

Karabakh. Twenty thousand people were killed and hundreds of thousands more were displaced before the conflict froze.

While an agreed upon ceasefire has been held for over 2 decades, the lack of a formal end to the war has left the Armenian people of Nagorno-Karabakh isolated.

Un-detonated mines and cluster bombs from the conflict remain in the region. As a result, Karabakh has one of the world's highest civilian casualty rates from land mines and the explosive remnants of war.

According to the HALO Trust, there have been nearly 400 civilian casualties from mines and unexploded ordnance in Karabakh over the last 2 decades, and a quarter of those land mine victims have been children.

In 2013, a needs assessment estimated that the HALO Trust's interventions in Karabakh have benefited over 80 percent of the region's population.

Mr. Chair, families and children shouldn't have to live in fear of dying due to a land mine accident. That is why I urge my colleagues in the House of Representatives to support my amendment.

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chair, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ROUDA) having assumed the chair, Mr. VAN DREW, 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. 2740) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR,  
HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES,  
AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED  
AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS  
ACT, 2020

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 431 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2740.

Will the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. VAN DREW) kindly take the chair.

□ 1450

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 further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2740) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes, with Mr. VAN DREW (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole House rose earlier today pursuant to House Resolution 431, further proceedings on amendment No. 87 printed in part B of House Report 116-109 offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN) had been postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 89 OFFERED BY MR. WALKER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 89 printed in part B of House Report 116-109.

Mr. WALKER. 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 405, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$3,366,500,000)".

Page 409, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$5,930,000,000)".

Page 410, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$4,164,867,000)".

Page 410, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$4,435,312,000)".

Page 411, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$92,043,000)".

Page 412, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$30,000,000)".

Page 413, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$172,700,000)".

Page 414, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$101,000,000)".

Page 414, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$770,334,000)".

Page 416, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$3,532,000,000)".

Page 416, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$1,000,000)".

Page 417, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$425,000,000)".

Page 418, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$905,000,000)".

Page 419, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$32,500,000)".

Page 419, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$30,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 431, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WALKER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chair, less than 10 days ago, this body missed a perfect opportunity. You see, natural disasters are unpredictable, but you know what isn't? Congress failing to do their job and prepare for them.

For too long Washington has governed by crisis and shifted its responsibility to adequately care for those in need, opting instead to saddle our children and grandchildren with an impossible debt.

Then days ago, this body wanted to spend more than \$19 billion with no consideration of how to pay for it. Was it for a worthy cause? Absolutely. Of course. I would hope that every dollar appropriated by Congress is for a worthy cause. But as then-Representative MIKE PENCE said in 2005, following the devastation of Hurricane Katrina, does Congress have a duty to ensure that a catastrophe of nature does not become a catastrophe of debt?

Congress should pay for these emergency packages by either cutting

spending in other areas that are less of a priority or responsibly budgeting for them ahead of time.

Disaster aid shouldn't be added to the debt. That is akin to going to the emergency room after an injury, putting the charges on a credit card, and then pretending that credit card bill is never going to arrive.

The bottom line is this, that even during an emergency, Washington needs to pay its bills.

My amendment is relatively simple, Mr. Chair. My amendment would be a 1-year reallocation of the Department of State and USAID's bilateral economic assistance and independent agency funds to cover the disaster recovery.

Let me explain. Combined, these accounts amount to more than \$23.9 billion and would fully cover the disaster recovery, including the \$5.87 billion in debt servicing costs of the borrowed funds, all while prioritizing America's recovery and resiliency.

America is still the most philanthropic country in the world and would continue to be.

Mr. Chair, this amendment recognizes our dire fiscal health by reducing foreign aid during these times and prioritizing Americans and American recovery efforts first.

As the President and this administration have said on multiple occasions, we must prioritize our domestic needs first and put the American citizens at the front of the line, especially during these times of disaster relief and especially since we are the ones that will foot the bill.

With these spending offsets, I believe we can show the American people we are serious about their recovery from disasters in a fiscally responsible manner that will not burden our future generations with debt and despair.

