security Center shall be located within the Office of Intelligence and Counterintelligence.

“(2) In establishing the Energy Infrastructure Security Center, the Director of the Office of Intelligence and Counterintelligence shall address the following missions and objectives to coordinate and disseminate intelligence relating to the security of the energy infrastructure of the United States:

“(A) Establishing a primary organization within the United States Government for analyzing and integrating all intelligence possessed or acquired by the United States pertaining to

the security of the energy infrastructure of the United States.

“(B) Ensuring that appropriate departments and agencies have full access to and receive intelligence support needed to execute the plans or activities of the agencies, and perform independent, alternative analyses.

“(C) Establishing a central repository on known and suspected foreign threats to the energy infrastructure of the United States, including with respect to any individuals, groups, or entities engaged in activities targeting such infrastructure, and the goals, strategies, capabilities, and networks of such individuals, groups, or entities.

“(D) Disseminating intelligence information relating to the security of the energy infrastructure of the United States, including threats and analyses, to the President, to the appropriate departments and agencies, and to the appropriate committees of Congress.

“(3) The President may waive the requirements of this subsection, and any parts thereof, if the President determines that such requirements do not materially improve the ability of the United States Government to prevent and halt attacks against the energy infrastructure of the United States. Such waiver shall be made in writing to Congress and shall include a description of how the missions and objectives in paragraph (2) are being met.

“(4) If the President decides not to exercise the waiver authority granted by paragraph (3), the President shall submit to Congress from time to time updates and plans regarding the establishment of an Energy Infrastructure Security Center.”.

SEC. 2423. REPEAL OF DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY INTELLIGENCE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AND BUDGET REPORTING REQUIREMENT.

Section 214 of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7144a) is amended—

(1) by striking “(a) DUTY OF SECRETARY.”; and

(2) by striking subsections (b) and (c).

Subtitle D—Other Elements

SEC. 2431. COLLOCATION OF CERTAIN DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY PERSONNEL AT FIELD LOCATIONS.

Not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Under Secretary of Homeland Security for Intelligence and Analysis shall transfer not less than 40 personnel who are stationed, as of the date of the enactment of this Act, at the Department of Homeland Security headquarters located in Nebraska Avenue Northwest, Washington, District of Columbia, to locations at least 30 miles from such headquarters in order to collocate such personnel with and provide support for Department of Homeland Security operational units from Customs and Border Protection, the Transportation Security Administration, Immigration and Customs Enforcement, or other elements of the Department of Homeland Security.

SEC. 2432. FRAMEWORK FOR ROLES, MISSIONS, AND FUNCTIONS OF DEFENSE INTELLIGENCE AGENCY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Director of National Intelligence and the Secretary of Defense shall jointly establish a framework to ensure the appropriate balance of resources for the roles, missions, and functions of the Defense Intelligence Agency in its capacity as an element of the intelligence community and as a combat support agency. The framework shall include supporting processes to provide for the consistent and regular reevaluation of the responsibilities and resources of the Defense Intelligence Agency to prevent imbalanced priorities, insufficient or misaligned resources, and the unauthorized expansion of mission parameters.

(b) MATTERS FOR INCLUSION.—The framework required under subsection (a) shall include each of the following:

(1) A lexicon providing for consistent definitions of relevant terms used by both the intelligence community and the Department of Defense, including each of the following:

- (A) Defense intelligence enterprise.
- (B) Enterprise manager.
- (C) Executive agent.
- (D) Function.
- (E) Functional manager.
- (F) Mission.
- (G) Mission manager.
- (H) Responsibility.
- (I) Role.
- (J) Service of common concern.

(2) An assessment of the necessity of maintaining separate designations for the intelligence community and the Department of Defense for intelligence functional or enterprise management constructs.

(3) A repeatable process for evaluating the addition, transfer, or elimination of defense intelligence missions, roles, and functions, currently performed or to be performed in the future by the Defense Intelligence Agency, which includes each of the following:

(A) A justification for the addition, transfer, or elimination of a mission, role, or function.

(B) The identification of which, if any, element of the Federal Government performs the considered mission, role, or function.

(C) In the case of any new mission, role, or functions—

(i) an assessment of the most appropriate agency or element to perform such mission, role, or function, taking into account the resource profiles, scope of responsibilities, primary customers, and existing infrastructure necessary to support such mission, role, or function; and

(ii) a determination of the appropriate resource profile and an identification of the projected resources needed and the proposed source of such resources over the future-years defense program, to be provided in writing to any elements of the intelligence community or the Department of Defense affected by the assumption, transfer, or elimination of any mission, role, or function.

(D) In the case of any mission, role, or function proposed to be assumed, transferred, or eliminated, an assessment, which shall be completed jointly by the heads of each element affected by such assumption, transfer, or elimination, of the risks that would be assumed by the intelligence community and the Department if such mission, role, or function is assumed, transferred, or eliminated.

(E) A description of how determinations are made regarding the funding of programs and activities under the National Intelligence Program and the Military Intelligence Program, including—

(i) which programs or activities are funded under each such Program;

(ii) which programs or activities should be jointly funded under both such Programs and how determinations are made with respect to funding allocations for such programs and activities; and

(iii) the thresholds and process for changing a program or activity from being funded under one such Program to being funded under the other such Program.

SEC. 2433. CONSULTATION BY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE WITH DIRECTOR OF NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE FOR CERTAIN FUNCTIONS.

Section 105(b) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3038(b)) is amended in the matter preceding paragraph (1) by inserting “, in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence,” after “the Secretary of Defense”.

SEC. 2434. CONSTRUCTION OF NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY EAST CAMPUS BUILDING 3.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that in carrying out the construction at the National Security Agency East Campus, the Director of the National Security Agency

should prioritize the consolidation of national intelligence mission activities on such campus and away from disparate leased facilities in the Washington-Baltimore region.

(b) INCREMENTAL CONSTRUCTION OF EAST CAMPUS BUILDING 3.

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director of the National Security Agency may provide for the construction of East Campus Building 3, as authorized in section 2102, in increments, subject to annual appropriations, except that the total amount expended on the construction of East Campus Building 3 may not exceed \$775,000,000.

(2) FISCAL YEAR 2019.—The authorization of appropriations for East Campus Building 3 under section 2102 is an authorization to proceed with the construction of East Campus Building 3. The Director of the National Security Agency shall conduct necessary activities during fiscal year 2019 to avoid delays in project completion.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of the National Security Agency shall submit to the congressional intelligence committees a plan for the construction of East Campus Building 4 and East Campus Building 5. Such plan shall include—

(1) a list of commercial leases in the Washington-Baltimore region that could be terminated if Congress authorizes the construction of East Campus Building 4 and East Campus Building 5; and

(2) an analysis of options to accelerate East Campus construction efforts.

SEC. 2435. ESTABLISHMENT OF ADVISORY BOARD FOR NATIONAL RECONNAISSANCE OFFICE.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—Section 106A of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3041a) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(d) ADVISORY BOARD.”

“(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the National Reconnaissance Office an advisory board (in this section referred to as the ‘Board’).

“(2) DUTIES.—The Board shall—

“(A) study matters relating to the mission of the National Reconnaissance Office, including with respect to space, overhead reconnaissance, acquisition, and other matters; and

“(B) advise and report directly the Director with respect to such matters.

“(3) MEMBERS.—

“(A) NUMBER AND APPOINTMENT.—The Board shall be composed of 5 members appointed by the Director from among individuals with demonstrated academic, government, business, or other expertise relevant to the mission and functions of the National Reconnaissance Office.

“(B) TERMS.—Each member shall be appointed for a term of 2 years. Except as provided by subparagraph (C), a member may not serve more than 3 terms.

“(C) VACANCY.—Any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring before the expiration of the term for which the member’s predecessor was appointed shall be appointed only for the remainder of that term. A member may serve after the expiration of that member’s term until a successor has taken office.

“(D) CHAIR.—The Board shall have a Chair, who shall be appointed by the Director from among the members.

“(E) TRAVEL EXPENSES.—Each member shall receive travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, in accordance with applicable provisions under subchapter I of chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code.

“(F) EXECUTIVE SECRETARY.—The Director may appoint an executive secretary, who shall be an employee of the National Reconnaissance Office, to support the Board.

“(4) MEETINGS.—The Board shall meet not less than quarterly, but may meet more frequently at the call of the Director.

“(5) REPORTS.—Not later than March 31 of each year, the Board shall submit to the Direc-

tor and to the congressional intelligence committees a report on the activities of the Board during the preceding year.

“(6) NONAPPLICABILITY OF CERTAIN REQUIREMENTS.—The Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) shall not apply to the Board.”.

(b) INITIAL APPOINTMENTS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of the National Reconnaissance Office shall appoint the initial 5 members to the advisory board under subsection (d) of section 106A of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3041a), as added by subsection (a).

TITLE V—REPORTS AND OTHER MATTERS

SEC. 2501. PUBLIC INTEREST DECLASSIFICATION BOARD.

Section 710(b) of the Public Interest Declassification Act of 2000 (Public Law 106-567; 50 U.S.C. 3161 note) is amended by striking “2018” and inserting “2028”.

SEC. 2502. REPEAL OF CERTAIN REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.

(a) CORRECTING LONG-STANDING MATERIAL WEAKNESSES.—Section 368 of the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 110-259; 50 U.S.C. 3051 note) is hereby repealed.

(b) ANNUAL REPORT ON INTERACTIONS BETWEEN INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY AND ENTERTAINMENT INDUSTRY.—Section 308 of the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (division N of Public Law 115-31; 131 Stat. 813; 50 U.S.C. 3222) is amended by striking subsection (c).

(c) DECLASSIFICATION REVIEW WITH RESPECT TO DETAINEES TRANSFERRED FROM UNITED STATES NAVAL STATION, GUANTANAMO BAY, CUBA.—Section 601 of such Act (division N of Public Law 115-31; 131 Stat. 827) is hereby repealed.

(d) INTERAGENCY THREAT ASSESSMENT AND COORDINATION GROUP.—Section 210D of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 124k) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (c); and

(2) by redesignating subsections (d) through (i) as subsections (c) through (h), respectively; and

(3) in subsection (c), as so redesignated—

(A) in paragraph (8), by striking “; and” and inserting a period; and

(B) by striking paragraph (9).

(e) INSPECTOR GENERAL REPORT.—Section 8H of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (g); and

(2) by redesignating subsections (h) and (i) as subsections (g) and (h), respectively.

SEC. 2503. NOTIFICATION OF SIGNIFICANT FOREIGN CYBER INTRUSIONS AND ACTIVE MEASURES CAMPAIGNS DIRECTED AT ELECTIONS FOR FEDERAL OFFICES.

(a) DETERMINATIONS OF SIGNIFICANT FOREIGN CYBER INTRUSIONS AND ACTIVE MEASURES CAMPAIGNS.—The Director of National Intelligence, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and the Secretary of Homeland Security shall jointly carry out subsection (b) if such Directors and the Secretary jointly determine—

(1) that on or after the date of the enactment of this Act, a significant foreign cyber intrusion or active measures campaign intended to influence an upcoming election for any Federal office has occurred or is occurring; and

(2) with moderate or high confidence, that such intrusion or campaign can be attributed to a foreign state or to a foreign nonstate person, group, or other entity.

(b) BRIEFING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 14 days after making a determination under subsection (a), the Director of National Intelligence, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and the Secretary of Homeland Security, shall jointly provide a briefing to the congressional leadership, the congressional intelligence committees

and, consistent with the protection of sources and methods, the other appropriate congressional committees. The briefing shall be classified and address, at a minimum, the following:

(A) A description of the significant foreign cyber intrusion or active measures campaign, as the case may be, covered by the determination.

(B) An identification of the foreign state or foreign nonstate person, group, or other entity, to which such intrusion or campaign has been attributed.

(C) The desirability and feasibility of the public release of information about the cyber intrusion or active measures campaign.

(D) Any other information such Directors and the Secretary jointly determine appropriate.

(2) ELECTRONIC ELECTION INFRASTRUCTURE BRIEFINGS.—With respect to a significant foreign cyber intrusion covered by a determination under subsection (a), the Secretary of Homeland Security, in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence and the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, shall offer to the owner or operator of any electronic election infrastructure directly affected by such intrusion, a briefing on such intrusion, including steps that may be taken to mitigate such intrusion. Such briefing may be classified and made available only to individuals with appropriate security clearances.

(3) PROTECTION OF SOURCES AND METHODS.—This subsection shall be carried out in a manner that is consistent with the protection of sources and methods.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ACTIVE MEASURES CAMPAIGN.—The term “active measures campaign” means a foreign semi-covert or covert intelligence operation.

(2) CANDIDATE, ELECTION, AND POLITICAL PARTY.—The terms “candidate”, “election”, and “political party” have the meanings given those terms in section 301 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30101).

(3) CONGRESSIONAL LEADERSHIP.—The term “congressional leadership” includes the following:

(A) The majority leader of the Senate.

(B) The minority leader of the Senate.

(C) The Speaker of the House of Representatives.

(D) The minority leader of the House of Representatives.

(4) CYBER INTRUSION.—The term “cyber intrusion” means an electronic occurrence that actually or imminently jeopardizes, without lawful authority, electronic election infrastructure, or the integrity, confidentiality, or availability of information within such infrastructure.

(5) ELECTRONIC ELECTION INFRASTRUCTURE.—The term “electronic election infrastructure” means an electronic information system of any of the following that is related to an election for Federal office:

(A) The Federal Government.

(B) A State or local government.

(C) A political party.

(D) The election campaign of a candidate.

(6) FEDERAL OFFICE.—The term “Federal office” has the meaning given that term in section 301 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30101).

(7) HIGH CONFIDENCE.—The term “high confidence”, with respect to a determination, means that the determination is based on high-quality information from multiple sources.

(8) MODERATE CONFIDENCE.—The term “moderate confidence”, with respect to a determination, means that a determination is credibly sourced and plausible but not of sufficient quality or corroborated sufficiently to warrant a higher level of confidence.

(9) OTHER APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term “other appropriate congressional committees” means—

(A) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 2504. REPORTS ON INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY LOAN REPAYMENT AND RELATED PROGRAMS.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) there should be established, through the issuing of an Intelligence Community Directive or otherwise, an intelligence community-wide program for student loan repayment, student loan forgiveness, financial counseling, and related matters, for employees of the intelligence community;

(2) creating such a program would enhance the ability of the elements of the intelligence community to recruit, hire, and retain highly qualified personnel, including with respect to mission-critical and hard-to-fill positions;

(3) such a program, including with respect to eligibility requirements, should be designed so as to maximize the ability of the elements of the intelligence community to recruit, hire, and retain highly qualified personnel, including with respect to mission-critical and hard-to-fill positions; and

(4) to the extent possible, such a program should be uniform throughout the intelligence community and publicly promoted by each element of the intelligence community to both current employees of the element as well as to prospective employees of the element.

(b) REPORT ON POTENTIAL INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY-WIDE PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence, in cooperation with the heads of the elements of the intelligence community and the heads of any other appropriate department or agency of the Federal Government, shall submit to the congressional intelligence committees a report on potentially establishing and carrying out an intelligence community-wide program for student loan repayment, student loan forgiveness, financial counseling, and related matters, as described in subsection (a).

(2) MATTERS INCLUDED.—The report under paragraph (1) shall include, at a minimum, the following:

(A) A description of the financial resources that the elements of the intelligence community would require to establish and initially carry out the program specified in paragraph (1).

(B) A description of the practical steps to establish and carry out such a program.

(C) The identification of any legislative action the Director determines necessary to establish and carry out such a program.

(c) ANNUAL REPORTS ON ESTABLISHED PROGRAMS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director of National Intelligence shall annually submit to the congressional intelligence committees a report on the covered programs. Each such report shall include, with respect to the period covered by the report, the following:

(A) The number of personnel from each element of the intelligence community who used each covered program.

(B) The total amount of funds each element expended for each such program.

(C) A description of the efforts made by each element to promote each covered program pursuant to both the personnel of the element of the intelligence community and to prospective personnel.

(2) COVERED PROGRAMS DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term “covered programs” means any loan repayment program, loan forgiveness program, financial counseling program, or similar programs, established pursuant to title X of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3191 et seq.) or any other provision of law that may be administered or used by an element of the intelligence community.

SEC. 2505. COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES REPORT ON SENIOR EXECUTIVES OF THE OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR OF NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE.

(a) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the congressional intelligence committees a report on the number of Senior Executive Service positions in the Office of the Director of National Intelligence.

(b) MATTERS INCLUDED.—The report under subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) The number of required Senior Executive Service positions for the Office of the Director of National Intelligence.

(2) Whether such requirements are reasonably based on the mission of the Office.

(3) A discussion of how the levels of the Senior Executive Service positions in the Office compare to the number of senior positions at other elements of the intelligence community.

(c) COOPERATION.—The Director of National Intelligence shall provide to the Comptroller General any information requested by the Comptroller General to carry out this section by not later than 5 business days after the date on which the Comptroller General makes such request.

(d) SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE POSITION DEFINED.—In this section, the term “Senior Executive Service position” has the meaning given that term in section 3132(a)(2) of title 5, United States Code, and includes any position above the GS-15, step 10, level of the General Schedule under section 5332 of such title.

SEC. 2506. BRIEFINGS ON COUNTERINTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES OF THE FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION.

(a) QUARTERLY BRIEFINGS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and on a quarterly basis thereafter, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall provide to the congressional intelligence committees a briefing on the counterintelligence activities of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Such briefings shall include, at a minimum, an overview and update of—

(1) the counterintelligence posture of the Bureau;

(2) matters of counterintelligence concern; and

(3) any other information relating to the counterintelligence activities of the Bureau that the Director determines necessary to keep the congressional intelligence committees fully and currently informed as required by section 501 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3091).

(b) GUIDELINES.—The Director, in coordination with the Attorney General and in consultation with the congressional intelligence committees, shall develop guidelines governing the scope of the briefings provided under subsection (a).

SEC. 2507. BRIEFING ON FBI OFFERING PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO SOURCES AND COOPERATORS.

Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall provide to the congressional intelligence committees a briefing on the ability of the Federal Bureau of Investigation to offer, as an inducement to assisting the Bureau, permanent residence within the United States to foreign individuals who are sources or cooperators in counterintelligence or other national security-related investigations. The briefing shall address the following:

(1) The extent to which the Bureau may make such offers, whether independently or in conjunction with other agencies and departments of the United States Government, including a discussion of the authorities provided by section 101(a)(15)(S) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(15)(S)), section 7 of the Central Intelligence Agency Act (50 U.S.C. 3508), and any other provision of law under which the Bureau may make such offers.

(2) An overview of the policies and operational practices of the Bureau with respect to making such offers.

(3) The sufficiency of such policies and practices with respect to inducing individuals to cooperate with, serve as sources for such investigations, or both.

(4) Whether the Director recommends any legislative actions to improve such policies and practices, particularly with respect to the counterintelligence efforts of the Bureau.

SEC. 2508. TECHNICAL AND CLERICAL AMENDMENTS TO THE NATIONAL SECURITY ACT OF 1947.

(a) **TABLE OF CONTENTS.**—The table of contents at the beginning of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3001 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by inserting after the item relating to section 2 the following new item:

“Sec. 3. Definitions.”;

(2) by striking the item relating to section 107;

(3) by striking the item relating to section 113B and inserting the following new item:

“Sec. 113B. Special pay authority for science, technology, engineering, or mathematics positions.”;

(4) by striking the items relating to sections 202, 203, 204, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, and 214; and

(5) by inserting after the item relating to section 311 the following new item:

“Sec. 312. Repealing and saving provisions.”.

(b) **OTHER TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS.**—Such Act is further amended—

(1) in section 102A—

(A) in subparagraph (G) of paragraph (1) of subsection (g), by moving the margins of such subparagraph 2 ems to the left; and

(B) in paragraph (3) of subsection (v), by moving the margins of such paragraph 2 ems to the left;

(2) in section 106—

(A) by inserting “SEC. 106” before “(a)”; and (B) in subparagraph (I) of paragraph (2) of subsection (b), by moving the margins of such subparagraph 2 ems to the left;

(3) by striking section 107;

(4) in section 108(c), by striking “in both a classified and an unclassified form” and inserting “to Congress in classified form, but may include an unclassified summary”;

(5) in section 112(c)(1), by striking “section 103(c)(7)” and inserting “section 102A(i)”; and

(6) by amending section 201 to read as follows:

SEC. 201. DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

Except to the extent inconsistent with the provisions of this Act or other provisions of law, the provisions of title 5, United States Code, shall be applicable to the Department of Defense.”;

(7) in section 205, by redesignating subsections (b) and (c) as subsections (a) and (b), respectively;

(8) in section 206, by striking “(a)”; and

(9) in section 207, by striking “(c)”; and

(10) in section 308(a), by striking “this Act” and inserting “sections 2, 101, 102, 103, and 303 of this Act”;

(11) by redesignating section 411 as section 312;

(12) in section 503—

(A) in paragraph (5) of subsection (c)—

(i) by moving the margins of such paragraph 2 ems to the left; and

(ii) by moving the margins of subparagraph (B) of such paragraph 2 ems to the left; and

(B) in paragraph (2) of subsection (d), by moving the margins of such paragraph 2 ems to the left; and

(13) in subparagraph (B) of paragraph (3) of subsection (a) of section 504, by moving the margins of such subparagraph 2 ems to the right.

The Acting CHAIR. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except

those printed in House Report 115-815. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. SCHIFF

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 115-815.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, as the designee of the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEATING), I offer amendment No. 1.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 17, line 2, insert “Russian,” after “Korean.”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 989, the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to offer this amendment on behalf of its author, Mr. KEATING of Massachusetts, who is one of our fine members who has great experience in public safety prior to coming to the Congress.

This amendment builds on an initiative from Chairman NUNES to extend tour lengths of deployed U.S. Government personnel, particularly those who are proficient in difficult languages such as Arabic, Farsi, Chinese, and Korean. Specifically, the amendment adds the Russian language to that list.

In view of the continuing threat to our national security posed by the aggressive action of the Russian Government, the U.S. Government must fully engage its cadre of personnel proficient in the Russian language.

I am a slow talker. I am talking even more slowly, and my colleague has arrived. I want to thank my colleague for his work.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support of this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, although I am not opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from California (Mr. NUNES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support the amendment, and I strongly encourage Members to support this amendment.

I have no further comments at this time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr.

KEATING), who is the author of the amendment.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I thank my two colleagues from California.

Mr. Chairman, I am here rising in support of my amendment to H.R. 6237.

The underlying bill requires all members of the Foreign Service to serve three consecutive terms if they have received language training in certain languages. My amendment adds the Russian language to that list.

Extending Foreign Service officers' length of service in these positions is vital to our foreign policy and national security objectives. Through this continuity of service, they can develop and deploy their cultural and language expertise to make the most of our diplomatic efforts in-country. Putin has become one of the greatest antagonists of the United States. He attacked our elections and those of our allies, and he is behind a number of cyber-related incidents recently.

He has invaded sovereign nations when they looked toward strengthening ties with the West. His government and government-controlled entities spread lies and misinformation about the United States—not only in Russia, but here in the U.S. as well—through fake social media accounts that attempt to sow division among all Americans.

He seeks to undermine all aspects of civil society and a free political process that challenge him and his control over the Russian Government and its people.

Putin presents a serious security threat to the United States and our interests. We must respond to these actions through sanctions, indictments, and other means, whether related to election interference, incursions into Ukraine, or human rights violations.

However, we must also keep our eyes on the long game. Russian language is broadly spoken around the globe, not just in Russia, but across Eastern Europe and many parts of Central Asia as well.

Representing the United States and our ideals abroad means being able to actually have meaningful person-to-person exchanges with local communities and build the relationships that will help us combat Putin's misinformation apparatus.

It means we can talk to local press in-country to clarify misunderstandings and to communicate directly with the local population about what we actually stand for. It means having the most accurate understanding of real-time security information, so that the United States can respond quickly and appropriately.

Today, we are not operating at full capacity in this regard when it comes to Russia, and, frankly, we cannot afford to keep looking the threat from Russia and Putin in the face and refusing not to do everything we can about it.

We have heard many times that the Russian people themselves have great

concern and great antagonism to Putin and his leadership. We need to have skilled people fluent in the language and understanding the culture there and on the front lines of our efforts to encourage them to stand up within their own country, and to make sure that our allies in Europe know that we are there, using every tool at our disposal to stop his aggression and interference.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment passes.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I urge passage of the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Chairman, I urge passage also, 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. SCHIFF).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. SCHNEIDER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 115-815.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. 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 20, line 7, before the period insert “, including an identification of the foreign state or foreign nonstate person, group, or entity to which such threat has been attributed”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 989, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHNEIDER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Chairman, we are still uncovering more troubling evidence on the extent of Russia's interference in our most recent election. These Russian actions were an attack on our democracy, and we need to respond both to hold them to account for past actions and to protect against future aggressions. With our next national election less than 4 months away, we must act now.

So I am pleased this bill takes steps to require a publicly available advisory report on foreign counterintelligence and cybersecurity threats facing our Federal elections. This joint report from the Director of National Intelligence, the Department of Homeland Security, and the FBI will help campaigns identify and counter these threats.

My amendment strengthens the reporting requirements to ensure we are publicly identifying the foreign state or nonstate actors that our intelligence officials identify as responsible for these threats.

The American people deserve to know who is trying to interfere in our democratic process, and they deserve a government that will hold these countries and these groups to account.

Protecting the integrity of our elections from outside influence by malign

foreign actors is of paramount importance. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment to help ensure that we treat the threat of foreign election interference with the seriousness it demands.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF), who is the ranking member.

1415

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for offering this amendment.

I am pleased to rise in support. This amendment clarifies section 1503 of the bill dealing with foreign counterintelligence and cybersecurity threats to Federal election campaigns.

The current provision directs that, for each Federal election, the Director of National Intelligence, the Under Secretary of Homeland Security, and the FBI will make publicly available a report on foreign counterintelligence and cybersecurity threats to our elections.

Section 1503 strengthens our elections by providing information to the public about these threats by providing information about best practices and resources which may be used to counter these threats.

Mr. SCHNEIDER's amendment adds to the publicly available report the identification of the foreign actor, when possible. This public attribution can be very powerful, not only in terms of protecting the public, but also in deterring any foreign intervention in our democratic affairs.

I want to thank my colleague again for his work, and I am happy to support the amendment.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, though I am not opposed.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Chairman, I urge support of the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHNEIDER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 115-815.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. 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 22, line 16, strike “and”.

Page 23, line 2, strike the period and insert “; and”.

Page 23, after line 2, insert the following new paragraph:

(6) an immediate review of a clearance may be triggered when a security clearance holder is reported to have engaged in violent acts against individuals, property, or public spaces based on the security clearance holder's association or sympathy with persons or organizations that advocate, threaten, or use force or violence, or any other illegal or unconstitutional means, in an effort to prevent others from exercising their rights under the Constitution or laws of the United States or of any State, based on factors including, at a minimum, race, religion, national origin, or disability.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 989, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I thank the ranking member and the chairman for bringing this bill to the floor and working on some very important items, including diversity, outreach, HBCUs, issues of which I have worked on as well. So I thank them very much, because bringing the expertise of diversity to the national security and intelligence community can only make us stronger.

Mr. Chairman, I have just left the Judiciary Committee where we have been spending a period of time dealing with questions that wrap themselves around the intelligence community and the importance of preserving confidential sources and as well the importance of the intelligence community as it relates to the ongoing Russian investigation.

Equally important, of course, is to ensure that we have a community that is well-recognized to have security clearances that are not impacted by actions or views that would do harm to the American people.

My amendment adds to the sense of Congress in the bill that a re-review of a security clearance holder's credentials can be triggered by his or her association or empathy with persons or organizations that advocate, threaten, or use force or violence or any other illegal or unconstitutional means in an effort to prevent others from exercising their rights under the Constitution or laws of the United States or of any State, on account of race, religion, national origin, disability, or other impermissible factors, which maybe include LGBTQ, and whether one is, in essence, considered different. That is the basis of I think a very positive addition to this legislation.

Mr. Chair, I include in the RECORD an article published on July 6, 2018, by PBS FRONTLINE about Michael Miselis, an active member of the California-based Rise Above Movement, RAM, as a well-known violent white supremacist group.

HE IS A MEMBER OF A VIOLENT WHITE SUPREMATIC GROUP; SO WHY IS HE WORKING FOR A DEFENSE CONTRACTOR WITH A SECURITY CLEARANCE?

This story is part of an ongoing collaboration between ProPublica and FRONTLINE that includes documentaries scheduled to begin on PBS in August 2018.

If you've witnessed or experienced hate crimes, harassment or incidents of bias, you can use this form to send information to FRONTLINE, ProPublica and other partners in the Documenting Hate project.

Update, July 6, 2018: One day after being exposed as a member of a violent white supremacist group, Michael Miselis has lost his job as an aerospace engineer. In an email, company spokesman Tim Paynter told ProPublica and FRONTLINE that Miselis "is no longer an employee of Northrop Grumman." Paynter did not say whether Miselis was fired or resigned from his position.

There likely isn't such a thing as a "typical" violent white extremist in America in 2018. Still, Michael Miselis—a University of California, Los Angeles doctoral student with a U.S. government security clearance to work on sensitive research for a prominent defense contractor—makes for a pretty unusual case.

For months, ProPublica and FRONTLINE have been working to identify the white supremacists at the center of violent demonstrations across the country, including the infamous Unite the Right rally last August in Charlottesville, Virginia. The Rise Above Movement, a Southern California group that expresses contempt for Muslims, Jews, and immigrants, became a focus of that effort. ProPublica and FRONTLINE were able to quickly identify a number of the group's leaders, and find evidence that put them in the middle of violence in Charlottesville and Berkeley, California, among other places.

But one seeming member of RAM was harder to nail down. In video shot in Charlottesville, a bearded, husky man is seen in a red Make America Great Again hat with his hands wrapped in tape that came in handy for the brawling that occurred that day. During one encounter, the unidentified man in the red hat pushed an African-American protester to the ground and began pounding on him, video of the episode shows; moments later, a known RAM member choked and bloodied a pair of female counter-protesters. The possible RAM member also had turned up in video shot during hours of combat at a Trump rally in Berkeley, as well. Wearing protective goggles to ward off pepper spray, the man fought alongside RAM members, wrestling one protester to the ground and punching others.

Ultimately, ProPublica and FRONTLINE determined the man in the violent footage was Miselis, a 29-year-old pursuing a Ph.D. in UCLA's aerospace engineering program. Miselis was identified using video footage and social media posts, and reporters confirmed his identity in an encounter with him outside his home. In interviews, a number of California law enforcement officials said Miselis was a member of RAM.

In addition to his scholarly pursuits, Miselis works as a systems engineer for Northrop Grumman, the giant defense contractor with a plant in Redondo Beach, California.

When approached by ProPublica and FRONTLINE in front of his home in Lawndale, a small city south of Los Angeles, Miselis said he "didn't know anything" about what happened in Charlottesville.

"I think you got the wrong guy," he said before driving off in his car.

Miselis did not respond to questions about his involvement with RAM. He did not answer additional questions sent by email.

Several current and former employees at Northrop Grumman told ProPublica and FRONTLINE that Miselis has received a security clearance to work in a computer modeling and simulation group within Northrop's aerospace division. Such security clearances are typically issued in a two-step process. The federal Office of Personnel Man-

agement conducts an investigation into the individual. The agency's findings are then forwarded to a special unit within the Department of Defense, which makes the final determination on whether the person should receive a clearance, a status that often allows the person access to classified or otherwise sensitive information concerning national security.

Public affairs officers at the Defense Department declined to comment about Miselis and his security clearance. The federal personnel management office referred questions regarding Miselis to Northrop Grumman.

Northrop Grumman did not respond to several requests for comment. However, interviews with current and former Northrop employees, as well as an internal email, make clear the company knows of Miselis' actions in Charlottesville and involvement with RAM. Miselis informed his superiors about his contact with reporters from ProPublica and FRONTLINE, as is required by any individual who holds a higher-level security clearance, the people said.

So far, it seems, the company has taken no action against Miselis, who remains employed.

Keegan Hankes, an analyst with the Southern Poverty Law Center who follows RAM closely, said he was surprised that nothing has been done about Miselis' employment and security clearance.

"It's ridiculous," Hankes said.

"They're openly motivated by racism," he added of RAM.

As ProPublica has previously reported, RAM first surfaced publicly last spring and has quickly established itself as one of the violent groups in the resurgent white supremacist scene; members, who regularly train in boxing and martial arts, have been documented engaging in a string of melees. Founded in early 2017 by Robert Rundo, a Queens, New York, native who served an 18-month prison sentence for stabbing a rival gang member six times during a 2009 street fight, the group's core membership is small—15 to 20 young men—but capable of real menace, ProPublica's reporting has shown.

Rundo has recruited followers from the Orange County and San Diego chapters of the Hammerskin Nation, the country's largest Nazi skinhead gang, and one the authorities say has been behind at least nine murders. One of the Hammerskins who joined up with RAM, Matthew Branstetter, went to prison in California in 2011 on hate crime charges for robbing and assaulting a Jewish man in an Orange County park. The attack left the victim with "a concussion, broken jaw, eye socket fracture, broken nose, cracked ribs, severe facial bruising, and cuts and bruises to his body and face," according to a news release issued by county prosecutors at the time. Other RAM members have spent time in prison and Los Angeles County jail on charges for robbery, firearms possession and other offenses.

The FBI has taken notice. Several law enforcement officials familiar with the bureau's work said agents have opened a formal investigation into RAM. In a statement, the FBI said: "While the FBI neither confirms nor denies the existence of an investigation, our agents investigate activity which may constitute a federal crime or pose a threat to national security. Our focus is not on membership in particular groups but on criminal activity. The FBI cannot initiate an investigation based solely on an individual's race, ethnicity, national origin, religion, or the exercise of their First Amendment rights, and we remain committed to protecting those rights for all Americans."

Since last August, local prosecutors have brought charges against a handful of participants in the Charlottesville rally, success-

fully convicting several men so far, including activists on both sides of the clashes. Now federal authorities are targeting neo-Nazi James Alex Fields, the man accused of killing counter-protester Heather Heyer and injuring more than two dozen others. Federal prosecutors recently filed 30 charges against Fields, including 28 hate crime charges.

A native of Stockton, California, Miselis earned a bachelor's of science degree in mechanical engineering from UCLA in 2011. UCLA's website today lists Miselis as a Ph.D. candidate in the engineering department's hypersonics and computational aerodynamics group. After FRONTLINE and ProPublica began making inquiries about Miselis, the school issued a brief statement saying only that he is technically on leave from the doctoral program.

Miselis was clearly prepared for the unrest in Berkeley in the spring of 2017. At the Trump rally he wore protective goggles to ward off pepper spray or tear gas, taped his hands up like a boxer, and wore a gray active-wear uniform, as did several other RAM members that day. In video footage reviewed by ProPublica and FRONTLINE, Miselis can be seen fighting alongside other RAM members.

The event turned into a multi-hour street battle pitting Trump supporters, including fascists and extreme-right activists, against counter-protesters, some of them militant anti-fascists. Police made 20 arrests, confiscating knives, pepper spray, a stun gun, an axe-handle and many wooden dowel rods, which were used as clubs by participants. At least seven people were transported to the hospital for their injuries. Rundo, RAM's founder, was arrested and detained for assault on a police officer, but Alameda County District Attorney Nancy O'Malley declined to file charges. "We determined we didn't have enough evidence to prove the charges beyond a reasonable doubt," said Teresa Drenick, an Alameda County deputy district attorney.

After the Berkeley rally, Miselis traveled across the country to take part in the massive white supremacist convergence in Charlottesville, where his activities were photographed and recorded on video, both by professional journalists and other people equipped with smart phones. At the rally on Aug. 12, pictures taken by photojournalist Jason Andrew show Miselis walking alongside two other RAM members previously identified by ProPublica, Tom Gillen and Ben Daley.

At roughly 10 a.m., Miselis and the other RAM members confronted counter-protesters a few steps away from Emancipation Park, where white supremacists had gathered beneath a statue of Confederate Gen. Robert E. Lee.

Daley attacked two female counter-protesters, kicking and punching them, a scene captured in video obtained by ProPublica and FRONTLINE. He wrapped both hands around the throat of one woman, throttling her until she fell to the ground, blood seeping from a gash on her temple. The other woman emerged from the incident with a laceration across her forehead. On video, she screams as blood drips across her face.

Miselis jumped into the fracas. In addition to FRONTLINE and ProPublica, National Geographic produced video documenting the brawl.

A sequence of pictures shot by photojournalist Edu Bayer, who was on assignment for The New York Times, show Miselis hurling what appears to be a can of soda at counter-protesters. In one photo he flexes his biceps muscles in celebration.

It's this sort of street combat that worries the SPLC's Hankes. In his view, such brazen

criminal activity should be a red flag for both Northrop Grumman and the Pentagon.

"I can't believe that participation in an organized white supremacist group focused on street-level violence wouldn't jeopardize your security clearance," Hankes said.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, this gentleman was at Charlottesville speaking loudly, intimidating my fellow alumni and students, having gone to the University of Virginia School of Law. I spoke to the president and officers there, and the students were patiently and conspicuously intimidated and frightened. But more importantly, this individual had a security clearance, and he worked for a defense contractor.

My amendment would ensure that the American people have strong national security, a strong intelligence community, but individuals who receive a clearance can receive it appropriately and that they themselves will not be a jeopardy to the citizens of the United States.

Mr. Chair, the Jackson Lee Amendment No. 3, designated as No. 33 on the Rules Committee rosters, amends the Sense of Congress already in the bill on the importance of re-review of security clearances held by individuals by adding consideration of whether the security clearance holder's association or sympathy with persons or organizations that advocate, threaten, or use force or violence, or any other illegal or unconstitutional means, in an effort to prevent others from exercising their rights under the Constitution or laws of the United States or of any state, on account of race, religion, national origin, disability, or other impermissible factors.

Mr. Miselis has a security clearance and worked for Northrup Grumman, a major defense contractor, at the time he engaged in physical violence against persons protesting racism and white supremacy in Charlottesville, Virginia.

In May 2018, Northrup Grumman was informed of Mr. Miselis' membership in RAM and the violent assaults he initiated while he was in Charlottesville participating in activities in support of white supremacy, which were captured on video and in photos.

Mr. Miselis worked for a government contractor and held a security clearance authorizing him to work on projects that were of vital interest to our nation and its defense.

Northrup Grumman did not dismiss him until the story broke earlier this month with media reports on the violence Mr. Miselis engaged in at white supremacists' rally held in Charlottesville, Virginia.

The violence of RAM members has been a hallmark of the group and its members.

The Anti-Defamation League describes RAM as a white supremacist group whose members believe they are fighting against a "modern world" corrupted by the "destructive cultural influences" of liberals, Jews, Muslims and non-white immigrants.

They refer to themselves as the "premier MMA (mixed martial arts) club of the Alt-Right."

RAM is characterized as operating like a street-fighting club.

Members actively train to do physical battle with their ideological foes, and have been involved in violent clashes during political rallies and demonstrations.

RAM members consider themselves to be part of the "Alt-Right."

RAM's membership has deep roots in California's racist skinhead movement, and includes individuals who have faced serious criminal charges, including assault, robbery and weapon offenses.

RAM consists of several dozen loosely affiliated neo-Nazis and racist skinheads who were formerly known as the DIY Division, but rebranded themselves as the Rise Above Movement in the spring of 2017.

The FBI has opened an informal investigation into this group because of the violence associated with its members.

The United States is a nation of laws, which gives us the freedom to agree and most importantly disagree with not only each other but with our government.

But the limitations to the right to disagree can be best described by the ancient wisdom: "Your right to swing your arms ends just where the other person's nose begins."

There is a limit to the expression of free speech and the freedom to assemble and that limit is violence.

The awarding of security clearances to contractors must be better managed and the consequences for involvement in activities that would be cause for dismissal from the armed services or any federal agency should not go unnoticed.

This Jackson Lee Amendment is an opportunity to make a clear statement to government contractors that the awarding of contracts that involve the security of our nation should not be taken lightly and that Congress will not tolerate the allocation of federal funds to contractors who employ persons who advocate or participate in acts against persons on account of their race, creed, religious beliefs, or gender who engage in constitutionally protected activities.

I ask that my colleagues support this Jackson Lee Amendment to H.R. 6237.

Mr. Chair, I ask my colleagues to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, though I am not opposed.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Texas has 2 1/4 minutes remaining.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 1/4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF), the ranking member of the Intelligence Committee.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by my friend and colleague, the gentlewoman from Texas, Congresswoman SHEILA JACKSON LEE.

This amendment complements other provisions in the bill focused on improving the security clearance process in the Intelligence Committee. Specifically, Ms. JACKSON LEE's amendment recognizes that an immediate review may be called for when a security

clearance holder is reported to have engaged in certain violent acts against individuals, property, or public spaces based on an association or sympathy with persons or organizations seeking to prevent others from exercising their constitutional rights. Such rights include those related to race, religion, national origin, or disability.

I thank the gentlewoman for offering this amendment. I am pleased to support it, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Chair, I am prepared to accept the amendment, and I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, RAM, the group that I have indicated in the letter I submitted for the RECORD, of which the gentleman in the article was a member of, is characterized as operating like a street fighting club. Members actively train to do physical battle with their ideological foes and have been involved in violent clashes during political rallies and demonstrations.

RAM members consider themselves a part of the alt-right. RAM's membership has deep roots in California, with the Skinheads and other individuals who face serious criminal charges. But more importantly, RAM consists of several dozen loosely affiliated neo-Nazi racist Skinheads.

It is not an emphasis on that group. This amendment is broadly structured to deal with protecting the security clearance process and the American people. I join with my colleagues in hoping and helping the intelligence community to be able to have the resources for the backlog of thousands and thousands of those seeking security clearance, so that they can be particular and astute to ensure that for the people who receive it, it is a benefit. It is, in essence, a gift. It is an honor to receive a security clearance.

The clearance that I and Members of Congress have, we hold with the highest respect and dignity. Therefore, if it is given to anyone, it should be given in that manner.

Mr. Chairman, I ask my colleagues to support the Jackson Lee amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Chairman, I will just close by saying that the security clearance process needs a lot of work. So we support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. VARGAS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 115-815.

Mr. VARGAS. 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 29, line 13, after “methods” insert “, including the use of virtual currencies.”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 989, the gentleman from California (Mr. VARGAS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. VARGAS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support my amendment to H.R. 6237.

By adding the use of virtual currencies to section 1505, we will ensure it is included in the assessment of threat financing related to Russia.

This assessment includes officials of the government of Russia, persons subject to sanctions with respect to Russia, Russian nationals subject to sanction, and Russian oligarchs or organized criminals.

Mr. Chairman, as you may know, a virtual currency is a digital representation of value that can be digitally traded.

Since the creation of Bitcoin, the first and most widely known example of a cryptocurrency, thousands of cryptocurrencies have emerged that are designed to serve a variety of purposes.

Just as virtual currencies have grown in use in legitimate commerce, they have become an increasingly popular financial payment method for criminals and other transnational bad actors.

Virtual currencies have been and continue to be exploited to pay for goods and services associated with illicit activities and as an effective tool to launder money or avoid sanctions.

If we are to craft effective solutions to combat Russia’s threat finance, we need to fully understand how virtual currencies may be used to finance activities against the United States and our allies, especially NATO. By including the use of virtual currencies in the report, we will ensure a robust analysis that will help us to impede Russian financing of cyber operations.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MURPHY).

Mrs. MURPHY of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague, Mr. VARGAS, for yielding, and I support his amendment.

I also support this bill more generally because it supports the quiet heroes in our intelligence community. They don’t seek public praise; in fact, they shun it. While others enjoy the limelight, they work hard in the shadows.

Section 1511 is a version of legislation I wrote called the POISE Act. I filed it after the President disclosed highly sensitive information to Russian officials at a White House meeting. This information had been entrusted to the U.S. by a key ally.

Section 1511, drawing on the POISE Act, says Congress must be notified when a member of the executive branch, including the President, dis-

closes top secret information to an adversary government outside established intelligence channels.

As a former specialist at the Department of Defense, I know these disclosures are dangerous because our adversary could use it to harm U.S. interests. Our partners could stop sharing intelligence if they don’t trust us to keep it confidential.

The congressional notification requirement will deter irresponsible disclosures and enable Congress to conduct oversight and limit any damage caused by the disclosure.

I also wanted to express my disappointment on a matter of national security. Congressman CURBELO and I offered a bipartisan amendment to require the DNI to report to Congress on the national security threat posed by deep fake technology and how the intelligence community will counter it. Deep fake technology is the digital falsification of images, video, and audio to portray an individual as having done or said something he or she didn’t do or say.

Senator RUBIO has raised alarms about how foreign intelligence service could use deep fake technology to undermine our Nation’s security and democracy.

Frankly, I was dismayed our amendment was not ruled in order, despite being supported by the Intelligence Committee. I know the Rules Committee often makes decisions for reasons unrelated to policy. But the exclusion of this amendment was a serious mistake, and I will look for other ways to ensure our country is prepared for the emerging threat posed by deep fake technology.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, though I am not opposed.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VARGAS. Mr. Chairman, I would simply then urge my colleagues to support the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Chairman, I urge passage of 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. VARGAS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MRS. TORRES

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 115-815.

Mrs. TORRES. 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 102, after line 13, insert the following:
SEC. 2509. NORTH KOREA FOLLOW THE MONEY ACT.

(a) ASSESSMENT REQUIRED.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of

this Act, the Director of National Intelligence, in coordination with the Assistant Secretary of State for Intelligence and Research and the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury for Intelligence and Analysis, shall produce an intelligence assessment of the revenue sources of the North Korean regime. Such assessment shall include revenue from the following sources:

(1) Trade in coal, iron, and iron ore.
(2) The provision of fishing rights to North Korean territorial waters.

(3) Trade in gold, titanium ore, vanadium ore, copper, silver, nickel, zinc, or rare earth minerals, and other stores of value.

(4) Trade in textiles.
(5) Sales of conventional defense articles and services.

(6) Sales of controlled goods, ballistic missiles, and other associated purposes.

(7) Other types of manufacturing for export, as the Director of National Intelligence considers appropriate.

(8) The exportation of workers from North Korea in a manner intended to generate significant revenue, directly or indirectly, for use by the government of North Korea.

(9) The provision of non-humanitarian goods (such as food, medicine, and medical devices) and services by other countries.

(10) The provision of services, including banking and other support, including by entities located in the Russian Federation, China, and Iran.

(11) Online commercial activities of the Government of North Korea, including online gambling.

(12) Criminal activities, including cyber-enabled crime and counterfeit goods.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The assessment required under subsection (a) shall include an identification of each of the following:

(1) The sources of North Korea’s funding.

(2) Financial and non-financial networks, including supply chain management, transportation, and facilitation, through which North Korea accesses the United States and international financial systems and repatriates and exports capital, goods, and services; and

(3) the global financial institutions, money services business, and payment systems that assist North Korea with financial transactions.

(c) SUBMITTAL TO CONGRESS.—Upon completion of the assessment required under subsection (a), the Director of National Intelligence shall submit to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate a copy of such assessment.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 989, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TORRES) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

□ 1430

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer my amendment to H.R. 6237, the Matthew Young Pollard Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 2018 and 2019.

Mr. Chairman, nearly 1 year and 3 months ago today, the North Korean regime announced that it had successfully executed an intercontinental ballistic missile test launch. That announcement raised the real possibility of a North Korean nuclear attack on American soil.

President Trump, rightly, has spent much of last year seeking a deal for the

denuclearization of North Korea. Secretary Pompeo is actively engaged in finding a solution, and Congress should be providing him with all of the resources we can to ensure a solution is meaningful and effective.

To prevent advancement of their nuclear weapons program, we need to obtain specific information regarding North Korean revenue sources; however, the U.S. Government does not have a sufficient understanding of this critical question. That is why I have offered this amendment, which is modeled after my North Korea Follow the Money Act.

This amendment directs the Director of National Intelligence to produce a National Intelligence Estimate of the revenue sources of North Korea. Any effective agreement between the U.S. and North Korea must consider all of the sources of funding, both legitimate and illegitimate, that have enabled this North Korean regime.

I am proud to offer this bipartisan amendment with Representative WAGNER, who has been a longtime partner of mine on this legislation, and I also appreciate Chairman NUNES and his staff and Ranking Member SCHIFF and his staff for working with me on this amendment.

Mr. Chair, I am hopeful that we can continue to work together for the security of our Nation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, even though I am not opposed to it.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER).

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of this amendment, of which I am a proud cosponsor.

Nearly 1 year ago, I traveled to Korea, Japan, and China. I visited the DMZ and the Chinese border town of Dandong. I watched as trucks loaded with goods drove across the China-Korea Friendship Bridge into North Korea.

Mr. Chair, 70 percent of North Korea's trade passes over that bridge, and it was a stark reminder that, in order to change North Korea's malign behavior, we need sanctions that undermine the financial networks that keep the Kim regime afloat.

Over the past year, the President has taken tremendous steps towards disrupting North Korean cash flows, but we still have an imperfect understanding of where and how North Korea gets its revenue, and our limited knowledge has weakened international sanctions.

This amendment would require the Director of National Intelligence to study North Korean financial and trade networks, weapons sales, labor exports, and supply chains to better understand the sources of the regime's revenue. It

would aid the international community in closing gaps in sanctions against North Korea. The report will help us support our diplomats as they seek to restore stability on the Korean Peninsula.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this critical amendment.

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment. Until we know where the North Korean regime gets its money, we won't know how much money they have to spend.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" and equip Secretary Pompeo with the tools that he needs to act in the best interests of our national security, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Chairman, I support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TORRES).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in House Report 115-815.

Mr. HASTINGS. 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 102, after line 13, insert the following:

SEC. 2509. EXPANSION OF INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY RECRUITMENT EFFORTS.

In order to further increase the diversity of the intelligence community workforce, not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence, in consultation with heads of elements of the Intelligence Community, shall create, implement, and submit to the congressional intelligence committees a written plan to ensure that rural and underrepresented regions are more fully and consistently represented in such elements' employment recruitment efforts. Upon receipt of the plan, the congressional committees shall have 60 days to submit comments to the Director of National Intelligence before such plan shall be implemented.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 989, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, my staff and I worked with Democratic staff members of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence and received input from the majority staff to craft what I believe is a common-sense amendment that will increase diversity throughout the intelligence community.

Mr. Chair, I just want to depart from my prepared remarks to say a word about the young man who is seated with me, Tony Matthews. It is a good indication of what the Brookings Institution does when they send us fellows

from either the Democratic or Republican side, and I am very pleased that he has been with my office and, in many respects, is the author of this amendment.

The amendment directs the Office of the Director of National Intelligence to, in consultation with heads of other intelligence community agencies, create and implement a plan that will successfully expand the intelligence community's recruitment efforts so that rural and underserved regions in the United States are more fully represented in these efforts.

It is my belief that this amendment will provide a unique opportunity for the intelligence community agencies to actively join forces in order to broaden their respective recruitment efforts and, by so doing, increase the diversity among their ranks. Although we have seen improvement in some areas—for instance, an increase in minority hiring for fiscal year 2017 over that of fiscal year 2016—we have also seen a disappointing decrease in the percentage of women hired over that same period of time. I believe that we can do better in both metrics, and I think one smart way of doing that is getting agencies to broaden their searches geographically.

This country's strength is born from its dedication to the rule of law, the belief that the best form of government is one that is of the people, by the people, and for the people—and from its diversity.

It is time for our intelligence community agencies to more fully commit to reaching all American people in an effort to let them know that inspiring and important work awaits them in the intelligence community. Indeed, by more fully tapping into this diversity, we can be assured of at least one result: the strengthening of our intelligence community. If the intelligence community is to succeed in its global mission, it must have a global force.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a "yes" vote on my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, even though I am not opposed to it.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF), the distinguished ranking member with whom I had the pleasure of serving on the Intelligence Committee when I was there some 100 years ago.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

It is a great pleasure to team up with the gentleman again in pursuit of important priorities for the intelligence community and for our committee.

Enhancing diversity in the intelligence community is a continuing priority for the House and, unfortunately, remains a continuing challenge for the IC. While there are many intelligence professionals who are sincerely working to create a culture of inclusion, they acknowledge that progress is slow.

Mr. HASTINGS' amendment, together with initiatives championed by committee colleagues, Representatives TERRI SEWELL and ANDRE CARSON, will help ensure that the Director of National Intelligence increases geographic outreach in IC recruitment efforts.

As coordinator of the IC, the DNI and his team are well postured to consolidate the separate recruitment activities of each IC entity into a comprehensive recruitment campaign that reaches every corner of our Nation, especially underserved regions that have had little interaction with the intelligence community.

With the DNI's leadership, smart division of labor among IC agencies, and innovative use of virtual communications vehicles, I am confident that a comprehensive recruitment campaign can cover the Nation more effectively and attract a workforce that is more representative of America.

Once again, I want to thank my colleague, Mr. HASTINGS, as well as my HPSCI colleagues for their commitment to diversity, and I encourage my colleagues to support the amendment.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support this amendment. I think we should expand more capabilities into rural areas and do more recruitment in rural areas. I appreciate this amendment. It has my full support.

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. HASTINGS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. SCHNEIDER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in House Report 115-815.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. 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:

Page 102, after line 13, insert the following:
SEC. 2509. REPORT ON IRANIAN SUPPORT OF PROXY FORCES IN SYRIA AND LEBANON.

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence shall submit to the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate a report on Iranian support of proxy forces in Syria and Lebanon and the threat posed to

Israel, other United States regional allies, and other specified interests of the United States as a result of such support.

(b) MATTERS FOR INCLUSION.—The report required under subsection (a) shall include information relating to the following matters with respect to both the strategic and tactical implications for the United States and its allies:

(1) A description of arms or related material transferred by Iran to Hezbollah since March 2011, including the number of such arms or related material and whether such transfer was by land, sea, or air, as well as financial and additional technological capabilities transferred by Iran to Hezbollah.

(2) A description of Iranian and Iranian-controlled personnel, including Hezbollah, Shiite militias, and Iran's Revolutionary Guard Corps forces, operating within Syria, including the number and geographic distribution of such personnel operating within 30 kilometers of the Israeli borders with Syria and Lebanon.

(3) An assessment of Hezbollah's operational lessons learned based on its recent experiences in Syria.

(4) A description of any rocket-producing facilities in Lebanon for non-state actors, including whether such facilities were assessed to be built at the direction of Hezbollah leadership, Iranian leadership, or in consultation between Iranian leadership and Hezbollah leadership.

(5) An analysis of the foreign and domestic supply chains that significantly facilitate, support, or otherwise aid Hezbollah's acquisition or development of missile production facilities, including the geographic distribution of such foreign and domestic supply chains.

(6) An assessment of the provision of goods, services, or technology transferred by Iran or its affiliates to Hezbollah to indigenously manufacture or otherwise produce missiles.

(7) An identification of foreign persons that are, based on credible information, facilitating the transfer of significant financial support or arms or related material to Hezbollah.

(8) A description of the threat posed to Israel and other United States allies in the Middle East by the transfer of arms or related material or other support offered to Hezbollah and other proxies from Iran.

(c) FORM OF REPORT.—The report required under subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

(d) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term “arms or related material” means—

(1) nuclear, biological, chemical, or radiological weapons or materials or components of such weapons;

(2) ballistic or cruise missile weapons or materials or components of such weapons;

(3) destabilizing numbers and types of advanced conventional weapons;

(4) defense articles or defense services, as those terms are defined in paragraphs (3) and (4), respectively, of section 47 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2794);

(5) defense information, as that term is defined in section 644 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2403); or

(6) items designated by the President for purposes of the United States Munitions List under section 38(a)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2778(a)(1)).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 989, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHNEIDER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my bipartisan amendment to require the Director of National Intelligence to report on Iran's support for proxy forces in Syria and Lebanon.