Finally, we can help our neighbors and serve the Americans impacted by natural disasters by prioritizing our families before foreign interests.

Congress should take this opportunity to put America first and lead responsibly.

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chair, Ranking Member ROGERS and I have worked hard to craft a bill that provides the necessary tools to the Secretary of State and USAID Administrator to advance United States foreign policy.

Smart use of global health, humanitarian, and development assistance supports the United States' interests, builds greater global stability, and promotes American values.

The gentleman's amendment would, not trim, but entirely cut all these investments, including support to 14.7 million people receiving lifesaving HIV treatment, including 700,000 children;

70 million children learning to read with U.S. assistance; 68.5 million refugees displaced by conflict or natural disasters; and 7,200 Peace Corps volunteers serving as excellent representatives of the United States.

How are these cuts in our national interest?

Mr. Chair, I urge a “no” vote on the gentleman’s amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chair, my amendment is simple. It is about prioritizing domestic needs. It is about prioritizing these families that have suffering. It is about prioritizing these children who are suffering.

We need to be responsible.

Mr. Chair, I thank the chairwoman and the ranking member for their hard work in the appropriations process, but nowhere is this spending disaster relief ever talked about. It is time that we do so.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chair, our national security is strongest when development, diplomacy, and defense are equally prioritized.

This amendment undermines United States leadership and diminishes our engagement in the world.

Mr. Chair, I strongly urge my colleagues to oppose 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 North Carolina (Mr. WALKER).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 91 OFFERED BY MR. PALMER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 91 printed in part B of House Report 116-109.

Mr. PALMER. 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 599, strike line 3 and all that follows through line 17 (and redesignate accordingly).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 431, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would strike the section that allows payments to go towards the Paris climate agreement. Most importantly, it would allow President Trump to follow through on his plan to withdraw from the agreement.

Just a few months ago, it was reported that the U.S. economy exceeded analysts’ predictions and grew at over 3 percent in the first quarter of this year.

In October of last year, unemployment had a mere 50-year low, and wages are going up. In fact, the Bureau of Labor Statistics reported there are 7.4 million jobs available.

Mr. Chair, now those on the other side of the aisle want to put at risk that growth and enforce policies that will do nothing to stop climate change.

□ 1500

What would staying in the agreement lead to?

The Heritage Foundation has modeled the policies that would be required to meet the Obama administration’s Paris commitments and found that by 2035 there would be an overall loss of nearly 400,000 jobs, half of which would be in manufacturing, an average total income lost of more than \$20,000 for a family of four, an aggregate GDP loss of over \$2.5 trillion, and an increase in household electricity expenditures between 13 percent and 20 percent.

My amendment would allow the United States to stay out of this unrealistic and overbearing agreement. I urge the Members to vote “yes” on this amendment.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PALMER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I rise in support of his amendment.

The Paris Agreement is an unworkable, unrealistic policy solution to climate change. If implemented, as the gentleman has said, the Paris accord could cost as many as 2.7 million American jobs by 2025 and imposes no meaningful obligations on the world’s leading polluters like China and India.

I can’t condone dedicating precious Federal funds to a half-baked solution. This amendment would strike funding provided for implementing that agreement, as well as language that attempts to prevent President Trump from withdrawing.

I urge Members to support the gentleman’s amendment, and I thank him for yielding.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Our global partners are critical in combating climate change, and the Paris Agreement is a sign of the global commitment from these countries to fight this scourge together.

In addition, climate change is a serious national security threat, and we need to treat it as such by seeking allies, including multilateral institutions to address it with urgency.

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

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chair, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES), the ranking member on the Select Committee on the Climate Crisis.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Alabama for yielding. I want to thank him for bringing this amendment up.

Mr. Chairman, it is really important to make sure we understand what we are talking about here. The Paris accord was engaged in for the purpose of benefiting the global environment, for benefiting the global environment and for reducing emissions, yet what has happened under the agreement with the pledges that the nations have made is that the United States, over the last several years, has actually reduced our emissions by nearly a billion tons. China has actually increased theirs by 4 billion tons.

This agreement is so disparate it doesn’t make sense. The President was right to withdraw.

But to distinguish, we can stay focused on the targets, the pledges, but we should not codify, memorialize, agree, or in anyway comply with this disparate approach where China can continue polluting the environment.

Mr. Chairman, this is similar to a scenario where I get together with a group of friends and I say, hey, we are going to have a savings club, and we are all going to get together, and I am going put money into it, and they are going come and take money out. That is not a savings club. That is what is happening.

This is not benefiting the environment. The United States should not participate, codify, or support this scenario where China is out there more than increasing by the emissions reductions that the United States is achieving.

We have had the greatest emissions reductions in the world, greater than the next 11 countries combined, and we have done it without this agreement.

I urge adoption of the amendment.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROUDA).

Mr. ROUDA. Mr. Chair, when are my colleagues on the other side of the aisle going to give up this toddler argument that we should not take action to address the number one issue facing humankind, and that is climate change?

The fact that other countries are not moving as fast as we are is no reason for us to give up the mantle of leadership and allow the United States of America to be the only country on the face of the Earth not a member of the Paris climate accord.

It is time for us to be on the right side of history, and I would implore the Members on the other side of the aisle to recognize this is their time to do the right thing, not just for us, but for our children, our grandchildren, and future generations.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chair, I would like to point out that the United States has led the world in reducing carbon emissions, and I would also like to point out that even former Secretary of State John Kerry, in 2015, stated, if we somehow eliminated all domestic greenhouse gas emissions—guess what—it still wouldn't be enough to offset the carbon pollution coming from the rest of the world.

I would also like to point out that, in a hearing before the Select Committee on the Climate Crisis, I asked the Democrat witnesses, including an author and editor of the International Panel on Climate Change, if the United States completely eliminated all of its carbon emissions, would it stop climate change, and their answer was it would not.

We have led the world in reducing carbon emissions without harming our economy, and it makes no sense scientifically or from an engineering perspective to engage in destroying our own economy when the rest of the world and, particularly, China and other emerging economies are not doing their part to reduce their carbon emissions.

I want to emphasize the fact that eliminating our carbon emissions will not stop climate change. Sound science, technology, and sound engineering will do more to mitigate and adapt than anything else you can do.

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chair, the best and the brightest among us—our military, our business leaders, our scientists—all agree that climate change is real and is a serious threat. We are already experiencing its harmful effects which will continue if we do not act alongside our multilateral partners. If we want to prepare our country to better mitigate and manage climate change, then I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama will be postponed.

The Chair understands that amendment No. 92 will not be offered.

The Chair also understands that amendment No. 93 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 94 OFFERED BY MR. ARRINGTON

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 94 printed in part B of House Report 116–109.

Mr. ARRINGTON. 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:

At the end of division D (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for contributions to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 431, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARRINGTON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment to H.R. 2740 that would prevent funds from being used to contribute to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change.

Mr. Chairman, at the heart of America's economic prosperity and unrivaled security is an abundant, affordable supply of domestic energy, and the lion's share of that, 90 percent, is fossil energy. The hardworking energy producers of west Texas and the folks in my district are leading the way.

In the Permian Basin of west Texas, we went from producing a million barrels of oil a day to 4 million a day, soon to be 8 million in just 3 or 4 years, making it the most active oil and gas producing region in the world.

The blessings of these natural resources have given us an overwhelming advantage for economic prosperity as well as national security. To ensure we continue these advantages for the next generation, I offer this amendment that would prevent U.S. taxpayer dollars from going to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, a costly, ineffective, and irresponsible program that has produced the likes of the Paris climate accord.

The climate activists' agenda, Mr. Chairman, and extreme ideological views promoted by the Framework Convention embrace the view that the only means to successfully reduce carbon emissions is to eliminate conventional fuels, which, by the way, power our Nation's economy, again, at 90 percent.