I thank my colleague from North Carolina, MARK MEADOWS, for his partnership in this endeavor, as well as KYRSTEN SINEMA and NORMA TORRES for cosponsoring this amendment.

Mr. Chair, Iran's destabilizing activities in the Middle East are no secret, and, of late, their malign influence has grown dramatically across the region, including in Yemen, Iraq, Lebanon, and Syria.

Specifically with respect to Syria, Iran is menacingly working to develop a permanent foothold in the country, increasing the threat to our key allies Jordan and, in particular, Israel. They are also assisting terrorist groups such as Hezbollah in supporting Assad. Battle-tested Hezbollah fighters are subsequently returning to Lebanon more capable and more dangerous than ever before.

Additionally, with assistance from Iran, Lebanese Hezbollah has been able to amass nearly 150,000 rockets and missiles on the border with Israel. This figure is a staggering increase from the, roughly, 15,000 rockets they had in 2006.

Iran has exploited several means of transferring weapons to Hezbollah, including by land and by air. Israel has often targeted these transfers to stop the weapons from reaching Lebanon. To eliminate the susceptibility of these transfers to interdiction, Iran is reportedly building missile production facilities in Lebanon to enable indigenous rocket-producing capability for Hezbollah.

A domestic missile production capability in Lebanon would enable Hezbollah to more easily continue to build its rocket arsenal not only with more weapons, but more sophisticated, more deadly weapons, and with less reliance on risky transits.

That is why I am offering my amendment today, to focus our intelligence community on this urgent threat. A DNI report would help us better understand the extent of Iran's support for terrorist proxies such as Hezbollah and the threat this support poses to Israel and other U.S. regional allies.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this important amendment.

Mr. Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF), the ranking member.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I am proud to support the amendment offered by Representatives SCHNEIDER, MEADOWS, TORRES, and SINEMA.

Mr. Chair, it is imperative that our Intelligence, Armed Services, and Foreign Affairs Committees with oversight of Iran's role in Syria and Lebanon stay informed of proxy forces operating there and the strategic threat posed to

Israel, our other allies, and our Nation's interests in the region.

Requiring that the Director of National Intelligence report on areas such as arms transfers from Iran to Hezbollah and other militias, weapons facilities, supply chains, and financial capabilities will help us gain greater understanding of nuclear, biological, and chemical weapon proliferation in the region.

I thank my colleagues for offering the amendment. I appreciate Mr. SCHNEIDER's leadership on this issue, and I urge the House to support it.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, even though I am not opposed to it.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Chair, I urge support of the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHNEIDER).

The amendment was agreed to.

1445

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. BERA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 8 printed in House Report 115-815.

Mr. BERA. 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 102, after line 13, insert the following:
SEC. 2509. BRIEFING ON EMERGING INFECTIOUS DISEASE AND PANDEMICS.

(a) BRIEFING.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence shall provide to the appropriate congressional committees a briefing on the anticipated geopolitical effects of emerging infectious disease (including deliberate, accidental, and naturally occurring infectious disease threats) and pandemics, and their implications on the national security of the United States.

(b) CONTENT.—The briefing under subsection (a) shall assess—

(1) the economic, social, political, and security risks, costs, and impacts of emerging infectious diseases on the United States and the international political and economic system;

(2) the economic, social, political, and security risks, costs, and impacts of a major transnational pandemic on the United States and the international political and economic system; and

(3) contributing trends and factors to the matters assessed under paragraphs (1) and (2).

(c) EXAMINATION OF RESPONSE CAPACITY.—In examining the risks, costs, and impacts of emerging infectious disease and a possible transnational pandemic under subsection (b), the Director of National Intelligence shall

also examine in the briefing under subsection (a) the response capacity within affected countries and the international system. In considering response capacity, the Director shall include—

(1) the ability of affected nations to effectively detect and manage emerging infectious diseases and a possible transnational pandemic;

(2) the role and capacity of international organizations and nongovernmental organizations to respond to emerging infectious disease and a possible pandemic, and their ability to coordinate with affected and donor nations; and

(3) the effectiveness of current international frameworks, agreements, and health systems to respond to emerging infectious diseases and a possible transnational pandemic.

(d) FORM.—The briefing under subsection (a) may be classified.

(e) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(1) the congressional intelligence committees;

(2) the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Armed Services, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives; and

(3) the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Armed Services, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 989, the gentleman from California (Mr. BERA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. BERA. Mr. Chairman, as a doctor, I know that understanding and managing infectious diseases is one of the most important parts of our security and our national security. The intelligence community has found that a country's health is directly linked to their stability and their well-being. We are reminded of this every few years through mass pandemics that are not going away.

In 2014, we saw the Ebola outbreak in West Africa, and just 2 years ago, we witnessed the Zika outbreak in Central and South America. And, unfortunately, as a doctor, I know we are going to continue to see these and other diseases again and again, and we need to be prepared.

So we offer this amendment as a way of getting the intelligence community to help us with that preparedness, to inform us and make sure we are not just protecting lives overseas, but we are also protecting our national interests and our national security.

Mr. Chairman, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, I thank my good friend from California for his leadership in this very important amendment, and I am proud to be an original cosponsor with him.

This amendment would require an intelligence briefing on the anticipated geopolitical effects of emerging infectious diseases and pandemics. These threats have serious implications for the national security of the country.

Just ask Director of National Intelligence, Daniel Coats, who earlier this year warned that the increase in the frequency and diversity of reported disease outbreaks probably will continue, including the potential of a severe global health emergency that could lead to major economic and societal disruptions, strain governmental international resources, and increase calls to the United States for support.

An outbreak in a remote village can spread to major cities in all six continents in less than 36 hours. Such an event can lead nations to close borders, disrupting the flow of people, goods, and services, and incurring grave economic, social, political, and security costs.

Nearly 70 percent of the world's nations are underprepared to manage and control such outbreaks.

These are not just hypotheticals. SARS, for example, spread across four continents, infected 8,100 people, killed more than 700, and cost the global economy \$40 billion between February and July of 2003. The Ebola and Zika outbreaks cost the American taxpayers more than \$6 billion.

Understanding the ability, Mr. Chairman, of affected nations and international organizations to detect and manage infectious diseases and transnational pandemics is a vital step to ensuring an effective response. I urge all of our colleagues to support Mr. BERA's and my amendment.

I thank Mr. BERA for his leadership.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, even though I am not opposed to it.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BERA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF), the ranking member.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

One hundred years ago, the great influenza pandemic, often called the Spanish flu, caused about 50 million deaths worldwide, between 3 to 6 percent of the global population, and far more than the deaths from combat casualties in World War I. Public health officials have warned that we are overdue for another pandemic that will likely spread even more virulently in our globalized world.

While global health may not be a topic that leaps to mind when thinking of the roles and missions of the intelligence community, the IC does play a pivotal role in defending us from microscopic threats. The IC's unique capabilities can be as valuable in combating disease as the other threats we face.

During the Ebola crisis, NGA and other IC agencies provided geospatial and other intelligence to health workers battling the outbreak. Ensuring

that we are prepared for any potential pandemic will be essential to saving American lives.

I wholeheartedly support the bipartisan amendment by my colleagues from California, Virginia, and Washington, and I thank them for working with the committee staff to refine and perfect it.

Mr. BEREA. Mr. Chairman, I have no additional comments, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Chairman, I support the 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. BEREA).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. KENNEDY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 9 printed in House Report 115-815.

Mr. KENNEDY. 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 102, after line 13, insert the following:

SEC. 2509. REPORT ON ESTABLISHMENT OF FOREIGN MALIGN INFLUENCE RESPONSE CENTER.

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence shall submit to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate a report on the potential establishment of a center, to be known as the “Foreign Malign Influence Response Center” that—

(1) is comprised of analysts from all appropriate elements of the intelligence community, including elements with related diplomatic and law enforcement functions;

(2) has access to all intelligence and other reporting acquired by the United States Government on foreign efforts to influence, through overt and covert malign activities, United States political processes and elections;

(3) provides comprehensive assessment, and indications and warning, of such activities; and

(4) provides for enhanced dissemination of such assessment to United States policy makers.

(b) CONTENTS.—The Report required by subsection (a)—

(1) shall contain, at a minimum, a discussion of the desirability of the establishment of such center and any barriers to such establishment; and

(2) may contain any recommendations the Director determines appropriate.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 989, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the chairman and Ranking Member SCHIFF for all their support and advocacy to make this amendment possible today.

Mr. Chairman, just a few weeks ago, DNI Director Dan Coats warned our

Nation and the world that “we continue to see Russian targeting of American society in ways that could affect our midterm elections.”

It is indisputable that Russia succeeded in meddling in our election in 2016. It is indisputable that their success, with little consequence, will inspire similar attacks in the future. And it is indisputable that our response to these threats has been inadequate.

States, cities, and towns have scrambled to secure their own elections without enough guidance and support from our national intelligence community.

Voters continue to face a torrent of misinformation online.

Candidates for Congress, city council, and school boards race towards November 6 uncertain that they will become Putin’s next target.

The multiple Federal agencies that are responsible for our Nation’s response rarely coordinate or receive little guidance from our Nation’s government at the highest levels.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment helps to begin to consolidate and concentrate our response to foreign efforts to influence our political processes and elections with one center drawing expertise across all relevant sectors of our government.

If anything, our adversaries have grown more confident in their ability to sway our elections and sow discord and dysfunction at every level of our society.

Our urgency lies now in one simple truth: Our democracy stands tall when our elections stand secure.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment because those who put ballot boxes in our crosshairs do not ascribe to one political party or the other.

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

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition to the amendment, even though I am not opposed to it.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment, 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. KENNEDY).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MISS RICE OF NEW YORK

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 10 printed in House Report 115-815.

Miss RICE of New York. 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 102, after line 13, insert the following:

SEC. 2509. REPORT ON POSSIBLE EXPLOITATION OF VIRTUAL CURRENCIES BY TERRORIST ACTORS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the “Stop Terrorist Use of Virtual Currencies Act”.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence, in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury, shall submit to Congress a report on the possible exploitation of virtual currencies by terrorist actors. Such report shall include the following elements:

(1) An assessment of the means and methods by which international terrorist organizations and State sponsors of terrorism use virtual currencies.

(2) An assessment of the use by terrorist organizations and State sponsors of terrorism of virtual currencies compared to the use by such organizations and States of other forms of financing to support operations, including an assessment of the collection posture of the intelligence community on the use of virtual currencies by such organizations and States.

(3) A description of any existing legal impediments that inhibit or prevent the intelligence community from collecting information on or helping prevent the use of virtual currencies by international terrorist organizations and State sponsors of terrorism and an identification of any gaps in existing law that could be exploited for illicit funding by such organizations and States.

(c) FORM OF REPORT.—The report required by subsection (b) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 989, the gentlewoman from New York (Miss RICE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

Miss RICE of New York. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would require the Director of National Intelligence and the Secretary of the Treasury to develop and submit a threat assessment report on the use of virtual currencies by terrorist organizations.

In the 17 years since the deadliest terrorist attack in American history, the United States has led the global campaign to combat terrorism, thwarting plots and preventing attacks on American soil, identifying and disrupting terrorist networks around the world, hunting down terrorists wherever they hide, and proving that they can and will be brought to justice.

We know that the threat of terrorism is not the same as it was 17 years ago. It is a threat that constantly evolves, and we need to evolve with it. We need to evolve ahead of it. That is why I have introduced this amendment.

In recent years, we have seen instances in which members of terrorist groups have turned to virtual currencies to finance and support their operations. In 2016, the Foundation for Defense of Democracies investigated a terrorist funding campaign in which a terrorist group in the Gaza Strip received donations through the virtual currency bitcoin. Last year, Indonesian authorities also reported that a Syria-

based Indonesian national with ties to ISIL used virtual currency to fund attacks in Indonesia.

Virtual currencies offer high-speed, low-cost financial networks with access to users across the globe. Many also offer their users anonymity, making it difficult for law enforcement to track transactions. These factors have made virtual currencies an increasingly appealing tool for terrorists seeking to circumvent American law enforcement and financial institutions.

Research suggests that terrorists' use of virtual currencies have so far been limited to a handful of instances, but, as terrorist organizations and lone-wolf attackers become more technologically sophisticated and virtual currencies become more widely accessible, the conditions are ripe for this threat to significantly increase in a very short period of time. That is why it is critical that we act now to assess and understand this emerging threat.

There is no denying it: Virtual currencies have exposed deep vulnerabilities in our counterterrorism efforts, and, unfortunately, right now, our government lacks a comprehensive response and strategy to address this threat.

My amendment would direct the Director of National Intelligence and the Treasury Department to report to Congress on how terrorist organizations and state sponsors of terrorism could use virtual currencies to finance terrorism, gaps in Federal and State regulations that could be exploited by terrorists, and recommendations to update regulations to more effectively address these vulnerabilities.

Enacting this amendment would give counterterrorism and law enforcement officials at all levels the information and strategies they desperately need to confront this threat head-on with 21st century solutions.

I want to thank Congressman PETER KING for cosponsoring my amendment. This is a commonsense bipartisan priority, and I urge all of my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition to the amendment, even though I am not opposed to it.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. BOST). Without objection, the gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Miss RICE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF).

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague for yielding, and I rise in support of the amendment offered by the Representatives from New York, Rice and King.

This amendment requires that the Director of National Intelligence, with the Department of the Treasury, submit to Congress a report on the pos-

sible exploitation of virtual currencies by terrorist actors, including state sponsors of terrorism.

It has long been said that if you wish to uncover the truth about malign activity, then follow the money. This remains true with the development and use of virtual currencies.

The IC must always remain one step ahead of our adversaries, and this amendment will help ensure that they continue to do just that.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Miss RICE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman NUNES and Ranking Member SCHIFF for supporting the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from New York for working in a bipartisan manner with a longtime member of our committee, Mr. KING, and I urge passage of this amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Miss RICE).

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 1500

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. LIPINSKI

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 11 printed in House Report 115-815.

Mr. LIPINSKI. 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 title V of division B, add the following new section:

SEC. 2509. REPORT ON IRANIAN EXPENDITURES SUPPORTING FOREIGN MILITARY AND TERRORIST ACTIVITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Director of National Intelligence shall submit to Congress a report describing Iranian expenditures in the previous calendar year on military and terrorist activities outside the country, including each of the following:

(1) The amount spent in such calendar year on activities by the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps, including activities providing support for—
 (A) Hezbollah;
 (B) Houthi rebels in Yemen;
 (C) Hamas;
 (D) proxy forces in Iraq and Syria; or
 (E) any other entity or country the Director determines to be relevant.

(2) The amount spent in such calendar year for ballistic missile research and testing or other activities that the Director determines are destabilizing to the Middle East region.

(b) FORM.—The report required under subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 989, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chair and ranking member of

the committee for their work on this bill. This bill is very important to help make America more secure.

My amendment will help to address the threat of Iran better in this bill.

According to the State Department, Iran is the world's foremost state sponsor of terrorism. In spite of Iran's weak economy and U.S.-imposed sanctions in response to their support for terrorism, abuse of human rights, and acquisition of prohibited weapons, Iran continues to support violent groups abroad.

As our diplomatic and military leaders determine how best to respond to Iran's ongoing destabilization, they should have a detailed accounting of the amounts spent by Iran to support specific terrorist groups and foreign military. This is especially important in light of the escalating conflict between Israel and Iran-backed forces in Syria, which has only gotten worse in the last couple of days. This information will send a clear message to Iran and our allies that we do not tolerate support of terrorism.

In addition, the nonclassified version of this report will shed light on Iran's behavior for all the world to see.

Specifically, my amendment will require an annual report from the Director of National Intelligence, describing Iranian expenditures on military and terrorist activities outside the country, including support for Hezbollah, Houthi rebels in Yemen, Hamas, proxy forces in Iraq and Syria, and any other entity or country the Director determines relevant.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, even though I am not opposed to it.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF), the ranking member of the committee.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I am proud to rise in support of the amendment offered by my colleague from Illinois, Congressman LIPINSKI.

This amendment requires that the Director of National Intelligence submit a report to Congress describing spending by Iran on military and terrorist activities outside of the country, including spending to support Hezbollah, Houthi rebels in Yemen, Hamas, and proxy forces elsewhere.

The intelligence community rightly remains focused on Iran's support for malign foreign military and terrorist activities abroad.

This amendment helps ensure that Congress has full visibility into the judgments and assessments of the IC

on Iran's spending to support these groups, and for that reason I support the amendment.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman NUNES and Ranking Member SCHIFF for their support of this amendment, and I thank them for their work on this important bipartisan bill.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for working with our committee to get support from both sides of the aisle for this amendment, I urge its passage, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MR. DAVIDSON

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 12 printed in House Report 115-815.

Mr. DAVIDSON. 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 title V of division B, add the following new section:

SEC. 2509. INCLUSION OF DISCIPLINARY ACTIONS IN ANNUAL REPORT RELATING TO SECTION 702.

Section 707(b)(1)(G)(ii) of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1881f(b)(1)(G)(ii)) is amended by inserting before the semicolon the following: “, including whether disciplinary actions were taken as a result of such an incident of noncompliance and the extent of such disciplinary actions”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 989, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DAVIDSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Chairman, today, I offer an amendment that is very straightforward. It simply takes an already existing reporting requirement within the section 702 program and adds an additional layer of congressional oversight. This will ensure that the Judiciary Committee and the Intelligence Committee have insight into how the intelligence community enforces its own internal guidelines for handling sensitive data.

Currently, the attorney general provides these committees with semi-annual reports about incidents of intelligence community noncompliance with the targeting, minimization, and querying procedures within the 702 program. These are important features that ensure the collection and use of data is solely for targeting dangerous terrorists and does not threaten the Fourth Amendment rights of Americans.

However, this report is lacking because it does not describe what, if any, disciplinary actions are taken by agencies in response to noncompliance. My amendment would simply require that this report include information about disciplinary action.

For example, was a violation simply flagged for agency records? Or was someone given additional training, disciplinary suspension, termination, or, perhaps, even prosecution?

My amendment intends to provide Congress with a high-level look at how agencies address the incidents they are already reporting on.

The privacy safeguards contained in the section 702 program are critical for protecting the constitutional rights of everyday Americans, and, indeed, the high functioning capability of this important program for national security.

Congress has the responsibility to make sure agencies are taking steps to mitigate abuse and enforce statutes, guidelines, and court orders relevant to this powerful surveillance tool.

This is a commonsense amendment that I have drafted in coordination with the House Intelligence Committee, and I urge my colleagues to support its adoption.

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

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, though I am not opposed.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. LAMBORN). Without objection, the gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Chairman, I think the thing I would emphasize is that it is important for us to understand: A) we should preserve the 702 program; and B) there are some incremental reforms that could make the program high functioning, and also give the American people peace of mind that their Fourth Amendment rights are protected.

It is also important for the intelligence community to know that the programs they have are working, and it can send an important message that there are disciplinary actions for those who don't follow the guidelines.

This will give Congress insight into how well that system is functioning and what disciplinary actions, if any, are taken.

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

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I thank all of the Members who offered amendments today. This is a critical piece of legislation, and I look forward to working with the Senate to send this bill to the President.

This year's bill is named after Matthew Young Pollard, who passed away earlier this year while carrying out the work of the Senate Intelligence Committee. Matt was a friend to many on

both sides of the aisle of our committee, a dedicated staff member, and a member of the Army National Guard. While his loss is devastating to us, we honor his service to the United States by naming this bill in his memory.

I thank the ranking member for his support on this bill, I urge passage of the amendment, and urge passage of H.R. 6237, the Matthew Young Pollard Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 2018 and 2019.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DAVIDSON).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the 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 (Mr. BOST) having assumed the chair, Mr. LAMBORN, 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. 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, and, pursuant to House Resolution 989, 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 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.

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. NUNES. 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.

□ 1515

RECLAMATION TITLE TRANSFER AND NON-FEDERAL INFRASTRUCTURE INCENTIVIZATION ACT

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 985, I call up

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, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 985, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3281

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 “Reclamation Title Transfer and Non-Federal Infrastructure Incentivization Act”.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

(2) ELIGIBLE FACILITY.—The term “eligible facility”—

(A) means a reclamation project or facility, or a portion of such a project or facility (which may include dams and appurtenant works, infrastructure, recreational facilities, buildings, distribution and drainage works, and associated lands or interests in lands or water) that meets the criteria for potential transfer established pursuant to section 4; and

(B) does not include a reclamation facility or separately functioning portion of such facility that generates hydropower marketed by a power marketing administration.

(3) QUALIFYING ENTITY.—The term “qualifying entity” means an agency of a State political subdivision, joint action or powers agency, water users association, Indian Tribe or Tribal utility authority, that—

(A) held or holds a water service contract, repayment contract, operation and maintenance contract, water rights settlement contract or exchange contract providing for water service from the eligible facility to be transferred; and

(B) as determined by the Secretary, has the capacity to continue to manage the conveyed property for the same purposes by which the property has been managed under reclamation law.

(4) CONVEYED PROPERTY.—The term “conveyed property” means an eligible facility that has been transferred out of Federal ownership under this Act.

SEC. 3. AUTHORIZATION OF TITLE TRANSFER.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may convey to a qualifying entity all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to any eligible facility, subject to subsections (b) and (c), if—

(1) the Secretary notifies Congress in writing of the proposed conveyance, and the reasons for the conveyance, not later than 90 days before the date on which the Secretary makes the conveyance; and

(2) Congress does not pass a joint resolution disapproving the conveyance before such date.

(b) ASSOCIATED WATER RIGHTS AND USES.—Federal interests in associated water rights and uses, if included, shall be conveyed in accordance with applicable State law under this Act by a written agreement between the Secretary and the qualifying entity.

(c) CONSULTATION.—Interests in eligible facilities shall be conveyed under this Act by a written agreement between the Secretary and the qualifying entity, developed in consultation with any existing water and power customers affected by the eligible facility.

(d) RIGHT OF FIRST REFUSAL.—If the entity that operates and maintains an eligible facility at the time that the Secretary attempts to facilitate the conveyance under subsection (c) is a qualifying entity, that entity shall have the right of first refusal to receive the conveyance under this Act.

SEC. 4. ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA FOR TITLE TRANSFER UNDER THIS ACT.

Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall establish criteria for determining whether facilities are eligible for title transfer under this Act. The criteria shall include the following minimum requirements:

(1) The qualifying entity agrees to accept title to the property proposed for transfer.

(2) The proposed title transfer will not have an unmitigated significant effect on the environment.

(3) The qualifying entity intends to use the property for substantially the same purposes the property is being used for at the time the Secretary evaluates the potential transfer.

(4) The transfer is consistent with the Secretary’s responsibility to protect land and water resources held in trust for federally recognized Indian Tribes.

(5) The transfer is consistent with the Secretary’s responsibility to ensure compliance with international treaties and interstate compacts.

(6) The qualifying entity agrees to provide, as consideration for the assets to be conveyed, compensation to the United States worth the equivalent of the present value of any repayment obligation to the United States or other income stream the United States derives from the assets to be transferred at the time of the transfer.

SEC. 5. OTHER CONDITIONS FOR CONVEYANCES.

(a) POWER RATES.—No conveyance under this Act may adversely impact power rates or repayment obligations.

(b) NEPA.—The Secretary shall apply a categorical exclusion process under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) on eligible facilities under this Act.

SEC. 6. LIABILITY.

Effective upon the date of conveyance of any eligible facility pursuant to this Act, the United States shall not be liable for damages of any kind arising out of any act, omission, or occurrence based on its prior ownership or operation of the conveyed property, except for damages caused by acts of negligence committed by the United States or by its employees, agents, or contractors, prior to conveyance.

SEC. 7. BENEFITS.

After a conveyance under this Act—

(1) the conveyed property shall not be considered to be a part of a Federal reclamation project; and

(2) in the event that a transfer of an entire project occurs, the entity to which the property is conveyed shall not be eligible to receive any benefits, including project power, with respect to the conveyed property, except benefits that would be available to a similarly situated entity with respect to property that is not part of a Federal reclamation project.

SEC. 8. COMPLIANCE WITH OTHER LAWS.

After a conveyance under this Act, the entity to which the property is conveyed shall comply with all applicable Federal, State, and local laws and regulations in its operation of the conveyed property.

SEC. 9. NOTIFICATION.

The Secretary shall submit, as part of the Secretary’s annual budget submission to Congress—

(1) a description of the actions taken to implement this Act; and

(2) a list of conveyances made or initiated by the Secretary or a qualifying entity under this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources.

The gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) and the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 3281.

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

There was no objection.

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

Today, the House is considering my bipartisan legislation, H.R. 3281, which aims to streamline the process for the transfer of some of the Bureau of Reclamation’s projects to local beneficiaries who have or will repay the Federal investment, and already operate and maintain these projects. Transferring these simple projects, or parts of them, will allow water districts and other local beneficiaries to leverage non-Federal financing through ownership equity while, simultaneously, decreasing Federal liability.

During committee consideration of this bill, we heard that the current process is time-consuming, cumbersome, expensive, and uncertain. This has proven to be a disincentive to many water users who are now rightly asking for and deserving change.

However, it wouldn’t be fair to heap all the blame on the agency. Congress has done its fair share, slowing down some of these simple title transfers.

Under current practice, every single transfer, regardless of the size or scope, requires congressional authorization. I want to be clear to my colleagues that this legislation does not remove congressional oversight. In fact, this legislation includes a provision offered by Ranking Member HUFFMAN, of the subcommittee, that allows for congressional review of any transfer authorized under this process.

Since my bill was introduced, we have seen the administration and the Senate put similar proposals together to achieve the same goals as this legislation that we are considering here today.

At the end of the day, my bill provides an optional process that could be used to expedite simple title transfers. Any title transfer can still use the existing process, if the participants prefer.

Now, despite what someone might say, this bill does not exempt any action from NEPA, National Environmental Protection Act, or any other environmental mandates.

To be crystal clear, I want to reiterate that this bipartisan legislation requires that eligible projects comply with and satisfy the NEPA process; any remaining Federal obligation be repaid by the recipient; and that Congress be given a 90-day period to review and, if opposed, to pass a resolution of disapproval.

The Bureau of Reclamation currently has the authority to transfer any water project that would be authorized under this legislation. My bill simply allows operators of these water projects throughout the West to receive title to the projects they have paid for and are currently maintaining, without subjecting them to having to get an act of Congress.

Again, this legislation authorizes an optional process for an expedited process for specific types of transfers.

My bill supports local infrastructure and gives local communities the ability to seek private financing, through equity, to improve their vital water infrastructure.

This bipartisan legislation is supported by the Family Farm Alliance, Friant Water Authority of California, and the Kennewick Irrigation District of Washington State.

I want to thank my colleague, Mr. COSTA, for sponsoring this bill with me, and I urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on this legislation.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the bill we are debating today is an attempt by my Republican colleagues to approve one part of President Trump’s so-called infrastructure plan.

H.R. 3281 would enact a proposal from the Trump infrastructure plan that approves the de facto privatization of some of the public’s most important water infrastructure, without safeguards to protect the American taxpayer or our natural heritage.

Now, you may remember, Mr. Speaker, that the Trump infrastructure plan that was transmitted to Congress in February focuses much of its attention on giving away the public’s infrastructure to private interests.

For example, the Trump plan calls for privatizing Western electricity infrastructure, the Dulles International Airport, the Washington Aqueduct, the George Washington and Baltimore Washington Parkways, and much of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

This Trump yard sale of critical public infrastructure would raise consumer costs and would enrich private interests, all while providing no meaningful funding for much-needed public infrastructure development.

Now, when it comes to the management of our public infrastructure, it is clear that this administration and this Republican Congress would simply rather sell it off than fix it. So today, we have before us the proposal to dole out much of the public water infra-

structure owned by the United States, with virtually no strings attached.

Mr. Speaker, this may be how Mr. Trump liquidates real estate during one of his infamous bankruptcies, but it is no way to manage public infrastructure.

Now, the Bureau of Reclamation owns some of the most important public water infrastructure in America, including hundreds of dams, canals, and other associated infrastructure. Reclamation’s infrastructure helps deliver water to tens of millions of people, and it serves numerous stakeholders, including municipal and industrial water users, farmers, Tribes, fishermen, and environmental and recreational interests.

H.R. 3281 irresponsibly gives the Secretary of the Interior new authority to transfer title, which is another term for relinquishing ownership, to a broad range of reclamation water projects.

Now, this bill’s proponents have claimed that it only expedites the relinquishment of small and easy projects that the Federal Government should no longer own. I wish that were the case.

Mr. Speaker, if that were actually the case, we would have a bipartisan bill, and I would be standing here in support of it, because I have supported title transfers for select, noncontroversial projects when it made sense for taxpayers and the public. In cases of canals and waterworks that don’t affect water operations and diversions, and where there is no significant opposition from Tribes or downstream users, it does make sense, to me, for Congress to give the executive branch some leeway to dispose of these facilities, as long as appropriate safeguards are in place.

Unfortunately, the bill before us allows this administration to unilaterally relinquish ownership of a very broad range of public water projects without appropriate safeguards that should be there to make sure taxpayers and other stakeholders are protected.

In fact, this bill is written so broadly that it would allow the Secretary of the Interior to hand over multipurpose water projects that have no business being owned by one water user.

Now, the fact is, many of Reclamation’s water projects need to be operated in a manner that balances difficult, conflicting interests. Giving up ownership and control of that project, handing it over to a single water user will, in some cases, result in significant harm to the many other interests who have a stake in the operation of Federal water projects.

I am also sorry to say that this bill is a bad deal for taxpayers. It allows the Secretary of the Interior to hand over publicly owned infrastructure and other Federal assets to private interests without appropriate taxpayer compensation.

For example, it fails to require that taxpayers be compensated for the loss of publicly owned lands and mineral in-

terests. And whenever the Federal Government gives away Federal assets, we should ensure that taxpayers who paid for these assets are properly compensated. This bill utterly fails on that score.

I must also point out that H.R. 3281 unwisely removes longstanding and necessary congressional oversight for an overly broad range of projects. Under existing law, Congress has responsibility to oversee and approve the transfer of Federal water projects to ensure that transfers are in the public interest.

This bill eliminates Congress’ current oversight and approval authority for a host of projects that deserve scrutiny before they are given away—not after, but before they are given away. Congress should think twice before it surrenders power and lets this administration irresponsibly give away the public’s infrastructure.

Before closing, I should also note that this bill is rightfully opposed by numerous conservation organizations, including the Sierra Club, Natural Resources Defense Council, Defenders of Wildlife, and many others.

Conservation-minded Americans oppose this bill because transferring ownership of Federal water projects to non-Federal operators will frequently mean less protection for the environment. That is because non-Federal water projects often don’t have to be operated with the same environmental protections that apply to water projects operated, owned by Federal agencies.

For example, projects operated by Federal agencies must comply with certain provisions in section 7 of the Endangered Species Act. Those same requirements would no longer apply if a water project was operated by a non-Federal entity.

For all these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I request a “no” vote on this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I think I may have heard, and I think it could be a misstatement to say, that this could have been a bipartisan bill. It is a bipartisan bill. Now, it may not be unanimous, but it is a bipartisan bill. And for that, I am glad.

I also thought I heard an emotional criticism of President Donald Trump. This was an idea first proposed by Vice President Al Gore during the Clinton administration in the 1990s, so it is not a new idea, by any means. This is an idea that has been around for a while; Congress just hasn’t acted on it. We are using the same old, case-by-case basis of doing transfers, which is cumbersome and works a hardship on the local people and communities out in the West.

Now, for the allegation that this in some way shortchanges the taxpayer, that is simply not true. I don’t call it a giveaway when someone gets title to something they have already paid for.

When my colleague goes to the car lot and buys a car and they give him a

car, that is not a giveaway; he has paid for that. He should receive title. He should receive ownership.

Facilities eligible for transfer under this process would be subject to an agreement with the Bureau of Reclamation that would require these projects to be fully paid off, based on the fair market value of any outstanding obligation to the taxpayers. That is in the language of the bill.

The bill specifically requires a qualifying entity to repay any outstanding obligation to the Federal Government and compensate the U.S. for any other income stream derived from the transferred facilities.

Furthermore, Congress routinely authorized title transfers that have already met many of the standards and financial safeguards established by this legislation.

There is nothing new here. All the bill does is gets Congress out of the way, and it removes a layer of bureaucracy.

In reality, any title transfers conducted under the authorities of this act would relieve the American taxpayer of associated liability, so it is a service to the taxpayers when they don't have to have liability for an already paid-off project that the local community takes over and assumes responsibility for.

In short, title transfers are already designed to recoup taxpayer investment, and this bill would further protect the long-term financial interests of the public.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA).

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I rise to support this important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I remember very clearly when President Clinton asked Vice President Gore to conduct an effort to reorganize government at the Federal level, to make it more efficient, to look for ways in which we could cut down on bureaucratic red tape and to try to find other efficiencies that exist. This was but one of many recommendations that Vice President Gore and his group came up with.

Mr. Speaker, the success of the Bureau of Reclamation to convert portions of the arid West into the largest and most advanced agricultural economy in the world cannot be overstated.

Nowhere is that more evident than in California's San Joaquin Valley, the most productive agriculture region in the world. We grow 60 percent of the Nation's fruits and vegetables, healthy diet, good nutritional food for America's dinner table, besides leading in so many other commodities that we grow.

As a matter of fact, it helps the balance of payments. California's agricultural economy, 44 percent of it, is part of our international trade.

It would not be possible, though, without the complex and well-planned set of dams, canals, and other structures that have operated successfully for generations—generations.

However, over time, the aging infrastructure needs to be repaired. It needs to be updated. Many of the reclamation projects, when they were originally authorized by Congress and the funds were appropriated, were intended to be turned over to local districts to operate once the projects were repaid, and that is an important caveat. Clearly, there was a requirement in the authorization that these projects be repaid, and many of these projects around the country are in various states of being repaid.

□ 1530

After the project's operation and maintenance responsibilities have been fully transferred, the actual ownership would then be transferred as well.

The transfer of title to local operators, I think, has numerous benefits to water users and to the taxpayers. It can reduce paperwork, staff time—both at the Federal and local levels—reduce Federal backlog of infrastructure repair projects, and help improve the environment for public safety because, yes, the environmental laws would still be in place.

I can tell you, in California, our environmental laws are stronger than at the Federal level, so I don't believe that is truly an issue.

And, frankly, we know what the status of our debt in this country is, and we know that so many of our departments and agencies—and in the case of Federal reclamation projects, there is not sufficient funding to do the repair and maintenance that is necessary. It is just very simple: The money is not there, and yet these aging projects are continuing to try to operate as best they can.

A transfer can also provide more flexibility to finance local upgrades and repairs because it provides an asset to be used as collateral.

When we passed the settlement agreement from the Friant water users, as an example, with the NRDC, part of the caveat was that Friant water users would be able to repair the Friant-Kern Canal.

Keeping water facilities in good condition, particularly those that recharge groundwater, is critical not only to the San Joaquin Valley that I represent that grows this abundant and incredible cornucopia of food that is on America's dinner table every night, but today there are large sections of the Friant-Kern Canal that stretch from the Friant Dam all the way down to Bakersfield that have less than 60 percent of their capacity to move water through.

So last year, when we had an abundance of water, almost 200 percent above average, that water could have been used to recharge the groundwater in parts of Tulare and Kern Counties. But because we couldn't move the water through that portion that has subsided, that has cracked, and that is badly in need of repair, we were not able to move the water that the facility initially had capacity to move.

That is one example. There are any other examples.

Importantly, a title transfer does not ultimately change the way facilities are operated; it just doesn't.

Since 1995, the Bureau of Reclamation, working with interested stakeholders, has worked to improve the title transfer process. But I believe it is very important to note that, however, specific congressional authorization—which this legislation attempts to provide some authorization—is still needed to transfer the title of any facility, no matter how small, unless a separate administrative process is established by law to allow the transfer of such ownership. That is what this legislation attempts to do.

This legislation, therefore, creates an administrative process while maintaining the ability of Congress to have the final word, and that is to disapprove of any proposed transfer by passing a resolution of disapproval.

So if the Secretary, in fact, worked such an agreement, moves forward with a transfer of the title, and Congress says, "No, we want to determine these on a case-by-case basis," this legislation will allow that to happen. It gives Congress the final word.

And a NEPA-like process must be a part of that administrative effort to, in fact, successfully transfer the title. So it has got to be repaid; you have to have a NEPA-like process; and—guess what—Congress has the final word.

This legislation would significantly streamline the title transfer process, divest the Federal Government of unnecessary liability, and allow these projects to run, I think, more effectively and with better outcomes when local water districts that are publicly owned, that have their own elected boards, have their own fiduciary responsibility to provide water to the area they serve, to make good, cost-effective decisions on behalf of the water interests that they serve, whether they be farmers or whether they be communities. And it is all of the above.

So this legislation is supported by many organizations, it is bipartisan, and I thank the author of the legislation for helping facilitate legislation that will allow reclamation to improve a title transfer process, which is not a new idea. It goes back to the Clinton administration.

Mr. Speaker, for these reasons, I support this legislation, I urge my colleagues to do the same, and I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

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

Mr. Speaker, it has been brought up that Vice President Al Gore proposed, in certain instances, that title transfer might make sense. That is correct.

But I have also acknowledged that I, myself, have proposed that, in appropriate circumstances, title transfers can make sense. They can be good for water users, for the taxpayers, and for other users as long as the right safeguards are in place.

What we are really talking about here, though, is a bill that fails to work in that narrowly tailored space that Al Gore and myself and others have been willing to work. This bill does not include those safeguards. This bill would not be limited to small, non-controversial projects. It could apply to very large multiuse projects, and it could apply to those projects in ways that do not include safeguards to protect other stakeholders and other interests. That is why we disagree on this point.

Now, it has also been argued that because water districts have repaid the Federal Government through water rates, somehow, that effectively means they should have an entitlement to transfer of these facilities.

A couple points need to be emphasized here.

First, under reclamation law, water districts generally only pay a fraction of the total cost to construct reclamation water projects. The rest of these costs have been borne by taxpayers because the projects were deemed to have public benefits, such as fish and wildlife enhancement and recreation.

Given the billions spent by taxpayers on reclamation projects, it is appropriate for the public to maintain ownership of projects, especially in cases where title transfer could result in operational changes that jeopardize those public benefits for which the public has borne the cost.

Now, project construction costs that are borne by water districts are further reduced by various taxpayer subsidies that should be part of the equation, including federally subsidized, zero-interest financing, power subsidies, and write-offs of debt owed to taxpayers that are deemed beyond a water district's "ability to pay" under reclamation law.

And then, finally, it is important to note that even water districts who pay for this water over time, they still don't pay for any land that might be appurtenant to these facilities. That land, under this bill, would go along with the title transfer, and so would the mineral rights underneath that land. These would be essentially bonus subsidies, potentially, to these water districts without proper compensation to the U.S. taxpayer.

Mr. Speaker, for all these reasons, we need to insist on the safeguards that I and others, when we worked on this issue, have proposed and that are so lacking, unfortunately, in this bill.

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

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I would disagree that we have not put in safeguards. We put in a safeguard that my colleague who just spoke offered in committee.

He offered an amendment, and we adopted it in the spirit of fair play and bipartisanship, that Congress be given a 90-day notice if there ever were to be a transfer that we objected to, and we could do a resolution of disapproval,

stopping that transfer. If something was wrong in the transaction, it was too big, multiuse, or whatever, we have a way to stop that. That was the amendment that my colleague offered, and we adopted that. So we have built-in safeguards.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE), who is an expert on many water issues in the West.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Colorado for yielding me some time this afternoon.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3281, the Reclamation Title Transfer and Non-Federal Infrastructure Incentivization Act, which is offered by my friend from Colorado, Chairman LAMBORN.

This legislation brings commonsense streamlining efforts to the Bureau of Reclamation to transfer Federal water projects to local water entities like irrigation districts and local water user associations.

Reclamation, or BOR, is the Nation's largest wholesale water supplier, providing one out of five Western farmers with irrigation water for over 10 million farmland acres that produce 60 percent of the Nation's vegetables and a quarter of its fresh fruit crops.

These projects in water districts are vital to my district in central Washington, where we grow over 300 different crops, including the iconic Washington apple—hopefully, you have enjoyed some of those—or Washington cherries, potatoes, and three-quarters of the Nation's hops production.

Reclamation's assets in Washington include 16 dams, three hydropower stations, four major water projects, and miles and miles of canals, which deliver water to the end users.

There are currently two water districts in central Washington seeking title to sections of Federal water projects—the Kennewick Irrigation District, the KID, and the Greater Wenatchee Irrigation District—both of which, for many years, have managed and maintained these important water delivery systems.

Now, this legislation would provide a streamlined process to transfer reclamation facilities to those local entities, which includes a number of benefits for the water users, but also a number of benefits to the Federal Government.

This streamlined process can reduce regulatory burden at the local and the State and Federal levels by cutting unnecessary paperwork and reducing staff time at all levels of government.

Additionally, through this process, local districts can take full control of these projects, which they already maintain and manage. By authorizing this streamlining process, local districts can leverage private financing through their ownership, which further reduces the Federal Government's spending and backlog of repairing and upgrading these projects.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation provides a win-win solution for the Federal Government and for the water users. These projects have been in place for many years, but Reclamation has been inundated and overwhelmed by some of the needs for a growing population and for water users. Local communities need this support.

Mr. Speaker, I was speaking with some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle just yesterday about this legislation, and they shared with me that they were worried that this was simply the privatization of Federal water projects and properties within Reclamation, but this is just not the case. This legislation simply allows the Department of the Interior to convey certain projects or facilities to these local entities, like irrigation districts, Indian Tribes, or State and local municipalities. This has nothing to do with selling off water assets to corporations.

Additionally, the entity receiving the assets must use them for the same purposes as intended by Reclamation. The transfer cannot have a significant effect on the environment, and the receiving entity must agree to provide the Federal Government with the equivalent present value of any repayment obligations.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation streamlines water uses for local communities while reducing government waste and burdensome regulations. It is simply a win-win for the American people. I look forward to voting in support of this legislation, and I encourage all of my colleagues to do the same.

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

Mr. Speaker, on my friend's point about privatization, let me just clarify that, in many cases, water districts, certainly many of those in California and many of those that serve agricultural interests in the Central Valley, are comprised and governed by private agribusiness owners and private landowners. They elect the board. They set the agenda.

Further, by the terms of this bill, it allows transfer to joint power entities which, under California law, at least—I would suspect, the laws of other States as well—can include nonpublic agency entities.

So I believe the concern about privatization is certainly valid in this case.

Now, the gentleman from California has mentioned the fact that one of the safeguards in legislation that I have proposed has been included in this bill. I am grateful for that. But the back end protection of the possibility of a joint resolution coming out of Congress within a certain period of time, while not insignificant, is pretty hard to actually achieve in a slow-moving Congress.

Far more important are the other safeguards that were in my legislation on the front end of the process, including safeguards that were intended to ensure that bigger multiuse, more controversial, more public benefit-oriented

projects would not be subject to this type of authority by the executive branch.

□ 1545

Those front-end protections are important, and the most important of them, of course, is that for those type of projects, Congress would retain project-by-project approval authority, and not cede it to the executive branch.

In effect, my bill included a belt and two suspenders. At best, the bill from my friend from Colorado includes one suspender and nothing else. So we disagree on the adequacy of these safeguards.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, in response, I would just point out that the amendment that we adopted in committee giving Congress the ability to, within 90 days, do a resolution of disapproval on any one of these transfers that we have a problem with, was offered by my colleague. It was his language. So it is something that I think he should approve of.

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

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 19 minutes remaining.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, it is hard for many people to understand how important water is in the West, what a precious resource it is in the West, and how complicated the issues regarding water are.

In the case of the Bureau of Reclamation, 140,000 Western farmers, one in five who get irrigation water, get it through 8,000 miles of canals through the Bureau of Reclamation. 500 dams run by the Bureau of Reclamation ensure flood control for tens of thousands of Westerners—millions, actually—and it also provides water for residential, municipal, and industrial use, serving 31 million people.

This is not something to be lightly tampered with with the privatization agenda of this administration. Now remember, we were going to have on the State of the Union day a \$1.5 trillion infrastructure plan. Where is it? It doesn't exist. In fact, they haven't put forward one penny. In fact, they have proposed to cut funding for infrastructure in the President's budget.

But they want to come up with little things so that they can say, oh, look, we are promoting infrastructure here. We are going to sell off Federal assets to who knows who—private entities, foreign entities, anybody who wants them.

Remember Enron and energy deregulation? The next big thing was going to

be water. That is what they were going to get into. They were going to control and manipulate water supplies to drive up the prices.

Well, this bill offers the prospect of someone like an Enron to get hold of public assets today—Bureau of Reclamation, a Federal asset—and its water resources. And then what happens? Well, that is an awfully big question mark. What would happen after a private entity takes over what was formerly being run in the public interest with allocation among competing users?

We might just have a new competition. If anybody remembers that movie—I can't remember the name right now about Los Angeles and Owens Valley and all of the shenanigans they did—"Chinatown." That is it. We could have a 21st century version of "Chinatown" involving private interests, or municipal interests, or foreign interests getting control of our water.

The gentleman from Colorado says, oh, no. Congress can act after this administration has arbitrarily entered into an agreement to sell off public assets, water assets, the Bureau of Reclamation, Congress can act to stop it. Anybody heard of the United States Senate?

Tell me, what are you going to get them to do in 90 days? Could you wake them from their nap? I don't think so. I mean, yeah, maybe in the House—particularly if the Democrats were in charge—we could stop some really bad privatization proposals by the Trump administration of these precious water resources in the Western United States. We could do it within 90 days. Heck, we can do it in quick time. Not the Senate. It is subject to a filibuster, so any one person could block Congress from acting.

So that is not a safeguard. That is about the flimsiest, phoniest, and most transparent of non-safeguard safeguards I have ever seen.

So why would we trust this administration with the most precious asset that many of us have in the Western United States—particularly this year, it has been so dry—which is our water resources, and then when the winters come, our flood-control resources? Why would we want private entities to control those things? You want us to shut the floodgates and stop your house from—well, that is going to cost you if you want us to retain that water up here, because that wasn't in our plan. So if you want some flood control, that will cost you X.

Oh, your fields have gone dry and you want us to do some release from the full reservoir that we control? It is our water. Well, that is going to cost you. It is going to cost you a lot, because it isn't going to rain for another 2 months, if you want to save your crops. This is a colossally bad idea and it should die here today.

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

Mr. Speaker, I, first of all, disagree with the characterization of the safeguard that Mr. HUFFMAN put into the bill as being flimsy and phony. I think what Mr. HUFFMAN proposed was legitimate.

This legislation also includes other multiple provisions to ensure that stakeholders are consulted and protected throughout the title transfer process. The bill requires that operations in use must remain consistent after transfer of title. An entity seeking title transfer must sign a written agreement with the Secretary in full consultation with any existing water or power customer affected by the transfer.

Transfers must be consistent with the Secretary's responsibility to protect land and water resources held in trust for a federally recognized Tribe, and no conveyance under the act may adversely impact power rates or repayment obligations.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend from Colorado.

So let's talk about this Huffman safeguard that has been discussed most recently. It is a perfectly good piece of a safeguard framework, if it is accompanied by all of the other pieces that went with it and that are designed to go with it. And that included all of the front-end protections that were part of the legislation I had proposed, but which my Republican colleagues did not include in their bill, to make sure that only the right kind of projects—not the controversial ones—were subject to this new grant of authority to the executive branch. That is what this is all about.

Simply tacking on one safeguard, which, frankly, was the flimsiest of them all to begin with, doesn't come anywhere close to addressing the problem. As I have said, instead of a belt and suspenders, it is a single suspender—a perfectly good suspender, but try walking around with one suspender all day long and you will find it not very adequate.

This bill recklessly authorizes the de facto privatization of public infrastructure. It fails to protect interests of numerous stakeholders, including American taxpayers, Tribes, fishing groups, environmental and recreational interests, and, finally, it comes from the bankrupt Trump infrastructure plan that reflects this administration's failed privatization philosophy.

The public deserves a real infrastructure plan, not a shell game that simply gives away and privatizes existing public infrastructure.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that my bill was introduced way before any Trump infrastructure plan bill was introduced.

And, secondly, the idea in this bill comes from the Clinton administration from 20–25 years ago. It was part of Al Gore's reinventing government initiative. So it has a bipartisan history that goes back decades. Emotional diatribes against the President, I think, are not germane to what this bill is really all about.

I would like to conclude, Mr. Speaker, by pointing out that this also has strong environmental protections. In no way is any environmental law eroded, and it does not allow those who wish to pursue title transfer to do so unless they adhere to Federal environmental statutes. Section 5 of the bill simply states that the Secretary develop a categorical exclusion process consistent with NEPA.

This section is in no way a NEPA waiver, nor is it a congressionally mandated categorical exclusion. This provision simply requires the Secretary to develop a checklist so that the agency can quickly identify any possible conflicts with the Endangered Species Act or any other environmental factors that need to be addressed in the NEPA process.

Section 8 of the bill specifically states that after conveyance into this act, the receiving entity must still comply with all applicable Federal, State, and local laws and regulations.

Finally, I think it is worth noting two additional criteria set forth in this legislation. The transfer must not have an unmitigated, significant effect on the environment, and the receiving entity must operate the property consistent with current operations under the Bureau of Reclamation.

So any thought that there is an evasion of environmental protections is simply false. At this point, I would urge my colleagues to support this commonsense legislation. There are plenty of good safeguards that are put into place on a bipartisan level. This is a bipartisan piece of legislation with decades of support from both parties. I would urge my colleagues to adopt H.R. 3281, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 985, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

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. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. HUFFMAN. I am in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Huffman moves to recommit the bill H.R. 3281 to the Committee on Natural Re-

sources with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

At the end of the bill, add the following:
SEC. 10. PROHIBITION AGAINST CONFLICT OF INTEREST.

The Secretary may not relinquish ownership of an eligible facility to a qualifying entity if the entity employed the Secretary or Deputy Secretary of the Interior as a federally registered lobbyist within the past 3 years.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, this is the part where I give the usual stipulation that this is the final amendment to the bill which will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

This amendment is simple. The underlying bill allows the Department of the Interior to dole out publicly owned infrastructure and other public assets to water districts.

My amendment simply says, the Department of the Interior can't give away public assets to a water district if that district has employed the Secretary or the Deputy Secretary of the Interior as a lobbyist in the previous 3 years.

Put another way, the Secretary and Deputy Secretary can't give away public infrastructure to those who recently signed their lobbying paychecks. It should go without saying that this basic ethics requirement is needed, particularly in this administration, where conflicts of interest and corruption run so rampant.

The Department of the Interior has been mired in scandals. The Interior Secretary's actions have triggered at least 10 government investigations. It was also recently revealed that the Secretary and/or his family, are currently in a business partnership to develop a former industrial site with the chairman of the energy company, Halliburton. Halliburton, of course, has a lot of business pending before the Department of the Interior. This is an outrageous conflict of interest, and demonstrates how hollow the President's pledge to drain the swamp has been.

Further, Mr. Speaker, Interior Deputy Secretary Bernhardt, the number two official at the agency, was most recently employed as a Federal lobbyist and had a long list of clients with business before the Department, including clients who stand to gain with the passage of this bill by taking ownership of public infrastructure. We must not allow such blatant conflicts to stand.

□ 1600

It is time for Congress to exercise some oversight over this administration and install some basic rules of accountability and ethics.

If my Republican colleagues are serious about exercising their oversight responsibilities, they will support my

amendment. It simply makes sure that the public's assets cannot be given away to big business and narrow special interests if those same interests employed agency leadership in the past 3 years.

Mr. Speaker, I urge an "aye" vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I claim the time in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LAMBORN. This motion, Mr. Speaker, is just a procedural gimmick to delay passage of this important bipartisan legislation.

If the amendment made by this motion was of critical importance to the minority, they could have offered this as an amendment when the Natural Resources Committee marked up the bill or filed this amendment with the Rules Committee. They did not in either case.

This bill is a commonsense, bipartisan bill that supports local infrastructure and gives local communities the ability to seek private financing through equity to improve local, vital water infrastructure.

Mr. Speaker, I urge rejection of the motion to recommit, 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. HUFFMAN. 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.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1645

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BYRNE) at 4 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Motion to recommit on H.R. 3281;
Passage of H.R. 3281, if ordered; and
Passage of H.R. 6237.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

RECLAMATION TITLE TRANSFER AND NON-FEDERAL INFRASTRUCTURE INCENTIVIZATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to recommit on 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, offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN), on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the motion.