This framework is flawed in its assumptions, fraught with political bias, hostile towards our main source of energy, and amounts to a jobs program for ideological bureaucrats, and I oppose it and so do the people of west Texas and most of the people in this country.

And did I mention that we spend billions of dollars to subsidize the biggest polluters to comply with the mandates from this framework and completely transition away from conventional energy sources?

America would pay out of the nose to fuel their vehicles and heat their homes. It would hurt our poor people more than anyone else.

The Paris accord is the most recent product and egregious example of this framework. At best, the Paris Agreement is political window dressing. At

worst, it is a tax on middle- and working-class families, with a price tag that, in just 5 years, would amount to \$250 billion in costs to our economy and 2.7 million jobs. Meanwhile, it would have forced us to subsidize the world's biggest polluters, like India, and it would give a pass to hostile powers like Russia and China for years.

I believe we have an environmental stewardship responsibility to our creator and to our children, but we must be responsible to balance those stewardship responsibilities with our economic and national security interests.

Here is the irony, Mr. Chairman. The irony is that America is already leading the way for a cleaner environment, and we are leading by example, not by words, by flowery words, fancy phrases, big speeches, fear-mongering. We are leading by example.

And we are doing this not through Big Government solutions, one-size-fits-all, top-down mandates. We are doing it through innovation and technology development in partnership with industry, and the results are remarkable and measurable.

Greenhouse gases are down by 14 percent since '05, the rest of the world up 20 percent; carbon emissions down 20 percent, the rest of the world up; methane gas cut in half. Since 1970, all the six key pollutants in the Clean Air Act, down 73 percent.

And this President is the only one who has put in a legally sound greenhouse gas emissions standard that will reduce the coal power plants' emissions by 34 percent of the levels they were at in 2005.

That is progress. Those are real results.

It is reckless and naive to bind taxpayers to international agreements that compromise our freedom and our economic security and virtually do nothing to impact the environment. Instead, we should put forth solutions that encourage the continued development of all energy sources while setting high but reasonable standards for environmental quality in human health, and achieve those objectives not in hostility to the energy source that has blessed us with all the things that I have mentioned and not through abuse of Presidential powers, but in partnership with States and other important stakeholders.

I urge my colleagues to support this very important amendment.

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

□ 1515

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chair, climate change is a global threat that the United States cannot tackle alone, and the U.N. Framework Convention on Climate Change convenes multilateral partners working together to mitigate damage to our globe.

The United States has been a party to the UNFCCC since 1992, thanks in large part to the leadership of the George H.W. Bush administration.

As chairwoman of the Appropriations Committee, I will not support efforts that will jeopardize our treaty-based obligations.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

Mr. Chair, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROUDA).

Mr. ROUDA. Mr. Chair, the gentleman knows the Paris climate accord is voluntary, so he does not save one job by declining to follow the protocol that we previously agreed on.

I do agree that there are economic opportunities that we can embrace, new technologies. I would love to see us work across the aisle to do just that.

As a former Republican, I used to be in that party because of its environmental stewardship, because it believed that capitalism could help solve these problems. I still believe it as a Democrat on this side of the aisle, and I am hopeful that we can work together.

For example, for every \$1 that we provide in economic incentives for renewable energies, we have provided \$80 to the fossil fuel industry. Clearly, if we had parity, we would see a much faster adoption of clean energies and the dissemination of clean energies by the existing energy companies. I can't wait to work with my colleagues across the aisle to accomplish that outcome.

Ninety-seven percent of scientists recognize that climate change is real. The Department of Defense recognizes this is one of the top, if not the number one, national threats to our security.

Let's work together. Let's quit pointing fingers across the aisle and using rhetoric that does not move forward an important issue that all of us should be fighting hard to address.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chair, the United States is a world leader in many areas, and we need to step up on climate change.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to oppose 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 Texas (Mr. ARRINGTON).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas will be postponed.

The Chair understands that amendment No. 96 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 98 OFFERED BY MR. BANKS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No 98 printed in part B of House Report 116-109.

Mr. BANKS. 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:

At the end of division D (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. —. Each amount made available in division D, except those amounts made available to the Department of Defense, is hereby reduced by 14 percent.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 431, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BANKS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BANKS. Mr. Chair, my amendment would apply a 14 percent reduction in the amounts made available for this division. However, it is important to note that this amendment would not apply to amounts made available for the Department of Defense and would have no effect on foreign military financing.

As my colleague highlights, there are worthy programs in this division to help us build and maintain strong relationships around the world, but we cannot continue to be a dependable friend to those in need if we do not put our own fiscal house in order first.

As I mentioned previously, Washington is addicted to spending. Our national debt today stands at over \$22 trillion. We are set here to add trillions of dollars more in debt every year for the foreseeable future if we continue down this path of spending without any fiscal discipline.

We need to act now to prevent a debt crisis that consumes our children and our grandchildren. Unfortunately, it appears that this is not a priority for my friends across the aisle.

America needs leadership to solve this problem. That is why I am here today again proposing that we start by making commonsense reductions to discretionary spending, like the one that I am proposing today to this division of H.R. 2740.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chair, the amendment applies an indiscriminate 14 percent across-the-board cut to all programs, projects, and activities in the bill, apart from those administered by the Defense Department.

The members of our committee worked hard to craft a bill that provides the Secretary of State and the USAID Administrator the necessary tools to advance United States economic and security interests abroad. While we did not agree on every issue, the bill prioritizes the programs and activities that Members on both sides of the aisle requested.

For example, under the amendment, global health programs would be cut by

\$1.3 billion, including drastic cuts to HIV/AIDS, maternal and child health, family planning, and infectious disease programs.

Humanitarian assistance, including funds to respond to those displaced by the crises in Venezuela, Syria, Iraq, Yemen, and South Sudan, would be cut by \$1.5 billion.

Embassy security, which ensures the protection of our diplomatic and development personnel and facilities overseas, would be cut by \$850 million.

Development assistance, which supports basic education, water, sanitation programs, efforts to combat human and wildlife trafficking, and global food security activities in the developing world would be cut by \$583 million.

Mr. Chair, I strongly urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BANKS. Mr. Chair, the contrast here couldn't be any clearer. We have so many young people who are watching us in the gallery today. At home, I have three daughters who are aged 9, 7, and 6. If we don't do something about a \$22 trillion national debt today, they are going to be holding the bag for the lack of leadership in this Congress that they are seeing firsthand with the spend, spend, spend mindset of politicians in Washington, D.C.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle want to continue spending outside of our government's means. What I hear from families back home in northeast Indiana is if they can live within a budget and if they can live within their means, why can't Washington, D.C., do the same?

Hoosiers are used to a State government with a balanced budget every year, that passes balanced budget after balanced budget and lives within its means at our State house, as well. Yet, they see exactly the opposite time and time again in Washington. They see deficits on the rise. They see the national debt grow at astronomical rates, to over \$22 trillion today.

That is why I am here again today, the second day in a row, offering an amendment to cut across the board 14 percent without affecting defense spending or foreign military financing to address our national security concerns.

Why am I here doing this for the second day in a row? It is because the Democratic majority has failed the most fundamental leadership test of all. The majority promised if they got the majority in the last election, they would pass a budget. They have failed to do that. By failing to do that, we are here today proposing cuts to discretionary spending to the tune of 14 percent.

Now, you might ask yourself, why 14 percent? That seems like an abnormal number to start with. Fourteen percent across the board is what it is going to take to balance the budget.

I have chaired the Republican Study Committee's spending and budget task

force over the past several months. With a group of many of my colleagues, we worked tirelessly every week to propose a budget of our own. Right now, it is the only budget in this Congress that has been proposed. It cuts spending to the tune of trillions of dollars, and it balances in 6 years.

To get to that balanced budget, it is an across-the-board 14 percent reduction in nondefense and discretionary spending.