The Clerk redesignated the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 187, nays 230, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 324]

YEAS—187

Adams	Doyle, Michael	Lipinski
Aguilar	F.	Loesback
Barragán	Engel	Lofgren
Bass	Eshoo	Lowenthal
Beatty	Espaillat	Lowey
Bera	Esty (CT)	Lujan Grisham, M.
Beyer	Evans	Luján, Ben Ray
Bishop (GA)	Foster	Lynch
Blumenauer	Frankel (FL)	Maloney,
Blunt Rochester	Fudge	Carolyn B.
Bonamici	Gabbard	Maloney, Sean
Boyle, Brendan F.	Gallego	Matsui
Brady (PA)	Garamendi	McCollum
Brown (MD)	Gomez	McEachin
Brownley (CA)	Gonzalez (TX)	McGovern
Bustos	Gottheimer	McNerney
Butterfield	Green, Al	Meeks
Capuano	Green, Gene	Meng
Carbajal	Grijalva	Moore
Cárdenas	Gutiérrez	Murphy (FL)
Carson (IN)	Hastings	Nadler
Cartwright	Heck	Napolitano
Castor (FL)	Higgins (NY)	Neal
Castro (TX)	Himes	Nolan
Chu, Judy	Hoyer	Norcross
Cicilline	Huffman	O'Halleran
Clark (MA)	Jackson Lee	O'Rourke
Clarke (NY)	Jayapal	Pallone
Clay	Jeffries	Panetta
Cleaver	Johnson (GA)	Pascarel
Clyburn	Johnson, E. B.	Payne
Cohen	Jones	Pelosi
Connolly	Kaptur	Peters
Cooper	Keating	Peterson
Correa	Kelly (IL)	Pingree
Courtney	Kennedy	Pocan
Crist	Khanna	Polis
Crowley	Kihuen	Price (NC)
Cuellar	Kildee	Riquigley
Cummings	Kilmer	Raskin
Davis (CA)	Kilmer	Rice (NY)
Davis, Danny	Kind	Richmond
DeFazio	Krishnamoorthi	Rosen
DeGette	Kuster (NH)	Royal-Allard
Delaney	Lamb	Ruiz
DeLauro	Langevin	Ruppersberger
DelBene	Larsen (WA)	Rush
Demings	Larson (CT)	Ryan (OH)
DeSaulnier	Lawrence	Sánchez
Deutch	Lawson (FL)	Sarbanes
Dingell	Lee	Schakowsky
Doggett	Levin	Schiff
	Lewis (GA)	
	Lieu, Ted	

Schneider	Soto	Veasey
Schrader	Suozzi	Vela
Scott (VA)	Swalwell (CA)	Velázquez
Scott, David	Takano	Visclosky
Serrano	Thompson (CA)	Wasserman
Sewell (AL)	Thompson (MS)	Schultz
Shea-Porter	Titus	Waters, Maxine
Sherman	Tonko	Watson Coleman
Sinema	Torres	Welch
Sires	Tsongas	Wilson (FL)
Smith (WA)	Vargas	Yarmuth

NAYS—230

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

NOT VOTING—11

□ 1715

Messrs. CLOUD, YOUNG of Alaska, GROTHMAN, LATTA, REICHERT, POE of Texas, BRADY of Texas, BILIRAKIS, JORDAN, and COLLINS of Georgia changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. SCHNEIDER, POCAN, Ms.
McCOLLUM, and Mr. NADLER
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 (Mr. POE of Texas). 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.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HUFFMAN. 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 233, noes 184, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 325]

AYES—233

Abraham	Donovan	King (IA)
Aderholt	Duffy	King (NY)
Allen	Duncan (SC)	Kinzinger
Amodei	Duncan (TN)	Knight
Arrington	Dunn	Labrador
Babin	Emmer	LaHood
Bacon	Estes (KS)	LaMalfa
Banks (IN)	Faso	Lamborn
Barletta	Ferguson	Lance
Barr	Fleischmann	Latta
Barton	Flores	Lesko
Bergman	Fortenberry	Lewis (MN)
Biggs	Foxx	LoBiondo
Bilirakis	Frelinghuysen	Long
Bishop (GA)	Gaetz	Loudermilk
Bishop (MI)	Gallagher	Love
Bishop (UT)	Garamendi	Lucas
Blackburn	Garrett	Luetkemeyer
Blum	Gianforte	MacArthur
Bost	Gibbs	Marchant
Brady (TX)	Gohmert	Marino
Brat	Goodlatte	Marshall
Brooks (AL)	Gosar	Mast
Brooks (IN)	Gottheimer	McCarthy
Buchanan	Gowdy	McCaul
Buck	Granger	McClintock
Bucshon	Graves (GA)	McHenry
Budd	Graves (LA)	McKinley
Burgess	Graves (MO)	McMorris
Byrne	Griffith	Rodgers
Calvert	Grothman	McSally
Carter (GA)	Guthrie	Meadows
Carter (TX)	Handel	Messer
Chabot	Harris	Mitchell
Cloud	Hartzler	Moolenaar
Coffman	Hensarling	Mooney (WV)
Cole	Herrera Beutler	Mullin
Collins (GA)	Hice, Jody B.	Newhouse
Collins (NY)	Higgins (LA)	Noem
Comer	Hill	Norcross
Comstock	Holding	Norman
Conaway	Hollingsworth	Nunes
Cook	Hudson	Olson
Costa	Huizenga	Palazzo
Costello (PA)	Hultgren	Palmer
Cramer	Hunter	Paulsen
Crawford	Hurd	Pearce
Cuellar	Jenkins (KS)	Perry
Culberson	Jenkins (WV)	Peterson
Curbelo (FL)	Johnson (LA)	Pittenger
Curtis	Johnson (OH)	Poe (TX)
Davidson	Johnson, Sam	Poliquin
Davis, Rodney	Jordan	Posey
Denham	Joyce (OH)	Ratcliffe
DeSantis	Katko	Reed
DesJarlais	Kelly (MS)	Reichert
Diaz-Balart	Kelly (PA)	Renacci

Rice (SC)	Sessions	Wagner
Roby	Shimkus	Walberg
Roe (TN)	Shuster	Walden
Rogers (AL)	Simpson	Walker
Rogers (KY)	Smith (MO)	Walorski
Rohrabacher	Smith (NE)	Walters, Mimi
Rokita	Smith (NJ)	Weber (TX)
Rooney, Francis	Smith (TX)	Webster (FL)
Rooney, Thomas J.	Smucker	Wenstrup
Ros-Lehtinen	Stefanik	Westerman
Roskam	Stewart	Williams
Ross	Stivers	Wilson (SC)
Rothfus	Taylor	Wittman
Rouzer	Tenney	Womack
Royce (CA)	Thompson (PA)	Woodall
Rutherford	Thornberry	
Scalise	Tipton	Yoder
Schrader	Trott	Yoho
Schweikert	Turner	Young (AK)
Scott, Austin	Upton	Young (IA)
Sensenbrenner	Valadao	Zeldin
	Vela	

NOES—184

Adams	Gabbard	Nadler
Aguilar	Gallego	Napolitano
Amash	Gomez	Neal
Barragán	Gonzalez (TX)	Nolan
Bass	Green, Al	O'Halleran
Beatty	Green, Gene	O'Rourke
Bera	Grijalva	Pallone
Beyer	Gutierrez	Panetta
Blumenauer	Hastings	Pascarel
Blunt Rochester	Heck	Payne
Bonamici	Higgins (NY)	Pelosi
Boyle, Brendan F.	Himes	Peters
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	Royal-Allard
Castor (FL)	Kelly (IL)	Ruiz
Castro (TX)	Kennedy	Ruppersberger
Chu, Judy	Khanna	Rush
Cicilline	Kihuen	Russell
Clark (MA)	Kildee	Ryan (OH)
Clarke (NY)	Kilmer	Sánchez
Clay	Kind	Sanford
Cleaver	Krishnamoorthi	Sarbanes
Clyburn	Kuster (NH)	Schakowsky
Cohen	Lamb	Schiff
Connolly	Langevin	Schneider
Cooper	Larsen (WA)	Scott (VA)
Correa	Larson (CT)	Scott, David
Courtney	Lawrence	Serrano
Crist	Lawson (FL)	Sewell (AL)
Crowley	Lee	Shea-Porter
Cummings	Levin	Sherman
Davis (CA)	Lewis (GA)	Sinema
Davis, Danny	Lieu, Ted	Sires
DeFazio	Lipinski	Smith (WA)
DeGette	Loeb sack	Soto
Delaney	Lofgren	Suozzi
DeLauro	Lowenthal	Swalwell (CA)
DelBene	Lowey	Takano
Demings	Lujan Grisham, M.	Thompson (CA)
DeSaulnier	Luján, Ben Ray	Thompson (MS)
Deutch	Lynch	Titus
Dingell	Maloney,	Tonko
Doggett	Carolyn B.	Torres
Doyle, Michael F.	Maloney, Sean	Tsungas
Engel	Massie	Vargas
Eshoo	Matsui	Velázquez
Espallat	McCullum	Viscosky
Esty (CT)	McEachin	Wasserman
Fitzpatrick	McGovern	Schultz
Foster	Meeks	Waterson Maxine
Frankel (FL)	Meng	Watson Colema
Fudge	Moore	Welch
	Murphy (FL)	Wilson (FL)
		Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—11

Black	Harper	Perlmutter
Cheney	Issa	Speier
Ellison	Kustoff (TN)	Walz
Hanabusa	Moulton	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1723

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama and Mr. FOSTER changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MATTHEW YOUNG POLLARD IN-
TELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION
ACT FOR FISCAL YEARS 2018
AND 2019

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on passage 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, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 363, nays 54, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 326]

YEAS—363

Abraham	Clay	Ferguson	Luetkemeyer	Rogers (AL)	Walberg
Adams	Cleaver	Fitzpatrick	Lujan Grisham,	Rogers (KY)	Walden
Aderholt	Cloud	Fleischmann	M.	Rohrabacher	Walker
Aguilar	Clyburn	Flores	Luján, Ben Ray	Rokita	Walorski
Allen	Coffman	Fortenberry	Lynch	Rooney, Francis	Walters, Mimi
Amodei	Cohen	Foster	MacArthur	Rooney, Thomas	Wasserman
Arrington	Cole	Foxx	Maloney,	J.	Schultz
Babin	Collins (GA)	Frankel (FL)	Carolyn B.	Ros-Lehtinen	Waters, Maxine
Bacon	Collins (NY)	Frelinghuysen	Maloney, Sean	Rosen	Weber (TX)
Banks (IN)	Comer	Fudge	Marchant	Roskam	Webster (FL)
Barletta	Comstock	Gaetz	Marino	Ross	Wenstrup
Barr	Conaway	Gallagher	Marshall	Rothfus	Westerman
Barragán	Connolly	Gallego	Mast	Rouzer	Williams
Barton	Cook	Garamendi	Matsui	Roybal-Allard	Wilson (FL)
Beatty	Cooper	Garrett	McCarthy	Royce (CA)	Wilson (SC)
Bera	Correa	Gianforte	McCaul	Ruiz	Wittman
Bergman	Costa	Gibbs	McClintock	Ruppersberger	Womack
Beyer	Costello (PA)	Gohmert	McEachin	Russell	Woodall
Bilirakis	Courtney	Gonzalez (TX)	McHenry	Rutherford	Yarmuth
Bishop (GA)	Cramer	Goodlatte	McKinley	Sánchez	Yoder
Bishop (MI)	Crawford	Gosar	McMorris	Sarbanes	Yoho
Bishop (UT)	Crist	Gottheimer	Rodgers	Scalise	Young (AK)
Blackburn	Crowley	Gowdy	McNerney	Schiff	Young (IA)
Blumenauer	Grüner	Grainger	McSally	Schneider	Zeldin

NAVS—54

Bonham	Cummings	Graves (LA)	Graves (MO)	Amash	Espalat	McCullum
Bost	Curbelo (FL)	Graves (MO)	Green, Gene	Bass	Gabbard	McGovern
Boyle, Brendan F.	Curtis	Griffith	Biggs	Gomez	Moore	
Brady (PA)	Davidson	Grothman	Blumenauer	Green, Al	Napolitano	
Brady (TX)	Davis (CA)	Guthrie	Buck	Grijalva	O'Rourke	
Brat	Davis, Rodney	Handel	Capuano	Gutiérrez	Pocan	
Brooks (AL)	DeGette	Harris	Carson (IN)	Huffman	Polis	
Brooks (IN)	Delaney	Hartzler	Castro (TX)	Jackson Lee	Raskin	
Brown (MD)	DeLauro	Hastings	Chu, Judy	Jayapal	Rush	
Brownley (CA)	Demings	Denham	Clark (MA)	Jeffries	Ryan (OH)	
Buchanan	DeSantis	Heck	Clarke (NY)	Jones	Sanford	
Bucshon	DesJarlais	Hensarling	Clarke (NY)	Khanna	Schakowsky	
Budd	Deutch	Herrera Beutler	Danny	DeFazio	Labrador	
Burgess	Diaz-Balart	Hice, Jody B.	Higgins (LA)	DelBene	Lee	Smith (WA)
Bustos	Dingell	Higgins (NY)	DeSaulnier	Lewis (GA)	Takano	
Butterfield	Donovan	Hill	Doggett	Loebback	Velázquez	
Byrne	Duffy	Himes	Doyle, Michael F.	Lofgren	Watson Coleman	
Calvert	Duncan (SC)	Holding	Duncan (TN)	Lowenthal	Welch	
Carbajal	Dunn	Hollingsworth		Massie		
Cárdenas	Emmer	Hoyer				

NOT VOTING—11

Cartwright	Estes (KS)	Hultgren	Black	Harper	Perlmutter
Castor (FL)	Esty (CT)	Hunter	Cheney	Issa	Speier
Chabot	Evans	Hurd	Ellison	Kustoff (TN)	Walz
Cicilline	Faso	Jenkins (KS)	Hanabusa	Moulton	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1730

Mr. LEVIN changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOMENT OF SILENCE HONORING ENSIGN SARAH MITCHELL

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I rise today in memory of Ensign Sarah Mitchell, a naval officer serving on Active Duty who passed away on July 8 due to injuries sustained in a training accident in Aqaba, Jordan.

Sarah was raised in Feasterville, Pennsylvania, and attended Lower Southampton Elementary School and Poquessing Middle School before attending Neshaminy High School in Bucks County, Pennsylvania.

While at Neshaminy, Sarah excelled in the classroom, as well as being a member of the school's field hockey team, basketball team, and track and field team.

Lisa Pennington, Sarah's field hockey coach, described her as the person you would always remember as smiling and working hard to be successful.

Upon graduation from Neshaminy High School, Sarah attended and graduated from Virginia Tech University, where she was a member of the Corps of Cadets.

Regarded as an exceptional student athlete and member of our community, Sarah's decision to serve our Nation came as no surprise to those who knew her best.

Her longtime friend Emily Curtin had these amazing words about Sarah in our local paper, the Bucks County Courier Times: “She was fearless in the pursuit of everything she wanted, never settling for less. Sarah never left anyone behind. Sarah's loyalty to her family, fiance, friends, and country was undeniable. She carried the burdens of others and helped every person” she encountered who was in need.

Mr. Speaker, may all of us use the legacy Sarah left us as a guide to live in a way that exemplifies patriotism and courage.

We send our deepest condolences to Sarah's fiance, Dave Collins; her parents, Jack and Betsy; her siblings, Kevin, Kristy, John, and Jillian.

Mr. Speaker, I ask our colleagues to join us in a moment of silence for Ensign Sarah Mitchell, an American hero.

A TAX REFORM SUCCESS STORY

(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 to bring your attention to yet another success story from tax reform.

A constituent of mine who is the founder and owner of All Pro Solutions, a small business in South Carolina, has benefited greatly from tax reform.

Tibi contacted my office with his recent success story, and he cannot downplay the positive impact he has seen.

All Pro Solutions is a digital archiving company of 10 employees, so they are in no way a big corporation. As a result of tax reform being signed into law, All Pro Solutions has been able to buy extra and newer equipment. They have already seen an increase in sales. They are now expanding their archiving work, and they will soon be hiring two more employees due to these wonderful circumstances.

His story proves that these tax cuts were for everyone. They are working on a local level, and these tax cuts are beneficial to all and working on a national level.

OPPOSING ADMINISTRATION PLANS TO ROB RYAN WHITE HIV/ AIDS PROGRAM FUNDS

(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, the vast majority of people in our country oppose the Trump administration's cruel policy of jailing immigrant children. This administration is rotten to the core.

Just yesterday, news broke that the Department of Health and Human Services' Office of Refugee Resettlement is preparing for possibly another surge of families to separate. They are planning for the possible detention of thousands more children, even though the office doesn't have enough money to take care of these children.

So what is the administration's plan for covering the cost of jailing children? According to internal documents obtained by reporters, HHS plans to pay for the child separation by robbing funds from the Ryan White HIV/AIDS Program. In fact, HHS is already moving money out of the Ryan White program.

Mr. Speaker, this administration is wicked. Stealing from the underinsured and the uninsured people living with HIV in order to put children in jail is outrageous. Congress needs to step up and protect the Ryan White program and end child detention.

WHERE IS THE HEART IN THIS ADMINISTRATION

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I will be returning to the House Judici-

ary Committee. We have been there for more than 8 hours, maybe 11 hours, with Peter Strzok, an FBI agent who has been vindicated by the inspector general regarding the Hillary Clinton emails, which were found to have no effect on any violation or any criminal violation, but yet Republicans have continued over and over again to hold these hearings without addressing the question of jailed children snatched from their families.

Today, we understand that Health and Human Services is holding back the reunification of some of these babies under 5 to their moms and their dads on the basis of unrelated or unnecessary predicaments of these parents, where they have been incarcerated for misdemeanors regarding immigration.

This is the administration that really has no caring and no love for people.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the World Health Organization had the delegation from this Nation, not representing me, fight a country that was trying to support breastfeeding, and they wanted to condemn Ecuador for a resolution supporting breastfeeding for mothers around the world.

What are we coming to? Where is the heart in this administration?

HONORING THE LIFE OF SUSAN SMITH

(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 Susan Smith.

Susan attended the Route 91 festival in Las Vegas on October 1.

Susan was a wife and a mother of two. She worked as an office manager at Vista Fundamental Elementary School in Simi Valley, California.

Susan loved traveling, scrapbooking, and documenting countless memories for her family.

Susan had a contagious laugh and a great sense of humor. She was patient, strong, and kind.

Susan is remembered for her love of her family, her drive, and the beautiful way she treated others.

Mr. Speaker, I extend my condolences to Susan Smith's family and friends. Please know that the city of Las Vegas, the State of Nevada, and the whole country grieve with you.

RECOGNIZING THE NATIONAL DAY OF CIVILITY

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

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the special day that today is. It is the National Day of Civility, #nationaldayofcivility.

I wanted to recognize this day because last year, as a freshman Member,

even before we were sworn in, my freshman colleagues and I were stuck in Williamsburg in a snowstorm. When we were stuck together, we decided to come up with a new course for our class and a new initiative called the Commitment to Civility—thanks to my colleagues, MIKE JOHNSON especially, for this brainchild.

From that day forward, we all agreed, and all of us except, I think, I believe three Members on the Democratic side, signed this with the hope of us finding a different course, finding some more civility and some more work across the aisle.

To this day, I have tried to live up to that commitment. Every bill that I have introduced that is originally sponsored, I have done with the bipartisan support of my Democratic colleagues. We have endeavored to work together on a number of initiatives, whether it is soliciting advice from other committees or the President or any kind of letter to the agencies that we represent.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to say thank you to all my colleagues who signed this and who continue to live up to our commitment to civility.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in encouraging that H. Res. 400, Creating a National Day of Civility, be recognized.

□ 1745

COVERAGE OF PREEXISTING CONDITIONS

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, President Trump, along with his Republican choir here in Congress, is sabotaging your healthcare.

First, his administration put hurdles to enrollment by slashing outreach for insurance signup efforts, and then he just announced he was slashing navigator funding. Now the administration cut off key payments to insurers that helped stabilize insurance markets.

This Republican Congress repealed the requirement that everyone have insurance, which puts further strains on costs in the healthcare system. Meanwhile, Republicans in States across our Union are urging Federal courts to rule health protections for 130 million people with preexisting conditions unconstitutional.

Ohioans are staring down an 8 percent increase in premiums for 2019, and what is the Trump administration doing? Sabotaging people's healthcare.

His Supreme Court nominee has now questioned the constitutionality of key elements of coverage in the Affordable Care Act.

There are bipartisan solutions to help Americans facing the daunting task of paying rising healthcare costs. This Congress must choose people over the profits of big pharmaceutical insurance companies. Human lives hang in the balance.

MR. TRUMP SHOULD TESTIFY

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

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, Robert Mueller is conducting a criminal investigation. Mr. Trump's attorney doesn't want him to testify.

Rudy Giuliani has taken three outrageous positions: He has claimed that Mr. Trump doesn't have to testify if he doesn't think the prosecutor has a good basis for the investigation; that Mr. Trump doesn't have to testify if he doesn't think the prosecutor is being objective; and that Mr. Trump doesn't have to testify if the prosecutor doesn't already have sufficient evidence of a crime.

On this poster is a picture of Mr. Al Capone. He was forced to testify before a grand jury. Mr. Capone didn't think that there was a basis for that investigation, and Mr. Capone didn't think that the prosecutor was objective. But he testified under oath, as did President Bill Clinton, because no one is above the law. No one is immune from a subpoena, not Mr. Al Capone, not Mr. Donald Trump.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. TENNEY). Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

CONTINUING RESOLUTIONS HURT THE MILITARY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TAYLOR) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TAYLOR. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the topic of this Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TAYLOR. Madam Speaker, we are here tonight to speak about how, for far too long, Congress has passed continuing resolutions that have devastating effects on our military and national security apparatus. They have hurt our maintenance, readiness, training, and contracting, causing a cascading and negative effect in extending our deployment schedules, which hurt our strong military families, who are the very foundation of our force.

Indeed, Secretary Mattis said in January 2018:

As hard as the last 16 years have been, no enemy in the field has done more to harm the readiness of the U.S. military than the combined impact of the Budget Control Act's defense spending cuts and operating under continuing resolutions.

Madam Speaker, Congress has passed continuing resolutions for 9 out of the past 10 years.

I will say, Madam Speaker, that I am encouraged, skeptical, and hopeful that Congress will move toward regular order this year and forego a continuing resolution for the defense of this Nation later this year: encouraged, because the Senate has expressed they will take up defense appropriations and move it to the floor for the first time in years; skeptical, because I am a realist, and they will attach another bill to it, which will make it tougher to get passed; hopeful, because I am an optimist. We all know it is the right thing to do, and we are pushing to make it happen.

Madam Speaker, I have the great honor of representing the district with more military and veterans than anywhere in the Nation. If anything is going on in the world, our men and women are there on the front lines, fighting for families, fighting for friends, fighting for freedom.

We, in Congress, owe them better. We must do better. We must get our acts together and lead with the courage and the spirit of our Nation, and the courage and spirit of those men and women in uniform who stand watch for us every single day.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER).

Mr. HUNTER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Virginia for his service. If you don't know, SCOTT TAYLOR enlisted in the Navy SEALs in 1997, got out, and then went back to Iraq in 2005. In Ramadi, as a Navy SEAL sniper, he was injured. And here he is now.

I thank the gentleman for doing this. Like all or most Navy SEALs, the gentleman does great when the camera is on him. As a Congressman, the camera is always on him, so he does very well in this job.

I would like to bring up one point that really struck me, because of the Budget Control Act and the continuing resolutions. The former Speaker of the House, when we passed this 9 years ago, looked us in the eye and said: This will never pass. It is too horrible. This will never happen. It is too horrible for the military. It hurts it too badly.

That is what the former Speaker of the House said. When he looked the Armed Services Committee in the eye and told them that, a lot of the Members proceeded to vote "yes" on the Budget Control Act, and that put us where we are now.

Let me tell you where the Budget Control Act has put us. In 2017, you had about 80 servicemembers die in training. That doesn't include drunk driving or falling off a cliff. But in training in the United States, all four branches of service, you had more than 80 servicemembers die last year just training.

You had 21 servicemembers die in combat. So you had 21 service people die in combat zones where they are getting shot at and fighting the enemy, and more than 80 people died back here at home just training.

The Budget Control Act and the continuing resolutions that we have been

doing have literally made it safer to go to war in Iraq, Afghanistan, Syria, Philippines. Name your place, it is safer than training here at home. It is safer than getting in a C-130 and flying here at home. It is safer to do it overseas.

That is a sad state for our American military, and it is a sad state of affairs for this Congress.

What Mr. TAYLOR said is absolutely right. The Senate needs to work on this. We are going to pass it. We are going to get a clean bill back from them.

It would be fantastic to be able to move forward and get out of these continuing resolutions and stay out of them. Once we started this, again, it took 9 years to get to where we are now, where we are finally getting out of it with the deals that this Speaker has made and with what this Senate has done.

Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman again for his service and for doing this Special Order this evening.

Mr. TAYLOR. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California, who is also a combat marine. I won't hold it against him. He is a marine, and we are appreciative of him being here and of his time in Iraq and Afghanistan in defending what we hold dear.

He is a leader on military and defense issues and national security issues here in Congress, so we truly appreciate his service then and now.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER).

Mrs. HARTZLER. Madam Speaker, I thank Congressman TAYLOR for hosting this very important, special event tonight.

As a member of the House Armed Services Committee, I have heard too many testimonies after testimonies talking about the dangerously low level of our military's readiness.

Years of budget cuts, coupled with continuing resolutions, have prevented and delayed the modernization of our airplanes, ships, and basic equipment, while at the same time reducing the readiness of our troops around the globe.

Here is the stunning and sobering reality: Today, we have the smallest Army since before World War II, the smallest Navy since before World War I, and the smallest Air Force we have ever had. Only 50 percent of our Nation's fighter and bomber forces are able to fly, fight, and decisively win a highly contested fight, much like our forces would encounter with China and Russia.

Get this: Less than half of the Navy's aircraft can fly due to maintenance and spare parts issues. Think about that. Less than half of the Navy's aircraft can fly due to maintenance and spare parts issues.

Budget cuts and increased operations have depleted America's supply of precision ammunitions. Simply put, we are running out of bombs.

Two Navy destroyers were involved in collisions that will take years to repair, resulting in the tragic deaths of 17 sailors—17 sailors of the 80 that my colleague from California, Representative DUNCAN, just shared about, where we lost 80 soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines in training accidents last year.

We lost 17 in this accident dealing with the two Navy destroyers. I saw the impact of this accident personally in September when I toured the USS *Fitzgerald* as part of an Armed Services fact-finding mission. I stood in the room where seven sailors died when their ship collided with a commercial freighter a little after 1 in the morning, tearing a huge hole in the side of the ship and flooding their room where they were sleeping with water in a little under 2 minutes, giving them very little time to escape.

It was heart-wrenching to see, and it was heartbreaking to think about the pain that the families will feel for years to come.

Sadly, these accidents were not due to an enemy attack. They were due to training lapses and poor leadership, which was exacerbated by high demand of services, combined with lack of funding for needed ships and lack of training caused by defense cuts and sequestration.

In some cases, we found out sailors are working 100 hours a week just to keep up with the training requirements and the current operations.

Our men and women in uniform deserve better. We cannot expect our sons and daughters to volunteer for the military only for them to be placed in harm's way without the proper equipment or adequate training to ensure they return home to us safely.

Congress must work to fix this problem. The 2-year budget agreement passed earlier this year increased the defense spending caps to allow our Nation's military to begin the rebuilding process. Congress took action for fiscal year 2018 by investing in critical military programs, such as increased funding for Navy ship and aircraft depot maintenance, providing an additional 24 F/A-18 Super Hornets to address the Navy's strike fighter shortage, and increased Active Duty end-strength for all the service branches.

However, our work is far from over. It is vital that we pass on-time appropriations for fiscal year 2019. Our military cannot adequately restore readiness without on-time appropriations. It is our responsibility as Members of Congress to ensure that the Department of Defense receives appropriations for fiscal year 2019 by this October 1.

The House has already passed our version of the Defense Appropriations bill, and I hope our colleagues in the Senate will act swiftly to ensure the Department of Defense is funded on time. We need their help to make this happen, and we owe it to our sailors and our servicemen everywhere.

Time is running out. We have an opportunity to get this right, and I urge the Senate to act swiftly and quickly.

Mr. TAYLOR. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Missouri, who is a strong, principled, conservative voice on the House Armed Services Committee and a huge supporter of our military and national security apparatus. I thank the gentlewoman for her service here and, of course, to our military, and for her good work.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BERGMAN).

Mr. BERGMAN. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague and my next-door office mate. The south wing of Cannon is well guarded.

Of course, the third verse of the "Marines' Hymn" says that when all the rest of us get to heaven, they will find that the gates are guarded by United States marines. But I guarantee you, there are some snipers up there somewhere, making sure that the marines don't get taken from behind.

We have a term, or had a term because I am no longer involved with the Pentagon on a direct basis, but while working there over a long period of time, there was a term called BLUF, B-L-U-F, bottom line up front. So the bottom line up front from my remarks today is that CRs, continuing resolutions, seriously inhibit and in some cases, prevent long-term planning, training, and readiness.

We have a term that you will hear now used by the military on a daily basis: We have to be ready to fight tonight. That is not tonight next week. That is not tonight next month. That is right now and around the globe.

□ 1800

When you have a mission like the U.S. military does to protect not only our citizens here but those citizens in countries of our coalition partners around the world, we have to be able to fight tonight, and we have to be able to fight as a coalition force around the world. When you are not ready, you are not a good partner. Continuing resolutions consume time, they consume resources, and they increase the overall cost of warfighting.

DOD's mission is to protect all of our citizens by successfully executing operational war plans. These operational plans change over time due to evolving threats. Continuing resolutions prevent DOD from maintaining momentum in keeping ahead of those changing threats. Warfighting is not like a sports team where you can go 18 and 1 for the season and still claim victory. That 1 has to always be in the zero column for our military.

Training and readiness go hand in hand. The readiness comes in two forms: personnel readiness and equipment readiness. When you think about the time it takes to train a young soldier, sailor, airman, marine or coast-guardsman, that can't be done overnight. Long-term planning goes into that individual training. That individual training morphs into unit training so that individual part of a unit is

ready to go and defend our Nation's interests at home and abroad.

Equipment readiness is a challenge, because when you cannot plan long term for your buys of parts, whether they be for aircraft, ships, tanks, whatever it happens to be, again, your cost goes up.

We have the responsibility as the Congress to give our Department of Defense and the Secretary of Defense the tools they need to keep our country safe. Continuing resolutions seriously hinder our capability to complete that mission.

I strongly urge the Senate to act swiftly and come to the realization that a continuing resolution is not an answer going forward for the safety and security of our country, all of its citizens, our families, and our coalition partners who rely on us when times get in dire straits.

So, Madam Speaker, I am thankful for the opportunity to speak with you tonight, and I just want to end with one real-time, real-life anecdote.

Forty-six years ago yesterday, July 11, 1972, we saw the evidence of a successful evolving threat in Vietnam when the worst, most devastating helicopter shoot-down of the entire Vietnam war occurred. Sixty-two people perished in one CH-53 helicopter in the northern I Corps. We had not had the capability to adjust our tactics because the SA-7 missile had been introduced. That is how quickly life can change on the battlefield.

We as the Congress need to do everything possible to ensure that that doesn't happen to our Nation's warriors.

Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague not only for his service, but for his friendship.

Mr. TAYLOR. Madam Speaker, I would certainly like to thank the gentleman, Congressman, general, and marine—marine nonetheless—for his fantastic service to this great Nation, both then and now, as a colleague, as a fellow veteran, and as a neighbor in the Cannon building on the south end there. I thank the gentleman for his service and his steadfast support of our military men and women.

Madam Speaker, the regular use, as you have heard, of continuing resolutions impacts commanders at all levels. You have heard about more training deaths than combat deaths. I have to tell you at the service and major command levels, commanders are not allowed to start new programs, increase rates of production, or begin new military construction projects. As you move to lower echelons of command, it forces leaders into making risk determinations related to readiness and training.

Consider, Madam Speaker, Oceana Naval Base. You heard the gentlewoman from Missouri talk about parts and maintenance and half of the Navy airplanes not being able to fly. Oceana Naval Base, which resides in my district, if it were a country, it would be

the seventh largest airforce in the world.

The Air Force Combat Command is also in my district. Flying hours for many of these units have been far below the needed hours for units prepping for combat deployments.

As you heard, many of the aircraft are grounded because of maintenance and not being able to get to parts. It has taken years and will take years to recover. We are certainly not there yet.

Air National Guardsmen who volunteer at the beginning of the year are only able to have orders cut for the duration of the continuing resolution if it happens. This sometimes reduces the level of their benefits, such as their basic housing allowance. They are eligible to receive less than that because the orders get broken into separate pieces.

This really affects the ones at the lower rank, the enlisted, like what I was, those who may have military families. Again, hurting our military families which is the strong basis of structure for a strong force.

Let me give you another example. While returning from a deployment, approximately 90 airmen had unanticipated changes in their itinerary which caused additional expenses to be incurred. Since these expenses were not authorized prior to the new fiscal year, these members were not reimbursed for more than 60 days after their return. Some of the unpaid expenses ranged from just a few dollars to \$7,000 for one young airman.

Imagine, Madam Speaker, if you are a young airman, E-3, E-4, and you have a family, \$7,000 is a lot of money. It could be the difference between paying the mortgage and keeping the lights on back home, contributing to the stress of our military families.

In the weekend of January 20, 2018, there was a scheduled training weekend. The expiration of the continuing resolution caused a last-minute cancelation of an event impacting 950 airmen. Fifty of the airmen who traveled out of Langley Air Force base, also in my district, before the order was given to cancel were immediately sent home without accomplishing any training events. They may never be able to get that training back as they prepare to go to combat for this Nation.

There are some other negative impacts that we don't hear about often. The Virginia National Guard is second contributing to the war effort amongst other guard units around the country. The Reserve components make up 47 percent of our Nation's operational forces, yet they are required to cease operations during a continuing resolution while Active Duty counterparts continue training. Forty-seven percent, Madam Speaker, of our operational forces have to shut down during continuing resolutions.

Let me read a couple things that I got from the Virginia National Guard.

During the most recent shutdown that happened, 3 days, was inac-

curately reported in many media outlets as having minimal impact, to the contrary Virginia National Guard faced the following: They had last-minute notification of inactive duty training for 2,211 personnel, resulting in the absence of anticipated monthly income, which equated to 4 days of Active Duty pay.

Notifications to more than 630 full-time soldiers and airmen that their potential employment would be temporarily terminated were sent out. That affects retention. \$28,000 worth of contract actions were canceled, and a projected \$7,500 in subsequent loss as a result of these cancelations.

Missed training opportunities. During the most recent shutdown, the National Guard lost training opportunities totaled \$7.7 million, affecting expected income for 58,000 soldiers and airmen and 37,000 Federal technicians.

Aside from those losses, that contributes to mission and morale impacts. Again, the Virginia National Guard is second in the Nation contributing to the war efforts, and the Reserve components make up 47 percent of the Nation's operational forces.

Madam Speaker, we have to do better for our military apparatus. I just want to reiterate to you that I have the great honor of representing the district with more military and veterans than any congressional district in the Nation. If there is anything going on in the world, if Mother Freedom needs to be defended anywhere in the world, then our men and women are there on the front-lines fighting for family, for friends, and for freedom.

We in Congress and the Senate owe them better, and we have to do better. We have to get our acts together. We have to lead with the courage and the spirit that they have. We can make it happen, and we should push and push until we got it done.

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

PETER STRZOK'S TESTIMONY ON CAPITOL HILL

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. Madam Speaker, it has been an interesting day here on Capitol Hill. Madam Speaker, the hearing was still going on when I was just in the Cloakroom, where we had an FBI agent, one of the top supervisors, he had been in charge of foreign counterintelligence as well, and then after his outrageous bias and comments through text messages came to light, Robert Mueller relieved him from the Trump investigation and left the others who were just as biased. But it was an incredible day.

For somebody who has not just shown bias, but outrageous animus, disgust, disdain, and deplored people who voted for Trump by their smell, he

tried to clean it up a little bit in his testimony today.

Madam Speaker, I thought it might be helpful to some of our Members who know there is some rule here of the House that somehow you are not supposed to besmirch other Members. I am not sure how far it goes, but if they will check the rule, it is for those who are elected, be it House Member, Senator, Vice President, President, we are required to show decency and not call into question the intentions of such an elected person.

When a witness comes before a hearing who is testifying 180 degrees opposite of what he put in writing thousands of times, for most of us, for a majority here in the House, it has no credibility. It makes the witness even look worse.

To come in after we have seen so many of the texts he sent, we have got a good sense of where this man's heart, soul, and mind have been. It appeared abundantly clear that he had gotten very, very good at lying. It doesn't violate any House rule to say that.

Now, when we were in our hearing, and one of my Democratic friends across the aisle yelled that I was off my meds, see, now, that was a violation of the rule. I thought about calling it out, having her words taken down, but we didn't need any further delays. But I thought it might be informative to my friends across the aisle who don't understand the rules of the House, but when somebody is lying through their teeth, sitting there smugly and smirking, and, frankly, when it hit me, that is probably the same smug little smirk you had on your face when you told your wife, no telling how many times, there is nothing going on between me and Lisa Page. He got really good at lying and showing no emotion whatsoever.

□ 1815

So, unfortunately, what I brought out in that hearing and he denied recalling should not be lost in the exchange about his lying. It is far more important.

But for the record, as a prosecutor, a defense attorney, a felony judge, a chief justice, and as a Member of Congress, I have asked thousands of witnesses questions. When you have somebody who has just gotten so good at lying that there is no indication in their eyes whatsoever that it bothers them to lie, somebody has got to call them out on it. It is just not good for the state of this Union.

It is also denying credibility to actually have the witness say he doesn't recall getting information about a foreign entity that is not Russia getting every—actually, it was over 30,000 emails, emails that were sent through to Hillary Clinton through the unauthorized server and unsecured server and every email she sent out. There were highly classified—beyond classified—top secret-type stuff that had gone through that server.

Out of the over 30,000 emails that went through that server, all but 4 of them—no explanation why those 4 didn't get the same instruction, but we have some very good intelligence people—when they were asked to look at Hillary Clinton's emails, they picked up an anomaly. As they did forensic research on the emails, they found that anomaly was actually an instruction embedded, compartmentalized data embedded in the email server telling the server to send a copy of every email that came to Hillary Clinton through that unauthorized server and every email that she sent out through that server, to send it to this foreign entity that is not Russia.

We know that efforts were made to get Inspector General Horowitz to receive that information. He would not return a call. Apparently, he didn't want that information because that would go against his saying that the bias did not affect the investigation.

Of course it affected the investigation. It couldn't help but affect the investigation. It denies logic and common sense to say somebody with that much animus, that much bias and prejudice would not have it affect their investigation.

Madam Speaker, I can tell you I know there are people in this House who don't care for me, but I can also tell you there is no one in this House on either side of this aisle who I would put up with being investigated and prosecuted by somebody with the hatred, the absolute nasty prejudice that Peter Strzok had for Donald Trump. I wouldn't put up with it. I would go to bat for any Democrat in this House, any Republican in this House, the ones who don't like me on either side. It wouldn't matter.

Nobody in the United States of America should have the full power of the Federal Government coming after them in the hands of somebody prejudiced, full of hate for that individual. But such is what we are dealing with here. That is why I laid the groundwork, gave the names of the people—some of them—that were there when Peter Strzok was informed about Hillary Clinton's emails for sure going to a foreign entity. This is serious stuff.

What came of our intelligence community providing that information to the FBI agent in charge, Peter Strzok? Nothing. Peter Strzok received the information that it wasn't speculation, that maybe Hillary Clinton's emails were capable of being hacked, but we have no evidence that they were hacked.

All this garbage that we have heard about from reports? No. When the FBI was told her emails were hacked and every email she received, every email she sent out—over 30,000, except for 4—over 30,000 were compromised and going to a foreign entity not Russia, and Mr. Strzok did nothing about it.

When I started laying the groundwork pointing out the people, I am told an attorney behind Mr. Strzok

mouthing, "Oh, my gosh," something like that, as I was laying the groundwork. I don't know if she knew what I was talking about or not, but I thought I picked up just a fleeting note of detection in Peter Strzok's eyes that he knew what I was talking about.

But, again, for my friends who are not familiar with the true rules of the House, let me explain. In trial courts, for example, the felony court over which I was a judge, the rules of evidence are very strict, and we protect the jury from hearing things that don't have any basis for believability. That is why most hearsay cannot come in, but there are exceptions.

But one rule that you always find in any court, no matter how strict the rules are, the credibility of the witness is always in evidence, always relevant, always material. The witness' credibility is always material and relevant.

When it has been as open and everyone in our hearing room knew what has been going on for such a prolonged period and I saw that look, that is all I could think is: I wonder if that is the same look you gave your wife over and over when you lied to her about Lisa Page.

The credibility of a witness is always material and relevant. Mark it down.

Now, in our House hearings, the rules are not that strict. It is more in the nature of anything that we feel may be relevant to the subject at hand. But in a hearing like today, even things that have nothing to do—they are not germane, they are not relevant, they are not material to what we are doing, we still have people bring in posters about something that is not germane, not relevant, not material; and they can get away with doing it, in some cases, as they did today, even though the rules probably could have restricted keeping some of that out. We have very relaxed rules, so these kind of things happen.

Like I say, to yell out I am off my meds, yes, that violates the rule, but I am sure my Democratic friend didn't realize what a rule-breaker she was as she tried to claim I was breaking the rules, which I was not.

But what really came home, too, is, again, Inspector General Horowitz did a good job gathering the evidence, except he refused to get the evidence that was offered to him about Hillary Clinton's emails absolutely, unequivocally being hacked and everything over 30,000, except for 4, going to a foreign entity not Russia.

You get the picture. The bias made a lot of difference in the outcome of the case.

Horowitz is just wrong about that. He was obviously—as I said at the hearing: So you give us over 500 pages showing bias by the investigators on the Republican side, and since you don't want your Democratic friends mad at you, you conclude there is no indication all of this evidence showed any affect on the outcome.

Well, hello. When you show such hatred and animus in the mind of the lead

investigator and you show that everything that concluded from that investigation was 100 percent consistent with the bias and hatred, you don't have to have the witness agree: You are right; you caught me. All my bias affected the outcome of my investigation.

Just like a prosecutor who puts on evidence that a guy gets in a car, drives to a bank, pulls out a gun, holds it to the head of the teller, makes the teller give him money, and leaves in that car, you have to prove intent, that he intended to rob the bank, but you don't have to have evidence that the bank robber said, "Hey, I intend to rob this bank." No.

When the results—and there are a lot of results—all of them are consistent with the bias and the hatred, the disdain, the animus, then you have got at least a de facto case, certainly one that can get past a motion for summary judgment and get to the jury and put in the hands of the fact finder.

Again, when you have somebody who is as good at lying to folks over and over and over again with a straight face, gets a lot of practice, and he comes before Congress—the guy is good. He is really good.

As I told him—I think, obviously, he and his lawyer had a different opinion, but it seemed to me it would have been more credible to come in and do what Inspector General Horowitz did, and say: Yeah, there is a lot of bias here, no question, but I don't think it affected the outcome.

Of course, he wasn't 100 percent sure, it didn't sound like, that it didn't affect when Strzok decided to end the Hillary Clinton investigation and when he immediately decided to pick up the investigation against Trump.

As I heard my friend say over and over about how Comey, of course, just really harmed the Clinton campaign, they are ignoring something that appeared pretty clear, even without resorting to people who have provided information about what went on.

□ 1830

We know Hillary Clinton's emails that she claimed were missing were found on Anthony Weiner's laptop. Maybe it was Huma Abedin, Anthony Weiner, one of their laptops. They found those emails there.

Of course, Peter Strzok, helping the woman whom he thought ought to win 100 million to 0 for President, wow, that was not good news for people like him who wanted to help Hillary.

They couldn't help the fact that FBI agents, when investigating something else, find all these missing 30,000 or so emails on this laptop. And they have got the information at least for some weeks, maybe 2, maybe 3, maybe 4. We are not sure, but they had found this information.

So Comey was in a difficult situation. He wanted Hillary to win, no question. He did not want Donald Trump to win. He never did like

Trump, never has, apparently, things he has said and done.

So what could he do that would cause the least amount of problems for Hillary Clinton?

There was a threat, apparently, that FBI agents were going to go public that they had found these missing emails and that Comey was blocking reopening the investigation now that we have all these emails. And if FBI agents, who are righteous, unlike Peter Strzok, really righteous people—and I know a lot of them around the country. They are good, decent, upstanding, honorable, give-their-life-for-their-country kind of people, not give their affair for themselves but give their lives for their country. Those people have gotten a big blemish on them because of Peter Strzok and others at the top of the Department of Justice in the last administration, as they held over. They would never do what Peter Strzok did. They would never do that.

So it gets a little like they erect a straw dog: You are condemning the thousands of great FBI agents around the country.

No, I am blaming you. We know they are good, but you are not.

And that is where we have been here. This country is in a lot of trouble. But it was very clear: Peter Strzok, intentionally and knowingly, with demonstrated prejudice, refused to pursue the disclosed fact to him, in his presence, that a foreign entity not Russia was getting every email that Hillary Clinton sent and received. There was classified material in there, and there was higher than just plain classified. There was extremely sensitive information in there.

What else did we know? Actually, if you dig what has been uncovered during the last 2 years, Hillary Clinton had the President's Daily Briefing going to her home. And there are times that the young man—I believe his name was Oscar Flores—who worked there, they may have tried to get him a clearance at one time, but, apparently, from what I could read, he didn't have any kind of clearance, yet he would print stuff off.

The President's Daily Briefing is some of the most sensitive information in the entire United States Government, extreme sensitivity, and she violated the law by making it accessible to people without the proper clearance and, certainly, her young man, or man, who was working there for her.

She violated the law. It wasn't necessary that she have intent; it was just necessary that she broke the law in that case.

I really would like to have intent be an element of most every crime that is in the Federal law. I think it would be a good idea. But right now it is not part of the laws she broke.

Yet people like Peter Strzok covered for her. They refused to pursue the things that would have made her guilty. They went after things to try to hurt Donald Trump.

When you look at that October press conference that Comey had, you realize, gee, what if he had not called that press conference and you had one or more FBI agents come out and say: "Hey, we found these emails on Anthony Weiner's laptop weeks ago, and Comey refused to reopen the investigation"; that would have doomed her election far worse than what happened.

So what, under the circumstances, was the best thing that Comey could do for his friend Hillary Clinton? It was to get out ahead of anybody disclosing that they had been sitting on the thought-to-be-lost emails and say: We have got them.

Then, as I had said back at the time, well, we will find out how serious Comey is. If he comes back within 2 or 3 days and says they have examined all 30,000 or so, whatever, of the emails, then we will know that this was just a charade to cover for Hillary Clinton, because they are not going to be able to adequately research all of those emails in just a matter of 2 or 3 days.

He came back very quickly, so that it would not affect the election coming up, and announced: No. Clean bill of health. We looked at all the new evidence. Nothing was there.

Except they still didn't bother to use the information provided by the intelligence community that was available. They didn't pick it up, didn't do anything with what was disclosed.

I am telling you, I am very grateful we have people working in this government who want to protect the United States and want to protect the United States' people. They don't get a lot of credit, usually don't get any credit, but they do a good job for this country; and my head and my heart and my salute go out to them as we deal with the mess that has been created by those with far more selfish motives.

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

CLOUD OF COLLUSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL) for 30 minutes.

Mr. PASCRELL. Madam Speaker, in light of the upcoming one-on-one meeting between President Trump and Vladimir Putin, I rise today to remind the American people about the cloud of collusion hanging over their heads.

As the American people continue to learn details of this unfolding scandal, the implausible idea of Russia compromising the President of the United States becomes more fact than fiction. The President, his family members, his campaign staff, and his close associates have repeatedly lied about their multiple contacts with Russian officials and close associates of Putin. They have had no consistent explanation for these meetings. It has happened over and over.

Furthermore, the President continues to parrot Putin's version of

world events over those of his own American career civil servants, intelligence operatives, military officials, and allies. This betrayal has become like clockwork, an inexplicable routine we cannot simply shrug off.

While it is possible the current list of known campaign contacts, positive policy positions, and fawning statements have an innocuous explanation, there is a simpler reason the House should be investigating: Has President Donald Trump been covertly influenced or personally compromised by Russia, a hostile foreign power?

Russian intelligence is known for using blackmail that exploits greed, stupidity, and ego—and other weaknesses—to leverage over people. He has employed Mr. Michael Cohen, Mr. Felix Sater—the record is very clear on this—both of whom have links to the Russian mafia. He has continued the secrecy about his business finances by not releasing his tax returns.

The ethics commissioner told the President of the United States to divest. He did not, and he defied that person most responsible for draining the swamp, the ethics commissioner.

From operating his business at or beyond the edge of ethical boundaries, Trump's penchant for compromising behavior, his willingness to work closely with criminals and expressed desire to protect his privacy makes him the ideal target.

With close business ties, Russia has enjoyed financial leverage over President Trump for 15 years. This is a fact that his family has admitted to multiple times. The story is well known.

After a series of brazen abuses of bankruptcy laws, President Trump, who was not President at the time, Mr. Trump, found it impossible to borrow from American banks, so he turned to unconventional sources of capital, including Russian cash.

From 2003 to 2017, people from the former Soviet Union made 86 all-cash purchases that we know of, a known red flag of potential money laundering of Trump properties, totaling \$109 million.

"Russians make up a pretty disproportionate cross-section of a lot of our assets." Those are the words of Donald Junior in 2008.

In 2010, the private wealth division of Deutsche Bank also loaned President Trump hundreds of millions of dollars during the same period it was laundering billions in Russian money.

"We don't rely on American banks. We have all the funding we need out of Russia." Those are the boasts of Eric Trump from 2014.

Shady business transactions offer the perfect cover for covert payments, and President Trump's adamant refusal to release his tax returns publicly only raises the level of suspicion.

The idea that Russia has been cultivating, supporting, and assisting Donald Trump to undermine Western alliances should come as no surprise to anyone paying attention. Before and

during his campaign for President—Mr. Trump—there were several odd connections between the two men, which they lied about to the public.

As President, Mr. Trump called Putin "fine people." He ignored the fact that Putin invaded Crimea; intervened in eastern Ukraine; poisoned people in the United Kingdom; has commissioned the murder of dissidents, journalists, and spies; shot down a commercial airliner in Europe; propped up the most ruthless dictator of our time in Syria; and violated our sovereignty in the 2016 Presidential election, by every—every—intelligence organization that says "USA."

To ensure the American people and future Congresses know how we got here today, today I will read parts of the Trump-Russia dossier into the RECORD, also known as the Christopher Steele dossier, and include a link to its entirety in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Partisans on the other side of the aisle may dismiss the document as bogus, even fake news, but they know that several allegations in this document have already been verified. While the dossier represents raw intelligence or, effectively, a first draft, not a single thing of substance has been disproven—not one. And Christopher Steele has reliably provided intelligence to the U.K. and U.S. intelligence agencies for decades.

While history will be the final judge on these matters, these are some of the allegations which we know have been verified.

Madam Speaker, this is serious business. When I read from the dossier, I am reading from my prime source. What I read tonight has all been verified and certified, that which I am reading.

□ 1845

While history will be a final judge on these matters, here are some of the allegations. Page 1 of the dossier, the claim: "Russian regime has been cultivating, supporting, and assisting Trump for at least 5 years. Aim, endorsed by Putin, has been to encourage splits and divisions in the Western alliance"—in the Western alliance.

"So far," the dossier reads, I will continue, "Trump has declined various sweetener real estate business deals offered him in Russia in order to further the Kremlin's cultivation of him. However, he and his inner circle have accepted a regular flow of intelligence from the Kremlin, including on his Democratic and other political rivals."

Now, here is the truth: On January 6, 2017, an intelligence community assessment released by the Office of the Director of National Intelligence stated that Russian leadership favored Trump's candidacy over Clinton's and that Putin personally ordered an influence campaign to harm Clinton's electoral chances and "undermine public faith in the U.S. democratic process," as well as ordering cyber attacks on "both major U.S. political parties."

Page 7 and 8, I don't have time to read the whole thing tonight, obviously. Dossier claim on page 7 and 8: "The Russian regime had been behind the recent leak of embarrassing email messages, emanating from the Democratic National Committee to the WikiLeaks platform. The reason for using WikiLeaks was 'plausible deniability,' and the operation had been conducted with the full knowledge and support of Trump and senior members of his campaign team. In return, the Trump team had agreed to sideline Russian intervention in Ukraine as a campaign issue and to raise U.S./NATO defense commitments in the Baltics and Eastern Europe to deflect attention away from Ukraine, a priority for Putin, who needed to cauterize the subject."

This is what he wrote. That is on page 7 and 8, what the dossier claims.

Now here is the truth: In July 2016, the Republican National Convention made changes to the Republican Party's platform on Ukraine. Initially, the GOP platform proposed providing "lethal weapons" to Ukraine. That is what it originally stated, that platform. But the line was watered down to promise "appropriate assistance."

NPR reported that Diana Denman, a Republican delegate who supported arming U.S. allies in Ukraine, has told people that Trump aide J.D. Gordon said at the Republican Convention in 2016 that Trump directed him to support weakening that position in the official platform.

J.D. Gordon, who was one of Trump's national security advisers during the campaign, said he had advocated for changing language because that reflected what Trump had said. The Trump campaign did not appear to have intervened in any other platform deliberations, only the language on Ukraine.

Here is the truth: As the President and throughout the campaign, Donald Trump has called NATO "obsolete"—although he changed his mind today, a little bit—championed the disintegration of the European Union, and said that he is open to lifting sanctions on Russia or has declined to enforce them.

Trump has repeatedly questioned whether our allies are paying enough into NATO, ultimately raising questions as to whether he is deliberately facilitating Putin's long-term objective of undermining the Western liberal order.

Dossier page 30: "Speaking to a trusted compatriot in mid-October 2015, a close associate of Rosneft president and Putin ally Igor Sechin"—his name appears all over the place in the dossier—"elaborated on the reported secret meeting between" Mr. Sechin and Carter Page, of United States Republican Presidential candidate's foreign policy team, in Moscow in July 2016.

The secret meeting "had been confirmed to him/her by a senior member of the staff, in addition to by the

Rosneft president himself. It took place on either 7 or 8 July, the same day or the one after Carter Page made a public speech to the Higher Economic School in Moscow.

"In terms of the substance of the discussion, Sechin's associate said that the Rosneft president was so keen to lift personal and corporate Western sanctions imposed on the company that he offered Page," and Mr. Trump's associates as well, "the brokerage of up to a 19 percent privatized stake in Rosneft in return. Page had expressed interest and confirmed that were Trump elected U.S. President," sanctions on Russia would be lifted.

The truth: On December 29, 2016, during the transition period between the election and the inauguration, National Security Advisor-designate Mike Flynn spoke to Russian Ambassador Sergey Kislyak, urging him not to retaliate for newly imposed sanctions. Ultimately, the Russians did not retaliate.

Days after the inauguration, the Trump administration ordered State Department staffers to develop proposals for immediately revoking the economic and other sanctions imposed against Russia. Thankfully, these staffers alerted Congress, who took steps to codify the sanctions in a law passed in August 2017. The attempt to overturn the sanctions was abandoned after Mr. Flynn's conversation was revealed and Mr. Flynn resigned.

Carter Page has confirmed this meeting with top Moscow and Rosneft officials, that company or corporation, in the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence testimony. It is all laid out.

When Page was asked if a Rosneft executive had offered him a potential sale of a significant percentage of Rosneft, Page said, "He may have briefly mentioned it."

Dossier claim on page 23: "Finally, speaking separately to the same compatriot, a senior Russian," Ministry of Foreign Affairs, "MFA official reported that, as a prophylactic measure, a leading Russian diplomat, Mikhail Kalugin, had been withdrawn from Washington at short notice because Moscow feared his heavy involvement in the U.S. Presidential election operation, including the so-called veterans' pensions ruse," which we reported previously in the dossier, "would be exposed in the media there. His replacement, Andrei Bondarev, however, was clean in this regard."

The truth: Mikhail Kalugin was the head of the economics section at the Russian Embassy. He returned to Russia in August 2016. The BBC would go on to report that United States officials in 2016 had identified Kalugin as a spy, that he was under surveillance, thus verifying this key claim in the dossier. Further reporting by McClatchy has claimed that the FBI was investigating whether Kalugin played a role in the election interference.

Mr. Speaker, these are facts. They just scratch the surface of what we are dealing with. This is what we know. Despite some opponents and opportunists and attempts, these facts are indisputable.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the link to the entire Trump/Russia dossier produced by Christopher Steele, so future generations will know the truth of how we got here today. The link is: <https://www.documentcloud.org/documents/3259984-Trump-Intelligence-Allegations.html>.

Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TAYLOR). The gentleman from New Jersey has 14 minutes remaining.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I am going to read a little bit more of the dossier, and I am going to stay away from the scurrilous things that have been reported in the newspaper, because they, to me, are just distractions from what we should be looking at.

This is from the dossier: The "mechanism for transmitting this intelligence involves 'pension' disbursements to Russian emigres living" in the United States as cover, using consular offices in New York, Miami, and D.C.

"Suggestion from source close to Trump and Manafort that Republican campaign team happy to have Russia as media bogeyman to mask more extensive corrupt business ties to China and other emerging countries.

"Speaking in confidence to a compatriot in late July 2016, Source E, an ethnic Russian close associate of Republican U.S. Presidential candidate Donald Trump, admitted that there was a well-developed conspiracy of cooperation between them and the Russian leadership. This was managed on the Trump side by the Republican candidate's campaign manager, Paul Manafort, who was using foreign policy adviser Carter Page and others as intermediaries. The two sides had a mutual interest in defeating Democratic Presidential candidate Hillary Clinton, whom President Putin apparently hated and feared.

"*Inter alia*, Source E acknowledged that the Russian regime had been behind the recent leak of embarrassing email messages emanating from the Democratic National Committee" to that WikiLeaks platform.

Attention, attention: "Source E said he understood that the Republican candidate and his team were relatively relaxed about this because it deflected media and the Democrats' attention away from Trump's business dealings in China and other emerging markets."

For the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, I will enter that in the RECORD at the proper time, not this evening. We have a whole dossier, again, having nothing to do with this, of every deal that we know of that the President and his team made in 52 foreign countries. That will be entered into the RECORD.

"Finally, regarding Trump's claimed minimal investment profile in Russia,

a separate source with direct knowledge said this had not been for want of trying. Trump's previous efforts had included exploring the real estate sector in St. Petersburg as well as Moscow, but, in the end, Trump had had to settle for the use of extensive sexual services there from local prostitutes rather than business success."

That is what the dossier says.

"Trump adviser Carter Page holds secret meetings in Moscow with Sechin and senior Kremlin Internal Affairs official, Divyekin. Sechin raises issues of future bilateral U.S.-Russian energy cooperation and associated lifting of Western sanctions against Russia over Ukraine. Page noncommittal in response. Divyekin discusses release of Russian dossier of 'kompromat' on Trump's opponent, Hillary Clinton, but also hints at Kremlin possession of such material on Trump."