Mr. Chair, I am going to be back. I am going to come back time and time again, proposing this same amendment for across-the-board cuts of 14 percent because my daughters' generation and the young people who are watching us in the gallery today are depending on it.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair would remind Members to avoid references to occupants of the gallery.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chair, I strongly urge a "no" vote on the gentleman's amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BANKS).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. BANKS. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana will be postponed.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chair, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ROUDA) having assumed the chair, Mr. VAN DREW, 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. 2740) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR,  
HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES,  
AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED  
AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS  
ACT, 2020

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 436 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2740.

Will the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. VAN DREW) kindly resume the chair.

□ 1528

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 further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2740) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes, with Mr. VAN DREW (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today pursuant to House Resolution 436, further proceedings on amendments en bloc offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) had been postponed.

□ 1530

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. ALLEN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part A of House Report 116-111.

Mr. ALLEN. 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:

At the end of division D (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_ . Each amount made available by this division is hereby reduced by 1 percent.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 436, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Chair, we are nearly 6 months into the Democratic-controlled House of Representatives, and here we are debating amendments to an almost \$1 trillion minibus, \$176 billion above current budget caps, without even a glimpse of a fiscal year 2020 budget proposal from House Democrats.

You might ask, how did we get to this point? Well, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are operating on a premise that an increase in defense spending justifies increases in non-defense spending across the board.

Now and always, strengthening our defense should remain priority number one, but providing more than twice as much additional funding in fiscal year 2020 for nondefense programs as for defense programs is simply irresponsible.

Additionally, if Congress does not come to a budget cap agreement, these spending levels would lead to sequestration, which would be devastating to our military.

Folks, as a former business owner and someone who has experience operating within a budget, I am appalled by the lack of fiscal responsibility being shown here today. With an almost \$22 trillion national debt, this minibus is a complete disservice to our country and our fellow Americans.

If we wish to avoid passing an insurmountable debt along to the future generations, we must act immediately to tighten the purse strings on Washington's spending habits.

My amendment today is simple. It would reduce State and Foreign Operations spending by 1 percent for fiscal year 2020. Democrats have increased this division by \$2 billion, bringing foreign nondefense spending to a whopping \$56 billion.

If you do the math, my amendment would cut \$560 million. Even with my 1 percent cut, this division will still increase spending for fiscal year 2020 compared to fiscal year 2019.

So, in my mind, my Democratic colleagues should support my amendment, as they will still be spending a lot more of your hard-earned money, just a bit less than they intended.

It is not my intention to cut funding going towards our critical ally, Israel. And while our diplomatic efforts abroad are necessary, it is equally as important that we take a hard look at the balance sheet and make appropriate cuts wherever possible.

Also, just to be clear, it was my goal to offer an amendment to reduce spending by 1 percent across all branches in this minibus spending package, with the exception of defense. However, House Democrats blocked this effort, continued to promote out-of-control government spending and neglecting our national debt crisis, and only ruled this amendment in order.

Mr. Chair, I am a proud grandfather of 13 grandchildren, and I believe it is my duty to do everything in my power to avoid placing a \$22 trillion—and rising—burden on their backs.

I urge my colleagues in this body to support my amendment today and take a small step towards bringing fiscal responsibility back to Washington.

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chair, our committee has worked hard on a bipartisan basis to craft a bill that provides the Secretary of State and the U.S. administrator with the necessary tools to advance United States foreign policy.

As I have said before, I have long opposed amendments that indiscriminately apply across-the-board cuts to the carefully thought-out funding recommendations in appropriations bills.

Such amendments make no provision for protecting high-priority programs and activities. For example, the amendment would cut \$33 million from security assistance to Israel. It would cut \$92 million from global health programs, including \$118 million less for HIV/AIDS; \$79 million from lifesaving humanitarian assistance; and \$60 million from funds made available to protect our diplomats and development personnel and their facilities.

Cuts would also impact funding for other key allies, such as Jordan, Egypt, Ukraine, Colombia, and countries in Eastern Europe battling Russian aggression and disinformation.