"Kremlin concerned that political fallout from DNC email hacking operation is spiraling out of control. Extreme nervousness among Trump's associates as result of negative media attention/accusations.

"Russians meanwhile keen to cool situation and maintain 'plausible deniability' of existing/ongoing pro-Trump and anti-Clinton operations; therefore, unlikely to be any ratcheting up offensive plays in the immediate future.

"Source close to Trump campaign, however, confirms regular exchange with Kremlin has existed for at least 8 years"—I said 5 years before; 8 years—"including intelligence fed back to Russia on oligarchs' activities in U.S."

□ 1900

"Within this context, Putin's priority requirement had been for intelligence on the activities, business and otherwise, in the U.S. of leading Russian oligarchs and their families." And his associates duly had obtained and supplied that information.

"Speaking in early August 2016, two well-placed and established Kremlin sources outlined the divisions and backlash in Moscow arising from the leaking of Democratic National Committee emails and the wider pro-Trump operation being conducted in the U.S. Head of Presidential Administration, Sergei Ivanov, was angry at the recent turn of events. He believed the Kremlin 'team' involved, led by presidential spokesman Dmitry Peskov, had gone too far in interfering in foreign affairs with their 'elephant in a china shop black PR'. Ivanov claimed always to have opposed the handling and exploitation of intelligence by this PR 'team'. Following the backlash against such foreign interference in U.S. politics, Ivanov was advocating that the only sensible course of action now for the Russian leadership was to 'sit tight and deny everything'."

And they did.

"Continuing on this theme, the source close to Ivanov reported that Peskov now was 'scared'"—I will not

use the derogatory term—"that he would be scapegoated by Putin and the Kremlin and held responsible for the backlash. . . ."

Page after page, Mr. Ivanov appears. He is at the center of this. And if we know this, then Mr. Mueller knows this. And if we know this, Mr. Mueller knows more.

So this is the dossier, which has been public now since early last year. And I wanted to bring this to the floor last year, but we chose to do it another way, if you remember, in trying to get the President's taxes made public.

So I will conclude with this, Mr. Speaker—you have been patient. This is, to me, a big deal: 83 percent of this dossier has been proven correct. I did not use anything that was dubious of the 17 percent.

So I say to you, the Congress has a right, as an equal branch of government, to review what has happened so that our President, as Mr. Shaub, the Director of the Office of Government Ethics, said to President Trump: What you need to do is cut yourself off from your assets. That is what you need to do. That is what you must do.

And, obviously, he did not do it.

So there is a lot of material out there. Going at this a year and a half is not a long time. You know how long Watergate took. But I would think that this is going to take longer than Watergate—that is my opinion—on some of these things which will have to be traced. Some people have been indicted. Some people are going to prison already. But I am telling you, the bulk of information is going to be laid out when Mr. Mueller is ready, not when I am ready or anybody in the Chamber is ready.

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

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

Mr. PASCRELL. That is unacceptable. I did not engage in any personalities. I read from the record. I didn't call anybody a name. If I read it, it was somebody else that was writing it, not me.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Remarks in debate in the House may not engage in personalities toward the President, whether originating as the Member's own words or being reiterated from another source.

Mr. PASCRELL. The President is not above the law, sir. I am not above the law.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman have a motion?

Mr. PASCRELL. No, I don't have a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is not recognized for debate at this time.

Mr. PASCRELL. Do you want me to make a motion to extend? Is that what you are asking me to do?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would entertain a motion to adjourn at this time.

Mr. PASCRELL. Fine. You have it your way. I will be back.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 4 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, July 13, 2018, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

5537. A letter from the Acting PRAO Branch Chief, Food and Nutrition Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Simplified Cost Accounting and Other Actions To Reduce Paperwork in the Summer Food Service Program [FNS-2013-0026] (RIN: 0584-AD84) received June 11, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5538. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility, Mason County, Illinois, et al. [Docket ID: FEMA-2018-0002; Internal Agency Docket No.: FEMA-8531] received June 11, 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.

5539. A letter from the Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Securities Transaction Settlement Cycle (RIN: 3064-AE64) received June 11, 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.

5540. A letter from the Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Investment Company Liquidity Disclosure (RIN: 3235-AM30) 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.

5541. A letter from the Director, Division of Coal Mine Workers' Compensation, Office of Workers' Compensation Programs, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule — Black Lung Benefits Act: Medical Benefit Payments (RIN: 1240-AA11) received June 15, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

5542. A letter from the Acting Chief of Staff, Office of the Chief, Natural Resources Conservation Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Conservation Program Recipient Reporting (RIN: 0578-AA64) received May 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.

5543. A letter from the Associate Bureau Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — The Uniendo a Puerto Rico Fund and the Connect USVI Fund [WC Docket No.: 18-143]; Connect America Fund [WC Docket No.: 10-90]; ETC Annual Reports and Certifications [WC Docket No.: 14-58] received June 11, 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.

5544. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's NUREG Revision — Consolidated Guidance About Materials Licenses: Program-Specific Guidance About Exempt Distribution Licenses [NUREG-1556] 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 Energy and Commerce.

5545. A letter from the Deputy Bureau Chief — CCR, Public Safety and Homeland Security Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Part 11 of the Commission's Rules Regarding the Emergency Alert System [PS Docket No.: 15-94] received June 11, 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.

5546. A letter from the Deputy Chief, Legal and Policy, Auctions and Spectrum Access Division, WTB, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Connect America Fund [WT Docket No.: 10-90]; Universal Service Reform — Mobility Fund [WT Docket No.: 10-208] received May 17, 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.

5547. A letter from the Supervisory Regulations Specialist, Office of Subsistence Management, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Subsistence Management Regulations for Public Lands in Alaska — Applicability and Scope; Tongass National Forest Submerged Lands [Docket No.: FWS-R7-SM-2015-0159; FXFR13350700640-167-FF07J00000; FBMS#4500096963] (RIN: 1018-BB22) received June 11, 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.

5548. A letter from the Chief, Branch of Delisting and Foreign Species, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Reclassifying Tobusch Fishhook Cactus From Endangered to Threatened and Adopting a New Scientific Name [Docket No.: FWS-R2-ES-2016-0130; FXES11130900000-178-FF09E42000] (RIN: 1018-BB90) received June 11, 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.

5549. A letter from the Chief, Branch of Delisting and Foreign Species, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Reclassifying Echinocereus fendleri var. kuenzleri from Endangered to Threatened [Docket No.: FWS-R2-ES-2016-0137; FXES11130900000 189 FF09E42000] (RIN: 1018-BB89) received June 11, 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.

5550. A letter from the Chief, Branch of Delisting and Foreign Species, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Removal of the Lesser Long-Nosed Bat From the Federal List of Endangered and Threatened Wildlife [Docket No.: FWS-R2-ES-2016-0138; FXES11130900000 178 FF09E42000] (RIN: 1018-BB91) received June 11, 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.

5551. A letter from the Wildlife Biologist, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department

of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Migratory Bird Subsistence Harvest in Alaska; Harvest Regulations for Migratory Birds in Alaska During the 2018 Season [Docket No.: FWS-R7-MB-2017-0087; FXMB12610700000-189-FF07M01000] (RIN: 1018-BC70) received June 11, 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.

5552. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Golden Tilefish Fishery; 2018 and Projected 2019-2020 Specifications [Docket No.: 170717675-7999-02] (RIN: 0648-XF571) received June 11, 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.

5553. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Affairs, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Omnibus Framework Adjustment Requiring Electronic Vessel Trip Reporting for Federally-Permitted Party and Charter Vessel Operators in the Mid-Atlantic Region [Docket No.: 170113076-7772-02] (RIN: 0648-BG60) received June 11, 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.

5554. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area; American Fisheries Act; Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Crab Rationalization Program [Docket No.: 170412391-7999-02] (RIN: 0648-BG84) received June 11, 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.

5555. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Affairs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Pacific Island Pelagic Fisheries; Exemption for Large U.S. Longline Vessels To Fish in Portions of the American Samoa Large Vessel Prohibited Area; Court Order [Docket No.: 170404354-7873-01] (RIN: 0648-BG79) received June 11, 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.

5556. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Magnuson-Stevens Act Provisions; Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Northeast Multispecies Fishery; Approval of Modifications to a Regulatory Exemption for Groundfish Sectors [Docket No.: 170104016-7732-02] (RIN: 0648-XF138) received June 11, 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.

5557. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Reef Fish Fishery of the Gulf of Mexico; Hogfish Management Measures in

Amendment 43 [Docket No.: 160630574-7542-02] (RIN: 0648-BG18) received June 11, 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.

5558. A letter from the Acting Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final specifications — Pacific Island Fisheries; 2017 Annual Catch Limits and Accountability Measures [Docket No.: 170120106-7999-01] (RIN: 0648-XF186) received June 11, 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.

5559. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Recreational Management Measures for the Summer Flounder and Scup Fisheries; Fishing Year 2017 [Docket No.: 170314268-7582-0] (RIN: 0648-BG68) received June 11, 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.

5560. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Summer Flounder, Scup, Black Sea Bass Fisheries; 2018 and Projected 2019 Scup Specifications and Announcement of Final 2018 Summer Flounder and Black Sea Bass Specifications [Docket No.: 170828822-70999-02] (RIN: 0648-XF669) received June 11, 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.

5561. A letter from the Chief, Branch of Recovery and State Grants, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Removing *Trichostema austromontanum* ssp. *compactum* (Hidden Lake Bluecurls) From the Federal List of Endangered and Threatened Plants [Docket No.: FWS-R8-ES-2016-0127; FXES1130900000 167 FF09E42000] (RIN: 1018-BB39) received June 11, 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.

5562. A letter from the Wildlife Biologist, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's Major final rule — Migratory Bird Hunting; Final Frameworks for Migratory Bird Hunting Regulations [Docket No.: FWS-HQ-MB-2017-0028; FX09M21200-178-FXMB1231099BPP0] (RIN: 1018-BB73) received June 11, 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.

5563. A letter from the Chief, Border Security Regulations Branch, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Elimination of Nonimmigrant Visa Exemption for Certain Caribbean Residents Coming to the United States as H-2A Agricultural Workers [Docket No.: USCBP-2016-0003] (CBP Decision No. 18-06) (RIN: 1651-AB09) received July 3, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5564. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's

temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Flagship Niagara's Mariners Ball; Presque Isle Bay, Erie, PA [Docket No.: USCG-2018-0518] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 11, 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.

5565. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Special Local Regulation; Great Western Tube Float; Parker, AZ [Docket No.: USCG-2018-0251] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received June 11, 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.

5566. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; US 68/KY 80 Lake Barkley Bridge, Cumberland River, Canton, KY [Docket No.: USCG-2018-0503] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 11, 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.

5567. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Special Local Regulation; Lake of the Ozarks, Bagnell, MO [Docket No.: USCG-2018-0307] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received June 11, 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.

5568. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Upper Mississippi River, mile markers 179 to 180, St. Louis, MO [Docket No.: USCG-2018-0379] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 11, 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.

5569. A letter from the Chief, Trade and Commercial Regulations Branch, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Import Restrictions Imposed on Archaeological and Ethnological Material from Libya (CBP Dec. 18-07) (RIN: 1515-AE38) received July 3, 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.

5570. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — 2019 Sec. 223 Inflation-Adjusted Item (Rev. Proc. 2018-30) received May 15, 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.

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. SMITH of Texas:

H.R. 6342. A bill to make revisions in title 51, United States Code, as necessary to keep the title current, and to make technical amendments to improve the United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUIZENGA:

H.R. 6343. A bill to provide for a demonstration program and pilot project to expand choice for inpatient psychiatric services under Medicaid and Medicare; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in

addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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. TIPTON (for himself, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. BANKS of Indiana, Mr. STEWART, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. ESTES of Kansas, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. SCHRADER, and Mr. WALDEN):

H.R. 6344. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to encourage voluntary conservation efforts; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. PEARCE (for himself, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. GIANFORTE, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. BANKS of Indiana, Mr. STEWART, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. ESTES of Kansas, and Mr. MCCLINTOCK):

H.R. 6345. A bill to provide for greater county and State consultation with regard to petitions under the Endangered Species Act of 1973, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana (for himself, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. JONES, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. BANKS of Indiana, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. LAMALFA, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. STEWART, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. ESTES of Kansas, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. NEWHOUSE, and Mr. MCCLINTOCK):

H.R. 6346. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to provide for consideration of the totality of conservation measures in determining the impact of proposed Federal agency action; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. EVANS (for himself and Mr. CURTIS):

H.R. 6347. A bill to adjust the real estate appraisal thresholds under the 7(a) program to bring them into line with the thresholds used by the Federal banking regulators, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. CURTIS (for himself and Mr. EVANS):

H.R. 6348. A bill to adjust the real estate appraisal thresholds under the section 504 program to bring them into line with the thresholds used by the Federal banking regulators, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. KINZINGER (for himself, Mrs. BEATTY, and Ms. TENNEY):

H.R. 6349. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to increase the income limit of the simplified needs test; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. BORDALLO (for herself, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. SABLAR, and Mrs. RADEWAGEN):

H.R. 6350. A bill to amend the PROTECT Act to expand the national AMBER Alert system to territories of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, and Appropriations, 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. JOHNSON of Ohio:

H.R. 6351. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 to improve the process by which the Secretary of Energy authorizes the transfer of civilian nuclear commerce technology and assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, 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 Mr. POLIS:

H.R. 6352. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act and the Higher Education Act of 1965 to require certain creditors to obtain certifications from institutions of higher education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Financial 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.

By Mr. ROE of Tennessee:

H.R. 6353. A bill to amend the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 to prohibit the United States Government from accessing and using information of United States persons collected under section 702 of such Act without a warrant; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select), 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. GOSAR (for himself, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. BANKS of Indiana, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. STEWART, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. ESTES of Kansas, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. NEWHOUSE, and Mr. MCCLINTOCK):

H.R. 6354. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to prohibit designation as critical habitat of certain areas in artificial water diversion or delivery facilities; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. WESTERMAN (for himself, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. BANKS of Indiana, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. STEWART, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. ESTES of Kansas, Mr. GOHMERT, and Mr. NEWHOUSE):

H.R. 6355. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to define petition backlog and provide expedited means for discharging petitions during such a backlog; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. GIANFORTE, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. BANKS of Indiana, Mr. STEWART, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. OLSON, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. ESTES of Kansas, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. NEWHOUSE, and Mrs. LESKO):

H.R. 6356. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to provide for improved precision in the listing, delisting, and downlisting of endangered species and poten-

tially endangered species; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 6357. A bill to direct the Comptroller General of the United States to assess and make recommendations related to disaster medical assistance teams, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. NORTON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. NADLER, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. McGOVERN, and Mr. TAKANO):

H.R. 6358. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit gay and trans panic defenses; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI (for himself and Ms. WILSON of Florida):

H.R. 6359. A bill to direct the head of each department and agency of the United States to submit annual reports to Congress on the security clearances to individuals by reason of the individuals' affiliation with hate groups, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. NORMAN (for himself, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. BANKS of Indiana, Mr. STEWART, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. ESTES of Kansas, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. NEWHOUSE, and Mr. WALDEN):

H.R. 6360. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to provide for greater certainty and improved planning for incidental take permit holders; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. POCAN (for himself, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. BLUMEAUER, Mr. McGOVERN, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, and Ms. CLARKE of New York):

H.R. 6361. A bill to establish a Commission tasked with establishing a humane immigration enforcement system, terminate Immigration and Customs Enforcement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Homeland Security, 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. STEFANIK:

H.R. 6362. A bill to establish an improved regulatory process to prevent the introduction and establishment in the United States of injurious wildlife; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, Ways and Means, and the Budget, 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. VELÁZQUEZ (for herself, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. McGOVERN, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. NORTON, Mr. GALLEGRO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. SOTO, and Mr. MEEKS):

H.R. 6363. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to provide for the establishment of immigration consumer fraud information hotlines and websites, and for outreach campaigns on immigration consumer fraud, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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 Mr. YOUNG of Alaska (for himself, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. EMMER, Mr. LUETKE-MEYER, Mr. MARSHALL, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. STEWART, Mr. BANKS of Indiana, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. NEWHOUSE, and Mr. ESTES of Kansas):

H.R. 6364. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to increase State and local involvement in management plans; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H. Res. 991. A resolution expressing support for the designation of National Public Safety Aviation Day; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. GARRETT:

H. Res. 992. A resolution condemning the actions taken by the Lao People's Democratic Republic against the Hmong ChaoFa Indigenous people, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

221. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of Michigan, relative to Senate Resolution No. 30, urging the Congress of the United States to continue the Meals on Wheels Program; which was referred to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

222. Also, a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey, relative to Assembly Resolution No. 76, respectfully urging the President and Congress to maintain the Northeast Gasoline Supply Reserve to ensure gasoline supply and distribution stability in an emergency; which was referred to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

223. Also, a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey, relative to Assembly Resolution 52, urging Congress to amend the "Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act" to require the Federal Emergency Management Agency to provide financial assistance for certain personal property damaged during a natural disaster; which was referred to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

224. Also, a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey, relative to Assembly Resolution 29, urging Congress and the President of the United States to fund the Federal Aviation Administration's Drone Test Site Program; which was referred to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

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. SMITH of Texas:

H.R. 6342.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution, which confers on Congress the au-

thority to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying into execution the powers vested by the Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

This legislation makes technical amendments to update statutory references to certain provisions classified to title 51, United States Code, as necessary to keep the title current and make technical corrections and improvements. Making revisions to the United States Code is a necessary role of Congress with respect to executing the powers vested by the Constitution in the government of the United States.

By Mr. HUIZENGA:

H.R. 6343.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. TIPTON:

H.R. 6344.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 (the Property Clause) which give Congress the power to make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States. In Kleppe v. New Mexico, 426 U.S. 592 (1976), the Congress was found to have sufficient power to regulate the activity of animals on public lands;

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (the Commerce Clause) which gives Congress the power to regulate commerce among the states. If the matter in question is not purely a local matter (intra-state) or if it has an impact on interstate commerce, it falls within the Congressional power to regulate interstate commerce. National Federation of Independent Business v. Sebelius, 567 U.S. (2012);

Article I, Section 8, clause 18 (the Necessary and Proper Clause) which gives Congress the power 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. PEARCE:

H.R. 6345.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 18 (the Necessary and Proper Clause) which gives Congress the power 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. JOHNSON of Louisiana:

H.R. 6346.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV Section III: The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to prejudice any claims of the United States, or of any particular state.

By Mr. EVANS:

H.R. 6347.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power *** To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H.R. 6348.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution

By Mr. KINZINGER:

H.R. 6349.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1, "The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States . . .";

and

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18, "The Congress shall have Power . . . To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying in Execution the foregoing powers . . ."

By Ms. BORDALLO:

H.R. 6350.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8 and Article IV, section 3, clause 2 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio:

H.R. 6351.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. POLIS:

H.R. 6352.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. ROE of Tennessee:

H.R. 6353.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, clause 3 and Article 1, Section 8, clause 18

By Mr. GOSAR:

H.R. 6354.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 (the Property Clause) which give Congress the power to make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States. In Kleppe v. New Mexico, 426 U.S. 592 (1976), the Congress was found to have sufficient power to regulate the activity of animals on public lands;

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3, which gives Congress the power to regulate commerce among the states. If the matter in question is not purely a local matter (intra-state) or if it has an impact on interstate commerce, it falls within the Congressional power to regulate interstate commerce. National Federation of Independent Business v. Sebelius, 567 U.S. (2012);

Article I, Section 8, clause 18, which gives Congress the power 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. WESTERMAN:

H.R. 6355.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 (the Commerce Clause) which gives Congress the power to regulate commerce among the states. If the matter in question is not purely a local matter (intra-state) or if it has an impact on interstate commerce, it falls within the Congressional power to regulate interstate commerce. National Federation of Independent Business v. Sebelius, 567 U.S. (2012);

By Mr. BIGGS:

H.R. 6356.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section VIII of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 6357.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H.R. 6358.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 and Clause 18.

By Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI:

H.R. 6359.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article II, 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. NORMAN:

H.R. 6360.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 (the Property Clause) which give Congress the power to make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States. In *Kleppe v. New Mexico*, 426 U.S.592 (1976), the Congress was found to have sufficient power to regulate the activity of animals on public lands.

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 (the Commerce Clause) which gives Congress the power to regulate commerce among the states. If the matter in question is not purely a local matter (intra-state) or if it has an impact on interstate commerce, it falls within the Congressional power to regulate interstate commerce. *National Federation of Independent Business v. Sebelius*, 567 U.S. (2012);

Article I, Section 8, clause 18 (the Necessary and Proper Clause) which gives Congress the power 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. POCAN:

H.R. 6361.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Ms. STEFANIK:

H.R. 6362.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 6363.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to . . . provide for the . . . general Welfare of the United States; . . .

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 6364.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution [Page H946]

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

- H.R. 84: Mr. GOHMERT.
- H.R. 502: Mr. LAMB.
- H.R. 592: Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee.
- H.R. 681: Mr. GIANFORTE.
- H.R. 712: Ms. CLARKE of New York.
- H.R. 754: Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. MACARTHUR, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. SARBANES, Mrs. LESKO, and Mr. SWALWELL of California.
- H.R. 809: Mr. MAST.
- H.R. 846: Mr. SOTO.
- H.R. 959: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi and Ms. DEGETTE.
- H.R. 1150: Mr. RICE of South Carolina.
- H.R. 1278: Mr. HOLDING.
- H.R. 1204: Mrs. LESKO.
- H.R. 1268: Mr. SIMPSON.
- H.R. 1270: Mr. COOK.
- H.R. 1298: Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. COFFMAN, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. LATTA, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. RENACCI, and Mr. PETERS.
- H.R. 1300: Mr. ADERHOLT.
- H.R. 1318: Mr. ESPAILLAT and Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.
- H.R. 1439: Mr. PETERS.
- H.R. 1552: Ms. MCSALLY.
- H.R. 1651: Mr. KEATING, Mr. KILDEE, and Ms. JACKSON LEE.
- H.R. 1661: Mr. KILDEE.
- H.R. 1810: Mr. HUFFMAN.
- H.R. 1880: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
- H.R. 1911: Mr. YODER.
- H.R. 2044: Mr. NOLAN.
- H.R. 2077: Miss RICE of New York.
- H.R. 2345: Mr. POSEY.
- H.R. 2723: Mrs. LESKO.
- H.R. 2777: Mr. KILMER.
- H.R. 2856: Mr. SCHRADLER.
- H.R. 2871: Mr. GOHMERT and Mr. AMASH.
- H.R. 2902: Ms. KELLY of Illinois.
- H.R. 3148: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
- H.R. 3239: Ms. CLARKE of New York.
- H.R. 3592: Mr. ROYCE of California.
- H.R. 3608: Mr. BANKS of Indiana, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. ESTES of Kansas, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. STEWART, and Mr. NORMAN.
- H.R. 3635: Mr. CRAWFORD.
- H.R. 3673: Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico.
- H.R. 3751: Ms. CLARKE of New York.
- H.R. 3773: Mr. SMITH of Washington.
- H.R. 3918: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
- H.R. 3994: Mr. GRIFFITH.
- H.R. 4099: Mr. HILL.
- H.R. 4114: Ms. BONAMICI.
- H.R. 4143: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.
- H.R. 4222: Mr. CICILLINE.
- H.R. 4256: Mr. LOBIONDO.
- H.R. 4345: Mr. NADLER.
- H.R. 4506: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN and Mr. VALADAO.
- H.R. 4548: Mr. LOEBSACK.
- H.R. 4549: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
- H.R. 4673: Ms. ROSEN.
- H.R. 4843: Mr. KILMER.
- H.R. 4897: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. LANCE, Mr. SIRES, and Ms. CLARKE of New York.
- H.R. 4912: Mr. CICILLINE.
- H.R. 5011: Mr. SOTO.
- H.R. 5060: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
- H.R. 5282: Mr. ROSS, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. BACON.
- H.R. 5306: Mr. VALADAO.
- H.R. 5311: Ms. NORTON and Mr. PETERSON.
- H.R. 5389: Ms. NORTON and Mrs. BEATTY.
- H.R. 5618: Mr. DONOVAN and Ms. TENNEY.
- H.R. 5644: Mr. TIPTON.
- H.R. 5658: Mr. POSEY.
- H.R. 5671: Mr. GALLEGOS, Mr. SCHRADLER, Mr. McGOVERN, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, and Mr. GARRETT.
- H.R. 5885: Mr. ESPAILLAT and Mr. MEEKS.
- H.R. 5899: Mr. SERRANO, Mr. LEVIN, and Mr. FOSTER.
- H.R. 5912: Mr. McGOVERN.
- H.R. 5948: Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, Mr. POSEY, and Mr. NEWHOUSE.
- H.R. 5949: Mr. POSEY and Mr. NEWHOUSE.
- H.R. 5988: Mr. MITCHELL and Mr. KELLY of Mississippi.
- H.R. 6014: Mr. MACARTHUR and Mrs. BUSTOS.
- H.R. 6016: Mr. SOTO and Ms. BARRAGÁN.
- H.R. 6018: Mr. POE of Texas.
- H.R. 6033: Mr. SWALWELL of California.
- H.R. 6071: Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. McGOVERN, and Mr. GARAMENDI.
- H.R. 6086: Mr. TURNER.
- H.R. 6097: Mr. SMITH of Washington.
- H.R. 6114: Miss RICE of New York, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. STEFANIK, and Mr. KENNEDY.
- H.R. 6137: Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. KIHUEN, Mr. SOTO, and Mr. SIRES.
- H.R. 6159: Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.
- H.R. 6193: Mr. CRIST, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. O'ROURKE.
- H.R. 6213: Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida, Mr. BRAT, and Mr. PERRY.
- H.R. 6250: Mr. SCHNEIDER.
- H.R. 6268: Mr. BIGGS.
- H.R. 6275: Mr. DONOVAN.
- H.R. 6284: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Mr. TAKANO.
- H.R. 6313: Mrs. LESKO.
- H.R. 6330: Mr. CHABOT and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.
- H.R. 6337: Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. AMASH, and Mr. FASO.
- H.J. Res. 107: Mr. O'HALLERAN.
- H. Con. Res. 72: Mrs. LOWEY.
- H. Res. 319: Mr. FLORES.
- H. Res. 869: Mr. PETERS.
- H. Res. 910: Mr. CICILLINE.
- H. Res. 926: Mr. KIHUEN.
- H. Res. 931: Mr. SERRANO.
- H. Res. 982: Mr. MCNERNEY and Mr. GREEN of Texas.
- H. Res. 987: Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, and Mr. TED LIEU of California.
- H. Res. 990: Mrs. NOEM, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. TURNER, and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

117. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Mr. Gregory D. Watson, a citizen of Austin, TX, relative to recommending that the United States House of Representatives censure Representative MAXINE WATERS of California for publicly urging businesses to refuse service to—and for openly inciting harassment of—officials and staff within President Donald Trump's administration; which was referred to the Committee on Ethics.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 164

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JULY 12, 2018

No. 117

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal God, the source of our joy, thank You for hearing our prayers, for Your mercy is unending. Strengthen our lawmakers that they may grow in grace and increase in their knowledge of You. Give them courage to cry out against injustice, to lift burdens, and to break fetters. May they strive to transform dark yesterdays into bright tomorrows. Lord, remind them that Your favor has a lifetime guarantee. Use our Senators as instruments of Your glory. May Your peace go with them as they see to do Your will on Earth, even as it is done in Heaven.

We pray in Your loving Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore 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.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH). The majority leader is recognized.

NOMINATION OF BRETT KAVANAUGH

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, the President of the United States made a superb choice. He chose to fill a place on the Nation's highest Court with one of the Nation's brightest legal minds. Brett Kavanaugh brings unimpeachable academic credentials as a

student at Yale and a lecturer at Harvard. He carries over a decade of experience ruling from the Nation's most consequential circuit court. Along the way, he has earned the admiration and praise of his peers—legal professionals with all manner of judicial and political philosophies—for his professional abilities and his experience, as well as qualities that simply go beyond his resume.

Nevertheless, the instant Judge Kavanaugh was announced, far-left groups and some of our own Democratic colleagues in the Senate started pushing the same old scare tactics. More than a week before the nomination, one Democratic Senator explained on cable news that President Trump's nominee, whoever it was, would threaten "the destruction of the Constitution, as far as I can tell." The President hadn't even named his selection, and already our entire system of government was on its last legs? Give me a break. This Senator, by the way, serves on the Judiciary Committee.

One leftwing group had an angry press release all ready to go for whoever the nominee would be, but after Judge Kavanaugh's nomination was announced, they forgot to fill in his name. They had the press release ready with a big blank there, and they forgot to fill in the name. They wound up decrying all the terrible things that would happen if we confirmed the President's "nomination of blank to the Supreme Court," and they sent it out. That kind of says it all—fill-in-the-blank opposition.

Our Democratic friends have learned Judge Kavanaugh's name by now, but the hysterical attacks haven't gotten any less desperate or any more sensible. No sooner are these silly attacks launched than they are beaten back by the facts.

One of the flavors of the week was the outlandish claim that in law review articles he wrote 10 or 20 years ago, Judge Kavanaugh supposedly said that

sitting Presidents cannot be held accountable under the law. Some far-left special interests claimed he said that. So did some congressional Democrats. It was the perfect conspiracy theory, catnip for their far-left base. The only problem was, it wasn't true. People who have actually looked at these articles note that Judge Kavanaugh "does not reach legal conclusions on issues" of Presidential accountability. If anything, he seems to arrive at the opposite conclusion of what has been alleged.

Professor Noah Feldman of Harvard Law School observed that "from a legal and constitutional perspective," Judge Kavanaugh "wasn't saying that the courts should find that the President shouldn't be investigated" or held accountable; "to the contrary." To the contrary. Professor Feldman observes that Judge Kavanaugh's logic would seem to imply that any President is open to being investigated and held accountable under the law. Here is how Professor Feldman finished his debunking of this unfair attack. This is what he said: "Trying to oppose him on logically backward grounds doesn't serve anyone's interests."

The Washington Post Fact Checker jumped on the Democrats' mischaracterization. It explained that Judge Kavanaugh's scholarly articles actually contained "a mainstream view" on this constitutional question. They blasted the Democratic rhetoric as "an extreme distortion of what he has written."

Let me sum that up. According to the Washington Post, it is Judge Kavanaugh's analysis that is mainstream. It is the distortions of his record by congressional Democrats and far-left special interest groups that are extreme.

We have a word for blatantly misrepresenting the record and character of a judicial nominee in order to achieve a political objective. We call it an attempt to Bork the nominee. It refers to how Judge Robert Bork was

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

slandered in the 1980s, when people both inside and outside the Congress blatantly and shamelessly distorted his record to claim he would do terrible things if confirmed to the Supreme Court.

It is actually in the dictionary now, literally. Judge Bork's last name is in the Merriam-Webster Dictionary as a verb. This is what "Bork" means: "to attack or defeat (a nominee or candidate for public office) unfairly through an organized campaign of harsh public criticism or vilification." To be Borked is now in the dictionary. It is completely unfair vilification.

Looking back, most people agree now that this episode was grossly unfair, insulted the intelligence of the American people, and stained the history of the U.S. Senate.

Jeffrey Rosen was a Democrat who worked in Senator Biden's office on the Democrats' side during that episode. Here is what he wrote a few years ago:

I remember feeling that the nominee was being treated unfairly. Senator Edward Kennedy set the tone with a demagogic attack. . . . Bork's record was distorted beyond recognition. . . . It [was] bad for the country.

This was a man named Jeffrey Rosen—a Democrat—who worked in Senator Biden's office during this episode.

Here is what a lawyer who helped lead the anti-Bork effort wrote just last year:

I regret my part in what I now regard as a terrible political mistake.

He was seized with guilt after all these years of having participated in this Borking. Because of that episode, he goes on, "we have undermined public confidence in the judiciary."

There is widespread and bipartisan agreement that trying to Bork judicial nominees is harmful to our Democratic process and to our judiciary.

Judge Kavanaugh's impressive record, impeccable credentials, and his enormous, bipartisan fan club of judicial peers and legal scholars all attest to the outstanding service he would render on the Supreme Court. I am glad that outside fact checkers are already swatting down Democrats' desperate attacks on his nomination.

In a breaking-news bombshell report just last night, we learned that Judge Kavanaugh enjoys America's pastime. Investigative reporters scoured his financial disclosures and learned that he and his friends buy tickets to baseball games and that he pays his bills. As you can see, there is still plenty of silliness to go around.

I urge every one of my colleagues to treat Judge Kavanaugh's record truthfully and treat the confirmation process with the respect that it and this institution in which we serve deserve. We need to act like a responsible United States Senate going through a confirmation process to the United States Supreme Court.

WORK OF THE SENATE

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, on another matter, while Judge

Kavanaugh's nomination has filled the headlines this week, the Senate has continued to attend to important business. Yesterday, the Senate voted to proceed to conference with the House on the first three of this year's appropriations bills. I understand the conferees are planning to meet as soon as today. The day before, we voted to go to conference on this year's Defense authorization bill. Soon, we will do the same with respect to the farm bill.

I am proud that we are continuing to deliver on our commitment to bring regular order back to the appropriations process, along with attending to the needs of our Armed Forces and confirming more of the President's nominees. Let's keep this momentum going. I hope the collaborative, bipartisan approach that Chairman SHELBY, Senator LEAHY, and our subcommittee chairmen have brought to the appropriations process will continue to characterize our progress on the floor as well. With continued hard work and steady cooperation, we can achieve our shared goal of funding our government through the regular appropriations process.

JOB GROWTH

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, on one final matter, the evidence keeps mounting that with Republicans at the helm in the White House, the House, and the Senate, the American people are enjoying what amounts to the most pro-worker, pro-opportunity economic moment in recent history.

Already in 2018, the number of Americans who say it is a good time to find a quality job has risen to its highest level in at least 17 years of data on record. The jobs report released last week showed, in June, that the rate of hire throughout the United States hit an 11-year high.

Interestingly, American workers voluntarily left their jobs at the highest rate in 17 years. What that means—and I would like to drill down on that point for a moment—is that during the Obama administration, we heard a great deal of talk from our Democratic friends about a phenomenon they called job lock.

The idea was that many workers were trapped in jobs that did not pay enough or did not take full advantage of their skills because there weren't enough open opportunities to justify taking the leap and looking for a better position.

Republicans agreed with our Democratic colleagues that we could build a better economy for middle-class workers. We just didn't think tax increases and massive new regulations were the way to do it. Now, following a year and a half of Republican policies, including historic tax reform, the voluntary quit rate has hit a 17-year high. Workers now feel free to climb up the ladder and move on to bigger and better things.

I have just one more data point: This economy is thriving, and the Repub-

licans' bold agenda is helping to make it happen.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the Ney nomination, which the clerk will report.

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. The Senator from Maryland.

ANNAPOLIS MASS SHOOTING

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, I rise today to discuss a topic far too many of my colleagues have also had to face—yet another fatal mass shooting in their State. This time it was in Annapolis, MD, in our State capital.

Exactly 2 weeks ago, on June 28, at about 2:30 p.m., a 38-year-old man who had a longstanding spurious grudge against the Capital Gazette newspaper made good on his sworn threats. He entered the newspaper offices, headed to the newsroom, and by the time he was done, he had shot and killed five employees of this community newspaper.

The Capital Gazette is the local paper of record in Annapolis. It is one of the oldest, continuously published newspapers in the United States. It traces its roots back to the Maryland Gazette, which began publishing in 1727, and to the Capital, which was founded in 1884.

This loss of life is personal to so many in Annapolis and around our State. You need to understand that the Capital Gazette is as much a part of the fabric of Annapolis as the State government it covers. It is perhaps embodied in Thomas Jefferson's famous quote: "Were it left to me to decide whether we should have a government without newspapers or newspapers without government, I should not hesitate a moment to prefer the latter."

Just 2 weeks ago, a man with a shotgun—a man who had made known his threats against this paper—purposefully entered the building which houses the Capital Gazette and killed people.

Let me take a moment to mourn those lost and to thank the first responders who first appeared on the scene literally 60 seconds after the first 911 call. Location means everything in

so many areas. On this day, 2 weeks ago, the fact that there were Anne Arundel County police officers down the street from the Capital Gazette offices at the time the shooting started most definitely saved lives. According to the Annapolis police chief, Timothy Altomare, within 2 minutes, the Anne Arundel County Police Department, the Annapolis Police Department, and the Anne Arundel County Sheriff's Office had rushed into the offices and into the newsroom to apprehend the gunman.

State and Federal law enforcement—including the FBI, the ATF, and many others—arrived soon thereafter to support local officials in their efforts to clear the building and meticulously investigate the scene. I want to thank each and every one of those law enforcement officers, from the individuals who rushed into the newsroom not knowing what danger they might encounter to those helping get others to safety, to those gathering the evidence to ensure nothing was lost in the bustle and chaos of the moment, and to those diverting traffic so that people could be safely evacuated and the investigators could do their jobs safely. I thank each and every professional who did their job and contributed to this emergency response.

We often say about our first responders that when we run from trouble, they run to it in order to save our lives. We owe our first responders our thanks and our admiration for the manner in which they handled this assignment under extreme circumstances.

Unfortunately, when faced with an individual intent on killing, lives were lost despite the swift response by law enforcement. Among them was Gerald Fischman, 61, who was an editor with more than 25 years of service with the Capital Gazette and was known at the newspaper and throughout the community for his brilliant mind and writing. Most often, it was his voice and his insightfulness that came through on the editorial pages of the Capital Gazette.

Fischman was described by Rick Hutzell, the Capital Gazette's editor, as "someone whose life was committed to protecting our community by telling hard truths."

Rob Hiaasen, 59, was a columnist, editor, teacher, and storyteller who brought compassion and humor to his community-focused reporting. Rob was described as a coach and mentor to many. According to former Baltimore Sun columnist Susan Reimer, he was "so happy working with young journalists. . . . He wanted to create a newsroom where everyone was growing."

John McNamara, 56, was a skilled writer and avid sports fan, who combined these passions in his 24-year career as a sports reporter at the Capital Gazette.

Former Capital Gazette sports editor Gerry Jackson said of McNamara—or "Mac," as he went by:

He could write. He could edit. He could design pages. He was just a jack of all trades and a fantastic person.

Rebecca Smith, 34, was a newly hired sales assistant known for her kindness, compassion, and love for her family. "Becca," as she was known, was described by a friend of her fiance as "the absolute most beautiful person" with "the biggest heart" and called her death "a great loss to this world."

Wendi Winters, 65, was a talented writer. She built her career as a public relations professional and journalist. She was well-known for her profound reporting on the lives and achievements of people within the community. She was a "proud Navy Mom" and Navy daughter.

As we learn more about the details of the shooting from the survivors, it is clear that Wendi herself saved lives during the attack. According to the Capital Gazette editorial that ran this past Tuesday, Wendi confronted and distracted the gunman with whatever she could find around her. The paper noted:

Wendi died protecting her friends, but also in defense of her newsroom from a murderous assault. Wendi died protecting freedom of the press.

My heartfelt condolences and prayers continue to go out to the families of those who were killed in this attack. They did not send their loved ones off to work that day knowing it would be the last day they would see them alive. It isn't right, and it never should have happened.

The surviving staff members also deserve our praise for their resilience and dedication to their mission as journalists and their respect for their fallen colleagues. During and after the attack, staff continued to report by tweets, sharing information to those outside, taking photos and documenting information as they would at other crime scenes. Despite their grief, shock, anger, and mourning, surviving staff—with the help from their sister publication, the Baltimore Sun, Capital Gazette alumni, and other reporters who wanted to lend a hand to fellow journalists—put out a paper the following day, Friday, and they have done so every day since. This is known as grace under pressure.

Fittingly, the editorial page the day after the shooting was purposely left blank with just a few words. The few words were:

Today, we are speechless. This page is intentionally left blank to commemorate victims of Thursday's shootings at our office.

The staff promised that on Saturday the page would "return to its steady purpose of offering our readers informed opinion about the world around them, that they might be better citizens."

It has been incredible to witness the unity, compassion, and resilience of the Capital Gazette staff, the city of Annapolis, and Anne Arundel County.

I want to repeat one quote from the Capital Gazette editorial page that bears repeating:

Wendi Winters died protecting her friends, but also in defense of her newsroom from a murderous assault. Wendi died protecting freedom of the press.

Wendi Winters and her colleagues died protecting freedom of the press.

As Americans, we have certain rights and responsibilities granted to us through the Constitution, which establishes the rule of law in this country. Freedom of the press is central to the very first amendment of the Constitution, and it has often been under attack, figuratively speaking, since our Nation's founding.

Today, those attacks have become more frequent and more literal, spurred on by dangerous rhetoric that has nearly created an "open season" on denigrating the media and harassing reporters and editors from doing their job: answering questions that need to be asked, investigating the stories that need to be uncovered, and bringing needed transparency to the halls of power, whether they are in Annapolis, Washington, DC, or elsewhere around the world. This rhetoric has gone beyond the pale and it must stop.

Journalists, like all Americans, should be free from the fear of being violently attacked while doing their job.

On this day, 2 weeks ago, just as the public was learning about the shooting at the Capital Gazette, I stopped in for a meeting one of my staffers was having with a group of students to talk about gun violence and school safety. Since what happened in Parkland—and we recently had an episode in our own State—I have been meeting with students on a frequent basis just to hear their concerns. In all circumstances, the students have expressed to me their fear and frustration with regard to how safe they feel in their schools. Some are angry, and all of them want to know when the adults will finally start acting like adults and do something to keep them and their country safe. Without fail, students have told me that "thoughts and prayers" simply are not enough. Thoughts and prayers will not protect them from bullets, and they want Congress to act.

Some of my colleagues have bought into the false rhetoric that there is nothing we can do about these acts of violence. But students in Maryland and around the country know that is not true, and so do the American people. A recent CNN poll found that 70 percent of Americans now back tougher gun safety laws. These responses get higher with each deadly incident.

Congress must act now to address the epidemic of gun violence in this country. Let's reinstate the assault weapon ban now. We can ban bump stocks now. Let us assure that all gun purchases have completed background checks.

I understand that the weapon used in the Annapolis shootings was a shotgun. It would not have been covered under these new laws. But the fact remains that if we pass sensible gun safety laws, we will save lives.

I do want to say clearly that “doing something” does not mean arming educators or bringing more guns into our schools. Teachers are hired to teach, not to be security guards. Instead of putting guns in the hands of educators, we need to get them out of the hands of attackers in the first place.

Let me conclude with these words of one of the survivors of the Capital Gazette shooting. Reporter Selene San Felice shared her thoughts in a July 1 opinion piece for the paper. She recounted the moments of the shooting and shared pretty succinctly what she thinks needs to happen next in this country. Selene wrote:

I watched John McNamara die. I had to step over Wendi Winters to escape . . .

If your help ends at thoughts and prayers, I don’t want them. What I want is action.

I’m not just talking to the president, or our governor, or our elected officials. I’m talking to every single person in this nation.

We must do better. We must vote better. We must push for legislation so that this doesn’t feel normal.

Rob Hiaasen, Gerald Fischman, Wendi Winters, John McNamara, Rebecca Smith and thousands of people are dead because of shootings like the one I lived through.

The man who killed the people I love bought this gun legally. His record of stalking and harassment had been expunged. But even if it hadn’t been, he still could have bought the gun he used to shoot Rebecca, Wendi, Rob, Gerald and John.

This is not political. I’m not asking for change as a liberal media puppet. I’m asking for something to be done for the sake of our humanity.

I think, quite frankly, Selene is speaking for many, many people in our community. We need to act. Now. For Rebecca, Wendi, Rob, Gerald, John, and the thousands of other innocent people who have been lost to needless gun violence, Congress must act. We must show that we can protect the American people, which is perhaps the most important task we have as lawmakers.

We cannot stand by and pretend we are helpless and powerless to prevent another tragedy. We can do something powerful today.

With that, 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. VAN HOLLEN. 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. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, I rise to honor the victims and the survivors of the terrible shooting at the Capital Gazette newspaper which occurred on June 28. I thank my friend and colleague Senator CARDIN for his remarks earlier today on this floor and thank the Senate for taking up a resolution in memory of the victims.

Our State of Maryland and the country were horrified by the tragic attacks on one of our great Maryland institutions—the Capital Gazette newspaper, the local newspaper of our State cap-

ital in Annapolis, which has been operating since 1727. It was, and is, your quintessential smalltown newspaper, which serves Annapolis and Anne Arundel County but is also a newspaper read throughout the State of Maryland.

In that awful shooting, we lost five members of the Capital Gazette: Gerald Fischman, Rob Hiaasen, John McNamara, Rebecca Smith, and Wendi Winters.

Gerald Fischman was an editorial page editor whose thoughtful columns and sly wit shed light on critical community issues. He was well known for his insatiable curiosity and his love of family, and his talent for writing extended to poems he composed for his wife Erica.

Rob Hiaasen was a big man with a big presence who applied his considerable skills as a journalist to mentor others, both fellow reporters and students at the University of Maryland College of Journalism. He gave of his time, and he gave of his talent.

John McNamara was a sports writer and sports fan—a big fan of the University of Maryland Terps. He covered everything from the Orioles to the local Little League. He was always generous with his time and known to many who follow sports around the country.

Sales Assistant Rebecca Smith was strong and smart and a fixture at her fiance Dewayne’s softball tournaments. She was also known to be unfailingly kind and always took the time to make people feel at home at the Gazette.

Wendi Winters had a great sense of humor and an incredible ability to pull stories out of just about anyone. Her colleagues say she charged at the shooter, displaying the bravery and determination she had so many times before in her life and saving the lives of others at the newspaper in the process.

Community newspapers like the Capital Gazette are more than just sources of news; they represent the lifeblood of our communities around the country and our Nation. They report on everything, big issues and small issues, because no issue is too small if it affects people in a particular community. I think all of us know these are the reporters who stay out late at local council meetings, they are the folks at the PTA meetings, they are the folks busy collecting news important to people in a local community. This newspaper has been at this for hundreds of years.

Even after that awful shooting, the next day the Capital Gazette put out a newspaper, as they have every day since then, with the help of fellow journalists at the Baltimore Sun and elsewhere. They put out a newspaper that talked about the terrible shooting they experienced at the Capital Gazette and remembered the victims and thanked the first responders.

I also salute the first responders, an incredible and brave response from local, State, and Federal agencies. At the local level, they were on the scene within 60 to 90 seconds. Had that not

happened, we would have had even more than the terrible loss we saw that awful day.

It also should cause all of us to think again about measures we can take in our communities, in our States, and at the Federal level to stop the violence. One of the victims, Gerald Fischman, who had been an editorial writer there, had written earlier in the aftermath of the terrible shooting at the Pulse nightclub in Orlando, and here is what Gerald Fischman wrote at that time:

Of all the words this week, hopelessness may be the most dangerous. We must believe there is a solution, a way to prevent another mass shooting. We must believe that we can find it if only we try a little harder.

I ask every Member of the Senate, every Member of this Congress, every elected official, and every citizen, let’s work harder to find a way to end the violence. There are things we can do to reduce the chances and the awful losses we are seeing around our country, both in mass shootings and daily violence.

As we remember these victims, I ask that we dedicate ourselves to the mission of ending the violence.

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. CORNYN. 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

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, yesterday, I had the chance to meet with the President’s nominee to fill the vacancy left by the retirement of Justice Anthony Kennedy on the Supreme Court, and I am pleased with the nominee the President has chosen. After talking to him yesterday morning, I look forward to supporting his nomination and doing whatever I can to ensure his bipartisan confirmation.

My conversation with Judge Kavanaugh refreshed my memory that we actually had met back in 2000 when I was attorney general of Texas and I was preparing to deliver an oral argument before the U.S. Supreme Court—something I had never done before. Thanks to Judge Kavanaugh, who wasn’t a judge at the time, Paul Clement and Ted Olson—both of whom had been Solicitor General of the United States—helped me get prepared and do the best job I was capable of doing before the Court, providing me a moot court opportunity. So it was good to catch up with Judge Kavanaugh.

I have followed Judge Kavanaugh’s career closely. In the interim, obviously he has served as a circuit court judge on the DC Circuit Court. Some might call it the second most important court in the Nation, and that is primarily because it is located here in the District of Columbia, and most of the major cases involving administrative authority, Federal power, end up finding their way one way or the other

through the DC Circuit Court of Appeals. So he has had a great judicial career over the last 12 years and has written on a variety of topics. I would say he is a pretty well-known quantity.

While you are going to hear a lot of demands for additional information—and I am all for as much transparency as can be provided, and Senators certainly have a right to get their hands on as much information as possible about the nominee and his qualifications, his background, and how he might perform as a Supreme Court Justice—I hope this doesn't turn into a delay-of-game tactic.

He has had a long career in the government. He worked at the White House as Staff Secretary, which, for those who aren't familiar with that, means he was the last person who saw a piece of paper before it was presented to the President for signature. That doesn't mean he was the publisher or the author of that paper, and many times it was really to make sure that it was correct, that it was accurate, that it had been verified and authenticated, but he was the one who decided to turn it over to the President for the President to sign, and it could have been major matters or minor matters. But I hope we don't get to a point where people say that every document or email that he happens to have been copied on or have seen somehow becomes essential for a Senator before they can decide whether to support his confirmation.

I would add that some Senators have come out and announced their opposition to the nominee before he was even announced. I think our friend from Pennsylvania did that—in other words, announced his opposition to anybody this President might nominate to fill the vacancy left by Anthony Kennedy. So I hope we don't hear from people like that, that now they need more information so they can make a decision. They have already made their decision, and it really is just a waste of everybody's time and really an insult to the rest of the Senators who are doing their due diligence and trying to perform their constitutional responsibilities when it comes to providing advice and consent on a nominee to the highest Court in the country.

Many people are familiar with the arc of Judge Kavanaugh's career, but let me mention a few things, lest they be lost in all of the noise here in Washington.

Of course, he graduated with honors from Yale College and attended Yale Law School—two of the elite universities and law schools in the country. He clerked for two Federal appellate judges before Justice Anthony Kennedy on the Supreme Court. As the Presiding Officer knows, those are the types of jobs that are highly competitive, and only the best of the best get asked to serve as law clerks to Federal appellate judges and certainly to the Supreme Court. Then he went on to work in private practice, in the White

House Counsel's office thereafter, and finally as Staff Secretary, which I mentioned a few minutes ago, before being confirmed to the Federal bench in Washington.

I want to step back for a moment because in the weeks ahead, we are going to have plenty of time to talk about his credentials, his experience, and his decisions, and we will have plenty of time to parse all of the dissents, the concurrences, the majority opinions he has written on the DC Circuit Court of Appeals, but I think it is also important to know the man, to know the person, because unfortunately, Washington, DC, has a way of chewing up people, and their personality and their humanity become separated from the political basis or ideological basis upon which people may oppose them. So I think it is important to know the qualities of this man because it informs us about his character, which I hope we would all agree is an important element in the qualifications of a Federal judge.

Judge Kavanaugh is one who is active in his community, as we heard on the night the announcement his nomination was made. He is known as Coach K on his daughter's basketball team and acts as a lector at his church. He serves meals to needy families on a regular basis and tutors children at local elementary schools. Frankly, I don't know where he finds the time to do all those things while serving as a member of the DC Circuit Court of Appeals. One friend called him a regular old "carpool dad." I think we all know what that is; it is a dad who drives the kids to school. That comment was reported in the Washington Post. This friend wrote that those who know Judge Kavanaugh's character would render a "unanimous verdict in his favor."

Judge Kavanaugh is the former captain of his high school basketball team. He has run the Boston Marathon—something I aspire to do. I just made it through a half-marathon years ago but never a full marathon, much less the Boston Marathon. He has won his court's annual 5K race five times. As a matter of fact, I have seen him year after year over in Anacostia when we have a race for charity that many of our Senate offices participate in, along with the press and the Federal agencies, including the courts. I believe I have seen him run in those 5K races with his team.

Professionally, Judge Kavanaugh is known as a distinguished legal professional, but it is important to know that even amidst the hustle and bustle of a high-powered legal career, he found time to do a lot of very important things. While in private practice, for example, he was head of a practice group devoted to protecting religious liberties. You don't earn a big fee as a lawyer by advocating in cases involving religious liberties. Typically, these are cases where you volunteer your time because you believe in the right of

the citizen to have their case heard by the courts. Particularly when it comes to religious liberties. Judge Kavanaugh's record is crystal clear. He has advocated on behalf of those—regardless of their ability to pay—whose religious liberties were at risk. He also wrote two briefs for the Supreme Court of the United States supporting the cause of religious liberty, including the case I mentioned earlier that I argued in the Supreme Court involving the Santa Fe Independent School District, which was sued by the American Civil Liberties Union to prevent them from allowing a student to volunteer their time to offer an inspirational saying or a prayer before a football game in Texas. He authored an amicus brief in support of that case.

When he is not volunteering for causes he believes in, he is the father of two daughters—something near to my heart, and I know the Presiding Officer has two daughters as well. He has been a mentor to many law students whom he has taught over the years.

His colleague, Jack Goldsmith, a distinguished lawyer in his own right at Harvard, described him as having "many, many considerable strengths as a judge and potential Justice, and [also] as a person."

His former professor, Akhil Amar, who supported Hillary Clinton in the last election, wrote in the New York Times a couple of days ago that Judge Kavanaugh is a "superb nominee" who has "already shown flashes of greatness." I believe the headline of that op-ed piece by Professor Amar talked about the liberal case for Brett Kavanaugh, and I appreciate his willingness to talk about the man and his professional credentials and not get bogged down in the polarized politics of judicial confirmations here in Washington. He called the nomination of Judge Kavanaugh President Trump's "finest hour, his classiest move." That is pretty impressive.

These are just a few of the reasons why here in the Senate we need to now move forward confidently and deliberately with the confirmation process. We will proceed thoroughly but with expedition. It is, after all, our constitutional role—now the President has discharged his constitutional role—to offer advice and consent on the President's nominee. I believe the President has chosen wisely, just as he did when he chose Neil Gorsuch for the vacancy created by the unfortunate death of Justice Scalia. The President has chosen well again, and I believe this nominee is deserving of this high honor to serve on our Nation's highest Court.

There are some who said that we need to wait or that there is not enough time before the midterm election to confirm Judge Kavanaugh. Well, that is a pretty transparent stalling tactic. Justice Kennedy said he is vacating the Bench at the end of this month, so when the Supreme Court reconvenes on October 1—I believe it is the first Monday in October—it would

be good to have that vacancy left by the retirement of Judge Kennedy filled with this nominee. So the idea that we can somehow put this off until after the midterm elections I think makes no sense, or if it makes sense, it makes sense only from the standpoint of stalling the confirmation process.

I agree with the senior Senator from Connecticut, who said recently that the Senate should do nothing to artificially delay consideration of the next Justice. I agree with him. Since Justice Gorsuch and Justice Sotomayor were confirmed just 66 days from the time they were nominated, a similar amount of time should not be unreasonable for Judge Kavanaugh. I am not suggesting it be exactly 66 days; it might be a few days earlier or a few days later. But just to sort of orient everybody as to the timeframe we are talking about, if it were 66 days, like Justice Gorsuch and Justice Sotomayor, that would mean we would vote to confirm Justice Kavanaugh on September 13, if my math is correct.

Well, we know that these judicial nominations—particularly for the Supreme Court of the United States—are hotly contested, and that is because on the left, they see the Court as an end run around the democratic process. In other words, what you can't win in an election and what you can't win in a debate and vote of Congress, well, if you can get the Court to do it—unelected, lifetime-appointed judges—then you have basically won in advancing your policy position at the Federal level. I would say that the opposite philosophy is one that was embraced by Alexander Hamilton and James Madison, who viewed the courts as what they called the least dangerous branch because they viewed the courts as not being political and judges as being impartial arbiters of the law and letting the chips fall where they may. But on the left, if they can't achieve their desired policy outcomes through the normal legislative process, well, doing it by lawsuit and by court decision becomes the means to their end. That is why they are so upset, I think, about this President's nominee. He is what I would call a traditional judge in the James Madison, Alexander Hamilton mold—someone who believes that judges have a very important job in our government, but it is a limited job and role.

In other words, the main responsibility for making public policy should fall on the shoulders of Members of Congress and the President because we stand for election. If people don't like what we are doing, they can knock on our door and say: Senator, we don't like what you are doing. We want you to change your vote or your point of view.

That is entirely appropriate. If we don't, they reserve the time-honored right to throw the rascals out. You can't do that for a Federal judge. That is why their role under the Constitution is circumscribed as interpreting

the law and applying the facts to settled law.

I understand why our friends across the aisle are disappointed. They were hoping that President Hillary Clinton would be filling this vacancy, and they were hoping that Majority Leader CHUCK SCHUMER would be the one guiding that nomination through the Senate. Instead, they were disappointed—I understand it; it is a normal human reaction—that President Trump won, so he is the one making the nomination, and a Republican Senate, led by Majority Leader MCCONNELL, is the one guiding this nomination through.

I can understand their disappointment. It is no reason to drag your feet or obstruct an orderly and thoughtful deliberative process when it comes to filling this vacancy. We are going to have a chance to talk about this topic a lot in the coming weeks.

KEEP FAMILIES TOGETHER AND ENFORCE THE LAW ACT

Mr. President, on a separate note, I want to address the situation unfolding on the U.S.-Mexico border. As of 7 o'clock this morning, we heard that the Trump administration has now complied with a court order and completed the reunification of those children under the age of 5 who immigrated here with their parents unlawfully. Those children have been reunited with their parents, which I think we all should be grateful for.

Secretary Azar of Health and Human Services; Kirstjen Nielsen, Secretary of Homeland Security; Attorney General Sessions; and all those officials at the Departments of Health and Human Services, Homeland Security, and Justice have been working tirelessly to complete these initial reunifications. Their goal has always been the well-being of these children and returning them to a safe environment.

As we can see from this morning's report, the administration clearly needs time to vet all the people. In fact, in some instances, they actually have to take DNA tests to confirm the claim that the adult who brought the child across is, in fact, their biological parent. We know that the cartels, the human traffickers, are very sophisticated, and if they can simply pair up an unaccompanied child with an adult and send them across the border while claiming to be a family unit, they can basically navigate the gaps in our legal enforcement system against illegal immigration.

Over the next few weeks, we know Federal officials will be working to reunite all other separated families, as they should. This is one thing we all—Republicans and Democrats alike—agree on; these families should be kept together. This is consistent with President Trump's Executive order, as well as a bill that I have introduced, along with other colleagues, called the Keep Families Together and Enforce the Law Act.

As that bill suggests, there are two parts to it. One is treating families

with compassion by allowing them to remain together and, also, enforcing the immigration laws on our books. They don't have to be mutually exclusive, and our bill will ensure that they aren't. It will allow parents to stay with their children in a safe facility while awaiting their court proceedings.

In other words, a number of these children and these adults are claiming asylum in the United States. That can be finally decided only by an immigration judge. What we would like to do is move them to the head of the line and get them a hearing in front of an immigration judge on a timely basis. Our bill would also set mandatory standards of care for family residential centers and keep children safe by requiring that they be removed from the care of an individual who endangers their safety.

In conclusion, I will say that this is not a new problem. We know that several of the countries in Central America are basically in a meltdown mode. In other words, gangs and violent organizations threaten the safety and welfare of families in these Central American countries.

What we saw in 2014 is what President Obama called a humanitarian crisis—when tens of thousands of these children, unaccompanied by a parent, were turned over to these criminal organizations and transported from Central America all the way through Mexico into the United States, where they were then processed and placed with a sponsor in the United States, consistent with the law currently in effect. This is not a new scenario.

The cartels, the criminal organizations, have found a new way to circumvent American law unless we change it, unless we fix it. What they are hoping for, ultimately, is a restoration of the catch-and-release policies of the past.

What happens when people are not detained and when they are not presented before an immigration judge on a timely basis is that they are given a notice to appear in the future and told to come back for their hearing in months and maybe years later. It should surprise no one that the vast majority of those people don't show up for their hearing.

What has happened is, the criminal organizations who profit from this business model and the people who illegally immigrate to the United States have basically gamed the system. Unless we are willing to stand up and fix it, then shame on us.

This is really about two issues. One is compassionate treatment of the children, treating the adults with dignity and providing them a safe place. But it is also about making sure that our laws are enforced.

Some of our colleagues across the aisle have said: Well, let's just abolish law enforcement at the border. Let's abolish Immigration and Customs Enforcement, abolish ICE, as it is called. That would be a disaster of the first

order. How would we be maintaining fidelity with our oath to support the Constitution and laws of the United States if we would not see to it that our law enforcement agencies, like ICE, which perform important and necessary duties along the border and throughout the country, were not there with our support to do the job we have asked them to do?

I know there has been a lot of discussion about this legislation, but at some point, patience ceases to be a virtue, and I expect that at some point there may well be an opportunity for one or more Senators to come to the floor and offer this legislation by unanimous consent. We will see who wants to be a constructive player in this process and who wants to object and obstruct our ability to fix this crisis at the border.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. FISCHER). The Senator from Iowa.

FBI

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, as we all know, the Federal Bureau of Investigation is a component of the Department of Justice. It is frequently described as the premier law enforcement agency in the country. The FBI's investigative authority has only grown—and grown tremendously—since its creation almost 100 years ago.

The Bureau now covers everything from kidnapping to counterintelligence, public corruption to bank robbery, and maybe a lot of things in between. Its power is very substantial, and its jurisdiction is far-reaching. It is a very important agency. Because of that, the FBI is subject to a lot of scrutiny.

Lately, we have had a lot of folks around here who seem to be mistaking the word "scrutiny" of the Bureau with the word "attacks" on the Bureau. Oversight of the FBI is not new, and it is a constitutional responsibility of the Congress at least to do oversight of every agency, and the FBI can't be an exception.

Far from being out of bounds, it is essential for the people's elected representatives in the Congress to put the FBI under a microscope. That is doubly true when the FBI gets involved in election controversies. The more power and the more secrecy the FBI claims in order to carry out its responsibilities, the more closely it ought to be watched.

Under our government, where the public's business ought to be public, that statement I just made ought to be common sense to everybody.

In its criminal work, the FBI is held accountable primarily by the court system. When the FBI secretly gathers information for intelligence purposes, the risk of impropriety skyrockets. If the information is never going to be presented in the courts, as in a criminal matter, who is going to be watching to make sure that the power to gather and use it is not being abused?

That is why we need vigorous congressional oversight and strong inspector general scrutiny. Lots of people say

that the FBI should be independent. I disagree. The FBI needs to be objective and nonpartisan. It should be insulated from undue political pressure.

If you want to call that independence, then I will use that word. It cannot be independent of accountability to the people's elected leaders. Civilian control of the military has always been a key safeguard to liberty for the same reason.

Freedom is at risk if the FBI can become a domestic intelligence service with free rein to weaponize information in secret. We have seen the risks of that in the text messages of Peter Strzok and Lisa Page. Their contempt for both the people of this country and, particularly, their elected leaders should disturb everyone.

Abuses of power at the FBI are why we have a term limit for the Director of the FBI. That term limit is not there to protect the FBI's independence; it is there to protect the people from the abuses that J. Edgar Hoover committed because he became too independent. He was accountable to no one. J. Edgar Hoover was feared by Presidents, Senators, and Congressmen. While the Director originally was selected by the Attorney General, in 1968, Congress made the position subject to Presidential appointment and Senate confirmation. In 1976, the Congress established a nonrenewable 10-year term limit for the Director. The Senate Judiciary Committee published a committee report on that bill that limited the 10-year term in 1974. It took a couple of years for the bill to pass the House.

In quoting from that report:

The purpose of the bill is to achieve two complementary objectives. The first is to insulate the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation from undue pressure being exerted upon him from superiors in the Executive Branch. The second is to protect against an FBI Director becoming too independent and unresponsive.

At the time, Congress was grappling with the fallout of Watergate and the decades of corruption and civil liberties abuses by that first Director of the FBI, J. Edgar Hoover—hence, the legislation. Congress knew the FBI had to be able to operate free of partisan interference but still be accountable to the duly elected leadership of the country, including all Members of Congress in their constitutional roles of oversight.

Certainly, the FBI Director can't be a politician's stooge, but history tells us that the bigger risk is in the other direction. Hoover abused his power to intimidate politicians and other political leaders. In a democracy, all of our leaders are ultimately accountable to the people. Access to information about what agencies like the FBI are doing is essential to holding them accountable. Transparency brings accountability. Abuses multiply in secret. That is why congressional oversight—Congress's responsibility under the Constitution—is key. The recent

report by the Department of Justice's inspector general is a very good example. It describes behavior having taken place in secret at the FBI that simply cannot be defended when having been brought to light.

First, the inspector general's report identified unacceptable messages that were sent on FBI mobile devices and computer systems by 5 of the 15 FBI employees on the Clinton email investigation. Those messages reeked with political bias. The report found that through such messages, these employees "brought discredit to themselves, sowed doubt about the FBI's handling of the Midyear investigation, and impacted the reputation of the FBI." One message explicitly suggested a willingness to take official investigative steps for partisan reasons where there should be no partisanship. That message vowed to stop the election of Donald Trump.

Can you imagine an FBI employee in an official capacity, on official devices, taking that approach and then claiming not to be biased?

Because of that message, the IG was unable to conclude that the FBI's inaction on the Clinton email matter, for nearly a month prior to the election, was free from partisan bias.

The IG referred to the Bureau all five employees who had expressed partisan bias in order for the FBI to consider potential disciplinary action. Those messages showed a bureau plagued by arrogance, disrespect for policy and norms, and disgust of democratic accountability.

The report found that Director Comey's actions usurped the Department's authority. It called his decision of publicly announcing that Secretary Clinton would not be prosecuted as "extraordinary" and "insubordinate." Director Comey acted as if he were accountable to no one except himself.

His subordinates also appeared content to ignore Bureau and Department policy and guidance—some, apparently, for their own personal interests.

The inspector general also recently concluded that the FBI's former Deputy, Andrew McCabe, authorized the disclosure of information to a reporter. That information confirmed the existence of an ongoing investigation. The IG report faulted McCabe for violating longstanding Department and Bureau policy. There is a public interest exception to that policy, but the inspector general found that McCabe authorized the disclosure of the information to make himself, McCabe, look good. Now McCabe claims Comey knew about it, but the FBI will not release information that supposedly supports that claim.

The FBI did little to nothing to address what now appears to be a culture of unauthorized contact with the media. Yet, somehow, every day, you read in the newspapers of the FBI's stiff-arming congressional oversight at every turn. Going to the newspapers is OK. When Congress wants the same information, no.

On the one hand, for example, the FBI stonewalls legitimate requests from the people's elected representatives, whom they "hate," in the words of Agent Strzok. On the other hand, FBI employees are accepting meals, sports tickets, and golf outings from reporters.

Now the Department and the FBI are refusing to comply with congressional subpoenas while lecturing Congress about the need to control access to sensitive information. While FBI agents are breaking the rules by talking to reporters left and right, the Bureau goes after legitimate whistleblowers who expose waste, fraud, and abuse, according to law.

The level of hypocrisy is staggering. The Bureau was investigating Secretary Clinton for her use of private communications to transact public business, but the employees in the Bureau who were handling that very investigation, including the Director, did exactly the same thing. Of course, these employees were not exclusively using a private server that was highly vulnerable to outside attacks. There truly is a difference in the order of magnitude, but the FBI's employees' behavior could help explain their apparent lack of enthusiasm for investigating Clinton's clear alienation of the Federal records. After all, how could they accuse her of violating the Federal Records Act when it appears they may also have been violating the very same law?

These are only some of the examples in the inspector general's latest report that we had a hearing on before my Judiciary Committee a couple of weeks ago.

Former Director Comey said his people "didn't give a rip about politics." We can see clearly now that that is just not true, at least not for five top individuals involved in this very high-profile, very important investigation. They now need to be held accountable for their actions. There is no place in the FBI for the kind of arrogance displayed in those text messages.

There is no place in the FBI for the kind of political timing and calculations made by the former Director. His subordinates openly discussed the enormous pressure they were under to close the Clinton email investigation before the political conventions. That was completely improper. Decisions at the FBI need to be made on merit, not on a political calendar.

The FBI needs to stay out of politics. It needs to submit to oversight. It needs to focus on doing its job to regain its reputation for objectivity. No one in this country is above the law. No one should be independent of accountability, especially not the FBI.

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. MARKEY. Madam 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

Mr. MARKEY. Madam President, the retirement of Supreme Court Justice Anthony Kennedy has created one of the most consequential vacancies on the High Court that this country has ever seen. There is a reason pundits have often referred to the Supreme Court as the "Kennedy Court." His influence on so many politically salient cases cannot be overstated. During his 30 years on the Supreme Court, Justice Kennedy was often the swing vote in decisions decided 5 to 4 on a divided bench of the Supreme Court. These include some of the most historic cases in our Nation's history: on a woman's right to choose, environmental protections, and same-sex marriage.

In 1992 Justice Kennedy wrote the controlling opinion in *Planned Parenthood v. Casey*, which reaffirmed *Roe v. Wade*'s core holding that the Constitution protects a woman's right to make a fundamental decision about her own healthcare, including a woman's right to choose.

In 2007 Justice Kennedy joined a 5-to-4 opinion in *Massachusetts v. EPA*, which held that greenhouse gas emissions are pollutants under the Clean Air Act and that the EPA must regulate those emissions under that statute, unless it can provide a scientific basis for its refusal to do so.

In 2013 Justice Kennedy wrote the majority opinion in *United States v. Windsor*, striking down as unconstitutional the Defense of Marriage Act because it violated basic due process and equal protection principles by extending certain Federal benefits to opposite-sex married couples but denying those same benefits to same-sex married couples.

In 2015 Justice Kennedy wrote the landmark opinion on same-sex marriage in *Obergefell v. Hodges*, which held that the Constitution guarantees same-sex couples the right to marriage.

In 2016 Justice Kennedy wrote the majority opinion in *Whole Woman's Health v. Hellerstedt*, which struck down a restrictive anti-choice law in Texas because it put an undue burden on women's access to reproductive healthcare services.

All of these decisions were decided by the single vote of a single Supreme Court Justice. That Justice was Anthony Kennedy. The Justice who succeeds Anthony Kennedy on the Supreme Court will have the opportunity to leave a deep and lasting mark on issues of the highest constitutional magnitude—issues that impact the health and freedom of women, the environment, LGBTQ rights, consumer protection, labor protections, affirmative action, criminal justice, gun safety, and more.

There are, without a doubt, important issues that will be decided. These will be the most important decisions of our generation, and this Supreme Court will be in a position to make that history.

Justice Kennedy's retirement handed President Trump the opportunity to fulfill his campaign promise to shift the balance of power on the Supreme Court to the far right on these issues. So the President dusted off a preapproved list of candidates for the High Court—a wish list prepared and presented to him by the ultraconservative Federalist Society. This is the same list of candidates that the Federalist Society assured President Trump would satisfy his litmus test of overturning *Roe v. Wade* and striking down critical healthcare protections. This is the same set of candidates from which the President selected Neil Gorsuch to fill the late Justice Antonin Scalia's seat—the seat that Senate Republicans stole when they violated all norms of Senate procedure by refusing even to hold a hearing on President Obama's nominee, Merrick Garland. In the short time that Justice Gorsuch has been on the Supreme Court, he has proven himself to be every bit of the far-right conservative Justice that the Federalist Society promised he would be.

DC Circuit Court Judge Brett Kavanaugh's name was on that Federalist Society's wish list as well. With the President's nomination of him to the Nation's highest Court, the President has found another Federalist Society-approved jurist whom he believes will pass his litmus test, and that should concern every single American.

Brett Kavanaugh is a judicial conservative's dream come true—a young jurist who will push the Supreme Court to the right for decades to come. His record on issues such as access to healthcare, consumer and environmental protections, and a free and open internet portend a rubberstamp for a conservative, right-wing agenda that would move us backward as a nation.

At the same time, it is very concerning that Judge Kavanaugh, who once served as Ken Starr's top deputy in the White Water and Monica Lewinsky investigations of President Clinton, has said that a sitting President should not be investigated for allegations of wrongdoing, should not be indicted or tried while he is in office, and should not have to participate in civil legal proceedings until he leaves office. This is from a veteran of Ken Starr's staff, leading the investigation against President Clinton throughout the Monica Lewinsky investigation. It is no coincidence that a President who now fears all of these legal actions would nominate a judge who could shield him from those legal actions.

Perhaps the gravest concern that the Kavanaugh nomination raises is the fate of *Roe v. Wade*. For 45 years, Roe has not just protected access to safe and legal procedures for women in our country, but it has affirmed the constitutional right to privacy. Roe recognizes that all Americans must be able to make their own personal health decisions based on their own beliefs, needs, and circumstances.

Judge Kavanaugh's record on the DC Circuit inspires no confidence that he will protect this fundamental right. He has supported restricting access to contraception, and he recently would have forced an undocumented minor in Texas to delay receiving a safe and legal termination of her pregnancy despite her taking all of the necessary steps to access that procedure under Texas State law. If confirmed, Judge Kavanaugh will almost certainly have more opportunities to inject the government into women's decisions about their own bodies.

Over recent years, State legislators across the country and their allies have pushed the boundaries of restrictions on legal abortion. Challenges to these laws are winding their way through the judicial system now and could certainly land in the welcoming arms of a nominee whom the Federalist Society have assured the President would reverse Roe v. Wade.

Confirming Judge Kavanaugh to the Supreme Court is an invitation for anti-choice advocates to intensify their crusade against women having access to procedures which they choose to make, taking them closer to their dream of overturning Roe v. Wade and turning back the clock on women's health freedom and economic security.

Let's be clear. Overturning Roe wouldn't end these procedures across this country. It would just end safe abortions that women would have access to.

Those across the country who care about protecting individual liberty and autonomy in healthcare decisions, including access to safe and legal procedures, are galvanized and mobilized politically in a way we haven't seen in a generation. They are organized, and I believe they will bring that political power to bear in opposition to the Kavanaugh nomination. Our judicial system—and the Supreme Court, in particular—has a special role in our democracy as a neutral arbiter of the law. The American people must have faith that this institution and its Justices will uphold this sacred responsibility.

Stepping back and from a larger perspective, looking at the Affordable Care Act, we have to ensure that, ultimately, protections for those with pre-existing conditions in the healthcare system, which are guaranteed under ObamaCare, are continued. Every family in our country has somebody with a preexisting condition, and we have to make sure this nomination does not lead to such fundamental changes in the Affordable Care Act, eviscerating those protections and rights.

The President had an opportunity to choose a nominee that would unify this country and assure the public of the independence of the judicial branch. Instead, he shamelessly, in a partisan way, picked someone who would only serve to propel our highest Court into a far-right orthodoxy for generations to come, becoming the "supreme right-wing court."

If Judge Kavanaugh is confirmed, women's freedom to make decisions about their bodies, reforms to our healthcare system, the quality of our air and water, and much more will be at risk. This is a critical moment for our country and much too important for any Senator to rubberstamp this nominee in the name of deference to the President.

I am going to fight this nominee every step of the way, and I ask every American to join me in this fight. We will need all Americans to organize, to march, to raise their voices, and to say: Judge Kavanaugh does not represent the values we need on the Supreme Court of the United States of America.

Thank you.

I yield back.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

COLORADO FOREST FIRES

MR. GARDNER. Madam President, I come to the floor today to talk about fires that Colorado faces right now—some of the most devastating fires in Colorado history. As of the writing of our comments this morning, there were 40 fires so far in 2018. This is one of them. I think this is the 416 fire, which I had the opportunity to visit just a couple of weeks ago.

This past week I was in Colorado, where we were able to see the Sugarloaf fire. I drove by the Weston Pass fire. This is some distance away from the Lake Christine fire, and obviously, the Spring Creek fire in Colorado. As a result of these fires, over 355,000 acres in Colorado have burned. That is simply devastating right now.

Congress has not been inattentive to the needs of our forests. Over the past several months, we passed legislation that would fix the fire borrowing crisis that had gripped the Forest Service. That was something that was forcing them to cannibalize dollars that could be used to reduce the next year's forest fires on this year's forest fires. We fixed that. We put fixes in place for that.

We also passed legislation to give our land managers more tools to help address dead trees and insect- and disease-ridden forests so we could have healthier forests. I hope the work we do on healthy forest policies, which we have already made progress on, will continue in this Congress. These fires are certainly devastating.

These communities remain open. No matter where you are in the country, if you have a summer vacation in Colorado, I hope you will still come. These communities need you now more than ever. They need your dollars. They need your resources. They want you to come and visit.

In the meantime, we have to make sure that we provide our firefighters—the great men and women on the frontlines of these fires—the tools they need to protect our communities and the tools our land managers need to make sure they can prevent these fires from happening.

In this Congress we have also considered policies addressing categorical exclusions. That is a fancy way of saying that it gives line managers tools to reduce the fire risks in certain areas. We have helped to provide tools in fire regimes I, II, and III. There are five fire regimes: fire regimes I, II, III, IV, and V. They are defined by how likely they are to burn and how frequently they are to burn in certain conditions. Much of the West, though, is what is called fire regimes IV and V. You can see the colors of fire regimes IV and V, the orange and reddish color, and the purple color. The green, the light green, the yellowish colors are I, II, III.

We have been able to provide new tools for fire regimes I, II, and III, but we haven't provided as many tools in fire regimes IV and V. That happens to be a significant portion of the West. That is where most of the beetle and other insect kill has occurred in Colorado. When a tree is killed by an insect, it creates a significant fire hazard.

We have also been able to provide the amendments that we filed in the farm bill. Unfortunately, they didn't succeed. I hope we can get them through to provide help in these high-risk areas of disease and insect-ridden forests.

Past management practices have created conditions where we may have monoculture forests, where you a forest with the same age of trees. You have the same conditions that allow them to be susceptible to the same insects and the same diseases, and you end up with thousands of acres that are susceptible to catastrophic wildfire.

Where a lot of Colorado's beetle kill and insect kill can be found is also where the headwaters of some of our Nation's most significant water sources are. Colorado is the only State in the country where all water flows out of and no water flows into. I know the Presiding Officer is a beneficiary of Colorado water as well—probably not enough of it, she would say. But it is important to Nebraska that we protect Colorado forests because the headwaters of the Platte River are in Colorado—the North Platte and the South Platte.

There is work we have to be doing to make sure that we protect these watersheds, because what happens when a forest burns is that you end up with hydrophobic soil conditions and that runoff from a rainstorm goes directly into the water. It destroys the watershed. If you have a forest that has four or five times the undergrowth that it should, then that takes more water out of what would naturally go to the waterway and the watershed, meaning there is less water available for other uses downstream.

I want to talk more about forest management. We had another fire in Colorado called the Buffalo fire in Summit, CO. If you have ever driven up I-70 through the Eisenhower Tunnel, toward Breckenridge, you go by a town called Silverthorne. You can see in

Summit County that the Buffalo fire threatened 1,400 homes. So 1,400 homes were evacuated as a result of this fire. The fire was 91 acres. It is about 95 percent containment, but this risk it posed was significant because there was a very densely populated area of the mountains, a community of homeowners. There were 1,400 homeowners who had to evacuate.

They had a lot of high-risk fuels, but what this community had done was something we should brag about all over the West. They actually had collaborative efforts with State and local governments in this area. They developed fuel treatments to help moderate fire activity.

This was a challenging fire. We have extreme fire behavior in Colorado this year, but because of the collaborative work they had done, that helped to reduce the risk, to thin forests, to reduce the fuel, and to create the fire breaks. They were able to keep this fire from reaching those homes. The fire treatment worked. This is an example of a process we ought to be spreading and looking at to help reduce hazardous fuels around the West to make sure we don't lose our communities when we have these devastating fires. This was just west of Silverthorne. These fuel reduction projects helped to create fire breaks, and they prescribed burns which contain a fire with extreme behavior that could have been devastating. This wasn't too far away from the Dillon Reservoir, a key source of water for Colorado.

I also want to talk about some of the language we have in the farm bill. We have language in the farm bill that addresses vegetation management. This picture shows what happened after a forest fire. This is a power line, obviously. You can see the power lines going through it.

We have risks to our forests, our communities, our homes, and risks to our watersheds. We also have risks to our power supply systems. You can see that this pole has been simply disintegrated as a result of the fire. This has cost at least one utility over \$10 million in the Basalt area, as a result of the fire.

We are working on language dealing with vegetation management. Senator BENNET and I sponsored language that would allow utilities to do work on their own dime outside of the rights of way to prevent this fire from impacting our electricity and energy system. The Lake Christine fire, which is near Basalt, put a lot of different types of electric infrastructure out of commission. This utility, as I mentioned, is estimating that it will be millions of dollars for them to repair. It makes sense for us to give tools to these utilities on their own dime to prevent this kind of damage, because they would be creating fire breaks. They would be creating more resilient systems that would allow our communities a little bit more security, I guess, in knowing that their electricity systems would be protected and safe.

These kinds of bills that we have been able to produce have had and will have great impact on how we can prevent and how we respond to catastrophic wildfires. Certainly, a \$10 million cost from one fire, as well as other costs, will increase rates. It has the potential to increase rates dramatically if we can't get a handle on the right kinds of policies.

Finally, I want to turn to another disturbing aspect of what we have seen in Colorado with these forest fires. We have seen an uptick of drones flying over active forest fires and firefighting areas. If you fly a drone and do that without interfering with the firefighter—following all the rules—then I don't think anybody has a problem with it. If you are flying a drone and violating the rules and you are flying it over an active fire, stop it. I talked to far too many incident commanders who had to call off air tankers because there was a drone in the area. There is a video on YouTube where you can see footage from the drone taking a picture of the forest, while you see the shadow of a tanker on the ground because the tanker went right over it.

The pilots of that tanker were asked: Did you see the drone?

They said: No.

What would have happened if that drone had hit that plane, perhaps causing an accident, perhaps costing lives, perhaps starting a new fire because the plane could have crashed as a result?

If you call off an air tanker already in the air, that tanker can't land with the slurry that it has onboard already. So the air tanker gets called off. It then has to dump the slurry somewhere else. That could be \$10,000 worth of slurry at a time wasted because they got called off because somebody decided they would rather fly their drone and get videos that they can post on YouTube, instead of allowing firefighters to do their job.

This is what the Forest Service put out: "If you fly, we can't."

You have a 110,000-acre fire in the Spring Creek fire right now. Over 200 homes are lost. An hour a day without supertankers—without air tankers—is a big problem for those communities and the men and women putting their lives at risk trying to defend and protect our forests and our communities. I hope people will use a little bit of common sense and not fly their drones over an active firefighting.

I introduced legislation with Senator BENNET and Congressman TIPTON to make it a felony to interfere with a firefighter operation over a forest fire if you are flying a drone illegally.

We met with individuals from Oregon and from all over the West when I visited the fire at the incident command center in Southern Colorado when we visited the Spring Creek fire. We talked to fire men and women who spent their Fourth of July not watching fireworks or picnicking with their family but defending and protecting our communities in Colorado. We

thank them for their work. We thank them for their tireless efforts and sacrifice.

It is dangerous. In fact, just last week, as we were at the fire on Friday, we commemorated and recognized the anniversary of the Storm King Mountain fire and the 14 persons who were killed near Glenwood Springs about 24 years before. This is a very serious fire season. Thankfully, we have serious policies in place that are addressing it. There is more work we can do.

I thank my colleagues.

RESTORE OUR PARKS ACT

Madam President, I come to the floor today also to talk about a bill called the Restore Our Parks Act and a committee hearing that we had yesterday before the Energy and Natural Resources Committee. That legislation would provide billions of dollars to address the most pressing maintenance needs at our Nation's national park units. National parks and monuments are an important part of Colorado's history and heritage and of our Nation's shared love of our public lands system.

We know that in 2016, the year the National Park Service was celebrating its centennial, Colorado's 12 units managed by the National Park Service saw over 7.5 million visitors who spent around \$485 million visiting our national parks in Colorado. However, after years of increasing visitation popularity, national park units across the country are showing signs of stress and overuse for which programmatic funding has not kept up.

National park units in Colorado account for over \$238 million of the \$11.6 billion in maintenance needs our national parks now face.

Rocky Mountain National Park, which is one of the Nation's most visited parks in the country and boasts the highest altitude paved road in the continental United States, has \$84 million alone in deferred maintenance needs.

Mesa Verde, Colorado's oldest national park and the first established to protect the works of man, needs \$70 million to address its deferred maintenance backlog.

The list goes on for Dinosaur National Monument, the Great Sand Dunes, and even Bent's Old Fort.

I have been happy to join with a bipartisan group of colleagues—Senators ALEXANDER, PORTMAN, KING, and WARNER, among others—to craft and advance legislation that fulfills our promise to the public that the upkeep of our public lands is a priority.

I am also pleased that it is based on a funding model that has worked so successfully for the Land and Water Conservation Fund—one of the crown jewels of our Nation's conservation programs.

I would point out that just 20 days ago another group of bipartisan Senators was holding a press conference to highlight the need to reauthorize LWCF in the next 100 days before that

authorization lapses. I was a part of that group. We talked about the need to have this program reauthorized again before it expires. Now the deadline is just about 78 days away.

I must also mention that we have yet to fulfill our promise on funding for LWCF. We need to fully fund that program. It is something I hope we can do in the near future.

While I believe the structure of the Restore Our Parks bill is sufficient and that the same will not happen here, we need to ensure our full commitment to this new effort, so it doesn't suffer the same fate, by making sure we have the funding promised by Congress.

I urge my colleagues to find a bipartisan path forward to permanently authorize and to fully fund the Land and Water Conservation Fund because access to the land we are trying to maintain is as important as the parks themselves.

I again thank my colleagues for coming together on the Restore Our Parks Act in recognition of the necessary, overdue fix to address our park unit's deferred maintenance backlog that has persisted for far too many years.

Thank you.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SASSE). The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRAPO). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to yield back the remainder of the time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

All time is expired.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Ney nomination?

Mr. GRASSLEY. 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 Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL), and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERDUE). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 70, nays 23, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 154 Ex.]

YEAS—70

Alexander	Flake	Murray
Barrasso	Gardner	Nelson
Bennet	Graham	Perdue
Blunt	Grassley	Portman
Boozman	Hassan	Reed
Burr	Hatch	Risch
Cantwell	Heinrich	Roberts
Capito	Heitkamp	Rounds
Cardin	Heller	Rubio
Carper	Hoeven	Sasse
Cassidy	Inhofe	Scott
Collins	Isakson	Shelby
Coons	Johnson	Smith
Corker	Jones	Tester
Cornyn	Kaine	Thune
Cotton	Kennedy	Toomey
Crapo	King	Udall
Cruz	Klobuchar	Van Hollen
Daines	Lankford	Warner
Donnelly	Manchin	McCaskill
Durbin	McConnell	Whitehouse
Enzi	Murkowski	Wicker
Ernst	Murphy	Young

NAYS—23

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Peters
Blumenthal	Harris	Sanders
Booker	Hirono	Schatz
Brown	Leahy	Stabenow
Casey	Lee	Sullivan
Cortez Masto	Markley	Warren
Duckworth	Menendez	Wyden
Feinstein	Merkley	

NOT VOTING—7

Hyde-Smith	Paul	Tillis
McCain	Schumer	
Moran	Shaheen	

The nomination was confirmed.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 595.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Randal Quarles, of Colorado, to be a Member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for a term of fourteen years from February 1, 2018.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The bill 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 Randal Quarles, of Colorado, to be a Member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for a term of fourteen years from February 1, 2018.

Mitch McConnell, Mike Crapo, Tom Cotton, Johnny Isakson, John Kennedy, John Thune, John Boozman, Roy Blunt, John Cornyn, Tim Scott, Richard Burr, Thom Tillis, Cory Gardner, Roger F. Wicker, Mike Rounds, John Barrasso, Jerry Moran.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 892.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Andrew S. Oldham, of Texas, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Fifth Circuit.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The bill 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 Andrew S. Oldham, of Texas, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Fifth Circuit.

Mitch McConnell, Roger F. Wicker, Steve Daines, Richard Burr, Mike Rounds, Bob Corker, Mike Crapo, Thom Tillis, Chuck Grassley, John Boozman, Johnny Isakson, Orrin G. Hatch, John Cornyn, David Perdue, John Barrasso, John Hoeven, Roy Blunt.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 903.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Ryan Wesley Bounds, of Oregon, to be

United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The closure motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The bill 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 Ryan Wesley Bounds, of Oregon, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit.

Mitch McConnell, Roger F. Wicker, Steve Daines, Richard Burr, Mike Rounds, Bob Corker, Mike Crapo, Thom Tillis, Chuck Grassley, John Boozman, Johnny Isakson, Orrin G. Hatch, John Cornyn, David Perdue, John Barrasso, John Hoeven, Roy Blunt.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum calls for the cloture motions be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Arizona.

NATO SUMMIT

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss a matter of great import, given the events of the past few days in Europe as they relate to friends, foes, and peace. Global peace is not a zero-sum game, and global alliances ought not be subject to whim, impulse, opaque machinations, or material threats of cancellation over internal disagreements. The world relies on the United States for stable and reliable leadership, and we have in turn benefited greatly from the peace and stability for which we have been the chief guarantors. This is not a subject that is even debatable.

Lately, the President of the United States has been characterizing our most vital relationships around the world in purely transactional terms, asserting that America has been taken advantage of, and he has gone so far as to suggest that when it comes to our relationship with our NATO partners, we get nothing for our troubles.

Nothing for a stable and peaceful Europe? This is the danger in viewing these relationships as mere transactions, absent our shared values. Absent values, the world is nothing but a cruel and cold place of warring camps and territorial ambitions and no durable alliances whatsoever. To view the world this way requires a frightening unawareness of the postwar security order that we ourselves created.

This posture of antagonism and suspicion toward our partners and peace can be held only when you blot out 70 of the most consequential years of the world. Apart from our shared sacrifice and our shared security, what we have been through together over those 70

years cannot adequately be reflected on any ledger or list of petty grievances, and a seeming ignorance of the scale of that history is blundering and strange.

The mindset that comprehends a trade deficit as a grievous offense or an unfair act of aggression is the same mindset that can upend vital security relationships that have been similarly misperceived. Sometimes, if I didn't know better, I might say that we are purposefully trying to destabilize the Western alliance and to turn the world upside down. I might come to this conclusion because, by a process of elimination, no other answer would make any sense.

If this is some kind of stratagem, what good could possibly be achieved by heedlessly making friends into enemies, and who, exactly, would benefit? What would this President replace the Western alliance with? There simply is no better order that could be achieved by this destabilization.

Today, I rise to pose a few questions, and I believe there is much riding on the answers to these questions.

A couple of days ago, the President of the United States said that his upcoming meeting with Russian President Vladimir Putin would likely be easier than his meeting with America's most important allies at the NATO summit. Why would a President—any President—say such a thing? The Russian President, at the very least, personally directed a propaganda campaign and an extraordinarily ambitious series of cyber attacks aimed at the integrity of our elections in 2016, and we have been told that these attacks are continuing. He has shown no signs whatsoever of changing his behavior.

The Russian President is a man schooled in treachery and espionage. He jails and murders his opponents, presides over a mafia state, and he is an enemy of democracy. Why would a meeting with Putin be easier than a meeting with the allies we rely on most to be a bulwark against him?

Vladimir Putin is not “fine,” as the President recently asserted. And singing his praises for no good reason sends a terrifying message to our allies, especially those countries that share a border with Russia. Flattering such a man, who has demonstrated his hostility toward us and contempt for our values and has recently annexed parts of neighboring sovereign countries, is simply bizarre. That the admiration comes from an American President—well, that is unconscionable.

The President, of course, continues to entertain Mr. Putin’s denial of election interference and otherwise hardly mentions the Russian attacks on us, other than to talk about the Russia hoax or to refer to Mueller’s investigation into the attacks as a “witch hunt”—this, in spite of conclusive and overwhelming proof of Russian involvement generated from investigations conducted by his own government. Why?

Then, before the recent G7 meeting, the President called for Russia to be readmitted to the G7, in spite of the fact that Moscow continues to occupy Crimea and has shown no remorse whatsoever for its behavior toward the United States. Why?

Then, yesterday in Brussels, the President offered a twisted interpretation of how NATO works and how it is financed in order to frame a grievance against our NATO allies, supposedly on behalf of the American taxpayer. Why?

Why would an American President create such conflict? Why does the President’s complaint about our closest friends on the global stage unnervingly echo the Russian position? Mr. Putin’s singular foreign policy goal is to weaken democracies and destroy the Western alliance. Could we possibly be helping him any more in his quest than by baselessly attacking our own allies?

The antipathy and hostility toward our friends and allies are simply inexplicable, but it is not good enough for us just to say that. It is our job and obligation in this body to try to end it—to reassure our allies that they are still our allies.

Over the Independence Day holiday, I had the privilege to lead a bipartisan and bicameral delegation to the Nordic and Baltic states to talk to our friends whose view of the Russian threat is much more intimate than ours and to hear of the concerns of the leaders there—NATO allies and partners. We wanted to assess the threat for ourselves.

In Latvia, where 40 percent of the population is ethnic Russian, the propaganda from Moscow is strong and unrelenting: The NATO alliance is weak. It will not last. The United States is an unreliable ally.

These themes have lately become very familiar on this side of the Atlantic as well.

The people of Latvia, ethnic Russians, and otherwise, pay close attention when an American President is reported to have said things like Crimea is rightfully part of Russia because the people in Crimea speak Russian. Well, there is a lot of Russian spoken in Latvia, too. Does that mean that the United States would concede to Russian aggression against Latvia on this basis?

Vladimir Putin presides dictatorially over the remains of a collapsed empire. All he has now are nationalism and territorial ambitions and nostalgic appeals to former glory. He is not a strong leader for his people, as our President has said, any more than Kim Jong Un’s people love their dictator, as he has also said. If we fail to see these things clearly, then we fail the world, and we fail ourselves, and we dishonor those from our own country and from our allied countries who kept the Soviet menace at bay for half a century as the world hung in the balance.

We are now told that the President will be meeting one-on-one with Mr.

Putin. He will have no staff present, no press, no one to make a record of the event. Why? If the White House is as confused about the nature of the threat we face from Mr. Putin as it seems to be, a meeting between our President and his Russian counterpart for which there is no record could not be more concerning. It is vital that even the most private meetings between leaders not be lost to history, especially when once again the world seems to be hanging in the balance.

NATO is one of the greatest and most visionary investments our Nation has ever made, and anybody who says differently is simply wrong. Any counter-narrative about NATO is willfully destructive and does real and lasting damage to us in the world.

I join my senior Senator, JOHN McCAIN, in the sentiments he expressed just weeks ago. To our allies: Bipartisan majorities of both parties support our alliances based on 70 years of shared values. Americans stand with you.

Now, I would be remiss if I did not, here today, remind my colleagues that the only time article 5 of the NATO Charter has been invoked has been by the United States after the attacks of 9/11/2001. Our allies accompanied us into battle to defend our country and our way of life, and they paid an eternal price for their commitment to our shared security. Of the more than 3,500 casualties sustained thus far in Afghanistan, roughly a third are the sons, the daughters, the husbands, and the wives of our NATO allies. In the spirit of NATO, those casualties are our casualties. We cherish them and their sacrifices as if they were our own because they are our own. Let us honor them not just in memory but in deed—in the way we conduct ourselves here in this place, in our commitment to the values for which they died, in the clarity of our purpose, and ultimately in our basic ability to tell right from wrong no matter the cost.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that with respect to the Ney nomination, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, 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. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASSIDY). Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOMINATION OF BRETT KAVANAUGH

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I rise today to talk about a couple of topics.

I first want to talk about Brett Kavanaugh.

Brett Kavanaugh is the President's nominee to be a new Justice on the U.S. Supreme Court. Yesterday, I had the chance to sit down with Judge Kavanaugh in my office and talk about his judicial philosophy, his view of the role of the courts, and how he would approach some of the tough issues the Court is likely to face. Frankly, I cannot think of anybody who is more qualified to serve as the next Associate Justice of the Supreme Court. This guy's background is incredibly impressive, as is his record, which I will get to in a minute.

As important to me is Brett Kavanaugh the person. Let me speak briefly about Brett, because I have known him for over 15 years. I have gotten to know him and his wife. I worked with him in the George W. Bush White House. I also had the opportunity to work with his wife because she was the personal assistant to President George W. Bush. They are both wonderful people. They are a great family. Brett Kavanaugh is a person I have gotten to know, not so much as a legal scholar or a judge but as a friend, and I have watched him as a father and as a husband. He is a guy with great compassion, great humility, and a big heart.

In his remarks on Monday at the White House, he talked a little bit about his life outside of being a judge.

He talked about coaching his daughter's basketball team. Many of us who have been coaches for our high school kids and grade school kids probably were able to relate to that. I am glad my kids got old enough where they could get better coaching so they wouldn't have all the bad habits I probably taught them. The fact is, that is who he is. He loves his daughters. He coaches the team. He makes that a priority.

He talked about tutoring kids, underprivileged kids. That is something he does quietly on his own time and feels strongly about.

Finally, he talked a little about the fact that he prepares and serves meals to homeless people who are connected through his church. He talked about the priest whom he works with on that. I talked to the priest afterward, and the priest said: You know, in fact, we do this regularly. In fact, we are going to be serving a meal together on Wednesday. You never heard Brett Kavanaugh talk about that. In fact, in my meeting yesterday, Brett Kavanaugh did not mention that he was going straight from my meeting with him to serve meals to the homeless. I found out after the fact when someone brought to my attention that on Twitter, there was somebody who was there and had taken a photograph of him kind of in the background with a ball cap on. It is not something he brags about. It is not something he told me about. It is not something he does because it is the right thing to do

for political purposes; he does it because it is the right thing to do as a Christian and as someone who cares about his community. That is the Brett Kavanaugh I know.

I hope that others will see these sides of Brett Kavanaugh as he goes through the confirmation process because I think that as people get to know him through that, they are going to be very impressed.

People are going to differ some on judicial philosophy. With regard to what kind of person you would want to see on the Supreme Court of the United States, to look at what will be difficult issues that will come before that Court, you want somebody who has a big heart, who has compassion, and who is humble and has the humility to be able to listen. Brett Kavanaugh is a good listener.

He has a very distinguished legal record. There are some great judges out there, but I don't think anybody has qualifications better than Brett Kavanaugh's. He is clearly qualified to sit on the U.S. Supreme Court.

Oftentimes, people call the DC Circuit the second highest court in the land. That is the court on which he already sits. There, serving on the court, he has earned the respect of justices across the spectrum—judges on the right, judges on the left. He has had a number of law clerks go through his process who end up clerking maybe for the Supreme Court or going into private practice or pro bono work or working with the government. Every one of them I have had the opportunity to know or talk to has glowing things to say about him—one who is my counsel in my own office. He has earned the respect of people whose lives he has touched, who have worked with him.

Brett Kavanaugh has a great legal education. He graduated from Yale Law School and clerked for Justice Anthony Kennedy. That is the Justice whom he would replace should he be confirmed. Anthony Kennedy is viewed as a consensus builder. Brett Kavanaugh is a consensus builder.

In his more than 300 published opinions, Judge Kavanaugh has proved time and again that he is a judge who deserves that respect because he applies the law fairly and impartially. He is independent, impartial, and smart. He interprets the law and the Constitution rather than try to legislate from the bench, which is very important. I think sometimes we forget about the separation of powers. This is where people are accountable to the voters and where we legislate. The members of the Supreme Court and the lower courts, as well, are meant to interpret those laws and take our great Constitution and faithfully interpret that as well. I think that is a very important judicial philosophy and one that I think most people want. That is what they are looking for in a judge—one who fairly and impartially applies the law and protects the rights guaranteed by our Constitution, not one who advances personal public policy goals by legislating from the bench.

Judge Kavanaugh has embodied this philosophy for his entire career as a judge.

Professor Kavanaugh, as he is known at Harvard Law School, where he has taught for 10 years, is so committed to the Constitution that his students say he carries a copy of it in his pocket. They also commented that it is a very well-worn copy, because he pulls it out. They say it is almost falling apart from the use he makes of it.

It is the Constitution he is loyal to, not partisan politics. According to one student from Harvard Law School:

If you didn't know his background that [partisanship] wouldn't come across. You wouldn't think, "Oh this guy's a Republican or this guy's a conservative." He wasn't in class to lecture us on Judge Kavanaugh's policy preferences. He was there to talk about the law. I don't see him as someone motivated by outcomes but as someone motivated in finding out what the law is and what the law says.

I think that is a big part of the reason why he is such a widely respected judge and why he is so widely cited by other courts, including the Supreme Court. They have endorsed his opinions more than a dozen times in the Supreme Court of the United States, including some of his dissents that have then become the law of the land. So they pick up his dissent at the DC Circuit and use that in the Supreme Court as the reasoning for a decision from the U.S. Supreme Court. That is highly unusual. I think that speaks to his credibility, his legal competence, and also his hard work. He is a hard worker who focuses on ensuring that he is fully prepared.

He is also a dedicated public servant. He has chosen to spend 25 of his last 28 years serving the American people in various jobs.

For all these reasons, I think he is a great pick. I think he has the experience and qualifications. I think he is someone who understands the appropriate role of the judiciary and puts that understanding into practice on the bench. He has a record to look at. Just as important to me, though, is that he is a good person.

I am proud to support Brett Kavanaugh's nomination to the U.S. Supreme Court. I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will keep an open mind and get to know Brett Kavanaugh, as I have gotten to know him and as I hope the American people will get to know him, before they make a judgment. My hope is that Brett Kavanaugh will become a Supreme Court Justice who will make us all proud.

RESTORE OUR PARKS ACT

Mr. President, I also want to talk today about an important topic, which is our national parks. Our parks are an absolute treasure for our country. They are beautiful places, beautiful public lands. As important, they are part of our American culture and part of the history we have as a country, and it is important to preserve that legacy.

As an example, in Ohio, we have the Wright brothers' home and shop in Dayton, OH. It stands as an inspiration to anybody who dreams big dreams because that is what these two brothers did. You can see where these two Ohio brothers changed the world. Otherwise, frankly, they lived a pretty ordinary life. Preserving their home and that shop is very important to see that anybody can dream big and make a big difference. We have a responsibility to preserve that site and so many others that are important to our history for generations to come.

The National Park System includes more than 84 million acres of parks and historical sites that now attract more than 330 million visitors annually. It is an amazing system.

By the way, I was told yesterday that only one department or agency of the Federal Government has more assets than the national parks, and that is the Department of Defense, with all the military bases and all the physical assets they have. Otherwise, it is the parks. The parks have an enormous number of buildings and roads and bridges and water systems and visitors' centers and so on.

In my home State of Ohio alone, we have eight of those national parks, including Cuyahoga Valley National Park, which is the 13th most visited park in the United States of America. We are very proud of Cuyahoga Valley, whether it is for biking or hiking or fishing or kayaking. I am one of those 2.7 million visitors in Ohio's national parks every year. In fact, the weekend after this weekend, I will be at Cuyahoga Valley National Park with my wife, enjoying that beautiful park.

These parks are treasures, and they have so many wonderful facilities. The problem is that over time we have allowed a maintenance backlog to build up, meaning that so many of these buildings and so much of the infrastructure—the roads, bridges, and water systems I talked about—is deteriorating to the point that some of it is actually not being used. If you go to a national park, you may see that a trail is closed or a visitors' center can't be visited. You may see that some of the facilities that provide overnight lodging aren't available anymore. Why? It is because our parks, frankly, are kind of crumbling from within. They may look great on the outside, and they are beautiful, but there is now a \$12 billion backlog of deferred maintenance at our parks. This has become a real problem.

By the way, that is equal to nearly four times the annual budget of the parks. They just don't have the resources to keep up with these deferred maintenance costs, which tend to be longer term costs, which tend to be more expensive and longer term. Frankly, they are not as interesting to fund. It is not as interesting for Congress to fund the fixing of the roof on a maintenance building at Yellowstone National Park as it is to set up a new nature program for visitors. So this has become a problem.

Think about your own home. If you allow deferred maintenance to build up—if you don't take care of the roof, for instance—what happens? You get a leak in your roof. Then you find out the drywall is ruined or the paint is ruined or the floor is ruined, and the costs mount. That is what is happening in our parks right now. When maintenance projects aren't completed on time, it is called getting delayed or getting deferred, and that is what we are focused on.

By the way, nearly two-thirds of that deferred maintenance is attributable to our national parks' aging infrastructure. This would be roads and bridges and buildings and so on.

The national parks just celebrated their 100th birthday in 2016, and a lot of us were very excited about that—100 years of these beautiful national treasures. Many of the facilities across the country, therefore, are very old. A lot are more than 80 years old, and some are almost 100 years old and are very badly in need of repair.

The visitation to our parks has increased in recent years, and this has added to this burden. So it is not only that there are deferred maintenance costs, where things are being put off, but with more and more visitors, there is more and more pressure on the parks. From 2006 until 2017—in those 10 years, in that period alone—annual visitation to our national parks increased by more than 58 million people. That is a good thing. To me, it is a good thing. More people are getting outdoors, particularly families who are taking their kids outdoors. More people are enjoying the parks and are learning more about nature and about our history, but it has put more and more pressure on the parks.

The challenges of keeping up with this aging infrastructure and the increased visitation have stretched the Park Service thin and have required it to focus on just the very immediate maintenance needs it has and to postpone, to delay, these projects that can't be completed on schedule.

We can't keep our parks in peak condition with bandaids. Some of this is going to require years of work and planning to go into that, which will require certainty and consistency about funding. When you do the annual appropriations process here, as you know, it is year to year. You do not know how much money you are going to get, and sometimes we cut back. They need to know there is going to be some funding there, some certainty, to be able to make some of these much needed repairs to our parks.

Unless we take action, of course, it is just going to get worse. We talked about that. When you don't deal with deferred maintenance, it tends to build up and become worse. We are told that the \$12 billion backlog is increasing at a rate of about 3 percent per year. That is because, as the experts have told us, it is a compounding issue, meaning that maintenance projects that go

unaddressed often create these other problems. They create more repair costs. The spike in visitation to national parks over recent years has put more pressure on, and the longer we wait, the more expensive it gets.

For the taxpayers, it is better to move now to address these maintenance needs than to wait as they become more and more expensive. When roads, bridges, parking lots, and pathways decay, people are not able to visit those sites often. Some are even shut down.

I mentioned that there are 330 million people a year who visit our parks. There are also 330 million people, therefore, who are spending money around our parks. It is a huge economic driver. For those who are listening who come from States like mine, where we have big national parks like Cuyahoga Valley National Park, those communities really want to be sure that we continue to have vibrant parks and that people will continue to want to visit and can visit in order to get the broader economic benefit. This is important all over the country.

In my State of Ohio alone, where we don't have the big parks like Yellowstone or Yosemite but where we have some great parks, there is more than \$100 million in overdue maintenance. For Cuyahoga Valley National Park, for example, there is more than \$45 million of backlog, and completing these long-overdue projects will make a huge difference for a visitor's experience. The needed maintenance includes—at Cuyahoga Valley, as an example—\$875,000 for badly needed renovations to the Boston Store Visitor Center. I have been there. I have seen it. It needs the help. That includes \$274,000 in renovations for a shelter and \$6 million in renovations for roads and parking lots to ensure people have parking. It includes water infrastructure improvements. Water infrastructure may not be the sexiest project to support, but it is a very important one. It is very important that we ensure that we have this infrastructure in place. It is the conservative thing to do.

Helping our Park Service has long been a priority of mine, as well as dealing with this backlog. About 12 years ago, when I served as the Director of the Office of Management and Budget in the George W. Bush administration, I launched in our budget something that President Bush and Mrs. Bush were strongly supportive of, which was the Centennial Initiative. Again, in thinking the centennial was coming up in 2016—10 years later—we wanted to put in place the idea of using public-private partnerships to fund the parks. We were successful in getting some of that started.

Frankly, Congress did not pass the legislation to do it, but I continued that effort when I came here as a U.S. Senator and as cochair of the Congressional Friends of the National Park Service for its centennial. I authored a

bill that we set up in 2006 that finally created this endowment fund to be able to take public-private partnerships. Part of it is in the park. Part of it is with the National Park Foundation. That bill, called the National Park Service Centennial Act, was signed into law in the year of the National Park Service's centennial anniversary. The two funds together that were codified in that law have now provided more than \$200 million to address the maintenance backlog.

By the way, more than \$125 million of that has been from private dollars, non-Federal dollars. The idea was to provide the Federal match to encourage more people who love the parks to contribute. We did better than the legislation required, which was a one-to-one match—\$200 million total, \$125 million of which came from non-Federal sources. That funding helps, and I am proud of that. Yet, frankly, as I mentioned earlier, a \$12 billion maintenance backlog requires even more. As soon as we are able to do that, we need to do it because the costs are going up.

I recently authored legislation with three of my colleagues, Senators MARK WARNER, LAMAR ALEXANDER, and ANGUS KING—two Republicans, one Democrat, and one Independent. It is called Restore Our Parks Act. The bill now has eight additional cosponsors who are Democrats and Republicans, and I am hopeful that many more of my colleagues will join us. The legislation is the product of a bipartisan agreement on consensus legislation that combines two similar bills that were already introduced. One was with Senator WARNER and me, and one was with Senator ALEXANDER and Senator KING.

The Restore Our Parks Act is a commonsense solution to this \$12 billion in long-overdue projects, and it ensures that we can do the maintenance to keep the parks up to speed. It creates a legacy restoration fund that will get half of all of the annual energy revenues over the next 5 years, which are not otherwise allocated, to be used for priority deferred maintenance projects. This is funding—these are royalties on offshore leases, let's say, and onshore energy projects. Some of this funding currently goes to land and water conservation funding, and it will continue to go there. These are funds that are otherwise unobligated. The bill caps deposits into the fund at \$1.3 billion a year, which would provide a total of \$6.5 billion for deferred maintenance projects in our parks over the next 5 years.

It is not the whole amount now, but it is historic. We have never had this much funding being put into the parks at this time. It will provide that certainty, to know it is going to be there year after year and for this purpose only. About two-thirds of those funds will go toward buildings, utilities, visitors' facilities, and about one-third will go toward transportation projects, like roads and pathways.

Through simply using funds that the government is already taking in from these on- and offshore energy development projects and not depositing them in the General Treasury, we can cut our national parks' long-overdue maintenance backlog in half. This is exciting because about half of these projects—about \$6 billion of the \$12 billion—are what the Park Service calls urgent projects, urgent priorities. So we will at least have the certainty of knowing that the funding will be there for these larger projects that need to get done. It is a certainty we will never find through the annual appropriations process. We will be able to get some of these bigger long-term maintenance projects done and restore the beauty of our parks where needed.

This legislation is broadly supported. Secretary of the Interior Ryan Zinke and the Trump administration support it. I thank Secretary Zinke personally because he has really committed himself to this issue. When he went through his nomination process, we talked about the maintenance issues at the parks. Like every good fiscal conservative, he said: This needs to be addressed and addressed now; otherwise, it is going to get worse and worse and worse. Instead of adding more to the parks, instead of giving the parks more responsibilities, let's be better stewards of what we have. And I agree with that philosophy. I commend him for that, and I commend him for his support and his help in ensuring that the administration supports it.

Mick Mulvaney, the OMB Director, has also been very helpful in ensuring that we can use this funding source and that they are supportive of it. We also have support from so many outside groups. I can't name them all, but I want to mention the National Parks Conservation Association. It has been terrific, as have the Pew Charitable Trusts and so many other groups. The Outdoor Industry Association and many more have endorsed it.

Just yesterday, we had a hearing on this legislation in the Senate's Energy and Natural Resources Subcommittee on National Parks. It was chaired by STEVE DAINES from Montana, who is, by the way, one of the cosponsors of this legislation. STEVE DAINES is a guy with a personal passion for the parks in his having grown up in the shadow of Yellowstone National Park. We had experts and conservation groups at our hearing who all voiced their support for this legislation.

The director of the Pew Charitable Trusts said it well:

Supporting the bipartisan Restore Our Parks Act is a wise investment for a National Park System that has overwhelming support from the American public, that generates hundreds of thousands of jobs and billions of dollars for the economy each year, that provides access to world class recreation opportunities, and that preserve our nation's history.

Well said.

Deb Yandala, who is the CEO of the Conservancy for Cuyahoga Valley National Park and who is also the president of the national association of all of the friends' groups for the parks, said:

Supporters of our national parks across the country are thrilled with this bill. Addressing deferred maintenance will greatly improve the visitor experience and go a long way toward protecting important historic and natural resources in our parks.

This bill makes sense, and it will help make our national parks even better for the hundreds of millions of visitors every year who take in their beauty and their history. I urge the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources to approve this bill quickly. I know that Senator MURKOWSKI, as chair of that committee, is a strong supporter of our parks, and I know she will be supportive in our moving forward. It is the same with MARIA CANTWELL, the ranking member. Then I hope the full Senate will vote on this legislation soon—vote on it now—so that we can move forward quickly.

We want to make the second 100 years of our national parks as magnificent and successful as the first 100 years have been. This bill is necessary in our being able to do that. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Thank you, Mr. President.

I wish to commend my colleague from Ohio. The national parks mean so much to us in Alaska, and I am looking forward to getting on that bill as a co-sponsor. It is a very important piece of legislation. Once again, Senator PORTMAN is leading the way in the Senate on so many issues.

NATO SUMMIT

Mr. President, this afternoon, I want to say a few words about the President's visit to NATO and the NATO meeting we just had and talk about the importance of alliances and our allies. If you read the press accounts, I think you will see that this trip and the meeting of the President with all of the NATO leaders in Brussels was, overall, a good trip.

There has been this commitment by NATO members since at least 2014—but it really goes way earlier than 2014—for each country to spend 2 percent or more of their GDP on defense spending so that we share the burden of defense.

The United States has essentially always met this target—easily met this target—but a lot of other countries haven't. They have heard time and again from Presidents about this, and yet they have kind of ignored it.

The success of this trip is that it looks like for the first time in years, NATO countries are moving away from cuts in defense spending. Even in the United States, from 2010 to 2016, we were cutting our defense spending. Although it was way above 2 percent, we

cut it by almost 25 percent. We saw a huge drop in readiness. We are changing that. Almost all of the NATO countries are starting to add billions of dollars to defense spending. I think the President deserves a lot of the credit for really pressing this issue. Other U.S. Presidents have pressed it, and the Europeans have kind of ignored it, and it seemed to go away. President Trump stayed focused on it, and we are starting to see a shift, and I think he deserves credit.

The President also highlighted a big national security issue that is in Europe that doesn't get a lot of attention, but that should get a lot of attention, and that is the issue of energy, particularly natural gas and how Russia feeds a lot of Europe—particularly, in this case, Germany. That undermines energy security and national security in Europe and in NATO. It is a controversial topic. A lot of countries in Europe don't like the fact that Germany is spending so much to import Russian gas when NATO is actually focused on defending Europe against Russia. I think the President also did a good job highlighting this issue and how we need to focus on this.

We are seeing some Europeans protesting the visit of our President, but I will state this—and you don't read about this a lot: There has been no Western leader who has done more to undermine Western interests and Western national security and European energy security than the former Chancellor of Germany, Gerhard Schroeder. He was the Chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany, and when he left office, what did he do? He immediately went to work for Gazprom and Vladimir Putin to sell natural gas to European countries, including his own government and his own country, Germany.

To me, that represents a remarkable betrayal of Western values, NATO security, and European energy security. It doesn't get highlighted, but, for our German friends—and they are our good, close allies—it is one thing to protest our President, but take a look at your former Chancellor. He is doing more damage to the national security of Europe and the energy security of Germany and our allies than probably anybody else in Europe.

The bottom line is this 2 percent GDP goal and this concern that we have with Russian energy going into European capitals. These have been bipartisan concerns of Democratic and Republican administrations of the United States for decades, and I think at this NATO summit we are starting to see some good progress.

The President ended the NATO meeting by saying: The United States' commitment to NATO is very strong, remains very strong, and the spirit of countries willing to spend additional amounts of money is amazing to see. To see that level of spirit in the room of all the leaders is incredible.

That is what the President said today, and I think that was a good

message with which to end this NATO leaders' summit in Brussels.

I want to emphasize another point about our alliances and about NATO. It is also important to know that NATO is not just the sum of the amount of money that countries spend. That is important. There is no doubt about it. But this alliance, which many have viewed as the most successful military alliance in history, is a lot more than just money. At its heart, it is about common values. At its heart, it is about countries coming together to defend democracy. At its heart, it is about countries that have the same core national security interests.

This is very important. At its heart, it is about shared sacrifice. There is shared sacrifice in the checkbook, yes, but it goes way beyond this. It is very important to remember article 5 of the NATO treaty, which is the treaty by which countries invoke the common defense. When you invoke article 5, that means that all of the other allies are coming to help you. All of the other allies are coming to defend you. Article 5 has been invoked in the NATO treaty, which was passed by this body in 1949, one time. It was invoked one time—one time. When was it invoked? After the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001.

Our NATO allies said: We are going to help defend America—that is really important—and they did. They did.

Again, we talk too much about dollars, and I commend the President for what he has done, but let's talk about other shared sacrifice. The alliances we have around the world aren't just about money. Since 9/11, over 1,000 non-U.S. NATO troops have been killed in action in Afghanistan, coming to our defense after 9/11 and going after the terrorists who killed over 3,000 Americans on 9/11. Over 1,000 NATO soldiers—non-American NATO soldiers—have paid the ultimate sacrifice because of the alliance they have with the United States.

You can't put a pricetag on that. You can't put a pricetag on that. Some sacrifices are more than just dollars. Some sacrifices can't be measured in dollars, and I think it is important for all of us here in the Senate, for the Trump administration, and for all Americans to remember that.

I wish to thank the families of those over 1,000 NATO alliance soldiers who have been killed in action and the thousands and thousands more who have been wounded in Afghanistan, hunting down terrorists who killed our citizens. It is very important to remember that.

The bottom line is this when it comes to one of the most important and enduring strategic advantages we have anywhere in the world: We are an ally-rich nation, and our adversaries—

such as Russia, North Korea, and Iran—and our potential adversaries—such as China—are ally-poor. We are ally-rich. Countries trust us. Countries want to join alliances with the United States, and our adversaries and potential adversaries are ally-poor.

That system of alliances has been built for over 70 years through the hard work of Democratic and Republicans Presidents, Secretaries of State and Defense, and U.S. Senators. It has been a joint collective effort.

Here is something else that is important to know. Our adversaries and potential adversaries know that this is the most important strategic advantage we have over any other country, and that is why for years—for decades—countries such as Russia, China, Iran, and North Korea have tried to split up our alliances. We shouldn't let that happen. It is important to remember this as we continue to deal with these countries. I think this NATO summit sent a strong message that we are going to stand together for decades more to come.

When it comes to alliances, this body, pursuant to the U.S. Constitution, plays a very important role. The alliances I have talked about—including, especially this week, NATO—came to the Senate for ratification. Again, it is important as we talk about national security, we talk about 2 percent, and we talk about burden sharing. Yes, we need that from our allies, but we also need to remember that our alliances go well beyond the checkbook—common values and shared sacrifice. Sometimes that is the most important issue to remember as we continue to deepen our alliances and expand them throughout the world, which is the best way to keep peace and prosperity, not just for us but for the entire world.

TRIBUTE TO GOVERNOR BILL SHEFFIELD

Mr. President, it is Thursday afternoon, and the new pages here will hopefully see that this certainly is one of my favorite moments in the Senate, and I know it is the Presiding Officer who gets to see the “Alaskan of the Week” every week around this time. I guarantee the young men and women who are doing a great job as our pages are going to start to view this as their favorite time, too, because they get to hear about Alaska and great stories about Alaska. They get to hear about great and wonderful people in the great State of Alaska who are doing great things for their community, their State, and their country. We call that person our Alaskan of the week.

From the onset, we have tried to focus, generally, on people who are unsung heroes in their communities—people who have worked diligently a lot of times without a lot of recognition. With my colleagues, I get to come and tell stories about what they have done for their community or State or even for their country. At other times, we recognize someone in our State who has made the headlines, someone whose contributions are well known through

all parts of the State. We just do that because we want to reemphasize it, because it is important.

Today we are going to recognize one of those people who is well known in Alaska but whom we think is worthy certainly of the title of Alaskan of the week because of all he has done. His name is Bill Sheffield. He was our State's Governor in 1982, and he has spent his adult life making Alaska a better place for all of us.

Governor Sheffield's story in Alaska embodies what many of us love about our great State. It doesn't matter where you come from or your social status, in Alaska, if you have grit, tenacity, determination, and a servant's heart, nothing can hold you back.

Governor Sheffield was born in 1928 in Spokane, Washington. When the Depression hit, his family had to grow and sell vegetables to survive. It was during this time that he saw firsthand how President Roosevelt's New Deal, passed by this body, helped people, including his father, who was struggling. The idea that government was there to help people stayed with him and turned him into a lifelong Democrat.

He joined the Air Force and, after his release, joined Sears, Roebuck and Company. In 1952 he moved to the great State of Alaska to work for the company as it expanded throughout the State. He repaired televisions and appliances and took on sales roles, excelling both in repairs and sales. He did this all while suffering from a serious, difficult stutter, one he had carried with him throughout his childhood. He said that when he was a child, he simply couldn't or wouldn't talk. “I had to point to pictures,” he told one interviewer. But his stutter lent him tremendous empathy, and it also steeled his determination to work hard to overcome obstacles and succeed.

And succeed he did. He got into the hotel business, eventually owning a chain of 19 hotels across Alaska, but he still wanted something more. He wanted to give back to his community. So, in 1982, as a long-shot politician, he ran for Governor. The long shot came in, and he won.

He always understood, and still does, that infrastructure is the key to creating a path for economic growth in Alaska. We are a resource-rich but infrastructure-poor State. The policies that he undertook as Governor and the projects that were built during his administration—likely more infrastructure projects than any other Governor—still have a huge impact on our State today.

Let me just mention a few of them.

The largest zinc and lead mine literally in the world, the Red Dog mine in Northwest Alaska, was made possible by his hard work and that of countless other Alaskans.

The Ketchikan Shipyard was built during the Sheffield administration.

An aggressive road and construction program was undertaken throughout the State, particularly in the city of Anchorage.

The Bradley Lake hydro project near Homer was built during his administration, along with several other hydro projects throughout Southeast Alaska.

He traveled extensively throughout rural Alaska. He went to almost every single village in our State. We have over 200 that are not connected by roads, so that was hard to do. Almost every one was visited by our Governor.

But his crowning achievement was the purchase of the Alaska Railroad. When he first became Governor, the Federal Government had owned the railroad and was threatening to shut it down, which would have been devastating to our State. There were no private buyers, so Governor Sheffield worked with the State legislature and the congressional delegation to buy the railroad from the Federal Government. Then they created a State-owned corporation designed to be operated like a private business, and that railroad, the Alaska Railroad, still serves as a critical transportation link for goods and people throughout Alaska. Since his time in office, Governor Sheffield has continued his ties to the railroad as CEO and chairman of the board.

He has also continued to serve in other public service capacities, such as the port director in Anchorage, and he has contributed to numerous causes and served on many charitable boards, like the Alaska Community Foundation board, and has received countless awards and recognition for his public service.

But what really makes Governor Sheffield so special to so many is that he is just a kind, warm person. He is always lending a hand to others. He is always there for many when he is needed. He does this without regard for political affiliation. His house is always full of Republicans, Democrats, and Libertarians. Last year, I was at a great event at his house, where he honored the Coast Guard Foundation. Many members, both current and past, from both sides of the political aisle—including from this body—have eaten wonderful dinners in his home, including my good friend Senator JOHN McCAIN, who had dinner in Governor Sheffield's house with Senator Hillary Clinton. That is bipartisanship. When he opens his doors to his beautiful home, all are welcome.

Governor Sheffield recently celebrated his 90th birthday with a party in Anchorage. Unfortunately, I was not able to attend, but I heard it was one for the ages. Hundreds of people showed up. People from all walks of life and all political affiliations were there, all of them sharing deep affection for one of our State's giants, a man with a huge heart, who has made life better for countless Alaskans.

Governor Sheffield, from the Senate, happy 90th birthday. Thanks for your great service to our great State and all you have done. Congratulations on being our Alaskan of the Week.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UPCOMING MEETING BETWEEN PRESIDENT TRUMP AND PRESIDENT PUTIN

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, if you are like me, a Member of the Senate in the hallways this week, I think the two questions that have come up over and over again were about the NATO meeting that just transpired in the last couple of days and the upcoming meeting on Monday between Vladimir Putin and President Trump.

I had intended to come to the floor and speak about policies toward China on trade. There is a lot to cover.

There was an article this morning in the Associated Press about how the Chinese Government has turned the American business class into lobbyists. They are basically telling these guys that are doing business in China: You should go back to Washington and lobby your government to stop imposing tariffs on us or you guys are going to pay a price. But I will have time to talk about that next week. That was really my intent.

I want to focus on the meeting on Monday between President Trump and Vladimir Putin because there is a lot of hyperbole. Someone came up and asked: Are you concerned that the President will meet one-on-one with Vladimir Putin and nobody else in the room?

I said: First of all, I guarantee someone else will be in the room because Putin doesn't speak English and President Trump doesn't speak Russian. It will not be a productive meeting if one or two other people aren't there. That should be the least we should focus on.

We should take this stuff seriously. It is an important and serious meeting. I don't take a back seat to anyone in terms of being clear-eyed about Vladimir Putin, and I want to talk about that today a little bit.

I want to start out by saying: Let's all take a deep breath and be reasonable. It is not unusual for the President of the United States to meet with the President of Russia because, of the 16,000 nuclear weapons on this planet, 90 percent of them are possessed by these two countries—almost equally divided. This is the reason other Presidents have met with President Putin or whoever the leader is of the Russian Federation. And that is why those meetings are important and will continue.

That said, it is important—when we analyze these meetings, what we hope they are about, and what we hope they will produce—to understand not just who you are meeting with and what they do but to understand why they are doing it. If you do not understand what the other side wants and what moti-

vates them, then the meetings are not nearly as productive, and neither is our analysis or the suggestions we make about our policy toward that country.

First is understanding Vladimir Putin. I have never met the man. I don't think you need to meet him to believe a couple of things about him. First, is he is a very suspicious human being himself—suspicious of others. I think his KGB background has probably influenced that. He also grew up in the Cold War in Russia in the Soviet Union when Russians didn't even trust each other.

Imagine growing up in a society where people spy on each other, and you don't know, if you say something to your friend in school, if he will report you to the authorities—not to mention the authorities themselves looking at you all of the time. Then imagine actually being a product of their intelligence services.

I think when you grow up in that era, in a place like that, you are naturally going to be suspicious of other people, and you are going to ascribe to them attributes. So that is the first thing.

By the way, I think that also informs his view of the United States. It is impossible, I believe, for someone like this to grow up in that era, in that place, working where he did, and not have deep suspicions and views—negative views—about the United States and the West at-large.

The second thing that is pretty apparent just by watching him, is this guy is competitive. He views everything as a personal thing. Personal-level dominance is important to him, but, more importantly, his relationship with the United States is a competitive one. I think, by and large, he views the world as a zero-sum game, but he most certainly views the relationship between the United States and Russia as a zero-sum game—meaning that in any sort of interaction we are having with Vladimir Putin, there is no scenario in which he envisions that we both do well. He believes there is only so much success in the world, and the more we have of it, the less he has of it. I do believe it informs all the decisions he makes. There can be only one winner.

I think he is also deeply driven by his personal image. I will tell you that he probably wouldn't last 2 weeks in American politics where people are habitually mocked, and if you run for public office or you are a public figure—whether it is social media or the like—everyone gets ridiculed, mocked, and attacked. I am not sure he could ever put up with that sort of scrutiny. He is probably sensitive about it.

The one thing you can tell by watching him is that this is a person who works very hard to control his emotions. He never wants to look angry. He never wants to look as though he is afraid of something or worried about anything. He never wants to look as though he is in doubt about anything. He is very image-driven, and that drives a lot about how he controls his emotions.

But the other thing that I think is common sense is, if you grew up as a spy in the KGB, you know how valuable personal information is and how personal information about you can be weaponized. So that is why we know very little about him as a person—his personal life, his health, or any of these things. You would never know about it other than what he allows us to see—photos of him on a horse without his shirt on or whatever else he wants to show us that day—because he wants to control the personal information that is available.

He also wants to be able to control how his image is portrayed. The image he wants to portray is twofold. No. 1, he wants an image that portrays Vladimir Putin as an important world leader, an indispensable world leader; he is the guy that matters, and in every major crisis on this planet, he is a person whose opinion, views, and positions have to be taken into account. That drives a lot of the decisions he makes. It is the reason they are in Libya right now. It is the reason they are in Afghanistan right now. It is the reason he is trying to figure out how he can finagle his way into the talks with North Korea. It is because he wants to be an indispensable world leader, and there should not be any major discussion on the planet that he is not in the middle of. So oftentimes he injects himself into these things for that reason.

That is tied to his second end goal, and that is the one that drives most of what he does. He wants to restore Russia as a great world power, equal to the United States of America. He cannot do that economically. The Russian economy's GDP is \$2 trillion, which makes it roughly the size of some of our States here in the United States and also roughly the size of Italy, Spain, and other countries. So he is not an economic superpower; therefore, he can only be an asymmetrical superpower, meaning the use of things that are not traditional, such as cyber warfare, his role on the security council, and the military—the ability to project power and to threaten with nuclear weapons and also with their conventional capabilities to invade neighboring countries or to intervene in places like Syria.

Ultimately, what drives him most of all—in addition to being, personally, an indispensable leader—is that he wants Russia and the United States to be viewed as equal powers on the world stage.

I think it is pretty clear from what he has said publicly that he views the 1990s as an era of humiliation for Russia. He looks at the end of the Cold War until the time he took over just in the last few years, and he sees that Russia was weak and America was strong, and we were preying on a weak Russia.

By the way, that is probably how he views the world. He views the world as a zero-sum game, a place where the weak are preyed on by the strong. Therefore, they must be strong, and they must be seen as equal to us.

Understanding all of that and any interaction with him is critical to having a positive, productive, or, at a minimum, not damaging interaction. If we go in with any illusions that this is, somehow, someone who, if we just get along with him better or if we work on some things together, then he is going to change behavior and be less problematic, that is a fool's errand. At the end of the day, if you believe the world is a zero-sum game and if you believe that the competition between the United States and Russia is one in which every time we win, they lose, and vice versa, then it is going to be very hard to find areas of interest that we can truly work on for the mutual benefit of both countries.

That does not mean that you are unnecessarily antagonistic. The bottom line is that the United States is both economically, militarily, and diplomatically superior to the Russian Federation Government in terms of our influence and our ability to do things in the world. When you are stronger—not an image, necessarily, but in reality—it should give you a level of security to be able to figure out ways in which we can work on things that are good for our country but also not lose the wisdom of understanding that you can often fall into traps. What we do not want is to fall into traps.

By the way, on this whole point of strong versus weak, I know a number of my colleagues had the opportunity to travel to Moscow during the last recess. It is interesting how it was covered in the American media—how they portrayed the visit—and how the Russian media portrayed it. I know many of them are frustrated by this. The Russian media basically portrayed them—again, it is state-controlled media, so they are going to portray it any way they want. But they almost made it look as though weaklings from America had gone over there. They were very frustrated by this. It just tells you—it gives you insight into the way they view things in the world. That is why you will very rarely see an interaction that they couch as a meeting that is respectful. They always want to put Putin in a dominant position, and they always want to put Russia in a dominant position.

By the way, one of the tactics Putin uses to accomplish this is before meetings even happen, he announces ahead of time that a deal has been struck, almost as if to trap you into the deal. Obviously, since he is announcing the deal, it sounds as if it is something he came up with.

All of these are interesting points, but where do these conversations lead us? There are a few things I think we need to keep in mind. The first is invitations to work together. They will probably happen, and he will probably announce them before the visit. One, he will say: Why don't we work together on counterterrorism? A lot of people would say: Well, that makes a lot of sense. They don't like the terror-

ists; we don't like the terrorists. So why can't we work with Putin to go after the terrorists?

Ideally, the answer would be: Yes, we have strong disagreements about a lot of things. Whether it is an ISIS element or an al-Qaida element, if we have a chance to work together on it, then we should pursue it.

There is a problem, though, and this what I hope everyone is clear-eyed about. They are not very good counterterrorism partners. To begin with, their capabilities are just not very good. We have seen that in Syria. They are not targeting terrorists. They are bombing schools and hospitals, and they are—not only have they committed war crimes, but they have assisted Assad in committing war crimes.

If you were going after terrorists, you would go to the places where the terrorists are. For much of that conflict, they have largely spent their time going after nonterrorist rebels—or at least non-al-Qaida, non-ISIS rebels. They are going after those rebels instead. So they are not very good at counterterrorism. They are not very capable.

The other thing is they use that as an opportunity to spy on us. When you are cooperating together militarily, you are embedded alongside each other and sharing information, so that gives you a lot of opportunity to spy on the people you are working with. We need to be wary of that.

Any effort to work together on counterterrorism has to be real. It has to be truly about terrorists, and it has to protect the United States and our information.

The second thing they love to talk about is: Well, why don't we work together on arms control? There are two problems with arms control. It sounds good on paper. The first is they cheat and they violate it. They deny it, but they violate it. The other is that they are for arms control as long as the arms that are being controlled are the ones we have more of or as long as the arms that are being controlled are the ones we are technologically superior in. They seek to use that as an advantage.

It is difficult because if you go out and you talk to people and say "Hey, the Russians want to work together on arms control," everyone says "Well, that is a great idea."

I understand. It sounds very good on paper, but the reality of arms control is something very different. It means this: We are going to look for opportunities to cheat on our end, and we are going to try to strictly enforce it on your end.

Remember, it is a zero-sum game. If they enter into a counterterrorism relationship with us, it will be one in which they win and we lose because Vladimir Putin does not foresee a cooperative agreement with anyone, especially the country he is in direct competition with.

If it is an arms reduction agreement, remember, it is a zero-sum game. He is

motivated by the desire to win at our expense, and he will use arms control as an opportunity to do that if he can structure it appropriately.

The other thing we hear him talk about is cyber. People chuckle about that. Imagine a cyber deal with the Russian Federation under Vladimir Putin. But, again, Vladimir Putin knows that the U.S. private sector and government have cyber capabilities that are superior to his. So if he could come up with some sort of cyber agreement that would create rules which take away our advantage but allow him to continue to cheat and deny they are cheating—zero-sum game—he would be able to jump on top of us. These are things we want to keep an eye on.

The other thing to keep an eye on moving forward in this relationship is the unexpected. One of the things you have seen in his behavior and the zero-sum game sort of analysis of our relationship with them is that any time he sees an opportunity to do something because we are distracted or because the world may not act, he takes advantage of it: 2007 in Georgia; 2013 and 2014 in Ukraine. We could see the Ukrainian hostilities resume. The world is focused on North Korea. We are focused on the arguments regarding NATO. We are focused on the trade situation with China, Canada, Mexico, and everyone else. Everyone is talking about something different, and Ukraine is falling off the headlines.

You could wake up one morning and all of a sudden realize that hostilities have resumed or maybe it will be a massive cyber attack. Maybe it will be ramping up their involvement in places such as Libya or Afghanistan or one morning we will wake up and realize they have deployed significant military assets to one of those two countries—or both, for that matter.

It would be very reminiscent of what we saw him do in Syria, when he saw the—and the excuses would be: The Russians were already there. We are working with the government. They have invited us to come in and bring more people to help them. You would have to foresee that.

The one thing I think we should anticipate Putin will push very strongly on is to get the United States to completely pull out of Syria. What he ideally, probably, wants is some sort of "international process" to resolve it but an international process in which Russia not only is a key player, but they get to stay in Syria; they get to keep their naval base; they get to keep their air assets; they get to keep a unified government in Syria that is friendly to them, all supervised by the international community. But the United States has to leave first.

He would love nothing more than an opportunity to set up that sort of scenario because in a zero-sum game situation, he foresees a world in the next 5 years in which Russia has significant

military and other assets in Syria permanently, potentially in Iraq, Afghanistan, and Libya, and all of a sudden, the countries in the Middle East are saying to themselves: You know, Russia's Vladimir Putin is a guy who can be an interlocutor, a mediator of the disputes in this region. This is a person we should be working with. This is a person who actually is more reliable to work with in the Middle East. He would love nothing more than that, and he would be able to do it without committing 100,000 troops or 50,000 troops or a large loss of Russian personnel. It is a zero-sum game, great power politics, the notion that he wants to be equal to the United States.

Imagine if he could create a scenario in which—if he hasn't done so already—Russia and the Middle East, under Vladimir Putin, are at least as important as, if not potentially more important than, the United States, a situation in which they have permanent military assets and a friendly regime in Syria, potentially in Iraq, Afghanistan, Libya, and other places, and the United States is pulling out of Syria, being forced to reduce its presence in Iraq and in other places. They become de facto more important in the Middle East, and he takes one step toward achieving the goal of reaching parity with the United States of America as far as being an influential global power.

By the way, these efforts to increase their influence would not be limited just to the Middle East. You could foresee them doing this in the Western Hemisphere. I read an article a few days ago. It was a big fanfare. They opened up what they call a counterdrug school in Nicaragua. I can only tell you that while it may very well be called a counterdrug school, anytime a country welcomes an unlimited number of Russian military personnel and others, they are welcoming in spies and influence agents and the ability to project power. They have long wanted permanent—or at least semipermanent—basing opportunities in the Western Hemisphere like those they had during the Cold War.

They already have intelligence facilities. They already have a presence in Cuba. They would love nothing more than to get into a place or to expand their presence in a place like Nicaragua and even potentially Venezuela, for that matter. We need to keep an eye on all of these things.

This is an important conversation, but it oftentimes gets lost in all of the rhetoric that is going on around the elections and American politics. We have to understand very clearly that we are not dealing with Belgium here. We are dealing with Vladimir Putin, who has used the world as a zero-sum game, the strong versus the weak, and who is trying to position Russia and himself as the strong versus others whom he hopes he can weaken.

There is no interaction between us and them in which he does not want to

come out ahead. He does not feel there is such a thing as a mutually good deal. The only good deals for him are deals in which they win and whomever he is dealing with loses, especially if it is the United States.

I will wrap up by saying that, with all of this in mind, I would not diminish the threat that Russia continues to pose to our electoral system, to our society, and to our politics. The No. 1 objective of Russian efforts in 2016—and it would be their No. 1 objective moving forward—is encouraging infighting in our politics. They have a clear understanding of American politics and its nuances—our societal divisions, the things we like to fight over, how we fight over them, and where we fight over them, and they have figured out and have gotten even better at being able to drive those narratives.

When people ask “What was the real goal of those efforts in 2016?” beyond anything else, it was not electing one person or another. His No. 1 objective—No. 1 objective—was to leave a country, the United States, deeply divided, at each other's throats, constantly fighting. No matter who won that election, that is the result he wanted, and that was the result we were going to get. Those efforts continue.

The second effort that I think they have as a priority, by the way, is to create pro-Russia constituencies in the United States. What I mean by that is there are people in American politics who actually take the Russian side or the Putin side of a debate. You have already seen the early phases of that in some places. It is still a minority thought process, but it is not unusual in many cases these days because it has gotten wrapped up in other things that are going on.

It is not outside the realm of the possible that you could see the growth of some pro-Putin element. It is maybe not like what you see in Europe or in Russian-speaking parts of Europe—but some pro-Russian types of constituencies in the United States. Whether that is somehow wrapped up around partisanship or the like, these remain their goals. Remember what I told you earlier. They cannot compete with us economically, but if they can divide us from within, it weakens us, at least in his mind. It is one of the things he can point to and say: Look how weak America is. All they do is fight with each other. Their democracy is a fraud, and look how strong we are because there is no dissent, there is no infighting going on in my Russia.

Obviously, what he doesn't tell you is that whoever fights against him winds up dead or in jail and that there is no press by which people can fight with him anyway. So these are the things to keep in mind as we move forward because the tools that remain at his disposal are still very significant. For example, I could foresee the time or day where—a lot of times there is a lot of focus in America about what if they go into the ballot box and change the

votes. That is probably much harder to do because of the way we conduct elections in this country—so decentralized.

Here is what a cyber actor could do. They could change party registration. They could go into the database and suddenly erase a bunch of voters. Imagine if they do so by being able to use analytics to identify here are the people in this town who we think are likely to vote for this candidate or that candidate. We are going to knock out a bunch of them so that on election day, a bunch of people who support certain candidates go vote, and they are told they are not registered. If you get enough people to do that and enough of those people complain to the press, we are going to see stories saying: Guess what. Supporters of candidate X or Y were not allowed to vote in the election. Fraud. Democracy is dead. We could foresee that at some point in the future. It is a real threat.

We could see Vladimir Putin taking the next step and doing here what he has done in parts of Europe; that is, creating an enemies list, politicians he believes are anti-Russia and targeting those individuals, targeting them with information he steals by hacking their emails, disclosing documents, even doctoring fake documents; perhaps doing something like deepfake, which is something we will be talking a lot about next week. That basically is off-the-shelf technology you can buy right now where you can produce a video that without the proper technology, you could not tell it is fake, where a person is saying something they never said or is doing something they didn't do—a doctored video that looks real. Imagine that, on the eve of an election, a video pops up online—and the media starts to report it—of a candidate saying something offensive they never said or taking a bribe because of a doctored video that looks real, and unless you are a technical expert, you can't tell. It is called a deepfake. They are not that hard to make, and they are not that hard to make for someone with off-the-shelf technology.

Imagine if a nation state decides to use it. You could foresee them targeting specific races.

They have, as I said, a pretty good understanding of American politics. You could foresee where they would say: There is a congressional race or a Governor's race or a Senate race somewhere in the country that is going to be a really big deal. It has an outsized influence on American politics, and that is the race we are going to interfere in. We are going to do something to impact the outcome of it because we think that will further our narrative one way or the other.

We have to be clear-eyed on all of these things as we go into this.

I would say, perhaps, the greatest goal Vladimir Putin would have in the short term is weakening NATO, not just limiting its expansion but weakening its resolve. NATO, at the end of the day, beyond military hardware

that is a part of it, is no better than the true commitment of a nation to a member of NATO to live up to the organizing documents and commitments we make to one another; meaning that we have a commitment, along with our partners in NATO, that if one of us is attacked, we have all been attacked. That has only been invoked one time in its history, and that was after September 11, 2001.

If he somehow could not just keep us from expanding NATO but begin to undermine it from within, it would be an enormous victory because, again, for him, it would be a sign that America is diminishing, that the threats against him are diminishing, and his influence and Russia's role in the world has increased.

So this is an important meeting. It probably will not be the last time they meet, but more important than the meeting are the issues at play between the leader in Russia who views everything as a zero-sum game, in which either he wins or America wins, but it can't be mutually beneficial.

We have to deal with him. He possesses a significant percentage of the world's nuclear weapons. Between the United States and Russia, we have 90 percent of the world's nuclear weapons in these two countries. We do have to talk to him, but we need to be very clear-eyed; that is, that it is a complicated but important relationship, and we should clearly understand what motivates him and what motivates his decision making and what their ultimate goals are in any conversation we have.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the following nomination: Executive Calendar No. 912.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the nomination. The assistant bill clerk read the nomination of Kelly Higashi, of the District of Columbia, to be an Associate Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia for the term of fifteen years.

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the nomination.

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate vote on the nomination with no intervening action or debate; that if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; that no further motions be in order; and that any statements relating to the nomination be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Higashi nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the following nomination: Executive Calendar No. 913.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the nomination.

The assistant bill clerk read the nomination of Emory A. Rounds III, of Maine, to be Director of the Office of Government Ethics for a term of five years.

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the nomination.

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate vote on the nomination with no intervening action or debate; that if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; that no further motions be in order; and that any statements relating to the nomination be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Rounds nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the following nomination: Executive Calendar No. 924.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the nomination.

The assistant bill clerk read the nomination of Georgette Mosbacher, of Florida, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Poland.

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the nomination.

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate vote on the nomination with no intervening action or debate; that if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; that no further motions be in order; and that any statements relating to the nomination be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Mosbacher nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. RUBIO. 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.

HONORING THE FALLEN OF THE "YANKY 72" CRASH

Mrs. HYDE-SMITH. Mr. President, I would like to call attention to a special event occurring this Saturday in Mississippi to honor 16 brave servicemembers who lost their lives a year ago in a tragic military aircraft crash.

I look forward to joining family members, Marine Corps leaders, and the people of Leflore County, MS, to honor the 15 marines and one Navy corpsman who died on July 10, 2017, when their Marine Corps KC-130T "Yank 72" crashed near Itta Bena, MS.

We have a responsibility to ensure we preserve the memory of those who gave that last full measure of devotion for our Nation. Those we lost last July include: Cpl Daniel Baldassare, SSgt Robert Cox, Capt. Sean Elliott, Maj. Caine Goyette, GySgt Sergeant Mark Hopkins, GySgt Brendan Johnson, Sgt Julian Kevianne, SSgt William Kundrat, Sgt Chad Jenson, Sgt Talon Leach, Sgt Owen Lennon, Sgt Joseph Murray, Cpl Collin Schaaff, Sgt Dietrich Schmieman, SSgt Joshua Snowden, and PO 2 Class Ryan Lohrey.

Immediately after the accident and since then, first responders and the citizens of Mississippi rallied in support of the fallen. The unveiling of a permanent monument will culminate a significant effort in Mississippi and across the Nation to memorialize these brave young men.

I am proud of the people of my State for their commitment to remember the fallen and to support their families. A recent Greenwood Commonwealth editorial thoughtfully expresses the significance of this work.

I ask unanimous consent that the July 11, 2018, Greenwood Commonwealth editorial titled "Open arms for families of the fallen" be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Greenwood Commonwealth, July 11, 2018]

OPEN ARMS FOR FAMILIES OF FALLEN

This weekend promises to be a highly emotional one for the families of the 16 servicemen who lost their lives a year ago when the transport plane on which they were flying fell out of the sky for reasons still not publicly disclosed.

It also could be a very meaningful weekend for the greater Greenwood community,

which has become associated with these 16 by a tragically sad quirk of fate.

When the KC-130T with the call name of Yank 72 was flying over the Mississippi Delta on July 10, 2017, no one on board or on the ground below could have imagined that its final destination would be a remote soybean field on the western edge of Leflore County rather than an airstrip in California.

It was a horrific accident, claiming the lives of everyone on board—15 Marines and one Navy corpsman.

Some 200 family members of those who died, plus a large number of the fallen servicemen's comrades, are expected to start arriving Thursday in Leflore County. For the next 72 hours or so, they will be our guests while they remember, grieve and perhaps connect with some of the good people of this community who, though they didn't personally know the 16, responded as if they did.

Today, the Commonwealth publishes a special section that not only explains what's planned to memorialize the 16, but also gives some insight into who the 16 were, and tells how some of their families have coped with their loss since that fateful afternoon.

Certainly, service in the military comes with risks. Everyone who signs up for it knows it, as do all of their friends and relatives. But death is not an ordinary outcome when you're just flying from one base to another. It would be hard to get one's mind around losing a loved one in a warzone, but losing one so unexpectedly as this has to be all that much tougher.

A large group of state and local volunteers has organized the Yank 72 Memorial Weekend in a way that it hopes will give some emotional aid to those who are grieving, while also reassuring them that their sons, brothers, husbands and boyfriends have not been forgotten, nor will they be.

The families will be given the space to grieve in private, to visit the crash scene, to share their experiences with others who had relatives on that plane, to do whatever it is that would give them some consolation. Some may want to be left alone; some may want to connect.

We know this community will respect their wishes and do whatever it takes to make their weekend one in which they feel surrounded by sympathy and love.

Saturday's public events, including the unveiling of a permanent memorial in Itta Bena, will provide a way to acknowledge appreciation for the ultimate sacrifice paid for by these 16. It would be wonderful if a large number of citizens from this community turned out.

For some of the fallen servicemen's families who come, this may be their first and only trip into the Delta. Others may make it a place of personal pilgrimage.

Whichever occurs, let's hope that we become the locus not of painful memories but of comforting ones.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO ELSIE STEWARD YOUNG

- Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, today I wish to congratulate Miss Elsie Steward Young of Highland County, OH, on her 102nd birthday and her recent induction into the Ohio Civil Rights Hall of Fame.

Miss Elsie is a legend in southwest Ohio and a lifelong fighter for justice and opportunity for all Ohio children.

In 1954, after the Supreme Court issued its landmark Brown v. Board of

Education decision and ordered an end to segregation in America's schools, the two all-White primary schools in Hillsboro, OH, refused to integrate. The district continued to send Black students to the one all-Black school, which was in shambles.

Miss Elsie and a group of mothers took matters into their own hands. For 2-years, the "Marching Mothers of Hillsboro" walked to the town's all-White primary schools every single day, just to be sent home, but they continued to march and to show that they would not rest until their children were given the quality education they were guaranteed under the law. They joined with the NAACP to file a lawsuit against the Hillsboro Board of Education, which made it all the way to the Supreme Court—and they won.

Because of Miss Elsie and her fellow mothers' advocacy, the Court ordered the schools to integrate, and paved the way for integration in other Northern cities. Their activism is a reminder of what ordinary citizens can achieve when they band together to fight for justice.

I am sure that my Senate colleagues join me in Honoring Miss Elsie Steward Young for her service to justice and equality. •

TRIBUTE TO COLONEL EDWARD CHAMBERLAYNE

- Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize the service and achievements of COL Edward P. Chamberlayne upon his retirement from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

Colonel Chamberlayne has been a valued member of the Army Corps for the past 25 years. He has served with distinction from Germany to Afghanistan to Iraq, where he participated in crucial route clearance operations during Operation Iraqi Freedom. Colonel Chamberlayne's accomplishments have earned him the Bronze Star Medal among numerous other decorations, but his most crucial mission, from my perspective, has been his service as the 67th commander of the Baltimore District.

The commander of the Baltimore District leads more than 1,200 employees in the protection and restoration of Maryland's military installations, waterways, infrastructure, and environment. Under Colonel Chamberlayne's leadership, the Baltimore District has maintained 290 miles of Federal channels and 148 miles of Federal flood protection levees; managed 15 reservoirs and the Washington Aqueduct, which supplies an average of 150 million gallons of drinking water daily; constructed 500 acres of oyster reefs in Maryland; restored 1,140 acres of environmentally fragile remote island habitat; completed aerostat pads for a missile defense system; coordinated tens of millions of dollars in dredging and restoration projects throughout the State of Maryland and streamlined the aquaculture permitting process.

Colonel Chamberlayne's vision and skills in navigating the budget forces within his own agency have brought many local projects to fruition. From dredging, construction, beach replenishment, habitat restoration, and permitting, Colonel Chamberlayne and his team have significantly improved the infrastructure, environment, business climate, regional partnerships, and economic development opportunities throughout the State of Maryland.

The State of Maryland has benefitted tremendously from Colonel Chamberlayne's service. Therefore, it is my honor to recognize the contributions of COL Edward P. Chamberlayne in his role as commander of the Army Corps of Engineers, Baltimore District, and to thank him for his years of dedicated service to our country and his tremendously positive impact on the State of Maryland. •

TRIBUTE TO BETSEY HEDRICK

- Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, this week I have the honor of recognizing Betsey Hedrick of Dawson County for her contribution to the community through Betsey's Badlands Catering.

Betsey was born and raised in Bozeman. After graduating from high school, she attended culinary school in Portland, which led her to work at a local country club and eventually run a steakhouse back in Bozeman. She and her husband, Phil, moved to Glendive 14 years ago, had their son Sam, and shortly after, she opened Betsey's Badlands Catering.

Fixing food has always been Betsey's passion. Her favorite part about cooking is not what she is cooking or who she is cooking for; it is the impact that food has on people. No matter people's backgrounds or history, food brings them together. She loves being a part of something that brings joy to people's lives, and that is why she continues to do it daily.

I congratulate Betsey on her significant contributions to Glendive and the greater Dawson County. I look forward to seeing her business grow and trying some of her famous seasonal dishes soon. •

TRIBUTE TO KALLIE CAREY

- Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize Kallie Carey, an intern in my Rapid City, SD, office, for all of the hard work she has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota over the past several weeks.

Kallie is a graduate of Wolsey-Wessington High School in Wolsey, SD. Currently, she is attending Black Hills State University in Spearfish, SD, where she is majoring in political science. She is a hard worker who has been dedicated to getting the most out of her internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Kallie for all of the fine work she has done and wish her continued success in the years to come. •

TRIBUTE TO SHANNON DUFFY

• Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize Shannon Duffy, an intern in my Washington, DC, office, for all of the hard work she has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota over the past several weeks.

Shannon is a graduate of St. Thomas More High School in Rapid City, SD. Currently, she is attending Georgetown University in Washington, DC, where she is pursuing degrees in operations and information management and finance. She is a hard worker who has been dedicated to getting the most out of her internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Shannon for all of the fine work she has done and wish her continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO TREVOR GUNLICKS

• Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize Trevor Gunlicks, an intern in my Washington, DC, office, for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota over the past several weeks.

Trevor is a graduate of Lincoln High School in Sioux Falls, SD. Currently, he is attending South Dakota State University in Brookings, SD, where he is pursuing degrees in political science and legal studies. He is a hard worker who has been dedicated to getting the most out of his internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Trevor for all of the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO JORDANN KROUSE

• Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize Jordann Krouse, an intern in my Washington, DC, office, for all of the hard work she has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota over the past several weeks.

Jordann is a graduate of Harrisburg High School in Harrisburg, SD. Currently, she is attending Boston University in Boston, MA, where she is pursuing degrees in international relations and environmental analysis. She is a hard worker who has been dedicated to getting the most out of her internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Jordann for all of the fine work she has done and wish her continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO CAROLINE MORIARTY

• Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize Caroline Moriarty, an intern in my Washington, DC, office, for all of the hard work she has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota over the past several weeks.

Caroline is a graduate of Roosevelt High School in Sioux Falls, SD. Currently, she is attending the University of Missouri-Kansas City, where she is

majoring in political science. She is a hard worker who has been dedicated to getting the most out of her internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Caroline for all of the fine work she has done and wish her continued success in the years to come.●

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:55 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, 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. 200. An act to amend the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act to provide flexibility for fishery managers and stability for fishermen, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2075. An act 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.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 200. An act to amend the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act to provide flexibility for fishery managers and stability for fishermen, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

H.R. 2075. An act 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; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM-254. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Louisiana memorializing the United States Congress to take such actions as are necessary to ensure that Tricare adequately covers behavioral therapies for military dependents; to the Committee on Armed Services.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 96

Whereas, Tricare is the health program of the United States Department of Defense that finances health services delivered by civilian healthcare providers to nearly nine million five hundred thousand United States military personnel, military retirees, and dependents of military families; and

Whereas, pursuant to a congressional mandate enacted in 2016, the military consolidated its three Tricare regions into two on January 1 of this year, marking the most extensive reform to Tricare since the program transitioned from a fee-for-service model to a managed care model in the mid-1990s; and

Whereas, though Tricare has largely resolved problems with computer networks, communications systems, and customer

service that emerged during its recent consolidation, military families continue to report facing significant obstacles in access to behavioral therapies for children; and

Whereas, according to behavioral therapy providers, these obstacles result from inconsistent reimbursement, undue delays in claims processing, problems with provider credentialing, misclassification of services and levels of coverage, and ongoing challenges in correcting errors by the managed care companies which now serve Tricare beneficiaries; and

Whereas, behavioral therapies can be immensely beneficial to children with autism and other behavioral or developmental conditions; and

Whereas, parents of special-needs children who have benefitted from behavioral therapies strongly contend that these specialized health services are not just beneficial, but in fact life-changing, in that they give their children a far better quality of life than would be possible without the services: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Legislature of Louisiana does hereby memorialize the United States Congress to take such actions as are necessary to ensure that Tricare adequately covers behavioral therapies for military dependents; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this Resolution be transmitted to the presiding officers of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America and to each member of the Louisiana congressional delegation.

POM-255. A resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey urging the United States Congress to enact H.R. 1411, the "Transparent Summer Flounder Quotas Act"; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION NO. 45

Whereas, New Jersey fisheries are ranked among the best in the nation and it is estimated that there are as many as one million recreational saltwater anglers fishing in New Jersey; and

Whereas, The fishing industry contributes 20,000 jobs and over \$1 billion to the State economy each year; and

Whereas, Of the many varieties of fish found off of New Jersey's shores, summer flounder is among the most sought after saltwater fish along the Atlantic Coast; and

Whereas, Summer flounder fisheries are managed cooperatively by the states through the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission (ASMFC) and the Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council (MAFMC); and

Whereas, Together, these managing entities are responsible for developing summer flounder fishery regulations as part of the Summer Flounder, Scup, and Black Sea Bass Fishery Management Plan; and

Whereas, The management plan is implemented through regulations adopted by the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), a division of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) within the United States Department of Commerce; and

Whereas, The management plan is designed to ensure the protection and maintenance of the summer flounder stock, primarily through the establishment of harvest limits, which are based on the most current stock assessment report published by NOAA; and

Whereas, Based on the 2016 Stock Assessment Update, the ASMFC and MAFMC have recommended a 40 percent cut in catch limits for the 2017 and 2018 summer flounder fishing seasons; and

Whereas, Highlighting NOAA's heavy reliance on random sampling to gather data for the 2016 stock assessment report, members of

the New Jersey delegation to the United States Congress have expressed concern about the accuracy of the estimates contained in the report and have questioned the need to implement such a drastic reduction in catch limits for the upcoming season; and

Whereas, The New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection has expressed similar concerns, warning that the drastic reduction in catch limits will devastate recreational and commercial fishing in New Jersey and have a detrimental effect on the economy of the New Jersey shore, particularly as the State continues to recover from Superstorm Sandy; and

Whereas, Despite significant opposition to the recommended reduction in summer flounder catch limits, and the potential for severe economic damage to the State, at the end of December 2016 the NMFS adopted a rule implementing the recommended reduction in summer flounder catch limits for the 2017 and 2018 fishing seasons; and

Whereas, In order to mitigate the economic devastation that may result from the reduced summer flounder quotas adopted by the NMFS, United States Congressman FRANK PALLONE, JR. has introduced legislation, co-sponsored by Congressman FRANK LOBIONDO, which would prohibit enforcement of the reduced summer flounder quotas until a new summer flounder stock assessment is completed and a new rule establishing summer flounder quotas is adopted based on the findings of the new stock assessment; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey:

1. The President and Congress of the United States are respectfully urged to enact House Bill No. 1411, known as the "Transparent Summer Flounder Quotas Act."

2. Copies of this resolution, as filed with the Secretary of State, shall be transmitted by the Clerk of the General Assembly to the President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, the Under Secretary of Commerce for Oceans and Atmosphere, the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, the Chair of the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission, the Chairman of the Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council, the Commissioner of the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection, and every member of Congress elected from the State of New Jersey.

POM-256. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Louisiana memorializing the United States Congress and the Louisiana Congressional Delegation to take such actions as are necessary to treat oil and gas production in the Gulf Coast states in a manner that is at least equal to onshore oil, gas, and coal production in interior states for revenue purposes; to rectify the revenue sharing inequities between coastal and interior energy producing states; and to ensure the dependability of such revenue sharing; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 48

Whereas, since 1920, interior states with mineral production in the United States have been privy to a revenue sharing agreement with the federal government that allowed those states to keep fifty percent of the revenues generated in their states from mineral production on federal lands within their borders, including royalties, severance taxes, and bonuses; and

Whereas, coastal states with onshore and offshore oil and gas production were not included in that revenue sharing agreement and therefore face inequities under the fed-

eral energy policies because those coastal states have not been party to this same level of revenue sharing partnership with the federal government; and

Whereas, coastal energy producing states have a limited partnership with the federal government that allows them to retain very little revenue generated from their offshore energy production and transportation, and activities associated with energy that are produced and transported for use throughout the nation; and

Whereas, in 2006 the United States Congress passed the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act (GOMESA) from which the state of Louisiana will begin receiving revenue sharing payments from mineral production in the Gulf of Mexico in 2017; an Act that calls for a sharing of thirty-seven and five tenths percent of coastal production revenues with four gulf states with a cap of five hundred million dollars per year; and

Whereas, according to the most recent data from the United States Energy Information Administration, Louisiana, including its state waters, is the ninth largest producer of oil in the United States while if offshore oil production from federal waters is included, it is the second largest oil producer in the country; and from wells located within the state boundaries including the state waters, Louisiana is the fourth largest producer of gas in the United States while if gas production from federal offshore waters in the Gulf of Mexico is included, it is the second largest gas producer in the United States; and

Whereas, with eighteen operating refineries in the state, Louisiana is second only to Texas in both total number of refineries and total refinery operating capacity, accounting for nearly one-fifth of the nation's total refining capacity; and

Whereas, Louisiana contributes to the United States Strategic Petroleum Reserve with two facilities located in the state consisting of twenty-nine caverns capable of holding nearly three hundred million barrels of crude oil; and

Whereas, with three onshore liquified natural gas (LNG) facilities and others already permitted, more LNG facilities than any other state in the country, and the Louisiana Offshore Oil Port, the nation's only deep-water oil port, Louisiana plays an essential role in the movement of natural gas from the United States Gulf Coast region to markets throughout the country; and

Whereas, it is apparent that Louisiana plays an essential role in supplying the nation with energy and it is vital to the security of our nation's energy supply, roles that should be recognized and compensated at an appropriate revenue sharing level; and

Whereas, the majority of the oil and gas production from the Gulf of Mexico enters the United States through coastal Louisiana with all of the infrastructure necessary to receive and transport such production, infrastructure that has for many decades damaged the coastal areas of Louisiana, an impact that should be compensated through appropriate revenue sharing with the federal government; and

Whereas, because Louisiana is losing more coastal wetlands than any other state in the country, in 2006 the people of Louisiana overwhelmingly approved a constitutional amendment dedicating revenues received from Outer Continental Shelf oil and gas activity through GOMESA to the Coastal Protection and Restoration Fund for the purposes of coastal protection, including conservation, coastal restoration, hurricane protection, and infrastructure directly impacted by coastal wetland losses; and

Whereas, the state of Louisiana has developed, through a science-based and stakeholder-involved process, a "2017 Comprehensive Master Plan for a Sustainable Coast" which identifies and prioritizes the most efficient and effective projects in order to meet the state's critical coastal protection and restoration needs and has received many accolades from the country's scientific community; and

Whereas, the Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority is making great progress implementing the projects in the "Comprehensive Master Plan for a Sustainable Coast" with all available funding, projects that are essential to the protection of the infrastructure that is critical to the energy needs of the United States; and

Whereas, in order to properly compensate the coastal states for the infrastructure demands that result from production of energy and fuels that heat and cool the nation's homes, offices, and businesses and fuel the nation's transportation needs, revenue sharing for coastal states needs to at least be at the same rate as interior states that produce oil, gas, and coal: Therefore, be it *Resolved*, That the Legislature of Louisiana does hereby memorialize the United States Congress and the Louisiana Congressional Delegation to take such actions as are necessary to treat oil and gas production in the Gulf Coast states in a manner that is at least equal to onshore oil, gas, and coal production in interior states for revenue purposes; and to rectify the revenue sharing inequities between coastal and interior energy producing states in order to address the nationally significant crisis of wetland loss in the state of Louisiana; and be it further

Resolved, That the Legislature of Louisiana does hereby memorialize the United States Congress and the Louisiana Congressional Delegation, along with the delegations from the other Gulf of Mexico states, to ensure that the agreement codified through the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act remains in place and that the Gulf Coast states receive their anticipated revenue sharing payments during Fiscal Year 2018–2019 and thereafter as provided for in the Act; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this Resolution be transmitted to the presiding officers of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America and to each member of the Louisiana Congressional Delegation.

POM-257. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Louisiana memorializing the United States Congress to take such actions as are necessary to adopt and enact legislation to be proposed that would establish the Caddo Lake National Heritage Area; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 110

Whereas, the Heritage Area Program is found in the Historic Sites Act, the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, and related statutes, and is under the jurisdiction of the United States Department of the Interior and the National Park Service; and

Whereas, the National Historic Preservation Act establishes a national policy for federal agencies to use measures such as financial and technical assistance to foster conditions under which our modern society and our prehistoric and historic resources can exist in productive harmony and fulfill the social, economic, and other requirements of present and future generations; and

Whereas, each national heritage area has been authorized by a specific federal statute in an effort to effectively carry out the national policy with these same statutes assigning a prominent role for the National Park Service to play in nurturing the areas and supporting their success; and

Whereas, the Caddo Lake National Heritage Area program will expand on traditional

approaches to resource stewardship by supporting large-scale, community centered initiatives that connect local citizens through preservation, conservation, and planning processes facilitated by a local coordinating entity, the Caddo Lake National Heritage Area Commission, to provide assistance to residents to improve their quality of life by protecting their shared cultural and natural resources; and

Whereas, the Caddo Lake National Heritage Area Commission will promote the conservation of natural, historic, scenic, and cultural resources, while improving the area's economic vitality, all guided by a management plan developed by the commission and approved by the Secretary of the Interior; and

Whereas, legislation will be filed in the 115th Congress, Second Session, that will delineate a procedure to be followed to establish the Caddo Lake National Heritage Area, including a time line; and

Whereas, nothing in the act establishing the Caddo Lake National Heritage Area allows for abridging the rights of any property owner including the right to refrain from participating in any plan, project, program, or activity conducted within the national heritage area; requiring any property owner to permit public access to such property or to modify any provisions of law with regard to public access or use of private lands; altering any duly adopted land use regulation or any approved land use plan; authorizing or implying the reservation or appropriation of water or water rights; diminishing the authority of the state to manage fish and wildlife including the regulation of fishing and hunting within a national heritage area; or creating any liability, or having any effect on any liability under any other law, of any private property owner with respect to any person injured on such private property; and

Whereas, the residents and agencies of the Caddo Lake area were so eager to have Caddo Lake designated a National Heritage Area that they embarked on the suitability and feasibility study prior to ever contacting the National Park Service to request their assistance or funding; and

Whereas, the feasibility study examined whether Caddo Lake is nationally distinctive and evaluated alternatives for management, preservation, and interpretation of nationally important cultural and historic landscapes, sites, and structures in and around the Caddo Lake area, including its tributaries of Cypress Bayou and James Bayou in Texas and Louisiana and Black Bayou and Red Bayou along with Soda, Shifftail, and Clear Lakes in Louisiana; and

Whereas, establishment of the Caddo Lake National Heritage Area would be of economic and cultural benefit to the Shreveport and Caddo Parish area of our great state:

Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Legislature of Louisiana does hereby memorialize the United States Congress to take such actions as are necessary to adopt and enact the legislation to be proposed that would establish the Caddo Lake National Heritage Area; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this Resolution be transmitted to the presiding officers of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America and to each member of the Louisiana congressional delegation.

POM-258. A resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of Louisiana memorializing the United States Congress to take such actions as are necessary to adopt and enact legislation to be proposed that would establish the Caddo Lake National Heritage Area; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

HOUSE RESOLUTION NO. 219

Whereas, the Heritage Area Program is found in the Historic Sites Act, the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, and related statutes, and is under the jurisdiction of the United States Department of the Interior and the National Park Service; and

Whereas, the National Historic Preservation Act establishes a national policy for federal agencies to use measures such as financial and technical assistance to foster conditions under which our modern society and our prehistoric and historic resources can exist in productive harmony and fulfill the social, economic, and other requirements of present and future generations; and

Whereas, each national heritage area has been authorized by a specific federal statute in an effort to effectively carry out the national policy with these same statutes assigning a prominent role for the National Park Service to play in nurturing the areas and supporting their success; and

Whereas, the Caddo Lake National Heritage Area program will expand on traditional approaches to resource stewardship by supporting large-scale, community centered initiatives that connect local citizens through preservation, conservation, and planning processes facilitated by a local coordinating entity, the Caddo Lake National Heritage Area Commission, to provide assistance to residents to improve their quality of life by protecting their shared cultural and natural resources; and

Whereas, the Caddo Lake National Heritage Area Commission will promote the conservation of natural, historic, scenic, and cultural resources, while improving the area's economic vitality, all guided by a management plan developed by the commission and approved by the Secretary of the Interior; and

Whereas, legislation will be filed in the 115th Congress, Second Session, that will delineate a procedure to be followed to establish the Caddo Lake National Heritage Area, including a time line; and

Whereas, nothing in the act establishing the Caddo Lake National Heritage Area allows for abridging the rights of any property owner including the right to refrain from participating in any plan, project, program, or activity conducted within the national heritage area; requiring any property owner to permit public access to such property or to modify any provisions of law with regard to public access or use of private lands; altering any duly adopted land use regulation or any approved land use plan; authorizing or implying the reservation or appropriation of water or water rights; diminishing the authority of the state to manage fish and wildlife including the regulation of fishing and hunting within a national heritage area; or creating any liability, or having any effect on any liability under any other law, of any private property owner with respect to any person injured on such private property; and

Whereas, the residents and agencies of the Caddo Lake area were so eager to have Caddo Lake designated a National Heritage Area that they embarked on the suitability and feasibility study prior to ever contacting the National Park Service to request their assistance or funding; and

Whereas, the feasibility study examined whether Caddo Lake is nationally distinctive and evaluated alternatives for management, preservation, and interpretation of nationally important cultural and historic landscapes, sites, and structures in and around the Caddo Lake area, including its tributaries of Cypress Bayou and James Bayou in Texas and Louisiana and Black Bayou and Red Bayou along with Soda, Shifftail, and Clear Lakes in Louisiana; and

Whereas, establishment of the Caddo Lake National Heritage Area would be of economic and cultural benefit to the Shreveport and Caddo Parish area of our great state. Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the Legislature of Louisiana does hereby memorialize the United States Congress to take such actions as are necessary to adopt and enact the legislation to be proposed that would establish the Caddo Lake National Heritage Area. Be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this Resolution be transmitted to the presiding officers of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America and to each member of the Louisiana congressional delegation.

POM-259. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Louisiana memorializing the United States Congress to take such actions as are necessary to adopt and enact legislation to be proposed that would establish the Caddo Lake National Heritage Area; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 110

Whereas, the Heritage Area Program is found in the Historic Sites Act, the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, and related statutes, and is under the jurisdiction of the United States Department of the Interior and the National Park Service; and

Whereas, the National Historic Preservation Act establishes a national policy for federal agencies to use measures such as financial and technical assistance to foster conditions under which our modern society and our prehistoric and historic resources can exist in productive harmony and fulfill the social, economic, and other requirements of present and future generations; and

Whereas, each national heritage area has been authorized by a specific federal statute in an effort to effectively carry out the national policy with these same statutes assigning a prominent role for the National Park Service to play in nurturing the areas and supporting their success; and

Whereas, the Caddo Lake National Heritage Area program will expand on traditional approaches to resource stewardship by supporting large-scale, community centered initiatives that connect local citizens through preservation, conservation, and planning processes facilitated by a local coordinating entity, the Caddo Lake National Heritage Area Commission, to provide assistance to residents to improve their quality of life by protecting their shared cultural and natural resources; and

Whereas, the Caddo Lake National Heritage Area Commission will promote the conservation of natural, historic, scenic, and cultural resources, while improving the area's economic vitality, all guided by a management plan developed by the commission and approved by the Secretary of the Interior; and

Whereas, legislation will be filed in the 115th Congress, Second Session, that will delineate a procedure to be followed to establish the Caddo Lake National Heritage Area, including a time line; and

Whereas, nothing in the act establishing the Caddo Lake National Heritage Area allows for abridging the rights of any property owner including the right to refrain from participating in any plan, project, program, or activity conducted within the national heritage area; requiring any property owner to permit public access to such property or to modify any provisions of law with regard to public access or use of private lands; altering any duly adopted land use regulation or any approved land use plan; authorizing

or implying the reservation or appropriation of water or water rights; diminishing the authority of the state to manage fish and wildlife including the regulation of fishing and hunting within a national heritage area; or creating any liability, or having any effect on any liability under any other law, of any private property owner with respect to any person injured on such private property; and

Whereas, the residents and agencies of the Caddo Lake area were so eager to have Caddo Lake designated a National Heritage Area that they embarked on the suitability and feasibility study prior to ever contacting the National Park Service to request their assistance or funding; and

Whereas, the feasibility study examined whether Caddo Lake is nationally distinctive and evaluated alternatives for management, preservation, and interpretation of nationally important cultural and historic landscapes, sites, and structures in and around the Caddo Lake area, including its tributaries of Cypress Bayou and James Bayou in Texas and Louisiana and Black Bayou and Red Bayou along with Soda, Shifftail, and Clear Lakes in Louisiana; and

Whereas, establishment of the Caddo Lake National Heritage Area would be of economic and cultural benefit to the Shreveport and Caddo Parish area of our great state: Now, Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Legislature of Louisiana does hereby memorialize the United States Congress to take such actions as are necessary to adopt and enact the legislation to be proposed that would establish the Caddo Lake National Heritage Area; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this Resolution be transmitted to the presiding officers of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America and to each member of the Louisiana congressional delegation.

POM-260. A resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of Louisiana memorializing the United States Congress to take such actions as are necessary to adopt and enact legislation to be proposed that would establish the Caddo Lake National Heritage Area; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

HOUSE RESOLUTION NO. 219

Whereas, the Heritage Area Program is found in the Historic Sites Act, the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, and related statutes, and is under the jurisdiction of the United States Department of the Interior and the National Park Service; and

Whereas, the National Historic Preservation Act establishes a national policy for federal agencies to use measures such as financial and technical assistance to foster conditions under which our modern society and our prehistoric and historic resources can exist in productive harmony and fulfill the social, economic, and other requirements of present and future generations; and

Whereas, each national heritage area has been authorized by a specific federal statute in an effort to effectively carry out the national policy with these same statutes assigning a prominent role for the National Park Service to play in nurturing the areas and supporting their success; and

Whereas, the Caddo Lake National Heritage Area program will expand on traditional approaches to resource stewardship by supporting large-scale, community centered initiatives that connect local citizens through preservation, conservation, and planning processes facilitated by a local coordinating entity, the Caddo Lake National Heritage Area Commission, to provide assistance to residents to improve their quality of life by

protecting their shared cultural and natural resources; and

Whereas, the Caddo Lake National Heritage Area Commission will promote the conservation of natural, historic, scenic, and cultural resources, while improving the area's economic vitality, all guided by a management plan developed by the commission and approved by the Secretary of the Interior; and

Whereas, legislation will be filed in the 115th Congress, Second Session, that will delineate a procedure to be followed to establish the Caddo Lake National Heritage Area, including a time line; and

Whereas, nothing in the act establishing the Caddo Lake National Heritage Area allows for abridging the rights of any property owner including the right to refrain from participating in any plan, project, program, or activity conducted within the national heritage area; requiring any property owner to permit public access to such property or to modify any provisions of law with regard to public access or use of private lands; altering any duly adopted land use regulation or any approved land use plan; authorizing or implying the reservation or appropriation of water or water rights; diminishing the authority of the state to manage fish and wildlife including the regulation of fishing and hunting within a national heritage area; or creating any liability, or having any effect on any liability under any other law, of any private property owner with respect to any person injured on such private property; and

Whereas, the residents and agencies of the Caddo Lake area were so eager to have Caddo Lake designated a National Heritage Area that they embarked on the suitability and feasibility study prior to ever contacting the National Park Service to request their assistance or funding; and

Whereas, the feasibility study examined whether Caddo Lake is nationally distinctive and evaluated alternatives for management, preservation, and interpretation of nationally important cultural and historic landscapes, sites, and structures in and around the Caddo Lake area, including its tributaries of Cypress Bayou and James Bayou in Texas and Louisiana and Black Bayou and Red Bayou along with Soda, Shifftail, and Clear Lakes in Louisiana; and

Whereas, establishment of the Caddo Lake National Heritage Area would be of economic and cultural benefit to the Shreveport and Caddo Parish area of our great state. Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the Legislature of Louisiana does hereby memorialize the United States Congress to take such actions as are necessary to adopt and enact the legislation to be proposed that would establish the Caddo Lake National Heritage Area. Be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this Resolution be transmitted to the presiding officers of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America and to each member of the Louisiana congressional delegation.

POM-261. A resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of Louisiana urging the United States Congress to pass legislation that supports efforts to build, modernize, and maintain the United States' infrastructure with consideration of certain principles; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

HOUSE RESOLUTION NO. 110

Whereas, a country's infrastructure is the bedrock of its economy; and

Whereas, the traditional system of roads, bridges, railroads, waterways, and pipelines, commonly referred to as infrastructure, af-

fектs a country's ability to produce goods, deliver services and products, and connect a workforce to jobs; and

Whereas, the strength and efficiency of a nation's infrastructure have a direct impact on that nation as a global economic competitor and leader; and

Whereas, on a local level, infrastructure also affects a state's ability to participate and thrive in the nation's economy; and

Whereas, with an inadequate infrastructure, a state struggles to move its people and goods throughout the state and across state lines; and

Whereas, Louisiana currently has a more than thirteen billion dollar backlog for sorely needed road and bridge work throughout the state; and

Whereas, identifying funding and generating revenue to address the state's backlog have been looming problems for many years; and

Whereas, the Louisiana section of the American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE) evaluated and studied eleven major components of Louisiana's infrastructure; and

Whereas, after its evaluations, the Louisiana section of the ASCE, in its 2017 Louisiana Infrastructure Report Card, determined that, "Our infrastructure is poorly maintained, inadequately funded, and not designed to meet tomorrow's demands. Consequently, the state is at a disadvantage and will continue to lose its economic competitiveness."; and

Whereas, the ASCE has given the state of Louisiana a statewide average grade of "D+" for its infrastructure; and

Whereas, the United States' infrastructure also suffers from years of deterioration and neglect; and

Whereas, for decades, the United States has failed to develop means to finance infrastructure projects to keep pace with the needs of the country; and

Whereas, choosing to defer repairs, maintenance, and upgrades to the country's infrastructure has delivered a crippling blow to the nation's economy and growth; and

Whereas, the United States also received a cumulative grade of "D+" from the ASCE, showing a drop in grades for three categories: parks, solid waste, and transit; and

Whereas, the ongoing and consistent decline of the country's infrastructure jeopardizes the United States' ability to remain competitive in the global market; and

Whereas, the United States now faces serious challenges as it seeks to address pitfalls including having to prioritize badly needed projects with insufficient funding; and

Whereas, through a combination of federal and nonfederal funding, President Donald Trump has set a one trillion dollar infrastructure investment as his target; and

Whereas, the president has outlined the following four key principles as the basis for his proposal:

- (1) Make targeted federal investments.
- (2) Encourage self-help.
- (3) Align infrastructure investment with entities best suited to provide sustained and efficient investment.
- (4) Leverage the private sector; and

Whereas, while the United States Congress will be faced with the decision to enact the president's plan or propose its own, choosing to do nothing is not a viable option; and

Whereas, since the United States Congress must act, it should do so with an eye toward responsibility, innovation, and sustainability; and

Whereas, it is vitally important that congress consider new and creative plans to design and implement an infrastructure network that reaches every state, serves every demographic, increases employment, and moves the United States of America into the

twenty-first century to rightfully regain its position as a global economic leader; and

Whereas, such plans must include a comprehensive approach to the nontraditional and ever-changing needs of the nation's people, businesses, and technology; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the Legislature of Louisiana does hereby memorialize the United States Congress to pass legislation that supports efforts to build, modernize, and maintain the nation's infrastructure with consideration for the following principles:

(1) Redefining infrastructure. A twenty-first century economy demands a broader, more inclusive definition to ensure that the country is fully considering all of its infrastructure needs. A newer definition should be expanded to include the following:

- (a) Energy-efficient housing.
- (b) Broadband.
- (c) Education facilities, including access to traditional universities and community colleges, as well as Historically Black Colleges and Universities.
- (d) Forest roads, sidewalks, and bike trails.
- (e) Parks.
- (f) Waste removal and treatment.
- (g) Programs connecting seniors to the rest of the economy.

(2) Committing to fund job training and workforce development. Provisions must focus on enabling young workers and urban residents to benefit from any infrastructure plan through training, pre-apprenticeships, and related approaches, including Registered Apprenticeships within the telecommunications and technology sectors. It must promote meaningful skills development, technical training, internships, and job placement opportunities for African Americans and urban community members. This must be fully integrated into any proposal. Without this, the benefits will not be broadly and fairly shared.

(3) Empowering minority contractors. Minority contractors should have the opportunity to rebuild their communities and employ hardworking Americans along the way. Infrastructure investments should be disseminated through a transparent procurement process with aggressive contracting goals for disadvantaged business entities and effective enforcement to root out fraudulent firms. Contractors and subcontractors should have the ability to employ local hiring preferences and subcontractors should receive prompt payment when services are rendered.

(4) Promoting inclusiveness. Infrastructure development and planning should be inclusive of underserved segments of the population, such as poor, rural, and elderly communities. A twenty-first century economy should not exclude any individuals from participation on the basis of demographics, geography, or financial means. By ensuring participation from all individuals, this country can provide equal opportunity for each and every American to contribute in meaningful ways to the economy and the communities in which they live.

(5) Building for resilience. Climate change and the volatility that are associated with extreme weather events are only expected to worsen over time. More intense storms, sea level rise, storm surges, and other unusual weather conditions are placing an immense strain on the nation's infrastructure and the limited resources that it has to build and maintain it. As the country plans for the future and conceptualizes how it will build up its infrastructure, it needs to consider the long-term viability of these projects and their resilience to extreme weather.

(6) Multi-modal transportation planning. A robust transportation network must con-

sider the changing demographics of its users and the subsequent changes in demand. Conventional transportation planning relies heavily on motor vehicle traffic. However, many communities—particularly in urban areas—must now consider pedestrians, cyclists, public transit riders, ridesharing, and other users when evaluating the effectiveness of the transportation ecosystem.

(7) Future-proofing. The development and adoption of autonomous vehicles, positive train control, NextGen, Smart City planning, and other technologies and transportation models are vastly altering the way the country conceptualizes, plans, and executes transportation policy. The unique challenges that the nation faces will only grow increasingly more complex as the population grows and the nature of its infrastructure becomes more interconnected. An infrastructure package must not only address the immediate needs of the country's crumbling system, but also anticipate the needs of a generation to come; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this Resolution be transmitted to the presiding officers of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America and to each member of the Louisiana congressional delegation.

POM-262. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma urging the United States Congress, pursuant to Article V of the United States Constitution, to call a convention of the states for the purpose of proposing amendments to the United States Constitution related to balancing the federal budget, imposing fiscal restraints on the federal government, limiting the power and jurisdiction of the federal government, and limiting the terms of office for its officials and for members of Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ENROLLED HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 43

Whereas, Article V of the Constitution of the United States provides that upon receipt of applications from two-thirds of the legislatures of the several states, Congress shall call a convention of the states for proposing amendments; and

Whereas, the Oklahoma Legislature adopted SJR 4 in the 2nd Session of the 55th Oklahoma Legislature that applied to the Congress of the United States "for the calling of a convention of the states limited to proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States requiring that in the absence of a national emergency the total of all federal appropriations made by the Congress for any fiscal year may not exceed the total of all estimated federal revenues for that fiscal year, together with any related and appropriate fiscal restraints"; and

Whereas, it appears that two-thirds of the states, including Oklahoma, soon will have applied for a convention to propose such an amendment adding to the United States Constitution a requirement that the federal government balance its budget; and

Whereas, it has also been proposed by several states, including Oklahoma, that a convention be called for proposing amendments to "impose fiscal restraints on the federal government, limit the power and jurisdiction of the federal government, and limit the terms of office for its officials and for members of Congress"; and

Whereas, in its call Congress will be required to specify an initial time and place for the meeting of the Article V Convention for proposing amendments; and

Whereas, it is appropriate for the state legislatures to prepare for the Article V Convention and recommend to Congress an initial time and place to hold the convention; and

Whereas, a gathering of the states called by a state legislature and consisting of members authorized by other state legislatures would be an effective way of considering and recommending solutions to common issues related to an Article V Convention, including planning for and recommending rules and procedures for an Article V Convention, and recommending to Congress the initial date and location of an Article V Convention; and

Whereas, a planning convention of the several states in September in Phoenix, Arizona, was attended by a delegation from Oklahoma as authorized by House Concurrent Resolution No. 1007 of the 1st Session of the 56th Oklahoma Legislature. Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives and the Senate of the 2nd Session of the 56th Oklahoma Legislature:

That a delegation of commissioners selected as provided in this resolution shall be authorized to attend and participate in a gathering of states proposed by any state legislature for the purposes of developing rules and procedures for an Article V Convention for proposing amendments to the United States Constitution to require a balanced federal budget, or to impose fiscal restraints on the federal government, to limit the power and jurisdiction of the federal government and to limit the terms of office for federal officials and members of Congress and for proposing an initial date and location for the meeting of the several states in an Article V Convention.

That the delegation of commissioners shall be composed of seven members, three of whom shall be appointed by the Speaker of the Oklahoma House of Representatives, three of whom shall be appointed by the President Pro Tempore of the Oklahoma State Senate, and one of whom shall be appointed by agreement of both the Speaker of the Oklahoma House of Representatives and the President Pro Tempore of the Oklahoma State Senate.

That two of the commissioners appointed by the Speaker of the Oklahoma House of Representatives shall be current members of the Oklahoma House of Representatives at the time of appointment, and two of the commissioners appointed by the President Pro Tempore of the Oklahoma State Senate shall be current members of the Oklahoma State Senate at the time of appointment. The third commissioner appointed by the Speaker of the Oklahoma House of Representatives shall be a current or former member of the Oklahoma House of Representatives and the third commissioner appointed by the President Pro Tempore of the Oklahoma State Senate shall be a current or former member of the Oklahoma State Senate.

That the commissioners shall be bound by the rules adopted by the gathering of the states or provided for in the proposal for the Article V Convention.

That unless otherwise provided by the Oklahoma Legislature, the commissioners provided for in this resolution shall also serve as commissioners to the Article V Convention for proposing amendments to the United States Constitution when called and shall be bound by the rules adopted by the members of the Article V Convention.

That if a commissioner is unable to participate in either the state gathering or an Article V Convention to propose amendments to the United States Constitution either permanently or temporarily, the appointing authority or authorities shall select an alternate, who shall be a current or former member of the appointing authority's legislative body, to serve for the time the commissioner is unable to serve. The alternate shall be bound by the same rules and procedures as the original commissioner.

That no commissioner or alternate from this state to an Article V Convention shall have the authority to vote to allow consideration of or vote to approve an unauthorized amendment for ratification to the United States Constitution.

That any commissioner or alternate casting a vote to allow consideration or approval of an unauthorized amendment shall be immediately recalled by the appointing authority or authorities and be replaced by an alternate.

That all voting in either a gathering of states or an Article V Convention shall be by state with each state having one vote.

That commissioners and alternates shall take the following oath of office before accepting their appointment:

"I do solemnly swear or affirm that to the best of my abilities I will, as a commissioner (alternate commissioner) to a convention for proposing any amendment to the United States Constitution, uphold the Constitution and laws of the United States and the State of Oklahoma.

I will abide by my specific instructions from the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma. I will not vote to allow consideration of or to approve any amendment proposed for ratification to the United States Constitution that is unrelated to the subject of the approved call of the convention by Congress.

I will vote only for convention rules that provide that each state have one equal vote and that a state or commissioner shall not be allowed to propose an amendment that is unrelated to the approved call of the convention. I acknowledge that any violation of this oath may result in being recalled by the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma or its authorized committee."

That an Article V Convention Committee shall be composed of three members, one appointed by the Speaker of the Oklahoma House of Representatives, one appointed by the President Pro Tempore of the Oklahoma State Senate and one appointed jointly by the Speaker and President Pro Tempore. A member of the Article V Convention Committee may not be a member of the delegation. The duties of the Article V Convention Committee and their appointing authority or authorities include:

1. Monitoring the delegation to determine if it is following legislative instructions and obeying convention rules;

2. Advising the delegation on the Legislature's position on issues before the convention;

3. Disciplining any commissioner who violates the oath of office or instructions or is otherwise guilty of malfeasance or nonfeasance. Discipline may include recall from the convention, removal as a commissioner or demotion to the office of alternate commissioner;

4. Notifying the convention that a commissioner has been recalled, removed as a commissioner or demoted to the office of alternate commissioner; and

5. Replacing any recalled commissioner.

That commissioners shall vote only for Article V Convention rules consistent with the following principles:

1. The convention is convened under the authority reserved to the state legislatures of the several states by Article V of the Constitution of the United States;

2. The only participants at this convention are the several states represented by their respective delegations duly selected in the manner that their respective legislatures have determined;

3. The scope of the convention's authority is defined by applications adopted by at least two-thirds of the legislatures of the several states, which authority is limited to the subject of the approved call of the convention.

The convention has no authority to propose or discuss an amendment on any other subject outside the approved call of the convention by Congress;

4. The convention shall provide for disciplining a commissioner or delegation for exceeding the scope of the convention's authority by raising subjects for discussion or debate that lie outside the convention's authority;

5. The convention shall not infringe on the respective state legislatures' authority to instruct, discipline, recall and replace commissioners; and

6. All voting at the convention or in a committee shall be by state with each state having one vote without apportionment or division. Each state legislature shall determine the internal voting and quorum rules for casting the vote of its delegation.

That the provisions of this resolution shall expire on December 31, 2023.

That the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives, immediately after the passage of this resolution, shall prepare and file one copy thereof with the Secretary of State and one copy with the Attorney General and transmit copies to the President and Secretary of the United States Senate and to the Speaker and Clerk of the United States House of Representatives, to the members of the Oklahoma Congressional Delegation, and to the presiding officers of each of the legislative houses in the several states, requesting their cooperation.

POM-263. A resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Cotati, California urging the United States Congress to enact, without delay, a revenue-neutral fee on carbon-based fossil fuels with several stipulations; to the Committee on Finance.

POM-264. A resolution adopted by the Council of the County of Maui, Hawaii urging the United States Congress to support the gun control policies promoted by March for Our Lives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

POM-265. A petition from a citizen of the State of Texas relative to asylum; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Ms. MURKOWSKI, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, without amendment:

H.R. 965. A bill to redesignate the Saint-Gaudens National Historic Site as the "Saint-Gaudens National Historical Park", and for other purposes (Rept. No. 115-299).

By Ms. MURKOWSKI, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with amendments and an amendment to the title:

H.R. 995. To direct the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior to modernize terms in certain regulations (Rept. No. 115-300).

By Mr. GRASSLEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

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.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GRASSLEY for the Committee on the Judiciary.

Maria Chapa Lopez, of Florida, to be United States Attorney for the Middle District of Florida for the term of four years.

Richard E. Taylor, Jr., of Texas, to be United States Marshal for the Northern District of Texas for the term of four years.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

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. BURR (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. HELLER, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. SCOTT, and Mr. ENZI):

S. 3199. A bill to establish an expedited process for removal of senior executives of the Internal Revenue Service based on performance or misconduct; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. PERDUE:

S. 3200. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for an alternative removal for performance or misconduct for Federal employees; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. SCHATZ (for himself and Mr. BOOZMAN):

S. 3201. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to extend certain morale, welfare, and recreation privileges to certain veterans and their caregivers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CRUZ:

S. 3202. A bill to limit claims under Federal law seeking judicial review of any environmental impact statement, environmental review, or authorization for the Lower Bois d'Arc Creek Reservoir Project in Fannin County, Texas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 3203. A bill to plan, develop, and make recommendations to increase access to sexual assault examinations for survivors by holding hospitals accountable and supporting the providers that serve them; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. NELSON (for himself and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 3204. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to authorize admission of Canadian retirees as long-term visitors for pleasure described in section 101(a)(15)(B) of such Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Ms. SMITH, Mr. REED, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. CARDIN):

S. 3205. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act and the Higher Education Act of 1965 to require certain creditors to obtain certifications from institutions of higher education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. NELSON:

S. 3206. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax relief to areas affected by toxic algal blooms; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. NELSON:

S. 3207. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to allow for the deferment of certain student loans during a period in which a borrower is receiving treatment for cancer; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

S. 3208. A bill to provide agencies with discretion in securing information technology and information systems; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 3209. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 413 Washington Avenue in Belleville, New Jersey, as the "Private Henry Svehla Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND:

S. 3210. A bill to establish an improved regulatory process to prevent the introduction and establishment in the United States of injurious wildlife; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. SMITH, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. WARREN, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. REED):

S. 3211. A bill to ensure greater accountability by licensed firearms dealers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 3212. A bill to facilitate effective research on and treatment of neglected tropical diseases through coordinated domestic and international efforts; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself, Mr. REED, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. UDALL, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. SCHATZ, and Mr. MARKEY):

S. Res. 573. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that climate change is real and that the National Science Foundation should engage on the communication of sound climate change science to the public; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. BURR (for himself and Mr. TESTER):

S. Res. 574. A resolution designating July 13, 2018, as Collector Car Appreciation Day and recognizing that the collection and restoration of historic and classic cars is an important part of preserving the technological achievements and cultural heritage of the United States; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BURR, Ms. CANTWELL, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. CASSIDY, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. COONS, Mr. CORKER, Mr. CORNYN, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. DAINES, Mr. DONNELLY, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. ENZI, Mrs. ERNST, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. GARDNER, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GRASSLEY, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. HASSAN,

Mr. HATCH, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. HELLER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HOEVEN, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. JONES, Mr. KAINA, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LEE, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. McCAIN, Mrs. McCASKILL, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MORAN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. PETERS, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. REED, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SASSE, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SCOTT, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. SHELBY, Ms. SMITH, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. TESTER, Mr. THUNE, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. UDALL, Mr. WARNER, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WICKER, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. YOUNG):

S. Res. 575. A resolution honoring the memory of the 5 victims of the attack at the Capital Gazette in Annapolis, Maryland, on June 28, 2018; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 194

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 194, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish a public health insurance option, and for other purposes.

S. 266

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 266, a bill to award the Congressional Gold Medal to Anwar Sadat in recognition of his heroic achievements and courageous contributions to peace in the Middle East.

S. 569

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 569, a bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to provide consistent and reliable authority for, and for the funding of, the Land and Water Conservation Fund to maximize the effectiveness of the Fund for future generations, and for other purposes.

S. 808

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 808, a bill to provide protections for certain sports medicine professionals who provide certain medical services in a secondary State.

S. 1564

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1564, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permit legally married same-sex couples to amend their filing status for returns outside the 3-year limitation.

S. 1580

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1580, a bill to enhance the

transparency, improve the coordination, and intensify the impact of assistance to support access to primary and secondary education for displaced children and persons, including women and girls, and for other purposes.

S. 1742

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1742, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for an option for any citizen or permanent resident of the United States age 55 to 64 to buy into Medicare.

S. 1970

At the request of Mr. BENNET, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1970, a bill to establish a public health plan.

S. 2101

At the request of Mr. DONNELLY, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) was added as a cosponsor 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. 2121

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2121, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require reporting of certain data by providers and suppliers of air ambulance services for purposes of reforming reimbursements for such services under the Medicare program, and for other purposes.

S. 2340

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2340, a bill to establish the Federal Labor-Management Partnership Council.

S. 2370

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2370, a bill to better support our early childhood educators and elementary school and secondary school teachers, and for other purposes.

S. 2639

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2639, a bill to require the Federal Trade Commission to establish privacy protections for customers of online edge providers, and for other purposes.

S. 2679

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2679, a bill to provide access to and manage the distribution of excess or surplus property to veteran-owned small businesses.

S. 2938

At the request of Mr. SASSE, the name of the Senator from Colorado

(Mr. GARDNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2938, a bill to require the Secretary of Transportation to modify provisions relating to hours of service requirements with respect to transportation of livestock and insects, and for other purposes.

S. 2946

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY) 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. 3027

At the request of Mrs. McCASKILL, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3027, a bill to save taxpayer money and improve the efficiency and speed of intragovernmental correspondence, and for other purposes.

S. 3040

At the request of Mr. SCOTT, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3040, a bill to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act to clarify Federal law with respect to reporting certain positive consumer credit information to consumer reporting agencies, and for other purposes.

S. 3063

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3063, a bill to delay the re-imposition of the annual fee on health insurance providers until after 2020.

S. 3172

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) 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. RES. 572

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the names of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE), the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS), the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER), the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 572, a resolution supporting the officers and personnel who carry out the important mission of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Ms. SMITH, Mr. REED, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. CARDIN):

S. 3205. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act and the Higher Education Act of 1965 to require certain creditors to obtain certifications from institutions of higher education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3205

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 “Know Before You Owe Private Education Loan Act of 2018”.

SEC. 2. AMENDMENTS TO THE TRUTH IN LENDING ACT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 128(e) of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1638(e)) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (3) and inserting the following:

“(3) INSTITUTIONAL CERTIFICATION REQUIRED.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), before a creditor may issue any funds with respect to an extension of credit described in this subsection, the creditor shall obtain from the relevant institution of higher education where such loan is to be used for a student, such institution’s certification of—

“(i) the enrollment status of the student;

“(ii) the student’s cost of attendance at the institution as determined by the institution under part F of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965; and

“(iii) the difference between—

“(I) such cost of attendance; and

“(II) the student’s estimated financial assistance, including such assistance received under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 and other financial assistance known to the institution, as applicable.

“(B) EXCEPTION.—Notwithstanding subparagraph (A), a creditor may issue funds with respect to an extension of credit described in this subsection without obtaining from the relevant institution of higher education such institution’s certification if such institution fails to provide within 15 business days of the creditor’s request for such certification—

“(i) the requested certification; or

“(ii) notification that the institution has received the request for certification and will need additional time to comply with the certification request.

“(C) LOANS DISBURSED WITHOUT CERTIFICATION.—If a creditor issues funds without obtaining a certification, as described in subparagraph (B), such creditor shall report the issuance of such funds in a manner determined by the Director of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau.”;

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (9), (10), and (11) as paragraphs (10), (11), and (12), respectively; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (8) the following:

“(9) PROVISION OF INFORMATION.—

“(A) PROVISION OF INFORMATION TO STUDENTS.—

“(i) LOAN STATEMENT.—A creditor that issues any funds with respect to an extension of credit described in this subsection shall send loan statements, where such loan is to be used for a student, to borrowers of such funds not less than once every 3 months dur-

ing the time that such student is enrolled at an institution of higher education.

“(ii) CONTENTS OF LOAN STATEMENT.—Each statement described in clause (i) shall—

“(I) report the borrower’s total remaining debt to the creditor, including accrued but unpaid interest and capitalized interest;

“(II) report any debt increases since the last statement; and

“(III) list the current interest rate for each loan.

“(B) NOTIFICATION OF LOANS DISBURSED WITHOUT CERTIFICATION.—On or before the date a creditor issues any funds with respect to an extension of credit described in this subsection, the creditor shall notify the relevant institution of higher education, in writing, of the amount of the extension of credit and the student on whose behalf credit is extended. The form of such written notification shall be subject to the regulations of the Bureau.

“(C) ANNUAL REPORT.—A creditor that issues funds with respect to an extension of credit described in this subsection shall prepare and submit an annual report to the Bureau containing the required information about private student loans to be determined by the Bureau, in consultation with the Secretary of Education.”.

(b) DEFINITION OF PRIVATE EDUCATION LOAN.—Section 140(a)(8)(A) of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1650(a)(8)(A)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating clause (ii) as clause (iii);

(2) in clause (i), by striking “and” after the semicolon; and

(3) by adding after clause (i) the following:

“(ii) is not made, insured, or guaranteed under title VII or title VIII of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 292 et seq. and 296 et seq.); and”.

(c) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 365 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau shall issue regulations in final form to implement paragraphs (3) and (9) of section 128(e) of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1638(e)), as amended by subsection (a). Such regulations shall become effective not later than 6 months after their date of issuance.

SEC. 3. AMENDMENT TO THE HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965.

(a) AMENDMENT TO THE HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965.—Section 487(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1094(a)) is amended by striking paragraph (28) and inserting the following:

“(28)(A) The institution shall—

“(i) upon the request of a private educational lender, acting in connection with an application initiated by a borrower for a private education loan in accordance with section 128(e)(3) of the Truth in Lending Act, provide certification to such private educational lender—

“(I) that the student who initiated the application for the private education loan, or on whose behalf the application was initiated, is enrolled or is scheduled to enroll at the institution;

“(II) of such student’s cost of attendance at the institution as determined under part F of this title; and

“(III) of the difference between—

“(aa) the cost of attendance at the institution; and

“(bb) the student’s estimated financial assistance received under this title and other assistance known to the institution, as applicable; and

“(ii) provide the certification described in clause (i), or notify the creditor that the institution has received the request for certification and will need additional time to comply with the certification request—

“(I) within 15 business days of receipt of such certification request; and

“(II) only after the institution has completed the activities described in subparagraph (B).

“(B) The institution shall, upon receipt of a certification request described in subparagraph (A)(i), and prior to providing such certification—

“(i) determine whether the student who initiated the application for the private education loan, or on whose behalf the application was initiated, has applied for and exhausted the Federal financial assistance available to such student under this title and inform the student accordingly; and

“(ii) provide the borrower whose loan application has prompted the certification request by a private education lender, as described in subparagraph (A)(i), with the following information and disclosures:

“(I) The amount of additional Federal student assistance for which the borrower is eligible and the advantages of Federal loans under this title, including disclosure of the fixed interest rates, deferments, flexible repayment options, loan forgiveness programs, and additional protections, and the higher student loan limits for dependent students whose parents are not eligible for a Federal Direct PLUS Loan.

“(II) The borrower’s ability to select a private educational lender of the borrower’s choice.

“(III) The impact of a proposed private education loan on the borrower’s potential eligibility for other financial assistance, including Federal financial assistance under this title.

“(IV) The borrower’s right to accept or reject a private education loan within the 30-day period following a private educational lender’s approval of a borrower’s application and about a borrower’s 3-day right to cancel period.

“(C) For purposes of this paragraph, the terms ‘private educational lender’ and ‘private education loan’ have the meanings given such terms in section 140 of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1650).”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the effective date of the regulations described in section 2(c).

SEC. 4. REPORT.

Not later than 24 months after the issuance of regulations under section 2(c), the Director of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau and the Secretary of Education shall jointly submit to Congress a report on the compliance of institutions of higher education and private educational lenders with section 128(e)(3) of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1638(e)), as amended by section 2, and section 487(a)(28) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1094(a)), as amended by section 3. Such report shall include information about the degree to which specific institutions utilize certifications in effectively encouraging the exhaustion of Federal student loan eligibility and lowering student private education loan debt.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 573—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT CLIMATE CHANGE IS REAL AND THAT THE NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION SHOULD ENGAGE ON THE COMMUNICATION OF SOUND CLIMATE CHANGE SCIENCE TO THE PUBLIC

Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself, Mr. REED, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. UDALL, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. SCHATZ, and Mr. MARKEY) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation:

S. RES. 573

Whereas there is scientific consensus based on peer-reviewed research and scientific evidence that—

(1) climate change is occurring due to increases in carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases in the atmosphere; and

(2) human activity has caused a significant increase in the atmospheric concentrations of greenhouse gases;

Whereas scientific measurements show that the concentration of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere ranged from 170 to 300 parts per million for at least 800,000 years (4 times as long as the species homo sapiens has existed), but has now, according to measurements taken at the Mauna Loa Observatory, exceeded 400 parts per million in each of the last 5 years;

Whereas the National Science Foundation (referred to in this preamble as the “NSF”) is an independent Federal agency created by Congress “to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; [and] to secure the national defense”;

Whereas the approval of any grant awards by NSF must undergo a rigorous merit review standard, including review by outside independent reviewers who do not work for the NSF or the institution that employs the researchers applying for the grant;

Whereas Congress reaffirmed the rigorous merit review standard of the NSF in Public Law 114-329;

Whereas the authorizing statute of the NSF states that the long-term goals of the NSF include promoting “the discovery, integration, dissemination, and application of new knowledge in service to society”;

Whereas the American Meteorological Society, the premier professional organization of the United States for individuals who work in the atmospheric and related sciences,—

(1) promotes broadcast meteorologists as “station scientists”; and

(2) equips broadcast meteorologists with tools and skills necessary to cover weather and climate effects on public health, transportation, agriculture, and energy use;

Whereas fossil fuel companies and allied organizations (according to peer-reviewed scientific research and investigative reporting) have long known about climate change and the role of fossil fuels in driving climate change;

Whereas fossil fuel companies are known to, both directly and through their trade associations, public relations firms, and foundations—

(1) support sophisticated campaigns to deny, counter, and obfuscate peer-reviewed research; and

(2) use misinformation campaigns to mislead the public about climate change; and

Whereas, it is in the public interest that scientists and other experts—

(1) communicate peer-reviewed science to the public; and

(2) educate the public about the causes and consequences of climate change: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) climate change is real and human activity is the main driver of modern climate change;

(2) the scientific consensus on climate change and the implications of climate change with respect to the increase in the frequency and severity of extreme weather makes it in the public interest that broadcast meteorologists knowledgeably communicate scientifically-based climate information to the public;

(3) fossil fuel companies, both directly and through their trade associations, public relations firms, and foundations, should cease their misinformation campaigns concerning the dangers of climate change; and

(4) it is within the authority and aligned with the mission of the National Science Foundation to provide grants to broadcast meteorologists to improve their understanding of climate change science and ability to communicate climate change science to the public.

SENATE RESOLUTION 574—DESIGNATING JULY 13, 2018, AS COLLECTOR CAR APPRECIATION DAY AND RECOGNIZING THAT THE COLLECTION AND RESTORATION OF HISTORIC AND CLASSIC CARS IS AN IMPORTANT PART OF PRESERVING THE TECHNOLOGICAL ACHIEVEMENTS AND CULTURAL HERITAGE OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BURR (for himself and Mr. TESTER) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 574

Whereas many people in the United States maintain classic automobiles as a pastime and do so with great passion and as a means of individual expression;

Whereas the Senate recognizes the effect that the more than 100-year history of the automobile has had on the economic progress of the United States and supports wholeheartedly all activities involved in the restoration and exhibition of classic automobiles;

Whereas the collection, restoration, and preservation of automobiles is an activity shared across generations and across all segments of society;

Whereas thousands of local car clubs and related businesses have been instrumental in preserving a historic part of the heritage of the United States by encouraging the restoration and exhibition of such vintage works of art;

Whereas automotive restoration provides well-paying, high-skilled jobs for people in all 50 States; and

Whereas automobiles have provided the inspiration for music, photography, cinema, fashion, and other artistic pursuits that have become part of the popular culture of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates July 13, 2018, as “Collector Car Appreciation Day”;

(2) recognizes that the collection and restoration of historic and classic cars is an important part of preserving the technological achievements and cultural heritage of the United States; and

(3) encourages the people of the United States to engage in events and commemorations of Collector Car Appreciation Day that create opportunities for collector car owners to educate young people about the importance of preserving the cultural heritage of the United States, including through the collection and restoration of collector cars.

SENATE RESOLUTION 575—HONORING THE MEMORY OF THE 5 VICTIMS OF THE ATTACK AT THE CAPITAL GAZETTE IN ANNAPOLIS, MARYLAND, ON JUNE 28, 2018

Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. McCONNELL, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BAR-RASSO, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BURR, Ms. CANTWELL, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. CASSIDY, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. COONS, Mr. CORKER, Mr. CORNYN, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. DAINES, Mr. DONNELLY, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. ENZI, Mrs. ERNST, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. GARDNER, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GRASSLEY, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. HATCH, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. HELLER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HOEVEN, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. JONES, Mr. KAINA, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LEE, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MCCAIN, Mrs. McCASKILL, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MORAN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. PETERS, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. REED, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SASSE, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SCOTT, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. SHELBY, Ms. SMITH, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. TESTER, Mr. THUNE, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. UDALL, Mr. WARNER, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WICKER, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. YOUNG) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 575

Whereas the Capital Gazette traces its history to 1727 and is one of the oldest newspapers published in the United States;

Whereas the Capital Gazette opposed the Stamp Act, a law that helped to precipitate the American Revolution;

Whereas the Capital Gazette is a sister publication to the Baltimore Sun and maintains a reputation as a trusted and well-respected newspaper outlet that informs and uplifts communities in Annapolis, Anne Arundel County, and Kent Island, Maryland;

Whereas journalism is a cornerstone of the democratic society of the United States;

Whereas local news outlets, including the Capital Gazette—

(1) are focused on delivering truthful and thorough reporting, local investigation, and community advocacy; and

(2) are unfettered by individuals or groups who seek to damage journalistic integrity by demonizing the media, spreading disinformation, and harassing and intimidating dedicated journalists;

Whereas Thomas Jefferson said: “Were it left to me to decide whether we should have a government without newspapers, or newspapers without a government, I should not hesitate a moment to prefer the latter.”;

Whereas, on the afternoon of June 28, 2018, a 38-year-old gunman entered the Capital Gazette newsroom in Annapolis, Maryland, with a shotgun and smoke grenades and killed 5 employees;

Whereas after the Circuit Court of Prince George’s County, Maryland, dismissed a spurious defamation lawsuit filed by the gunman against the Capital Gazette in 2011, the gunman held a grudge against the newspaper and harassed and threatened the staff of the newspaper and other local news outlets and local public officials;

Whereas during the attack, staff inside the building remained committed to their journalistic duty and continued to report by tweeting and sharing information while their lives were in danger;

Whereas officers of the Anne Arundel County Police Department, the Annapolis Police Department, and the Anne Arundel County Sheriff’s Office responded to the scene within 1 minute after receiving the first 911 calls and bravely apprehended the gunman and evacuated the building;

Whereas officers of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives and the Federal Bureau of Investigation and other Federal law enforcement officers also responded swiftly to assist local law enforcement and the Maryland State Police;

Whereas other first responders also arrived on the scene within minutes of the attack, helping save lives and restore order;

Whereas staff from the Capital Gazette and the Baltimore Sun affirmed their dedication to journalistic integrity and released a newspaper the morning following the attack that reported on the shooting and commemorated the lives of their friends and colleagues with 5 heartfelt obituaries;

Whereas the Senate honors—

(1) Gerald Fischman, 61, who was an editor with more than 25 years of service with the Capital Gazette and who was known at the newspaper and throughout the community for his brilliant mind and writing;

(2) Rob Hiaasen, 59, who was a columnist, editor, teacher, and storyteller and who brought compassion and humor to his community-focused reporting;

(3) John McNamara, 56, who was a skilled writer and avid sports fan and who combined these passions in his 24-year career as a sports reporter at the Capital Gazette;

(4) Rebecca Smith, 34, who was a newly-hired sales assistant known for her kindness, compassion, and love for her family; and

(5) Wendi Winters, 65, who was a talented writer who built her career as a public relations professional and journalist and who was well-known for her profound reporting on the lives and achievements of people within the community;

Whereas the community of Anne Arundel County, Maryland, survivors of the attack, loved ones of the victims, and mourners across Maryland came together to express an outpouring of support for the victims and their families;

Whereas the State of Maryland immediately ordered all State flags in Maryland to be flown at half-staff in honor of the victims; and

Whereas the flags of the United States were flown at half-staff across the United States in honor of the Capital Gazette victims on July 3, 2018: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) commemorates the lives, careers, and service of the 5 victims of the shooting, Gerald Fischman, Rob Hiaasen, John McNamara, Rebecca Smith, and Wendi Winters;

(2) honors the survivors of the attack and the families of the victims and pledges continued support for their recovery;

(3) applauds the bravery and professionalism of the staff of the Capital Gazette who remained committed to their journalistic craft and their fallen colleagues during and after the attack;

(4) thanks the State, county, local, and Federal law enforcement officers and other emergency first responders for their heroic actions;

(5) recognizes the unity, compassion, and resilience of the communities of Annapolis, Maryland and Anne Arundel County, Maryland, after the attack;

(6) reaffirms the commitment of the Senate to defending the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States;

(7) honors media and journalism as core institutions of the democracy of the United States; and

(8) respectfully requests that the Secretary of the Senate transmit enrolled copies of this resolution to the Editor-in-Chief of the Capital Gazette.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I have 5 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 BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, July 12, 2018, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled “An overview of the credit bureaus and the fair credit reporting act.”

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

The Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, July 12, 2018, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, July 12, 2018, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled “Implications for U.S. Foreign Policy and the International Economy.”

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, July 12, 2018, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on pending legislation and the following nominations: 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.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, July 12, 2018, at 2 p.m., to conduct a closed hearing.

NATIONAL WHISTLEBLOWER APPRECIATION DAY

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration of and the Senate now proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 558.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 558) designating July 30, 2018, as “National Whistleblower Appreciation Day.”

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. RUBIO. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 558) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of June 28, 2018, under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

COLLECTOR CAR APPRECIATION DAY

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 574, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 574) designating July 13, 2018, as Collector Car Appreciation Day and recognizing that the collection and restoration of historic and classic cars is an important part of preserving the technological achievements and cultural heritage of the United States.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. RUBIO. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 574) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

HONORING THE MEMORY OF THE 5 VICTIMS OF THE ATTACK AT THE CAPITAL GAZETTE IN ANNAPOLIS, MARYLAND

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 575, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 575) honoring the memory of the 5 victims of the attack at the Capital Gazette in Annapolis, Maryland, on June 28, 2018.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. RUBIO. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 575) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, JULY 16, 2018

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 3 p.m., Monday, July 16; 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. I ask that following leader remarks, the Senate proceed to executive session to consider Executive Calendar No. 936, Scott Stump; that the time until 5:30 p.m. be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees and that the Senate then vote on confirmation of the nomination with no intervening action or debate; further, that if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, JULY 16, 2018, AT 3 P.M.

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 5:11 p.m., adjourned until Monday, July 16, 2018, at 3 p.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 12, 2018:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

PAUL C. NEY, JR., OF TENNESSEE, TO BE GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

THE JUDICIARY

KELLY HIGASHI, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AN ASSOCIATE JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FOR THE TERM OF FIFTEEN YEARS.

OFFICE OF GOVERNMENT ETHICS

EMORY A. ROUNDS III, OF MAINE, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF GOVERNMENT ETHICS FOR A TERM OF FIVE YEARS.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

GEORGETTE MOSBACHER, OF FLORIDA, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF POLAND.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING GEORGE CALLAS

HON. PAUL D. RYAN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 12, 2018

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, one of the most significant policy achievements in the last three decades would not have been possible without George Callas. George and I have been kindred spirits in our work to enact historic tax reform. He laid the groundwork for our eventual success with his early work on draft reform legislation while at the Ways and Means Committee, and he drove us over the finish line as my senior tax counsel in the Speaker's Office. I am sad to see him leave but eternally grateful for his lasting contributions to this country. George is a problem solver, relentless, and quite simply the best tax policy mind that I've ever encountered. Some of the most enjoyable moments of my speakership have been batting around tax reform ideas with George. As he departs Congress after nearly 15 years, I wish him and his family all the best and congratulate him on a job well done.

CONGRATULATING THE 4X800M RELAY TEAM OF THE WASHINGTON BLUE JAYS

HON. BLAINE LUETKEMEYER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 12, 2018

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating the 4x800m Relay Team of the Washington Blue Jays for their first-place finish at the 2018 Missouri Class 4 State Track and Field Championship. This 4x800m relay team includes Mikayla Reed, Mia Reed, Morgan Holdmeyer, and Claire Ayers.

The 4x800m Relay Team and their coach should be commended for all of their hard work throughout this past year and for bringing home the state championship to their school and community.

I ask you to join me in recognizing the 4x800m Relay Team for a job well done.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 12, 2018

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, on July 11, on final passage of H.R. 200, The Strengthening Fishing Communities and Increasing Flexibility in Fisheries Management Act, I inadvertently cast my vote contrary to my own intentions. I intended to vote NO on that bill. Had I been present, I would have voted Nay on Roll Call No. 321.

ROBERT SPARKS COAST GUARD PUBLIC SERVICE AWARD

HON. KEN BUCK

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 12, 2018

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the heroic actions of Robert Sparks.

In May, 1957, Mr. Sparks was fishing with his father off of Nahant, MA when they heard distressed cries for help in the distance. Mr. Sparks and his father then sailed to the source of the screams to find Mr. Rudolph Day, who was in the water struggling to remain afloat after his boat had capsized. Mr. Sparks then pulled Mr. Day, who was barely conscious at the time, from the water, performed first aid upon him, and took him safely to shore.

For his swift and critical response to aid Mr. Day, Mr. Sparks received the Coast Guard's Meritorious Public Safety Medal, as his actions well-reflected the ideals and traditions of the USCG. It is this commitment of our servicemen and women to protecting their fellow Americans that allows our country to remain free, prosperous, and secure. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to celebrate the actions of Robert Sparks.

CONGRATULATING BRYAN CANDRL OF THE OWENSVILLE DUTCHMEN

HON. BLAINE LUETKEMEYER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 12, 2018

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Bryan Candrl of the Owensville Dutchmen for his first-place finish in the Pole Vault Field Event at the 2018 Missouri Class 3 State Track and Field Championship.

Bryan and his coach should be commended for all of their hard work throughout this past year and for bringing home the state championship to their school and community.

I ask you to join me in recognizing Bryan Candrl for a job well done.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LYNN JENKINS

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 12, 2018

Ms. JENKINS of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I was absent for Roll Call votes No. 314 and 315 on the evening of July 10, 2018. I would have voted in favor of H.R. 5793, sponsored by Rep. SEAN DUFFY. I would have voted in favor of H.R. 5749, sponsored by Rep. RANDY HULTGREN.

Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 314 and YEA on Roll Call No. 315.

RECOGNIZING COLONEL JOHN WAGNER

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 12, 2018

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to rise today to acknowledge the exceptional career of Colonel John Wagner, United States Air Force. Colonel Wagner is retiring after a dedicated career of military service to our nation. Colonel Wagner exemplifies the qualities of a great leader with a culminating assignment as the United States Air Force Chair and Military Professor at the Dwight D. Eisenhower School for National Security and Resource Strategy. His truly outstanding leadership has contributed greatly to our nation, and it is no doubt that Colonel Wagner's retirement is well earned.

Colonel Wagner's career began at the United States Air Force Academy where he graduated with a degree in Astronautical Engineering in 1991. Subsequently he has had a distinguished career dedicated to our nation's space operations. He is also a graduate of the United States Air Force Institute of Technology, the School of Advanced Air & Space Studies, the Air Command and Staff College, the Air War College and the National War College.

I had the good fortune to meet Colonel Wagner during his tenure as dual commander of the 460th Space Wing and Buckley Air Force Base. Buckley Air Force Base is located in Aurora, Colorado, which I have the honor of representing here in the United States House of Representatives. Colonel Wagner performed exceptionally as the base and wing commander. Some of his key accomplishments include completing the new Block 10 Ground Control System for the Space-Based Infrared System and Defense Support System. Colonel Wagner also worked tirelessly to enhance the health and welfare of those serving on the base by obtaining the funding and approval to develop adequate on base primary medical care facilities. In particular, Colonel Wagner's command time is notable for his broad vision and implementation of the "Team Buckley" concept where the needs of all of the many tenants on the base received his full attention. Most emblematic of this was his support for the Colorado Air National Guard's Compatible Use Buffer Project which plays a key role in protecting the base's flying mission from the threat of encroachment.

Mr. Speaker, Colonel Wagner has led by example throughout his career as a space operator, as a commander and as an instructor. His career as a military leader can serve as an inspiration to all Americans. I thank him for his contribution to the security of our nation and I wish him all the best as he retires from the United States Air Force.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

CONGRATULATING JASMINE EVERS OF THE EUGENE EAGLES

HON. BLAINE LUETKEMEYER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 12, 2018

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Jasmine Evers of the Eugene Eagles for her first-place finish in the Discus Event at the 2018 Missouri Class 2 State Track and Field Championship.

Jasmine and her coach should be commended for all of their hard work throughout this past year and for bringing home the state championship to their school and community.

I ask you to join me in recognizing Jasmine Evers for a job well done.

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE OF RETIRED MISSISSIPPI FIRST JUDICIAL DISTRICT CHANCERY JUDGE CHARLES D. THOMAS

HON. TRENT KELLY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 12, 2018

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor the life of one of Mississippi's most devoted citizens and public servants, retired Chancery Judge Charles D. Thomas. Judge Thomas passed away on Thursday, April 19, 2018. Judge Thomas was born on August 28, 1936, in Collins, Mississippi. His parents were Mr. and Mrs. William Otis Thomas, Sr.

Upon graduation from high school, Judge Thomas attended school at Marion Institute in Alabama. He earned his Juris Doctorate from the University of Mississippi School of Law. Following graduation, Judge Thomas began a distinguished career practicing law at the Doty and Thomas Law Firm in Pontotoc, Mississippi. Judge Thomas was well-known for his skills as an attorney which served him well when he entered into public service as the First Judicial District of Mississippi Chancery Court Judge in 1993. Governor Kirk Fordice appointed Judge Thomas to fill the remainder of the term that was vacated by First Judicial District Chancery Judge Jim Roberts.

Bill Benson, Lee County Chancery Court administrator, said that Judge Thomas was a good judge who was known for being fair. "Judge Thomas was a fair judge with rulings that were on point," Benson said. "He was well in command of his courtroom. You had no doubt who was in charge."

Judge Thomas was also known to be a loyal friend. If you were his friend, he would go to any lengths to help you. Danny Weatherly, a devoted friend of Judge Thomas in Pontotoc, said he was a person who enjoyed conversations with people from all walks of life. "He was an intelligent, successful man and down to earth," Weatherly said. "He loved to fellowship with everyone—especially those who loved Ole Miss Athletics as much as he did."

Judge Thomas made friends in both the civilian and military worlds. He was a U.S. Army veteran. He served as a commander in the Pontotoc National Guard. Additionally, Judge

Thomas was a member of the Pontotoc American Legion Post #16 and the Pontotoc Masonic Lodge #81. Judge Thomas was an active member of the Pontotoc Rotary Club. He also served on the First National Bank Board of Directors.

In 2006, Judge Thomas retired from public office and spent much of his time studying his favorite book—the Holy Bible. He was known as a scholar of the Bible and enjoyed studying scripture in a variety of translations. His favorite Bible verse was John 3:16, "For God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life."

Judge Thomas is a man I am grateful to have known. His devotion to God, America and his fellow man will always be remembered. My thoughts and prayers are with Judge Thomas' family and friends.

RECOGNIZING PRESIDENTIAL AWARD WINNER DR. MARIA DELORES CIMINI OF THE STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK AT ALBANY

HON. PAUL TONKO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 12, 2018

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate an extraordinary constituent, Dr. Maria Delores Cimini, who was recently awarded the Presidential Award for Excellence in Science, Mathematics and Engineering Mentoring by the National Science Foundation.

As a leader and mentor, Dr. Cimini has helped countless individuals, especially women with disabilities, study science, technology, engineering, and mathematics. Drawing on her background as a psychologist and her own experience living with a visual disability, she has paved the way for many to follow their curiosity and realize their potential through STEM education.

Dr. Cimini currently works as an Adjunct Clinical Professor in the School of Education at the University at Albany, a position she's held for more than 20 years. She has also served as Assistant Director for Prevention and Program Evaluation of the University's Counseling Center for more than 10 years.

Our National Institutes of Health and the U.S. Department of Education have both recognized Dr. Cimini with numerous awards for her extraordinary work. In 2012, President Obama recognized her in a White House ceremony as a "Champion of Change in STEM." Her repeated national recognition reflects her enduring work that has changed the lives of so many.

I am honored to congratulate Dr. Cimini for earning her most recent impressive distinction, and thank her for her selfless commitment to serving and educating others. We can all learn from her example.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. GUS M. BILIRAKIS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 12, 2018

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, July 10, 2018, I was unavoidably detained and

was unable to make votes that evening. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" for:

Roll Call 314, H.R. 5793—Housing Choice Voucher Mobility Demonstration Act; and Roll Call 315, H.R. 5749—Options Markets Stability Act.

RECOGNIZING HARRISON FRAN OF THE RUSSELLVILLE INDIANS

HON. BLAINE LUETKEMEYER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 12, 2018

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Harrison Fran of the Russellville Indians for his first-place finish in the 800m Run at the 2018 Missouri Class 2 State Track and Field Championship.

Harrison and his coach should be commended for all of their hard work throughout this past year and for bringing home the state championship to their school and community.

I ask you to join me in recognizing Harrison Fran for a job well done.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LYNN JENKINS

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 12, 2018

Ms. JENKINS of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I was absent for Roll Call votes No. 316, 317, 318, 319, and 320 on the evening of July 11, 2018. Had I been present, I would have voted Yea on Roll Call No. 316; Yea on Roll Call No. 317; Yea on Roll Call No. 318; Yea on Roll Call No. 319; Nay on Roll Call No. 320; and Yea on Roll Call No. 321.

HONORING MENTIS, NAPA'S CENTER FOR MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 12, 2018

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mentis, Napa's Center for Mental Health Services, for its 70 years of service to Napa County, California.

Mentis opened in 1948 as Family Service, an agency dedicated to assisting Napa's veterans and their families. In 2015, the organization moved to a new, expanded clinic and changed its name to Mentis, Napa's Center for Mental Health Services, to reflect the expansion of its work to accommodate residents of every age, stage, and income level.

The staff at Mentis is committed to giving the best possible assistance and seeks to meet clients wherever they have need, including at schools, senior living homes and family resource centers county-wide. The dedicated staff members provide bi-lingual services that are tailored to the clients' backgrounds and cultures. Through these efforts, Mentis is able to assist community members that may have

no other options available. Mentis achieves excellent results well above the national average, with 80 percent of its clients reporting improvements in emotional wellness and daily functioning.

Mentis is the oldest continually operating non-profit in Napa County, and in its 70 years of service, Mentis has proven to be a mental health champion for all of our Napa community. With the help of partners all around the County, Mentis runs a diversity of programs including supportive housing programs, dementia and depression interventions for older residents and those recovering from natural disasters. Its work was invaluable during the October 2017 wildfires. The staff at Mentis provided support and counsel for 700 individuals and families who were affected by the fires that tore through our community.

Mr. Speaker, Mentis, Napa's Center for Mental Health Services, has been an incredible resource for our community for the last 70 years. Therefore, it is fitting and proper that we honor its continued service here today.

**CONGRATULATING ANNA HEACOCK
OF THE FESTUS TIGERS**

HON. BLAINE LUETKEMEYER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 12, 2018

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Anna Heacock of the Festus Tigers for her first-place finish in the 300m Hurdles at the 2018 Missouri Class 2 State Track and Field Championship.

Anna and her coach should be commended for all of their hard work throughout this past year and for bringing home the state championship to their school and community.

I ask you to join me in recognizing Anna Heacock for a job well done.

TRIBUTE TO JOHN MACK

HON. JAMES E. CLYBURN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 12, 2018

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a great American and South Carolina native, John Mack. John, the former longtime President of the Los Angeles Urban League who spent eight years on L.A.'s Police Commission passed away June 21st after a long battle with cancer. He was 81 years old and will be sorely missed.

The Los Angeles Times recently wrote John Mack was "one of L.A.'s most influential black figures" on the subject of police reform. He led the Los Angeles Urban League through wide-ranging and significant changes for nearly 36 years. He saw the election of the first black mayor in Tom Bradley, the advancement of African Americans in prominent positions in the city and the emergence of a growing black-Latino coalition, and gained international recognition in 1992 when leading then-President George H.W. Bush on a tour after the 1992 Los Angeles riots that were precipitated by the arrest and videotaped beating of Rodney King by members of the Los Angeles po-

lice Department; and called for the resignation of then-Police Chief Daryl F. Gates.

The Times continued, "[t]hrough the Urban League he offered services to some of L.A.'s most disenfranchised citizens" and "improved the lives of countless black and brown people in the city." Even after his retirement from his official duties, Mack remained influential behind the scenes and recently played a key role in the hiring of a new police chief strong on police reform and the effort to eradicate police brutality and racism within the LAPD.

John Mack was born in Kingstree, South Carolina on January 6, 1937, and grew up in Darlington, South Carolina. His father was a Methodist minister and his mother a public school teacher. Being PKs (preacher's kids), was a bond we shared throughout our many years of friendship. He attended North Carolina A&T State University, where he was the president of the NAACP chapter. He graduated in 1958 with a degree in applied sociology. He later earned a master's degree in social work from Clark Atlanta University.

John began his professional career in Oxnard, California at the Camarillo State Mental Hospital. He later served as the executive director of the Flint Urban League in Flint, Michigan from 1964 to 1969. He returned to California for good in 1969.

In 1959, John married Harriet Johnson Mack, an elementary school teacher, who predeceased him in death. They had three children.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the House to join me in acknowledging the work and leadership of the late great John Mack.

**CONGRATULATING EMMA
HOMFELDT OF THE CALVARY
LUTHERAN LIONS**

HON. BLAINE LUETKEMEYER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 12, 2018

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Emma Homfeldt of the Calvary Lutheran Lions for her first-place finish in the 800m Run at the 2018 Missouri Class 1 State Track and Field Championship.

Emma and her coach should be commended for all of their hard work throughout this past year and for bringing home the state championship to their school and community.

I ask you to join me in recognizing Emma Homfeldt for a job well done.

**PAYING TRIBUTE TO LARRY LANDIS ON THE OCCASION OF HIS
RETIREMENT AS EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE INDIANA PUBLIC
DEFENDER COUNCIL**

HON. SUSAN W. BROOKS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 12, 2018

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Larry Landis on the occasion of his retirement as Executive Director of the Indiana Public Defender Council. For the past 41 years, Larry has devoted his life to ensuring those unable to afford counsel have ex-

ceptional legal representation. For the entirety of his career, Larry was instrumental in public defense reforms, developing and advising talented lawyers, and encouraging others to become public defenders. The people of Indiana's Fifth Congressional District are forever grateful for Larry's commitment to the law and for educating decades of Indiana law students.

A lifelong Hoosier, Larry was raised in Highland, Indiana. He attended Indiana University where he graduated with a bachelor's degree in business in 1969. Interested in the legal system, he earned his juris doctorate from the Indiana University Robert H. McKinney School of Law in 1973. A true public servant, Larry began his law career as a deputy state public defender. His passion for legislation advocacy led him to work on criminal code reform in 1976, 1977, and in 2014, which focused on ensuring Indiana's criminal justice system values restoration over punishment. Throughout his career, Larry worked with the Indiana General Assembly in crafting criminal and juvenile justice bills. His many appearances testifying before the Indiana General Assembly, as well as providing significant input on most bills affecting the criminal justice system has been invaluable to the state of Indiana.

An exceptional leader, Larry helped establish the Indiana Public Defender Council when it was created in 1977. In 1980, he became Executive Director where he conducted over 350 seminars and workshops, published six manuals and numerous articles on criminal defense, and lectured on a variety of criminal justice topics. He later drafted legislation that created the Indiana Public Defender Commission in 1989, an organization that recommends standards for low income defense in capital cases, adopts guidelines of salary and fee schedules for individual county reimbursement eligibility, and reviews and approves requests for reimbursement in capital and non-capital cases. Ever dedicated to the Commission's mission, Larry now serves as an advisor.

Passionate about education, Larry became an adjunct professor in trial advocacy at IU McKinney Law School in 1981, where he founded the Trial Skills Practice course. Larry recruited a network of highly respected and qualified trial lawyers and judges to teach, providing students with an exceptional experiential learning experience. As a third year IU McKinney Law student in 1985, I am among the countless lawyers who benefited from Larry Landis's Trial Skills Practice class. More importantly, a multitude of clients have benefited from the enhanced skills of those fortunate enough to have participated in this critically important course for future trial lawyers.

Larry has been honored with numerous awards in the public and private sectors. Notably, he received the Hoosier Freedom Award from the Indiana Trial Lawyers Association in 2012, the Chancellor's Award for Excellence in Teaching from Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis (IUPUI) in 2010, as well as the Part-Time Teaching Award from Indiana University President Michael McRobbie, in 2010. Additionally, he received the Marc Emery Award from the Marion County Public Defender Agency Board of Directors in 2007, the Distinguished Teaching Award from Indiana University School of Law in Indianapolis in 1998 and 1999, the Reginald Heber Smith Award from the National Legal Aid and Defender Association in 1996, and the Criminal

Justice Service Award from the Indiana State Bar Association Criminal Justice Section in 1996.

Larry's life-long commitment to justice and public defense led to his service on the board of directors at the Indiana Criminal Justice Institute, the Commission on Children, and the Commission on the Interstate Compact on Probation and Parole. He has also served as a member of the American Bar Association, National Legal Aid and Defender Association, National Association of Criminal Defense Lawyers, Indiana State Bar Association, International Bar Association, the Public Defender Commission, the Criminal Code Evaluation Commission and the Criminal Law and Sentencing Policy Study Committee.

Larry has made a remarkable impact on his community and the lives of his friends, family, and colleagues. He has truly left a legacy of success at the Indiana Public Defender Council and in the State of Indiana that will be built upon for years to come. On behalf of Indiana's Fifth Congressional District, I congratulate Larry Landis on his extraordinary career and extend my gratitude for all the wonderful contributions he has made to our Hoosier community. I wish the very best to my dear friend and his family, and hope that he will have many happy times on the golf course and beyond as he enjoys a well-deserved retirement.

CONGRATULATING GABRIEL KURTZ OF THE CAMDENTON LAKERS

HON. BLAINE LUETKEMEYER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 12, 2018

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Gabriel Kurtz of the Camdenton Lakers for his first-place finish in the Javelin Field Event at the 2018 Missouri Class 4 State Track and Field Championship.

Gabriel and his coach should be commended for all of their hard work throughout this past year and for bringing home the state championship to their school and community.

I ask you to join me in recognizing Gabriel Kurtz for a job well done.

RECOGNIZING THE SERVICE OF UNITED STATES ARMY NATIONAL GUARD COLONEL (COL) CHESTER GUYER

HON. TRENT KELLY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 12, 2018

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in honor of Colonel (COL) Chester Guyer's 31 years of service in the U.S. Army National Guard (ARNG). During his long and distinguished career, COL Guyer demonstrated his commitment to our nation, serving in numerous leadership roles and staff positions. COL Guyer began his military career in 1986, when he joined the Pennsylvania National Guard. In 1988, COL Guyer graduated from Shippensburg University in Pennsylvania with a degree in Education and an Armor Offi-

cer commission as second lieutenant. COL Guyer was first assigned to Company D, 1–103rd Armor in Chambersburg, Pennsylvania, where he served as Armor platoon leader, company executive officer, and company commander in traditional status.

In 1994, COL Guyer and his wife, Michele, moved to Jackson, Mississippi, where he served in the 2–198 Armor Battalion, Headquarters and Headquarters Company (HHC) Executive Officer for the 155 Separate Armor Brigade. Additionally, COL Guyer served as the Brigade Logistic Coordinator for the brigade rotation at the National Training Center (NTC), Fort Irwin, California, in the Active Duty for Special Work (ADSW) program.

Entering Title 10 Active Guard Reserve (AGR) status in 1999, COL Guyer was assigned to the Fort Knox Armor School. As an instructor for the team, COL Guyer assisted with the development and execution of the Armor Captain Career Course—Distant Learning. In 2002, COL Guyer was assigned as the deputy chief of the Training Development Division (TDD) at the Fort Knox Armor School, and oversaw the development of all programs of instruction.

From 2003 to 2006, COL Guyer served as the assistant to the commander at the Army Training Support Center (ATSC), Fort Eustis, Virginia. He worked on a wide range of training support issues, including development of distribution plans for training devices for the ARNG, and ensuring Army training support for deploying ARNG units. From March until August 2005, COL Guyer served as the ATSC training support representative (forward), in Kuwait. During this period, COL Guyer was instrumental in fielding laser marksmanship training devices to AC and ARNG units in Afghanistan and Iraq, in accordance with the vice chief of staff of Army guidance. COL Guyer also helped to build long-term training capabilities at Camp Buehring, Kuwait.

In 2006, COL Guyer was assigned as the executive officer for the Training Division at the ARNG Readiness Center in Arlington, Virginia. Selected for promotion to lieutenant colonel, COL Guyer was assigned as the chief of the Training Support Branch within the Training Division in February 2007, and was promoted lieutenant colonel in April 2007. Additionally, COL Guyer served as the ARNG lead for the development of the Muscatatuck Urban Training Center (MUTC), a sub-installation of Camp Atterbury, Indiana.

Selected for command, COL Guyer was assigned to be the first commander of the Operations Training Group (OTC) at MUTC. He assumed command on July 1, 2009. The OTC conducted monthly integrated civilian—military field training events to prepare U.S. government civilians to operate with military security in Afghanistan and Iraq. Upon completion of command, COL Guyer was reassigned to the Army G3 in the Collective Training Division (CTD), where he managed active and reserve component training support funding programs.

Following assignment as deputy chief of staff for the deputy commanding general—National Guard at U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC) headquarters, COL Guyer was selected for promotion to colonel in 2014, and was reassigned to North American Aerospace Defense Command (NORAD) and the United States Northern Command (USNORTHCOM) as Deputy Command Center Director and the Chief of the Support and Crew Operations (SCO) division.

His final assignment prior to retirement was Chief, Strategic Plans Division (SPD), National Guard Bureau, J5. Retired U.S. Army Major (MAJ) Christine Langin, SPD interorganizational strategist & planner, recently said COL Guyer's impact on the SPD cannot be overstated. "His methodical and approachable manner brought the concept of integrating National Guard all hazards support planning to a higher level, across new audiences, and into new sectors," MAJ Langin said. "COL Guyer collaborated with more diversified partners than the NGB had ever done before, while simultaneously strengthening existing partnerships. This effort was critical during the historic hurricane season of 2017, where COL Guyer led the National Guard Bureau Future Plans Center and anticipated the support requirements to all of the impacted states, as well as those states providing response assets. COL Guyer will be long respected and spoken of, particularly when NGB remembers leaders who were given tough problems and always delivered thoughtful solutions."

Colonel (COL) Douglas C. Rose, Jr., NORAD and USNORTHCOM LNO to FEMA Engineer, said COL Guyer distinguished himself throughout his career. COL Rose recommended COL Guyer for the Legion of Merit Award in recognition of his meritorious service. "COL Guyer's service was marked with effective leadership, keen analysis, and superb dedication that proved invaluable to the U.S. Army, the Army National Guard and the National Guard Bureau," COL Rose said. "The singularly distinctive accomplishments of COL Guyer culminate a long and distinguished career in the service of this country and reflect great credit upon himself, the Army National Guard, and the United States Army."

COL Guyer's many awards and decorations include The Legion of Merit, the Defense Meritorious Award, the Army Meritorious Service Medal with six Oak Leaf Clusters, the Army Commendation Service Medal, the Mississippi Magnolia Medal, the Indiana Distinguished Service Medal, the Order of Saint George (Bronze) Medal, and the Army Staff Identification Badge.

COL Guyer is a member of the United States Armor Association and the Mississippi Army National Guard Association.

Throughout his career, COL Guyer has been supported by his loving family, including his wife, Michele; and his two daughters, Julia and Madeline.

I am grateful for COL Guyer's service to our great nation. He is a trusted friend. I wish him all the best in his future endeavors.

IN HONOR OF THE ONE YEAR ANNIVERSARY OF THE DEATH OF LIU XIAOBO AND IN RECOGNITION OF PRISONERS OF CONSCIENCE IN CHINA

HON. BARBARA COMSTOCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 12, 2018

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the one-year anniversary of the death of Liu Xiaobo, Chinese writer, human rights activist and Nobel Peace Prize laureate. Renowned as a freedom fighter, he is praised for his long and non-violent struggle for fundamental human rights in China.

Mr. Xiaobo was instrumental in the 1989 Tiananmen Square protests, one of the most significant protests of communist rule in China.

Throughout his life, his works were banned and censored by the communist Chinese government. Mr. Xiaobo drafted some of the most influential literature to protest Chinese communism including The Monologues of a Doomsday's Survivor and the October Tenth Declaration and created the Independent Chinese PEN Centre, a nongovernmental, non-profit and nonpartisan organization offering free association for Chinese writers.

Mr. Xiaobo was formally arrested four times by the Chinese government under such charges as "inciting subversion of state power." His works were deemed subversive by the Chinese Communist Party and actively censored. On June 26, 2017, Mr. Xiaobo was released from his prison sentence on medical parole after being diagnosed with terminal liver cancer. Mr. Xiaobo died on July 13, 2017 in Shenyang, China. Many believe his imprisonment greatly contributed to his deteriorating health.

Throughout his life, his work received international recognition as a defender of freedom from groups such as Reporters Without Borders, the Nobel Prize Committee, Hong Kong Human Rights Press, and many others. As a Member of the Tom Lantos Human Rights Commission, I feel especially motivated to bring to light Mr. Xiaobo's work.

Today, many others like Mr. Xiaobo are detained by their government as prisoners of conscience—a person who has been imprisoned for holding political or religious views that are not tolerated by their own government. We are grateful to live in a nation where our freedom of religion, press, speech, right to assemble and petition the government are protected at the highest level. With these remarks, I would like to commemorate a wonderful life dedicated to human rights and political freedom and bring attention to the many others who are threatened with becoming prisoners of conscience.

**CONGRATULATING KYLIE MEIER
OF THE CAMDENTON LAKERS**

HON. BLAINE LUETKEMEYER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 12, 2018

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Kylie Meier of the Camdenton Lakers for her first-place finish in the 100m and 300m Hurdles at the 2018 Missouri Class 4 State Track and Field Championship.

Kylie and her coach should be commended for all of their hard work throughout this past year and for bringing home the state championship to their school and community.

I ask you to join me in recognizing Kylie Meier for a job well done.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ROD BLUM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 12, 2018

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to vote on July 11, 2018 due to the Vice Presi-

dent's visit to the First District of Iowa. Had I been present, I would have voted NAY on Roll Call No. 320 and YEA on Roll Call No. 321.

HONORING DOUG McILROY

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 12, 2018

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with the Honorable JARED HUFFMAN to honor Doug McIlroy for his commitment to sustainable agriculture and his work to protect the jobs and livelihoods of farmers in our community from overregulation. Mr. McIlroy is being honored with the Luther Burbank Conservation Award by the Sonoma County Farm Bureau.

Mr. McIlroy was born in England and moved with his family to Marin County, California when he was an infant. He developed a passion for agriculture from an early age. He spent his summers driving tractors and picking prunes on his family's Aquarius Ranch near the Russian River in Healdsburg, California. Mr. McIlroy studied at the Santa Rosa Junior College and graduated from the University of California, Davis, with degrees in economics and plant science.

In 2001, Mr. McIlroy was recruited by Rodney Strong Vineyards to manage its estate vineyards and be its Director of Winegrowing. Due in no small part to his leadership, vineyards at Rodney Strong are now 100 percent sustainable. Much like the Sonoma County Winegrowers' mission, Mr. McIlroy's goal is for all of Sonoma County vineyards to be sustainably farmed.

In addition to his work at Rodney Strong Vineyards, Mr. McIlroy also sits on the Board of Directors for Sonoma County Winegrowers, United Winegrowers of Sonoma County and the American Vineyard Foundation. Within these organizations, Mr. McIlroy has worked tirelessly on environmental issues and has been at the forefront of every water issue growers have faced.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. McIlroy is a passionate farmer, environmentalist and scientist who has a record for giving back to our agricultural community. It is therefore fitting and proper that we honor Doug McIlroy here today.

HONORING THE BRYAN/COLLEGE STATION CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

HON. BILL FLORES

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 12, 2018

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 100th Anniversary of the Bryan/College Station Chamber of Commerce.

In 1900, several Bryan businesspersons recognized the need for a collective organization aimed at improving business in the area. After several months of planning, the Bryan Business League held its first meeting. The organization has been known by many names including the Bryan Commercial Club, the Downtown Bryan Merchants Association, and the Bryan & Brazos Industrial League. In 1918 they settled on another name, the Bryan and

Brazos Chamber of Commerce which is now known as the Bryan/College Station Chamber of Commerce.

Over the years, the Chamber has established itself as one of the best Chambers in the state of Texas, and it has played a large part in the development of the economies of both Bryan and the neighboring community of College Station. Today the Chamber's membership has grown to over 1,500 businesses including Fortune 100 companies, small-to-medium sized business, non-profits, civic organizations, divisions of Texas A&M University System, Blinn College, representatives from local city and county governments, and individual citizens. The Bryan/College Station Chamber of Commerce unites business, civic, academia and government leaders with leadership focused programs and special events.

Like other Chambers of Commerce across the country, the Bryan/College Station Chamber is the voice of the business community to elected officials of local, state and federal governments. Once a year, members of the Chamber come to Washington to advocate for policies that will help our nation's business owners and employees. I always look forward to hosting the Bryan/College Station Chamber; and my team and I take great pride in making sure they feel welcome and at home.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in commemorating the centennial anniversary of the Bryan/College Station Chamber of Commerce and recognizing their years of service to the Brazos Valley. It is an honor for me to represent such an outstanding group of entrepreneurs, local leaders, and visionaries in Congress.

I have requested that a United States flag be flown over our nation's Capitol to honor the Bryan/College Station Chamber of Commerce on its 100th anniversary.

As I close, I ask everyone to continue praying for our country, our military, and our first responders who selflessly serve and sacrifice to protect us.

**CONGRATULATING MIKAYLA REED
OF THE WASHINGTON HIGH SCHOOL BLUE JAYS**

HON. BLAINE LUETKEMEYER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 12, 2018

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Mikayla Reed of the Washington High School Blue Jays for her first-place finish in the 800m, 1600m, 3200m Run at the 2018 Missouri Class 4 State Track and Field Championship.

Mikayla and her coach should be commended for all of their hard work throughout this past year and for bringing home the state championship to their school and community.

I ask you to join me in recognizing Mikayla Reed for a job well done.

CONGRATULATIONS TO SERGEANT MAJOR MICHAEL CLEMENS ON 30 YEARS OF SERVICE

HON. BILLY LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 12, 2018

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Sergeant Major Michael Clemens of Republic, Missouri, as he retires after 30 years of service in the United States Army.

Sergeant Major Clemens began his career in high school with service in the Missouri Army National Guard, but soon transitioned to the U.S. Army as an active duty soldier. In his 30 years, he served in many different places, including in the Middle East and all throughout the U.S. While serving overseas, Sergeant Major Clemens took part in Operations Iraqi Freedom, Desert Storm and Intrinsic Action.

To add to his already long résumé, Sergeant Major Clemens worked diligently to complete every level of training in the Non-commissioned Officer Education System, leading to his graduation from the United States Sergeants Major Academy.

Sergeant Major Clemens exemplifies the sought-after traits of leadership, courage, responsibility and discipline. Throughout the course of his career he received numerous awards, including five Army Commendation Medals, the Afghanistan Campaign Medal with three stars, the Humanitarian Service Medal and a list of others. His commitment to his country exists not only on the large scale of his sacrifice, but also in participating in one of our most fundamental rights as American citizens that of voting, and his consistent voting record through his absentee voting in primary and general elections as he served abroad.

Sergeant Major Clemens has shown time and time again that he is worthy of the awards and recognition he has received throughout his time serving our great nation. I am honored to congratulate him on his successful career and I am confident that his strong character will lead him to continue to make positive impacts on the world around him.

CONGRATULATIONS TO JUDY SCHNEIDER

HON. JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 12, 2018

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, like so many of my colleagues, I rely on Judy Schneider of the Congressional Research Service. A long-time Hill staffer with 42 years of Congressional experience, she is a valued source of guidance and trusted source of information. Tomorrow, Judy will receive the Congressional Management Foundation's first Staff Lifetime Achievement Democracy Award, and I can think of no one more deserving of that honor.

Judy literally wrote the book on Congressional procedures—The Congressional Deskbook—which she co-authored with Michael Koempel. In addition to giving us this written reference guide, Judy is always available to give personal guidance. Her knowledge and her creativity are both invaluable and legendary.

When I got to Congress, one of the first things I did was reach out to Judy to train my staff and me. She taught us how to use sometimes arcane rules and procedures to get things done. Whenever we had a question about committee or floor procedures or wanted to know about Congressional precedent, we called Judy Schneider. We still do today. Judy is always available to answer our questions—and to let us know the questions we should have been asking, then answer those as well.

Throughout her career, Judy has served to help all of us on the Hill and many off the Hill understand how Congress was designed to work, how it actually works and how we could make it work better. Her commitment to public service, her love of the institution and its people, and her willingness to share her gifts are evident. Judy is valued and a valuable resource, and she is also my friend.

I congratulate Judy on winning the Democracy Award, and thank her for all the help she's given me and so many others. I look forward to benefitting from her wisdom for years to come.

CONGRATULATING GAVIN WEATHERS OF THE VIENNA EAGLES

HON. BLAINE LUETKEMEYER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 12, 2018

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Gavin Weathers of the Vienna Eagles for his first-place finish in the Discus Event at the 2018 Missouri Class 2 State Track and Field Championship.

Gavin and his coach should be commended for all of their hard work throughout this past year and for bringing home the state championship to their school and community.

I ask you to join me in recognizing Gavin Weathers for a job well done.

RECOGNIZING RICK GONZALES, SR.

HON. JOHN GARAMENDI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 12, 2018

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Rick Gonzales, Sr. and his family for their selfless service to their community.

As a young child, Rick Gonzales, Sr. made it to the fifth grade before it became evident that he needed to work on the family farm to help provide for the family, but his desire to learn and have a good education never wavered. As a young adult, Rick Sr. was drafted and proudly served our country during the WWII Pacific campaign in Okinawa. Upon his honorable discharge he enrolled in barber school, where he met his wife, Angela. Together, they raised four sons, Laverne, Rick Jr., Garry and Jerry. Barber school would soon prove to be far more than a career decision; it was a move that would begin Rick's lifelong journey as an agent for change.

In 1953, Rick Sr. opened Rick's Top Hat barbershop, and the business soon became the central hub of information on political and

social issues. Soon after, Rick and Angela knew that women in the community would also be an important component, and Angela opened Velvet Touch Beauty Salon. Rick Sr. had a passion to make a difference. He wanted to give a voice to the voiceless and restore hope to those who couldn't. Rick and Angela relished in these "teaching moments," of listening, guiding and helping their community.

In 1970, Rick became co-founder of the Mexican-American Concilio of Yolo County, which operated with five employees serving the Latino community. Rick Gonzales, Sr. has been recognized by his community for his outstanding accomplishments and activism. The Yolo County Department of Social Services has named their building the Rick Gonzales Building and in 2018, the city of Woodland honored him by naming their newest park after him.

Rick Gonzales, Sr. valued education and instilled the importance in his children as they were growing up. All four pursued and received higher education degrees with three receiving their Masters degrees. Continuing his father's legacy and under his mentorship until 2004, Rick Gonzales, Jr. joined the Concilio and currently serves as their President. In 1998, under his leadership, Rick Jr. created the Annual Concilio Recognition Dinner & Scholarship Fundraiser, which awarded two scholarships the first year. Rick has devoted the past twenty years raising awareness for the scholarship dinners and this year reached a milestone of raising \$400,000 for 1000 scholarships awarded. His passion and service to the community is admirable.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Rick Gonzales, Sr. and his family for their incredible dedication, selfless service and contributions to the Yolo County community.

IN THANKS FOR THE SERVICE OF MY LONGTIME CHIEF OF STAFF, OLIVER SCHWAB

HON. DAVID SCHWEIKERT

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 12, 2018

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, this week I bid farewell to my longtime Chief of Staff, Oliver Schwab, who served with great heart and commitment in this body for nearly a decade.

Since Oliver's announcement on Monday that he would be transitioning his role to pursue new opportunities, I have been moved by hundreds of people who have come up to me to share just how much Oliver's friendship has meant to them. As a mentor, Oliver has been devoted to helping others discover qualities and confidences that they did not always know they possessed. As a mentee, Oliver has sought guidance and perspective with the kind of dedication to lifelong learning that only the finest of others can bestow.

Oliver is the best that I have ever seen at helping others work through their needs. Anyone who knows Oliver can attest to his passion for history, love for our country, and work to restore civility to our politics.

Oliver began serving as my Chief of Staff in January 2011 after managing my successful 2010 election to the U.S. House of Representatives. Since that time, Oliver has guided an

inspired management approach, building one of the best teams on Capitol Hill. Just this year, the Congressional Management Foundation recognized Oliver's efforts by naming our office a finalist for the first-ever Democracy Award highlighting excellence in workplace culture. Oliver's academic focus on behavioral science, talent management, and decision theory has made him one of the most effective practitioners of leadership.

I will always be grateful for the manner in which Oliver directed strategy and operations to help me achieve two seats on the U.S. House Financial Services Committee followed by a seat on the U.S. House Ways and Means Committee. Additionally, Oliver masterfully directed a member services initiative that enabled me to secure a cardinal seat on the U.S. House Republican Steering Committee.

I thank Oliver for the talented hard work and devotion that he has given me, the people of Arizona, and the United States Congress. I am going to miss having him by my side, but I know there are great things in store for him next. Oliver and Ana will always have my support and friendship.

HONORING THE OPENING OF THE GREATER ELGIN FAMILY CARE CENTER

HON. RAJA KRISHNAMOORTHI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 12, 2018

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI. Mr. Speaker, today I honor the Greater Elgin Family Care Center on the occasion of the Grand Opening of its Summit Health Center on July 12, 2018.

With the addition of the new Summit Health Center, the Greater Elgin Family Care Center now serves five counties with a total of nine health care facilities.

Since its establishment in 2001, the Center has made a great impact in Elgin and its surrounding communities. The Center employs more than 275 workers who, in 2017, provided assistance to more than 47,000 patients including 13,659 residents of the City of Elgin—14 percent of the City's population. Additionally, in 2017, Center professionals delivered 774 newborns. It provides care for patients regardless of their insurance status.

The Center is Elgin's largest not-for-profit organization (excluding the schools and hospital systems). In 2017, the Center was recognized as a Hypertension Control Champion by the Centers for Disease Control, the only community health center in Illinois to receive this honor.

For more than 17 years, the Greater Elgin Family Care Center has touched lives and provided exceptional care to residents in the Illinois 8th congressional district and beyond. I am grateful for its work, and I hope for its continued success.

I include in the RECORD this statement today to honor Greater Elgin Family Care Center in Elgin, Illinois on July 12th.

HONORING AL GERHARDT

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 12, 2018

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with the Honorable JARED HUFFMAN to honor Al Gerhardt for his lifetime commitment to Sonoma County agriculture and to recognize his unparalleled contributions to our farming community.

Mr. Gerhardt was born in 1938 and grew up in Sebastopol, California and attended Green Valley School. He graduated from Analy High School and was a member of the school's chapter of Future Farmers of America (FFA). Mr. Gerhardt was married to Pat Jesse from 1963 until she passed away. They had four children, Kathe, Gerry, Diana and the late Anna Marie. In 2000, he married Jan Smith and they moved to the family ranch near Occidental, California.

Mr. Gerhardt served on the Sonoma County Farm Bureau Board of Directors for sixteen years. While on the Board, he was on many committees, including agriculture education, membership and water. Mr. Gerhardt was known for his attention to detail and dedication to the Farm Bureau. He read the monthly Board packets cover to cover to ensure he was ready to discuss the issues facing Sonoma County farmers and ranchers and rarely missed a meeting.

Agriculture was a passion and community involvement was a lifestyle for Mr. Gerhardt. His dedication to our farming community is a main reason agriculture is still vital to Sonoma County's identity. Mr. Gerhardt was a supporter of FFA and 4-H and loved to support and encourage young farmers. He was a founder and director of the North Coast Livestock Protective Association and was a Commissioner on the County of Sonoma's Fish and Wildlife Commission. He was also a member of the Sonoma County Taxpayers Association and the Sonoma County Trailblazers. Mr. Gerhardt was an active member of St. Philip's Catholic Church in Occidental, California and was a committed volunteer for the Rural Food Program of St. Philip and St. Teresa Parish.

Mr. Speaker, Al Gerhardt was always willing to lend a hand and help our community flourish. He was a devoted steward of the land and was dedicated to preserving Sonoma County's agricultural integrity and history. It is therefore fitting and proper that we honor him here today.

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE OF HOMER E. (BILLY) BREWER

HON. TRENT KELLY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 12, 2018

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize the life of former high school and college head football coach Homer E. (Billy) Brewer, who died on May 12, 2018, in Memphis, Tennessee. Coach Brewer served as head football coach throughout his long and distinguished career, leading young men to excel on the football field for 34 years.

He was a true leader both on and off the field, earning the respect and admiration of many.

Coach Brewer, a native of Columbus, Mississippi, played football for Lee High School. Upon graduation from high school, he attended the University of Mississippi, where he played defensive back for the Ole Miss Rebels. Following graduation from the University of Mississippi, Coach Brewer began coaching football at Lee High School. He coached ten successful seasons which included multiple Big Eight Conference championships.

It was during his time as head coach for Lee High School that Coach Brewer chose Robert Youngblood to be an assistant coach for the football team. Mr. Youngblood assisted Coach Brewer on the field in the years to follow at Southeastern Louisiana University, Louisiana Tech University, and the University of Mississippi. Mr. Youngblood said the two became close friends and were loyal to each other. "He would let you coach," Mr. Youngblood said. "He was a good person to work for and to work with. We became more than acquaintances. We became friends."

It was important to Coach Brewer to build and maintain relationships with his players which enhanced their performance on the football field. "One of his strong suits was Coach Brewer's ability to identify, motivate, and be a player's coach," Mr. Youngblood said. "The players respected him and played hard for him." While serving as head coach for the Ole Miss Rebels, the team had 67 wins which placed him as the second most winningest coach in school history. Current Ole Miss Head Coach Matt Luke issued a statement to the Associated Press following Coach Brewer's passing. "He was greatly admired by his players and his teammates," Coach Luke said. "He will forever be engrained in the history of Rebel Football."

Brett Brewer, Coach Brewer's son, said his father's accomplishments were more than his record. "He taught life lessons to the young men he coached," Brewer said. "His legacy is within them—not just the wins and the losses." Brewer said his dad loved coaching, but above all, he loved people.

Coach Brewer was preceded in death by his wife of 51 years, Kay Gunter Brewer; and his two brothers, Bobby Brewer and Richard Brewer. He is survived by his sons, Brett Brewer and Gunter Brewer; and his five grandchildren, Keaton, Blaine, Lauren, Bailey, and Brogan Brewer.

Coach Brewer served as an inspiration to many people from all walks of life. He will always be remembered as a man who possessed a determined spirit to achieve excellence.

IN HONOR OF VELMA BULVIN'S 100TH BIRTHDAY CELEBRATION

HON. LIZ CHENEY

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 12, 2018

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to extend my congratulations to Velma Bulvin on the celebration of her 100th birthday.

I join her friends and family in extending my best to her on this occasion and in celebrating her life and contributions to our great state

and country. I hope she uses this momentous day to do the same.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I would like to extend my congratulations to Velma Bulvin on her birthday. May her year be filled with happiness and blessings.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. GARRET GRAVES

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 12, 2018

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 314, and YEA on Roll Call No. 315.

HONORING THE DEBERNARDI FAMILY**HON. MIKE THOMPSON**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 12, 2018

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with the Honorable JARED HUFFMAN to honor Don and Bonnie DeBernardi and their family for their immense contribution to the dairy industry in Sonoma County. The DeBernardi family is being honored as the Farm Family of the Year by the Sonoma County Farm Bureau.

Mr. and Ms. DeBernardi are first generation dairy farmers who entered the profession and lifestyle in the hills of Goat Rock in Sonoma County, California in 1968. They have been producing cows' milk since then and in the late 1990s added goats to their farm. Mr. DeBernardi followed the footsteps of his Swiss ancestors and began producing their Tomme-style Two Rock Valley Goat Cheese and expanding the DeBernardi Dairy franchise. They currently have 2,000 acres of owned or leased farmland, which is home to their 700 organic cows and 200 goats.

Mr. and Ms. DeBernardi are active members of our community. They are longtime contributors of 4H, FFA, Petaluma High School and Tomales High School. Mr. DeBernardi sits on the Sonoma County Farm Bureau Board of Directors and is a member of the Western United Dairymen, Druids, Elks, Nicasio Native Sons and the Petaluma Golf and Country Club. Ms. DeBernardi is a founding member of the North Bay Dairy Women and a member of St. Vincent de Paul Church. Mr. DeBernardi was an early supporter of the annual Artisan Cheese Festival and DeBernardi Dairy frequently participates in the community event. In 1979, DeBernardi Dairy was honored as the Dairy of the Year by the Sonoma County Fair.

Today the DeBernardi Dairy has three generations actively participating on the family farm. The entire family shares Mr. and Ms. DeBernardi's passion for the dairy industry and our community. Mr. and Ms. DeBernardi are dedicated stewards of the land and hard-working and passionate people.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. and Ms. DeBernardi and the entire DeBernardi family have made important contributions to our community. It is therefore fitting and proper that we honor them here today.

Thursday, July 12, 2018

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S4923–S4955

Measures Introduced: Fourteen bills and three resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 3199–3212, and S. Res. 573–575.

Pages S4950–51

Measures Reported:

H.R. 965, to redesignate the Saint-Gaudens National Historic Site as the “Saint-Gaudens National Historical Park”. (S. Rept. No. 115–299)

H.R. 995, To direct the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior to modernize terms in certain regulations, with amendments. (S. Rept. No. 115–300)

S. 2946, to amend title 18, United States Code, to clarify the meaning of the terms “act of war” and “blocked asset”, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Page S4950

Measures Passed:

National Whistleblower Appreciation Day: Committee on the Judiciary was discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 558, designating July 30, 2018, as “National Whistleblower Appreciation Day”, and the resolution was then agreed to.

Page S4955

Collector Car Appreciation Day: Senate agreed to S. Res. 574, designating July 13, 2018, as Collector Car Appreciation Day and recognizing that the collection and restoration of historic and classic cars is an important part of preserving the technological achievements and cultural heritage of the United States.

Page S4955

Honoring the Memory of the 5 Victims of the Attack at the Capital Gazette: Senate agreed to S. Res. 575, honoring the memory of the 5 victims of the attack at the Capital Gazette in Annapolis, Maryland, on June 28, 2018.

Page S4955

Quarles Nomination—Cloture: Senate began consideration of the nomination of Randal Quarles, of Colorado, to be a Member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

Page S4933

A motion was entered to close further debate on the nomination, and, in accordance with the provi-

sions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur on Tuesday, July 17, 2018.

Page S4933

Prior to the consideration of this nomination, Senate took the following action:

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Legislative Session.

Page S4933

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Executive Session to consider the nomination.

Page S4933

Oldham Nomination—Cloture: Senate began consideration of the nomination of Andrew S. Oldham, of Texas, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Fifth Circuit.

Page S4933

A motion was entered to close further debate on the nomination, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur upon disposition of the nomination of Randal Quarles, of Colorado, to be a Member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

Page S4933

Prior to the consideration of this nomination, Senate took the following action:

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Legislative Session.

Page S4933

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Executive Session to consider the nomination.

Page S4933

Bounds Nomination—Cloture: Senate began consideration of the nomination of Ryan Wesley Bounds, of Oregon, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit.

Pages S4933–43

A motion was entered to close further debate on the nomination, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur upon disposition of the nomination of Andrew S. Oldham, of Texas, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Fifth Circuit.

Page S4934

Prior to the consideration of this nomination, Senate took the following action:

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Legislative Session.

Page S4933

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Executive Session to consider the nomination.

Page S4933

Stump Nomination—Agreement: A unanimous-consent-time agreement was reached providing that

at approximately 3 p.m., on Monday, July 16, 2018, Senate begin consideration of the nomination of Scott Stump, of Colorado, to be Assistant Secretary for Career, Technical, and Adult Education, Department of Education; that the time until 5:30 p.m. be equally divided between the two Leaders or their designees; and that Senate then vote on confirmation of the nomination with no intervening action or debate.

Page S4955

Nominations Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nominations:

By 70 yeas to 23 nays (Vote No. EX. 154), Paul C. Ney, Jr., of Tennessee, to be General Counsel of the Department of Defense. **Pages S4924–33, S4955**

Kelly Higashi, of the District of Columbia, to be an Associate Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia for the term of fifteen years.

Emory A. Rounds III, of Maine, to be Director of the Office of Government Ethics for a term of five years.

Georgette Mosbacher, of Florida, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Poland. **Pages S4943, S4955**

Messages from the House: **Page S4945**

Measures Referred: **Page S4945**

Petitions and Memorials: **Pages S4945–50**

Executive Reports of Committees: **Page S4950**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S4951–52**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S4952–54**

Additional Statements: **Pages S4944–45**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Pages S4954–55**

Record Votes: One record vote was taken today. (Total—154) **Page S4933**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 5:11 p.m., until 3 p.m. on Monday, July 16, 2018. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S4955.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

FAIR CREDIT REPORTING ACT

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the credit bureaus and the Fair Credit Reporting Act, including S. 2188, to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act to provide protections for consumers after a data breach at a consumer reporting agency, S. 2362, to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act to require that

a consumer authorize the release of certain information, S. 3040, to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act to clarify Federal law with respect to reporting certain positive consumer credit information to consumer reporting agencies, S. 2289, to create an Office of Cybersecurity at the Federal Trade Commission for supervision of data security at consumer reporting agencies, to require the promulgation of regulations establishing standards for effective cybersecurity at consumer reporting agencies, to impose penalties on credit reporting agencies for cybersecurity breaches that put sensitive consumer data at risk, and H.R. 3626, to amend the Bank Service Company Act to provide improvements with respect to State banking agencies, after receiving testimony from Peggy Twohig, Assistant Director, Office of Supervision Policy, Supervision, Enforcement and Fair Lending Division, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection; and Maneesha Mithal, Associate Director, Division of Privacy and Identity Protection, Federal Trade Commission.

INTERSTATE DELIVERY NETWORKS

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the policy issues facing interstate delivery networks for natural gas and electricity, after receiving testimony from James J. Hoecker, Husch Blackwell LLP, and Joseph T. Kelliher, NextEra Energy, Inc., both of Washington, D.C.; J. Curtis Moffatt, Kinder Morgan, Inc., Houston, Texas; and James J. Murchie, Energy Income Partners, LLC, Westport, Connecticut.

TARIFFS

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded a hearing to examine tariffs, focusing on implications for United States foreign policy and the international economy, after receiving testimony from Manisha Singh, Assistant Secretary of State for Economic and Business Affairs; and Joshua Bolten, Business Roundtable, and Michael H. Fuchs, Center for American Progress, both of Washington, D.C.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. 2946, to amend title 18, United States Code, to clarify the meaning of the terms "act of war" and "blocked asset", with an amendment in the nature of a substitute; and

The nominations of 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.

INTELLIGENCE

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee met in closed session to receive a briefing on certain intel-

ligence matters from officials of the intelligence community.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 23 public bills, H.R. 6342–6364; and 2 resolutions, H. Res. 991–992, were introduced. **Pages H6172–74**

Additional Cosponsors: **Page H6175**

Reports Filed: There were no reports filed today.

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative DesJarlais to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H6115**

Recess: The House recessed at 10:45 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon. **Page H6120**

Guest Chaplain: The prayer was offered by the Guest Chaplain, Rev. J. Josh Smith, Prince Avenue Baptist Church, Athens, GA. **Page H6120**

Recess: The House recessed at 4:01 p.m. and reconvened at 4:45 p.m. **Page H6160**

Reclamation Title Transfer and Non-Federal Infrastructure Incentivization Act: The House passed 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 233 ayes to 184 noes, Roll No. 325. **Pages H6154–60, H6161–62**

Rejected the Huffman 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 230 nays, Roll No. 324.

Pages H6160–61

H. Res. 985, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 50) and (H.R. 3281) was agreed to yesterday, July 11th.

Matthew Young Pollard Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 2018 and 2019: The House passed 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, by a yea-and-nay vote of 363 yeas to 54 nays, Roll No. 326. **Pages H6129–54, H6162–63**

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 an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 115–80, in lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute now printed in the bill.

Page H6133

Agreed to:

Schiff amendment (No. 1 printed in H. Rept. 115–815) that adds Russian to the list of the languages in Sec. 1501; **Pages H6144–45**

Schneider amendment (No. 2 printed in H. Rept. 115–815) that amends Sec. 1503 to include a list of foreign state or foreign nonstate actors involved in the threats to election campaigns for Federal offices; **Page H6145**

Jackson Lee amendment (No. 3 printed in H. Rept. 115–815) that amends the Sense of Congress already in the bill on the importance of re-review of security clearances held by individuals by adding consideration of whether the security clearance holder's association or sympathy with persons or organizations that advocate, threaten, or use force or violence, or any other illegal or unconstitutional means, in an effort to prevent others from exercising their rights under the Constitution or laws of the United States or of any state, including but not limited to race, religion, national origin, or disability; **Pages H6145–47**

Vargas amendment (No. 4 printed in H. Rept. 115–815) that adds “the use of virtual currencies” to “section 1505” to ensure it is included in the assessment of threat finance; **Pages H6147–48**

Torres amendment (No. 5 printed in H. Rept. 115–815) that directs Director of National Intelligence, in coordination with the Assistant Secretary of State for Intelligence and Research and the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury for Intelligence and Analysis, to produce a national intelligence estimate of the revenue sources of the North Korean regime; **Pages H6148–49**

Hastings amendment (No. 6 printed in H. Rept. 115–815) that directs the Director of National Intelligence to create and implement a plan that expands the recruitment efforts of all intelligence agencies geographic parameters used in recruitment efforts so

that rural and other underserved regions across the nation are more fully represented in such efforts;

Pages H6149–50

Schneider amendment (No. 7 printed in H. Rept. 115–815) that directs the DNI to report on Iran's support for proxy forces in Syria and Lebanon, including Hezbollah, and an assessment of the threat posed to Israel and other U.S. regional allies;

Pages H6150–51

Bera amendment (No. 8 printed in H. Rept. 115–815) that requires a briefing to relevant Congressional committees on the anticipated geopolitical effects of emerging infectious disease and pandemics, and their implications on the national security of the United States;

Pages H6151–52

Kennedy amendment (No. 9 printed in H. Rept. 115–815) that requires the Director of National Intelligence to submit a report on the potential establishment of the “Foreign Malign Influence Response Center” comprised of analysts from all elements of the intelligence community, to provide comprehensive assessment of foreign efforts to influence United States political processes and elections; **Page H6152**

Rice (NY) amendment (No. 10 printed in H. Rept. 115–815) that requires the Director of National Intelligence to report on the possible exploitation of virtual currencies by terrorist actors;

Pages H6152–53

Lipinski amendment (No. 11 printed in H. Rept. 115–815) that requires an annual report from the Director of National Intelligence describing Iranian expenditures on military and terrorist activities outside the country, such as on Hezbollah, Houthi rebels in Yemen, Hamas, and proxy forces in Iraq and Syria; and **Pages H6153–54**

Davidson amendment (No. 12 printed in H. Rept. 115–815) that enhances oversight by augmenting existing semiannual reporting requirements regarding disciplinary actions. **Page H6154**

H. Res. 989, the rule providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 6237) was agreed to by a recorded vote of 235 ayes to 178 noes, Roll No. 323, after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 229 yeas to 182 nays, Roll No. 322.

Pages H6122–29

Quorum Calls—Votes: Three yea-and-nay votes and two recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H6128, H6128–29, H6161, H6161–62, and H6162–63. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 7:04 p.m.

Committee Meetings

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Full Committee held a 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”. H. Res. 982 and H.R. 6032 were ordered reported, without amendment. H.R. 959, H.R. 1676, H.R. 3728, H.R. 5385, H.R. 2278, H.R. 2389, H.R. 1320, H.R. 6140, H.R. 2345, H.R. 3994, H.R. 4881 and H.R. 5709 were ordered reported, as amended.

THE ANNUAL TESTIMONY OF THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY ON THE STATE OF THE INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL SYSTEM

Committee on Financial Services: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “The Annual Testimony of the Secretary of the Treasury on the State of the International Financial System”. Testimony was heard from Steven T. Mnuchin, Secretary, Department of the Treasury.

COUNTERING THE FINANCIAL NETWORKS OF WEAPONS PROLIFERATION

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Terrorism and Illicit Finance held a hearing entitled “Countering the Financial Networks of Weapons Proliferation”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

NICARAGUAN CRISIS: NEXT STEPS TO ADVANCING DEMOCRACY; MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere held a hearing entitled “Nicaraguan Crisis: Next Steps to Advancing Democracy”; and held a markup on H. Res. 981, condemning the violence, persecution, intimidation, and murders committed by the Government of Nicaragua against its citizens. H. Res 981 was forwarded to the full Committee, without amendment. Testimony was heard from Carlos Trujillo, U.S. Permanent Representative, Organization of American States; Michael Kozak, Senior Advisor and Senior Bureau Official, Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor, Department of State; and Barbara Feinstein, Deputy Assistant Administrator, Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean, U.S. Agency for International Development.

COMBATING TUBERCULOSIS IN SOUTHERN AFRICA

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations held a hearing entitled “Combating Tuberculosis in Southern Africa”. Testimony was heard from Deborah L. Birx, M.D., U.S. Global AIDS Coordinator, U.S. Special Representative for Global Health Diplomacy, Department of State; Irene Koek, Senior Deputy Assistant Administrator, Global Health Bureau, U.S. Agency for International Development; and Rebecca Martin, Director, Center for Global Health, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Department of Health and Human Services.

ACCESS DENIED: KEEPING ADVERSARIES AWAY FROM THE HOMELAND SECURITY SUPPLY CHAIN

Committee on Homeland Security: Subcommittee on Counterterrorism and Intelligence; and Subcommittee on Oversight and Management Efficiency held a joint hearing entitled “Access Denied: Keeping Adversaries Away from the Homeland Security Supply Chain”. Testimony was heard from Gregory Wilshusen, Director of Information Security Issues, Government Accountability Office, and the following Department of Homeland Security officials: Soraya Correa, Chief Procurement Officer, Office of the Chief Procurement Officer; John Zangardi, Chief Information Officer, Office of the Chief Information Officer; Jeanette Manfra, Assistant Secretary, Office of Cybersecurity and Communications, National Protection and Programs Directorate; and Tina W. Gabbielli, (Acting) Deputy Under Secretary for In-

telligence Enterprise Operations. A portion of this hearing was closed.

OVERSIGHT OF FBI AND DOJ ACTIONS SURROUNDING THE 2016 ELECTION: TESTIMONY BY FBI DEPUTY ASSISTANT DIRECTOR PETER STRZOK

Committee on the Judiciary: Full Committee; and full Committee of the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform held a hearing entitled “Oversight of FBI and DOJ Actions Surrounding the 2016 Election: Testimony by FBI Deputy Assistant Director Peter Strzok”. Testimony was heard from Peter Strzok, Deputy Assistant Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation.

THE ESSENTIAL ROLE OF LIVESTOCK GRAZING ON FEDERAL LANDS AND ITS IMPORTANCE TO RURAL AMERICA

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Federal Lands held a hearing entitled “The Essential Role of Livestock Grazing on Federal Lands and its Importance to Rural America”. Testimony was heard from Brad Little, Lieutenant Governor, Idaho; and public witnesses.

BIG DATA CHALLENGES AND ADVANCED COMPUTING SOLUTIONS

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Subcommittee on Energy; and Subcommittee on Research and Technology held a joint hearing entitled “Big Data Challenges and Advanced Computing Solutions”. Testimony was heard from Bobby Kasthuri, Researcher, Argonne National Laboratory; Katherine Yelick, Associate Laboratory Director for Computing Sciences, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory; and public witnesses.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Veterans’ Affairs: Full Committee held a 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. The resolutions to assign Representative Bill Flores of Texas to the Subcommittees on Health and Economic Opportunity; to amend Rule 5 of the Committee Rules for the 115th Congress to establish a new Subcommittee on Technology Modernization; to approve the ratio of the Subcommittee on Technology Modernization; to appoint the Chairman and Majority Members of the Subcommittee on Technology Modernization; and to appoint the Ranking

Member and Minority Member of the Subcommittee on Technology Modernization were adopted.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Full Committee held a 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. H.R. 2787, H.R. 5649, H.R. 5693, H.R. 6066 were ordered reported, as amended. H.R. 2409, H.R. 5538, H.R. 5864, H.R. 5882, H.R. 5938, H.R. 5974 were ordered reported, without amendment.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Ways and Means: Full Committee concluded markup on H.R. 6301, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide high deductible health plans with first dollar coverage flexibility; H.R. 6317, 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 rea-

son 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. H.R. 6301, H.R. 6317, H.R. 6305, H.R. 6309, H.R. 6199, H.R. 6312, H.R. 4616, H.R. 6306, H.R. 6313, H.R. 6314, and H.R. 6311 were ordered reported, as amended.

Joint Meetings

APPROPRIATIONS PROCESS CHALLENGES

Joint Select Committee on Budget and Appropriations Process Reform: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the current challenges facing the appropriations process in Congress and discuss possibilities for improvement, after receiving testimony from former Representatives Leon Panetta and David Obey.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR FRIDAY, JULY 13, 2018

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

No meetings/hearings scheduled.

House

No hearings are scheduled.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

3 p.m., Monday, July 16

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

9 a.m., Friday, July 13

Senate Chamber

Program for Monday: Senate will begin consideration of the nomination of Scott Stump, of Colorado, to be Assistant Secretary for Career, Technical, and Adult Education, Department of Education, and vote on confirmation of the nomination at 5:30 p.m.

House Chamber

Program for Friday: Complete consideration of H.R. 50—Unfunded Mandates Information and Transparency Act.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue**HOUSE**

Bilirakis, Gus M., Fla., E1002
 Blum, Rod, Iowa, E1005
 Brooks, Susan W., Ind., E1003
 Buck, Ken, Colo., E1001
 Cheney, Liz, Wyo., E1007
 Clyburn, James E., S.C., E1003
 Coffman, Mike, Colo., E1001

Comstock, Barbara, Va., E1004
 Flores, Bill, Tex., E1005
 Garamendi, John, Calif., E1006
 Graves, Garret, La., E1008
 Higgins, Brian, N.Y., E1001
 Jenkins, Lynn, Kans., E1001, E1002
 Kelly, Trent, Miss., E1002, E1004, E1007
 Krishnamoorthi, Ill., E1007
 Long, Billy, Mo., E1006

Luetkemeyer, Blaine, Mo., E1001, E1002, E1002, E1002, E1003, E1003, E1004, E1005, E1005, E1006
 Ryan, Paul D., Wis., E1001
 Schakowsky, Janice D., Ill., E1006
 Schweikert, David, Ariz., E1006
 Thompson, Mike, Calif., E1002, E1005, E1007, E1008
 Tonko, Paul, N.Y., E1002



Congressional Record

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.